



Internal School Review Report

Name of Institution

Reviewed: Perry County Central High School

Date: March 24, 2014-March 25, 2014

School Principal: Neal Feltner



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 2.00	Team Rating for Standard 3 2.33
---	--	--

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 2	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)		
Student Performance Data		
Classroom Observation Data		
Stakeholder Survey Data		
Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review		
School Performance Diagnostic		

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 Report Card shows growth in all EOC (end-of-course) areas.
- Delivery targets were met in all areas except math:
 - The Delivery target in reading was for 42.7% of students to score at the proficient/distinguished level. The actual percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level was 49.4%.
 - The Delivery target in combined reading and math was for 37.8% of students to score at the proficient/distinguished level. The actual percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level was 40.0%.
 - The Delivery target in math was for 32.9% of students to score at the proficient/distinguished level. The actual percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level was 30.5%.

- The Delivery target in science was for 34.0% of students to score at the proficient/distinguished level. The actual percentage of students who scored at the proficient/distinguished level was 40.2%.
- The Delivery target in social studies was for 24.1% of students to score at the proficient/distinguished level. The actual percentage of students who scored at the proficient/distinguished level was 30.1%.
- The Delivery target in writing was for 34.4% of students to score at the proficient/distinguished level. The actual percentage of students who scored at the proficient/distinguished level was 46.8%.
- The School Report Card shows growth in all Gap areas.

Classroom Observation Data:

- The ELEOT High Expectations Environment Indicator B.2, “Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable,” received a rating of 2.6 on a 4-point scale.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 72% of students agree/strongly agree that the school offers a challenging curriculum.
- 59% of students indicate the school prepares them for the future.
- 72% of teachers indicate the curriculum provides an equitable learning experience for all students.
- 77% of teachers indicate all stakeholders are informed of policies, processes, and procedures related to grading and reporting.
- 80% of parents report that teachers provide an equitable curriculum for their children.
- 79% of parents indicate that the teachers assign challenging work to their children.
- 69% of parents indicate that teachers keep them informed about student progress and grades.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Student interviews indicate the work in the classroom is much more challenging than in past years. They also report feeling prepared for college as a result of improved instructional practices. There is a sense that the school is concerned with educating ALL students and RTI is a positive step in providing needed intervention.

Other pertinent information:

According to the School Performance Diagnostic,

- All 18 students taking the AP Calculus exam received qualifying scores.
- 10 of the 20 students who took the AP Biology exam received qualifying scores.
- PLAN data from 2012-13 indicates 10th grade students had a greater percentage meeting benchmarks in English, reading and science than state averages.
- 51.5% of all students scored at the novice level on the social studies EOC (end-of-course) exam.

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)		
Student Performance Data		
Classroom Observation Data		
Stakeholder Survey Data		
Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review		
Other pertinent information: PLC minutes and agendas		

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

Develop practices and procedures that will ensure teachers use multiple assessments of student learning and an examination of professional practice, to systematically monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and to facilitate vertical and horizontal alignment that support the school’s goals for achievement and instruction.

Supporting Evidence

Classroom Observation Data:

- The ELEOT High Expectations Environment Domain Indicator B.2, “Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable,” received a rating of 2.6 on a 4-point scale.
- The ELEOT Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment Indicator E.1, “Is asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning,” received a rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 71% of the students indicate they receive multiple assessments to check for understanding and learning.
- 70% of teachers agree that instruction is adjusted based on data analysis from student assessments.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Student interviews indicated the lack of awareness for formative assessment in the classroom.
- Student interviews reported in several classrooms assessments were limited to end-of-unit tests or quizzes.

3.3	Teachers engage students in their learning through instructional strategies that ensure achievement of learning expectations.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 3
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.		
X	3 Teachers plan and use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.		
	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.
X	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.
	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)		
Student performance data		
Classroom observation data		
Stakeholder survey data		
Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review		
School Performance Diagnostic		

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)

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The School Report Card shows growth in all EOC (end-of-course) areas.
- Delivery targets were met in all areas except math:
 - The Delivery target in reading was for 42.7% of students to score at the proficient/distinguished level. The actual percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level was 49.4%.
 - The Delivery target in combined reading and math was for 37.8% of students to score at the proficient/distinguished level. The actual percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level was 40.0%.
 - The Delivery target in math was for 32.9% of students to score at the proficient/distinguished level. The actual percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level was 30.5%.
 - The Delivery target in science was for 34.0% of students to score at the proficient/distinguished level. The actual percentage of students who scored at the proficient/distinguished level was 40.2%.
 - The Delivery target in social studies was for 24.1% of students to score at the proficient/distinguished level. The actual percentage of students who scored at the proficient/distinguished level was 30.1%.
 - The Delivery target in writing was for 34.4% of students to score at the proficient/distinguished level. The actual percentage of students who scored at the proficient/distinguished level was 46.8%.
- The School Report Card shows growth in all Gap areas.

Classroom Observation Data:

- The ELEOT Active Learning Environment Indicator D.1, “Has several opportunities to engage in discussions with teacher and other students,” received a rating of 2.7 on a 4-point scale, and indicator D.3, “Is actively engaged in the learning activities” received a rating of 2.9 on a 4-point scale.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 63% of students indicate they are motivated to learn new things in the classroom.
- More than 50% of the students surveyed responded either “Neutral” or “Disagree” when asked if teachers personalize instruction to meet student needs.
- 62% of teachers indicate instruction is differentiated to meet student needs. This reveals a disagreement between teacher and student perceptions of personalized instruction in the classroom.
- 68% of teachers agree that instructional strategies provide opportunities for student collaboration, self-reflection, and the development of critical-thinking skills.
- 66% of teachers indicate the use of a variety of technology for instructional purposes.
- 77% of parents agree that teachers use a variety of instructional strategies for teaching and learning.
- 66% of parents indicate teachers meet student needs by individualizing instruction.
- 71% of parents reported that there is a connection between what is being taught to the students and everyday life.

- 84% of parents surveyed responded that students have up-to-date technology for learning in the classroom.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An RTI block has been added to the daily schedule using Cambridge curriculum and is in the initial implementation year.
- Student, teacher and parent interviews indicate the RTI program is responsible for moving students to meet criteria for College and Career Readiness, that it has helped prevent students from failing core courses, and has allowed students to show growth in core academic areas.
- Student and teacher interviews indicated that there is a lack of differentiation to meet individual needs in most classrooms.
- Student and teacher interviews report the use of tablets across the curriculum. Tablets are being used to take notes, collect research information, create presentations, practice ACT questions, as a means of communicating with absentee students, and to tutor students needing remedial help in math.
- Students report that social studies courses hold debates and challenge students to engage in classroom discussions requiring critical thinking skills.

Other pertinent information:

According to the School Performance Diagnostic,

- The special education population reported the highest growth in PLAN and EOC courses in 2012-13.
- This population also showed growth on ACT math scores.

3.4	School/district leaders monitor and support the improvement of instructional practices of teachers to ensure student success.	School Rating 1	Team Rating 1
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.	
	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.	
X	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)
Classroom performance data
Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review
TELL survey
Stakeholder survey

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

Employ a formal and consistent procedure to monitor instructional practices for all classroom visits that provides meaningful feedback to teachers regarding effective instructional strategies and identified areas for professional growth.

Supporting Evidence

Classroom Observation Data:

The following provides evidence supporting improvement of instructional practices:

- The ELEOT Equitable Learning Environment Indicator A.1, “Has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs,” received a rating of 1.8 on a 4- point scale.
- The ELEOT High Expectations Environment indicator B.5, “Is asked and responds to questions that require higher order thinking,” received a rating of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- The ELEOT Progress Monitoring Environment indicator E.3, “Demonstrates or verbalizes understanding of the lesson/content,” received a rating of 2.4 on a 4-point scale.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- Nearly 25% of the staff did not agree that school leaders hold all staff members accountable for student learning.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Staff interviews indicate the principal has stated, “No news is good news” regarding classroom visits. However, teachers expressed a desire for constructive feedback to enrich instructional practices.
- During the school presentation and principal interview, the principal acknowledged an area of growth is in providing meaningful feedback to teachers based on classroom visits.
- Interviews with teachers and administrators indicate that administrators are frequently in the classroom; however, teachers indicated these visits are often very brief. While teachers agree that these visits contribute to a positive school culture, they do not receive needed feedback to impact instructional practices in the classroom.
- Members of the administrative team attend PLC meetings to monitor protocols and action steps according to interviews.

Other pertinent information:

- TELL Survey data reported that 60% of teachers stated they receive feedback that can help them improve teaching. This is well below the district average of 81% and state average of 83.6% that agreed.

3.5	Teachers participate/system operates in collaborative learning communities to improve instruction and student learning.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 3
Performance levels			
	4	All members of the school staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule.	
X	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.	
	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.
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)		
Classroom observation data		
Stakeholder survey data		
Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review		

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

Classroom Observation Data:

- The ELEOT High Expectations Environment Domain Indicator B.2, “Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable,” received a rating of 2.6 on a 4-point scale.

- The ELEOT High Expectations Environment Indicator B.4, “Is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and /or tasks,” received a rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 58% of teachers agree they have been trained to implement a formal process of professional collaboration.
- 63% of parents agree that teachers work as a team to help students learn.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Members of the administrative team attend PLC meetings to monitor protocols and action steps according to interviews.
- Interviews indicate that each department PLC generates Plus/Delta reports and the “next steps” from those reports contribute to both the 30-60-90 and Quarterly Reports.
- Teacher interviews indicate that PLC meetings and common planning is having a positive impact on collaboration within departments and more specifically for teachers of the same course.
- PLC lead teachers report the lead teacher meetings prior to PLC meetings are crucial for preparation and clarification of purpose.

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.	
X	3	Exemplars are often provided to guide and inform students.	
	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)		
Classroom Observation Data		
Stakeholder Survey Data		
Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review		

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

Establish a process for teachers to use multiple measures, including formative assessments, in all classes to inform students with specific and immediate feedback about their learning.

Supporting Evidence

Classroom Observation Data:

- The ELEOT Progress Monitoring Environment Indicator E.3, “Demonstrates or verbalizes understanding of the lesson/content,” received a rating of 2.4 on a 4-point scale.
- The ELEOT Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment Indicator E.5, “Has opportunities to revise/improve work based on feedback,” received a rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 64% of students indicate that teachers provide students with information about learning and grades.

- 85% of teachers report that a process exists to inform students of learning expectations and performance standards.
- 60% of teachers indicate that students are provided specific and timely feedback about their learning.
- 66% of teachers agree that multiple types of assessment are used to modify instruction and revise the curriculum.
- 90% of parents agree that students know the expectations for learning in each classroom.
- 78% of parents indicate multiple assessments are given to students for measurement of understanding.
- 68% of students indicate teachers use a variety of instructional methods and strategies to provide necessary skills.
- 66% of students agree that teachers explain classroom expectations for learning and behavior.
- 65% of students agree that teachers use tests, projects, presentations, and portfolios for student understanding.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Student and teacher interviews indicate a lack of awareness and/or use of formative assessment in the classroom to gauge student growth and inform instructional practice.
- Student interviews suggest written feedback is minimal and is used for grade improvement rather than student learning.
- Student interviews indicated that in several classes assessments were limited to end-of-unit tests and quizzes.

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 2	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)			

Stakeholder survey data
Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review
Other pertinent information: walkthrough feedback, mentor schedule, mentor documentation/job description, work products from mentoring sessions

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

Ensure the school provides staff with mentoring and coaching supports based on individual teacher needs consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning.

Supporting Evidence

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 53% of teachers report that a formal process exists for peer coaching.
- 57% of teachers report that a formal process exists for helping new teachers develop professional practice.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Teacher interviews indicate a quality district-wide program for mentoring new teachers.
- Teacher interviews indicate a building mentor is provided for new teachers.

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.	
	4	Families have multiple ways of staying informed of their children’s learning progress.	
X	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			
Stakeholder Survey Data			
Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review			
Other pertinent information: Operation Preparation			

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

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- Only 45% of students indicate that teachers inform families of student academic progress.
- 55% of students indicate the school offers opportunities to engage families in school activities and student learning.
- Only 46% of teachers indicate that the school engages families in learning opportunities.
- 72% of parents report teachers help them to understand the progress of their child.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews indicate staff facilitates 8th grade orientation to build relationships with students and increase parent engagement in student learning.
- Interviews indicate future plans for holding stakeholder meetings in the various communities served by the school.
- Grandparents Raising Grandchildren Celebration Day
- Family and Community Engagement Policy
- Open House
- Backpack Program
- Family and Schools Together

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	3
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.			
X	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.			
	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.			
X	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.			
X	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.			
	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)

Classroom Observation Data

Stakeholder Survey Data

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review

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

Classroom Observation Data:

- The ELEOT Supportive Learning Environment Indicator C.1, “Demonstrates or expresses that learning experiences are positive,” received a rating of 2.6 on a 4-point scale.
- The ELEOT Supportive Learning Environment Indicator C.2, “Demonstrates positive attitudes about the classroom and learning,” received a rating of 2.9 on a 4-point scale.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- When surveyed as to whether each student at the school has at least one adult advocate, 47% of students agreed, 60% of teachers agreed and 70% of parents agreed. This reveals a perception on the behalf of staff and parents that is inconsistent with the student response.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Student interviews indicate adult advocates are present at the school for most and this is the result of relationships fostered by faculty and administration.
- Interviews and evidence (Advisor/Advisee calendar, advisee information sheet, learning style assessment) indicate an Advisor/Advisee program has been implemented to build relationships between adults and students in the building. Teachers will advise the same group of students throughout their high school years.

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 2	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.
	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)

Classroom Observation Data

Stakeholder Survey Data

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review

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

Formulate a common grading and reporting policy for the school that is consistent with the district’s grading scale to ensure equity in like classes and courses.

Supporting Evidence

Classroom Observation Data:

- The ELEOT Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment Indicator E.1, “Is asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning,” received a rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.
- The ELEOT Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment Indicator E.4, “Understands how her/his work is assessed,” received a rating of 2.0 on a 4-point scale.
- The ELEOT Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment Indicator E.5, “Has opportunities to revise/improve work based on feedback,” received a rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 69% of parents indicate that teachers keep them informed about student progress and grades.
- 69% of students report that work is fairly graded and evaluated by teachers.
- 66% of teachers indicate that the school uses a consistent and fair grading policy and is based on a clearly defined set of criteria.
- 83% of parents report that teachers provide information about student progress in language that is easy to understand.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews indicate that all classrooms follow the district grading policy that sets a common grading scale for the entire district.
- Interviews indicate that the high school teachers have inconsistencies concerning how course grades are generated.

3.11	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 2
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.
	3	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school.
X	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.
	2	The program is regularly evaluated for effectiveness.
X	1	If a program exists, it is rarely and/or randomly evaluated.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Stakeholder Survey Data		
Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review		
Tell Survey Data		

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

Implement a system to identify professional growth needs for all teachers in order to develop a comprehensive plan for continuous professional learning that is aligned with the school’s purpose and direction.

Supporting Evidence

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 76% of teachers report that they participate in PLCs (professional learning communities).
- 81% of teachers indicate that continuous professional learning is occurring based on the needs of the school.
- 72% of teachers indicate that professional development is designed to build capacity among all teachers and support staff.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews suggest that the professional development plan was influenced by the needs identified in teacher professional growth plans as interpreted by the principal.

Other pertinent information:

TELL Survey data:

- 52.9% of staff indicates that professional development is differentiated to meet the needs of individual teachers.
- 46.3% of staff reports that follow-up for professional development is provided.
- 49% of staff agrees that professional development is evaluated and results are reported to teachers.

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).	
X	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).	
	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)			

Classroom Observation Data
Stakeholder Survey Data
Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review

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

Ensure that school personnel use data to identify the unique learning needs of all students in order to provide and coordinate related individualized learning support services to all students.

Supporting Evidence

Classroom Observation Data:

- The ELEOT Equitable Learning Environment Indicator A.1, “Has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs,” received a rating of 1.8 on a 4-point scale.
- The ELEOT Equitable Learning Environment Indicator A.2, “Has equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology and support,” received a rating of 2.9 on a 4-point scale.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 59% of students indicate learning support services are provided for all students based on individual needs.
- 75% of teachers indicate learning support services are provided for all students based on need.
- 68% of teachers report that student data is used to meet the learning needs of all students.
- 77% of parents indicate that their child has access to support services based on individual needs.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews indicate the existence of a support staff PLC which includes district, school, and community members collaborating to provide for the needs of individual students.

- Staff interviews indicate the Gear Up program grant has provided funding for a CCR staff position. This program works with freshmen at the school and focuses on keeping students on track for college entrance.

Standard 3 Overview

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

Themes that have emerged from the team's review of the standard are explained below.

- Recognizing that instruction at the school needed to be improved, the principal instituted three non-negotiable instructional practices:
 - Bell to bell instruction
 - Meaningful conversations between teachers and students
 - Rigorous instruction in the classroom
- The principal has established an RTI period in the master schedule for interventions and/or enrichment. Students are assigned to an RTI group based on performance data and are regrouped as mastery of standards occurs based on individual student needs.
- All teachers participate in professional learning communities and routinely engage in collaborative discussions about curriculum, instruction, and assessment of student learning. Administrators attend PLC meetings to monitor PLC work and to ensure alignment with the school's purpose and direction.
- The principal has established a positive school culture throughout the building.
- The principal is visible during the school day and is seen in numerous classrooms to encourage and build positive relationships with students. However, teacher interviews suggest that they do not receive meaningful feedback on a regular and recurring basis regarding instructional strategies from administrative visits.
- Observations revealed that technology is used in most classrooms by students for research, analysis and creating presentations. It appeared that teachers used technology as a regular learning tool and a means to provide immediate feedback. Additionally, in some instances teachers were using technology to connect with students who were missing work due to absences.

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

Deficiency 1: The principal does not hold himself and all staff members accountable for the success or failure of each and every student at Perry County Central 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:

- Principal interview
- Staff and student interviews
- ELEOT observations
- Non-negotiables as developed by the principal and communicated to all stakeholders.
- Formation of PLC Leads, PLC groups, Support Staff PLC, and Program Briefing PLC
- Assignment of liaison to central office to bridge communication gaps
- A faculty handbook has been developed to include expectations for all stakeholders.
- PLC development and setting of a protocol
- PLC agendas and minutes
- Student Data Day and student data notebooks
- RTI period inserted into master schedule and planning
- CCR tracking charts
- CSIP and 30-60-90 day planning
- Quarterly Reporting
- Technology: tablet one-to-one initiative
- Principal reports monthly to board of education and District Leadership Team

Team comments:

- The principal holds himself and all staff accountable for the success or failure of all students. PLC leads have been trained by administration and ER staff to deploy instructional initiatives. PLCs meet weekly and an administrator is directly assigned to each PLC to monitor the process to ensure that they are adhering to the protocol.
- All students are tested using MAP or Discovery Ed, EXPLORE, PLAN, and ACT. They are placed in RTI according to skill deficits. Those that are at benchmark or above are provided enrichment.

Deficiency 2: The principal does not ensure common planning time is used effectively.

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:

- Staff interviews
- Common planning has been protected in the master scheduling.
- Formation of PLC leads, PLC groups, Support Staff PLC, Program Briefing PLC and a set meeting schedule developed for all groups
- PLC leads meet with administration every Tuesday to plan for weekly PLC meetings
- All PLCs meet on Wednesday and Thursday of every week
- PLCs have been restructured with a set protocol. The PLCs have an administrator that is assigned to attend all PLC meetings in conjunction with an assigned PLC lead to help build leadership capacity.
- PLC agendas and minutes
- Unit/Lesson plans
- Curriculum maps and pacing guides
- Administrative team and PLC Plus/ Delta documentation

Team comments:

Common planning time has been created so teachers can plan together as well as meet weekly in PLCs. PLC leads meet weekly to plan work for the PLC, using the PLC protocol. During PLCs a member of the administrative team is in attendance to provide feedback to the lead about the meeting. All PLC work is structured and planned to improve student learning. PLC leads report the following week in lead meeting about the outcomes of their last PLC.

Deficiency 3: There is no systemic monitoring of curriculum, assessment and instructional practices that ensures rigorous student learning is occurring.

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:

- Stakeholder interviews
- ELEOT observations
- Walkthrough protocol to monitor instructional practices and student learning

- Planning in curriculum, assessment, instructional practices, and data are embedded in the restructuring of the PLC.
- Walkthroughs with feedback
- Job-embedded professional development reflected in PLC work
- Unit plans/ lesson plans, curriculum maps, pacing guides
- Student Data Day agendas and talking points
- Administrative and PLC Plus/Delta documentation that direct plans, such as 30-60-90 Day Plan, and Quarterly Report

Team comments:

While the principal and administrative team conduct walkthroughs to monitor rigor and instructional practice there is inconsistency in the delivery of meaningful feedback to teachers from those classroom visits. PLCs are monitored for effectiveness by an administrator and feedback is provided to the lead. Teachers are developing common assessments so they can monitor their own instructional practice.

Deficiency 4: The Perry County Central High School council is not fully functioning.

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:

- Interview with Advisory Council teacher and parent members
- Interview with administration and ER staff
- Advisory Council agendas that include standing items, document viewing, policy discussions, data analysis, budget reporting, deficiency progress, and PLC reporting
- Advisory Council agendas and minutes
- Advisory Council members have been trained to help define roles

Team comments:

The Advisory Council has monthly meetings that are open to the public. There is always public notification. Members have been trained in the work of the council. The council has been reviewing and revising policies that govern the school. Each month a different department reports to the council about what is working well in their departments and what are the barriers for success. Each month, the council reviews the following: CSIP, 30-60-90, PGES, PLC, data analysis, Quarterly Report, budget information, policy review, and deficiency updates.

Deficiency 5: The principal has not implemented a fully functioning system of interventions to reduce achievement gaps and ensure all students meet state and federal proficiency standards.

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:

- Staff interviews
- Administration and ER staff interviews
- ELEOT observations
- Master schedule with RTI period
- RTI plan
- Plan utilizing data to place students in reading and math transition courses to target student skill deficits.
- Advisor-Advisee initiative and protocol
- Use of universal screeners (MAP and Discovery Education)
- Unit plans/ lesson plans
- Student data notebooks
- CSIP and 30-60-90 Day planning
- CCR tracking charts
- After school tutoring sessions after school to assist with skill deficits
- Credit Recovery program to provide students the opportunity to recover credits

Team comments:

The school bell schedule has been revised to include a 30 minute period that is used for RTI. Students take Map or Discovery tests to determine skill deficits. EXPLORE, PLAN, and ACT data is also used to place students in intervention to improve learning and close achievement gaps. Students are moved in RTI groups as they master skills as noted on the next round of MAP and Discovery Ed testing. Students use their data notebooks to record test scores and goals. Seniors not meeting CPE Benchmarks are placed in transition courses in both math and reading.

Deficiency 6: The principal and school council do not systematically seek parent and community participation in the decision-making processes of the high school.

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:

- Advisory Council member interviews
- Administration and ER staff interviews
- Parent and community distribution list created to provide appropriate

communication to stakeholders.

- Documentation from Parent/Family night Sept. 5, 2013
- Documentation of School Advisory Council meetings announcements
- Communication plan
- Open House documentation
- Parent surveys
- Samples from social media campaign include Facebook, Twitter, and weekly newsletter, school website, school entrance marquee all inviting parents to be involved in the education of their children.
- Prichard Committee school and parent “Missing Piece” Workshop attendance
- Operation Preparation participant training and attendance documentation

Team comments:

Systems have been implemented by the principal, advisory council and staff in an effort to consciously include parents and community participation in the decision-making of the school. The school has developed a communication plan to ensure that all stakeholders are aware of everything that is happening in the school community. There is a weekly newsletter that is e-mailed to all parents that have made their contacts available. Open House is conducted at each mid-term during the school year. The school has a Facebook page and a Twitter account to open lines of communication. The school hosted a community work session where the public was invited to visit the classrooms and see instruction as it was happening. Parent surveys have been conducted and results have been used to plan parent and student events.

ELEOT Ratings

