



2 Day/Progress Monitoring Visit Report

Name of Institution

Reviewed: Hopkins County School District

Date: February 1 - 3, 2016

Team Member: Sam Watkins

Team Member: Jeanne Crowe

Team Member: Ruth Montgomery

Superintendent: Linda Zellich



Introduction

The KDE Internal School/District Review is designed to:

- provide feedback to Priority Schools and their districts regarding the progress on improving student performance during the preceding two years based on Kentucky assessment and accountability data
- inform continuous improvement processes leading to higher levels of student achievement as well as ongoing improvement in the conditions that support learning

The report reflects the team's analysis of AdvancED Standard 3, Teaching and Assessing for Learning. Findings are supported by:

- review of the 2013-2014 Leadership Assessment report
- examination of an array of student performance data
- Self-Assessment, Executive Summary and other diagnostics completed in ASSIST during the fall of 2015
- school and classroom observations using the Effective Learning Environment Observation Tool (ELEOT)
- review of documents and artifacts
- examination of ASSIST stakeholder survey data collected in the fall of 2015
- principal and stakeholder interviews

The report includes:

- an overall rating for Standard 3
- a rating for each indicator
- listing of evidence examined to determine the rating
- Powerful Practices (level 4) and Improvement Priorities (level 1 or 2) also include narrative explanations or rationale based on data and information gathered or examined by the team

Standard 3: Teaching and Assessing for Learning

Standard 3: The school/district’s curriculum, instructional design, and assessment practices guide and ensure teacher effectiveness and student learning.	District Rating for Standard 3 2.67	Team Rating for Standard 3 2.75
--	--	--

Indicator Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Powerful Practice <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement Priority	District Rating	Team Rating
3.1	<p>The school/district’s curriculum provides equitable and challenging learning experiences that ensure all students have sufficient opportunities to develop learning, thinking and life skills that lead to success at the next level.</p> <p><i>Level 4</i> Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide all students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills that align with the school/district’s purpose. Evidence clearly indicates curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level. Like courses/classes have the same high learning expectations. Learning activities are individualized for each student in a way that supports achievement of expectations.</p> <p><i>Level 3</i> Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide all students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills. There is some evidence to indicate curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level. Like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations. Some learning activities are individualized for each student in a way that supports achievement of expectations.</p> <p><i>Level 2</i> Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide most students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills. There is little evidence to indicate curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level. Most like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations. Little individualization for each student is evident.</p> <p><i>Level 1</i> Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide few or no students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills. There is no evidence to indicate how successful students will be at the next level. Like courses/classes do not always have the same learning expectations. No individualization for students is evident.</p>	3	3

Indicator Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Powerful Practice <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement Priority	District Rating	Team Rating
3.2	<p>Curriculum, instruction and assessment are monitored and adjusted systematically in response to data from multiple assessments of student learning and an examination of professional practice.</p>	3	3

	<p>Level 4 Using data from multiple assessments of student learning and an examination of professional practice, school/district personnel systematically monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose. There is a systematic, collaborative process in place to ensure alignment each time curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised. The continuous improvement process has clear guidelines to ensure that vertical and horizontal alignment as well as alignment with the school/district’s purpose are maintained and enhanced in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.</p> <p>Level 3 Using data from student assessments and an examination of professional practice, school/district personnel monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose. There is a process in place to ensure alignment each time curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised. The continuous improvement process ensures that vertical and horizontal alignment as well as alignment with the school/district’s purpose are maintained and enhanced in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.</p> <p>Level 2 School/district personnel monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose. A process is implemented sometimes to ensure alignment when curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.</p> <p>There is limited evidence that the continuous improvement process ensures vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district’s purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.</p> <p>Level 1 School/district personnel rarely or never monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school/district’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose. No process exists to ensure alignment when curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised. There is little or no evidence that the continuous improvement process is connected with vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school/district’s purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.</p>
--	---

Indicator Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Powerful Practice <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement Priority	District Rating	Team Rating
3.3	<p>Teachers engage students in their learning through instructional strategies that ensure achievement of learning expectations.</p> <p>Level 4 Teachers are consistent and deliberate in planning and using instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills. Teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of each student. Teachers consistently use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.</p> <p>Level 3 Teachers plan and use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills. Teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students when necessary. Teachers use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.</p>	3	3

	<p>Level 2 Teachers sometimes use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self- reflection, and development of critical thinking skills. Teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of groups of students when necessary. Teachers sometimes use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.</p> <p>Level 1 Teachers rarely or never use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self- reflection, and development of critical thinking skills. Teachers seldom or never personalize instructional strategies. Teachers rarely or never use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.</p>
--	---

Indicator Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Powerful Practice <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement Priority	District Rating	Team Rating
3.4	<p>School/district leaders monitor and support the improvement of instructional practices of teachers to ensure student success.</p> <p>Level 4 School/district leaders formally and consistently monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures beyond classroom observation to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.</p> <p>Level 3 School/district leaders formally and consistently monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.</p> <p>Level 2 School/district leaders monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.</p> <p>Level 1 School/district leaders occasionally or randomly monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.</p>	3	3

Indicator Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Powerful Practice <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement Priority	District Rating	Team Rating
3.5	<p>Teachers participate in collaborative learning communities to improve instruction and student learning.</p> <p>Level 4 All members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule. Frequent collaboration occurs</p>	3	3

	<p>across grade levels and content areas. Staff members implement a formal process that promotes productive discussion about student learning. Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching are a part of the daily routine of school/district staff members. school/district personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.</p> <p>Level 3 All members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally. Collaboration often occurs across grade levels and content areas. Staff members have been trained to implement a formal process that promotes discussion about student learning. Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching occur regularly among most school/district personnel. School/district personnel indicate that collaboration causes improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.</p> <p>Level 2 Some members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally. Collaboration occasionally occurs across grade levels and content areas. Staff members promote discussion about student learning. Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching sometimes occur among school/district personnel. School/district personnel express belief in the value of collaborative learning communities.</p> <p>Level 1 Collaborative learning communities randomly self-organize and meet informally. Collaboration seldom occurs across grade levels and content areas. Staff members rarely discuss student learning. Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching rarely occur among school/district personnel. School/district personnel see little value in collaborative learning communities.</p>
--	--

Indicator Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Powerful Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improvement Priority	District Rating	Team Rating
3.6	<p>Teachers implement the school/district’s instructional process in support of student learning.</p> <p>Level 4 All teachers systematically use an instructional process that clearly informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance. Exemplars are provided to guide and inform students. The process requires the use of multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction and provide data for possible curriculum revision. The process provides students with specific and immediate feedback about their learning.</p> <p>Level 3 All teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance. Exemplars are often provided to guide and inform students. The process includes multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction and provide data for possible curriculum revision. The process provides students with specific and timely feedback about their learning.</p> <p>Level 2 Most teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance. Exemplars are sometimes provided to guide and inform students. The process may include multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction. The process provides students with feedback about their learning.</p> <p>Level 1 Few teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance. Exemplars are rarely provided to guide and inform students. The</p>	2	2

	process includes limited measures to inform the ongoing modification of instruction. The process provides students with minimal feedback of little value about their learning.
--	--

Indicator Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Powerful Practice <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement Priority	District Rating	Team Rating
		3	3
3.7	<p>Mentoring, coaching and induction programs support instructional improvement consistent with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning.</p> <p>Level 4 All school/district personnel are engaged in systematic mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning. These programs set high expectations for all school/district personnel and include valid and reliable measures of performance.</p> <p>Level 3 School/district personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning. These programs set expectations for all school/district personnel and include measures of performance.</p> <p>Level 2 Some school/district personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning. These programs set expectations for school/district personnel.</p> <p>Level 1 Few or no school/district personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning. Limited or no expectations for school/district personnel are included.</p>		

Indicator Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Powerful Practice <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement Priority	District Rating	Team Rating
		3	3
3.8	<p>The school/district engages families in meaningful ways in their children’s education and keeps them informed of their children’s learning progress.</p> <p>Level 4 Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children’s education are designed, implemented, and evaluated. Families have multiple ways of staying informed of their children’s learning progress.</p> <p>Level 3 Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children’s education are designed and implemented. School/district personnel regularly inform families of their children’s learning progress.</p> <p>Level 2 Programs that engage families in their children’s education are available. School/district personnel provide information about children’s learning.</p> <p>Level 1 Few or no programs that engage families in their children’s education are available. School/district personnel provide little relevant information about children’s learning.</p>		

Indicator Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Powerful Practice <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement Priority	District Rating	Team Rating
		2	2
3.9	<p>The school/district has a formal structure whereby each student is well known by at least one adult advocate in the school/district who supports that student’s educational experience.</p> <p>Level 4 School/district personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student and related adults. All students participate in the structure. The structure allows the school/district employee to gain significant insight into and serve as an advocate for the student’s needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.</p> <p>Level 3 School/district personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student. All students may participate in the structure. The structure allows the school/district employee to gain insight into and serve as an advocate for the student’s needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.</p> <p>Level 2 School/district personnel participate in a structure that gives them interaction with individual students, allowing them to build relationships over time with the student. Most students participate in the structure. The structure allows the school/district employee to gain insight into the student’s needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.</p> <p>Level 1 Few or no opportunities exist for school/district personnel to build long-term interaction with individual students. Few or no students have a school/district employee who advocates for their needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.</p>		

Indicator Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Powerful Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improvement Priority	District Rating	Team Rating
		2	2
3.10	<p>Grading and reporting are based on clearly defined criteria that represent the attainment of content knowledge and skills and are consistent across grade levels and courses.</p> <p>Level 4 All teachers consistently use common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures based on clearly defined criteria that represent each student’s attainment of content knowledge and skills. These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented without fail across all grade levels and all courses. All stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures. The policies, processes, and procedures are formally and regularly evaluated.</p> <p>Level 3 Teachers use common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures based on clearly defined criteria that represent each student’s attainment of content knowledge and skills. These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented consistently across grade levels and courses. Stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures. The policies, processes, and procedures are regularly evaluated.</p> <p>Level 2 Most teachers use common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures based on criteria that represent each student’s attainment of content knowledge and skills. These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented across grade levels and courses. Most stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures. The policies, processes, and procedures may or may not be evaluated.</p>		

	<p>Level 1 Few or no teachers use common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures. Policies, processes, and procedures, if they exist, are rarely implemented across grade levels or courses, and may not be well understood by stakeholders. No process for evaluation of grading and reporting practices is evident.</p>
--	--

Indicator Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Powerful Practice <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement Priority	District Rating	Team Rating
		3	3
3.11	<p>All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning.</p> <p>Level 4 All staff members participate in a rigorous, continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district’s purpose and direction. Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school/district and the individual. The program builds measurable capacity among all professional and support staff. The program is rigorously and systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.</p> <p>Level 3 All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district’s purpose and direction. Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school/district. The program builds capacity among all professional and support staff. The program is systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.</p> <p>Level 2 Most staff members participate in a program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district’s purpose and direction. Professional development is based on the needs of the school/district. The program builds capacity among staff members who participate. The program is regularly evaluated for effectiveness.</p> <p>Level 1 Few or no staff members participate in professional learning. Professional development, when available, may or may not address the needs of the school/district or build capacity among staff members. If a program exists, it is rarely and/or randomly evaluated.</p>		

Indicator Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Powerful Practice <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement Priority	District Rating	Team Rating
		2	3
3.12	<p>The school/district provides and coordinates learning support services to meet the unique learning needs of students.</p> <p>Level 4 School/district personnel systematically and continuously use data to identify unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency as well as other learning needs (such as second languages). School/district personnel stay current on research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related individualized learning support services to all students.</p> <p>Level 3 School/district personnel use data to identify unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency as well as other learning needs (such as second languages). School/district personnel stay current on research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related learning support services to all students.</p>		

	<p>Level 2 School/district personnel use data to identify unique learning needs of special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs (such as second languages). School/district personnel are familiar with research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related learning support services to students within these special populations.</p> <p>Level 1 School/district personnel identify special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs (such as second languages). School/district personnel provide or coordinate some learning support services to students within these special populations.</p>
--	---

Teaching and Learning Impact

The impact of teaching and learning on student achievement is the primary expectation of every institution. The relationship between teacher and learner must be productive and effective for student success. The impact of teaching and learning includes an analysis of student performance results; instructional quality; learner and family engagement; support services for student learning; curriculum quality and efficacy; and college and career readiness data. All key indicators of an institution's performance demonstrate an impact on teaching and learning.

Summary of School and Student Performance Data:

Annual Measurable Objective (AMO)

Year	Prior Year Overall Score	AMO Goal	Overall Score	Met AMO Goal	Met Participation Rate Goal	Met Graduation Rate Goal
2014-2015	79.3	79.8	74.6	No	Yes	No
2013-2014	75.4	75.9	79.3	Yes	Yes	Yes

Percentages of Students Scoring at Proficient/Distinguished (P/D) Levels on the K-PREP End-of-Course Assessments at the School and in the State (2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015)

Content Area	%P/D School (12-13)	%P/D State (12-13)	%P/D School (13-14)	%P/D State (13-14)	%P/D School (14-15)	%P/D State (14-15)
English II	54.6	55.8	54.3	55.4	56.7	56.8
Algebra II	64.8	36.0	75.0	37.9	38.3	38.2
Biology	36.2	36.3	40.9	39.8	38.2	39.7
U.S. History	No Data	51.3	55.2	58.0	58.9	56.9
Writing	51.8	48.2	43.5	43.3	50.4	50.0
Language Mech.	48.6	51.4	53.1	49.9	61.7	51.6

Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmarks on PLAN, Grade 10, at the School and in the State (2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015)

Content Area	Percentage School (12-13)	Percentage State (12-13)	Percentage School (13-14)	Percentage State (13-14)	Percentage School (14-15)	Percentage State (14-15)
English	68.9	67.8	71.2	66.2	71.3	62.3
Math	21.2	25.8	21.8	25.6	25.7	27.9
Reading	43.9	43.2	48.6	48.0	46.5	43.7
Science	20.8	21.2	15.2	19.5	23.5	21.9

Percentages of Students Meeting Benchmarks on ACT, Grade 11, at the School and in the State (2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015)

Content Area	Percentage School (12-13)	Percentage State (12-13)	Percentage School (13-14)	Percentage State (13-14)	Percentage School (14-15)	Percentage State (14-15)
English	55.1	53.1	56.0	55.9	49.5	55.3
Math	39.8	39.6	51.3	43.5	27.5	38.1
Reading	47.4	44.2	48.2	47.1	37.4	47.4

School Achievement of Proficiency and Gap Delivery Targets (2014-2015)

Tested Area	Proficiency Delivery Target for % P/D	Actual Score	Met Target (Yes or No)	Gap Delivery Target for % P/D	Actual Score	Met Target (Yes or No)
Combined Reading & Math	61.2	47.7	No	54.6	38.6	No
Reading	56.7	57.3	Yes	48.4	45.7	No
Math	65.7	38.0	No	60.7	31.5	No
Science	38.3	39.2	Yes	32.7	28.9	No
Social Studies	59.2	59.6	Yes	39.2	49.6	Yes
Writing	49.1	51.4	Yes	40.0	40.5	Yes

School Achievement of College and Career Readiness (CCR) and Graduation Rate Delivery Targets (2014-2015)

Delivery Target Type	Delivery Target (School)	Actual Score (School)	Actual Score (State)	Met Target (Yes or No)
College and Career Readiness	66.0	72.0	66.9	Yes
Graduation Rate (for 4-year adjusted cohort)	89.4	86.9	88.0	No
Graduation Rate (for 5-year adjusted cohort)	89.7	91.4	89.0	Yes

Program Reviews 2014-2015						
Program Area	Curriculum and Instruction (3 pts possible)	Formative & Summative Assessment (3 pts possible)	Professional Development (3 pts possible)	Administrative/Leadership Support (3 pts possible)	Total Score (12 points possible)	Classification
Arts and Humanities	2.35	1.86	2.44	2.30	9.0	Proficient
Practical Living	2.17	2.00	2.44	2.55	8.9	Proficient
Writing	2.11	2.25	2.44	2.86	9.7	Proficient
World Language and Global Competency*	1.50	1.36	1.67	1.54	6.1	Needs Improvement

*The 2014-15 World Language Program Reviews scores for High Schools will be included with other program reviews to generate the comparable 2014-15 program review baseline score needed for 2015-16 accountability reporting.

Plus

- The school met its AMO goal in 2013-14.
- The graduation goal for 2013-14 was met.
- School percentages of Proficient/Distinguished exceed state percentages in 2014-15 for Algebra II, U.S. History, writing and language mechanics.
- From 2013-14 to 2014-15 there was an increase of percent Proficient/Distinguished students in English II, U.S. History, writing and language mechanics.
- Language mechanics made the largest gain of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished from the 2012-13 school year to the 2014-15 school year with an increase of 13.1 percentage points.
- Regarding PLAN results, for the 2014-15 school year English, reading and science show a higher percentage of students meeting benchmark than at the state level.
- On PLAN, all four content areas show gains in percent meeting benchmark from 2012-13 to 2014-15.
- Reading, science, social studies and writing met Delivery targets for Proficiency for the 2014-15 school year.
- Social studies and writing met Gap Delivery targets for the 2014-15 school year. The school met the Delivery target for College and Career Readiness and also exceeded the state score for the 2014-15 school year.
- The school met the Graduation Rate Delivery target for the 5-year adjusted cohort and exceeded the state score for the 2014-15 school year
- The school is classified as Proficient in Arts and Humanities, Practical Living and Writing Program Review areas.

Delta

- The school did not meet its AMO goal in 2014-15.
- The school did not meet its Graduation Rate goal for 2014-15.
- Algebra II showed a 36.7 point decrease in the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished from 2013-14 to 2014-15.
- Regarding PLAN results for the 2014-15 school year, math shows a lower percentage of students meeting benchmark than at the state level.
- On PLAN the percentage of students meeting benchmark in reading decreased by 2.1 percentage points from 2013-14 to 2014-15.

- On ACT, all three content areas (English, math, and reading) experienced a decrease in the percentage of students meeting benchmark from 2013-14 to 2014-15.
- Regarding ACT results, all three content areas (English, math, and reading) were below the state average of students meeting benchmark in the 2014-15 school year.
- Math did not meet the Delivery target for Proficiency in the 2014-15 school year.
- Reading, math and science failed to meet the Gap Delivery target for the 2014-15 school year.
- The combined areas of reading and math did not the Proficiency Delivery target or the Gap Delivery target for the 2014-15 school year.
- Math was 27.7 points shy of meeting the Proficiency Delivery target and 29.2 points short of meeting the Gap Delivery target based on the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished.
- The school did not meet the Graduation Rate Delivery target for 4-year adjusted cohort and fell shy of the state score for the 2014-15 school year.
- The school is classified as Needs Improvement in the World Language and Global Competency Program Review area.
- Formative and Summative Assessment was the lowest scoring standard out of all standards in three of the four program areas.

Stakeholder Survey Results

Indicator	Parent Survey		Student Survey		Staff Survey	
	Survey Item	%agree/ strongly agree	Survey Item	%agree/ strongly agree	Survey Item	%agree/ strongly agree
3.1	10	85.2	10	60.9	26	88.2
3.1	11	84.1	11	51.9	51	89.4
3.1	13	78.7	17	41.9		
3.1	34	93.7	32	60.0		
3.2	21	87.8	17	41.9	16	80.9
3.2					22	79.4
3.3	12	84.2	10	60.9	17	80.9
3.3	13	78.7	16	57.1	18	82.4
3.3	22	93.5	17	41.9	19	85.3
3.3			26	58.4		
3.4					3	97.1
3.4					11	87.0
3.4					12	92.8
3.4					13	88.4
3.5	14	80.2	5	58.9	8	94.2
3.5					24	89.7
3.5					25	86.8
3.6	19	92.3	9	64.6	20	83.8
3.6	21	87.8	18	60.9	21	75.0

3.6			20	59.6	22	79.4
3.7	14	80.2	5	58.9	8	94.2
3.7					30	85.3
3.7					31	88.2
3.8	9	89.0	13	48.7	15	91.3
3.8	15	83.8	21	50.1	34	66.2
3.8	16	79.8			35	88.2
3.8	17	87.7				
3.8	35	85.0				
3.9	20	88.2	14	50.1	28	91.2
3.9						
3.10			22	61.8	9	91.3
3.10					21	75.0
3.10					23	79.4
3.11					32	97.1
3.11					33	89.7
3.12	13	78.7	1	74.5	27	88.2
3.12	23	89.9	17	41.9	29	85.3

Summary of Stakeholder Feedback

Plus

- Ninety-seven percent of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “Our school’s purpose statement is based on shared values and beliefs that guide that guide decision-making.”
- Ninety-seven percent of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all staff members participate in continuous professional learning based on identified needs of the school.”
- Ninety-four percent of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “Our school’s leaders support an innovative and collaborative culture.”
- Ninety-four percent of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My child is prepared for success in the next school year.”
- Ninety-four percent of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My child has up-to-date computers and other technology to learn.”

Delta

- Forty-two percent of students surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers change their teaching to meet my learning needs.”
- Forty-nine percent of students surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school offers opportunities for my family to become involved in school activities and my learning.”
- Sixty-six percent of staff surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all school personnel regularly engage families in their children’s learning progress.”
- The percentage of students agreeing/strongly agreeing to statements in the survey regarding Standard 3 were all below 70 percent with one exception: the first survey item had 74 percent of students agree/strongly agree.

- Seventy-five percent of staff surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school provide students with specific and timely feedback about their learning.”
- Seventy-nine percent of staff surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use multiple types of assessments to modify instruction and to revise the curriculum.”
- Seventy-nine percent of staff surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use consistent and common grading and reporting policies across grade levels and courses based on clearly defined criteria.”
- Seventy-nine percent of parents surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers meet his/her learning needs by individualizing instruction.”

Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot™) Results

Every learner should have access to an effective learning environment in which she/he has multiple opportunities to be successful. The Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool measures the extent to which learners are in an environment that is equitable, supportive, and well-managed. An environment where high expectations are the norm and active learning takes place. It measures whether learners' progress is monitored and feedback is provided and the extent to which technology is leveraged for learning.

Observations of classrooms or other learning venues are conducted for a minimum of 20 minutes per observation. Every member of the External Review Team is required to be trained and pass a certification exam to use the eleot™ tool for observation. Team members conduct multiple observations during the review process and provide ratings on 30 items based on a 4-point scale. During the review, team members conducted eleot™ observations in 26 classrooms.

The following provides the aggregate average score across multiple observations for each of the 7 learning environments included in eleot™.

See Hopkins County Central High School Accreditation Report for eleot™ graphs and Learning Environments summary data.

Summary of eleot™ Data

Equitable Learning Environment

Plus

- Observations revealed that it was evident/very evident in 69% of classrooms that students had “equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.” (A2).

Delta

- Instances of “differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meets his/her learning needs” (A1) were evident/very evident in 35% of classrooms observed.

High Expectations Learning Environment

Plus

- Observations revealed that in 58% of classrooms it is evident/very evident that students are “tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable” (B2).

Delta

- “Exemplars provided of high quality work” (B3) was evident/very evident in 19% of observations.

Supportive Learning Environment

Plus

- Instances in which students were “provided support and assistance to understand content and accomplish tasks” (C4) were evident/very evident in 62% of observations.

Delta

- It was evident/very evident in 19% of observations that students were “provided additional/alternative instruction and feedback at the appropriate level of challenge for her/his needs” (C5).

Active Learning Environment

Plus

- “Several opportunities to engage in discussions with teacher and other students” (D1) was evident/very evident in 54% of observations.

Delta

- Instances of making “connections from content to real life experiences” (D2) was evident/very evident in 31% of observations.

Progress Monitoring Learning Environment

Plus

- Students “demonstrate or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content” (E3) was evident/very evident in 54% of classrooms observed

Delta

- “Is asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning” (E1) was evident/very evident in 38% of classrooms observed.
- Students’ demonstration of “understands how her/his work is assessed” (E4) was evident/very evident in 35% of classrooms observed.

Well-Managed Learning Environment

Plus

- Students “follow classroom rules and work well with others” (F2) was evident/very evident in 65% of classrooms observed.

Delta

- Students “collaborate with other students during student-centered activities” (F4) was evident/very evident in 38% of classrooms observed.

Digital Learning Environment

Plus

- N/A-- Percentages were not high enough to qualify as a plus.

Delta

- Students “use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning” (G2) was evident/very evident in 42% of classrooms observed.
- Student use of “digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning” (G3) was evident/very evident in 35% of classrooms observed.

FINDINGS OF THE INTERNAL REVIEW TEAM

DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PRIORITY

Indicator: 3.6

Action statement:

Collaborate with schools to further refine and monitor a system that ensures all teachers use an instructional process that clearly informs students of learning expectations and the criteria necessary for standards mastery. Incorporate exemplars into daily lessons to guide students and use multiple measures of student learning outcomes such as formative assessments, summative unit assessments, and benchmark assessments to inform the instructional process and to assure appropriate modifications are made to meet student learning needs. This process provides students with specific and timely feedback about their learning.

Evidence and Rationale:

Student Performance Data

Student performance data, as detailed in this report, indicated that neither the overall Annual Measurable Objective Goal nor the Graduation Rate goal for the 2014-15 school year were met. Algebra II showed a 36.7 point decrease in the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished from 2013-14 to 2014-15. The percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in English II and Biology lagged behind state scores in the most recent state assessment results. On ACT, all three content areas (English, math, and reading) experienced a decrease in the percentage of students meeting benchmark from 2013-14 to 2014-15 and all three content areas were below the state average of students meeting benchmark in the 2014-15 school year. Math did not meet the Delivery target for Proficiency in the 2014-15 school year while reading, math and science failed to meet the Gap Delivery target for the same school year. This data appears to suggest that a strong instructional process has not been fully implemented at this time.

Classroom Observation Data

According to Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot™) data, the component (B3), “Is provided exemplars of high quality work,” was evident/very evident in 19 percent of classrooms observed. Additionally, the component (E1), “Is asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning,” was evident/very evident in 38 percent of classrooms. The High Expectations Learning Environment had a score of 2.28 on a four point scale which was sixth out of the seven Learning Environments in ratings.

Stakeholder Survey Data

Student survey data indicated 61 percent of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers explain their expectations for learning and behavior so I can be successful,” indicating there is absence of agreement among students regarding this matter. Additionally, 60 percent of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers provide me with information about my learning and grades.” The staff had limited agreement to the statement, “All teachers in our school provide students with specific and timely feedback about their learning,” suggesting the need of an instructional process that better informs students in a timely manner while giving specific feedback regarding the individual student’s performance.

Stakeholder Interviews

Interviews revealed that although there is an instructional process in place, interviewees had trouble articulating the full scope and sequence of the process being used. Although interviews indicated that guided planning is occurring, this activity appears to be focused on general assistance and more of a checklist activity as opposed to guiding and coaching teachers in the instructional process.

Documents and artifacts

Upon review of the guided planning documents, there are several forms for facilitators to use in the guided planning process. Utilizing the process with fidelity should prove very beneficial and have a strong impact on student achievement.

Additionally, according to the superintendent’s presentation two areas were targeted for opportunities of improvement with those being: 1) develop and implement professional learning opportunities to train teachers how to use exemplars to guide and inform student learning 2) Utilize PAC (Principal’s Advisory Committee) and PLC (professional learning community) meetings to train teachers how to provide effective, timely, and specific feedback to students about their learning.

The district’s Self-Assessment document (2015) states that, “As a district, Hopkins County Schools needs to secure exemplars for standards of performance which provides guidance for students, teachers, and administrators allowing for informed feedback regarding learning.”

DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PRIORITY

Indicator: 3.10

Action statement:

Collaborate with schools to revise and implement a grading and reporting policy that has clearly defined criteria representing academic grades based on the attainment of content knowledge and skills with consistency across grade levels. A system for monitoring and evaluation of grading and reporting practices must be in place and on-going in order to ensure equitable and challenging experiences in all classes, preparing students for the next level of success.

Evidence and Rationale:

Student Performance Data

Student performance data, as detailed in this report, indicated that neither the overall Annual Measurable Objective Goal nor the Graduation Rate goal for the 2014-15 school year were met. Algebra II showed a 36.7 point decrease in the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished from 2013-14 to 2014-15. The percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in English II and Biology lagged behind state scores in the most recent state assessment results. On ACT, all three

content areas (English, math, and reading) experienced a decrease in the percentage of students meeting benchmark from 2013-14 to 2014-15 and all three content areas were below the state average of students meeting benchmark in the 2014-15 school year. Math did not meet the Delivery target for Proficiency in the 2014-15 school year while reading, math and science failed to meet the Gap Delivery target for the same school year.

Classroom Observation Data

According to the Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot™) Rating Guide, “Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment” had the lowest overall rating among the environments with an average of 2.2 on a 4.0 scale. Within the “Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment”, the indicator E4, “Student understands how his/her work is assessed”, was evident/very evident in 35 percent of classrooms observed. “Is asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning” (E1) was very evident/evident in 38 percent of classrooms observed.

This data suggests a need to revisit the current district and school policies to ensure implementation, evaluation, and monitoring of a system for grading and reporting that is based on a clearly defined set of criteria that represent the attainment of content knowledge and skills across all grade levels.

Stakeholder Survey Data

Student survey data indicated 62 percent of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers fairly grade and evaluate my work”, indicating there is an absence of agreement among students. The staff had limited agreement to the statement, “All teachers in our school provide students with specific and timely feedback about their learning.” Additionally, there is a limited agreement among staff on the statement, “All teachers in our school use consistent common grading and reporting policies across grade levels and courses based on clearly defined criteria.” These responses suggest the need for a consistent grading process based on attainment of content knowledge and skills across all grade levels.

Stakeholder Interviews

Interviews revealed that although there is a grading policy in place, there is some question as to whether the current policy accurately reflects what a student knows and is able to do. According to interviews, “Grading is based more on knowledge and skills now than ever before.” Although it appears that progress is being made in this area, a concern that grades are inflated at the high school level clearly exists.

Documents and artifacts

Upon review of district and school policies, there are current grading policies in place. The policies do not clearly define criteria that represents the attainment of content knowledge and skills as the basis for grading nor a process for monitoring and evaluation of grading practices at the school level. The district’s Self-Assessment document (2015) states, “The district can ensure high expectations and consistency district-wide by clearly defining criteria for grading and reporting for all levels.” Therefore the district appears to be aware of the need to revisit and revise grading practices and policies to enhance student success.

Attachments:

- 1) eleot™ Worksheet

2015 Feedback Report Addendum

The purpose of this addendum is to provide feedback on progress made in addressing improvement priorities identified in the 2013-14 Two Day Visit report for the Hopkins County School District.

Improvement Priority 1: Create and utilize a formal districtwide, systemic process to monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction and assessment in response to multiple data sources that ensures vertical and horizontal alignment are maintained and enhanced with each revision.

School/District	Team	
		This improvement priority has been addressed in an exemplary manner.
X	X	This improvement priority has been addressed satisfactorily.
		This improvement priority has been partially addressed.
		There is little or no evidence that this improvement priority has been addressed.

District Evidence:

- District-wide curriculum maps and pacing guides for ELA (English/language arts), math, social studies and science grades PK (pre-kindergarten)-12
- District-wide systematic review process for curriculum, instruction, and assessment through PAC (Principal's Advisory Committee) and PLC (professional learning community)
- District-wide common assessments and data analysis protocol for grades K-8
- District-wide common assessments and data analysis protocol for high school EOC (End-of-Course) areas
- District-wide standards-based report cards for grades K-2
- District-wide K-5 math and reading fluency expectations
- Survey results from Hopkins County Central parents and students
- Program descriptions for Family Resource and Youth Service Centers, Special Education, Extended School Services, School to Careers, Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports, Kentucky System of Interventions, Gifted and Talented, KERA (Kentucky Education Reform Act) Preschool, Federal Title Programs, and Student Assessment
- District Certified Evaluation Plan
- Documentation of on-going professional learning and K-12 writing vertical alignment
- Lesson plans/classroom instructional framework
- District-wide data analysis tools: Big Buttons, Universal Screeners, KASC (Kentucky Association of School Councils) tool-kits, Novice Reduction goal setting
- Comprehensive School and District Improvement Plans
- Professional development plans, evaluations, and needs assessments
- District level instructional coaching for all schools

District Supporting Rationale:

Hopkins County Schools is a distinguished district for consecutive years according to the most recent K-PREP data. The 5 year cohort graduation rate for 2013-14 was 88.8 percent while the 2014-15 increased to 92.3 percent. The 2013-14 and 2014-15 district elementary school gap scores exceeded the state percentage of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in reading, math, social studies, language mechanics, and writing. The 2013-14 and 2014-15 district middle school gap scores exceeded

the state percentage of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in reading, math, social studies, and writing. The 2013-14 district high school gap scores exceeded the state percentage of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in math, science and language mechanics. The 2014-15 high school scores reflected gap scores exceeding the state percentage of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in the areas of reading, math, social studies, writing, and language mechanics. In elementary schools BRIGANCE and MAP data are analyzed; in middle and high schools CERT data are gathered and disaggregated to inform instructional decisions, develop individualized intervention plans, and set goals for individual student progress and growth. Elementary schools share common curricula in reading, math, science, and writing supported with common district-wide pacing guides and common assessments. Middle schools utilize a common math curriculum, common ELA unit maps and pacing guides, and common science pacing documents which are validated by district-wide math and ELA common assessments. The district has made a financial commitment for a common district-wide ELA curriculum to be implemented in the 2016 school year. District high schools generate course of study guides and administer end-of-course assessments in four core areas. During the second trimester, high schools will administer common assessments in the EOC areas. The district utilizes a common data analysis tool focused on the five data questions for all common assessments. In addition to core instruction and assessment, students are provided opportunities for individualized supplemental enrichment through special education and related services, gifted and talented, extended school, Kentucky System of Interventions, schoolwide Title I, and School-to-Careers services. The Persistence to Graduation Tool is used in every building to identify at-risk students in order for early intervention. Instructional technology is prevalent throughout all levels of the district and supports differentiated instruction. Some examples include district-wide adopted common instructional curricula, Odysseyware, Study Island, BrainPop, and CIITS among others.

Team Evidence:

- Instructional Summit documents
- Content department agendas and minutes
- PLC agendas and minutes
- Curriculum coordinator's agenda and minutes
- Documents monitoring progress on improvement priorities
- Benchmark assessments
- Guided planning documents
- Data analysis documents
- 2-day/Progress Monitoring visit survey reports
- Vertical alignment plans
- Walkthrough documents
- eleot documents
- Curriculum documents

Team Supporting Rationale:

The district has engaged in several initiatives to satisfactorily address this improvement priority. Vertical and horizontal alignment has been a major focus of the district to make sure there is a seamless alignment among grade levels and courses. Instructional coaching, guided planning, district walkthroughs, aligned assessments, numerous professional learning communities, central office mentors for each school, and extensive professional development has occurred in the district. Leadership teams have been trained to analyze the data and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to address identified needs.

Improvement Priority 2: Develop and implement a formal district walkthrough process that consistently monitors instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures. District leadership ensures 1) alignment with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) an aligned and approved curriculum, 3) direct engagement with all students in monitoring their learning, and 4) the use of content specific standards of professional practice.

School/District	Team	
		This improvement priority has been addressed in an exemplary manner.
X	X	This improvement priority has been addressed satisfactorily.
		This improvement priority has been partially addressed.
		There is little or no evidence that this improvement priority has been addressed.

District Evidence:

- District-wide curriculum maps and pacing guides for ELA, math, social studies and science, grades PK-12
- District-wide systematic review process for curriculum, instruction, and assessment through PAC (Principal’s Advisory Committee) and PLC (professional learning community)
- District-wide common assessments and data analysis protocol for grades K-8
- District-wide common assessments and data analysis protocol for high school EOC areas
- District-wide standards-based report cards for grades K-2
- District-wide K-5 math and reading fluency expectations
- Survey results from Hopkins County Central parents and students
- District-wide PBIS (Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports) walk-throughs and SET monitoring visits
- District-wide 6-12 eleot[®] walk-throughs and questioning walk-through analysis
- District provided training and guidance resources on walk-through instruments
- District-wide Teachscape calibration reports for administrators
- District-wide peer observations for TPGES (Teacher Professional Growth and Effectiveness System), OPGES (Other Professionals Professional Growth and Effectiveness System), and DCPGES (District Certified Professional Growth and Effectiveness System)
- District-wide PPGES (Principal Professional Growth and Effectiveness System) site visits and coaching visit questions
- District-wide New Teacher Induction Program
- District Certified Evaluation Plan
- Hopkins County Board of Education recognizes Certified and Operation Employees of the Month
- Hopkins County Central recognizes a “Teacher of the Week”
- Lesson plans/classroom instructional framework
- District-wide data analysis tools: Big Buttons, Universal Screeners, KASC tool-kits, Novice Reduction goal setting
- Comprehensive School and District Improvement Plans
- Professional development plans, evaluations, and needs assessments
- District level instructional coaching for all schools

District Supporting Rationale:

District and school administrators formally and consistently monitor instruction and assessment through the following methods:

- Conducting bi-annual district instructional and Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports walkthroughs of all schools;
- Monitoring instructional practices and data analysis through participation in district-wide professional learning communities utilizing a common district format addressing curriculum, instruction, and assessment;
- Mentoring principals and leadership teams by district coaching through involvement with Principal Advisory Committees;
- Leading district-wide trainings in comprehensive planning, data analysis, leadership development, teaching and content strategies, and school specific training as needed;
- Developing an individual accommodation tracking form for students with learning needs to assist in supports;
- Implementing a new Certified Evaluation Plan for all certified employees as well as a District Growth and Effectiveness Plan;
- Conducting district walkthroughs and learning walks as well as district administrative coaching visits;
- Supporting teacher growth through the New Teacher Induction Program, the PGES procedures and peer observation;
- Analyzing interim formative assessment data (MAP/CERT/common assessments) and action planning; and
- Supporting on-going job embedded professional learning through summer professional development, PLCs, designated professional development within the school calendar, and release time for professional learning.

Team Evidence:

- PLC minutes and agendas
- Certified Evaluation Plan
- Walkthrough documents
- District mission, vision, and beliefs
- Vertical alignment plans
- Content department agendas and minutes
- PLC agendas and minutes
- Curriculum coordinator's agenda and minutes
- Documents monitoring progress on improvement priorities
- Guided planning documents
- Data analysis documents
- 2-day/Progress Monitoring visit survey reports
- eleot® documents
- Curriculum documents

Team Supporting Rationale:

District and school leaders have developed and implemented a formal, consistent walkthrough process to monitor and evaluate instructional practices on a regular basis. Additional support staff at the district and school levels are assigned to provide regular one-on-one mentoring and coaching, participate in professional learning communities, and provide assistance to high school staff in addressing identified needs. Teacher perception data support they are evaluated on criteria designed to improve their skills and that all staff are held accountable for student learning.