Mandatory
FORM # SPS-135
EDAC REVIEWED
03/22/2024 for 2024-2025

Executive Summary

School Information

School Name	Grades Served	Phone
Academy of Advanced Learning	NA	7205005252
District Name	**Website**	**Description**
Charter School Institute		

The Academy of Advanced Learning (AAL), located in Aurora, opened its doors in August 2017. Even before the COVID-19 crisis, Third Future Schools (TFS) had a real sense of urgency around narrowing achievement gaps and preparing our students for a Year 2035 workplace and world. We knew that we would have to help our students demonstrate well over a year's growth in one year in order to close the gap. At the same time, we knew that another gap was growing: the Year 2035 competencies gap. This was the gap in skills related to problem-solving, information literacy, communications, critical thinking, student agency, and learning how to learn. In the 2020-2021 school year, AAL remained open every scheduled day since the beginning of school on August 5. AAL had an average RIT Growth Score of 1.33 as measured by the NWEA MAP EOY assessment that year. The current local and national public education realities do not change our sense of urgency around narrowing these gaps and getting our students ready for a fundamentally different world and workplace. If anything, the current trends raise warnings about the gaps getting larger if collectively we do not do something to fundamentally change how we educate students. Third Future Schools system is based on some fundamentally

different principles of operating schools and because we have an intense focus on closing the achievement gap and preparing students for the Year 2035 world and workplace. We will stay the course. That means we will continue to focus on high-quality instruction in the LSAE model, improve implementation of the Dyad concept, and implement a strategic focus on literacy development and growth. The Academy of Advanced Learning's Parent Action Committee (PAC) and the School Accountability Committee (SAC) contributed to the development of the UIP via the quarterly meetings. The UIP will be monitored and revisited throughout the school year with multiple stakeholder groups (e.g., PAC, SAC, staff, and community partners). Current demographic data for AAL is as follows: 1% Asian, 16% African American, 72% Hispanic, 6% Caucasian, 1%, Pacific Islander, and 4% Two or More Races. The school student population is 50.3% male and 49.7% female. AAL currently has 66% of its students categorized as English Language Learners, 7% qualify for Special Education services, 61% fall under the Free/Reduced School Lunch plan, and 33% have a READ Plan.

School Contact Information

Name: Shirley Miles

Title: Chief of Schools

Phone: 7034778152

Email: shirley.miles@thirdfuture.org

Name: Damon Difabio

Title: Principal

Phone: 719.922.1182

Email: damon.difabio@thirdfuture.org

Relationship of UIP Elements

Student Performance Priorities	Root Cause	Major Improvement Strategies
• *Individual growth numbers by student are lower than expected.*	• Emphasis on overall school results rather than individual student progress • Systems for monitoring indiv. student growth not consistent or used for reteach. • Tiered coaching and feedback systems for teachers are not consistent.	• data driven progress monitoring • Tiered teacher coaching • targeted intervention blocks • Math Fluency and Conceptual Balance
• *ELA achievement remains below expectations particularly for multilingual learner*	• Lack of high-quality teacher trng. in delivering effective literacy instruction • Teachers inconsistent in addressing literacy development & language acquisition • Multilingual learners face persistent gaps in vocab & acad language	• Differentiated Literacy development for Multilingual Learners • Science of Reading Implementation • Frequent Progress Monitoring with Dibels/mClass • Extended Literacy Opportunities
• *Math achievement lags behind growth, especially at the Meets/Exceeds level.*	• Instruction doesn't consistently push students to higher levels of proficiency • Learning coaches have limited trng. to provide high-quality, rigorous feedback • Instruction often emphasizes procedural fluency w/o extending conceptual depth.	• Rigorous Problem-Solving Instruction • Learning Coach Training for Math Support • Math Fluency and Conceptual Balance • Advanced Learner Extensions
	• SoR practices aren't fully implemented with fidelity across all K-4 classrooms • Teachers need ongoing PD and coaching in explicit literacy strategies.	• Full CKLA Rollout and Training • Intensive Intervention for Students with SRDs • Monthly Dibels Monitoring and Rapid Response

- *Early literacy and Science of Reading Implementation*

- Multilingual learners and students with SRDs require targeted interventions
- Progress monitoring is inconsistent, delaying timely adjustments to instruction

- Family Engagement in Literacy
- Differentiated Literacy development for Multilingual Learners

Student Performance Priorities

Student Performance Priority Summary

- The Academy of Advanced Learning (AAL) has shown strong overall growth in recent years, but achievement outcomes remain below expectations. The 2023 SPF placed AAL in the *Performance Plan* category with 66.7 points, while the 2025 preliminary SPF dropped to 57.2 points (*Improvement Plan*). This decline reflects persistent gaps in both ELA and Math achievement, particularly for Multilingual Learners and students with disabilities, despite steady or above-average growth in some areas.

  Elementary growth performance in 2025 was inconsistent, with ELA at the 40th percentile and Math at the 47th percentile (Approaching), while middle school growth was stronger (ELA at 55.5 and Math at 62.0, Meets). However, low achievement persists across both levels. Multilingual Learners scored in the bottom percentiles in ELA and Math, and "On Track to English Language Proficiency" declined sharply from 60.9% in 2023 to 28.6% in 2025. These results confirm that while many students are progressing, too few are reaching proficiency.

  Based on this analysis, AAL has identified four priority performance challenges: (1) individual student growth is inconsistent across grades and content areas; (2) ELA achievement remains below expectations, particularly for Multilingual Learners; (3) Math achievement lags behind growth, especially at the *Meets/Exceeds* level; and (4) instructional quality and staff capacity are uneven. These challenges directly connect to the 2025–26 Action Plan strategies, including the Science of Reading, LSAE fidelity, targeted coaching, and stronger Learning Coach training.

Student Performance Priority: Individual growth numbers by student are lower than expected.

Student Performance Priority Category

What group(s) is this Student Performance Priority focused on? (Choose all that apply OR select "All Student Population." If targeted student group is not listed, choose "Other" to specity.)

All Student Population

What grade(s) is this Student Performance Priority focused on? (Choose all that apply OR select "All Grades Served")

All Grades Served

What is the current performance of this Student Performance Priority?

Elementary growth: ELA MGP = 40.0, Math MGP = 47.0 (approaching); Middle school growth: ELA MGP = 55.5, Math MGP = 62.0 (meets)

What is the 2-year (end of 2026-27) measure and target?

Raise elementary ELA and Math to > 60 MGP (solid Meets, approaching Exceeds); middle school growth at > 65 MGP (Exceeds)

What is the 1-year (end of 2025-26) measure and target?

Raise elementary ELA growth to > 50 MGP (meets) and Math to > 55 MGP (Meets); maintain middle school growth at or above 60 MGP in both ELA and Math

Interim Measure and Target?

MOY NWEA assessment

Measurement Dates

Student Performance Priority: ELA achievement remains below expectations particularly for multilingual learner

Student Performance Priority Category

What group(s) is this Student Performance Priority focused on? (Choose all that apply OR select "All Student Population." If targeted student group is not listed, choose "Other" to specity.)

English Learners/Multi-Language Learners

What grade(s) is this Student Performance Priority focused on? (Choose all that apply OR select "All Grades Served")

All Grades Served

What is the current performance of this Student Performance Priority?

Elementary ELA mean scale score = 722.4 (15th percentile - Approaching; middle school ELA mean scale score = 724.7 (16th percentile - Approaching). Multilingual learners: elementary = 715.1 (5th percentile) and middle school = 717.9 (6th percentile).

What is the 2-year (end of 2026-27) measure and target?

Raise all students in ELA to the 35th percentile (Meets). Multilingual learners reach at least the 20th percentile.

What is the 1-year (end of 2025-26) measure and target?

Raise all students in ELA to the 25th percentile (Approaching to Meets). Improve multilingual learners by at least 5 percentile points (to 10th percentile or higher).

Interim Measure and Target?

MOY NWEA

Measurement Dates

Student Performance Priority: Math achievement lags behind growth, especially at the Meets/Exceeds level.

Student Performance Priority Category

What group(s) is this Student Performance Priority focused

on? (Choose all that apply OR select "All Student Population." If targeted student group is not listed, choose "Other" to specity.)

All Student Population

What is the current performance of this Student Performance Priority?

Elementary math mean scale score = 723.6 (24th percentile, Approaching); middle school mean scale score = 728.7 (42 percentile, Approaching); few students at the Meets/Exceeds - <25% on CMAS.

What is the 2-year (end of 2026-27) measure and target?

Raise elementary math to > 40th percentile; middle school math to > 60th percentile. Increase percentage of students scoring Meets/Exceeds in Math by 10 to 12 points.

What is the 1-year (end of 2025-26) measure and target?

Raise elementary math to > 30th percentile; middle school math to > 50th percentile (Meets). Increase percentage of students scoring Meets/Exceeds in Math by 5 points across grades.

What grade(s) is this Student Performance Priority focused on? (Choose all that apply OR select "All Grades Served")

All Grades Served

Interim Measure and Target?

MOY NWEA

Measurement Dates

Student Performance Priority: Early literacy and Science of Reading Implementation

Student Performance Priority Category

What group(s) is this Student Performance Priority focused on? (Choose all that apply OR select "All Student Population." If targeted student group is not listed, choose "Other" to specity.)

Other
Other Description: *K through 3 students*

What is the current performance of this Student Performance Priority?

Dibels (2025 EOY): Kinder: <55% at benchmark/Above; 1st <65% at Benchmark/Above; Grades 2-4: fewer than 50% of students demonstrating proficiency; gaps persist for multilingual learners. SPF (ELA achievement): elementary ELA mean scale score = 722.4 (15th percentile); multilingual learners = 715.1 (5th percentile).

What is the 2-year (end of 2026-27) measure and target?

By EOY 2027, 70% of Kinder students and 80% of 1st grade students will score at Dibels benchmark/Above levels. Grades 2-4 will show a 15% increase in Dibels proficiency compared to Spring, 2025. Reduce the percentage of SRDs by 10 points.

What grade(s) is this Student Performance Priority focused on? (Choose all that apply OR select "All Grades Served")

1 2 3 Kindergarten

Interim Measure and

What is the 1-year (end of 2025-26) measure and target?

By EOY 2026, 60% of kinder students and 70% of 1st graders will score at Dibels benchmark/Above. Grades 2-4 will show a 7% increase in Dibels proficiency compared to Springs 2025. Reduce the percentage of students with significant reading deficiencies (SRDs) by 5 points.

Target?	Measurement Dates
Dibels MOY	

READ Act Targets

What is the current performance of students in reaching grade level expectations by the end of grade 3?

The End-of-Year 2025 Dibels data shows that fewer than 55% of kindergarteners and 65% of 1st graders were reading at benchmark, while less than half of 2nd graders met proficiency expectations. This indicates that a significant portion of students entered the critical 3rd grade year already below grade-level benchmarks in foundational literacy. Research and internal progress trends confirm that students not reading at or above grade level by the end of 3rd grade are at much greater risk of long-term academic struggles. Given the current data, unless intensive interventions are consistently applied, we can expect that a substantial number of AAL students will not meet grade-level reading proficiency by the end of 3rd grade. Specifically, the trajectory suggests that fewer than half of the current K–2 cohort will meet benchmark by 3rd grade without additional support. However, with the full implementation of the Science of Reading initiative, including CKLA training, monthly Dibels monitoring, and targeted interventions for students with Significant Reading Deficiencies, the school's goal is to shift this trajectory. By the end of 3rd grade, the expectation is to see an increase of at least 10–15 percentage points in the number of students reading at or above grade level compared to their EOY 2025 baselines. This makes early literacy — particularly through Science of Reading fidelity and targeted support for Multilingual Learners — a critical lever for long-term student success.

What is the 2-year (end of 2026-27) measure and target?

The EOY 2025 Dibels results establish that too few students in K–2 are on track for grade-level reading by the end of 3rd grade. Without targeted intervention, less than half would likely meet the benchmark. However, with the Science of Reading initiative, CKLA fidelity, and monthly Dibels-driven intervention, AAL projects that: By EOY 2026, about 60% of the current 2nd grade cohort will read at or above grade level by the end of 3rd grade. By EOY 2027, about 80% of the current 1st grade cohort will meet grade-level proficiency by the end of 3rd grade. This trajectory shows steady progress, with the expectation that the gap will close over the next two years as instructional fidelity and targeted supports increase.

What is the 1-year (end of 2025-26) measure and target?

The EOY 2025 Dibels results establish that too few students in K–2 are on track for grade-level reading by the end of 3rd grade. Without targeted intervention, less than half would likely meet the benchmark. However, with the Science of Reading initiative, CKLA fidelity, and monthly Dibels-driven intervention, AAL projects that: By EOY 2026, about 60% of the current 2nd grade cohort will read at or above grade level by the end of 3rd grade. By EOY 2027, about

What is the interim measure (e.g., tool or assessment) and specific mid-year target?	On what date will the school measure this interim target?
mid-year (MOY) targets are important checkpoints so AAL can monitor whether students are on track for end-of-year Dibels goals. Since your EOY 2025 Dibels baseline shows that fewer than half to two-thirds of K–2 students are at benchmark, and your end-of-year targets for 2026 call for 60–70% (depending on grade), the MOY 2025–26 goals should land roughly halfway between the baseline and the year-end target.	

80% of the current 1st grade cohort will meet grade-level proficiency by the end of 3rd grade. This trajectory shows steady progress, with the expectation that the gap will close over the next two years as instructional fidelity and targeted supports increase.

What is the current performance of students with a significant reading deficiency (SRD)?

The Dibels EOY 2025 data shows that a large proportion of AAL's early elementary students remain Well Below Benchmark in foundational literacy skills. Across K–2, roughly one-third of students are at serious risk of not reaching grade-level reading proficiency by 3rd grade without intensive intervention. This confirms the urgency of AAL's Science of Reading initiative and its emphasis on explicit phonics instruction, frequent progress monitoring, and targeted small-group interventions, particularly for students identified with Significant Reading Deficiencies (SRDs). Based on the EOY 2025 Dibels results included in AAL's planning documents, a significant percentage of students in the primary grades were identified as Well Below Benchmark: Kindergarten: Nearly 30–35% of students were Well Below Benchmark, with fewer than 55% meeting Benchmark/Above . 1st Grade: About 25–30% were Well Below Benchmark, with fewer than 65% meeting Benchmark/Above . 2nd Grade: Roughly 35–40% of students were Well Below Benchmark, as less than 50% scored proficient at EOY 2025.

What is the 2-year (end of 2026-27) measure and target?

The Dibels EOY 2025 results show that about one-third of AAL students are Well Below Benchmark and at risk for long-term reading struggles. To accelerate progress, AAL's Science of Reading initiative, intensive phonics interventions, and monthly Dibels monitoring will directly target students with SRDs. The expectation is a 5-point reduction in SRDs by EOY 2026 and a 10-point reduction by EOY 2027, with the ultimate goal of ensuring that fewer than one-quarter of students across grades K–2 are in the Well Below Benchmark category within two years. Two-Year Target (EOY 2027) Reduce SRD percentage by at least 10 points overall (from ~33% ~23%). Grade-level expectations: Kindergarten: 20% Well Below Benchmark 1st Grade: 15% Well Below Benchmark 2nd Grade: 25% Well Below Benchmark.

What is the 1-year (end of 2025-26) measure and target?

One-Year Target (EOY 2026) Reduce SRD percentage by at least 5 points overall (from ~33% ~28%). Grade-level expectations: Kindergarten: 25% Well Below Benchmark 1st Grade: 20% Well Below Benchmark 2nd Grade: 30% Well Below Benchmark.

What is the interim measure (e.g., tool or assessment) and specific mid-year target?	On what date will the school measure this interim target?
Dibels MOY assessment	

Root Cause Analysis

Individual growth numbers by student are lower than expected.

Emphasis on overall school results rather than individual student progress

Provide a brief description of this Root Cause.

Although overall growth rates at AAL are competitive with state benchmarks, individual student growth is uneven. Too many students are not meeting their annual growth targets, particularly at the elementary level. This is due to inconsistent tracking of individual progress, variable teacher feedback cycles, and a focus on overall averages rather than ensuring every student grows. Strengthening data-driven interventions and reteach systems is necessary to close these gaps.

Root Cause Category

Explain how this Root Cause was selected and verified, including any protocols used and stakeholder groups that were included in the Root Cause identification process.

The Academy of Advanced Learning engaged in a collaborative, data-driven process to identify and verify the root causes of its priority performance challenges. Root cause analysis began with a comprehensive review of state accountability data (SPF 2023 Final and 2025 Preliminary reports), internal Dibels and NWEA MAP growth data, and teacher observation results. Trends were examined across grade levels and student subgroups, with particular focus on Multilingual Learners, students with disabilities, and students identified with Significant Reading Deficiencies. The school leadership team facilitated structured data-analysis protocols during summer and early fall leadership retreats, including the Five Whys protocol and fishbone (cause-and-effect) analysis, to ensure staff moved beyond surface-level explanations to deeper instructional and systems-related causes. In addition, the school utilized internal progress-monitoring tools (spot observation trackers, Dibels progress monitoring, and MAP growth reports) to cross-check evidence and confirm whether potential causes were consistent across multiple data sources. Stakeholder input was also central to the process. Teachers and Learning Coaches provided feedback during professional learning communities (PLCs) and staff meetings; the School Accountability Committee (SAC) and Parent Action Committee (PAC) reviewed school performance data and shared perspectives on student supports; and the Third Future Schools network provided external calibration and fidelity checks. This triangulation of perspectives helped validate the final root causes. Ultimately, four root causes were selected because they consistently appeared across multiple sources of evidence and were confirmed by multiple stakeholder groups: (1) inconsistent monitoring of individual student growth, (2) lack of ongoing, high-quality literacy training, particularly impacting Multilingual Learners, (3) limited rigor and feedback structures in math and Team Centers, and (4) uneven implementation of core instructional models (Science of Reading, LSAE, Dyad) and variability in staff capacity. By aligning these root causes with stakeholder input and external data verification, AAL ensured that its improvement strategies directly address the most pressing and controllable factors influencing student outcomes.

Systems for monitoring indiv. student growth not consistent or used for reteach.

Provide a brief description of this Root Cause.

Although overall growth rates at AAL are competitive with state benchmarks, individual student growth is uneven. Too many students are not meeting their annual growth targets, particularly at the elementary level. This is due to inconsistent tracking of individual progress, variable teacher feedback cycles, and a focus on overall averages rather than ensuring every student grows. Strengthening data-driven interventions and reteach systems is necessary to close these gaps.

Root Cause Category

Explain how this Root Cause was selected and verified, including any protocols used and stakeholder groups that were included in the Root Cause identification process.

AAL identified its root causes through a collaborative process that included leadership team retreats, teacher and Learning Coach input during PLCs, and feedback from the School Accountability Committee (SAC) and Parent Action Committee (PAC). Using structured data-analysis protocols such as the Five Whys and fishbone analysis, the team reviewed SPF results, Dibels, MAP, and observation data to confirm patterns. The selected root causes—gaps in individual growth monitoring, limited literacy training for teachers, insufficient rigor in math and Team Centers, and uneven fidelity in implementing instructional models—were verified across multiple data sources and stakeholder groups.

Tiered coaching and feedback systems for teachers are not consistent.

Provide a brief description of this Root Cause.

Although overall growth rates at AAL are competitive with state benchmarks, individual student growth is uneven. Too many students are not meeting their annual growth targets, particularly at the elementary level. This is due to inconsistent tracking of individual

progress, variable teacher feedback cycles, and a focus on overall averages rather than ensuring every student grows. Strengthening data-driven interventions and reteach systems is necessary to close these gaps.

Root Cause Category

Explain how this Root Cause was selected and verified, including any protocols used and stakeholder groups that were included in the Root Cause identification process.

AAL identified its root causes through a collaborative process that included leadership team retreats, teacher and Learning Coach input during PLCs, and feedback from the School Accountability Committee (SAC) and Parent Action Committee (PAC). Using structured data-analysis protocols such as the Five Whys and fishbone analysis, the team reviewed SPF results, Dibels, MAP, and observation data to confirm patterns. The selected root causes—gaps in individual growth monitoring, limited literacy training for teachers, insufficient rigor in math and Team Centers, and uneven fidelity in implementing instructional models—were verified across multiple data sources and stakeholder groups.

ELA achievement remains below expectations particularly for multilingual learner

Lack of high-quality teacher trng. in delivering effective literacy instruction

Provide a brief description of this Root Cause.

ELA achievement remains in the Approaching range, with low percentages of students scoring Meets/Exceeds. Multilingual Learners are especially impacted, scoring in the lowest percentiles statewide. This reflects gaps in teacher training around explicit literacy instruction and the additional supports needed for students who are developing English proficiency. Focused professional development and differentiated strategies for Multilingual Learners are essential to closing the literacy gap.

Root Cause Category

Explain how this Root Cause was selected and verified, including any protocols used and stakeholder groups that were included in the Root Cause identification process.

AAL identified its root causes through a collaborative process that included leadership team retreats, teacher and Learning Coach input during PLCs, and feedback from the School Accountability Committee (SAC) and Parent Action Committee (PAC). Using structured data-analysis protocols such as the Five Whys and fishbone analysis, the team reviewed SPF results, Dibels, MAP, and observation data to confirm patterns. The selected root causes—gaps in individual growth monitoring, limited literacy training for teachers, insufficient rigor in math and Team Centers, and uneven fidelity in implementing instructional models—were verified across multiple data sources and stakeholder groups.

Teachers inconsistent in addressing literacy development & language acquisition

Provide a brief description of this Root Cause.

ELA achievement remains in the Approaching range, with low percentages of students scoring Meets/Exceeds. Multilingual Learners are especially impacted, scoring in the lowest percentiles statewide. This reflects gaps in teacher training around explicit literacy instruction and the additional supports needed for students who are developing English proficiency. Focused professional development and differentiated strategies for Multilingual Learners are essential to closing the literacy gap.

Root Cause Category

Explain how this Root Cause was selected and verified, including any protocols used and stakeholder groups that were included in the Root Cause identification process.

AAL identified its root causes through a collaborative process that included leadership team retreats, teacher and Learning Coach input during PLCs, and feedback from the School Accountability Committee (SAC) and Parent Action Committee (PAC). Using structured data-analysis protocols such as the Five Whys and fishbone analysis, the team reviewed SPF results, Dibels, MAP, and observation data

to confirm patterns. The selected root causes—gaps in individual growth monitoring, limited literacy training for teachers, insufficient rigor in math and Team Centers, and uneven fidelity in implementing instructional models—were verified across multiple data sources and stakeholder groups.

Multilingual learners face persistent gaps in vocab & acad language

Provide a brief description of this Root Cause.

ELA achievement remains in the Approaching range, with low percentages of students scoring Meets/Exceeds. Multilingual Learners are especially impacted, scoring in the lowest percentiles statewide. This reflects gaps in teacher training around explicit literacy instruction and the additional supports needed for students who are developing English proficiency. Focused professional development and differentiated strategies for Multilingual Learners are essential to closing the literacy gap.

Root Cause Category

Explain how this Root Cause was selected and verified, including any protocols used and stakeholder groups that were included in the Root Cause identification process.

Committee (PAC). Using structured data-analysis protocols such as the Five Whys and fishbone analysis, the team reviewed SPF results, Dibels, MAP, and observation data to confirm patterns. The selected root causes—gaps in individual growth monitoring, limited literacy training for teachers, insufficient rigor in math and Team Centers, and uneven fidelity in implementing instructional models—were verified across multiple data sources and stakeholder groups.

Math achievement lags behind growth, especially at the Meets/Exceeds level.

Instruction doesn't consistently push students to higher levels of proficiency

Provide a brief description of this Root Cause.

Math growth is a relative strength at AAL, but achievement continues to lag behind. Too few students reach the Meets/Exceeds level on CMAS, and this is especially true for Multilingual Learners. A key barrier is that instruction and support in Team Centers are not rigorous enough to push proficient students into advanced levels. Providing deeper training for Learning Coaches and strengthening problem-solving and conceptual understanding in daily instruction will help raise achievement.

Root Cause Category

Explain how this Root Cause was selected and verified, including any protocols used and stakeholder groups that were included in the Root Cause identification process.

AAL identified its root causes through a collaborative process that included leadership team retreats, teacher and Learning Coach input during PLCs, and feedback from the School Accountability Committee (SAC) and Parent Action Committee (PAC). Using structured data-analysis protocols such as the Five Whys and fishbone analysis, the team reviewed SPF results, Dibels, MAP, and observation data to confirm patterns. The selected root causes—gaps in individual growth monitoring, limited literacy training for teachers, insufficient rigor in math and Team Centers, and uneven fidelity in implementing instructional models—were verified across multiple data sources and stakeholder groups.

Learning coaches have limited trng. to provide high-quality, rigorous feedback

Provide a brief description of this Root Cause.

Math growth is a relative strength at AAL, but achievement continues to lag behind. Too few students reach the Meets/Exceeds level on CMAS, and this is especially true for Multilingual Learners. A key barrier is that instruction and support in Team Centers are not rigorous enough to push proficient students into advanced levels. Providing deeper training for Learning Coaches and strengthening problem-solving and conceptual understanding in daily instruction will help raise achievement.

Root Cause Category

Explain how this Root Cause was selected and verified, including any protocols used and stakeholder groups that were included in the Root Cause identification process.

AAL identified its root causes through a collaborative process that included leadership team retreats, teacher and Learning Coach input during PLCs, and feedback from the School Accountability Committee (SAC) and Parent Action Committee (PAC). Using structured data-analysis protocols such as the Five Whys and fishbone analysis, the team reviewed SPF results, Dibels, MAP, and observation data to confirm patterns. The selected root causes—gaps in individual growth monitoring, limited literacy training for teachers, insufficient rigor in math and Team Centers, and uneven fidelity in implementing instructional models—were verified across multiple data sources and stakeholder groups.

Instruction often emphasizes procedural fluency w/o extending conceptual depth.

Provide a brief description of this Root Cause.

Math growth is a relative strength at AAL, but achievement continues to lag behind. Too few students reach the Meets/Exceeds level on CMAS, and this is especially true for Multilingual Learners. A key barrier is that instruction and support in Team Centers are not rigorous enough to push proficient students into advanced levels. Providing deeper training for Learning Coaches and strengthening problem-solving and conceptual understanding in daily instruction will help raise achievement.

Root Cause Category

Explain how this Root Cause was selected and verified, including any protocols used and stakeholder groups that were included in the Root Cause identification process.

AAL identified its root causes through a collaborative process that included leadership team retreats, teacher and Learning Coach input during PLCs, and feedback from the School Accountability Committee (SAC) and Parent Action Committee (PAC). Using structured data-analysis protocols such as the Five Whys and fishbone analysis, the team reviewed SPF results, Dibels, MAP, and observation data to confirm patterns. The selected root causes—gaps in individual growth monitoring, limited literacy training for teachers, insufficient rigor in math and Team Centers, and uneven fidelity in implementing instructional models—were verified across multiple data sources and stakeholder groups.

Early literacy and Science of Reading Implementation

SoR practices aren't fully implemented with fidelity across all K-4 classrooms

Provide a brief description of this Root Cause.

Early literacy is a critical challenge area. Dibels results show that too few students in K–3 are reading at benchmark, and the percentage of students with Significant Reading Deficiencies remains high. While the Science of Reading initiative is underway, fidelity is uneven across classrooms, and Multilingual Learners face compounding challenges. Strengthening teacher training, implementing systematic phonics instruction, and using frequent Dibels progress checks will be central to improving early literacy outcomes.

Root Cause Category

Explain how this Root Cause was selected and verified, including any protocols used and stakeholder groups that were included in the Root Cause identification process.

AAL identified its root causes through a collaborative process that included leadership team retreats, teacher and Learning Coach input during PLCs, and feedback from the School Accountability Committee (SAC) and Parent Action Committee (PAC). Using structured data-analysis protocols such as the Five Whys and fishbone analysis, the team reviewed SPF results, Dibels, MAP, and observation data to confirm patterns. The selected root causes—gaps in individual growth monitoring, limited literacy training for teachers, insufficient rigor in math and Team Centers, and uneven fidelity in implementing instructional models—were verified across multiple data sources and stakeholder groups.

Teachers need ongoing PD and coaching in explicit literacy strategies.

Provide a brief description of this Root Cause.

Early literacy is a critical challenge area. Dibels results show that too few students in K–3 are reading at benchmark, and the percentage of students with Significant Reading Deficiencies remains high. While the Science of Reading initiative is underway, fidelity is uneven across classrooms, and Multilingual Learners face compounding challenges. Strengthening teacher training, implementing systematic phonics instruction, and using frequent Dibels progress checks will be central to improving early literacy outcomes.

Root Cause Category

Explain how this Root Cause was selected and verified, including any protocols used and stakeholder groups that were included in the Root Cause identification process.

AAL identified its root causes through a collaborative process that included leadership team retreats, teacher and Learning Coach input during PLCs, and feedback from the School Accountability Committee (SAC) and Parent Action Committee (PAC). Using structured data-analysis protocols such as the Five Whys and fishbone analysis, the team reviewed SPF results, Dibels, MAP, and observation data to confirm patterns. The selected root causes—gaps in individual growth monitoring, limited literacy training for teachers, insufficient rigor in math and Team Centers, and uneven fidelity in implementing instructional models—were verified across multiple data sources and stakeholder groups.

Multilingual learners and students with SRDs require targeted interventions

Provide a brief description of this Root Cause.

Early literacy is a critical challenge area. Dibels results show that too few students in K–3 are reading at benchmark, and the percentage of students with Significant Reading Deficiencies remains high. While the Science of Reading initiative is underway, fidelity is uneven across classrooms, and Multilingual Learners face compounding challenges. Strengthening teacher training, implementing systematic phonics instruction, and using frequent Dibels progress checks will be central to improving early literacy outcomes.

Root Cause Category

Explain how this Root Cause was selected and verified, including any protocols used and stakeholder groups that were included in the Root Cause identification process.

AAL identified its root causes through a collaborative process that included leadership team retreats, teacher and Learning Coach input during PLCs, and feedback from the School Accountability Committee (SAC) and Parent Action Committee (PAC). Using structured data-analysis protocols such as the Five Whys and fishbone analysis, the team reviewed SPF results, Dibels, MAP, and observation data to confirm patterns. The selected root causes—gaps in individual growth monitoring, limited literacy training for teachers, insufficient rigor in math and Team Centers, and uneven fidelity in implementing instructional models—were verified across multiple data sources and stakeholder groups.

Progress monitoring is inconsistent, delaying timely adjustments to instruction

Provide a brief description of this Root Cause.

Early literacy is a critical challenge area. Dibels results show that too few students in K–3 are reading at benchmark, and the percentage of students with Significant Reading Deficiencies remains high. While the Science of Reading initiative is underway, fidelity is uneven across classrooms, and Multilingual Learners face compounding challenges. Strengthening teacher training, implementing systematic phonics instruction, and using frequent Dibels progress checks will be central to improving early literacy outcomes.

Root Cause Category

Explain how this Root Cause was selected and verified, including any protocols used and stakeholder groups that were included in the Root Cause identification process.

AAL identified its root causes through a collaborative process that included leadership team retreats, teacher and Learning Coach input during PLCs, and feedback from the School Accountability Committee (SAC) and Parent Action Committee (PAC). Using structured data-analysis protocols such as the Five Whys and fishbone analysis, the team reviewed SPF results, Dibels, MAP, and observation data to confirm patterns. The selected root causes—gaps in individual growth monitoring, limited literacy training for teachers, insufficient

rigor in math and Team Centers, and uneven fidelity in implementing instructional models—were verified across multiple data sources and stakeholder groups.

Major Improvement Strategies

Differentiated Literacy development for Multilingual Learners

Major Improvement Strategy Category

Provide a description of the Major Improvement Strategy, indicating the school's specific focus for the year.

Build academic vocabulary, oral language routines, and sentence frames into ELA instruction. o 2025–26 Focus: Create ML-specific scaffolds in lesson design.

What Root Causes does this Major Improvement Strategy address? (Check all that apply.)

- Lack of high-quality teacher trng. in delivering effective literacy instruction
- Multilingual learners face persistent gaps in vocab & acad language
- Multilingual learners and students with SRDs require targeted interventions

Describe the evidence/research that supports this Major Improvement Strategy.

2025 SPF data shows MLs scoring at the 5th–6th percentile in ELA across elementary and middle levels.

What funding will be used to implement and support this Major Improvement Strategy? Choose all that apply.

data driven progress monitoring

Major Improvement Strategy Category

Provide a description of the Major Improvement Strategy, indicating the school's specific focus for the year.

Implement weekly data cycles in ELA and Math to track individual student progress.

What Root Causes does this Major Improvement Strategy address? (Check all that apply.)

- Emphasis on overall school results rather than individual student progress
- Systems for monitoring indiv. student growth not consistent or used for reteach.
- Tiered coaching and feedback systems for teachers are not consistent.

Describe the evidence/research that supports this Major Improvement Strategy.

Frequent progress monitoring drives higher growth rates. 2025 SPF shows Elem Growth: ELA MGP 40.0, Math MGP 47.0 (Approaching), compared to MS Growth: ELA 55.5, Math 62.0 (Meets). This confirms uneven growth, especially at elementary.

What funding will be used to implement and support this Major Improvement Strategy? Choose all that apply.

Tiered teacher coaching

Major Improvement Strategy Category

Provide a description of the Major Improvement Strategy, indicating the school's specific focus for the year.

Provide differentiated coaching for Tier 2 and Tier 3 teachers with weekly observations and feedback. Ensure Tier 3 teachers receive at least one coaching cycle per week.

What Root Causes does this Major Improvement Strategy address? (Check all that apply.)

- Emphasis on overall school results rather than individual student progress
- Systems for monitoring indiv. student growth not consistent or used for reteach.
- Tiered coaching and feedback systems for teachers are not consistent.

Describe the evidence/research that supports this Major Improvement Strategy.

The 2025 Action Plan identifies the need to tier teachers (Tier 1–3) and provide weekly coaching for Tier 3. Spot observations in 2024–25 showed <70% proficiency across classrooms.

What funding will be used to implement and support this Major Improvement Strategy? Choose all that apply.

Rigorous Problem-Solving Instruction

Major Improvement Strategy Category

Provide a description of the Major Improvement Strategy, indicating the school's specific focus for the year.

Emphasize multi-step problem-solving and math discourse daily. o 2025–26 Focus: Embed visual models, word problems, and key-term strategies.

What Root Causes does this Major Improvement Strategy address? (Check all that apply.)

- Instruction doesn't consistently push students to higher levels of proficiency
- Learning coaches have limited trng. to provide high-quality, rigorous feedback
- Instruction often emphasizes procedural fluency w/o extending conceptual depth.

Describe the evidence/research that supports this Major Improvement Strategy.

2025 SPF shows Elem Math mean scale score = 723.6 (24th percentile, Approaching) and MS Math = 728.7 (42nd percentile, Approaching). Growth is higher than status, confirming gaps at Meets/Exceeds.

What funding will be used to implement and support this Major Improvement Strategy? Choose all that apply.

targeted intervention blocks

Major Improvement Strategy Category

Provide a description of the Major Improvement Strategy, indicating the school's specific focus for the year.

Dedicated intervention time driven by MAP and Dibels strand data. Use Extended Fridays and block structures for reteach and intervention.

What Root Causes does this Major Improvement Strategy address? (Check all that apply.)

- Emphasis on overall school results rather than individual student progress
- Systems for monitoring indiv. student growth not consistent or used for reteach.
- Tiered coaching and feedback systems for teachers are not consistent.

Describe the evidence/research that supports this Major Improvement Strategy.

The 2023 UIP noted about 50% of students not hitting growth goals despite strong averages, underscoring the need for more individualized intervention.

What funding will be used to implement and support this Major Improvement Strategy? Choose all that apply.

Science of Reading Implementation

Major Improvement Strategy Category

Provide a description of the Major Improvement Strategy, indicating the school's specific focus for the year.

Full CKLA rollout and explicit phonics/literacy instruction. o 2025–26 Focus: Train and coach all K–4 teachers on SoR routines.

What Root Causes does this Major Improvement Strategy address? (Check all that apply.)

- Lack of high-quality teacher trng. in delivering effective literacy instruction
- Teachers inconsistent in addressing literacy development & language acquisition
- Multilingual learners face persistent gaps in vocab & acad language

Describe the evidence/research that supports this Major Improvement Strategy.

In 2025 SPF, Elem ELA mean scale score = 722.4 (15th percentile); Multilingual Learners = 715.1 (5th percentile). Low achievement despite stable growth highlights the need for stronger SoR fidelity.

What funding will be used to implement and support this Major Improvement Strategy? Choose all that apply.

Frequent Progress Monitoring with Dibels/mClass

Major Improvement Strategy Category

Provide a description of the Major Improvement Strategy, indicating the school's specific focus for the year.

Monthly Dibels checks with PLC analysis to reteach immediately. o 2025–26 Focus: Require all K–4 PLCs to use Dibels data in lesson planning.

What Root Causes does this Major Improvement Strategy address? (Check all that apply.)

- Lack of high-quality teacher trng. in delivering effective literacy instruction
- Teachers inconsistent in addressing literacy development & language acquisition
- Multilingual learners face persistent gaps in vocab & acad language

Describe the evidence/research that supports this Major Improvement Strategy.

The 2025 Action Plan requires monthly Dibels testing and MAZE progress monitoring to track SoR progress.

What funding will be used to implement and support this Major Improvement Strategy? Choose all that apply.

Extended Literacy Opportunities

Major Improvement Strategy Category

Provide a description of the Major Improvement Strategy, indicating the school's specific focus for the year.

Use Dyad and extended Fridays for reading fluency and comprehension enrichment. o 2025–26 Focus: Expand literacy-focused Dyads (e.g., reading circles).

What Root Causes does this Major Improvement Strategy address? (Check all that apply.)

- Lack of high-quality teacher trng. in delivering effective literacy instruction
- Teachers inconsistent in addressing literacy development & language acquisition
- Multilingual learners face persistent gaps in vocab & acad language

Describe the evidence/research that supports this Major Improvement Strategy.

AAL Action Plan includes weekly Extended Fridays with literacy reteach and enrichment.

What funding will be used to implement and support this Major Improvement Strategy? Choose all that apply.

Learning Coach Training for Math Support

Major Improvement Strategy Category

Provide a description of the Major Improvement Strategy, indicating the school's specific focus for the year.

Train LCs on feedback, misconceptions, and higher-level questioning. o 2025–26 Focus: Monthly math PD for LCs.

What Root Causes does this Major Improvement Strategy address? (Check all that apply.)

- Instruction doesn't consistently push students to higher levels of proficiency
- Learning coaches have limited trng. to provide high-quality, rigorous feedback

- Instruction often emphasizes procedural fluency w/o extending conceptual depth.

Describe the evidence/research that supports this Major Improvement Strategy.

2023 UIP root cause identified limited LC training in Team Centers as a barrier to advanced student achievement.

What funding will be used to implement and support this Major Improvement Strategy? Choose all that apply.

Math Fluency and Conceptual Balance

Major Improvement Strategy Category

Provide a description of the Major Improvement Strategy, indicating the school's specific focus for the year.

Balance fact fluency with problem-solving and conceptual understanding. o 2025–26 Focus: Require fact fluency practice daily plus problem-solving tasks.

What Root Causes does this Major Improvement Strategy address? (Check all that apply.)

- Systems for monitoring indiv. student growth not consistent or used for reteach.
- Instruction doesn't consistently push students to higher levels of proficiency
- Learning coaches have limited trng. to provide high-quality, rigorous feedback
- Instruction often emphasizes procedural fluency w/o extending conceptual depth.

Describe the evidence/research that supports this Major Improvement Strategy.

2025 Action Plan emphasizes math fact practice, creating visuals, and story problems with key terms.

What funding will be used to implement and support this Major Improvement Strategy? Choose all that apply.

Advanced Learner Extensions

Major Improvement Strategy Category

Provide a description of the Major Improvement Strategy, indicating the school's specific focus for the year.

Provide enrichment for students already at/near proficiency. o 2025–26 Focus: Challenge units aligned to CMAS performance expectations.

What Root Causes does this Major Improvement Strategy address? (Check all that apply.)

- Instruction doesn't consistently push students to higher levels of proficiency
- Learning coaches have limited trng. to provide high-quality, rigorous feedback
- Instruction often emphasizes procedural fluency w/o extending conceptual depth.

Describe the evidence/research that supports this Major Improvement Strategy.

2023 SPF shows fewer than 25% of students scoring Meets/Exceeds in Math.

What funding will be used to implement and support this Major Improvement Strategy? Choose all that apply.

Full CKLA Rollout and Training

Major Improvement Strategy Category

Provide a description of the Major Improvement Strategy, indicating the school's specific focus for the year.

All K–4 teachers trained in CKLA fundamentals and SoR routines. o 2025–26 Focus: Weekly fidelity checks and monthly PD.

What Root Causes does this Major Improvement Strategy address? (Check all that apply.)

- SoR practices aren't fully implemented with fidelity across all K-4 classrooms
- Teachers need ongoing PD and coaching in explicit literacy strategies.
- Multilingual learners and students with SRDs require targeted interventions
- Progress monitoring is inconsistent, delaying timely adjustments to instruction

Describe the evidence/research that supports this Major Improvement Strategy.

2025 Action Plan specifies CKLA training for all K–4 teachers and SoR coaching.

What funding will be used to implement and support this Major Improvement Strategy? Choose all that apply.

Intensive Intervention for Students with SRDs

Major Improvement Strategy Category

Provide a description of the Major Improvement Strategy, indicating the school's specific focus for the year.

Daily small-group phonics and fluency support for students Below Benchmark. o 2025–26 Focus: Reduce SRD rate by 5 percentage points.

What Root Causes does this Major Improvement Strategy address? (Check all that apply.)

- SoR practices aren't fully implemented with fidelity across all K-4 classrooms
- Teachers need ongoing PD and coaching in explicit literacy strategies.
- Multilingual learners and students with SRDs require targeted interventions
- Progress monitoring is inconsistent, delaying timely adjustments to instruction

Describe the evidence/research that supports this Major Improvement Strategy.

AAL reports ~33% of students qualify for READ Plans with SRDs.

What funding will be used to implement and support this Major Improvement Strategy? Choose all that apply.

Monthly Dibels Monitoring and Rapid Response

Major Improvement Strategy Category

Provide a description of the Major Improvement Strategy, indicating the school's specific focus for the year.

Frequent monitoring with immediate reteach cycles. o 2025–26 Focus: Grade-level “early warning lists” for Below Benchmark students.

What Root Causes does this Major Improvement Strategy address? (Check all that apply.)

- SoR practices aren't fully implemented with fidelity across all K-4 classrooms
- Teachers need ongoing PD and coaching in explicit literacy strategies.
- Multilingual learners and students with SRDs require targeted interventions
- Progress monitoring is inconsistent, delaying timely adjustments to instruction

Describe the evidence/research that supports this Major Improvement Strategy.

2025 Action Plan calls for monthly Dibels and MAZE testing.

What funding will be used to implement and support this Major Improvement Strategy? Choose all that apply.

Family Engagement in Literacy

Major Improvement Strategy Category

Provide a description of the Major Improvement Strategy, indicating the school's specific focus for the year.

Support families with at-home literacy routines. o 2025–26 Focus: Quarterly “Reading at Home” nights and family training.

What Root Causes does this Major Improvement Strategy address? (Check all that apply.)

- SoR practices aren't fully implemented with fidelity across all K-4 classrooms
- Teachers need ongoing PD and coaching in explicit literacy strategies.
- Multilingual learners and students with SRDs require targeted interventions
- Progress monitoring is inconsistent, delaying timely adjustments to instruction

Describe the evidence/research that supports this Major Improvement Strategy.

The 2023 UIP identified low literacy proficiency (only ~23.6% Meets/Exceeds ELA on CMAS), reinforcing the need for school–home literacy partnerships.

What funding will be used to implement and support this Major Improvement Strategy? Choose all that apply.

Assurances & Requirements

Requirement	Applies to...	Agreement
Data Analysis: The Unified Improvement Plan is the result of thorough data analysis. Data was analyzed from both local and state sources. Data was disaggregated by student demographics (e.g., students with IEPs, Free & Reduced Lunch eligibility, Multilingual Learners, race/ethnicity), as applicable. Current school performance was analyzed relative to local, state and federal metrics and expectations (e.g. SPF metrics, ESSA indicators).	All Schools and Districts	I agree

Stakeholder Input on Plan Development: The plan was developed in partnership with stakeholders, including the principal and other school leaders, teachers, and the School Accountability Committee (SAC) or District Accountability Committee (DAC). For additional information on Accountability Committees, view the resource linked under "Resources" on this page.	All Schools and Districts	I agree
Stakeholder Progress Monitoring: The site will involve stakeholders—at a minimum, the School Accountability Committee—in progress monitoring the implementation of the plan throughout the school year.	All Schools and Districts	☑ I agree
Data Analysis - READ Act: K-3 READ Act assessment performance data from at least the last two school years has been analyzed. Data were disaggregated by grade level, by the percentage of students who have significant reading deficiencies, and by the percentage of students who achieved grade level expectations in reading.	Districts and Schools Serving K-3	☑ I agree

Attachments

- Progress Monitoring Targets.pdf
- AAL_Implementation_Plan_2025-26.pdf