



Internal School Review Report

Name of Institution

Reviewed: Livingston Central High School

Date: January 14, 2014-January 15, 2014

School Principal: Scott Gray



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 3.08	Team Rating for Standard 3 2.08
---	---	--

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 2
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.	
3	Like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations.	
x 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.	
x 2	Little individualization for each student is evident.	

1	No individualization for students is evident.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)	
Livingston Central High School Internal Self-Assessment	
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)	
KDE School Report Card data	
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results	
Stakeholder interviews	
Principal Presentation of 2011 Leadership Assessment Deficiencies	
Review of school documents and artifacts (lesson plans, guided planning congruency protocol, pacing guides)	

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

Develop and implement a challenging curriculum for all students. Monitor instructional practices of all teachers to ensure all students are provided learning experiences to develop their learning, thinking, and life skills that lead to success at the next level.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- Student performance data on the 2013 K-PREP End-of-Course (EOC) assessments are below the state average in all areas. English II scores declined 14 points on the NAPD calculations.
- Achievement and gap writing scores from the 2012–13 School Report Card are slightly above the state average. The overall gap score of 26.6 increased yet still indicates substantial achievement gaps.

- The 2013 assessment data indicate the combined reading and math non-duplicated Gap Delivery target was not met. The reading performance gap increased by 17.9 percentage points.
- The 2013 assessment data indicate the combined reading and math Proficiency Delivery target was not met.
- The 2013 assessment data from the K-PREP EOC indicate non-duplicated gap students score below the state average in all areas.
- ACT scores are above the state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.
- The 2013 PLAN scores have increased in all areas with an overall .9 increase in the composite based on data from the school's Quarterly Report.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT data reveals results for the Active Learning Environment was rated 2.2 on a 4.0 point scale (somewhat evident).
- The Equitable Learning Environment statement, "Has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs," was rated a 1.5 out of a possible 4.0, indicating instruction is not consistently differentiated based on individual classroom data (somewhat evident).

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 89% of teachers surveyed believe students are provided a challenging curriculum and set of learning experiences. However, only 49% of students and 56% of parents agreed that the curriculum is challenging.
- Less than 40% of students surveyed believe the school prepares them for issues they may face in their future.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- The school has developed curriculum documents and pacing guides for all content areas.
- Vertical alignment meetings occurred during the summer and are scheduled to continue throughout the year.

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 2	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.
	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.
x	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)

Livingston Central High School Internal Self-Assessment

Classroom observation data (ELEOT)

KDE School Report Card data

AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results

Stakeholder interviews

Principal Presentation of 2011 Leadership Assessment Deficiencies

Review of school documents and artifacts (lesson plans, guided planning congruency protocol, pacing guides)

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)

Opportunity for Improvement

Refine processes to ensure that curriculum, instruction and assessments are effectively monitored and adjusted systematically in response to school and classroom data from multiple assessments.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- Student performance data on the 2013 K-PREP EOC assessments are below the state average in all areas. English II scores declined 14 points on the NAPD calculations.
- Achievement and gap writing scores from the 2012–13 School Report Card are slightly above the state average. The overall gap score of 26.6 indicates a substantial achievement gap.
- The 2013 assessment data indicate the combined reading and math non-duplicated Gap Delivery target was not met. The reading performance gap increased by 17.9 percentage points.
- The 2013 assessment data indicates the combined reading and math Proficiency Delivery target was not met.
- The 2013 assessment data from the K-PREP EOC indicates non-duplicated gap students score below the state average in all areas.
- ACT scores are above the state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.
- The 2013 PLAN scores have increased in all areas with an overall .9 increase in the composite based on data from the school's Quarterly Report.

Classroom Observation Data:

- The Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment received an overall rating of 1.8 on a 4.0 point scale. The statement "Is asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning" was rated at 1.9 (somewhat evident).
- The Equitable Learning Environment statement, "Has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs," was rated a 1.5 out of a possible 4.0, indicating instruction is not consistently differentiated based on individual classroom data (somewhat evident).
- An expectation from the guided planning congruency protocol to formatively assess the daily learning targets to inform instruction was not evident in most classrooms.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In a survey, 55% of students indicated that they are given multiple assessments to check their learning and understanding. 58% of parents responded that their students are given multiple ways to show their learning and understanding.
- In a survey, 81% of teachers indicated that curriculum, instruction and assessments are monitored and adjusted based on data from student assessments.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- In interviews, teachers indicated that administrators lead the guided planning process each week using the congruency protocol to monitor curriculum, instruction and assessment development. The monitoring process through guided planning did not result in the effective modification of curriculum and instruction in all classrooms based on classroom observation data (ELEOT).

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)

Livingston Central High School Internal Self-Assessment
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)
KDE School Report Card data
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results
Stakeholder interviews
Principal Presentation of 2011 Leadership Assessment Deficiencies
Review of school documents and artifacts (lesson plans, guided planning congruency protocol, pacing guides)

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 deliver effective, varied, and rigorous instructional strategies that actively engage all students in all classes to ensure academic achievement.

Student Performance Data:

- Student performance data on the 2013 K-PREP EOC assessments are below the state average in all areas. English II scores declined 14 points on the NAPD calculations.
- Achievement and gap writing scores from the 2012–13 School Report Card are slightly above the state average. The overall gap score of 26.6 indicates a substantial achievement gap.
- The 2013 assessment data indicate the combined reading and math non-duplicated Gap Delivery target was not met. The reading performance gap increased by 17.9 percentage points.
- The 2013 assessment data indicate the combined reading and math Proficiency Delivery target was not met.
- The 2013 assessment data from the K-PREP EOC indicate non-duplicated gap students score below the state average in all areas.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT data reveals that the Digital Learning Environment received an overall rating of 1.3 on a 4.0 point scale (not observed).
- The Equitable Learning Environment statement, “Has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs,” was rated a 1.5 out of a possible 4.0, indicating instruction is not consistently differentiated based on individual classroom data (somewhat evident).

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- Only 38% of students surveyed indicated that the school motivates them to learn new things.
- While 78% of teachers surveyed indicated that they personalize learning to address individual student needs, only 22% of students and 41% of parents believe that teachers change their teaching to meet individual student learning needs.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews and PLC agendas and minutes revealed some PLCs are focused on student-centered instructional strategies and best practices using PD 360 and the Danielson Framework for Teaching. Classroom observations indicated a lack of rigor and student engagement in most classes.

3.4	School leaders monitor and support the improvement of instructional practices of teachers to ensure student success.	School Rating 4	Team Rating 2
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.	
	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.	
x	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)			
Livingston Central High School Internal Self-Assessment			
Classroom Observation Data (ELEOT)			
KDE School Report Card Data			
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey Results			
Stakeholder Interviews			
Principal Presentation of 2011 Leadership Assessment Deficiencies			
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

Collaborate with the other administrators to continuously monitor the delivery of instruction, provide feedback and ongoing support to promote higher order thinking skills, student engagement, and rigor in the classroom to ensure student success.

Student Performance Data:

- Quarterly Report data for the 2013014 December report indicate the freshman English passing rate is 84%. However, only 26.8% of students scored at the proficient level on the English II EOC assessment--indicating grading is not consistent with EOC assessment rigor.
- MAP data for first quarter 9th grade students does not indicate a performance level consistent with the grades received as indicated above.
- Less than 50% of graduating seniors over the last two years were college ready.
- Student performance data on the 2013 K-PREP EOC assessments is below the state average in all areas. English II scores declined 14 points on the NAPD calculations.
- Achievement and gap writing scores from the 2012–13 School Report card are slightly above the state average. The overall gap score of 26.6 indicates a substantial achievement gap.
- The 2013 assessment data indicate the combined reading and math non-duplicated Gap Delivery target was not met. The reading performance gap increased by 17.9 percentage points.
- The 2013 assessment data indicate the combined reading and math Proficiency Delivery target was not met.
- The 2013 assessment data from the K-PREP EOC indicate non-duplicated gap students score below the state average in all areas.

Classroom Observation Data:

- The Active Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.2 on a 4.0 point scale. The statement, “Is actively engaged in the learning activities,” was rated the lowest at 2.1 (somewhat evident).
- The High Expectations Environment received an overall rating of 1.6 on a 4.0 point scale. The statement, “Is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks,” was rated a 1.7 (somewhat evident).

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- Only 38% of students surveyed indicated the school motivates them to learn new things.

- While 78% of teachers surveyed indicated they personalize learning to address individual student needs, only 22 % of students and 41 % of parents believe that teachers change their teaching to meet individual student learning needs.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews and document reviews indicated the school leadership has developed processes to monitor and support the improvement of instructional practices. Teachers indicated the use of the guided planning congruency protocol has helped define the expected instructional process. However, the process has not resulted in teachers consistently engaging all students in all classrooms with the use of effective, varied, and rigorous instructional strategies.

3.5		Teachers participate in collaborative learning communities to improve instruction and student learning.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 2
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.		
	3	Collaboration often occurs across grade levels and content areas.		
x	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.		
	3	Staff members have been trained to implement a formal process that promotes discussion about student learning.		
X	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.		

	3	School personnel indicate that collaboration causes improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
x	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)		
Livingston Central High School Internal Self-Assessment		
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)		
KDE School Report Card data		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results		
Stakeholder interviews		
Principal Presentation of 2011 Leadership Assessment Deficiencies		
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

Refine professional learning community meetings to ensure implementation of a highly effective comprehensive system that is focused on improvement of student performance and the professional practice of teachers.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s accountability index rose from 49.3 to 59.3. The greatest areas of growth were seen in college and/or career readiness and in graduation rate.

- ACT scores are above the state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.
- The 2013 PLAN scores have increased in all areas with an overall .9 increase in the composite based on data from the school's Quarterly Report.
- Student performance data on the 2013 K-PREP EOC assessments are below the state average in all areas. English II scores declined 14 points on the NAPD calculations.
- Achievement and gap writing scores from the 2012–13 School Report Card are slightly above the state average. The overall gap score of 26.6 indicates a substantial achievement gap.
- The 2013 assessment data indicate the combined reading and math non-duplicated Gap Delivery target was not met. The reading performance gap increased by 17.9 percentage points.
- The 2013 assessment data indicate the combined reading and math Proficiency Delivery target was not met.
- The 2013 assessment data from the K-PREP EOC indicate non-duplicated gap students score below the state average in all areas.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT data reveals the Equitable Learning Environment was rated 2.0 on a 4 point scale (somewhat evident).
- ELEOT data reveals the High Expectations Environment was rated 1.6 on a 4 point scale (somewhat evident).

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- While 78% of teachers surveyed indicated they have been trained in a formal process to promote discussion about student learning, only 42% of parents responded that their children's teachers work as a team to help their children learn.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Document reviews of PLC agendas and minutes along with interviews of stakeholders indicate some PLCs are scheduled to increase teachers' knowledge and skills in the use of student-centered instructional strategies through PD 360 and components of the Danielson Framework for Teaching.
- Document reviews of PLC agendas and minutes indicate some PLCs were for the dissemination of information and not focused on student achievement and refinement of teaching to meet the instructional needs of all students.

3.6	Teachers implement the school's instructional process in support of student learning.	School Rating 3	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.
	2	Exemplars are sometimes provided to guide and inform students.
x	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)		
Livingston Central High School Internal Self-Assessment		
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)		
KDE School Report Card data		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results		
Stakeholder interviews		
Principal Presentation of 2011 Leadership Assessment Deficiencies		
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

Improvement Priority

Implement, monitor and measure the effectiveness of instructional practices that ensure teachers meaningfully engage students in their education by providing them with learning expectations and feedback on their performance.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The 2013 assessment data indicate the combined reading and math non-duplicated Gap Delivery target was not met. The reading performance gap increased by 17.9 percentage points.
- The 2013 assessment data indicate the combined reading and math Proficiency Delivery target was not met.
- The 2013 assessment data from the K-PREP EOC indicate non-duplicated gap students score below the state average in all areas.
- ACT scores are above the state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.
- The 2013 PLAN scores have increased in all areas with an overall .9 increase in the composite based on data from the school's Quarterly Report.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT data reveals the Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment was rated 1.8 on a 4.0 point scale (somewhat evident).

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 85% of teachers agree that all teachers use a process to inform students of learning expectations. 78% of parents indicated that their students know the expectations for learning in their classes. However, only 50% of students agree that teachers explain their expectations for learning and behavior in all their classes.
- 78% of teachers believe they provide specific and timely feedback about student learning, but only 49% of students indicated that teachers provide them information about their learning and grades.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews and documents reinforced the use of the guided planning congruency protocol to establish the expectations of the instructional process. Classroom observations revealed many classrooms failed to implement the expectations of the established instructional process.

3.7	Mentoring, coaching, and induction programs support instructional improvement consistent with the school's values and beliefs about teaching and learning.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 2
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.	
	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.	
x	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)			
Livingston Central High School Internal Self-Assessment			
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)			
KDE School Report Card data			
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results			
Stakeholder interviews			
Principal Presentation of 2011 Leadership Assessment Deficiencies			
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

Refine the mentoring, coaching, and induction programs to include a focus on instructional improvement that is consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning.

Student Performance Data:

- Student performance data on the 2013 K-PREP EOC assessments are below the state average in all areas. English II scores declined 14 points on the NAPD calculations.
- Achievement and gap writing scores from the 2012–13 School Report Card are slightly above the state average.
- The 2013 assessment data indicate the combined reading and math non-duplicated Gap Delivery target was not met. The reading performance gap increased by 17.9 percentage points.
- The 2013 assessment data indicate the combined reading and math Proficiency Delivery target was not met.
- The 2013 assessment data from the K-PREP EOC indicate non-duplicated gap students score below the state average in all areas.
- ACT scores are above the state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.
- The 2013 PLAN scores have increased in all areas with an overall .9 increase in the composite based on data from the school’s Quarterly Report.

Classroom Observation Data:

- The Equitable Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.0 on a 4.0 point scale. The indicator, “Has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet his/her needs,” was rated the lowest at 1.5 (somewhat evident).
- The High Expectations Environment received an overall rating of 1.6 on a 4.0 point scale. The indicator, “Is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussion, and/or tasks,” was rated a 1.7 (somewhat evident).
- The Supportive Learning Environment indicator, “Is provided additional/alternative instruction and feedback at the appropriate level of challenge for her/his needs,” was rated the lowest in that environment at 1.4 (not observed).
- The Active Learning Environment received an overall score of 2.2 on a 4.0 point scale (somewhat evident).

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 93% of teacher surveyed indicated a formal support system for new staff members is in place.
- 74% of teachers said that staff members provide peer coaching to other teachers.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews and the review of PLC agendas and minutes indicate training and coaching through the use of videos from the Danielson Framework for Teaching and PD 360 to support instructional improvement. The ELEOT classroom observation data indicate the classroom instruction was not consistent with the school’s belief in offering an engaging, rigorous, and relevant curriculum.

3.8	The school engages families in meaningful ways in their children’s education and keeps them informed of their children’s learning progress.	School Rating 4	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children’s education are designed, implemented, and evaluated.	
	3	Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children’s education are designed and implemented.	
x	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			
Executive Summary			
Livingston Central High School Internal Self-Assessment			
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)			
KDE School Report Card data			
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results			
Stakeholder interviews			
Principal Presentation of 2011 Leadership Assessment Deficiencies			
Review of school documents and artifacts (8 th Grade Night Agenda, Project PASS schedule)			

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

Further refine and clearly communicate with all stakeholders the processes to engage families and keep them informed of their children’s learning progress.

Supporting Evidence

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 63% of teachers surveyed responded that school personnel regularly engage families in children’s learning. However, only 38% of students agreed that the school offers opportunities for families to be involved and less than half of the parents (47%) agreed that teachers help them understand their children’s progress.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews along with a review of artifacts indicate several methods are used to inform parents of their children’s education. However, the data from stakeholder surveys do not support this statement.

3.9	The school 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 1	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.	
	4	All students participate in the structure.	

	3	All students may participate in the structure.
x	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)		
Livingston Central High School Internal Self-Assessment		
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)		
KDE School Report Card data		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results		
Stakeholder interviews		
Principal Presentation of 2011 Leadership Assessment Deficiencies		
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

Develop and implement a formal process whereby each student has at least one adult advocate in the school that supports the student’s educational development by ensuring he or she is well integrated into the school and engaged in the school experience.

Supporting Evidence

Classroom Survey Data:

- The Supportive Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.1 on a 4.0 point scale. The statement, “Demonstrates or expresses that learning experiences are positive,” was rated at 2.2 indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.
- The Supportive Learning Environment statement, “Student demonstrates a positive attitude about the classroom and learning,” scored a 2.4 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- Parents (75%) and teachers (63%) shared similar results when asked if students have adult advocates within the school that support the student’s educational experience. However, only 36% of students stated that there is an adult within the building that knows them well and shows an interest in their future.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews indicated some structures are in place that allow faculty and staff to gain insight into the unique academic and emotional needs of students.

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 4	Team Rating 2
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.	
x	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.	
	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.	
x	2	These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented across grade levels and courses.	
	1	Policies, processes, and procedures, if they exist, are rarely implemented across grade levels or courses, and may not be well understood by stakeholders.	

x	4	All stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures.
	3	Stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures.
	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)		
Livingston Central High School Internal Self-Assessment		
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)		
KDE School Report Card data		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results		
Stakeholder interviews		
Principal Presentation of 2011 Leadership Assessment Deficiencies		
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

Develop and implement a system to ensure students' grades are based on the attainment of content knowledge and skills. Monitor grading and reporting practices to provide consistency across grade levels and courses.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- Quarterly Report data for the 2013-14 December report indicate the freshman English passing rate is 84%. However, only 26.8% of students scored at the proficient level on the English II EOC assessment--indicating grading is not consistent with EOC assessment rigor.
- MAP data for first quarter 9th grade students does not indicate a performance level consistent with the grades received as indicated above.
- Less than 50% of graduating seniors over the last two years were college ready.

Classroom Observation Data:

- The Equitable Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.0 on a 4.0 point scale. The indicator, "Has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet his/her needs," was rated the lowest at 1.5 (somewhat evident).
- ELEOT data reveals the High Expectations Environment was rated 1.6 on a 4.0 point scale (somewhat evident).

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- Although 89% of teachers surveyed indicated that all teachers use consistent common grading and reporting policies, only 36% of parents surveyed indicated that teachers regularly keep them informed about how their children are graded. Only 29% of students agreed that teachers keep their families informed about academic progress.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews and review of documents revealed that policies exist regarding grading and reporting practices. These policies do not provide clear guidelines that students' grades are based solely on the attainment of content knowledge and skills or that these practices are consistent across grade levels and courses.

3.11	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning.	School Rating 4	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.	

	4	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school and the individual.
x	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.
	3	The program builds capacity among all professional and support staff.
x	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)		
Livingston Central High School Internal Self-Assessment		
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)		
KDE School Report Card data		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results		
Stakeholder interviews		
Principal Presentation of 2011 Leadership Assessment Deficiencies		
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:

- The school’s accountability index rose from 49.3 to 59.3. This translates to a gain statewide from the 23rd percentile to the 75th percentile. The largest gains were seen in college-career readiness and in graduation rates.
- Achievement and gap writing scores from the 2012–13 School Report Card are slightly above the state average.
- ACT scores are above the state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.
- The 2013 PLAN scores have increased in all areas with an overall .9 increase in the composite based on data from the school’s Quarterly Report.

Classroom Observation Data:

- The High Expectations Environment received an overall rating of 1.6 on a 4.0 point scale. The indicator, “Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable,” scored a 1.7 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating. Challenging activities were not observed in many classes.
- The High Expectations Environment indicator, “Student is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions and and/or tasks,” scored a 1.7 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 93% of teachers surveyed reported participation in collaborative learning communities.
- 93% of teachers surveyed reported participation in continuous professional learning based on identified needs of the school.
- 96% of teachers surveyed indicated that professional learning is designed to build capacity among professional and support staff members.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews and review of PLC agendas and minutes indicate that all teachers participate weekly in professional learning communities. However, classroom observations and data from end-of-course exams show the existence of achievement gaps. Participation in PLCs has not transferred into the improvement of instructional practices of all teachers in all classes.

3.12	The school provides and coordinates learning support services to meet the unique learning needs of students.	School Rating 3	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.
2	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)		
Livingston Central High School Internal Self-Assessment		
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)		
KDE School Report Card data		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results		
Stakeholder interviews		
Principal Presentation of 2011 Leadership Assessment Deficiencies		
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

Examine the effectiveness of learning support services provided or coordinated by the school to meet the unique learning needs of students. Determine the effectiveness of current services and make revisions based on student data.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- CCR data from the 2012-13 School Report Card reveal 48.9% of seniors are not college or career ready.
- Student performance data for the 2013 K-PREP EOC assessments are below the state average in all areas. English II scores declined 14 points on the NAPD calculations.
- Achievement and gap writing scores from the 2012–13 School Report Card are slightly above the state average. The overall gap score of 26.6 indicates a substantial achievement gap.
- The 2013 assessment data indicate the combined reading and math non-duplicated Gap Delivery target was not met. The reading performance gap increased by 17.9 percentage points.
- The 2013 assessment data indicate the combined reading and math Proficiency Delivery target was not met.
- The 2013 assessment data from the K-PREP EOC indicate non-duplicated gap students score below the state average in all areas.
- ACT scores are above the state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.
- The 2013 PLAN scores have increased in all areas with an overall .9 increase in the composite based on data from the school's Quarterly Report.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT data reveal the Supportive Learning Environment was rated a 2.1 on a 4.0 point scale (somewhat evident).
- ELEOT data reveal that the Equitable Learning Environment was rated 2.0 on a 4.0 point scale (somewhat evident).

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 85% of teachers surveyed indicated that learning support services are provided for all students based on their needs. However, 61% of parents and 39% of students agreed that students have learning support services provided based on their needs.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews indicated a comprehensive system to monitor and measure the effectiveness of all school programs and processes is not fully developed to ensure continuous improvement.

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:

Livingston Central High School's accountability index increased ten points during the 2012 - 2013 school year. This gain moved Livingston Central High School from the 23rd percentile to the 75th percentile and a proficiency/progressing classification. The largest gains in the Next-Generation accountability model were seen in college-career readiness and in graduation rate measures. The Internal Review team at Livingston Central High School recognized the effort by all stakeholders to achieve this type of growth on the measures of the Next-Generation accountability model. The team also identified some common themes from AdvancED's Standard 3 (Teaching and Assessing for Learning) to help the school gain a better understanding of their current reality so they can define actions to be implemented to continue their school improvement efforts.

Continuous improvement and equity emerged as common themes when considering the set of indicators and performance levels in Standard 3. Livingston Central High School has begun the process of collecting and analyzing longitudinal data on each student. The longitudinal data has been used to change the master schedule in an effort to provide more opportunities for students to graduate college/career ready. To reduce the achievement gap in math, intervention labs have also been created for identified students.

All teachers meet weekly in professional learning communities that are driven by district agenda items such as PD 360 and components from the Danielson Framework for Teaching. The PLCs are designed to provide embedded professional development to increase the skills, knowledge, and craft of all teachers. The leadership has also developed the guided planning congruency protocol in an effort to review all teachers' instructional plans and assessments. These initiatives have led to increased student performance. However, observations of classrooms indicate that these embedded trainings are not implemented with fidelity in all classrooms. These processes have not resulted in teachers consistently engaging all students in all classrooms with the use of effective, varied, and rigorous instructional strategies. EOC and gap scores are a further indication that all teachers have not implemented the school's instructional process in support of student learning. EOC and gap scores dropped in some areas from the previous year and are below the state average in all areas except on-demand writing.

The review of documents and stakeholder interviews indicated the absence of a systematic process to adjust curriculum, instruction, assessments, and professional practice in response to classroom level assessment data. Developing and implementing a process in the collecting and analyzing of classroom level data, setting goals, planning, implementing, and evaluating the results will provide administration and teachers a process of continuous improvement to meet the unique learning needs of all students. Learning from, using, and discussing the results of teaching practices, the examination of student work, reflection, and peer coaching should

become a part of the professional learning communities to support instructional improvement consistent with the school's beliefs about teaching and learning.

All stakeholders should participate in a systemic process of the review and evaluation of school-wide initiatives. Monitoring the implementation and impact of these initiatives must be the focus of the school leadership team for student performance data to continue to improve in all areas of accountability.

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 Livingston Central High School.

Deficiency 1: The principal has not ensured that teachers use differentiated, authentic, and rigorous instructional strategies to meet the unique learning needs of all students.

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

Team evidence:

- Student performance data
- Interviews with stakeholders
- School Report Card
- Quarterly Report

Team comments:

There is a process for examining some student assessments and providing students with interventions and enrichment based on the data analysis of MAP testing and EPAS data. Observations and ELEOT results do not support that the needs of all learners are being met. A comprehensive continuous improvement plan that includes all teachers using rigorous instructional strategies and differentiation is not evident at this time.

Deficiency 2: The school council and principal have not implemented an effective system for monitoring, documenting, and ensuring accountability for all programs and personnel.

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:

- Student performance data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Survey data

Team comments:

Systems for some programs have been developed and implemented. The programs are not comprehensive and documented. The processes are not always implemented with fidelity by monitoring and being evaluated for effectiveness.

Deficiency 3: The principal has not implemented a fully functioning system of interventions to reduce achievement gaps and increase student achievement.

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:

- RTI plan
- Student performance data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Student interviews

Team comments:

Intervention programs have been developed (ALEKS, Reading Plus, Truancy Diversion) and are in place. The effectiveness of these programs is mixed. Student achievement on EPAS scores increased, while the performance gap increased in some areas. A continuous intervention plan with consistent monitoring and analysis of effectiveness that ensures all students are placed in intervention based on diagnostic data and classroom performance has not been fully developed and refined.

Deficiency 4: The principal has not defined a culture of high expectations for students or staff.

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:

- Stakeholder surveys
- Stakeholder interviews
- ELEOT observations

Team comments:

There is evidence that student achievement is valued and celebrated with student

recognition on posters and pictures displayed for academic achievement. School and leadership provide support for the physical, cultural, and intellectual needs of students. Multiple communication strategies are used for the dissemination of information to all stakeholders. Classroom instruction that challenges students to perform at high levels and actively engages them in their learning is not always evident.

Deficiency 5: The principal does not ensure teachers maximize data analysis as a basis for sound decision making.

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:

- Student performance data
- RTI plan
- Stakeholder interviews
- Quarterly Report
- PLC meeting
- Guided Planning Process

Team comments:

Implementation of data analysis has occurred for student interventions based on MAP testing and EPAS data. However, a formal protocol has not been developed to analyze classroom data to inform instruction.

Deficiency 6: The principal does not ensure the master schedule meets the academic needs of all students.

School/District	Team	
X		This deficiency has been addressed in an exemplary manner.
	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:

- Master schedule
- Stakeholder interviews
- Student performance data
-

Team comments:

The master schedule offers many academic and career paths for students. Students are able to attend career and technical classes in Paducah to fulfill requirements for career readiness. RTI classes have been added to schedule for math and reading. Students

meeting benchmark in a math or reading intervention class may not have a class to go to depending on time of year and availability of classes. The schedule lacks the flexibility to meet the unique needs of all students.

ELEOT Ratings

