



# Internal School Review Report

**Name of Institution**

**Reviewed:** Trimble County High School

**Date:** March 10, 2014-March 11, 2014

**School Principal:** Rachael Adams



## Introduction

The KDE Internal School Review is designed to:

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

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

- review of the 2011-2012 Leadership Assessment report
- examination of an array of student performance data
- Self-Assessment, Executive Summary and other diagnostics completed in ASSIST during the fall of 2013
- school and classroom observations using the Effective Learning Environment Observation Tool (ELEOT)
- review of documents and artifacts
- examination of ASSIST stakeholder survey data collected in the fall of 2013 and TELL Kentucky survey data
- principal and stakeholder interviews

The report includes:

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

## Standard 3: Teaching and Assessing for Learning

<b>Standard: The school’s curriculum, instructional design, and assessment practices guide and ensure teacher effectiveness and student learning.</b>	School Rating for Standard 3  <b>2.00</b>	Team Rating for Standard 3  <b>1.92</b>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------

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

3.1	The school curriculum provides equitable and challenging learning experiences that ensure all students have sufficient opportunities to develop learning, thinking, and life skills that lead to success at the next level.	School Rating  <b>2</b>	Team Rating  <b>2</b>
-----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Performance levels

	4	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide all students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills that align with the school’s purpose.
	3	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide all students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
x	2	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide most students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	1	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide few or no students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	4	Evidence clearly indicates curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
	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.
x	3	Like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations.
	2	Most like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations.
	1	Like courses/classes do not always have the same learning expectations.
	4	Learning activities are individualized for each student in a way that supports achievement of expectations.
	3	Some learning activities are individualized for each student in a way that supports achievement of expectations.
x	2	Little individualization for each student is evident.
	1	No individualization for students is evident.

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

Internal Diagnostic Review Report
Comprehensive School Improvement Plan
School Report Card
2011-12 KDE Scholastic Audit and Leadership Addendum
Teacher, student and parent survey data
ELEOT Classroom Observation data
Interviews with stakeholders
Review of artifacts and documents

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	<b>Opportunity for Improvement</b>
	<b>Improvement Priority</b>

### **Opportunity for Improvement**

**Ensure that a challenging and equitable curriculum is delivered to all students in all courses every day. Provide individualization of instruction during regular classroom time and within the dedicated intervention time for all students. Closely monitor all intervention strategies to ensure all students develop learning, thinking, and life skills that lead to success at the next level.**

#### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 48.7 to 61.9. This resulted in an increase from the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile to the 84<sup>th</sup> 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.
- The school’s overall weighted gap accountability score increased by 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 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."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Curriculum maps and pacing guides that are present demonstrate equitable and challenging learning experiences.
- Stakeholder interviews indicate that some differentiation of instruction occurs.

3.2	Curriculum, instruction, and assessment are monitored and adjusted systematically in response to data from multiple assessments of student learning and an examination of professional practice.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
4	Using data from multiple assessments of student learning and an examination of professional practice, school personnel systematically monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.		
3	Using data from student assessments and an examination of professional practice, school personnel monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school’s goals for achievement and instruction		

		and statement of purpose.
x	2	School personnel monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure for vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school's goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.
	1	School personnel rarely or never monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school's goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.
	4	There is a systematic, collaborative process in place to ensure alignment each time curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.
x	3	There is a process in place to ensure alignment each time curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.
	2	A process is implemented sometimes to ensure alignment when curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.
	1	No process exists to ensure alignment when curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.
	4	The continuous improvement process has clear guidelines to ensure that vertical and horizontal alignment as well as alignment with the school's purpose are maintained and enhanced in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
	3	The continuous improvement process ensures that vertical and horizontal alignment as well as alignment with the school's purpose are maintained and enhanced in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
x	2	There is limited evidence that the continuous improvement process ensures vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school's purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
	1	There is little or no evidence that the continuous improvement process is connected with vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school's purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>		
Internal Diagnostic Review Report		
Comprehensive School Improvement Plan		
School Report Card		
2011-12 KDE Scholastic Audit and Leadership Addendum		
Teacher, student and parent survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Interviews with stakeholders		
Review of artifacts and documents		

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

---

### **Opportunity for Improvement**

**Develop a comprehensive system where data analysis and reflection on instruction results in overt instructional change systematically at the classroom level. Implement a monitoring system to ensure that data is analyzed promptly and reflectively, and that these reflections lead to classroom instructional improvement for all students. Include a system to measure the impact of these data-driven instructional changes in order to determine if these new instructional changes are having desired effects.**

#### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- Accountability scores for the non-duplicated gap group increased in language arts, reading and science (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 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:

- Teacher interviews indicated that Mastery Connect and common formative and summative assessments are used to assess student knowledge.
- Samples of data collected were evident, however minimal reflection that would impact instructional accommodations were evident.

3.3	Teachers engage students in their learning through instructional strategies that ensure achievement of learning expectations.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	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.	
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>			
Internal Diagnostic Review Report			
Comprehensive School Improvement Plan			
School Report Card			
2011-12 KDE Scholastic Audit and Leadership Addendum			
Teacher, student and parent survey data			

ELEOT Classroom Observation data
Interviews with stakeholders
Review of artifacts and documents

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	<b>Opportunity for Improvement</b>
	<b>Improvement Priority</b>

### Opportunity for Improvement

**Ensure that engaging instructional strategies in all classrooms make students true partners in their education. Hold teachers accountable for the use of student-centered engaging instruction in all classrooms. Monitor instruction and give teachers feedback on improvement areas. Implement the plan to make instructional strategies the focus of school improvement efforts. Use digital learning to increase opportunities for more student engagement. Partner with the district to explore all possible avenues to increase the number of computers available for students within classrooms.**

### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- 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 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. Some classrooms observed used traditional teacher-led lecture or book-work models. 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 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:

- The principal interview indicated a three year plan that would implement a school wide focus on instructional improvement in the 2014-15 school year.
- Evidence from lesson plans did not indicate planning that included student engagement.

3.4	School/district leaders monitor and support the improvement of instructional practices of teachers to ensure student success.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			

	4	School leaders formally and consistently monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures beyond classroom observation to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.
	3	School leaders formally and consistently monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.
x	2	School leaders monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.
	1	School leaders occasionally or randomly monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>		
Internal Diagnostic Review Report		
Comprehensive School Improvement Plan		
School Report Card		
2011-12 KDE Scholastic Audit and Leadership Addendum		
Teacher, student and parent survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Interviews with stakeholders		
Review of artifacts and documents		
School walkthrough samples		

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 and expand current professional development/professional learning community initiatives to ensure that all students receive high quality instructional practices in all classes every day. Formally and consistently monitor lesson planning, instruction and provide improvement feedback to make certain that instructional practices ensure the success of all students.**

#### Supporting Evidence

##### Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 48.7 to 61.9. This resulted in an increase from the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile to the 84<sup>th</sup> 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).
- 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).

##### Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure A.1, “Student has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet his/her needs,” was scored 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 scored 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 scored at 2.1 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.

##### Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews and documentation indicate that peer coaches provide PLC professional development.
- Job embedded professional development is limited due to a lack of common planning.

3.5	Teachers participate/system operates in collaborative learning communities to improve instruction and student learning.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 2
-----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------	------------------

#### Performance levels

	4	All members of the school staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule.
x	3	All members of the school staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally.
	2	Some members of the school staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally.
	1	Collaborative learning communities randomly self-organize and meet informally.
	4	Frequent collaboration occurs across grade levels and content areas.
	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.
x	3	Staff members have been trained to implement a formal process that promotes discussion about student learning.
	2	Staff members promote discussion about student learning.
	1	Staff members rarely discuss student learning.
	4	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching are a part of the daily routine of school staff members.
	3	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching occur regularly among most school personnel.
x	2	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching sometimes occur among school personnel.
	1	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching rarely occur among school personnel.
	4	School personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
	3	School personnel indicate that collaboration causes improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
x	2	School personnel express belief in the value of collaborative learning communities.
	1	School personnel see little value in collaborative learning communities.
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>		
Internal Diagnostic Review Report		
Comprehensive School Improvement Plan		
School Report Card		
2011-12 KDE Scholastic Audit and Leadership Addendum		
Teacher, Student and Parent Survey Data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation Data		
Interviews with Stakeholders (Admin, Teachers, Other Staff, Students and Parents)		
Review of Artifacts and Documents		
PLC Agendas and Minutes		
PLC Training Materials		

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

---

### **Opportunity for Improvement**

**Ensure all professional learning communities are equipped to improve instruction in all content areas. Monitor PLC work to ensure that instruction in all content areas is student-centered and modified/improved based on results of ongoing analysis of classroom performance results.**

#### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- Accountability scores for the non-duplicated gap group increased in language arts, reading and science (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).
- Students in the free/reduced meals gap group showed a decline in meeting the reading benchmark by 10.4%.
- The percentage of students who met the reading benchmark on the ACT increased by .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:

- Documentation demonstrated that professional learning community professional development has occurred.
- Pacing guides and curriculum maps have been developed for content areas.
- Interviews indicated that teachers lead PLC meetings; however these meetings usually involve planning for SLC (Student Learning Community) groups.
- Minimal documentation was evident in PLC meeting minutes indicating the use of data to drive Tier 1 interventions in the classroom.

3.6	Teachers implement the school/system’s instructional process in support of student learning.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	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.
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>		
Internal Diagnostic Review Report		
Comprehensive School Improvement Plan		
School Report Card		
2011-12 KDE Scholastic Audit and Leadership Addendum		
Teacher, student and parent survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Interviews with stakeholders		
Review of artifacts and documents		

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	<b>Opportunity for Improvement</b>
	<b>Improvement Priority</b>

## Opportunity for Improvement

**Develop a system in which all students are informed of learning expectations and provided exemplars for proficiency in all classrooms. Reflectively analyze multiple measures of data to ensure that continuous modification of instruction is implemented in all classrooms for all students. Ensure that instruction moves from teacher-centered lecture activities to true student engagement of content.**

### Supporting Evidence

#### Student Performance Data:

- 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 by 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 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).

#### 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. Some classes observed exhibited significant teacher-student interaction regarding understanding of content. 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:

- Exemplary work samples were not evident throughout all classroom settings.
- While the previous work has focused on curriculum development, the use of learning targets and timely feedback was only somewhat evident in instructional practices.

3.7	Mentoring, coaching, and induction programs support instructional improvement consistent with the school/system's values and beliefs about teaching and learning.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	4	All school personnel are engaged in systematic mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school's values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	3	School personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school's values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
x	2	Some school personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school's values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	1	Few or no school personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school's values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	4	These programs set high expectations for all school personnel and include valid and reliable measures of performance.	
	3	These programs set expectations for all school personnel and include measures of performance.	
x	2	These programs set expectations for school personnel.	
	1	Limited or no expectations for school personnel are included.	
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>			
Internal Diagnostic Review Report			
Comprehensive School Improvement Plan			
School Report Card			
2011-12 KDE Scholastic Audit and Leadership Addendum			
Teacher, student and parent survey data			
ELEOT Classroom Observation data			
Interviews with stakeholders			

Review of artifacts and documents
New teacher training artifacts

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

- Self-Assessment
- Executive Summary
- Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
- KDE School Report Card
- 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	<b>Opportunity for Improvement</b>
	<b>Improvement Priority</b>

**Opportunity for Improvement**

**Develop a system of support that provides teachers with opportunities for instructional improvement through mentoring with teachers who have demonstrated highly effective teaching strategies. Create a system for inducting new (and new-to-district) teachers into the school culture – including policies and non-negotiable expectations for all classrooms.**

**Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- Accountability scores for the non-duplicated gap group increased in language arts, reading and science (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 female students meeting proficiency benchmarks on the PLAN assessment decreased 3.1 points in math and 10.7 points in reading (2012, 2013).
- Fewer students receiving free/reduced-price meals met the reading benchmark on the PLAN assessment. The percentage of students from this group that met the reading benchmark decreased 10.4 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:

- Documentation and teacher interviews indicate that new teacher induction occurs prior to the start of the school year. No formal system for teacher mentoring throughout the year was evident.
- Department meetings are documented, yet monitoring to ensure PLC protocols provide for the improvement of effective teaching strategies relevant to student data is not evident.

3.8		The school/system engages families in meaningful ways in their children’s education and keeps them informed of their children’s learning progress.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>				
	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 personnel regularly inform families of their children’s learning progress.		
x	2	School personnel provide information about children’s learning.		
	1	School personnel provide little relevant information about children’s learning.		
<b>Evidence Reviewed</b>				
Internal Diagnostic Review Report				
Comprehensive School Improvement Plan				
School Report Card				
2011-12 KDE Scholastic Audit and Leadership Addendum				
Teacher, student and parent survey data				
ELEOT Classroom Observation data				
Interviews with stakeholders				
Review of artifacts and documents				
Samples of school-home communications				

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

---

### **Opportunity for Improvement**

**Develop a process for involving parents as partners in the education of their students. Continue and expand two-way (school-to-home and home-to-school) communication initiatives to inform parents about student progress as well as involve parents in teaching and learning. Ensure equitable communication to all stakeholder households. Explore all possible communication streams to connect with all parents.**

#### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- 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.
- 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.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure E.2, “Student responds to teacher feedback to improve understanding, was scored at 1.9 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.

- ELEOT measure E.4, “Student understands how his/her work is assessed,” was scored at 1.6 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.

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:

- Survey data of stakeholders indicated that all families were not involved by the school in the learning process.
- Interviews indicated that opportunities are available for parent involvement; however, promotion of events and incentives for attending are minimal.

3.9	The school/system has a formal structure whereby each student is well known by at least one adult advocate in the school who supports that student’s educational experience.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	4	School personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student and related adults.	
	3	School personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student.	
x	2	School personnel participate in a structure that gives them interaction with individual students, allowing them to build relationships over time with the student.	
	1	Few or no opportunities exist for school personnel to build long-term interaction with individual students.	
	4	All students participate in the structure.	
x	3	All students may participate in the structure.	
	2	Most students participate in the structure.	
	4	The structure allows the school employee to gain significant insight into and serve as an advocate for the student’s needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.	
	3	The structure allows the school employee to gain insight into and serve as an advocate for the student’s needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.	
x	2	The structure allows the school employee to gain insight into the student’s needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.	
	1	Few or no students have a school employee who advocates for their needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.	
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>			

Internal Diagnostic Review Report
Comprehensive School Improvement Plan
School Report Card
2011-12 KDE Scholastic Audit and Leadership Addendum
Teacher, student and parent survey data
ELEOT Classroom Observation data
Interviews with stakeholders
Review of artifacts and documents
Master schedule
Charts and guidelines posted in common areas

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	<b>Opportunity for Improvement</b>
	<b>Improvement Priority</b>

### Opportunity for Improvement

**The Student Learning Community (SLC) initiative structure allows for student connections to adult advocates. However, a monitoring system is needed to ensure the fidelity of school-wide implementation. Continue to expand the focus of this dedicated time to include enrichment opportunities for students not in need of remediation. Actively promote student feedback loops about the content and impact of the SLC program.**

### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- 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 male students who met the English and math benchmarks on the ACT declined by 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:

- The Student Learning Community is regularly scheduled with an intentional focus on students in need of math and reading intervention.
- Stakeholder interviews indicated that the effectiveness of this program is limited to those receiving intervention.

3.10	Grading and reporting are based on clearly defined criteria that represent the attainment of content knowledge and skills and are consistent across grade levels and courses.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	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.	

x	3	These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented consistently across grade levels and courses.
	2	These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented across grade levels and courses.
	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.
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>		
Internal Diagnostic Review Report		
Comprehensive School Improvement Plan		
School Report Card		
2011-12 KDE Scholastic Audit and Leadership Addendum		
Teacher, student and parent survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Interviews with stakeholders		
Review of artifacts and documents		

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	<b>Opportunity for Improvement</b>
	<b>Improvement Priority</b>

## Opportunity for Improvement

**Develop or revise council policy to guide grading practices throughout the school. Communicate and use this policy to ensure that content in lessons experienced by students is rigorous and congruent with appropriate grade-level standards and skills. In addition, ensure assessments of student understanding of content are authentic and congruent with the rigor of the standards.**

### Supporting Evidence

#### Student Performance Data:

- 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 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:

- The expectation of mastery learning in all classrooms is communicated to faculty, however a formal system to ensure this occurs in all classrooms is not evident.

3.11	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	4	All staff members participate in a rigorous, continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school's purpose and direction.	
x	3	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school's purpose and direction.	
	2	Most staff members participate in a program of professional learning that is aligned with the school's purpose and direction.	
	1	Few or no staff members participate in professional learning.	
	4	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school and the individual.	
	3	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school.	
x	2	Professional development is based on the needs of the school.	
	1	Professional development, when available, may or may not address the needs of the school or build capacity among staff members.	
	4	The program builds measurable capacity among all professional and support staff.	
	3	The program builds capacity among all professional and support staff.	
x	2	The program builds capacity among staff members who participate.	
	4	The program is rigorously and systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	3	The program is systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	2	The program is regularly evaluated for effectiveness.	
x	1	If a program exists, it is rarely and/or randomly evaluated.	
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>			
Internal Diagnostic Review Report			
Comprehensive School Improvement Plan			
School Report Card			
2011-12 KDE Scholastic Audit and Leadership Addendum			
Teacher, student and parent survey data			
ELEOT Classroom Observation data			
Interviews with stakeholders			
Review of artifacts and documents			

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	<b>Opportunity for Improvement</b>
	<b>Improvement Priority</b>

### **Opportunity for Improvement**

**Develop and implement a system for assessing professional development needs of teachers based on deficiencies in student performance. Ensure that professional development is personalized and focused on specific teacher needs. Systematically evaluate professional development initiatives for effectiveness as it relates to the improvement of instruction and student learning.**

#### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- Accountability scores for the non-duplicated gap group increased in language arts, reading and science (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 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 were not observed in many classes.
- ELEOT measure B.4, “Student is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions and and/or tasks,” was scored at 2.0 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating

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:

- Interviews indicated that teachers participate in professional development regarding PLCs, collaborative teaching, and curriculum and assessment.
- A system for monitoring professional development for its effectiveness in impacting instructional strategies for academic improvement was not evident.

3.12	The school provides and coordinates learning support services to meet the unique learning needs of students.	School Rating 1	Team Rating 1
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	4	School personnel systematically and continuously use data to identify unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency as well as other learning needs (such as second languages).	
	3	School personnel use data to identify unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency as well as other learning needs (such as second languages).	
x	2	School personnel use data to identify unique learning needs of special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs (such as second languages).	
	1	School personnel identify special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs (such as second languages).	
	4	School personnel stay current on research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related individualized learning support services to all students.	
	3	School personnel stay current on research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related learning support services to all students.	
	2	School personnel are familiar with research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related learning support services to students within these special populations.	
x	1	School personnel provide or coordinate some learning support services to students within these special populations.	
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>			
High School Internal Diagnostic Review Report			
Comprehensive School Improvement Plan			
School Report Card			
2011-12 KDE Scholastic Audit and Leadership Addendum			
Teacher, student and parent survey data			

ELEOT Classroom Observation data
Interviews with stakeholders
Review of artifacts and documents

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

### Improvement Priority

**Continue and expand efforts to identify unique learning needs of all students (e.g., collect and analyze formative, interim and summative assessment data, analyze student learning styles and inventory results for instructional implications). Use identified needs information to structure appropriate interventions and enrichments to support student success at all levels. Hold teachers accountable for the success of all students regardless of their unique learning needs. Analyze the impact of instruction upon student success and revise all instructional programs based on results. Ensure that all students equitably receive instruction that fully meets their individual needs.**

### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- 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 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 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:

- Interviews indicated that learning needs of students who are in need of intervention are the current focus; however, enrichment for students performing on grade level or above is not evident.
- Documentation for a system for monitoring the impact of instructional practice on student learning was not apparent.

## 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.

School leadership's three year plan to improve curriculum, assessment and instruction was referenced by administrators and teachers during interviews. This plan has been well communicated and is serving to provide a year-long focus for the school's next steps in the turnaround process. Next year's focus on instruction should be implemented with appropriate training, modelling and monitoring for impact at the classroom level. However, the current focus on quality assessment should be driving instructional change currently within all classrooms. Assessment results that uncover instructional deficiencies for current students should lead to instructional changes to ensure success for this year's students as well.

Interviews indicate that lesson plans are produced and presented to school leadership, but feedback on those lesson plans is inconsistently given. The improvement initiatives already implemented in the areas of curriculum and assessment should be closely monitored at the classroom level through careful monitoring of lesson planning. In addition to the stated expectations for teachers regarding assessments, school leadership should partner with district leadership to implement 1) consistent monitoring of all lesson plans to ensure a viable curriculum is taught; 2) consistent written feedback regarding lesson planning to teachers to communicate curriculum delivery expectations; and 3) consistent school/district walkthrough observations of classrooms to examine implementation of the curriculum within daily lessons. These walkthroughs (whether using ELEOT or other district-developed instruments) should lead to collection of data related to classroom instruction that is communicated to all faculty to ensure continuous improvement in lesson delivery and to uncover growth areas for future professional development.

Another theme found within the school is a need for additional communication related to improvement initiatives. Stakeholders of all role groups (administrators and teachers) discussed the need for stronger cohesive work as a team. To facilitate this work, all initiatives should be based on data-based needs of the students. Professional development should be specifically tied to those student needs. Development of a student-centered school should be the goal of all decisions related to the structure and function of the school. The school council and its committees should be fully used in the decision-making process in order to facilitate ownership of all school processes by all members of the school teaching community.

The final theme discussed frequently during interviews was the promising practice of Student Learning Communities. This daily intervention and advising time is having a significant impact on average and struggling students. However, interviews indicate that this time is not fully utilized to extend or enhance the learning for students on a consistent basis. This program should be developed and implemented so that all students (regardless of ability) complete meaningful work that enhances the likelihood of increased achievement and student success. Feedback loops for all stakeholders involved in the SLC should be consistently used and the information gathered about SLC program effectiveness from users should drive continuous

improvement throughout the SLC system. This daily allocation of time is a significant commitment to student success. Feedback from users and adjustments to the program should ensure the best use of this academic time for all participants.

2) Promising Practice:

Primary Indicator: 3.9

Explanation/Justification:

The Student Learning Communities initiative that provides structure and reserves time for Response to Interventions, Advisor-Advisee, co-curricular clubs and other school activities is a promising practice that will lead to improvements in student success when fully implemented with fidelity. The initiative must provide for the needs of all students – remediating and extending the learning depending upon the individual student’s specific instructional needs.

**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 High School.

**Deficiency 1: The principal has not implemented a fully functioning system of interventions to ensure all students meet state and federal standards.**

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

Team evidence:

- Master schedule (including student learning community period)
- Interviews with administrators, teachers, students and parents
- Review of documents and artifacts related to the SLC (Student Learning Community) initiative
- Professional development training records

Team comments:

School leadership has implemented a daily period for intervention with students based on their specific identified skill deficits. This time has been flexibly used for different intervention needs throughout the school year. Interviews indicate that this time is effective with students needing remediation, but is not yet fully implemented with fidelity for students who need extended or enhanced learning activities. Implementation of RtI Tier 1 strategies at the classroom level was not seen during observations nor referenced during interviews.

**Deficiency 2: The principal does not lead school staff in the analysis of data to identify gaps in the curriculum and weaknesses in the instructional program.**

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:

- Curriculum documents
- Interviews with administrators, teachers, students and parents
- Review of documents and artifacts related to professional learning communities
- Professional development training records

Team comments:

School leadership led an initiative to develop and implement a fully viable high school curriculum for all students in all classes during the 2012-13 school year. Assessments are mandated this year to check for learning of curriculum standards. Interviews reflect that the extent to which analysis of assessment results lead to curriculum modifications varies from content area to content area. Data is analyzed, but the results are not yet fully used to drive curricular or instructional improvement.

**Deficiency 3: The principal has not ensured that teachers deliver rigorous, differentiated, and student centered instruction that meets the learning needs of all students.**

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

Team evidence:

- ELEOT classroom observation data
- Student survey data
- Teacher survey data
- Interviews with administrators, teachers, students and parents
- Review of school artifacts and documents

Team comments:

School leadership has developed and communicated a three-year plan for school improvement. Year one (last school year) focused on curriculum; the current school year focuses on assessment. School leadership's plan is to focus on instruction during the 2014-15 school year. ELEOT classroom observation data provide some evidence of challenging learning activities (2.0 rating on a 4-point scale), rigorous coursework (2.0 rating), higher order thinking (1.9 rating), active engagement (2.1 rating), and high classroom expectations (2.1 rating). All of these ELEOT values reflect some instructional success within classrooms, but a school-wide systematic focus on instructional improvement is not yet evident.

**Deficiency 4: The principal and school council have not addressed the learning deficiencies of struggling students in reading and math to meet the goals of No Child Left Behind.**

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:

- Master schedule (including Student Learning Community period)
- Interviews with administrators, teachers, students and parents
- Review of documents and artifacts related to the SLC initiative
- Professional development training records
- School master schedule
- School Report Card data

Team comments:

Improvements in student performance and school accountability occurred during the 2012-13 school year, specifically in College and Career Readiness. The implementation of Student Learning Communities has provided time and structure to address deficiencies of struggling students, but current School Report Card data for the 2012-13 school year reflects a decrease in math accountability scores and a decrease in gap group scores. The number of students meeting the math benchmark on the PLAN assessment decreased. The number of male students meeting the benchmark in English and math decreased.

**Deficiency 5: The principal has not ensured that all teachers develop assessments (formative and summative) that are rigorous and relevant to the standards.**

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

Team evidence:

- Interviews with administrators, teachers and students
- Review of documents and artifacts
- Professional development training records
- Professional learning community artifacts

Team comments:

School leadership has initiated and communicated a focus on quality assessments as a targeted improvement area for this school year. Expectations for learning checks and standards-based assessments have been communicated, and training has been facilitated to improve the use of assessments in improving student achievement. School performance data does not yet reflect the impact of this assessment focus.

**Deficiency 6: The principal has not engaged all stakeholder groups in sharing ownership of the goals, plans, successes, and mission of the 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:

- Interviews with administrators, teachers and students
- Review of documents and artifacts
- Review of school vision and mission.
- Examples of school communications.

Team comments:

School leadership led an initiative to create a new unified school vision and set of mission statements involving stakeholders from multiple stakeholder groups. Interviews suggested that the school communicates to the home effectively, but systems are lacking to promote and encourage home to school communication regarding student performance and support. An effort to reinitialize a Parent-Teacher Support Association has met with minimal success thus far.

## ELEOT Ratings

