



Internal School Review Report

Name of Institution

Reviewed: Lincoln County High School

Date: March 24, 2014-March 25, 2014

School Principal: Tim Godbey



Introduction

The KDE Internal School Review is designed to:

- provide feedback to Priority Schools 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 2011-2012 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 2013
- 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 2013 and TELL Kentucky survey data
- principal and stakeholder interviews

The report includes:

- an overall rating for Standard 3
- a rating for each indicator
- a rating for each concept within the indicator
- listing of evidence examined to determine the rating
- Powerful Practices (level 4), Opportunities for Improvement (level 2), 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: The school's curriculum, instructional design, and assessment practices guide and ensure teacher effectiveness and student learning.	School Rating for Standard 3 2.58	Team Rating for Standard 3 2.42
---	--	--

Standard: The school's curriculum, instructional design, and assessment practices guide and ensure teacher effectiveness and student learning.

3.1	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.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 3
-----	--	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

Performance levels

4		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's purpose.
3		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.
X	2	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.
1		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.
4		Evidence clearly indicates curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
X	3	There is some evidence to indicate curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
2		There is little evidence to indicate curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
1		There is no evidence to indicate how successful students will be at the next level.
4		Like courses/classes have the same high learning expectations.
X	3	Like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations.
2		Most like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations.
1		Like courses/classes do not always have the same learning expectations.
4		Learning activities are individualized for each student in a way that supports achievement of expectations.
X	3	Some learning activities are individualized for each student in a way that supports achievement of expectations.
2		Little individualization for each student is evident.
1		No individualization for students is evident.

Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)

Self-Assessment
Executive Summary
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
KDE School Report Card
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey Data
ELEOT Classroom Observation Data
Stakeholder interviews
Review of school documents and artifacts

In determining the rating for this indicator the team should consider an array of information. However, **these sources of information must be considered:**

- Self-Assessment
- Executive Summary
- Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
- KDE School Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

Indicators receiving a rating of “1” will be **“Improvement Priorities”**

The team will determine whether Indicators receiving a rating of “2” will be **“Improvement Priorities”** or **“Opportunities for Improvement”**

“Opportunities for Improvement” and **“Improvement Priorities”** should follow to the format below.

(Check one)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Opportunity for Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

As shown in the table below,

- The school did not meet the school report card Delivery targets on the reading, math, science, social studies, and writing accountability assessments. However, the school met the Delivery target for College and Career Readiness.
- There was a reduction in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level on the reading, math, and writing accountability assessments.

Comparison %P/D (Proficient/Distinguished) from 2011-12 to 2012-13

	Reading % P/D	Math% P/D	Science % P/D	Social Studies % P/D	Combined 10 th /11 th Writing% P/D	%CCR
2011-12	55.1	44.5	18.0	48.0	42.6	42.9
2012-13	44.8	37.9	19.6	51.9	40.0	56.8

+/-	-10.3	-6.6	+1.6	+3.9	-2.6	+13.9
Met Delivery Target	No	No	No	No	No	Yes

As shown in the table below,

- The school’s non-duplicated gap group outperformed the state average for students who scored at the proficient level on the math, social studies, and language mechanics accountability assessments.
- The school’s non-duplicated gap group outperformed the state percentage for students scoring distinguished on the social studies and language mechanics accountability assessments.
- The school’s non-duplicated gap group performed below the state average for students who scored at the proficient and distinguished levels on the reading, science and writing accountability assessments.

Non-duplicated Gap Group Performance (% P/D) on Accountability Assessments (2012, 2013)

	Novice	Novice (State)	Apprentice	Apprentice (State)	Proficient	Proficient (State)	Distinguished	Distinguished (State)
Reading	47.0	45.6	16.2	11.7	33.3	37.9	3.5	4.8
Math	31.2	31.5	39.4	42.2	25.9	22.3	3.5	3.9
Science	36.7	28.5	49.5	47.6	13.8	20.3	0.0	3.7
Social Studies	38.0	43.0	17.5	18.3	34.5	30.3	9.9	8.5
Writing	16.7	15.7	51.7	48.2	29.4	33.0	2.2	3.1
Language Mechanics	17.9	25.4	35.4	35.6	31.3	26.4	15.4	12.7

Classroom Observation Data:

- The Equitable Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.0 on a 4-point scale, as shown in the chart below. Among the lowest ratings in this environment was “Has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs” which received a rating of 1.7 on a 4-point scale, indicating students seldom receive differentiated instructional opportunities.

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicator	Average Rating	Description	Not Observed	Partially Observed	Evident	Very Evident
A.1	1.7	Has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs	49%	35%	12%	4%
A.2	2.6	Has equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support	4%	41%	45%	10%

A.3	2.3	Knows that rules and consequences are fair, clear, and consistently applied	25%	35%	27%	12%
A.4	1.5	Has ongoing opportunities to learn about their own and other's backgrounds/cultures/differences	69%	20%	10%	2%
Overall rating on a 4 point scale:		2.0				

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 57.5% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction and assessment based on data from student assessments and examination of professional practice.”
- 55.3% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students.”
- 59.6% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school regularly use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.”
- 70.2% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, challenging curriculum and learning experiences provide equity for all students in the development of learning, thinking, and life skills.”
- 78.7% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, related learning support services are provided for all students based on their needs.”
- 66.0% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all staff members use student data to address the unique learning needs of all students.”
- 73.9% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school provides me with challenging curriculum and learning experiences.”
- 57.4% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school prepares me to deal with issues I may face in the future.”
- 62.4% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school provides learning services for me according to my needs.”
- 69.7% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers use a variety of teaching methods and learning activities to help me develop the skills I will need to succeed.”
- 30.7% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers change their teaching to meet my learning needs.”
- 76.5% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers explain their expectations for learning and behavior so I can be successful.”
- 80.4% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers use tests, projects, presentations, and portfolios to check my understanding of what is taught.”
- 70.1% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers provide me with information about my learning and grades.”
- 60.3% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers provide an equitable curriculum that meets his/her learning needs.”
- 68.1% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers give work that challenges my child.”
- 60.7% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers use a variety of teaching strategies and learning activities.”

- 42.6% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers meet his/her learning needs by individualizing instruction.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews and the principal’s presentation reveal a commitment to the development of a vertically articulated curriculum that provides equitable and challenging learning experiences for all students.
- The school’s SkyDrive and Dropbox contain documents evidencing teacher collaboration on the following aspects of power standards:
 - selection of power standards
 - the development of instructional units addressing power standards
 - common assessments measuring student mastery of power standards
 - the development of learning targets articulating a learning progression toward the achievement of power standards
 - the development of lessons aligned to power standards

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

		and assessment.
	2	There is limited evidence that the continuous improvement process ensures vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school’s purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
	1	There is little or no evidence that the continuous improvement process is connected with vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school’s purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey Data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation Data		
Stakeholder Interviews		
Review of School Documents and Artifacts		

In determining the rating for this indicator the team should consider an array of information. However, **these sources of information must be considered:**

- Self-Assessment
- Executive Summary
- Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
- KDE School Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

Indicators receiving a rating of “1” will be **“Improvement Priorities”**

The team will determine whether Indicators receiving a rating of “2” will be **“Improvement Priorities”** or **“Opportunities for Improvement”**

“Opportunities for Improvement” and **“Improvement Priorities”** should follow to the format below.

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Design and implement a formal system that utilizes data obtained from multiple student assessments and that examines the effectiveness of instructional practices in promoting student learning. Frequently monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction and assessment ensuring vertical and horizontal alignment and congruency to the school’s goals for achievement. Embed this curricular monitoring and adjustment system in the professional learning community for all content areas and

courses to promote teacher collaboration resulting in positive student learning outcomes. Additionally, establish a system that frequently evaluates the curriculum revision process to ensure its alignment to the current school achievement goals.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

As shown in the table below,

- The percentage of students scoring at the novice level on the reading, science, social studies, and 10th grade writing accountability assessments is greater than the percentage of students scoring at the novice level on these assessments state wide.
- The percentage of students scoring at the apprentice level on the reading, science, 10th grade writing, and 11th grade writing accountability assessments is greater than the percentage of students scoring at the apprentice level on these assessments state wide.
- The percentage of students scoring at the proficient level on the math, social studies and language mechanics accountability assessments is greater than the students scoring at the proficient level on these assessments state wide.
- The percentage of students scoring at the distinguished level on the reading, math, science, social studies, 10th grade writing, 11th grade writing, and the language mechanics accountability assessments are less than the state average of students scoring at the distinguished level on these assessments state wide.

Achievement Scores for Accountability (2012, 2013): %NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished)

	Novice	Novice (State)	Apprentice	Apprentice (State)	Proficient	Proficient (State)	Distinguished	Distinguished (State)
Reading	40.5	33.9	14.7	10.3	40.1	45.2	4.7	10.6
Math	23.0	24.8	39.1	39.2	32.2	27.6	5.7	8.4
Science	31.9	20.2	48.6	43.5	18.5	28.2	2.0	9.2
Social Studies	31.3	31.8	16.8	16.9	38.5	35.5	13.4	15.8
Writing 10 th Grade	13.7	10.5	64.1	53.9	21.5	31.7	0.8	3.9
Writing 11 th Grade	10.0	10.5	30.3	27.8	52.4	52.5	7.4	9.2
Language Mechanics 10 th Grade	13.9	17.8	34.3	30.8	32.1	29.2	19.6	22.2

Classroom Observation Data:

As shown in the chart below,

- The Equitable Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.0 on a 4-point scale.
- The High Expectations Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Supportive Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The Active Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Progress Monitoring Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Well-Managed Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4 point scale.

- The Digital Learning Environment received an overall rating of 1.5 on a 4 point scale.

Overall Ratings for ELEOT Learning Environments

A. Equitable Learning	B. High Expectations	C. Supportive Learning	D. Active Learning	E. Progress Monitoring	F. Well-Managed Learning	G. Digital Learning
2.0	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.1	2.3	1.5

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 57.5% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction and assessment based on data from student assessments and examination of professional practice.”
- 63.8% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use multiple types of assessments to modify instruction and to revise the curriculum.”
- 87.2% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally across grade levels and content areas.”
- 74.5% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school have been trained to implement a formal process that promotes discussion about student learning (e.g., action research, examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching).”
- 70.2% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, challenging curriculum and learning experiences provide equity for all students in the development of learning, thinking, and life skills.”
- 66.0% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all staff members use student data to address the unique learning needs of all students.”
- 82.1% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school gives me multiple assessments to check my understanding of what is taught.”
- 73.9% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school provides me with challenging curriculum and learning experiences.”
- 69.7% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers use a variety of teaching methods and learning activities to help me develop the skills I will need to succeed.”
- 30.7% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers change their teaching to meet my learning needs.”
- 68.1% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers give work that challenges my child.”
- 60.7% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers use a variety of teaching strategies and learning activities.”
- 42.6% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers meet his/her learning needs by individualizing instruction.”
- 74.2% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My child is given multiple assessments to measure his/her understanding of what is taught.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews revealed that great efforts have been made to begin the process of aligning curriculum, assessment and instruction. Like courses now use common assessments and have developed common instructional units that address specific priority standards. The school’s SkyDrive and Dropbox contain detailed unit plans, lesson plans and learning targets that evidence curricular alignment to the school’s vision for student learning and achievement goals.

Other pertinent information:

- The school in collaboration with other schools in the district has created a foundation whereby the vertical and horizontal articulation of curriculum can ultimately transform into a guaranteed and viable curriculum. Through the systematic monitoring and adjustment of the curriculum to meet student needs throughout this school year and subsequent school years, the curriculum can continue to provide increasingly equitable and challenging learning experiences for all students.

3.3	Teachers engage students in their learning through instructional strategies that ensure achievement of learning expectations.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	Teachers are consistent and deliberate in planning and using instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
	3	Teachers plan and use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
X	2	Teachers sometimes use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
	1	Teachers rarely or never use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
	4	Teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of each student.	
	3	Teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students when necessary.	
X	2	Teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of groups of students when necessary.	
	1	Teachers seldom or never personalize instructional strategies.	
	4	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.	
	3	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.	
X	2	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.	
	1	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.	
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)			
Self-Assessment			
Executive Summary			
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment			
KDE School Report Card			
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey Data			

ELEOT Classroom Observation Data
Stakeholder Interviews
Review of School Documents and Artifacts

In determining the rating for this indicator the team should consider an array of information. However, **these sources of information must be considered:**

- Self-Assessment
- Executive Summary
- Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
- KDE School Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

Indicators receiving a rating of “1” will be **“Improvement Priorities”**

The team will determine whether Indicators receiving a rating of “2” will be **“Improvement Priorities”** or **“Opportunities for Improvement”**

“Opportunities for Improvement” and **“Improvement Priorities”** should follow to the format below.

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Initiate a program of professional development that increases teacher capacity to plan and use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection and development of critical thinking skills in all content areas and courses. Within this professional development plan, incorporate opportunities for teachers to develop instructional skills necessary to personalize instructional strategies and interventions that address the individual learning needs of students in all courses and content areas. Furthermore, provide opportunities for teachers to develop the capacity to use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines and use technologies as learning tools.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The percentage of students making typical or higher growth was greater than the state percentage of students making typical or higher growth on the reading and math accountability assessments, as shown in the table below:

Percentage of Students Making Typical or Higher Growth (2012-2013)

Reading (School)	Reading (State)	Math (School)	Math (State)	Combined Reading and Math (School)	Combined Reading and Math (State)
61.5	56.9	67.1	57.3	64.4	57.2

Classroom Observation Data:

- The High Expectations Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale. “Knows and strives to meet the high expectations established by the teacher” was Evident/Very evident in 31% of classrooms and was partially observed in 55% of classrooms suggesting that students are not always aware of teachers’ high expectations for learning. “Is provided exemplars of high quality work” and “Is asked and responds to questions that require higher order thinking” received an overall rating of 1.9 on a 4-point scale, which indicates that students are not regularly receiving models of proficient work to guide their learning, and that students are not consistently receiving opportunities to practice higher order thinking skills (e.g., applying, evaluating, synthesizing).

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Partially Observed	Evident	Very Evident
B.1	2.2	Knows and strives to meet the high expectations established by the teacher	14%	55%	25%	6%
B.2	2.3	Is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable	20%	47%	20%	14%
B.3	1.9	Is provided exemplars of high quality work	45%	27%	20%	8%
B.4	2.2	Is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks	25%	47%	14%	14%
B.5	1.9	Is asked and responds to questions that require higher order thinking (e.g., applying, evaluating, synthesizing)	39%	31%	25%	4%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:	2.1					

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 55.3% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students.”
- 59.6% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school regularly use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.”
- 51.1% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use a variety of technologies as instructional resources.”
- 70.2% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, challenging curriculum and learning experiences provide equity for all students in the development of learning, thinking, and life skills.”

- 78.7% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, related learning support services are provided for all students based on their needs.”
- 66.0% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all staff members use student data to address the unique learning needs of all students.”
- 62.4% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school provides learning services for me according to my needs.”
- 69.7% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers use a variety of teaching methods and learning activities to help me develop the skills I will need to succeed.”
- 30.7% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers change their teaching to meet my learning needs.”
- 60.3% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers provide an equitable curriculum that meets his/her learning needs.”
- 68.1% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers give work that challenges my child.”
- 60.7% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers use a variety of teaching strategies and learning activities.”
- 42.6% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers meet his/her learning needs by individualizing instruction.”
- 73.6% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My child has up-to-date computers and other technology to learn.”
- 69.3% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My child has access to support services based on his/her identified needs.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews and the principal’s presentation demonstrate a commitment to establishing a high expectations learning environment aligned to highly effective instructional strategies that promote student mastery of content standards and skills. However, interviews and the principal’s presentation also reveal that high expectations for learning and highly effective instructional strategies that yield student mastery of content standards and skills are not consistently applied in all content areas and classrooms.

3.4	School/district leaders monitor and support the improvement of instructional practices of teachers to ensure student success.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 3
Performance levels			
	4	School 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’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.	
X	3	School leaders formally and consistently monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school’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.	
	2	School leaders monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school’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.	

1	School leaders occasionally or randomly monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school’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.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)	
Self-Assessment	
Executive Summary	
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment	
KDE School Report Card	
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey Data	
ELEOT Classroom Observation Data	
Stakeholder Interviews	
Review of School Documents and Artifacts	

In determining the rating for this indicator the team should consider an array of information. However, **these sources of information must be considered:**

- Self-Assessment
- Executive Summary
- Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
- KDE School Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

Indicators receiving a rating of “1” will be **“Improvement Priorities”**

The team will determine whether Indicators receiving a rating of “2” will be **“Improvement Priorities”** or **“Opportunities for Improvement”**

“Opportunities for Improvement” and **“Improvement Priorities”** should follow to the format below.

(Check one)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Opportunity for Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

As shown in the chart below,

- The percentage of students meeting College and Career Readiness benchmarks increased by 13.9 points between the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school years.
- The percentage of students scoring at the proficient or distinguished levels increased on the science and social studies assessments between the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school years.

- The percentage of students scoring at the proficient or distinguished levels decreased on the reading, math, and writing accountability assessments between the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school years.
- The school did not meet its state determined student achievement delivery targets on the reading, math, science, social studies, and writing accountability assessments.
- The school met its College and Career Readiness Delivery target as determined by the Kentucky Department of Education.

Comparison of %P/D (proficient/distinguished) 2011-12 to 2012-13

	Reading % P/D	Math% P/D	Science % P/D	Social Studies % P/D	Combined 10 th /11 th Writing% P/D	%CCR
2011-2012	55.1	44.5	18.0	48.0	42.6	42.9
2012-2013	44.8	37.9	19.6	51.9	40.0	56.8
+/-	-10.3	-6.6	+1.6	+3.9	-2.6	+13.9
Met Delivery Target	No	No	No	No	No	Yes

- The percentage of students making typical or higher growth was greater than the state percentage of students making typical or higher growth on the reading and math accountability assessments, as shown in the table below:

11th Grade: Percentage of Students Making Typical or Higher Growth (2012-13)

Reading (School)	Reading (State)	Math (School)	Math (State)	Combined Reading and Math (School)	Combined Reading and Math (State)
61.5	56.9	67.1	57.3	64.4	57.2

As shown in the chart below,

- The school performed above the state average for ACT scores on the English, math, reading, and science assessments. The school's composite score on the ACT was greater than the state average.
- The school performed above the state average PLAN score on the English assessment. The school performed below the state average on PLAN scores on the math, reading and science assessments.

ACT/PLAN Average Scores Compared to the State Average (2012-13)

	English	English (State)	Math	Math (State)	Reading	Reading (State)	Science	Science (State)	Composite	Composite (State)
ACT	18.8	18.4	19.0	18.9	20.0	19.4	20.1	19.5	19.6	19.2
PLAN	17.3	17.0	17.1	17.4	17.0	17.2	18.1	18.3	17.5	17.6

Classroom Observation Data:

As shown in the table below,

- The Equitable Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.0 on a 4-point scale.
- The High Expectations Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Supportive Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The Active Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Progress Monitoring Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.

- The Well-Managed Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The Digital Learning Environment received an overall rating of 1.5 on a 4-point scale.

Overall Ratings on ELEOT Learning Environments

A. Equitable Learning	B. High Expectations	C. Supportive Learning	D. Active Learning	E. Progress Monitoring	F. Well-Managed Learning	G. Digital Learning
2.0	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.1	2.3	1.5

- The average rating of each learning environment suggests that effective instruction is occurring in some classrooms. Furthermore, ratings of “Evident” or “Very Evident” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 33% of classrooms. Ratings of “Somewhat Evident” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 35% of classrooms. Ratings of “Not Observed” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 32% of classrooms. These findings indicate that students are receiving inconsistent access to highly effective instruction.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 59.6% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, staff members provide peer coaching to teachers.”
- 87.2% 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.”
- 85.1% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, a professional learning program is designed to build capacity among all professional and support staff members.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews, the principal’s presentation, a review of classroom walkthrough tools, and an examination of the school leadership’s teacher evaluation process demonstrate a commitment to monitoring and supporting the development of highly effective instructional practices.

3.5	Teachers participate/system operates in collaborative learning communities to improve instruction and student learning.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 3
-----	---	--------------------	------------------

Performance levels

X	4	All members of the school staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule.
	3	All members of the school staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally.
	2	Some members of the school staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally.
	1	Collaborative learning communities randomly self-organize and meet informally.
	4	Frequent collaboration occurs across grade levels and content areas.
X	3	Collaboration often occurs across grade levels and content areas.

	2	Collaboration occasionally occurs across grade levels and content areas.
	1	Collaboration seldom occurs across grade levels and content areas.
	4	Staff members implement a formal process that promotes productive discussion about student learning.
X	3	Staff members have been trained to implement a formal process that promotes discussion about student learning.
	2	Staff members promote discussion about student learning.
	1	Staff members rarely discuss student learning.
	4	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 staff members.
	3	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 personnel.
X	2	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 personnel.
	1	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 personnel.
	4	School personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
X	3	School personnel indicate that collaboration causes improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
	2	School personnel express belief in the value of collaborative learning communities.
	1	School personnel see little value in collaborative learning communities.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey Data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation Data		
Stakeholder Interviews		
Review of School Documents and Artifacts		

In determining the rating for this indicator the team should consider an array of information. However, **these sources of information must be considered:**

- Self-Assessment
- Executive Summary
- Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
- KDE School Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

Indicators receiving a rating of “1” will be “**Improvement Priorities**”

The team will determine whether Indicators receiving a rating of “2” will be “**Improvement Priorities**” or “**Opportunities for Improvement**”

“**Opportunities for Improvement**” and “**Improvement Priorities**” should follow to the format below.

(Check one)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Opportunity for Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

As shown in the table below,

- The school’s non-duplicated gap group outperformed the state average for students scoring at the proficient level on the math, social studies, and language mechanics accountability assessments.
- The school’s non-duplicated gap group outperformed the state average for the percentage of students scoring at the distinguished level on the social studies and language mechanics accountability assessments.
- The school’s non-duplicated gap group performed below the state percentage for students scoring at the proficient and distinguished level on the reading, science and writing accountability assessments.

Non-duplicated Gap Group Performance (% P/D) on Accountability Assessments (2012, 2013)

	Novice	Novice (State)	Apprentice	Apprentice (State)	Proficient	Proficient (State)	Distinguished	Distinguished (State)
Reading	47.0	45.6	16.2	11.7	33.3	37.9	3.5	4.8
Math	31.2	31.5	39.4	42.2	25.9	22.3	3.5	3.9
Science	36.7	28.5	49.5	47.6	13.8	20.3	0.0	3.7
Social Studies	38.0	43.0	17.5	18.3	34.5	30.3	9.9	8.5
Writing	16.7	15.7	51.7	48.2	29.4	33.0	2.2	3.1
Language Mechanics	17.9	25.4	35.4	35.6	31.3	26.4	15.4	12.7

- The school’s percentage of students making typical or higher growth was greater than the state percentage of students making typical or higher growth on the reading and math accountability assessments, as shown in the chart below:

11th Grade: Percent Making Typical or Higher Growth (2012-13)

Reading (School)	Reading (State)	Math (School)	Math (State)	Combined Reading and Math (School)	Combined Reading and Math (State)
61.5	56.9	67.1	57.3	64.4	57.2

Classroom Observation Data:

As shown in the chart below,

- The Equitable Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.0 on a 4-point scale.
- The High Expectations Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Supportive Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The Active Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Progress Monitoring Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Well-Managed Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The Digital Learning Environment received an overall rating of 1.5 on a 4-point scale.

A. Equitable Learning	B. High Expectations	C. Supportive Learning	D. Active Learning	E. Progress Monitoring	F. Well-Managed Learning	G. Digital Learning
2.0	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.1	2.3	1.5

- The average rating of each learning environment suggests that effective instruction is occurring in some classrooms. Furthermore, ratings of “Evident” or “Very Evident” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 33% of classrooms. Ratings of “Somewhat Evident” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 35% of classrooms. Ratings of “Not Observed” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 32% of classrooms. These findings indicate that students are receiving inconsistent access to highly effective instruction.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 87.2% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally across grade levels and content areas.”
- 74.5% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school have been trained to implement a formal process that promotes discussion about student learning (e.g., action research, examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching).”
- 50.3% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers work as a team to help my child.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews, the principal’s presentation, and a review of documents and artifacts demonstrate a commitment to the continuous development of high functioning professional learning communities (PLCs). Additionally, all teachers and administrators participate in PLCs driven by the use of student learning outcomes to design and implement instructional practices responsive to student learning needs on a weekly basis.

3.6	Teachers implement the school/system’s instructional process in support of student learning.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
4	All teachers systematically use an instructional process that clearly informs students of learning		

		expectations and standards of performance.
	3	All teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
X	2	Most teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
	1	Few teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
	4	Exemplars are provided to guide and inform students.
	3	Exemplars are often provided to guide and inform students.
X	2	Exemplars are sometimes provided to guide and inform students.
	1	Exemplars are rarely provided to guide and inform students.
	4	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.
	3	The process includes multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction and provide data for possible curriculum revision.
X	2	The process may include multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction.
	1	The process includes limited measures to inform the ongoing modification of instruction.
	4	The process provides students with specific and immediate feedback about their learning.
	3	The process provides students with specific and timely feedback about their learning.
X	2	The process provides students with feedback about their learning.
	1	The process provides students with minimal feedback of little value about their learning.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey Data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation Data		
Stakeholder Interviews		
Review of School Documents and Artifacts		

In determining the rating for this indicator the team should consider an array of information. However, **these sources of information must be considered:**

- Self-Assessment
- Executive Summary
- Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
- KDE School Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

Indicators receiving a rating of “1” will be **“Improvement Priorities”**

The team will determine whether Indicators receiving a rating of “2” will be **“Improvement Priorities”** or **“Opportunities for Improvement”**

“Opportunities for Improvement” and **“Improvement Priorities”** should follow to the format below.

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Design and administer a professional development program whereby all teachers develop the capacity to use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance. Institute a clearly articulated process that develops teacher ability to effectively provide exemplars of high quality models of learning to inform students of goals and expectations for learning in all courses and content areas. Within the process of developing teacher capacity to provide quality, timely feedback to students about their learning, include training on the construction of formative assessments that provide data informing ongoing modifications to instruction and evidence of student learning that teachers can utilize to regularly revise curriculum to meet student learning needs.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

As shown in the table below,

- The percentage of students scoring at the novice level on the reading, science, and 10th grade writing accountability assessments is greater than the percentage of students scoring at the novice level on these assessments state wide.
- The percentage of students scoring at the apprentice level on the reading, science, 10th grade writing, and 11th grade writing accountability assessments is greater than the percentage of students scoring at the apprentice level on these assessments state wide.
- The percentage of students scoring at the proficient level on the math, social studies and language mechanics accountability assessments is greater than the students scoring at the proficient level on these assessments state wide.
- The percentage of students scoring at the distinguished level on the reading, math, science, social studies, 10th grade writing, 11th grade writing, and the language mechanics accountability assessments are less than the state average of students scoring at the distinguished level on these assessments statewide.

Achievement Scores for Accountability (2012, 2013): %NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished)

	Novice	Novice (State)	Apprentice	Apprentice (State)	Proficient	Proficient (State)	Distinguished	Distinguished (State)
Reading	40.5	33.9	14.7	10.3	40.1	45.2	4.7	10.6
Math	23.0	24.8	39.1	39.2	32.2	27.6	5.7	8.4
Science	31.9	20.2	48.6	43.5	18.5	28.2	2.0	9.2
Social Studies	31.3	31.8	16.8	16.9	38.5	35.5	13.4	15.8
Writing 10 th Grade	13.7	10.5	64.1	53.9	21.5	31.7	0.8	3.9
Writing 11 th Grade	10.0	10.5	30.3	27.8	52.4	52.5	7.4	9.2
Language Mechanics 10 th Grade	13.9	17.8	34.3	30.8	32.1	29.2	19.6	22.2

Classroom Observation Data:

As shown in the chart below,

- The Equitable Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.0 on a 4-point scale.
- The High Expectations Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Supportive Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The Active Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Progress Monitoring Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Well-Managed Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The Digital Learning Environment received an overall rating of 1.5 on a 4-point scale.

A. Equitable Learning	B. High Expectations	C. Supportive Learning	D. Active Learning	E. Progress Monitoring	F. Well-Managed Learning	G. Digital Learning
2.0	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.1	2.3	1.5

- The average rating of each Learning Environment suggests that effective instruction is occurring in some classrooms. Furthermore, ratings of “Evident/Very Evident” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 33% of classrooms. Ratings of “Somewhat Evident” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 35% of classrooms. Ratings of “Not Observed” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 32% of classrooms. These findings indicate that students are receiving inconsistent access to highly effective instruction.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 70.2% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use a process to inform students of their learning expectations and standards of performance.”
- 44.7% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school provide students with specific and timely feedback about their learning.”

- 63.8% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use multiple types of assessments to modify instruction and to revise the curriculum.”
- 44.7% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use consistent common grading and reporting policies across grade levels and courses based on clearly defined criteria.”
- 82.1% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school gives me multiple assessments to check my understanding of what is taught.”
- 80.4% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers use tests, projects, presentations, and portfolios to check my understanding of what is taught.”
- 70.1% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers provide me with information about my learning and grades.”
- 76.5% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers explain their expectations for learning and behavior so I can be successful.”
- 87.1% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My child knows the expectations for learning in all classes.”
- 74.2% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My child is given multiple assessments to measure his/her understanding of what is taught.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Student interviews, the principal’s presentation and interviews with teachers demonstrate that a highly effective instructional process that supports student learning is inconsistently implemented throughout the school. While some highly effective instruction is occurring in some classrooms, not all classrooms offer instruction engaging students in rigorous learning opportunities that promote mastery of content standards and skills.

3.7	Mentoring, coaching, and induction programs support instructional improvement consistent with the school/system’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 3
Performance levels			
	4	All school personnel are engaged in systematic mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
X	3	School personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	2	Some school personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	1	Few or no school personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	4	These programs set high expectations for all school personnel and include valid and reliable measures of performance.	
	3	These programs set expectations for all school personnel and include measures of performance.	
X	2	These programs set expectations for school personnel.	
	1	Limited or no expectations for school personnel are included.	

Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)
Self-Assessment
Executive Summary
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
KDE School Report Card
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey Data
ELEOT Classroom Observation Data
Stakeholder Interviews
Review of School Documents and Artifacts

In determining the rating for this indicator the team should consider an array of information. However, **these sources of information must be considered:**

- Self-Assessment
- Executive Summary
- Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
- KDE School Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

Indicators receiving a rating of “1” will be **“Improvement Priorities”**

The team will determine whether Indicators receiving a rating of “2” will be **“Improvement Priorities”** or **“Opportunities for Improvement”**

“Opportunities for Improvement” and **“Improvement Priorities”** should follow to the format below.

(Check one)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Opportunity for Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

As shown in the table below,

- The percentage of students scoring at the novice level on the reading, science, social studies, and 10th grade writing accountability assessments is greater than the percentage of students scoring at the novice level on these assessments state wide.
- The percentage of students scoring at the apprentice level on the reading, science, 10th grade writing, and 11th grade writing accountability assessments is greater than the percentage of students scoring at the apprentice level on these assessments state wide.
- The percentage of students scoring at the proficient level on the math, social studies and language mechanics accountability assessments is greater than the students scoring at the proficient level on these assessments state wide.

- The percentage of students scoring at the distinguished level on the reading, math, science, social studies, 10th grade writing, 11th grade writing, and the language mechanics accountability assessments is less than the state average of students scoring at the distinguished level on these assessments statewide.

Achievement Scores for Accountability (2012, 2013): %NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished)

	Novice	Novice (State)	Apprentice	Apprentice (State)	Proficient	Proficient (State)	Distinguished	Distinguished (State)
Reading	40.5	33.9	14.7	10.3	40.1	45.2	4.7	10.6
Math	23.0	24.8	39.1	39.2	32.2	27.6	5.7	8.4
Science	31.9	20.2	48.6	43.5	18.5	28.2	2.0	9.2
Social Studies	31.3	31.8	16.8	16.9	38.5	35.5	13.4	15.8
Writing 10 th Grade	13.7	10.5	64.1	53.9	21.5	31.7	0.8	3.9
Writing 11 th Grade	10.0	10.5	30.3	27.8	52.4	52.5	7.4	9.2
Language Mechanics 10 th Grade	13.9	17.8	34.3	30.8	32.1	29.2	19.6	22.2

As shown in the table below,

- The school's percentage of students meeting benchmark on the ACT English, math and reading assessments was greater than the percentage of students meeting benchmark on these assessments statewide.
- The percentage of students meeting benchmark on the PLAN English assessment was greater than the percentage of students meeting benchmark on this assessment statewide.
- The percentage of students meeting benchmark on the PLAN math, reading and science assessments was less than the percentage of students meeting benchmark on these assessments statewide.

ACT/PLAN % Meeting Benchmarks (2012, 2013)

	English	English (State)	Math	Math (State)	Reading	Reading (State)	Science	Science (State)
ACT	60.0	53.1	40.0	39.6	50.4	44.2		
PLAN	75.8	67.8	24.5	25.8	40.4	43.2	17.7	21.2

Classroom Observation Data:

As shown in the chart below,

- The Equitable Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.0 on a 4-point scale.
- The High Expectations Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Supportive Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The Active Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Progress Monitoring Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.

- The Well-Managed Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The Digital Learning Environment received an overall rating of 1.5 on a 4-point scale.

A. Equitable Learning	B. High Expectations	C. Supportive Learning	D. Active Learning	E. Progress Monitoring	F. Well-Managed Learning	G. Digital Learning
2.0	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.1	2.3	1.5

- The average rating of each learning environment suggests that effective instruction is occurring in some classrooms. Furthermore, ratings of “Evident” and “Very Evident” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 33% of classrooms. Ratings of “Somewhat Evident” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 35% of classrooms. Ratings of “Not Observed” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 32% of classrooms. These findings indicate that students are receiving inconsistent access to highly effective instruction.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 59.6% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, staff members provide peer coaching to teachers.”
- 87.2% 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.”
- 85.1% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, a professional learning program is designed to build capacity among all professional and support staff members.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Teacher interviews, the principal’s presentation, and a review of documents and artifacts demonstrate the school’s commitment to engaging all faculty members in ongoing mentoring, coaching and professional development opportunities aimed at improving instruction in alignment with the school’s goals for achievement and vision for student learning.

3.8	The school/system engages families in meaningful ways in their children’s education and keeps them informed of their children’s learning progress.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 3
-----	--	--------------------	------------------

Performance levels

	4	Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children’s education are designed, implemented, and evaluated.
X	3	Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children’s education are designed and implemented.
	2	Programs that engage families in their children’s education are available.
	1	Few or no programs that engage families in their children’s education are available.
X	4	Families have multiple ways of staying informed of their children’s learning progress.
	3	School personnel regularly inform families of their children’s learning progress.
	2	School personnel provide information about children’s learning.
	1	School personnel provide little relevant information about children’s learning.

Evidence Reviewed
Self-Assessment
Executive Summary
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
KDE School Report Card
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey Data
ELEOT Classroom Observation Data
Stakeholder Interviews
Review of School Documents and Artifacts

In determining the rating for this indicator the team should consider an array of information. However, **these sources of information must be considered:**

- Self-Assessment
- Executive Summary
- Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
- KDE School Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

Indicators receiving a rating of “1” will be **“Improvement Priorities”**

The team will determine whether Indicators receiving a rating of “2” will be **“Improvement Priorities”** or **“Opportunities for Improvement”**

“Opportunities for Improvement” and **“Improvement Priorities”** should follow to the format below.

(Check one)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Opportunity for Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

As shown in the chart below,

- The percentage of students meeting college and career readiness benchmarks increased by 13.9 points between the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school years.
- The percentage of students scoring at the proficient or distinguished levels increased on the science and social studies assessments between the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school years.
- The percentage of students scoring at the proficient or distinguished levels decreased on the reading, math, and writing accountability assessments between the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school years.

- The school did not meet its state determined student achievement Delivery targets on the reading, math, science, social studies, and writing accountability assessments.
- The school met its College and Career Readiness Delivery target as determined by the Kentucky Department of Education.

Comparison of %P/D (proficient/distinguished) 2011-12 to 2012-13

	Reading % P/D	Math% P/D	Science % P/D	Social Studies % P/D	Combined 10 th /11 th Writing% P/D	%CCR
2011-2012	55.1	44.5	18.0	48.0	42.6	42.9
2012-2013	44.8	37.9	19.6	51.9	40.0	56.8
+/-	-10.3	-6.6	+1.6	+3.9	-2.6	+13.9
Met Delivery Target	No	No	No	No	No	Yes

Classroom Observation Data:

- The Equitable Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.0 on a 4-point scale.
- The High Expectations Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Supportive Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The Active Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Progress Monitoring Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Well-Managed Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The Digital Learning Environment received an overall rating of 1.5 on a 4-point scale.

A. Equitable Learning	B. High Expectations	C. Supportive Learning	D. Active Learning	E. Progress Monitoring	F. Well-Managed Learning	G. Digital Learning
2.0	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.1	2.3	1.5

- The average rating of each learning environment suggests that effective instruction is occurring in some classrooms. Furthermore, ratings of “Evident” and “Very Evident” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 33% of classrooms. Ratings of “Somewhat Evident” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 35% of classrooms. Ratings of “Not Observed” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 32% of classrooms. These findings indicate that students are receiving inconsistent access to highly effective instruction.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 46.8% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all school personnel regularly engage families in their children’s learning progress.”
- 46.0% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school offers opportunities for my family to become involved in school activities and my learning.”
- 40.1% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers keep my family informed of my academic progress.”
- 55.2% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers help me to understand my child’s progress.”
- 46.6% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers keep me informed regularly of how my child is being graded.”

- 65.1% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers report on my child’s progress in easy to understand language.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Parent interviews demonstrate the school’s commitment to engaging families in their students’ learning.

3.9	The school/system has a formal structure whereby each student is well known by at least one adult advocate in the school who supports that student’s educational experience.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	School 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.	
	3	School 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.	
X	2	School personnel participate in a structure that gives them interaction with individual students, allowing them to build relationships over time with the student.	
	1	Few or no opportunities exist for school personnel to build long-term interaction with individual students.	
X	4	All students participate in the structure.	
	3	All students may participate in the structure.	
	2	Most students participate in the structure.	
	4	The structure allows the school employee to gain significant insight into and serve as an advocate for the student’s needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.	
	3	The structure allows the school employee to gain insight into and serve as an advocate for the student’s needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.	
X	2	The structure allows the school employee to gain insight into the student’s needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.	
	1	Few or no students have a school employee who advocates for their needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.	
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)			
Self-Assessment			
Executive Summary			
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment			
KDE School Report Card			
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey Data			
ELEOT Classroom Observation Data			
Stakeholder Interviews			
Review of School Documents and Artifacts			

In determining the rating for this indicator the team should consider an array of information. However, **these sources of information must be considered:**

- Self-Assessment

- Executive Summary
- Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
- KDE School Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

Indicators receiving a rating of “1” will be **“Improvement Priorities”**

The team will determine whether Indicators receiving a rating of “2” will be **“Improvement Priorities”** or **“Opportunities for Improvement”**

“Opportunities for Improvement” and **“Improvement Priorities”** should follow to the format below.

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Initiate a formal structure whereby all students have long-term interactions with an adult advocate allowing the development of strong relationships over time. Ensure that the student advocacy structure provides an adequate framework to support the growth of all students’ learning skills, thinking skills and life skills.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

As shown in the table below,

- The percentage of students scoring at the novice level on the reading, science, social studies, and 10th grade writing accountability assessments is greater than the percentage of students scoring at the novice level on these assessments state wide.
- The percentage of students scoring at the apprentice level on the reading, science, 10th grade writing, and 11th grade writing accountability assessments is greater than the percentage of students scoring at the apprentice level on these assessments state wide.
- The percentage of students scoring at the proficient level on the math, social studies and language mechanics accountability assessments is greater than the students scoring at the proficient level on these assessments state wide.
- The percentage of students scoring at the distinguished level on the reading, math, science, social studies, 10th grade writing, 11th grade writing, and the language mechanics accountability assessments is less than the state average of students scoring at the distinguished level on these assessments statewide.

Achievement Scores for Accountability (2012, 2013): %NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished)

	Novice	Novice (State)	Apprentice	Apprentice (State)	Proficient	Proficient (State)	Distinguished	Distinguished (State)
Reading	40.5	33.9	14.7	10.3	40.1	45.2	4.7	10.6
Math	23.0	24.8	39.1	39.2	32.2	27.6	5.7	8.4
Science	31.9	20.2	48.6	43.5	18.5	28.2	2.0	9.2
Social Studies	31.3	31.8	16.8	16.9	38.5	35.5	13.4	15.8
Writing 10 th Grade	13.7	10.5	64.1	53.9	21.5	31.7	0.8	3.9
Writing 11 th Grade	10.0	10.5	30.3	27.8	52.4	52.5	7.4	9.2
Language Mechanics 10 th Grade	13.9	17.8	34.3	30.8	32.1	29.2	19.6	22.2

Classroom Observation Data:

As shown in the chart below,

- The Equitable Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.0 on a 4-point scale.
- The High Expectations Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Supportive Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The Active Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Progress Monitoring Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Well-Managed Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The Digital Learning Environment received an overall rating of 1.5 on a 4-point scale.

A. Equitable Learning	B. High Expectations	C. Supportive Learning	D. Active Learning	E. Progress Monitoring	F. Well-Managed Learning	G. Digital Learning
2.0	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.1	2.3	1.5

- The average rating of each learning environment suggests that effective instruction is occurring in some classrooms. Furthermore, ratings of “Evident” and “Very Evident” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 33% of classrooms. Ratings of “Somewhat Evident” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 35% of classrooms. Ratings of “Not Observed” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 32% of classrooms. These findings indicate that students are receiving inconsistent access to highly effective instruction.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 74.5% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, a formal structure exists so that each student is well known by at least one adult advocate in the school who supports that student’s educational experience.”

- 45.2% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school makes sure there is at least one adult who knows me well and shows interest in my education and future.”
- 67.5% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My child has at least one adult advocate in the school.”
- Stakeholder interviews and a review of artifacts reveal the school has an intervention program, Red Zone, intended as a safety net to intervene with students based on individual need. While the program is designed for Response to Intervention, an added mentoring situation has evolved with particular groups, especially with groups led by community stakeholders. This initiative promotes the development of adult advocacy for students. However, stakeholder interviews reveal that students in the Advanced Placement and honors programs do not experience a variety of opportunities to support their learning needs. Furthermore, evidence reveals infrequent opportunities for all students to learn life skills and/or the college application process, including the fact that information on FAFSA, scholarship opportunities, and assistance with completing college applications are available.

3.10	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.	School Rating 1	Team Rating 1
Performance levels			
	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.	
	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.	
	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.	
X	1	Few or no teachers use common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures.	
	4	These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented without fail across all grade levels and all courses.	
	3	These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented consistently across grade levels and courses.	
	2	These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented across grade levels and courses.	
X	1	Policies, processes, and procedures, if they exist, are rarely implemented across grade levels or courses, and may not be well understood by stakeholders.	
	4	All stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures.	
	3	Stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures.	
X	2	Most stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures.	
	4	The policies, processes, and procedures are formally and regularly evaluated.	
	3	The policies, processes, and procedures are regularly evaluated.	
X	2	The policies, processes, and procedures may or may not be evaluated.	
	1	No process for evaluation of grading and reporting practices is evident.	

Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)
Self-Assessment
Executive Summary
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
KDE School Report Card
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey Data
ELEOT Classroom Observation Data
Stakeholder Interviews
Review of School Documents and Artifacts

In determining the rating for this indicator the team should consider an array of information. However, **these sources of information must be considered:**

- Self-Assessment
- Executive Summary
- Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
- KDE School Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

Indicators receiving a rating of “1” will be **“Improvement Priorities”**

The team will determine whether Indicators receiving a rating of “2” will be **“Improvement Priorities”** or **“Opportunities for Improvement”**

“Opportunities for Improvement” and **“Improvement Priorities”** should follow to the format below.

(Check one)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Opportunity for Improvement
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Improvement Priority

Improvement Priority

Provide training and related support to develop teacher capacity to design and implement common grading and reporting policies, processes and procedures based on clearly defined criteria that accurately represent each student’s attainment of content knowledge and skills. Institute a monitoring system to ensure grading policies, processes and procedures are implemented with fidelity across grade levels and courses. As a component of the monitoring process, frequently and formally assess the effectiveness of grading and reporting processes, policies and procedures to ensure they positively support student learning. Additionally, establish a plan that informs all stakeholders of the grading and reporting policies, processes and procedures.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

As shown in the chart below,

- The school did not meet the school report card Delivery targets on the reading, math, science, social studies, and writing accountability assessments. However, the school met the Delivery target for college and career readiness.
- There was a reduction in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level on the reading, math, and writing accountability assessments.

Comparison of %P/D (proficient/distinguished) 2011-12 to 2012-13

	Reading % P/D	Math% P/D	Science % P/D	Social Studies % P/D	Combined 10 th /11 th Writing% P/D	%CCR
2011-2012	55.1	44.5	18.0	48.0	42.6	42.9
2012-2013	44.8	37.9	19.6	51.9	40.0	56.8
+/-	-10.3	-6.6	+1.6	+3.9	-2.6	+13.9
Met Delivery Target	No	No	No	No	No	Yes

Classroom Observation Data:

The Progress Monitoring Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale. As shown in the chart below,

- “Is asked or quizzed about individual progress/learning” was Evident/Very Evident in 26% of classroom observations.
- “Responds to teacher feedback to improve understanding” was Evident/Very Evident in 30% of classroom observations.
- “Demonstrates or verbalizes understanding of the lesson/content” was Evident/Very Evident in 33% of classroom observations.
- “Understands how his/her work is assessed” was Evident/Very Evident in 28% of classroom observations.
- “Has opportunities to revise/improve work based on feedback” was Evident/Very Evident in 36% of classroom observations.
- These observation data indicate students have inconsistent access to feedback and assessment that: 1) Provide clear criteria representing the students’ attainment of content knowledge and skills; 2) Provide opportunities for students to revise work to improve understanding of content knowledge and skills.

E. Progress Monitoring						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Partially Observed	Evident	Very Evident
E.1	1.9	Is asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning	35%	39%	24%	2%
E.2	2.1	Responds to teacher feedback to improve understanding	27%	43%	24%	6%

E.3	2.2	Demonstrates or verbalizes of understanding of the lesson/content	22%	45%	27%	6%
E.4	1.9	Understands how her/his work is assessed	39%	33%	24%	4%
E.5	2.2	Has opportunities to revise/improve work based on feedback	31%	33%	24%	12%
Overall rating on a 4 point scale:	2.1					

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 44.7% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school provide students with specific and timely feedback about their learning.”
- 44.7% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use consistent common grading and reporting policies across grade levels and courses based on clearly defined criteria.”
- 46.8% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all school personnel regularly engage families in their children’s learning progress.”
- 67.5% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all stakeholders are informed of policies, processes, and procedures related to grading and reporting.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews and the principal’s presentation reveal that there is no structure in place to ensure grading practices that reliably inform students of their attainment of content knowledge and skills are consistently applied.

3.11	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 3
Performance levels			
	4	All staff members participate in a rigorous, continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school’s purpose and direction.	
X	3	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school’s purpose and direction.	
	2	Most staff members participate in a program of professional learning that is aligned with the school’s purpose and direction.	
	1	Few or no staff members participate in professional learning.	
X	4	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school and the individual.	
	3	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school.	
	2	Professional development is based on the needs of the school.	
	1	Professional development, when available, may or may not address the needs of the school or build capacity among staff members.	
	4	The program builds measurable capacity among all professional and support staff.	
X	3	The program builds capacity among all professional and support staff.	

	2	The program builds capacity among staff members who participate.
	4	The program is rigorously and systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.
	3	The program is systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.
X	2	The program is regularly evaluated for effectiveness.
	1	If a program exists, it is rarely and/or randomly evaluated.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey Data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation Data		
Stakeholder Interviews		
Review of School Documents and Artifacts		

In determining the rating for this indicator the team should consider an array of information. However, **these sources of information must be considered:**

- Self-Assessment
- Executive Summary
- Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
- KDE School Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

Indicators receiving a rating of “1” will be **“Improvement Priorities”**

The team will determine whether Indicators receiving a rating of “2” will be **“Improvement Priorities”** or **“Opportunities for Improvement”**

“Opportunities for Improvement” and **“Improvement Priorities”** should follow to the format below.

(Check one)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Opportunity for Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

As shown in the chart below, during the 2012-13 school year,

- The school’s percentage of students meeting benchmark on the ACT English, math and reading assessments was greater than the percentage of students meeting benchmark on these assessments statewide.

- The percentage of students meeting benchmark on the PLAN English assessment was greater than the percentage of students meeting benchmark on this assessment statewide.
- The percentage of students meeting benchmark on the PLAN math, reading and science assessments was less than the percentage of students meeting benchmark on these assessments statewide.

ACT/PLAN % Meeting Benchmarks (2012, 2013)

	English	English (State)	Math	Math (State)	Reading	Reading (State)	Science	Science (State)
ACT	60.0	53.1	40.0	39.6	50.4	44.2		
PLAN	75.8	67.8	24.5	25.8	40.4	43.2	17.7	21.2

As shown in the chart below,

- The school did not meet the school report card Delivery targets on the reading, math, science, social studies, and writing accountability assessments. However, the school met the Delivery target for college and career readiness.
- There was a reduction in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level on the reading, math, and writing accountability assessments.

Comparison of %P/D (proficient/distinguished) 2011-12 to 2012-13

	Reading % P/D	Math% P/D	Science % P/D	Social Studies % P/D	Combined 10 th /11 th Writing% P/D	%CCR
2011-2012	55.1	44.5	18.0	48.0	42.6	42.9
2012-2013	44.8	37.9	19.6	51.9	40.0	56.8
+/-	-10.3	-6.6	+1.6	+3.9	-2.6	+13.9
Met Delivery Target	No	No	No	No	No	Yes

Classroom Observation Data:

As shown in the chart below,

- The Equitable Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.0 on a 4-point scale.
- The High Expectations Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Supportive Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The Active Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Progress Monitoring Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Well-Managed Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The Digital Learning Environment received an overall rating of 1.5 on a 4-point scale.

A. Equitable Learning	B. High Expectations	C. Supportive Learning	D. Active Learning	E. Progress Monitoring	F. Well-Managed Learning	G. Digital Learning
2.0	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.1	2.3	1.5

- The average rating of each learning environment suggests that effective instruction is occurring in some classrooms. Furthermore, ratings of “Evident” and “Very Evident” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 33% of classrooms.

Ratings of “Somewhat Evident” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 35% of classrooms. Ratings of “Not Observed” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 32% of classrooms. These findings indicate that students are receiving inconsistent access to highly effective instruction.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 87.2% 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.”
- 85.1% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, a professional learning program is designed to build capacity among all professional and support staff members.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews, the principal’s presentation, and a review of documents and artifacts reveal a commitment to providing high quality professional development to all teachers that promotes improved instructional practice and individualized professional growth. A review of stakeholder interviews, documents and artifacts also demonstrate that there is not a system in place to evaluate and measure the effectiveness of professional development in relationship to improved classroom instruction.

3.12	The school/system provides and coordinates learning support services to meet the unique learning needs of students.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	School 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).	
	3	School 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).	
X	2	School 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).	
	1	School personnel identify special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs (such as second languages).	
	4	School 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.	
	3	School 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.	
X	2	School 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.	
	1	School personnel provide or coordinate some learning support services to students within these special populations.	
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)			
Self-Assessment			
Executive Summary			

Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
KDE School Report Card
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey Data
ELEOT Classroom Observation Data
Stakeholder Interviews
Review of School Documents and Artifacts

In determining the rating for this indicator the team should consider an array of information. However, **these sources of information must be considered:**

- Self-Assessment
- Executive Summary
- Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
- KDE School Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

Indicators receiving a rating of “1” will be **“Improvement Priorities”**

The team will determine whether Indicators receiving a rating of “2” will be **“Improvement Priorities”** or **“Opportunities for Improvement”**

“Opportunities for Improvement” and **“Improvement Priorities”** should follow to the format below.

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Coordinate a system that ensures school personnel systematically use student learning data to identify the unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency. Organize professional learning opportunities that effectively promote understanding of current research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and build capacity to provide or coordinate related learning support services to all students.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

As shown in the table below,

- The school’s non-duplicated gap group outperformed the state average for students who scored at the proficient level on the math, social studies, and language mechanics accountability assessments.
- The school’s non-duplicated gap group outperformed the state percentage for students scoring distinguished on the social studies and language mechanics accountability assessments.

- The school’s non-duplicated gap group performed below the state average for students who scored at the proficient and distinguished levels on the reading, science and writing accountability assessments.

Non-duplicated Gap Group Performance (% P/D) on Accountability Assessments (2012, 2013)

	Novice	Novice (State)	Apprentice	Apprentice (State)	Proficient	Proficient (State)	Distinguished	Distinguished (State)
Reading	47.0	45.6	16.2	11.7	33.3	37.9	3.5	4.8
Math	31.2	31.5	39.4	42.2	25.9	22.3	3.5	3.9
Science	36.7	28.5	49.5	47.6	13.8	20.3	0.0	3.7
Social Studies	38.0	43.0	17.5	18.3	34.5	30.3	9.9	8.5
Writing	16.7	15.7	51.7	48.2	29.4	33.0	2.2	3.1
Language Mechanics	17.9	25.4	35.4	35.6	31.3	26.4	15.4	12.7

- The percentage of students making typical or higher growth was greater than the state percentage of students making typical or higher growth on the reading and math accountability assessments, as shown in the table below:

Percentage of Students Making Typical or Higher Growth (2012-2013)

Reading (School)	Reading (State)	Math (School)	Math (State)	Combined Reading and Math (School)	Combined Reading and Math (State)
61.5	56.9	67.1	57.3	64.4	57.2

Classroom Observation Data:

As shown in the chart below,

- The Equitable Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.0 on a 4-point scale.
- The High Expectations Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Supportive Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The Active Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Progress Monitoring Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The Well-Managed Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The Digital Learning Environment received an overall rating of 1.5 on a 4-point scale.

A. Equitable Learning	B. High Expectations	C. Supportive Learning	D. Active Learning	E. Progress Monitoring	F. Well-Managed Learning	G. Digital Learning
2.0	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.1	2.3	1.5

- The average rating of each learning environment suggests that effective instruction is occurring in some classrooms. Furthermore, ratings of “Evident” and “Very Evident” on the Learning

Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 33% of classrooms. Ratings of “Somewhat Evident” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 35% of classrooms. Ratings of “Not Observed” on the Learning Environment continuum for highly effective instruction were given in 32% of classrooms. These findings indicate that students are receiving inconsistent access to highly effective instruction.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 78.7% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, related learning support services are provided for all students based on their needs.”
- 66.0% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all staff members use student data to address the unique learning needs of all students.”
- 62.4% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school provides learning services for me according to my needs.”
- 69.3% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My child has access to support services based on his/her identified needs.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews and a review of documents and artifacts demonstrate that there are learning support services in place for many students. The school’s Strategies Courses provide additional support to students not meeting benchmarks on EPAS exams. The school also has a program, Red Zone, which provides Tier II and Tier III learning interventions to students on a weekly basis.

Standard 3 Overview

A brief narrative overview concludes the team's analysis and review of the standard. This overview consists of two components:

- 1.) Themes that have emerged from the team's review of the standard.
 - Stakeholder interviews, survey results, and an artifact review provide evidence that staff, led by the principal, have initiated multiple opportunities for stakeholder groups to positively impact student growth and achievement. All evidence indicates a shift in culture toward a more collaborative and data-based learning environment.
 - Based on the majority of stakeholder interviews, the principal's presentation, and artifact review, an area for school-wide growth is the need for an aligned standards-based grading system to be initiated with policy and the development of appropriate criteria and procedures across all courses.
 - The principal's presentation and a review of artifacts highlight the intentional focus on development of engaging student activities, active learning and rigor and relevance. Observations revealed inconsistent evidence of active student engagement and differentiated learning experiences to meet the unique needs of students. Instructional delivery was mainly teacher-led using whole-group methods. Evidence of formalized collaboration between special needs and regular education teachers to design and deliver personalized instruction and increase student engagement was also inconsistent.

- 2) (Optional) Promising practices or approaches which may be new initiatives or recently adopted policies that, when fully implemented, appear likely to improve the institution's rating of one or more indicators. Promising practices must be aligned to a specific indicator.

1. Promising Practice:

Primary Indicator: __3.5__

Explanation/Justification

The school's commitment to developing highly functioning collaborative professional learning communities (PLCs) in all content areas and courses was evident in all stakeholder interviews, documents and artifacts evidencing teacher and administrator collaboration, stakeholder surveys, and the principal's presentation. Highly functioning PLCs are essential to the school turnaround process and provide the necessary foundation for the implementation of a continuous improvement process.

Attachments:

- 1) Leadership Assessment Addendum
- 2) ELEOT Worksheet

The purpose of this addendum is to provide feedback on progress made in addressing identified deficiencies in the 2011-2012 Leadership Assessment Report for Lincoln County High School.

Deficiency 1: The principal does not ensure that classroom instructional practices meet the needs of all students.

School/District	Team	
		This deficiency has been addressed in an exemplary manner.
x	x	This deficiency has been addressed satisfactorily.
		This deficiency has been partially addressed.
		There is little or no evidence of improvement with regard to this deficiency.

Team evidence:

- Mission and Vision
- Curriculum documents
- Plus/Deltas
- Stakeholder surveys
- Instructional coaching session work
- Springboard, ALEKS, NovelStar, ILP Method ACT, Study Island, and TI-Inspire materials
- Professional development plans and lists
- Principal presentation/interview
- Classroom observations

Team comments:

- At the principal's initiative, in collaboration with administrative staff and teacher leaders, the school has engaged in a wide array of professional learning opportunities focused on building teacher efficacy and positively impacting student growth and achievement. Evidence of this work was highlighted throughout the principal's presentation (e.g. systems training, numerous book studies, job-embedded professional learning community trainings, turnaround training) and in artifacts on the school's SkyDrive (e.g. the school's participation in the rollout of TPGES, Thoughtful Education strategies work, work sessions on explicit instruction). Teachers also participate in content-specific state conferences.
- Stakeholder interviews, artifacts, and survey data suggest that a true PLC process (e.g., use of norms, work sessions to initiate positive curricular, instructional, assessment changes based on student data) does exist with groups performing at varying levels on the continuum of implementation.
- Interviews and evidence reveal that teachers do receive regular, descriptive feedback on their instruction during feedback sessions following the PGES-like minis with teachers guiding the session based on scripts created by administrators.
- However, these professional learning experiences do not appear to have consistently translated to improved and rigorous classroom experiences that

promote higher levels of thinking or differentiated learning activities. Classroom observations reveal that the High Expectations Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale. The degree to which students were “engaged in rigorous coursework, discussion, and/or tasks,” was either evident or very evident in 14% of classrooms. Observations also revealed that the degree to which students are exposed to an effective questioning technique “that requires higher order thinking (e.g., applying, evaluating, synthesizing)” was evident in 13%, partially evident in 16%, and not observed in 20% of classrooms.

Deficiency 2: The principal has not ensured that all staff embrace high expectations and does not hold them responsible for their individual roles and responsibilities in the success and failure of each student.

School/District	Team	
		This deficiency has been addressed in an exemplary manner.
x	x	This deficiency has been addressed satisfactorily.
		This deficiency has been partially addressed.
		There is little or no evidence of improvement with regard to this deficiency.

- Team evidence:
- PLC process documents
 - Turnaround team agendas/minutes
 - Common planning logs
 - PDSA work
 - Student data notebooks/Goal setting sheets
 - Walkthroughs/Feedback sessions/Lesson plan review and feedback forms
 - Evaluation system/ICAPs
 - Student watch lists
 - Advisement session plans
 - Stakeholder interviews/surveys

- Team comments:
- The principal has established and communicated the school’s vision and mission. In addition, classroom vision statements and learning systems are evident in some classrooms but are not systematically deployed throughout the school.
 - Based on survey data and system deltas, the walkthrough process has been revised to offer more specific feedback to teachers. The feedback sessions following the walkthroughs include analysis of lesson effectiveness from the teacher, collaborative goal-setting, and next steps. Departmental goal-setting occurs during professional learning community work as student data is analyzed and trends are identified. Student goals are set within the workings of the student data notebooks being utilized in some classrooms.
 - PLC work is informed by the Turnaround Team, made up of school and district stakeholders.
 - Lesson plans and instructional artifacts are revised and analyzed during PLC work. Teachers are required to place daily lessons in a folder attached to their classroom doors to be utilized during walkthroughs and for curriculum development checks.

- Although these expectations are in place, classroom observations reveal that the High Expectations Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale. The degree to which students “know and strive to meet the high expectations established by the teacher” was either evident or very evident in only 16% of classrooms. Observation data also reveals that in only 17% of classrooms are students “tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.”

Deficiency 3: The principal has not instilled a sense of urgency for improving student achievement at the high school.

School/District	Team	
		This deficiency has been addressed in an exemplary manner.
x	x	This deficiency has been addressed satisfactorily.
		This deficiency has been partially addressed.
		There is little or no evidence of improvement with regard to this deficiency.

Team evidence:

- Weekly e-mail communication
- ICAPs
- Principal presentation
- 30-60-90 Day Plan
- Walkthroughs/Feedback session notes
- Online artifacts
- Stakeholder interviews
- Classroom observations

Team comments:

- The principal has led the school to the 83rd percentile from the 15th. Stakeholders currently share a goal of achieving the 90th percentile.
- The principal develops a weekly e-mail communication distributed each weekend to set the tone for the upcoming week with listings of weekly activities, providing of relevant information, requests for feedback, and kudos offered to staff members who perform above and beyond their duties.
- Walkthroughs and feedback sessions are used to create a sense of “positive pressure” with staff and to keep the focus of the work on instructional practice.
- The principal schedules visits with all students during the course of the school year to discuss talking points (e.g. end-of-course assessments, ACT, College and Career Readiness).
- The principal established snow day work sessions for students to keep current with their curriculum and to prepare for upcoming assessments.

Deficiency 4: The principal and school council do not systematically review and analyze all instructional and behavioral programs and interventions to ensure the most efficient and effective use of human, physical, and fiscal resources.

School/District	Team	
		This deficiency has been addressed in an exemplary manner.
	x	This deficiency has been addressed satisfactorily.
x		This deficiency has been partially addressed.
		There is little or no evidence of improvement with regard to this deficiency.

Team evidence:

- PLC artifacts
- Common planning meeting artifacts
- DAWG team artifacts
- Advisory Council agendas/minutes
- PBIS – P.R.I.D.E. minutes
- Program Review team agendas/minutes
- Plus/Deltas
- Data-wise questions with answers

- The principal and his leadership team have implemented systems tools (e.g., plus/delta, Data-wise questions) to inform team processes and next steps with a variety of stakeholder groups. This is especially apparent with student plus/deltas shaping the Red Zone intervention work. Based on stakeholder interviews and artifacts, students who have met benchmarks are offered limited enrichment opportunities.
- The school's Data Analysis Working Group (DAWG Team) analyzes the Quarterly Report data in order to suggest program changes to the Turnaround Team (TAT).
- PBIS (P.R.I.D.E.) group meets regularly (each month) to disaggregate behavior data for the planning of next steps and for strategy development.
- The school's Program Review process is a clear process for the involvement of all content areas through which related programs are assessed. The Program Review Teams include representatives from each area who have apparent roles and responsibilities.

Deficiency 5: The principal and school council do not actively recruit stakeholders for school decision making.

School/District	Team	
		This deficiency has been addressed in an exemplary manner.
x	x	This deficiency has been addressed satisfactorily.
		This deficiency has been partially addressed.
		There is little or no evidence of improvement with regard to this deficiency.

Team evidence:

- AdvancED Surveys
- TELL Survey

- Civic event memberships
- Communication plan
- Plus/Deltas
- Stakeholder interviews
- Online artifacts

Team comments:

- Stakeholder interviews indicate a culture shift within the school community toward one of collaborative decision-making resulting in greater involvement of all stakeholders.
- The Advisory Council meets regularly, as documented by agendas and minutes, and operates to remove barriers for students through avenues such as school policy development and revision and through hiring processes.
- Interviews, observations, and a review of artifacts and other documents reveal that the school has made efforts to enhance stakeholder involvement (i.e. Messenger call system, Twitter feeds, the addition of teachers to the School Leadership Team, school newsletter). The principal's meetings with the Student Council illustrate a desire to give students a voice in the school.
- The principal has made efforts toward increasing other avenues of community involvement (e.g. serving as an officer on the board for the Patriot Club, reporting school turnaround progress at civic organization meetings/events). However, evidence suggests a need to extend school-community relationships to specifically promote the school's stated vision.
- A Winter Showcase is hosted by the school each year in order to create a collaborative environment where parents participate in their children's education.
- The school has established a partnership with the community hospital to promote literacy by providing literacy materials and books for every newborn in the county.

Deficiency 6: The principal does not ensure the use of the evaluation process to focus individual growth for all administrators and teachers in promoting student achievement.

School/District	Team	
		This deficiency has been addressed in an exemplary manner.
x	x	This deficiency has been addressed satisfactorily.
		This deficiency has been partially addressed.
		There is little or no evidence of improvement with regard to this deficiency.

- Team evidence:
- Walkthrough schedules/Feedback
- TPGES roll-out materials
- Leadership Survey/TELL Survey
- Online artifacts
- Stakeholder interviews
- Classroom observations

Team comments:

- The principal used the district certified evaluation process and the TPGES

framework (with 7 pilot teachers) as a tool to drive improved teacher performance and instructional practice.

- Administrators and teachers state that professional growth plans are derived from identified areas of need resulting from the evaluation process.
- On a quarterly basis, district personnel participate in the school-level walkthroughs.
- TPGES has been a regular topic for professional development work sessions.
- Lesson plans are monitored through several avenues, including through the use of a monitoring rubric that has also informed the feedback conferences.
- Currently, four teachers are on corrective action plans to address more urgent needs.
- The principal uses the evaluation process to dismiss ineffective teachers as evidenced by specific cases.
- Some teachers use the data notebook as an opportunity to self-reflect on instructional practice in order to inform professional growth plans.

Overall ELEOT Rating

- A. Equitable Learning
- B. High Expectations
- C. Supportive Learning
- D. Active Learning
- E. Progress Monitoring
- F. Well-Managed Learning
- G. Digital Learning

