



Internal District Review Report

Name of Institution

Reviewed: Hopkins County District

Date: February 11 – February 12, 2014



Introduction

The KDE Internal School/District Review is designed to:

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

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

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

The report includes:

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

Standard 3: Teaching and Assessing for Learning

Standard 3: The school/district’s curriculum, instructional design, and assessment practices guide and ensure teacher effectiveness and student learning.	District Rating for Standard 3 2	Team Rating for Standard 3 2.08
--	--	--

Standard: 3 The school/district’s curriculum, instructional design, and assessment practices guide and ensure teacher effectiveness and student learning.

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

Performance levels

	4	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide all students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills that align with the school/district’s purpose.
	3	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide all students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
X	2	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide most students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	1	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide few or no students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	4	Evidence clearly indicates curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
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)		
Student performance data (CCR, EOC, K-PREP)		
Classroom observation data		
Student, teacher, and parent surveys		
Stakeholder interviews		
Kentucky High School Feedback Report		
School guided planning documents		
School pacing guides		

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

- Self-Assessment
- Executive Summary
- Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
- KDE School/District 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"/>	Opportunity for Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Implement a district curriculum to provide all students with equitable and rigorous opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills. District leadership should formally adopt a curriculum and develop a process to systematically monitor and provide support for teachers to ensure all students experience challenging learning opportunities 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 62nd percentile to the 96th percentile. The greatest gains came from achievement 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 benchmarks 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 to the 2012-13 school year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- In the Equitable Learning Environment, the statement, "Has equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support," received a rating of 2.9 on a 4-point scale, indicating that it is evident that most students have equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
- In the High Expectations Environment, the statement, "Is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable," received a rating of 2.7 on a 4-point scale, which reflects there is evidence that the activities in the classroom are challenging.
- In the Active Learning Environment, the statement, "Makes connections from content to real – life experiences," received a rating of 2.5 on a 4-point scale, suggesting that there is some evidence that students have equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In a survey, 58.3% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, "My school provides me with challenging curriculum and learning experiences," indicating that over half of all students surveyed feel their experiences with curriculum and learning are challenging.
- In a survey, 46.6% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, "My school prepares me to deal with issues I may face in the future," suggesting that less than half of all students surveyed make connections to curriculum and real world application.
- In a survey, 91.8% of teachers strongly agree/agree 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," indicating most teachers feel the level of challenge of the curriculum and connection to real-life application is much higher than reported by students.
- In a survey, 87.7% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, "In our school, all stakeholders are informed of the policies, process, and procedures related to grading and reporting," suggesting that most teachers believe stakeholders are aware of the grading and reporting process and teachers apply a common grading process in accordance with grading policies and procedures. There was minimal evidence at the district level to support the existence of a current grading and communication policy.

- In a survey, 75.3% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers provide an equitable curriculum that meets his/her learning needs,” suggesting that a majority of parents feel the curriculum is presented to their children based on individual learning needs.
- In a survey, 72.9% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers give work that challenges my child,” indicating that a majority of parents feel the curriculum is challenging. This presents a discrepancy between the student and parent surveys regarding the challenge level of the curriculum.
- In a survey, 55.4% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers keep me informed regularly of how my child is being graded,” suggesting that a little over half of all parents feel regularly informed of grading policies/procedures. This creates a discrepancy between teachers and parents regarding all stakeholders being informed of policies, processes, and procedures related to grading and reporting.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review included school pacing guides and guided planning documents created by teachers and/or PLCs. There is some evidence to support district involvement in the PLC process and the development of these tools.
- An artifact review revealed the 2013 Kentucky High School Feedback Report, which indicates a 53.6% college-going rate for HCCC as compared to 60.2% for the state.
- An artifact review suggested that district personnel are participating in learning walks and are involved in PLC meetings at the high school; however data indicates participation has been reduced from the previous year.
- Stakeholder interviews indicated positions for curriculum specialists and interventionists have been created by the district to ensure teacher effectiveness and student learning.

3.2	Curriculum, instruction, and assessment are monitored and adjusted systematically in response to data from multiple assessments of student learning and an examination of professional practice.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	Using data from multiple assessments of student learning and an examination of professional practice, school/district personnel systematically monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.	
	3	Using data from student assessments and an examination of professional practice, school/district personnel monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.	
X	2	School/district personnel monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure for vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.	
	1	School/district personnel rarely or never monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school/district’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.	
	4	There is a systematic, collaborative process in place to ensure alignment each time curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.	

	3	There is a process in place to ensure alignment each time curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.
X	2	A process is implemented sometimes to ensure alignment when curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.
	1	No process exists to ensure alignment when curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.
	4	The continuous improvement process has clear guidelines to ensure that vertical and horizontal alignment as well as alignment with the school/district's purpose are maintained and enhanced in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
	3	The continuous improvement process ensures that vertical and horizontal alignment as well as alignment with the school/district's purpose are maintained and enhanced in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
X	2	There is limited evidence that the continuous improvement process ensures vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district's purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
	1	There is little or no evidence that the continuous improvement process is connected with vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school/district's purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Student and teacher surveys		
Student performance data		
Stakeholder interviews		
Common assessments		
Pacing guides		
PLC schedule		
Guided planning protocol		

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/District 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)

Improvement Priority

Create and utilize a formal districtwide, systemic process to monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction and assessment in response to multiple data sources that ensures vertical and horizontal alignment are maintained and enhanced with each revision.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school's academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62nd percentile to the 96th percentile. The greatest gains came from achievement 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 to the 2012-13 school year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- In the Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment, the statement, "Is asked and/or quizzed about individual learning," received a rating of 2.4 on a 4-point scale, indicating it is somewhat evident that students are questioned regarding their learning.
- In the High Expectations Environment, the statement, "Is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable," received a rating of 2.7 on a 4-point scale, suggesting that curriculum is appropriate and rigorous as evidenced by the higher level questioning observed in some classes.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In a survey, 89.6% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, "My school gives me multiple assessments to check my understanding of what was taught," indicating that most students feel they are given multiple assessments to assess understanding of the curriculum.
- In a survey, 83.9% of teachers strongly agree/agree 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," suggesting that most teachers are utilizing student assessment information to adjust practice to meet the needs of their students.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review produced PLC agendas, indicating that professional learning communities do exist at the school within common classes/courses. There was minimal evidence provided to demonstrate the effectiveness of these PLCs. There was minimal evidence demonstrating the opportunity of grade levels to participate in vertical curriculum alignment.

- An artifact review demonstrated a lesson planning template that included a daily standard, learning target, engagement activity, research-based instructional activity, guided practice, formative assessment, percent mastery, intervention and connection to program review.
- An artifact review revealed sample MAP data and a sample item analysis for an English assessment. There are documents that suggest teachers implemented a variety of formative assessment and practice EPAS assessments as well.
- An artifact review revealed a template for the guided planning protocol.
- An artifact review suggested that district personnel are participating in learning walks and are involved in PLC meetings at the high school; however data indicates participation has been reduced from the previous year.
- Stakeholder interviews indicated the district is currently in the process of refining a districtwide Response to Intervention program.
- Stakeholder interviews referenced the school and district’s commitment to analyzing multiple sources of data or triangulating data as critical for identifying individual student needs.
- An artifact review and stakeholder interviews indicate district and school leadership have collaborated to ensure all teachers have received training in the creation and administration of common assessments; however, the district notes this continues to be an area of need.
- Stakeholder interviews suggest that the school has been provided multiple resources from the district designed to facilitate periodic data disaggregation.
- Stakeholder interviews revealed the district provided release days designed for teachers to analyze data and collaboratively create common formative assessments.

3.3	Teachers engage students in their learning through instructional strategies that ensure achievement of learning expectations.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	Teachers are consistent and deliberate in planning and using instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
X	3	Teachers plan and use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
	2	Teachers sometimes use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
	1	Teachers rarely or never use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
	4	Teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of each student.	
	3	Teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students when necessary.	
X	2	Teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of groups of students when necessary.	
	1	Teachers seldom or never personalize instructional strategies.	
	4	Teachers consistently use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.	
	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)		
Student, teacher, and parent survey		
Student performance data		
Stakeholder interviews		
Classroom formative assessment		
MAP data		
Good to Great notebook		
Professional development schedule		
Sample walkthrough data		
PLC notebooks		

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

Opportunity for Improvement

Collaborate with school leadership to monitor and support teacher implementation of classroom instructional strategies and interventions which address the individual learning needs of all students in a systemic manner. Ensure effective implementation of personalized instruction that engages students through collaboration, self-reflection and critical thinking skills and that occurs on a consistent basis in all classrooms.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school's academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62nd percentile to the 96th percentile. The greatest gains came from achievement 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 benchmarks 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 to the 2012-13 school year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- In the Equitable Learning Environment, the statement, "Has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs," received a score of 2.4 on a 4-point scale, which reflects there is some evidence within the classroom that teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs. Learning centers and student choice were observed in some classrooms.
- In the High Expectations Environment, the statement, "Is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks," received a score of 2.8 on a 4-point scale, indicating that it is evident that teachers use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.
- In the Active Learning Environment, the statement, "Is actively engaged in the learning activities," received a score of 2.5 on a 4-point scale, which reflects there is some evidence that teachers use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.
- The Digital Learning Environment received an overall score of 1.9 on a 4-point scale, suggesting teachers sometimes use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In a survey, 49.9% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, "My school motivates me to learn new things," suggesting that less than half of students feel motivated to learn new information.
- In a survey, 34.7% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, "All of my teachers change their teaching to meet my learning needs," suggesting that few students feel the curriculum is adjusted to meet their individual needs. This creates a discrepancy between students and teachers regarding adjustment of curriculum to meet individual learning needs and

indicates interventions are provided only for a select group of students and are not available for all students.

- In a survey, 76.7% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school regularly use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills,” indicating a majority of teachers use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.
- In a survey, 76.7% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students,” suggesting that a majority of teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students when necessary.
- In a survey, 72.6% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use a variety of technologies as instructional resources,” indicating that a majority of teachers use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.
- In a survey, 72.3% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers use a variety of teaching strategies and learning activities,” suggesting that a majority of parents believe that teachers utilize varied instructional strategies and resources to meet the needs of students.
- In a survey, 60.3% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers meet his/her learning needs by individualizing instruction,” indicating that more than half of parents agree that teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of groups of students when necessary. This indicates a discrepancy between parents and teachers regarding the personalization of instruction to meet the individual learning needs of students.
- In a survey, 68.7% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My child sees a relationship between what is being taught and his/her everyday life,” suggesting that a majority of parents believe that students acknowledge real-world application of the content. This suggests a discrepancy between students and parents regarding the relevance of instruction.
- In a survey, 81.9% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My child has up-to-date computers and other technology to learn,” indicating most parents believe their children have access to necessary technological tools to experience success.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review revealed a document titled “Evaluation of PLC Notebooks 13-14,” which indicated “Evidence of teacher technology missing for all.” However, classroom observations and stakeholder interviews indicated technology is readily available to all teachers and most students as needed.
- An artifact review demonstrated the guided planning protocol as well as an outline for a formal lesson planning process
- An artifact review revealed a guided planning process, including engagement activities and interventions for students based on individual student need. While it is evident the expectation is a part of the planning process, there was limited evidence to indicate interventions were provided during Tier I instruction based on individual student need.
- Stakeholder interviews revealed a district focus on scaling up technology available to students in the high school.
- Stakeholder interviews suggested the district is aware of the need to support teachers in creating opportunities to meet the individualized learning needs of all students.

3.4	School/district leaders monitor and support the improvement of instructional practices of teachers to ensure student success.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	School/district leaders formally and consistently monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures beyond classroom observation to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.	
	3	School/district leaders formally and consistently monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.	
X	2	School/district leaders monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.	
	1	School/district leaders occasionally or randomly monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.	
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)			
Student performance data			
Stakeholder interviews			
Pacing guides			
Teacher lesson plans			
PLC notebook			
Walkthrough schedules			
Progress monitoring data			
School Sustainability Plan			
Central Leadership Team agendas and minutes			
PLC agendas and minutes			

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Improvement Priority

Develop and implement a formal district walkthrough process that consistently monitors instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures. District leadership ensures 1) alignment with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) an aligned and approved curriculum, 3) direct engagement with all students in monitoring their learning, and 4) the use of content-specific standards of professional practice.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62nd percentile to the 96th percentile. The greatest gains came from achievement 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 benchmarks 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 to the 2012-13 school year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- The Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment received an overall rating of 2.4 on a 4-point scale indicating that there is some evidence that school leaders monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review suggested that district personnel are participating in learning walks and are involved in PLC meetings at the high school; however data indicates participation has been reduced from the previous year.
- An artifact review revealed a sustainability plan that called for a weekly walkthrough schedule. There is evidence of a weekly walkthrough schedule from 2012-13 that did include district personnel; however, there is no evidence of a similar schedule for 2013-14
- An artifact review revealed the existence of a Central Leadership Team and sample agendas that reference classroom data walkthrough analysis.

- Stakeholder interviews revealed that district personnel do participate in walkthroughs at the high school, are involved in PLC meetings, and are represented on the Central Leadership Team that meets weekly.

3.5	Teachers participate/system operates in collaborative learning communities to improve instruction and student learning.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 3
-----	---	----------------------	------------------

Performance levels			
	4	All members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule.	
	3	All members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally.	
X	2	Some members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally.	
	1	Collaborative learning communities randomly self-organize and meet informally.	
	4	Frequent collaboration occurs across grade levels and content areas.	
X	3	Collaboration often occurs across grade levels and content areas.	
	2	Collaboration occasionally occurs across grade levels and content areas.	
	1	Collaboration seldom occurs across grade levels and content areas.	
	4	Staff members implement a formal process that promotes productive discussion about student learning.	
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/district staff members.	
	3	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching occur regularly among most school/district personnel.	
X	2	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching sometimes occur among school/district personnel.	
	1	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching rarely occur among school/district personnel.	
	4	School/district personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.	

X	3	School/district personnel indicate that collaboration causes improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
	2	School/district personnel express belief in the value of collaborative learning communities.
	1	School/district personnel see little value in collaborative learning communities.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Teacher and parent survey		
Student performance data		
PLC notebooks, PLC agendas and minutes		
Mentoring and coaching protocols		
Guided planning protocol		

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/District Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62nd percentile to the 96th percentile. The greatest gains came from achievement 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 benchmarks 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 to the 2012-13 school year.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In a survey, 89.0% of teachers strongly agree/agree 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),” indicating that a majority of teachers report having received the training necessary to successfully participate in professional learning communities.
- In a survey, 63.7% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers work as a team to help my child learn,” suggesting that more than half of parents acknowledge their children’s teachers work collaboratively in professional learning communities to ensure learning occurs.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review revealed PLC templates – agendas, minutes, and notebooks.
- A sample of PLC minutes from the math department meeting suggested there is little opportunity to intervene for students or student intervention is optional based on the statement, “Suggestion was made to work with these three students individually in the classroom while others are working on specific tasks. Teacher has asked students to stay before and after school; students have not done that.”
- An artifact review and stakeholder interviews indicate that school and district leadership are involved in the PLC process.
- An artifact review provided a PLC observation schedule, suggesting that administrators monitor PLCs. It is to be noted, however, that the monitoring administrator for each PLC is rotated periodically.
- An artifact review revealed a tool for evaluating PLC notebooks and a sample of such a review.
- Stakeholder interviews and the artifact review revealed that all teachers have received training to implement the PLC process.
- Stakeholder interviews suggest that district and school personnel see value in the PLC process related to student achievement.

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

	1	Few teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
	4	Exemplars are provided to guide and inform students.
	3	Exemplars are often provided to guide and inform students.
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.
X	3	The process includes multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction and provide data for possible curriculum revision.
	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)		
Student, teacher, and parent surveys		
Student performance data		
Classroom observation data		
Stakeholder interviews		
Progress monitoring data		
Common instructional process and learning expectations (CIF)		
PLC notebooks		

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/District 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

Monitor and support an instructional process which clearly informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance. District leadership ensures that the process includes exemplars to guide and inform students as well as multiple measures, including formative assessments, to provide specific and timely feedback.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school's academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62nd percentile to the 96th percentile. The greatest gains came from achievement 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 benchmarks 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 to the 2012-13 school year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- In the High Expectations Environment, the statement, "Knows and strives to meet the high expectations established by the teacher," received a score of 2.4 on a 4-point scale, indicating there is some evidence that most teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations.
- In the High Expectations Environment, the statement, "Is provided exemplars of high quality work," received a score of 2.2 on a 4-point scale, indicating there is some evidence that exemplars are sometimes provided to guide and inform students.
- The Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment received an overall rating of 2.4 on a 4-point scale, indicating there is some evidence that students receive specific and timely feedback about their learning.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In a survey, 54.5% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, "All of my teachers provide me with information about my learning and grades," suggesting that about half of students are provided feedback regarding their learning and grades.
- In a survey, 89.0% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, "All teachers in our school use a process to inform students of their learning expectations and standards of performance," indicating that most teachers use an instructional process that informs students

of learning expectations and standards of performance. There is a noted discrepancy in survey information between students and teachers regarding the process of informing students of their learning.

- In a survey, 74.0% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school provide students with specific and timely feedback about their learning,” suggesting a majority of teachers implement a process that provides students with specific and timely feedback about their learning. Again, this notes a discrepancy between students and teachers related to being informed about student learning.
- In a survey, 78.1% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use multiple types of assessments to modify instruction and to revise the curriculum,” indicating that a majority of teachers implement a process that includes multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction and provide data for possible curriculum revision.
- In a survey, 88.6% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My child knows the expectations for learning in all classes,” suggesting that most parents believe teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
- In a survey, 80.7% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My child is given multiple assessments to measure his/her understanding of what was taught,” indicating a majority of parents feel teachers utilize a process that includes multiple measures, including formative assessments, to measure students’ understanding of what was taught.
- In a survey, 52.5% of students strongly agree/agree 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,” indicating half of all students are exposed to a variety of teaching methods or believe the teaching methods they are exposed to will help them develop the necessary skills to be successful. This creates a discrepancy between teachers and students regarding teaching methods and/or content being applicable to real-world success.
- In a survey, 54.7% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my teachers explain their expectations for learning and behavior so I can be successful,” suggesting that half of all students report not being aware of teacher expectations for learning and behavior. This indicates a discrepancy between students, teachers, and parents regarding students being aware of learning and behavior expectations.
- In a survey, 57.1% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my teachers use tests, projects, presentations, and portfolios to check my understanding of what was taught,” indicating that a little over half of all students report the use of multiple measures to check understanding of content. This suggests a discrepancy between students and teachers regarding the use of multiple measures to assess individual student comprehension of content.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review revealed the existence of a common instructional process that informs students of learning expectations (CIF).
- An artifact review of PLC notebooks showed minimal evidence that exemplars are provided to all students.
- Stakeholder interviews indicated that multiple sources of data are analyzed to inform the instructional process. There is evidence to suggest universal screening leads to instructional placement for some students. There is also minimal evidence to suggest practice assessments are utilized to meet the individualized needs of a select group of students.
- Stakeholder interviews indicated multiple resources are provided through district Title I funds to assist in facilitating the instructional process.

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

Performance levels

	4	All school/district personnel are engaged in systematic mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.
	3	School/district personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.
X	2	Some school/district personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.
	1	Few or no school/district personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.
	4	These programs set high expectations for all school/district personnel and include valid and reliable measures of performance.
	3	These programs set expectations for all school/district personnel and include measures of performance.
X	2	These programs set expectations for school/district personnel.
	1	Limited or no expectations for school/district personnel are included.

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

Teacher survey
Student performance data
Mentoring and coaching protocols
PLC agendas and minutes
Professional development calendar
PLC notebooks
Teacher Professional Development survey

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

- Self-Assessment
- Executive Summary
- Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
- KDE School/District 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

Establish and implement a process in which school personnel are engaged in systematic mentoring, coaching and induction programs consistent with the district’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning and the conditions that support learning. District leadership ensures that district personnel directly support these programs, which include valid and reliable measures, establishing high expectations for all school personnel.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62nd percentile to the 96th percentile. The greatest gains came from achievement 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 benchmarks 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 to the 2012-13 school year.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In a survey, 83.6% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “In our school, staff members provide peer coaching to teachers,” suggesting a majority of teachers is engaged in mentoring or coaching programs.
- In a survey, 87.7% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “In our school, a formal process is in place to support new staff members in their professional practice,” indicating that a majority of teachers report the school has a formal process for inducting new staff members and providing support related to their professional practice.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review revealed minimal evidence to support the existence, implementation of, or effectiveness of a formal teacher mentoring and/or coaching program.
- An artifact review did indicate some evidence that walkthroughs are being conducted on a regular basis by the high school.

- Stakeholder interviews indicated the district provides all teachers new to the field as well as those new to the district with mentoring teachers.
- Stakeholder interviews revealed the district collaborates with school administrators to provide support and mentorship to identified veteran teachers as needed.
- An artifact review and stakeholder interviews suggested that district personnel collaborate with new teachers to conduct periodic needs analyses.

3.8	The school/system engages families in meaningful ways in their children’s education and keeps them informed of their children’s learning progress.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children’s education are designed, implemented, and evaluated.	
	3	Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children’s education are designed and implemented.	
X	2	Programs that engage families in their children’s education are available.	
	1	Few or no programs that engage families in their children’s education are available.	
	4	Families have multiple ways of staying informed of their children’s learning progress.	
	3	School/district personnel regularly inform families of their children’s learning progress.	
X	2	School/district personnel provide information about children’s learning.	
	1	School/district personnel provide little relevant information about children’s learning.	
Evidence Reviewed			
Student, teacher, and parent surveys			
Student performance data			
Stakeholder interviews			
District newsletters			
Community event sign-in sheets			
Community event calendar			
Student community service participation			

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/District Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

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

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

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

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Design and implement districtwide programs to engage families in meaningful ways regarding their children’s education and evaluate the process as a whole. District leadership supports opportunities for school personnel to provide families with multiples means of staying informed of their children’s learning progress.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62nd percentile to the 96th percentile. The greatest gains came from achievement 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 benchmarks on the ACT increased in all areas.
- While the 2011-2012 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 to the 2012-13 school year.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In a survey, 45.3% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my teachers keep my family informed of my academic process,” indicating that less than half of all students report that the school communicates with their families regarding their academic progress.
- In a survey, 44.1% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My school offers opportunities for my family to become involved in school activities and my learning,” suggesting that less than half of all students report that their families are aware of opportunities to become involved in school activities and student learning.
- In a survey, 61.7% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “In our school, all school personnel regularly engage families in their children’s learning progress,” suggesting that over half of all teachers report the availability of programs that engage families in their children’s education.
- In a survey, 69.9% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers help me to understand my child’s progress,” indicating a majority of parents report that teachers communicate with families regarding student learning progress.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review revealed multiple communication techniques with families/community through technology.
- An artifact review demonstrated multiple extracurricular student groups that participated in various community service activities.
- An artifact review provided a calendar of various community activities; however, there is minimal evidence to indicate the district’s level of involvement or support.
- Stakeholder interviews noted the district created a community liaison at the high school designed to increase community involvement and to serve as a mentor for targeted students.
- Stakeholder interviews indicated town hall meetings designed to better connect district personnel to community were effective for those in attendance; however attendance was minimal.
- Stakeholder interviews revealed Madisonville Community College’s involvement with the high school through School Counts! and through providing the Work Keys Assessment to targeted students.

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

Stakeholder Review
Storm Advisory Program guidelines and scripts
Student scheduling protocol

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/District 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

Support a formal schoolwide structure in which each student is well known by at least one adult advocate who supports that student’s educational experience. Ensure district participation in this structure to maintain long-term interaction with individual students in order to build relationships in this process.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62nd percentile to the 96th percentile. The greatest gains came from achievement 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 to the 2012-13 school year.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In a survey, 44.2% of students strongly agree/agree 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,” suggesting that less than half of all students feel there is a structure that gives teachers long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student and related adults.
- In a survey, 83.6% of teachers strongly agree/agree 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,” indicating that a majority of teachers report there is a structure in place that 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. This creates a discrepancy between the existence of a formal structure and the success of that structure to create relationships based on survey results.
- In a survey, 78.3% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My child has at least one adult advocate in the school,” suggesting that a majority of parents feel their child is supported by and connected to at least one adult advocate in the school. There is a discrepancy between students and teachers/parents regarding the existence and/or effectiveness of a structure that 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.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review indicates the existence of an advisory program but limited evidence to support the district’s involvement.
- Stakeholder interviews suggest the district-provided community liaison is designed to assist in supporting the school-based advisory program.
- Stakeholder interviews revealed that the school communicates with the family of each student related to scheduling at the beginning of each year.

3.10		Grading and reporting are based on clearly defined criteria that represent the attainment of content knowledge and skills and are consistent across grade levels and courses.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels				
	4	All teachers consistently use common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures based on clearly defined criteria that represent each student’s attainment of content knowledge and skills.		
	3	Teachers use common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures based on clearly defined criteria that represent each student’s attainment of content knowledge and skills.		
X	2	Most teachers use common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures based on criteria that represent each student’s attainment of content knowledge and skills.		
	1	Few or no teachers use common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures.		
	4	These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented without fail across all grade levels		

		and all courses.
	3	These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented consistently across grade levels and courses.
X	2	These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented across grade levels and courses.
	1	Policies, processes, and procedures, if they exist, are rarely implemented across grade levels or courses, and may not be well understood by stakeholders.
	4	All stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures.
	3	Stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures.
X	2	Most stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures.
	4	The policies, processes, and procedures are formally and regularly evaluated.
	3	The policies, processes, and procedures are regularly evaluated.
X	2	The policies, processes, and procedures may or may not be evaluated.
	1	No process for evaluation of grading and reporting practices is evident.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Student, teacher, and parent surveys		
Student performance data		
Stakeholder interviews		
School/district grading policy		

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/District 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

Review and update the district grading policy to ensure clearly defined criteria that represent attainment of content knowledge and skills that are consistent across grade levels and courses.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school's academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62nd percentile to the 96th percentile. The greatest gains came from achievement 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 benchmarks 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 to the 2012-13 school year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- The Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment received an overall rating of 2.4 on a 4-point scale, indicating there is some evidence that students receive specific and timely feedback about their learning.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In a survey, 54.7% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, "All of my teachers fairly grade and evaluate my work," suggesting that half of all students may not be aware of or feel grading policies, processes, and procedures are implemented inconsistently across grade levels and courses.
- In a survey, 71.2% of teachers strongly agree/agree 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," indicating that a majority of teachers report that grading policies, processes, and procedures are implemented consistently across grade levels and courses. This notes a discrepancy between students and teachers regarding the consistent implementation and/or equity related to evaluation, grading, or reporting of student grades.
- In a survey, 70.5% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, "All of my child's teachers report on my child's progress in easy to understand language," suggesting that a majority of parents report awareness of the policies, processes, and procedures associated with grading and/or student learning progress.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review related to policies for grading and reporting provided outdated evidence regarding re-testing and grade requirements for athletic participation.
- An artifact review provided minimal evidence to suggest the existence of standards-based grading or the periodic communication of student academic performance with students and/or parents.
- An artifact review revealed a district newsletter that communicated grade reporting dates.

3.11	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	All staff members participate in a rigorous, continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district's purpose and direction.	
	3	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district's purpose and direction.	
X	2	Most staff members participate in a program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district's purpose and direction.	
	1	Few or no staff members participate in professional learning.	
	4	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school/district and the individual.	
X	3	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school/district.	
	2	Professional development is based on the needs of the school/district.	
	1	Professional development, when available, may or may not address the needs of the school/district or build capacity among staff members.	
	4	The program builds measurable capacity among all professional and support staff.	
	3	The program builds capacity among all professional and support staff.	
X	2	The program builds capacity among staff members who participate.	
	4	The program is rigorously and systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	3	The program is systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
X	2	The program is regularly evaluated for effectiveness.	
	1	If a program exists, it is rarely and/or randomly evaluated.	
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)			
Teacher survey			
Student performance data			
Stakeholder interviews			
School/district professional development plan			
Professional development reflection protocol			

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/District 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

Provide a continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the district’s purpose and direction, is based on individual professional development needs of all teachers, and is systematically evaluated for effectiveness. District leadership should directly support and provide professional development opportunities based on an individual teacher needs assessment as well as whole group professional development based on a school needs assessment.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62nd percentile to the 96th percentile. The greatest gains came from achievement 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 benchmarks 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 to the 2012-13 school year.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In a survey, 90.4% of teachers strongly agree/agree 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,” indicating that most teachers participate in a program of professional learning communities.
- In a survey, 94.5% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “In our school, all staff members participate in continuous professional learning based on the identified needs of the school,” suggesting that teachers participate in a program that is systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.

- In a survey, 87.7% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “In our school a professional learning program is designed to build capacity among all professional and support staff members,” indicating that a majority of teachers participate in a program that builds capacity among all professional and support staff.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review revealed multiple PD opportunities for teachers, typically sponsored by the school.
- An artifact review provided some connection between the PD calendar and the result of the PD needs assessment completed by 22 staff members.
- An artifact review provided evidence suggesting PD offered was connected to groups of teachers as opposed to individual teacher needs based on walkthrough and/or student assessment data.
- Stakeholder interviews suggest most PD is identified and generated at the school level; however, the district does support co-teacher training for all teachers.

3.12	The school/system provides and coordinates learning support services to meet the unique learning needs of students.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	School/district personnel systematically and continuously use data to identify unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency as well as other learning needs (such as second languages).	
	3	School/district personnel use data to identify unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency as well as other learning needs (such as second languages).	
X	2	School/district personnel use data to identify unique learning needs of special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs (such as second languages).	
	1	School/district personnel identify special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs (such as second languages).	
	4	School/district personnel stay current on research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related individualized learning support services to all students.	
	3	School/district personnel stay current on research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related learning support services to all students.	
	2	School/district personnel are familiar with research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related learning support services to students within these special populations.	
X	1	School/district personnel provide or coordinate some learning support services to students within these special populations.	
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)			
Student, teacher, and parent surveys			
Student performance data			
Stakeholder interviews			
Student scheduling protocol			
Title I Report outlining resources			

Progress monitoring data
PLC protocol

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/District 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

Provide data-based learning support systems districtwide to meet the unique learning needs of students at all levels of proficiency. Support school personnel in staying current on research-based strategies related to student learning styles, multiple intelligences, and personality type indicators.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 56.6 to 69.1. This resulted in an increase from the 62nd percentile to the 96th percentile. The greatest gains came from achievement 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 benchmarks 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 to the 2012-13 school year.

- The School Report Card indicates the ECE population far exceeds the percent proficient/distinguished in English II, Algebra II, and Biology as compared to state performance.

Classroom Observation Data:

- The Supportive Learning Environment received an overall score of 2.7 on a 4-point scale indicating there is some evidence to suggest that classroom teachers create a positive classroom environment that provides support and assistance to ensure students understand content.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In a survey, 51.5% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My school provides learning services for me according to my need,” indicating that half of all students feel systems exist that provide and coordinate learning support services to meet the unique learning needs of all students.
- In a survey, 90.4% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “In our school, related learning services are provided for all students based on their needs,” suggesting that school personnel provide or coordinate some learning support services to students based on individual need. The discrepancy between students and teachers regarding learning support services based on individual student needs suggest there may be miscommunication regarding the effectiveness and/or awareness of such support services.
- In a survey, 79.5% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “In our school, all staff members use student data to address the unique learning needs of all students,” suggesting that a majority of teachers are utilizing data to identify unique learning needs of special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs.
- In a survey, 72.5% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My child has access to support services based on his/her identified needs,” suggesting parents believe their children have access to learning support services to meet the unique learning needs of all students. There is a discrepancy between students and parents regarding student access to such support services.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review provided general information connected to a Response to Intervention outline.
- An artifact review revealed a flow chart outlining student assignment to various classes based on MAP, EXPLORE, and/or PLAN data.
- Stakeholder interviews note a district policy mandating the weekly collection of data for targeted students to support placement in intervention classes.
- Stakeholder interviews indicate the school support team (district curriculum specialists, school psychologist, guidance counselor, speech/language pathologist, and school special education consultant) references six data points for all students below the 70% mastery level to inform instructional decisions.
- Stakeholder interviews indicate professional development is provided for all teachers centered on co-teaching.
- An artifact review indicates the provision of additional resources including but not limited to ZOOM math for GAP students.

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.
 - An artifact review, stakeholder interviews and survey, and the district presentation indicate the superintendent and district leadership/personnel intentionally work to create an environment of **continuous improvement**. The district presentation and interviews indicate a self-awareness of strengths as well as areas of need. Stakeholder interviews and the artifact review suggest district level support and emphasis on data analysis and the review of multiple sources of data are utilized to drive the decision making process. An artifact review, student performance data, and stakeholder interviews suggest the district may be considering shifting focus away from the priority school.
 - An artifact review, stakeholder interviews, and district presentation indicate the superintendent and district leadership/personnel have created a culture of **personalization**. The district has provided personnel, a variety of data analysis resources, and supplemental student assessment and learning materials to the priority school based on a specific school-based needs assessment.

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 School District.

Deficiency 1: There is a lack of clarity among district and school staff of the roles, responsibilities, and authority of district administrators.

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:

- Certified and classified job descriptions
- Realignment of Central Office Instructional Team
- District presentation
- Stakeholder interviews
- Creation of Human Resources Department
- District web site review

Team comments:

- Job descriptions were well-developed and described the scope of responsibilities and performance responsibilities of each position.
- The district web site revealed the creation of an HR Department.
- Stakeholder interviews revealed articulate personnel who were mostly effective at describing roles and responsibilities.
- Stakeholder interviews suggest there may be some miscommunication between school and district related to personnel assignment. For example, the district creates the position and provides the resource to the school, who perceive that as school personnel as opposed to district support.
- Stakeholder interviews suggest there is still lack of clarity regarding awareness of district employees housed at the building.

Deficiency 2: There is a widespread perception that the failure to value education in a segment of the community limits the effectiveness of instruction in persistently low-achieving schools.

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:

- District presentation
- Town Hall agenda and sign in sheets
- Stakeholder interviews
- Monthly district newsletters
- Community liaison
- Superintendent communication to all employees
- Student performance data

Team comments:

- The district created the community liaison position for the high school to increase community partnerships and mentor/coach students and community regarding the value of education.
- District leadership provided opportunities for town hall meetings designed to create opportunities for the community to become involved in the educational process. Interviews suggest that meetings have proven to be impactful for those in attendance; however, participation has been minimal.
- District newsletters contain varied and pertinent information designed to increase awareness and encourage the value of education.
- Student performance data indicate the gap group has seen a continuous increase in student achievement.
- Stakeholder interviews indicate that while student performance data has improved, there is still a community perception that education is not valued in all regions of the district.

Deficiency 3: District leadership has not perpetuated a culture of high expectations for all students among all district staff and stakeholders, particularly in persistently low-achieving schools.

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:

- District funded position
- Superintendent newsletter
- ECE resources
- Student performance data
- Stakeholder interviews

Team comments:

- Student performance data indicate the ECE and gap populations far exceed percent proficient/distinguished in Algebra II, English II, and Biology as compared to the state.
- The district has created interventionist and writing coach positions to work with targeted students.
- The superintendent newsletter communicates a vision of high expectations
- Stakeholder interviews suggest there may a perception that not all schools or all regions of the district are held to a standard of high expectations.

Deficiency 4: Classroom assessments are not always rigorous, relevant, and aligned with Kentucky standards, and they are not used to guide instruction.

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:

- Rigor and Relevance training
- Walkthrough data
- Good to Great principal binders
- Hopkins County Central High School Assessment training
- CIITS professional development focused on creating assessments
- District presentation

Team comments:

- Teachers have received training in rigor and relevance at the high school.
- Teachers use the PLC forum to examine the level of rigor and relevance on assessments with support from district personnel.
- Guided planning for curriculum, instruction and assessment is documented in the Good to Great binders required for all principals by district leadership.
- The district has created a curriculum advisor position at the high school to collaborate with teachers on the PLC process.
- District leadership has ensured the delivery of CIITS training in the development and administration of common formative assessments that are standards-based and rigorous; however, there is limited evidence to indicate follow up and /or implementation of this professional development.

Deficiency 5: The district leadership does not monitor the implementation or effectiveness of professional learning communities.

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:

- PLC agendas and minutes
- Good to Great binders
- Professional development calendar
- Hopkins County Central High School PLC notebooks
- Stakeholder interviews
- District presentation

Team comments:

- District personnel attend PLC meetings at the high school on a regular basis.
- District leadership requires principals to maintain Good to Great binders, including PLC documentation. These binders are collected and reviewed with principals quarterly.
- District leadership provides a curriculum advisor at the high school to monitor curriculum alignment, monitor instruction for rigor and relevance and collaborate in PLCs.
- District leadership provides two embedded staff development days for school staff to participate in PLC work.
- The PLC notebooks at the high school document data analysis from PLC meetings.

Deficiency 6: District leadership does not effectively monitor instruction to ensure that it is rigorous, relevant, varied, and effective.

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:

- PLC meeting minutes and agendas
- District walkthroughs
- Guided planning tool

- Central Leadership Team
- District personnel

Team comments:

- An artifact review and stakeholder interviews provide evidence that district personnel do participate in learning walks at the high school level; however the number and consistency of participation have been reduced in 2013-2014.
- An artifact review revealed walkthrough data; however, there is limited evidence available to indicate how data was utilized to improve teacher performance.
- An artifact review revealed a guided planning tool.
- An artifact review and stakeholder interviews indicate district personnel participate in weekly leadership team meetings at the high school.
- The District Leadership Team meets weekly to review student performance data; however there is limited evidence to indicate how information from the meetings are communicated and/or drive improvement at the high school level.
- District leadership provides a curriculum advisor at the high school to monitor curriculum alignment, monitor instruction for rigor and relevance and collaborate in PLCs.