



Internal District Review Report

Name of Institution

Reviewed: Trimble County School District

Date: March 10, 2014-March 11, 2014



Introduction

The KDE Internal School/District Review is designed to:

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

The report reflects the team's analysis of 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
- District 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/district’s curriculum, instructional design, and assessment practices guide and ensure teacher effectiveness and student learning.	District Rating for Standard 3 2.17	Team Rating for Standard 3 1.92
--	--	--

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

3.1	The school/district 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.	District Rating 2	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/district’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.
3		There is some evidence to indicate curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
x 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.
2		Little individualization for each student is evident.
1		No individualization for students is evident.

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

District Self-Assessment

Deficiencies from the 2011 Leadership Scholastic Audit
KDE School/District Report Card data
Stakeholder Survey results
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)
District presentation of progress
Interviews with stakeholders
Review of district documents and artifacts
District curriculum documentation
CIITS lesson plan documentation

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
- 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 a process to ensure that curriculum is implemented with fidelity and provides challenging and equitable learning experiences for post-secondary aspirations. Require a process that is a collaborative and continuous effort among faculty to carefully align course content and performance standards across the district.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 48.7 to 61.9. This resulted in an increase from the 20th percentile to the 84th percentile. The greatest gains came from College and Career Readiness.
- The school’s accountability score in College and Career Readiness (CCR) increased 43.1 points, from 31.9 in 2011-12 to 75.0 in 2012-2013.
- Accountability scores for the non-duplicated gap group increased in language arts, reading and science (2012, 2013).

- The school’s overall weighted gap accountability score increased 2.0 points (2012, 2013).
- Math accountability scores (NAPD calculation—Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) saw a decrease of 5.2 points overall and a decrease in the performance of the non-duplicated gap group (2012, 2013).
- The social studies accountability score (NAPD calculation) decreased 4.8 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students meeting the math benchmark on the PLAN assessment decreased 1.7 points.
- The percentage of female students meeting proficiency benchmarks on the PLAN assessment decreased 3.1 points in math and 10.7 points in reading (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students from the free/reduced-price meals group that met the reading benchmark on the PLAN assessment decreased 10.4 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students who met the reading benchmark on the ACT increased .7 points; however, the mean score in reading on the ACT declined .3 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of male students who met the English and math benchmarks on the ACT declined 25.9 points and 23.3 points, respectively (2012, 2013).

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure B.2, “Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable,” was scored at 2.0 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating. Challenging activities and higher level questioning were not observed in all classes.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 41.9% of the students who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "My school provides me with challenging curriculum and learning experiences."
- 61.0% of the students who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "My school prepares me to deal with issues I may face in the future."
- 63.0% of the teachers who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "In our school, challenging curriculum and learning experiences provide equity for all students in the development of learning, thinking, and life skills."
- 63.2% of the parents who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "All of my child’s teachers provide an equitable curriculum that meets his/her learning needs."
- 70.6% of the parents who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "All of my child’s teachers give work that challenges my child."

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.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
4	Using data from multiple assessments of student learning and an examination of professional practice, school/district personnel systematically monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.		
3	Using data from student assessments and an examination of professional practice, school/district personnel monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.		

x	2	School/district personnel monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure for vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district's goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.
	1	School/district personnel rarely or never monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school/district's goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.
	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/district'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/district'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/district'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/district's purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
District Self-Assessment		
Deficiencies from the 2011 Leadership Scholastic Audit		
KDE School/District Report Card Data		
Stakeholder Survey results		
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)		
District presentation of progress		
Interviews with stakeholders		
Review of district documents and artifacts		
Curriculum documentation (guides, processes, plans)		
MAP data collection, interpretation, and instructional implementation		
PLC agendas and minutes		

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
- 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

Create and implement a district-wide process in which all staff collect and use data to monitor, adjust, and evaluate curriculum, instruction, and assessments to improve the learning environments. Ensure that there are systems in place that evaluate the effectiveness of the conditions that support student learning and that it proves to be a consistent practice.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 48.7 to 61.9. This resulted in an increase from the 20th percentile to the 84th percentile. The greatest gains came from College and Career Readiness.
- The school’s accountability score in College and Career Readiness (CCR) increased 43.1 points, from 31.9 in 2011-12 to 75.0 in 2012-2013.
- Accountability scores for the non-duplicated gap group increased in language arts, reading and science (2012, 2013).
- The school’s overall weighted gap accountability score increased 2.0 points (2012, 2013).
- Math accountability scores (NAPD calculation—Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) saw a decrease of 5.2 points overall and a decrease in the performance of the non-duplicated gap group (2012, 2013).
- The social studies accountability score (NAPD calculation) decreased 4.8 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students meeting the math benchmark on the PLAN assessment declined 1.7 points.
- The percentage of female students meeting proficiency benchmarks on the PLAN assessment decreased 3.1 points in math and 10.7 points in reading (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students from the free/reduced-price meals group that met the reading benchmark on the PLAN assessment decreased 10.4 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students who met the reading benchmark on the ACT increased .7 points; however, the mean score in reading on the ACT declined .3 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of male students who met the English and math benchmarks on the ACT declined 25.9 points and 23.3 points, respectively (2012, 2013).

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure E.1, “Student is asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning,” was scored at 1.8 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.

- ELEOT measure B.2, “Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable,” was scored at 2.0 on a 4-point scale indicating an “evident” rating. Challenging activities and higher level questioning were not observed in all classes.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 66.2% of the students who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "My school gives me multiple assessments to check my understanding of what was taught."
- 44.4% of the teachers who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "All teachers in our school monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment based on data from student assessments and examination of professional practice."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An examination of district and school walk-through documentation reveals that there are attempts at monitoring curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Feedback is provided via the Teacher Shared Drive. There is no evidence that suggests that this is a formalized and consistent practice.
- Classroom observations and lesson plan reviews indicate formative data are not consistently and uniformly utilized to modify the curriculum and make instructional decisions to meet the needs of individual students in all classes. Additionally, there was no evidence to indicate daily formative assessments are consistently used by all teachers to ensure student learning.
- Stakeholder interviews and artifact review indicates the utilization of Mastery Connect to assist with creating assessments and interpreting data.

Other pertinent information:

- The 2013 TELL Survey indicates that 96.4% of teachers use assessment data to inform their instruction as opposed to 86.4% in the 2011 TELL Survey.

3.3	Teachers engage students in their learning through instructional strategies that ensure achievement of learning expectations.	District Rating 2	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)

District Self-Assessment
Deficiencies from the 2011 District Leadership Scholastic Audit
KDE School/District Report Card Data
Stakeholder Survey results
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)
District presentation of progress
Interviews with stakeholders
Review of district documents and artifacts
Findings from district walk-throughs at the school level, such as peer observation documents
PD plans
PLC meeting agendas and minutes

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
- 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

Use a collaborative process to develop procedures that can be systematically implemented that will ensure all teachers are consistently engaging students in learning activities that result in achievement of learning expectations. Document the process and include methods of monitoring for effectiveness.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school's academic index grew from 48.7 to 61.9. This resulted in an increase from the 20th percentile to the 84th percentile. The greatest gains came from College and Career Readiness.
- The school's accountability score in College and Career Readiness (CCR) increased 43.1 points, from 31.9 in 2011-12 to 75.0 in 2012-2013.
- Accountability scores for the non-duplicated gap group increased in language arts, reading and science (2012, 2013).
- The school's overall weighted gap accountability score increased 2.0 points (2012, 2013).
- Math accountability scores (NAPD calculation—Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) saw a decrease of 5.2 points overall and a decrease in the performance of the non-duplicated gap group (2012, 2013).
- The social studies accountability score (NAPD calculation) decreased 4.8 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students meeting the math benchmark on the PLAN assessment declined 1.7 points.
- The percentage of female students meeting proficiency benchmarks on the PLAN assessment decreased 3.1 points in math and 10.7 points in reading (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students from the free/reduced-price meals group that met the reading benchmark on the PLAN assessment decreased 10.4 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students who met the reading benchmark on the ACT increased .7 points; however, the mean score in reading on the ACT declined .3 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of male students who met the English and math benchmarks on the ACT declined 25.9 points and 23.3 points, respectively (2012, 2013).

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure D.1, "Student has several opportunities to engage in discussions with teacher and other students," was scored at 2.3 on a 4-point scale indicating a "somewhat evident" rating. In some classrooms that were observed, traditional teacher-led lecture or book-work models were used. Few classrooms used student-centered, engaging instructional activities that forced students to engage content.
- ELEOT measure D.3, "Student is actively engaged in the learning activities," was scored at 2.1 on a 4-point scale indicating a "somewhat evident" rating. Some students were authentically engaged, while others were sitting quietly but not participating in the lesson. Some students were allowed to stay off task (e.g. on a computer site not related to course, sleeping) without re-direction.
- ELEOT measures G.2 and G.3 regarding the Digital Learning Environment all scored in the "not observed" range on the 4-point scale. Many teachers used smart boards for general note-taking similar to a whiteboard.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 52.0% of the students who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "My school motivates me to learn new things."
- 69.9% of the students who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "All of my teachers change their teaching to meet my learning needs."

- 48.2% of the teachers who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "All teachers in our school personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students."
- 45.5% of the teachers who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "All teachers in our school regularly use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills."
- 43.0% of the parents who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "All of my child's teachers use a variety of teaching strategies and learning activities."
- 60.5% of the parents who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "All of my child's teachers meet his/her learning needs by individualizing instruction."
- 59.8% of the parents who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "My child sees a relationship between what is being taught and his/her everyday life."
- 44.8% of the parents who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "My child has up-to-date computers and other technology to learn."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review determined the district and school provided numerous professional development opportunities towards improving instructional strategies.

3.4	School/district leaders monitor and support the improvement of instructional practices of teachers to ensure student success.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	School/district leaders formally and consistently monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures beyond classroom observation to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.	
	3	School/district leaders formally and consistently monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.	
x	2	School/district leaders monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.	
	1	School/district leaders occasionally or randomly monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.	
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)			

District Self-Assessment
Deficiencies from the 2011 District Leadership Scholastic Audit
KDE School/District Report Card data
Stakeholder Survey results
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)
District presentation of progress
Interviews with stakeholders
Review of district documents and artifacts
Curriculum maps
Supervision and evaluation procedures
Lesson plan monitoring
District walk through and evaluation documentation
Peer observation documentation
PLC planning

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
- 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

Monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation beyond classroom observations to ensure they are aligned with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning, are directly engaged with all students in their learning, and use content-specific standards. Ensure that continuous support for teachers is provided through coaching, mentoring, professional development, the PLC framework, etc., to improve the instructional practices of all teachers.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 48.7 to 61.9. This resulted in an increase from the 20th percentile to the 84th percentile. The greatest gains came from College and Career Readiness.
- The school’s accountability score in College and Career Readiness (CCR) increased 43.1 points, from 31.9 in 2011-12 to 75.0 in 2012-2013.
- Accountability scores for the non-duplicated gap group increased in language arts, reading and science (2012, 2013).
- The school’s overall weighted gap accountability score increased 2.0 points (2012, 2013).
- Math accountability scores (NAPD calculation—Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) saw a decrease of 5.2 points overall and a decrease in the performance of the non-duplicated gap group (2012, 2013).
- The social studies accountability score (NAPD calculation) decreased 4.8 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students meeting the math benchmark on the PLAN assessment declined 1.7 points.
- The percentage of female students meeting proficiency benchmarks on the PLAN assessment decreased 3.1 points in math and 10.7 points in reading (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students from the free/reduced-price meals group that met the reading benchmark on the PLAN assessment decreased 10.4 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students who met the reading benchmark on the ACT increased .7 points; however, the mean score in reading on the ACT declined .3 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of male students who met the English and math benchmarks on the ACT declined 25.9 points and 23.3 points, respectively (2012, 2013).

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure A.1, “Student has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet his/her needs, was rated at 1.9 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating. Many classrooms exhibited traditional teacher-centered instruction (e.g. lecture, teacher presentations) instead of student-led engagement of content.
- ELEOT measure B.5, “Student is asked and responds to questions that require higher-order thinking,” was rated at 1.9 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating. Questions posed to students in many lessons did not require processing before answering – many were memorized fact answers.
- ELEOT measure E.3, “Student demonstrates or verbalizes understanding of the lesson/content,” was rated at 2.1 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- District interviews and documentation included numerous walkthroughs during the 2012-13 school year; however, fewer walkthroughs have been conducted in the 2013-14 school year.

3.5	Teachers participate/system operates in collaborative learning communities to improve instruction and student learning.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
4	All members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that		

		meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule.
	3	All members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally.
x	2	Some members of the school/district 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/district 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/district 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/district 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/district personnel.
	4	School/district personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
	3	School/district personnel indicate that collaboration causes improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
x	2	School/district personnel express belief in the value of collaborative learning communities.
	1	School/district personnel see little value in collaborative learning communities.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
District Self-Assessment		
Deficiencies from the 2011 District Leadership Scholastic Audit		
KDE School/District Report Card data		
Stakeholder Survey results		
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)		
District presentation of progress		
Interviews with stakeholders		
Review of district documents and artifacts, such as action planning for deltas		
PLC agendas and minutes		
Program review monitoring		
PGES documentation		

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

Opportunity for Improvement

Develop and implement a formal process district-wide (elementary, middle, and high) that promotes discussion about student learning and analysis of student assessment data through the use of collaborative learning communities across grade levels and content areas. Use the collaborative learning communities to ensure teachers learn from, use, and discuss the results of inquiry practices and improve instructional practice and student performance.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 48.7 to 61.9. This resulted in an increase from the 20th percentile to the 84th percentile. The greatest gains came from College and Career Readiness.
- The school’s accountability score in College and Career Readiness (CCR) increased 43.1 points, from 31.9 in 2011-12 to 75.0 in 2012-2013.
- Accountability scores for the non-duplicated gap group increased in language arts, reading and science (2012, 2013).
- The school’s overall weighted gap accountability score increased 2.0 points (2012, 2013).
- Math accountability scores (NAPD calculation—Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) saw a decrease of 5.2 points overall and a decrease in the performance of the non-duplicated gap group (2012, 2013).
- The social studies accountability score (NAPD calculation) decreased 4.8 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students meeting the math benchmark on the PLAN assessment declined 1.7 points.

- The percentage of female students meeting proficiency benchmarks on the PLAN assessment decreased 3.1 points in math and 10.7 points in reading (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students from the free/reduced-price meals group that met the reading benchmark on the PLAN assessment decreased 10.4 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students who met the reading benchmark on the ACT increased .7 points; however, the mean score in reading on the ACT declined .3 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of male students who met the English and math benchmarks on the ACT declined 25.9 points and 23.3 points, respectively (2012, 2013).

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure B.2, “Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable,” was scored at 2.0 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.
- ELEOT measure B.4, “Student is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussion and/or tasks,” was scored at 2.0 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 66.7% of the teachers who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "All teachers in our school have been trained to implement a formal process that promotes discussion about student learning (e.g., action research, examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching)."
- 57.5% of the parents who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "All of my child’s teacher’s work as a team to help my child learn."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review and stakeholder interviews indicate that it is evident that professional learning communities (PLCs) have been established at the high school level and that the district has fully supported this process; however, this process remains in the initial phase of deployment. Formal protocols and processes do not exist for professional learning communities.
- The review of documents and artifacts revealed limited evidence to support that the work of the PLCs is being monitored by district and school administration on a consistent basis.
- The review of documents and artifacts revealed limited evidence of a formal process to provide a framework for the discussion of student learning and the analysis of student performance data that includes a focus on high-yield instructional strategies and differentiation for students who mastered the content and students who did not master the content. There was noted evidence of a Student Work Analysis Tuning Protocol, but interviews indicated that it is in draft and discussion mode only.

Other pertinent information:

- The 2013 TELL Survey indicates that 89.0% of teachers say they work in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices as opposed to 55.6% in the 2011 TELL Survey.

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

		expectations and standards of performance.
	3	All teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
x	2	Most teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
	1	Few teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
	4	Exemplars are provided to guide and inform students.
	3	Exemplars are often provided to guide and inform students.
	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)		
District Self-Assessment		
Deficiencies from the 2011 Leadership Scholastic Audit		
KDE School/District Report Card data		
Stakeholder Survey results		
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)		
District presentation of progress		
Interviews with stakeholders		
Review of district documents and artifacts: RTI pyramid, monitoring chart, tiered levels		
Examples of assessments illustrating modification of instruction		
Lesson plans in CIITS		
Student progress monitoring through the use of MAP		
Learning target documentation		
Instructional modification resulting from progress monitoring		

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
- 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

Create and systematically implement an instructional process that clearly informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance. Ensure that the process 1) includes the use of exemplars to guide students’ work, 2) relies on the use of multiple assessments to inform ongoing modification of instruction, and 3) provides students with timely and specific feedback about their learning.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 48.7 to 61.9. This resulted in an increase from the 20th percentile to the 84th percentile. The greatest gains came from College and Career Readiness.
- The school’s accountability score in College and Career Readiness (CCR) increased 43.1 points, from 31.9 in 2011-12 to 75.0 in 2012-2013.
- Accountability scores for the non-duplicated gap group increased in language arts, reading and science (2012, 2013).
- The school’s overall weighted gap accountability score increased 2.0 points (2012, 2013).
- Math accountability scores (NAPD calculation—Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) saw a decrease of 5.2 points overall and a decrease in the performance of the non-duplicated gap group (2012, 2013).
- The social studies accountability score (NAPD calculation) decreased 4.8 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students meeting the math benchmark on the PLAN assessment declined by 1.7 points.
- The percentage of female students meeting proficiency benchmarks on the PLAN assessment decreased by 3.1 points in math and 10.7 points in reading (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students from the free/reduced-price meals group that met the reading benchmark on the PLAN assessment decreased 10.4 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students who met the reading benchmark on the ACT increased .7 points; however, the mean score in reading on the ACT declined .3 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of male students who met the English and math benchmarks on the ACT declined 25.9 points and 23.3 points, respectively (2012, 2013).

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure B.3, “Student is provided exemplars of high quality work,” was scored at 1.5 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.
- ELEOT measure E.3, “Student demonstrates or verbalizes understanding of the lesson/content,” was scored at 2.1 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating. In some classes that were observed, significant teacher-student interaction regarding understanding of content was exhibited. In other classes, feedback to students was not observed.
- ELEOT measure E.5, “Student has opportunities to revise/improve work based on feedback,” was scored at 2.0 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 40.2% of the students who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "All of my teachers provide me with information about my learning and grades."
- 40.7% of the teachers who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "All teachers in our school use a process to inform students of their learning expectations and standards of performance."
- 48.2% of the teachers who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "All teachers in our school provide students with specific and timely feedback about their learning."
- 55.6% of the teachers who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "All teachers in our school use multiple types of assessments to modify instruction and to revise the curriculum."
- 64.4% of the parents who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "My child knows the expectations for learning in all classes."
- 42.5% of the parents who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "My child is given multiple assessments to measure his/her understanding of what was taught."
- 44.5% of the students who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "All of my teachers use a variety of teaching methods and learning activities to help me develop the skills I will need to succeed."
- 39.0% of the students who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "All of my teachers explain their expectations for learning and behavior so I can be successful."
- 68.8% of the students who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "All of my teachers use tests, projects, presentations, and portfolios to check my understanding of what was taught."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Most teachers post daily learning targets, but classroom observations did not indicate that teachers reference learning targets during class and formative assessments were not used consistently to monitor the mastery of learning targets.

3.7	Mentoring, coaching, and induction programs support instructional improvement consistent with the school/system’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
-----	---	----------------------	------------------

Performance levels

	4	All school/district personnel are engaged in systematic mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.
	3	School/district personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.
x	2	Some school/district personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.
	1	Few or no school/district personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.
	4	These programs set high expectations for all school/district personnel and include valid and reliable measures of performance.
	3	These programs set expectations for all school/district personnel and include measures of performance.
x	2	These programs set expectations for school/district personnel.
	1	Limited or no expectations for school/district personnel are included.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
District Self-Assessment		
Deficiencies from the 2011 District Leadership Scholastic Audit		
KDE School/District Report Card data		
Stakeholder Survey results		
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)		
District presentation of progress		
Interviews with stakeholders		
Review of district documents and artifacts		
Meeting agendas and minutes reflecting feedback		
Documentation illustrating teacher induction program		
PGES rollout documentation		
TELL Survey		
PLC agendas and minutes		
New teacher orientation documentation		
Faculty meeting documentation		

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

Opportunity for Improvement

Develop a teacher mentoring program to support all teachers in the improvement of their craft through one-on-one coaching, modeling, and observation that is consistent with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning. Monitor the implementation of the program to ensure it has high expectations for participation, content, and application and that the program is measured for its effectiveness.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 48.7 to 61.9. This resulted in an increase from the 20th percentile to the 84th percentile. The greatest gains came from College and Career Readiness.
- The school’s accountability score in College and Career Readiness (CCR) increased 43.1 points, from 31.9 in 2011-12 to 75.0 in 2012-2013.
- Accountability scores for the non-duplicated gap group increased in language arts, reading and science (2012, 2013).
- The school’s overall weighted gap accountability score increased 2.0 points (2012, 2013).
- Math accountability scores (NAPD calculation—Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) saw a decrease of 5.2 points overall and a decrease in the performance of the non-duplicated gap group (2012, 2013).
- The social studies accountability score (NAPD calculation) decreased 4.8 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students meeting the math benchmark on the PLAN assessment declined 1.7 points.
- The percentage of female students meeting proficiency benchmarks on the PLAN assessment decreased 3.1 points in math and 10.7 points in reading (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students from the free/reduced-price meals group that met the reading benchmark on the PLAN assessment decreased 10.4 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students who met the reading benchmark on the ACT increased .7 points; however, the mean score in reading on the ACT declined .3 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of male students who met the English and math benchmarks on the ACT declined 25.9 points and 23.3 points, respectively (2012, 2013).

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 62.7% of the teachers who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "In our school, staff members provide peer coaching to teachers."
- 66.7% of the teachers who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "In our school, a formal process is in place to support new staff members in their professional practice."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews and evidence suggest that there are limited opportunities for mentoring, coaching, and induction programs provided at the district level. There was documented evidence of a new teacher training hosted at the beginning of school, but further support and nurturing for beginning teachers is not a consistent practice.

Other pertinent information:

- The 2013 TELL Survey results for the district indicates that 67.5% of teachers believe the leadership makes a sustained effort to address teachers concerns about new teacher support as opposed to 66.2% in the 2011 TELL Survey.

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.	District Rating 3	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.		
	4	Families have multiple ways of staying informed of their children’s learning progress.		
	3	School/district personnel regularly inform families of their children’s learning progress.		
x	2	School/district personnel provide information about children’s learning.		
	1	School/district personnel provide little relevant information about children’s learning.		
Evidence Reviewed				
District Self-Assessment				
Deficiencies from the 2011 Leadership Scholastic Audit				
KDE School/District Report Card data				
Stakeholder Survey results				
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)				
District presentation of progress				
Interviews with stakeholders				
Review of district documents and artifacts				
Documentation of varied activities and communication with families				
District student recognitions				
Parent involvement policy, Coffee and Conversations district support, newsletters				
District website and local media coverage				

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
- 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

Research strategies that will help include parents as partners in the education of their students. Continue and expand two-way (school/district-to-home and home-to-school/district) communication initiatives to inform parents about student progress as well as involve parents in teaching and learning. Streamline communication methods for all schools in the district by creating a district communication plan to ensure consistent, transparent messages are occurring at all levels across the district.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 48.7 to 61.9. This resulted in an increase from the 20th percentile to the 84th percentile. The greatest gains came from College and Career Readiness.
- The school’s accountability score in College and Career Readiness (CCR) increased 43.1 points, from 31.9 in 2011-12 to 75.0 in 2012-2013.
- Accountability scores for the non-duplicated gap group increased in language arts, reading and science (2012, 2013).
- The school’s overall weighted gap accountability score increased 2.0 points (2012, 2013).
- Math accountability scores (NAPD calculation—Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) saw a decrease of 5.2 points overall and a decrease in the performance of the non-duplicated gap group (2012, 2013).
- The social studies accountability score (NAPD calculation) decreased 4.8 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students meeting the math benchmark on the PLAN assessment declined 1.7 points.
- The percentage of female students meeting proficiency benchmarks on the PLAN assessment decreased 3.1 points in math and 10.7 points in reading (2012, 2013).

- The percentage of students from the free/reduced-price meals group that met the reading benchmark on the PLAN assessment decreased 10.4 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students who met the reading benchmark on the ACT increased .7 points; however, the mean score in reading on the ACT declined .3 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of male students who met the English and math benchmarks on the ACT declined 25.9 points and 23.3 points, respectively (2012, 2013).

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 61.3% of the students who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement "All of my teachers keep my family informed of my academic progress."
- 61.3% of the students who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "My school offers opportunities for my family to become involved in school activities and my learning."
- 74.1% of the teachers who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "In our school, all school personnel regularly engage families in their children's learning progress."
- 44.8% of the parents who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "All of my child's teachers help me to understand my child's progress."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review and stakeholder interviews indicated that there are multiple methods in which the school/district communicates with families. Some of the methods are the following: parent/guardian e-mail distribution lists, One Call system, district and school website, Coffee and Conversation meetings with community members and parents, and local newspaper and radio coverage. However, a formalized district communication plan has not been developed to streamline efforts for each school within the district.
- The review of documents and artifacts revealed that the school maintains a web site, provides newsletters for parents, and utilizes Infinite Campus to communicate with parents about their children's progress.

Other pertinent information:

- The 2013 TELL Survey indicates that 72.2% of teachers agree that parents/guardians are influential decision makers in their schools as opposed to 54.4% in the 2011 TELL Survey.
- The 2013 TELL Survey indicates that 83.1% of teachers agree that their school does a good job of encouraging parent/guardian involvement as opposed to 74.7% in the 2011 TELL Survey.

3.9	The school/system has a formal structure whereby each student is well known by at least one adult advocate in the school/district who supports that student's educational experience.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
4	School/district personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student and related adults.		
3	School/district personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student.		
x 2	School/district personnel participate in a structure that gives them interaction with individual		

		students, allowing them to build relationships over time with the student.
	1	Few or no opportunities exist for school/district 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/district employee to gain significant insight into and serve as an advocate for the student's needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	3	The structure allows the school/district employee to gain insight into and serve as an advocate for the student's needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
x	2	The structure allows the school/district 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/district employee who advocates for their needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
District Self-Assessment		
Deficiencies from the 2011 Leadership Scholastic Audit		
KDE School/District Report Card data		
Stakeholder Survey results		
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)		
District presentation of progress		
Interviews with stakeholders		
Review of district documents and artifacts: goal setting schedules, district participation in event		
List of students matched to adults during advisor/advisee		
Support staff provided by district: GEAR UP , Race To The Top		

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
- 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

Continue the implementation of the Student Learning Community where each student is connected to an adult advocate in the school/district who supports the student's educational experience. In addition, continue to target specific students who are identified as at-risk for dropping out of school with intensive interventions designed to provide extra support for their unique needs. Enhance opportunities to extend learning for students who exhibit success to consistently raise the expectation so students can continually progress to higher levels of learning.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school's academic index grew from 48.7 to 61.9. This resulted in an increase from the 20th percentile to the 84th percentile. The greatest gains came from College and Career Readiness.
- The school's accountability score in College and Career Readiness (CCR) increased 43.1 points, from 31.9 in 2011-12 to 75.0 in 2012-2013.
- Accountability scores for the non-duplicated gap group increased in language arts, reading and science (2012, 2013).
- The school's overall weighted gap accountability score increased 2.0 points (2012, 2013).
- Math accountability scores (NAPD calculation—Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) saw a decrease of 5.2 points overall and a decrease in the performance of the non-duplicated gap group (2012, 2013).
- The school's social studies accountability score (NAPD calculation) decreased 4.8 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students meeting the math benchmark on the PLAN assessment declined 1.7 points.
- The percentage of female students meeting proficiency benchmarks on the PLAN assessment decreased 3.1 points in math and 10.7 points in reading (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students from the free/reduced-price meals group that met the reading benchmark on the PLAN assessment decreased 10.4 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students who met the reading benchmark on the ACT increased .7 points; however, the mean score in reading on the ACT declined .3 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of male students who met the English and math benchmarks on the ACT declined 25.9 points and 23.3 points, respectively (2012, 2013).

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure C.1, "Student demonstrates or expresses that learning experiences are positive," was scored at 2.3 on a 4-point scale indicating a "somewhat evident" rating.
- ELEOT measure C.2, "Student demonstrates a positive attitude about the classroom and learning," was scored at 2.5 on a 4-point scale indicating an "evident" rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 58.1% of the students who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "My school makes sure there is at least one adult who knows me well and shows interest in my education and future."

- 74.1% of the teachers who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "In our school, a formal structure exists so that each student is well known by at least one adult advocate in the school who supports that student's educational experience."
- 65.1% of the parents who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "My child has at least one adult advocate in the school."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Evidence suggests that an advisor/advisee structure has been created to develop one-on-one interaction to foster individualized and personalized action to further enhance relationships between administration, faculty, and students. However, it is in the initial phase of implementation and a documented process is needed.

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.	District 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)			
District Self-Assessment			
Deficiencies from the 2011 District Leadership Scholastic Audit			

KDE School/District Report Card data
Stakeholder Survey results
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)
District presentation of progress
Interviews with stakeholders
Review of district documents and artifacts
Quarterly Report data
Graduation requirements and grading policy
Communication of district and school procedures through handbooks

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
- Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

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

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

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

(Check one)

x	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Initiate a collaborative process to examine current grading policies and the extent to which they contribute to rigorous coursework and high academic expectations. Use the results of this examination to revise grading policies that assure academic grades are based on content knowledge and skills and common courses have the same high expectations.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 48.7 to 61.9. This resulted in an increase from the 20th percentile to the 84th percentile. The greatest gains came from College and Career Readiness.
- The school’s accountability score in College and Career Readiness (CCR) increased 43.1 points, from 31.9 in 2011-12 to 75.0 in 2012-2013.
- Accountability scores for the non-duplicated gap group increased in language arts, reading and science (2012, 2013).

- The school’s overall weighted gap accountability score increased 2.0 points (2012, 2013).
- Math accountability scores (NAPD calculation—Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) saw a decrease of 5.2 points overall and a decrease in the performance of the non-duplicated gap group (2012, 2013).
- The school’s social studies accountability score (NAPD calculation) decreased 4.8 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students meeting the math benchmark on the PLAN assessment declined 1.7 points.
- The percentage of female students meeting proficiency benchmarks on the PLAN assessment decreased 3.1 points in math and 10.7 points in reading (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students from the free/reduced-price meals group that met the reading benchmark on the PLAN assessment decreased 10.4 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students who met the reading benchmark on the ACT increased .7 points; however, the mean score in reading on the ACT declined .3 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of male students who met the English and math benchmarks on the ACT declined 25.9 points and 23.3 points, respectively (2012, 2013).

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure E.1, “Student is asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning,” was scored at 1.8 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.
- ELEOT measure E.4, “Student understands how her/his work is assessed,” was scored at 1.6 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.
- ELEOT measure E.5, “Student has opportunities to revise/improve work based on feedback,” was scored at 2.0 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 74.1% of the teachers who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "In our school, all stakeholders are informed of policies, processes, and procedures related to grading and reporting."
- 67.1% of the parents who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "All of my child’s teachers keep me informed regularly of how my child is being graded."
- 62.4% of the students who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "All of my teachers fairly grade and evaluate my work."
- 40.7% of the teachers who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "All teachers in our school use consistent common grading and reporting policies across grade levels and courses based on clearly defined criteria."
- 50.6% of the parents who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "All of my child’s teachers report on my child's progress in easy to understand language."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews and artifact review determined that the District Handbook includes graduation requirements, credit requirements, requirements for student recognition, and a grading scale.

3.11	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 2
------	---	----------------------	------------------

Performance levels		
	4	All staff members participate in a rigorous, continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district's purpose and direction.
x	3	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district's purpose and direction.
	2	Most staff members participate in a program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district'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/district and the individual.
	3	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school/district.
x	2	Professional development is based on the needs of the school/district.
	1	Professional development, when available, may or may not address the needs of the school/district 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)		
District Self-Assessment		
Deficiencies from the 2011 District Leadership Scholastic Audit		
KDE School/District Report Card data		
Stakeholder Survey results		
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)		
District presentation of progress		
Interviews with stakeholders		
Review of district documents and artifacts		
Documentation of district monitoring of professional development		
PLC planning documentation		
District/School goal setting documentation		
Documentation of district use of PD360		

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
- 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

Ensure that all staff members participate in a rigorous, continuous program of professional learning with a developed protocol that is aligned with the school/district’s purpose and direction and based on an assessment of needs of the school/district and the individual. Evaluate the effectiveness of the professional learning through a rigorous and systematic process to confirm that the learning is applied and improves instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 48.7 to 61.9. This resulted in an increase from the 20th percentile to the 84th percentile. The greatest gains came from College and Career Readiness.
- The school’s accountability score in College and Career Readiness (CCR) increased 43.1 points, from 31.9 in 2011-12 to 75.0 in 2012-2013.
- Accountability scores for the non-duplicated gap group increased in language arts, reading and science (2012, 2013).
- The school’s overall weighted gap accountability score increased 2.0 points (2012, 2013).
- Math accountability scores (NAPD calculation—Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) saw a decrease of 5.2 points overall and a decrease in the performance of the non-duplicated gap group (2012, 2013).
- The school’s social studies accountability score (NAPD calculation) decreased 4.8 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students meeting the math benchmark on the PLAN assessment declined 1.7 points.
- The percentage of female students meeting proficiency benchmarks on the PLAN assessment decreased 3.1 points in math and 10.7 points in reading (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students from the free/reduced-price meals group that met the reading benchmark on the PLAN assessment decreased 10.4 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students who met the reading benchmark on the ACT increased .7 points; however, the mean score in reading on the ACT declined .3 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of male students who met the English and math benchmarks on the ACT declined 25.9 points and 23.3 points, respectively (2012, 2013).

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 50.7% of the teachers who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "All teachers in our school participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally across grade levels and content areas."
- 81.5% of the teachers who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "In our school, all staff members participate in continuous professional learning based on identified needs of the school."
- 66.7% of the teachers who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "In our school, a professional learning program is designed to build capacity among all professional and support staff members."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review indicated that leadership meetings, faculty meetings, and PLC meetings are used in providing professional learning opportunities for faculty.
- Stakeholder interviews and an artifact review indicate that the PLC process is in an initial implementation stage, and there is no set protocol that fosters the continuous improvement process.

Other pertinent information:

- The 2013 TELL Survey indicates that 52.3% of teachers believe that sufficient resources are available for professional development in their school as opposed to 76.5% in the 2011 TELL Survey.
- The 2013 TELL Survey indicates that 30.5% of teachers believe that professional development is differentiated to meet the needs of the individual teachers as opposed to 61.4% in the 2011 TELL Survey.
- The 2013 TELL Survey indicates that 43.5% of teachers believe that professional development deepens teachers' content knowledge as opposed to 75.3% in the 2011 TELL Survey.

3.12	The school/system provides and coordinates learning support services to meet the unique learning needs of students.	District Rating 1	Team Rating 1
Performance levels			
	4	School/district personnel systematically and continuously use data to identify unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency as well as other learning needs (such as second languages).	
	3	School/district personnel use data to identify unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency as well as other learning needs (such as second languages).	
	2	School/district personnel use data to identify unique learning needs of special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs (such as second languages).	
x	1	School/district personnel identify special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs (such as second languages).	
	4	School/district personnel stay current on research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related individualized learning support services to all students.	
	3	School/district personnel stay current on research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or	

		coordinate related learning support services to all students.
x	2	School/district personnel are familiar with research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related learning support services to students within these special populations.
	1	School/district personnel provide or coordinate some learning support services to students within these special populations.

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

District Self-Assessment
Deficiencies from the 2011 District Leadership Scholastic Audit
KDE School/District Report Card data
Stakeholder Survey results
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)
District presentation of progress
Interviews with stakeholders
Review of district documents and artifacts
Documentation on the implementation of programs addressing individual student learning needs
Documents illustrating data disaggregation of student gap groups
Documentation of district learning support structures

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
- Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Improvement Priority

Expand efforts to use data to systematically and continuously identify the learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency, such the practice of using the school's Data Room to display disaggregated data. Place an additional emphasis on data analysis and interpretation of formative and summative assessments, universal screeners, and other items identified on the school's Quarterly Report. From these multiple sources of data, develop strategies that will feed into planning to allow appropriate interventions and enrichments to become intentional and structured.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school's academic index grew from 48.7 to 61.9. This resulted in an increase from the 20th percentile to the 84th percentile. The greatest gains came from College and Career Readiness.
- The school's accountability score in College and Career Readiness (CCR) increased 43.1 points, from 31.9 in 2011-12 to 75.0 in 2012-2013.
- Accountability scores for the non-duplicated gap group increased in language arts, reading and science (2012, 2013).
- The school's overall weighted gap accountability score increased 2.0 points (2012, 2013).
- Math accountability scores (NAPD calculation—Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) saw a decrease of 5.2 points overall and a decrease in the performance of the non-duplicated gap group (2012, 2013).
- The school's social studies accountability score (NAPD calculation) decreased 4.8 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students meeting the math benchmark on the PLAN assessment declined 1.7 points.
- The percentage of female students meeting proficiency benchmarks on the PLAN assessment decreased 3.1 points in math and 10.7 points in reading (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students from the free/reduced-price meals group that met the reading benchmark on the PLAN assessment decreased 10.4 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of students who met the reading benchmark on the ACT increased .7 points; however, the mean score in reading on the ACT declined .3 points (2012, 2013).
- The percentage of male students who met the English and math benchmarks on the ACT declined 25.9 points and 23.3 points, respectively (2012, 2013).

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure A.1, "Student has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs," was scored at 1.9 on a 4-point scale indicating a "somewhat evident" rating.
- ELEOT measure A.2, "Student has equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology and support," was scored at 2.5 on a 4-point scale indicating an "evident" rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 54.3% of the students who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "My school provides learning services for me according to my needs."
- 40.7% of the teachers who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "In our school, related learning support services are provided for all students based on their needs."
- 40.7% of the teachers who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "In our school, all staff members use student data to address the unique learning needs of all students."

- 41.5% of the parents who completed the survey were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "My child has access to support services based on his/her identified needs."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- District documents included sample presentations, sign-in documentation, and a district PD plan.

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.

This review produced several consistent themes that were present in all twelve indicators of Standard 3 (Teaching and Assessing for Learning.) The district and high school have initiated multiple processes and protocols designed to improve instruction for all students and lead to greater student success.

Communication for enhanced student learning

Several communication themes are embedded throughout Standard 3. The district uses multiple methods for communicating to stakeholders (i.e. district newsletters, local radio and newspaper media coverage, district and school websites, brochures, the use of Parent Portal in Infinite Campus, e-mails, etc.) These communication methods are primarily one-way delivery of pertinent information to all stakeholders for educational progress throughout the district. Furthermore, there is limited evidence illustrating formal processes for two-way communication with all stakeholders which would prompt input to ensure that all voices are heard. In communicating to enhance student learning it is vital for both the district and the school to communicate instructional decisions that stem from data analysis. Numerous events are noted throughout meeting agendas and minutes that prove to be very important to the course of the district and schools; however, there must be a consistent focus on intentional planning to communicate the results as these events transpire.

Collaboration for enhanced student learning-

There is a strong sense of community that is quite evident at both the district and school levels. Interviews with representatives from represented stakeholder groups indicate that the community and school are very united and supportive of one another. The support that is so evident for all of the athletic and academic successes should be tapped for additional effort in addressing the needs of struggling learners.

The interviews with the central office revealed a passion for the students in the district. A board member interview further revealed the passion and the commitment to students that extends from the governing body in the school system. Continue the efforts to improve learning opportunities for every child and focus this pride, passion, and commitment toward a laser-like effort for even greater success for every child.

For continuous improvement, it is vital that both the district and school work collaboratively on a consistent basis with an intentional focus. There is evidence of quality collaborative efforts; however, the efforts lack consistency over long periods, lack effective monitoring and lack evaluation toward revision for the long term. Using Dr. Stephen Covey's term Big Rocks, identify the big ideas to push, or the most effective ideas that need to continue, and push them with tenacity as continuous improvement goals.

Continuous Improvement for enhanced student learning

One template for continuous improvement is the PDSA Cycle. Plan, Do, Study and Act or PDSA is a format for addressing any initiative from the initial planning, through implementation, evaluation, and revision. There are numerous programs that have been introduced in the district that have, or potentially could have, a positive impact on student learning. The review of the documentation describing these programs indicates they have good stages of planning and implementation, or Plan and Do. However, there appears to be limited fidelity to the stages of monitoring, evaluation and revision in many of these programs (the Study and Act stages of the cycle). There is evidence of the use of data for decision making in the district but interviews at the district and school level reveal a number of people who are very intuitive and nurturing. This important mindset of the intuitive person has the potential to conflict with data driven decision making that is a priority in the continuous improvement process. Fidelity to following what the data indicates as evaluation and revision stages are encountered is crucial. The continuous improvement mindset has a potential to improve every process, department and program in the district through the continual questioning and protocol for “How can we get better?” Appropriate systems and protocols should be developed to maintain the fidelity of each area. For example, PLC’s have been developed at the high school but lack a set protocol that fosters the continuous improvement cycle. Likewise, the RTI and the Advisor-Advisee require similar organization. As these initiatives are instituted, professional development must be developed to provide a strong foundational structure of each initiative to ensure that time is maximized as student learning takes top priority. Leadership should also focus on the monitoring, evaluation, and revision as these initiatives progress.

Support for enhanced success

District documentation and stakeholder interviews indicate a supportive environment in the community, district and school. There is evidence from 2012-13 school year of an intensive effort by the district leadership team to interact closely with the school. However, this effort did not continue as strongly in the 2013-14 school year. The collaborative efforts that were instituted in 2012-13 assisted the school towards the success evidenced in the 2013 assessment results, and this effort needs to be sustained. Increased walkthroughs, staff observations, and presence in the instructional conversations by the district leadership team will further enhance progress at both the district and the school levels.

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 Trimble County School District.

Deficiency 1: District leadership and the Trimble County High School principal are not united as a cohesive team anchored by common goals.

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:

- Documentation of support to second year principal (agendas and minutes)
- Mission and vision work
- Master schedule discussions to include 30 minute RTI Period/Advisor-Advisee/SLC
- Meeting minutes reflecting SIG discussions
- Big Rock meeting documentation for planning next steps
- District and school talking points developed for goal setting discussions with students
- District monthly meeting agendas and minutes
- Vertical and horizontal alignment of curriculum across district

Team comments:

There is noted evidence of collaborative efforts between the district office and school-level personnel that includes meetings regarding “Big Rock” planning efforts with outlined next steps, revision of mission, vision, and belief statements, conversations regarding flexing the master schedule to include an RTI, Advisor/Advisee, and the PLC period. These efforts include making necessary changes to transportation routes to accommodate change, and the development of talking points for goal setting with one-on-one meetings with individual students. District leadership also meets monthly with principals to communicate state and district initiatives (PPGES, TPGES, RTI, CCR, CDIP, and CSIP). There is also documentation of collaborative efforts of walkthroughs with feedback opportunities. However, a variety of interviews at the school indicate a perception of support but at a more limited level than indicated by the district.

Deficiency 2: District leadership has not ensured high quality instruction occurs in every classroom, every day at Trimble County 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:

- Walkthrough documentation
- RTI documentation
- Advisor/Advisee agendas
- Vertical and horizontal alignment of curriculum across district
- Peer observation opportunities
- Professional development job-embedded opportunities/PD plan and PLC documentation

Team comments:

District leadership has initiated steps towards ensuring that quality instruction is occurring at the school. Some of the efforts include walkthroughs using CHETL (Characteristics of Highly Effective Teaching and Learning) to document instructional practice, streamlining work to include vertical and horizontal alignment of standards in math and language arts, and opportunities for the peer observation process allowing effective practices to be modeled. While these generated probable impact during the 2012-13, the regularity of these visits has not extended into the 2013-14 school year to provide a continuous improvement process.

Deficiency 3: The superintendent lacks experience in dealing with difficult situations in a firm and decisive manner.

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:

- Informal protocol to address areas of responsibility
- Holding personnel accountable (i.e., for PGP, PPGES)
- EPSB consultation on warranted staff related situations
- Collaboration opportunities with ER staff
- Sharing of deficiencies and next steps with school principal

Team comments:

The district leadership team has developed an informal protocol to address and describe areas of responsibility within specific to job duties. The superintendent works to confer with appropriate staff to make decisions and act promptly. The superintendent is working to hold district and school leadership accountable for improving the instructional capacity of all teachers and improving student achievement. The superintendent has collaborated with an ERL as a mentor to build on skills and to step out of the “comfort zone” when making difficult decisions at the district level. The superintendent is self-described as a “hands on” person who seeks to solve as many problems as possible through relationship-based means. There is evidence to indicate that difficult situations have warranted and received decisive action.

Deficiency 4: District leadership has not provided ongoing professional development anchored by current data and best practices.

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:

- PD plan
- CDIP planning documentation
- RTI process
- Math and language arts vertical alignment
- Peer observation-PD360
- Thinking strategies
- CIITS, CHETL, peer observation, Teacher Shared Drive, IEP process
- District Process Book documentation

Team comments:

The district leadership has collaborated with the high school leadership to develop a multi-year, data driven, job embedded professional development plan that is designed to increase the capacity of the high school staff. The participation in Gear-Up and the Race to the Top grant have added additional requirements to the annual PD cycle. There have been additional concerns with required calendar changes due to the inclement weather that will require the movement of PD until the end of the year. The plan is ambitious and includes:

- District Improvement Plan (Culture; Curriculum, Assessment, Instruction; RTI)
- RTI process
- Math and language arts vertical alignment
- Peer observation – on line PD (PD360)
- Thinking strategies – district initiative
- CIITS, CHETL, Peer observations, Teacher Shared Drive, IEP process

There is ample evidence of the implementation of many of the initiatives but little to no evidence documenting how the initiatives are monitored, evaluated and adjusted for

maximum impact.

Deficiency 5: The superintendent has not developed organizational structures to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of all resources, including personnel and fiscal.

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:

- Job description refinement opportunities
- Organizational Flowchart
- CDIP roles and responsibilities
- Monitoring of PPGES

Team comments:

- District personnel are in the process of updating job descriptions and getting board approval for these changes. Organizational flow charts were developed to provide a description of the roles and responsibilities of the administrators in the district. The action items in the Comprehensive District Improvement Plan (CDIP) also identify the responsibilities of individuals in regard to overall district improvement. The district's next steps are to review and refine these district documents as necessary.
- The high school is a PPGES pilot and the superintendent monitors the principal through the pilot PPGES process to ensure focus on student achievement.
- The district has allocated additional administrative support and teaching staff to assist with student supervision. There was no evidence presented as to how the additional support is evaluated or the degree of effectiveness the additional support provides in increasing student learning and improving academic rigor.

