



# Internal School Review Report

**Name of Institution**

**Reviewed:** Hopkins County Central High School

**Date:** February 11, 2014-February 12, 2014

**School Principal:** Tommy Burrough



## Introduction

The KDE Internal School Review is designed to:

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

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

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

The report includes:

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

## Standard 3: Teaching and Assessing for Learning

<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>2.08</b>	Team Rating for Standard 3  <b>2.08</b>
---	--	--

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

3.1	The school’s curriculum provides equitable and challenging learning experiences that ensure all students have sufficient opportunities to develop learning, thinking, and life skills that lead to success at the next level.	School Rating  1	Team Rating  2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
4	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide all students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills that align with the school’s purpose.		
3	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide all students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.		
x 2	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide most students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.		
1	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide few or no students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.		
4	Evidence clearly indicates curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.		
x 3	There is some evidence to indicate curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.		
2	There is little evidence to indicate curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.		
1	There is no evidence to indicate how successful students will be at the next level.		
4	Like courses/classes have the same high learning expectations.		
3	Like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations.		
x 2	Most like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations.		
1	Like courses/classes do not always have the same learning expectations.		
4	Learning activities are individualized for each student in a way that supports achievement of expectations.		
x 3	Some learning activities are individualized for each student in a way that supports achievement of expectations.		
2	Little individualization for each student is evident.		
1	No individualization for students is evident.		

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

Principal and Central Leadership Team presentation
Effective Learning Environment Observation Tool (ELEOT) Observation data
Stakeholder Survey results (teachers, students and parents)
Stakeholder interviews (administrators, teachers, parents, students)
School documents (curriculum documents and plans)
Internal School Diagnostic Review
Hopkins County Central Quarterly Report
Professional learning community records (agendas and artifacts)
School plans, policies and procedures
2011-12 KDE Leadership Assessment Report

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

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

---

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

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

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

(Check one)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Opportunity for Improvement</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<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 additional supports and flexible interventions to gap students to close the 27-point achievement gap. Develop and deploy additional 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 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62<sup>nd</sup> percentile to the 96<sup>th</sup> percentile. The greatest gains resulted from achievement score improvement and college and career readiness.
- Achievement scores increased in all areas.

- Gap groups showed significant growth in all end-of-course assessments. However, a 27 point achievement gap still exists between all students and the gap student group.
- The gap group’s performance improved in all content areas except language mechanics (0.4 point decline).
- The percentage of students meeting benchmarks on the ACT increased in all areas.
- The composite ACT score remained unchanged from the 2011-12 school year and the 2012-13 school year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT indicator B.2, “Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable,” scored a 2.7 on a 4-point scale indicating an “evident” rating. Challenging activities and higher level questioning were observed in some classes.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 92% of teachers surveyed indicated that the school provides a challenging curriculum and learning experiences. 73% of parents agreed that the work provided challenges their students. However, only 58% of students agree that the curriculum and learning experiences are challenging.
- Only 47% of students agree that the school prepares them to deal with issues they may face in the future.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- PLC notebooks reflect some discussion regarding equitable and challenging learning experiences.
- CIF lesson plans indicate that challenging and equitable instruction is planned in some classes.
- Staff interviews indicate the use of common assessments to ensure challenging curriculum in some subject areas.

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.
	3	There is a process in place to ensure alignment each time curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.
x	2	A process is implemented sometimes to ensure alignment when curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.
	1	No process exists to ensure alignment when curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.
	4	The continuous improvement process has clear guidelines to ensure that vertical and horizontal alignment as well as alignment with the school's purpose are maintained and enhanced in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
	3	The continuous improvement process ensures that vertical and horizontal alignment as well as alignment with the school's purpose are maintained and enhanced in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
x	2	There is limited evidence that the continuous improvement process ensures vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school's purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
	1	There is little or no evidence that the continuous improvement process is connected with vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school's purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>		
Principal and Central Leadership Team presentation		
Effective Learning Environment Observation Tool (ELEOT) Observation data		
Stakeholder Survey results (teachers, students and parents)		
Stakeholder interviews (administrators, teachers, parents, students)		
School documents (curriculum documents and plans)		
Internal School Diagnostic Review		
Hopkins County Central Quarterly Report		
Professional learning community records (agendas and artifacts)		
School plans, policies and procedures		
2011-12 KDE Leadership Assessment Report		

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

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

---

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

---

### Opportunity for Improvement

**Develop a comprehensive system where data analysis and reflection on instruction is continuous, purposeful and 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:

- The school's academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62<sup>nd</sup> percentile to the 96<sup>th</sup> percentile. The greatest gains resulted from achievement score improvement and college and career readiness.
- Gap groups showed significant growth in all end-of-course assessments. However, a 27 point achievement gap still exists between all students and the gap student group.
- The gap group's performance improved in all content areas except language mechanics (0.4 point decline).
- PLAN scores showed growth in all areas.
- While the 2011-12 science ACT scores exceeded the state average, the current year showed a decrease of 0.5 points.
- The composite ACT score remained unchanged from the 2011-2012 school year and the 2012-13 school year.

#### Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item descriptor E.1, "Student is asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning," scored a 2.4 on a 4-point scale indicating a "somewhat evident" rating.
- ELEOT item descriptor B.2, "Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable," scored a 2.7 on a 4-point scale indicating an "evident" rating. Challenging activities and higher level questioning were observed in some classes.

#### Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 90% of students agree that the school gives them multiple assessments to check their learning and understanding of content. 84% of teachers agree that teachers monitor and adjust curriculum based on data from student assessments and examination of professional practice.

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

- Interviews with staff indicate that student performance data is regularly collected and housed in a school network drive.
- A few samples of minutes and notes from meetings show reflective use of this data to modify and improve instruction – however, a full system of regular reflection for improvement from all data streams was not evident. Interviews indicate that a large amount of data is collected, but further training regarding the use of data to make instructional decisions is needed.

3.3	Teachers engage students in their learning through instructional strategies that ensure achievement of learning expectations.	School 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)**

Principal and Central Leadership Team presentation
Effective Learning Environment Observation Tool (ELEOT) Observation data
Stakeholder Survey results (teachers, students and parents)
Stakeholder interviews (administrators, teachers, parents, students)
School documents (curriculum documents and plans)
Internal School Diagnostic Review
Hopkins County Central Quarterly Report
Professional learning community records (agendas and artifacts)
School plans, policies and procedures
2011-12 KDE Leadership Assessment Report

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

- Self-Assessment

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

x	<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. Use teachers with strong student engagement as models to build capacity for student engagement among all staff. Hold teachers accountable for the use of student-centered engaging instruction in all classrooms.**

### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- PLAN scores showed growth in all areas.
- The percentage of students meeting benchmark on the ACT increased in all areas.
- While the 2011-12 science ACT scores exceeded the state average, the current year showed a decrease of 0.5 points.
- The composite ACT score remained unchanged from the 2011-12 school year and the 2012-13 school year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item descriptor D.1, “Student has several opportunities to engage in discussions with teacher and other students,” scored a 2.8 on a 4-point scale indicating an “evident” rating. Some classrooms observed used traditional teacher-led lecture or book-work models. Other classrooms used engaging instructional activities that encouraged students to engage with content.
- ELEOT item descriptor D.3, “Student is actively engaged in the learning activities,” scored a 2.5 on a 4-point scale indicating an “evident” rating. Some students were authentically engaged, while others were sitting quietly but not participating in the lesson.
- ELEOT item descriptors G.1, G.2 and G.3 regarding the Digital Learning Environment all scored in the “somewhat evident” range on the 4-point scale. Many teachers used smart boards for general note-taking similar to a whiteboard.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 77% of teachers surveyed agreed that instructional strategies and interventions address the individual learning needs of students. 60% of parents agree that teachers individualize instruction for their children. However, only 35% of students indicate that teachers change their teaching to meet their learning needs.
- 77% of teachers surveyed agree that instructional strategies regularly require student collaboration, self-reflection and development of critical thinking skills.
- 73% of teachers and 82% of parents believe that teachers use up-to-date computers and technology to help students learn.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- CIF lesson plans reflected an expectation for student engagement strategies.
- The school PD plan indicates training for student use of technology, but observations showed limited use of technology by students as reflected in ELEOT observation data.
- Some CIF lesson plans reflect teacher-centered instruction (e.g., lecture).

3.4	School 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>			
Principal and Central Leadership Team presentation			
Effective Learning Environment Observation Tool (ELEOT) Observation data			
Stakeholder Survey results (teachers, students and parents)			
Stakeholder interviews (administrators, teachers, parents, students)			
School documents (curriculum documents and plans)			

Internal School Diagnostic Review
Hopkins County Central Quarterly Report
Professional learning community records (agendas and artifacts)
School plans, policies and procedures
2011-12 KDE Leadership Assessment Report

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### **Opportunity for Improvement**

**Continue and expand current professional development/professional learning community initiatives to ensure that all students (especially gap students) receive high quality instructional practices in all classes every day. Formally and consistently monitor instruction and provide improvement feedback to ensure that instructional practices ensure the success of all students (especially gap students).**

#### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- Gap groups showed significant growth in all end-of-course assessments. However, a 27 point achievement gap still exists between all students and the gap student group.
- The gap group’s performance improved in all content areas except language mechanics (0.4 point decline).
- While the 2011-12 science ACT scores exceeded the state average, the current year showed a decrease of 0.5 points.
- The composite ACT score remained unchanged from the 2011-12 school year and the 2012-13 school year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item descriptor A.1, “Student has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet his/her needs”) scored a 2.4 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating. While some lessons observed were designed for a single learning task for all students, other classrooms had learning centers or student choice of activities.
- ELEOT item descriptor B.5, “Student is asked and responds to questions that require higher-order thinking,” scored a 2.5 on a 4-point scale indicating an “evident” rating. Questions posed to students in some classes required processing and synthesizing of information, while other teachers posed questions that involved little analysis or application of the learning.
- ELEOT item descriptor E.3, “Student demonstrates or verbalizes understanding of the lesson/content,” scored a 2.4 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 73% of parents agree that teachers use a variety of teaching strategies and learning activities.
- 52% of students agree that teachers use a variety of teaching methods and learning activities to help them develop skills they will need to succeed.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- The PLC monitoring schedule rotates through multiple administrator monitors.
- Interviews indicate that guided planning occurs every other week (in 2012-13, guided planning occurred every week). New teachers have guided planning every week.
- Teachers are assigned to a consistent administrator for guided planning.
- Professional development is scheduled once per month. Some PD is facilitated by teacher leaders.

3.5	Teachers participate in collaborative learning communities to improve instruction and student learning.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	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>		
Principal and Central Leadership Team presentation		
Effective Learning Environment Observation Tool (ELEOT) Observation data		
Stakeholder Survey results (Teachers, Students and Parents)		
Stakeholder Interviews (Admin, Teachers, Parents, Students)		
School Documents (Curriculum Documents and Plans)		
Internal School Diagnostic Review		
Hopkins County Central Quarterly Report		
Professional Learning Committee Records (Agendas and Artifacts)		
School plans, policies and procedures		
2011-12 KDE Leadership Assessment Report		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

<input 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 and monitored to improve instruction in all content areas. Provide differentiated levels of support based on each professional learning community’s current level of development and implementation. This support may include varying degrees of monitoring or additional participation by school leadership until all PLC groups are functioning with fidelity. Include measures for building capacity for using data to make reflective decisions regarding necessary changes in instructional process and measures to determine if those changes are effective when implemented in the classroom.**

#### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62<sup>nd</sup> percentile to the 96<sup>th</sup> percentile. The greatest gains resulted from achievement score improvement and college and career readiness.
- Achievement scores increased in all areas.
- Gap groups showed significant growth in all end-of-course assessments. However, a 27 point achievement gap still exists between all students and the gap student group.
- The gap group’s performance improved in all content areas except language mechanics (0.4 point decline).
- While the 2011-12 science ACT scores exceeded the state average, the current year showed a decrease of 0.5 points.
- The composite ACT score remained unchanged from the 2011-12 school year and the 2012-13 school year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item descriptor B.2, “Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable,” scored a 2.7 on a 4-point scale indicating an “evident” rating. Challenging activities and higher level questioning were observed in some classes.
- ELEOT item descriptor B.4, “Student is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussion and/or tasks,” scored a 2.8 on a 4-point scale indicating an “evident” rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 89% of teachers agree that they have been trained to implement a formal process to promote discussion about student learning. However, only 63% of parents agree that all of their students’ teachers work as a team to help their students learn.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- PLC binders exist for all content areas.
- Binders contain some student data/lesson effectiveness artifacts, but also include program review evidence and departmental meeting minutes.
- Interviews reflect that the effectiveness of and value placed on PLC work varies across content areas.

3.6	Teachers implement the school’s instructional process in support of student learning.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 2
-----	---	--------------------	------------------

**Performance levels**

	4	All teachers systematically use an instructional process that clearly informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
	3	All teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
x	2	Most teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
	1	Few teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
	4	Exemplars are provided to guide and inform students.
	3	Exemplars are often provided to guide and inform students.
x	2	Exemplars are sometimes provided to guide and inform students.
	1	Exemplars are rarely provided to guide and inform students.
	4	The process requires the use of multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction and provide data for possible curriculum revision.
	3	The process includes multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction and provide data for possible curriculum revision.
x	2	The process may include multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction.
	1	The process includes limited measures to inform the ongoing modification of instruction.
	4	The process provides students with specific and immediate feedback about their learning.
	3	The process provides students with specific and timely feedback about their learning.
x	2	The process provides students with feedback about their learning.
	1	The process provides students with minimal feedback of little value about their learning.

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

Principal and Central Leadership Team presentation
Effective Learning Environment Observation Tool (ELEOT) Observation data
Stakeholder Survey results (teachers, students and parents)
Stakeholder interviews (administrators, teachers, parents, students)

School documents (curriculum documents and plans)
Internal School Diagnostic Review
Hopkins County Central Quarterly Report
Professional learning community records (agendas and artifacts)
School plans, policies and procedures
2011-12 KDE Leadership Assessment Report

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

x	<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.**

#### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62<sup>nd</sup> percentile to the 96<sup>th</sup> percentile. The greatest gains resulted from achievement score improvement and college and career readiness.
- Achievement scores increased in all areas.
- Gap groups showed significant growth in all end-of-course assessments. However, a 27 point achievement gap still exists between all students and the gap student group.
- The gap group’s performance improved in all content areas except language mechanics (0.4 point decline).

- PLAN scores showed growth in all areas.
- The composite ACT score remained unchanged from the 2011-12 school year and the 2012-13 school year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item descriptor E.3, “Student demonstrates or verbalizes understanding of the lesson/content,” scored a 2.4 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating. Some classes observed exhibited significant teacher-student interaction regarding understanding of content.
- ELEOT item descriptor E.5, “Student has opportunities to revise/improve work based on feedback,” scored a 2.3 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating. Some teachers provided feedback that supported student understanding of content.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 89% of teachers agree that they use a process to inform students of learning expectations and standards of performance. 89% of parents agree that their children know the expectations for learning in all of their classes. However, only 55% of students agree that all of their teachers explain their expectations for learning and behavior so that they can be successful.
- 73% of teachers agree that they provide students with specific and timely feedback about their learning.
- 78% of teachers and 80% of parents agree that students have multiple types of assessments to demonstrate their learning, but only 57% of students agree that they have opportunity to use tests, projects, presentations and portfolios to check their understanding of what was taught.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- While interviews did indicate a willingness of teachers to meet learning needs of students, the use of learning targets, exemplars and instructional feedback varied from classroom to classroom.
- Exemplary student work was not commonly seen posted throughout the school.
- Interviews indicated a need for more punctual and impactful feedback to students to impact their learning.

3.7	Mentoring, coaching, and induction programs support instructional improvement consistent with the school’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>		
Principal and Central Leadership Team presentation		
Effective Learning Environment Observation Tool (ELEOT) Observation data		
Stakeholder Survey results (teachers, students and parents)		
Stakeholder interviews (administrators, teachers, parents, students)		
School documents (curriculum documents and plans)		
Internal School Diagnostic Review		
Hopkins County Central Quarterly Report		
Professional learning community records (agendas and artifacts)		
School plans, policies and procedures		
2011-12 KDE Leadership Assessment Report		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

## Opportunity for Improvement

Coordinate efforts with district personnel to ensure the alignment of district and school mentoring programs (such as new teacher training). Develop a system for monitoring the impact of guided planning on instructional effectiveness. Include a feedback loop for reflection after the lesson about the effectiveness of guided planning and a process for ensuring high quality instruction by all teachers in all classrooms. Continue to utilize TPGES in order to improve teacher performance.

### Supporting Evidence

#### Student Performance Data:

- Gap groups showed significant growth in all end-of-course assessments. However, a 27 point achievement gap still exists between all students and the gap student group.
- The gap group’s performance improved in all content areas except language mechanics (0.4 point decline).
- PLAN scores showed growth in all areas.
- The percentage of students meeting benchmark on the ACT increased in all areas.
- While the 2011-12 science ACT scores exceeded the state average, the current year showed a decrease of 0.5 points.
- The composite ACT score remained unchanged from the 2011-12 school year and the 2012-13 school year.

#### Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 84% of teachers agree that staff members provide peer coaching to other teachers.
- 88% of teachers agree that a formal process is in place to support new staff members in their professional practice.

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

- Interviews report that new teachers (and new-to-district) teachers attend both school-level and district-level new teacher training. Interviews indicate that these trainings are not coordinated for common messages or elimination of overlaps of topics.
- Guided planning is used for mentoring and coaching. Interviews regarding impact and effectiveness of guided planning produced mixed results. A system for monitoring the impact of guided planning on instructional effectiveness was not evident.

3.8	The school engages families in meaningful ways in their children’s education and keeps them informed of their children’s learning progress.	School Rating 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>		
Principal and Central Leadership Team presentation		
Effective Learning Environment Observation Tool (ELEOT) Observation data		
Stakeholder Survey results (teachers, students and parents)		
Stakeholder interviews (administrators, teachers, parents, students)		
School documents (curriculum documents and plans)		
Internal School Diagnostic Review		
Hopkins County Central Quarterly Report		
Professional learning community records (agendas and artifacts)		
School plans, policies and procedures		
2011-12 KDE Leadership Assessment Report		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

X	<b>Opportunity for Improvement</b>
	<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 (e.g., alternate methods of distributing and receiving information for households without internet access).**

## Supporting Evidence

### Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62<sup>nd</sup> percentile to the 96<sup>th</sup> percentile. The greatest gains resulted from achievement score improvement and college and career readiness.
- Achievement scores increased in all areas.
- Gap groups showed significant growth in all end-of-course assessments.
- The gap group’s performance improved in all content areas except language mechanics (0.4 point decline).
- PLAN scores showed growth in all areas.
- The percentage of students meeting benchmark on the ACT increased in all areas.
- While the 2011-12 science ACT scores exceeded the state average, the current year showed a decrease of 0.5 points.
- The composite ACT score remained unchanged from the 2011-12 school year and the 2012-13 school year.

### Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item descriptor E.2, “Student responds to teacher feedback to improve understanding,” scored a 2.3 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.
- ELEOT item descriptor E.4, “Student understands how his/her work is assessed,” scored a 2.5 on a 4-point scale indicating an “evident” rating.

### Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 62% of teachers agree that school personnel regularly engage families in the children’s learning progress. 70% of parents agree that their students’ teachers help them to understand their students’ progress. 45% of students agree that their family is kept informed of their educational progress, and 44% believe that the school offers opportunities for their parents to become involved in school activities and their learning.

### Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews indicated that parents have access to student data information through Infinite Campus. However, if internet access is unavailable to families there is no system other than midterm and report cards to regularly inform parents of student performance.
- Automated phone dialer and Infinite Campus email are used to regularly inform parents of upcoming events.
- While some activities are scheduled to encourage parents to come to school (e.g., CCR night, registration, tailgating) participation in parent involvement activities remains low.
- Interviews reflect the need for additional parent training to fully utilize Infinite Campus/Parent Portal.

3.9	The school has a formal structure whereby each student is well known by at least one adult advocate in the school who supports that student’s educational experience.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 2
-----	---	--------------------	------------------

### Performance levels

	4	School personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student and related adults.
	3	School personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student.
X	2	School personnel participate in a structure that gives them interaction with individual students, allowing them to build relationships over time with the student.
	1	Few or no opportunities exist for school personnel to build long-term interaction with individual students.
	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>		
Principal and Central Leadership Team presentation		
Effective Learning Environment Observation Tool (ELEOT) Observation data		
Stakeholder Survey results (teachers, students and parents)		
Stakeholder interviews (administrators, teachers, parents, students)		
School documents (curriculum documents and plans)		
Internal School Diagnostic Review		
Hopkins County Central Quarterly Report		
Professional learning community records (agendas and artifacts)		
School plans, policies and procedures		
Principal and Central Leadership Team presentation		
2011-12 KDE Leadership Assessment Report		

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

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

---

Indicators receiving a rating of "1" will be **"Improvement Priorities"**

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

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

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

---

### Opportunity for Improvement

**Continue to strengthen the effectiveness of the STORM Advisory program. Actively promote student feedback loops about STORM Advisory effectiveness and impact. Modify the program based on feedback from students to increase its effectiveness. Explore ways to make mentor-mentee connections authentic and based on pre-existing relationships. 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.**

### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62<sup>nd</sup> percentile to the 96<sup>th</sup> percentile. The greatest gains resulted from achievement score improvement and college and career readiness.
- Gap groups showed significant growth in all end-of-course assessments. However, a 27 point achievement gap still exists between all students and the gap student group.
- The gap group’s performance improved in all content areas except language mechanics (0.4 point decline).

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item descriptor C.1, “Student demonstrates or expresses that learning experiences are positive,” scored a 2.7 on a 4-point scale indicating an “evident” rating.
- ELEOT measure C.2, “Student demonstrates a positive attitude about the classroom and learning,” scored a 2.8 on a 4-point scale indicating an “evident” rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 84% of teachers agree that a formal structure exists so that each student is well known by at least one supportive adult advocate in the school. 78% of parents agree with this statement. However, only 44% of students agree that the school makes sure that there is at least one adult advocate who knows them well and shows interest in their education and their future.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- STORM advisory is regularly scheduled with specific tasks identified for each session.
- Interviews and survey data indicated the effectiveness of this program varies. Mentoring relationships are not always viewed as authentic.

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

### Performance levels

	4	All teachers consistently use common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures based on clearly defined criteria that represent each student's attainment of content knowledge and skills.
	3	Teachers use common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures based on clearly defined criteria that represent each student's attainment of content knowledge and skills.
X	2	Most teachers use common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures based on criteria that represent each student's attainment of content knowledge and skills.
	1	Few or no teachers use common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures.
	4	These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented without fail across all grade levels and all courses.
	3	These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented consistently across grade levels and courses.
X	2	These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented across grade levels and courses.
	1	Policies, processes, and procedures, if they exist, are rarely implemented across grade levels or courses, and may not be well understood by stakeholders.
	4	All stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures.
	3	Stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures.
X	2	Most stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures.
	4	The policies, processes, and procedures are formally and regularly evaluated.
	3	The policies, processes, and procedures are regularly evaluated.
	2	The policies, processes, and procedures may or may not be evaluated.
X	1	No process for evaluation of grading and reporting practices is evident.

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

Principal and Central Leadership Team presentation
Effective Learning Environment Observation Tool (ELEOT) Observation data
Stakeholder Survey results (teachers, students and parents)
Stakeholder interviews (administrators, teachers, parents, students)
School documents (curriculum documents and plans)
Internal School Diagnostic Review
Hopkins County Central Quarterly Report
Professional learning community records (agendas and artifacts)
School plans, policies and procedures
2011-12 KDE Leadership Assessment Report

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

- Self-Assessment
- Executive Summary

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

---

### **Opportunity for Improvement**

**Develop, communicate and implement a policy designed to guide grading practices throughout the school. Use this policy to ensure that 1) content in lessons experienced by students is rigorous and congruent with appropriate grade-level standards and skills and 2) assessments of student understanding of content are authentic and congruent with the rigor of the standards.**

#### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62<sup>nd</sup> percentile to the 96<sup>th</sup> percentile. The greatest gains resulted from achievement score improvement and college and career readiness.
- Achievement scores increased in all areas.
- Gap groups showed significant growth in all end-of-course assessments. However, a 27 point achievement gap still exists between all students and the gap student group.
- The gap group’s performance improved in all content areas except language mechanics (0.4 point decline).
- While the 2011-12 science ACT scores exceeded the state average, the current year showed a decrease of 0.5 points.
- The composite ACT score remained unchanged from the 2011-12 school year and the 2012-13 school year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item descriptor E.1, “Student is asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning,” scored a 2.4 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.
- ELEOT item descriptor E.4, “Student understands how her/his work is assessed,” scored a 2.5 on a 4-point scale indicating an “evident” rating.
- ELEOT item descriptor E.5, “Student has opportunities to revise/improve work based on feedback,” scored a 2.3 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 88% of teachers agree that all stakeholders are informed of policies, processes and procedures used in grading and reporting. 71% of parents indicate that teachers report on their children’s progress in easy to understand language. 55% of students agree that all of their teachers provide them with information about learning and their grades.
- 71% of teachers agree that consistent grading based on clearly defined criteria are used with fidelity. 55% of parents indicate that they are regularly informed of how their child is being graded. 55% of students agree that all of their teachers fairly grade and evaluate their work.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews reported that a common grading practice exists, but no formal guiding policy has been written.
- Classroom goals for mastery (80/20) are communicated. A formal monitoring system to ensure mastery goals are met in all classrooms was not evident.

3.11	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 3
<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.	
X	3	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school.	
	2	Professional development is based on the needs of the school.	
	1	Professional development, when available, may or may not address the needs of the school or build capacity among staff members.	
	4	The program builds measurable capacity among all professional and support staff.	
X	3	The program builds capacity among all professional and support staff.	
	2	The program builds capacity among staff members who participate.	
	4	The program is rigorously and systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	3	The program is systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
X	2	The program is regularly evaluated for effectiveness.	
	1	If a program exists, it is rarely and/or randomly evaluated.	
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>			
Principal and Central Leadership Team presentation			
Effective Learning Environment Observation Tool (ELEOT) Observation data			

Stakeholder survey results (teachers, students and parents)
Stakeholder interviews (administrators, teachers, parents, students)
School documents (curriculum documents and plans)
Internal School Diagnostic Review
Hopkins County Central Quarterly Report
Professional learning community records (agendas and artifacts)
School plans, policies and procedures
2011-12 KDE Leadership Assessment Report

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62<sup>nd</sup> percentile to the 96<sup>th</sup> percentile. The greatest gains resulted from achievement score improvement and college and career readiness.
- Achievement scores increased in all areas.
- PLAN scores showed growth in all areas.
- The percentage of students meeting benchmark on the ACT increased in all areas.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item indicator B.2, “Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable,” scored a 2.7 on a 4-point scale indicating an “evident” rating. Challenging activities were not observed in many classes.
- ELEOT item indicator B.4, “Student is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions and and/or tasks,” scored a 2.8 on a 4-point scale indicating an “evident” rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 90% of teachers agree that they participate in formal and informal professional learning communities that meet across grade levels and content areas.
- 95% of teachers agree that they participate in continuous professional learning based on the identified needs of the school.
- 88% of teachers believe that a professional learning program is designed to build professional capacity within the school.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews indicate a culture of professional learning exists.
- Teachers participate in monthly professional development.
- A system for monitoring the impact of all professional development on student success is not evident.
- Professional development that is differentiated for individual teachers was cited as a growth area during stakeholder interviews.

3.12	The school provides and coordinates learning support services to meet the unique learning needs of students.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 2
<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.	
X	2	School personnel are familiar with research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related learning support services to students within these special populations.	
	1	School personnel provide or coordinate some learning support services to students within these special populations.	
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>			
Principal and Central Leadership Team presentation			
Effective Learning Environment Observation Tool (ELEOT) Observation data			
Stakeholder Survey results (teachers, students and parents)			
Stakeholder interviews (administrators, teachers, parents, students)			
School documents (curriculum documents and plans)			
Internal School Diagnostic Review			

Hopkins County Central Quarterly Report
Professional learning community records (agendas and artifacts)
School plans, policies and procedures
2011-12 KDE Leadership Assessment Report

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### **Opportunity for Improvement**

**Continue and expand efforts to identify unique learning needs of students (e.g., collect and analyze formative, interim and summative assessment data, analyze student learning styles inventory results for instructional implications). Use identified needs information to structure appropriate interventions to support student success (especially among gap students.) Make interventions flexible so that students can move between tiers of support as their performance level changes. Hold teachers accountable for the success of all students regardless of their unique learning needs.**

### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- Gap groups showed significant growth in all end-of-course assessments. However, a 27 point achievement gap still exists between all students and the gap student group.
- The gap group’s performance improved in all content areas except language mechanics (0.4 point decline).
- While the 2011-12 science ACT scores exceeded the state average, the current year showed a decrease of 0.5 points.
- The composite ACT score remained unchanged from the 2011-12 school year and the 2012-13 school year.

#### Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item descriptor A.1, “Student has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs,” scored a 2.4 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.
- ELEOT item descriptor A.2, “Student has equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology and support,” scored a 2.9 on a 4-point scale indicating an “evident” rating.

#### Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 79% of teachers agree that student data is used to address the unique learning needs of students.
- 90% of teachers and 72% of parents agree that learning support services are provided to students based on their identified needs. Only 52% of student agrees that learning services are provided according to their needs.

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

- Interviews report that student learning styles are assessed. Implications for classroom use were not apparent.
- A tiered system of interventions that allows for flexible movement between tiers, based on achieving mastery, was not evident. Movement between tiers only occurs at the end of the trimester.

## 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.

Although assessment scores have improved significantly, the school staff still strives to continue to improve their instruction in order to produce additional successful students. School leadership, faculty and students strive for continued academic success with a focus on improving on the previous year's performance. The school exhibits a self-awareness of its current successes and ongoing challenges/potential areas for growth.

One theme emerging from the review was the need to increase the reflective use of data to improve instruction in all classrooms. Significant data is gathered, stored and available for teachers. However, only a few samples of documentation were available to indicate a systemic, effective examination of data reflectively leading to subsequent instructional modifications. Some samples of this process were seen. Consistent and widespread use of data reflections to improve instruction for all students (especially gap students) is not yet evident.

Another theme that emerged was the gradual release of improvement processes to teacher leaders. The idea to build capacity within teacher leaders to continue all improvement initiatives is a positive step. However, leadership should ensure that active support is not withdrawn too early. Differentiation of the levels of leadership, support and monitoring for PLC activities is necessary with the eventual goal of internal autonomy within the group.

A final theme identified during this review addresses the continuation of the school improvement efforts into the future. The Central Leadership Team concept is building leadership capacity within the school. School leadership should continue to develop internal capacity within an even wider variety of staff members to ensure future sustainability once state and/or district levels of support are reduced.

### 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 Hopkins County Central High School.

**Deficiency 1: The principal has not used the services of district personnel to support his efforts in moving all students and staff of Hopkins County Central High School to proficiency and beyond.**

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 school and district personnel
- Leadership team meeting artifacts
- Presentation from principal and Central Leadership Team

Team comments: The district has provided additional personnel to support the work of the school (e.g., community liaison, educational consultant, special education building coach). Interviews indicate that district personnel attend leadership meetings. Interviews indicate that district personnel transfer promising high school initiatives to other feeder schools within the district.

**Deficiency 2: The principal does not ensure teachers are creating learning environments where students are active participants and are engaged in hands-on experiences and motivated to accept responsibility for their learning.**

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 school and district personnel.
- Leadership team meeting artifacts.
- Presentation from principal and Central Leadership Team.
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data

Team comments: Classroom observations indicated that some lesson environments were structured to provide active learning that engages students instead of passive receipt of content via lecture. ELEOT Observation item indicator D.3, "Student is actively engaged in the learning activities," scored a 2.5 on a 4-point scale indicating

that active engagement is marginally “evident”. While some lessons exhibited rigorous instruction congruent to the appropriate content standard, other lessons were less rigorous and engaging. Hands-on activities for students were observed in some classes.

**Deficiency 3: The principal and his leadership team do not monitor the work of professional learning communities to ensure expectations are clearly defined and decision making is intentionally focused on curricular, assessment, and instructional decisions.**

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:

- Interviews with school and district personnel.
- Leadership team meeting artifacts.
- Presentation from principal and Central Leadership Team.

Team comments: School leadership has trained staff in the implementation of professional learning communities. School leaders do not attend PLC meetings as they did last year, but monitor PLC work through evidence binders. Written feedback on the evidence binders is provided by school leadership. Interviews indicate that the value placed on PLC work by participants varies from one content area to another. School leadership is in the process of transferring ownership of the PLC process to the individual departments. However, interviews indicate that the level of effectiveness and fidelity of implementation of PLC work varies from group to group.

**Deficiency 4: The school does not have a process to collect, analyze, and evaluate data from multiple sources and use the results to make informed decisions that positively affect student achievement.**

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

Team evidence:

- Review of school artifacts and documents
- Interviews with stakeholders
- Presentation from principal and Central Leadership Team.

Team comments: School leadership has implemented a system for the collection and storage of data on a school network drive and provided access to teachers for use in

instructional improvement. Interviews indicated that school personnel need additional training on how to analyze this data and reflectively use the results to improve instruction for all students. While interviews indicate that the analysis and use of data to improve instruction has begun, documentation of the reflective use of data across all content areas is minimal.

**Deficiency 5: The principal and district leadership have not intentionally developed a plan to engage students, families, and business and community members as partners to improve student achievement for all students in the high school.**

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

Team evidence:

- Interviews with stakeholders
- Review of school documents and artifacts
- Presentation from principal and Central Leadership Team

Team comments: School leadership has facilitated parent outreach efforts (e.g., newsletters, emails, phone calls, college and career readiness nights, assemblies), but the percentage participation by parents and families remains very low. The district-provided community liaison position has had some impact with improving communication. A comprehensive plan to engage parents and community as partners in student success (including school-to-home as well as home-to-school communication loops) was not evident.

**Deficiency 6: The school council has not fulfilled its role or accepted its responsibility for the governance 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 Advisory Council members
- Interviews with stakeholders
- Review of advisory council artifacts
- Presentation from principal and Central Leadership Team.

Team comments: The school Advisory Council meets regularly with the principal

serving as the superintendent's designee. Interviews with participants indicate that the advisory council functions in the same way a fully-authorized council would function, seeking consensus and voting when necessary. A student representative has been added to the council. Advisory council agendas, minutes and records are maintained in the school office and online. When asked about the ongoing work and impact of the council, many stakeholders could not describe the current work of the council (e.g., decisions, policies enacted).