



Internal School Review Report

Name of Institution

Reviewed: Lawrence County High School

Date: March 10, 2014-March 11, 2014

School Principal: Christy Moore



Introduction

The KDE Internal School Review is designed to:

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

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

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

The report includes:

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

Standard 3: Teaching and Assessing for Learning

Standard: The school’s curriculum, instructional design, and assessment practices guide and ensure teacher effectiveness and student learning.	School Rating for Standard 3 2.33	Team Rating for Standard 3 2.67
---	--	--

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The School Report Card for 2012-13 indicates growth in each of the accountability areas from the 2011-12 School Report Card.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card indicates that the NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculations of the Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability are below the state average in the content areas of math and on-demand writing, while English, science, social studies, and language mechanics are just above the state average, as shown in the table below:

2012-13 Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science / Biology		Social St / US History		Writing/On Demand		Language Mechanics	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
61.9	61.0	36.0	55.6	64.0	58.1	60.1	59.8	62.4	68.9	69.7	69.0

- Student performance data from the 2012-13 School Report Card classifies the school as a proficient and progressing school based on the Learners Overall Accountability Score of 60.6 and a ranking at the 78th percentile, which is a significant increase from the 2011-12 overall score of 46.4 and ranking at the 14th percentile.
- Data from the 2012-13 School Report Card shows an increase in all of the five areas of the Next Generation Learners Accountability points, as shown in the table below:

Achievement		Gap		Growth		CCR		Graduation Rate	
11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13*
53.3	57.2	23.3	33.7	52.4	59.4	33.4	58.1	69.2	95.0
	+3.9		+10.4		+7.0		+24.7		+25.8

*Cohort Graduation Rate

- A comparison of the 2011-12 and the 2012-13 School Report Cards for College and Career Readiness (CCR) indicates an increase in the total points from 33.4 to 58.1. On the ACT, the percentage of students meeting the benchmark increased from 43.1% to 45.3% in English. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark increased in math from 23.6% to 26.6% and decreased in reading from 41.0% to 38.1%.
- A comparison of growth data from the 2011-12 to 2012-13 School Report Cards shows an increase of 5.1 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and an increase of 9.0 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2011-12 and 2012-13 School Report Cards indicates a 12.1 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in reading and a 1.7 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in math for the non-duplicated gap group.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 44.1 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 37.5.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 31.5 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 30.8.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure A.2, "Student has equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support," was evident or very evident in 91% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure B.2, "Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable," was evident or very evident in 86% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure B.4, "Student is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks," was evident or very evident in 77% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure B.5, "Student is asked and responds to questions that require higher order thinking (e.g., applying, evaluating, synthesizing)," was evident or very evident in 77% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

The following numbers of stakeholders completed the surveys referenced below – 94 parents, 15 staff members, and 324 students.

- According to staff survey data, 76.5% agree/strongly 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.”
- According to student survey data, 62.6% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school provides me with challenging curriculum and learning experiences.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- A review of curriculum documents and stakeholder interviews shows that like courses have pacing guides and common assessments that have been approved by the principal using a rubric to ensure assessment quality. Also, like classes develop, implement, and assess common learning targets. The school had a 24.7 point increase in College and Career Readiness from the 2011-12 school year to the 2012-13 school year.

3.2	Curriculum, instruction, and assessment are monitored and adjusted systematically in response to data from multiple assessments of student learning and an examination of professional practice.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 3
Performance levels			
	4	Using data from multiple assessments of student learning and an examination of professional practice, school personnel systematically monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.	
X	3	Using data from student assessments and an examination of professional practice, school personnel monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.	
	2	School personnel monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure for vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.	
	1	School personnel rarely or never monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.	
x	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.	
	2	A process is implemented sometimes to ensure alignment when curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.	
	1	No process exists to ensure alignment when curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.	
	4	The continuous improvement process has clear guidelines to ensure that vertical and horizontal alignment as well as alignment with the school’s purpose are maintained and enhanced in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.	
X	3	The continuous improvement process ensures that vertical and horizontal alignment as well as alignment with the school’s purpose are maintained and enhanced in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.	
	2	There is limited evidence that the continuous improvement process ensures vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school’s purpose in curriculum, instruction, and	

		assessment.
	1	There is little or no evidence that the continuous improvement process is connected with vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school's purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Presentation by members of the leadership team		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Stakeholder interviews		
Review of documents and artifacts		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The School Report Card for 2012-13 indicates growth in each of the accountability areas from the 2011-12 School Report Card.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card indicates that the NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculations of the Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability are below the state average in the content areas of math and on-demand writing, while English, science, social studies, and language mechanics are just above the state average, as shown in the table below:

2012-13 Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science / Biology		Social St / US History		Writing/On Demand		Language Mechanics	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
61.9	61.0	36.0	55.6	64.0	58.1	60.1	59.8	62.4	68.9	69.7	69.0

- Student performance data from the 2012-13 School Report Card classifies the school as a proficient and progressing school based on the Learners Overall Accountability Score of 60.6 and a ranking at the 78th percentile, which is a significant increase from the 2011-12 overall score of 46.4 and ranking at the 14th percentile.
- Data from the 2012-13 School Report Card shows an increase in all of the five areas of the Next Generation Learners Accountability points, as shown in the table below:

Achievement		Gap		Growth		CCR		Graduation Rate	
11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13*
53.3	57.2	23.3	33.7	52.4	59.4	33.4	58.1	69.2	95.0
	+3.9		+10.4		+7.0		+24.7		+25.8

*Cohort Graduation Rate

- A comparison of the 2011-12 and the 2012-13 School Report Cards for College and Career Readiness (CCR) indicates an increase in the total points from 33.4 to 58.1. On the ACT, the percentage of students meeting the benchmark increased from 43.1% to 45.3% in English. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark increased in math from 23.6% to 26.6% and decreased in reading from 41.0% to 38.1%.
- A comparison of growth data from the 2011-12 to 2012-13 School Report Cards shows an increase of 5.1 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and an increase of 9.0 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2011-12 and 2012-13 School Report Cards indicates a 12.1 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in reading and a 1.7 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in math for the non-duplicated gap group.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 44.1 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 37.5.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 31.5 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 30.8.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure B.2, "Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable," was evident or very evident in 86% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

The following numbers of stakeholders completed the surveys referenced below: 15 staff members and 324 students.

- According to staff survey data, 88.2% agree/strongly 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."
- According to student survey data, 69.0% agree/strongly agree with the statement, "My school gives me multiple assessments to check my understanding of what was taught."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Professional learning communities meet weekly with a focus on curriculum, instruction, and assessment. One example of this is the creation of “hot lists” where students are identified as needing additional support. It is evident data driven decision making is common practice. Evidence suggests that multiple assessments are used to monitor and adjust instruction including common assessments, MAP and EPAS data, and daily formative assessments. The principal and assistant principal conduct weekly lesson plan checks and provide timely feedback to ensure improved professional practice. Departments meet quarterly for Data Nights during which assessments are created and reviewed for quality.

3.3	Teachers engage students in their learning through instructional strategies that ensure achievement of learning expectations.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 2
-----	---	--------------------	------------------

Performance levels

	4	Teachers are consistent and deliberate in planning and using instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.
	3	Teachers plan and use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.
X	2	Teachers sometimes use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.
	1	Teachers rarely or never use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.
	4	Teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of each student.
	3	Teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students when necessary.
X	2	Teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of groups of students when necessary.
	1	Teachers seldom or never personalize instructional strategies.
	4	Teachers consistently use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.
	3	Teachers use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.
X	2	Teachers sometimes use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.
	1	Teachers rarely or never use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.

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

Presentation by members of the leadership team
Self-Assessment
Executive Summary
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

x	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Research implement, and monitor the effective use of research-based instructional strategies to support individual learning needs. In addition, integrate student use of technology as instructional resources and learning tools.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The School Report Card for 2012-13 indicates growth in each of the accountability areas from the 2011-12 School Report Card.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card indicates that the NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculations of the Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability are below the state average in the content areas of math and on-demand writing, while English, science, social studies, and language mechanics are just above the state average, as shown in the table below:

2012-13 Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science / Biology		Social St / US History		Writing/On Demand		Language Mechanics	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
61.9	61.0	36.0	55.6	64.0	58.1	60.1	59.8	62.4	68.9	69.7	69.0

- Student performance data from the 2012-13 School Report Card classifies the school as a proficient and progressing school based on the Learners Overall Accountability Score of 60.6 and a ranking at the 78th percentile, which is a significant increase from the 2011-12 overall score of 46.4 and ranking at the 14th percentile.
- Data from the 2012-13 School Report Card shows an increase in all of the five areas of the Next Generation Learners Accountability points, as shown in the table below:

Achievement		Gap		Growth		CCR		Graduation Rate	
11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13*
53.3	57.2	23.3	33.7	52.4	59.4	33.4	58.1	69.2	95.0
	+3.9		+10.4		+7.0		+24.7		+25.8

*Cohort Graduation Rate

- A comparison of the 2011-12 and the 2012-13 School Report Cards for College and Career Readiness (CCR) indicates an increase in the total points from 33.4 to 58.1. On the ACT, the percentage of students meeting benchmark increased from 43.1% to 45.3% in English. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark increased in math from 23.6% to 26.6% and decreased in reading from 41.0% to 38.1%.
- A comparison of growth data from the 2011-12 to 2012-13 School Report Cards shows an increase of 5.1 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and an increase of 9.0 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2011-12 and 2012-13 School Report Cards indicates a 12.1 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient and distinguished level in reading and a 1.7 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient and distinguished level in math for the non-duplicated gap group.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 44.1 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 37.5.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 31.5 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 30.8.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure A.1, "Student has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs," was evident or very evident in only 32% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure B.4, "Student is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks," was evident or very evident in 77% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure B.5, "Student is asked and responds to questions that require higher order thinking (e.g., applying, evaluating, synthesizing)," was evident or very evident in 77% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure D.1, "Student has several opportunities to engage in discussions with teacher and other students," was evident or very evident in 77% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure D.3, "Student is actively engaged in the learning activities," was evident or very evident in 73% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure F4, "Student collaborates with other students during student-centered activities," was evident or very evident in 45% of the team's observations.

- ELEOT measure G.1, “Student uses digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning,” was evident or very evident in 18% of the team’s observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

The following numbers of stakeholders completed the surveys referenced below: 94 parents, 15 staff members, and 324 students.

- According to parent survey data, 49.1% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers use a variety of teaching strategies and learning activities.”
- According to parent survey data, 38.8% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers meet his/her learning needs by individualizing instruction.”
- According to parent survey data, 39.4% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My child sees a relationship between what is being taught and his/her everyday life.”
- According to parent survey data, 71.4% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My child has up-to-date computers and other technology to learn.”
- According to staff survey data, 76.5% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students.”
- According to staff survey data, 82.4% agree/strongly 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.”
- According to staff survey data, 82.4% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use a variety of technologies as instructional resources.”
- According to student survey data, 53.1% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school motivates me to learn new things.”
- According to student survey data, 24.8% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers change their teaching to meet my learning needs.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholders indicated that there is a need to improve in the area of technology as an instructional resource. Examples include the addition of more SMART boards and clicker sets across the building. In addition, ELEOT data tied to digitals tools was below 20% across the board in the team’s observations.

3.4	School leaders monitor and support the improvement of instructional practices of teachers to ensure student success.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 3
Performance levels			
	4	School leaders formally and consistently monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures beyond classroom observation to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.	
X	3	School leaders formally and consistently monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.	

2	School leaders monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.
1	School leaders occasionally or randomly monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The School Report Card for 2012-13 indicates growth in each of the accountability areas from the 2011-12 School Report Card.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card indicates that the NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculations of the Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability are

below the state average in the content areas of math and on-demand writing, while English, science, social studies, and language mechanics are just above the state average, as shown in the table below:

2012-13 Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science / Biology		Social St / US History		Writing/On Demand		Language Mechanics	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
61.9	61.0	36.0	55.6	64.0	58.1	60.1	59.8	62.4	68.9	69.7	69.0

- Student performance data from the 2012-13 School Report Card classifies the school as a proficient and progressing school based on the Learners Overall Accountability Score of 60.6 and a ranking at the 78th percentile, which is a significant increase from the 2011-12 overall score of 46.4 and ranking at the 14th percentile.
- Data from the 2012-13 School Report Card shows an increase in all of the five areas of the Next Generation Learners Accountability points, as shown in the table below:

Achievement		Gap		Growth		CCR		Graduation Rate	
11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13*
53.3	57.2	23.3	33.7	52.4	59.4	33.4	58.1	69.2	95.0
	+3.9		+10.4		+7.0		+24.7		+25.8

*Cohort Graduation Rate

- A comparison of the 2011-12 and the 2012-13 School Report Cards for College and Career Readiness (CCR) indicates an increase in the total points from 33.4 to 58.1. On the ACT, the percentage of students meeting benchmark increased from 43.1% to 45.3% in English. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark increased in math from 23.6% to 26.6% and decreased in reading from 41.0% to 38.1%.
- A comparison of growth data from the 2011-2012 to 2012-2013 School Report Cards shows an increase of 5.1 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and an increase of 9.0 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2011-12 and 2012-13 School Report Cards indicates a 12.1 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in reading and a 1.7 point increase in math for students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level for the non-duplicated gap group.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 44.1 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 37.5.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 31.5 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 30.8.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure B.2, "Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable," was evident or very evident in 86% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- The principal and assistant principal conduct weekly lesson plan checks and provide timely feedback to ensure improved professional practice. The principal monitors the work of the Professional Learning Communities by attending or reviewing their agendas and minutes. The School Instructional Leadership Team (SILT) meets regularly to review school data and progress toward SMART goals. Also, the principal and assistant principal provide coaching sessions after walkthroughs if needed.

3.5	Teachers participate in collaborative learning communities to improve instruction and student learning.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 3
-----	---	--------------------	------------------

Performance levels

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

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

Presentation by members of the leadership team
Self-Assessment
Executive Summary

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The School Report Card for 2012-13 indicates growth in each of the accountability areas from the 2011-12 School Report Card.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card indicates that the NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculations of the Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability are below the state average in the content areas of math and on-demand writing, while English, science, social studies, and language mechanics are just above the state average, as shown in the table below:

2012-13 Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science / Biology		Social St / US History		Writing/On Demand		Language Mechanics	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
61.9	61.0	36.0	55.6	64.0	58.1	60.1	59.8	62.4	68.9	69.7	69.0

- Student performance data from the 2012-13 School Report Card classifies the school as a proficient and progressing school based on the Learners Overall Accountability Score of 60.6 and a ranking at

the 78th percentile, which is a significant increase from the 2011-12 overall score of 46.4 and ranking at the 14th percentile.

- Data from the 2012-13 School Report Card shows an increase in all of the five areas of the Next Generation Learners Accountability points, as shown in the table below:

Achievement		Gap		Growth		CCR		Graduation Rate	
11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13*
53.3	57.2	23.3	33.7	52.4	59.4	33.4	58.1	69.2	95.0
	+3.9		+10.4		+7.0		+24.7		+25.8

*Cohort Graduation Rate

- A comparison of the 2011-12 and the 2012-13 School Report Cards for College and Career Readiness (CCR) indicates an increase in the total points from 33.4 to 58.1. On the ACT, the percentage of students meeting the benchmark increased from 43.1% to 45.3% in English. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark increased in math from 23.6% to 26.6% and decreased in reading from 41.0% to 38.1%.
- A comparison of growth data from the 2011-12 to 2012-13 School Report Cards shows an increase of 5.1 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and an increase of 9.0 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2011-12 and 2012-13 School Report Cards indicates a 12.1 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in reading and a 1.7 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in math for the non-duplicated gap group.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 44.1 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 37.5.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 31.5 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 30.8.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure B.2, “Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable,” was evident or very evident in 86% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure B.4, “Student is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks,” was evident or very evident in 77% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

The following numbers of stakeholders completed the surveys referenced below: 94 parents and 15 staff members.

- According to parent survey data, 39.1% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers work as a team to help my child learn.”
- According to staff data, 88.2% agree/strongly 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).”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- The principal explained that all members of the staff serve on a professional learning community except two due to scheduling conflicts. In addition, several members of the staff attended a national professional learning community training and shared the information with the staff. The review of professional learning community documents indicates the use of norms, regular examination of student work, and reflection. Lastly, as a Teacher Professional Growth and Effectiveness System pilot school, peer observers are trained and provide coaching.

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

Performance levels

	4	All teachers systematically use an instructional process that clearly informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
	3	All teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
X	2	Most teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
	1	Few teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
	4	Exemplars are provided to guide and inform students.
	3	Exemplars are often provided to guide and inform students.
X	2	Exemplars are sometimes provided to guide and inform students.
	1	Exemplars are rarely provided to guide and inform students.
	4	The process requires the use of multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction and provide data for possible curriculum revision.
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)

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

x	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Provide training, monitoring and support to increase the use of exemplars and effective feedback in support of student learning.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The School Report Card for 2012-13 indicates growth in each of the accountability areas from the 2011-12 School Report Card.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card indicates that the NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculations of the Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability are below the state average in the content areas of math and on-demand writing, while English, science, social studies, and language mechanics are just above the state average, as shown in the table below:

2012-13 Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science / Biology		Social St / US History		Writing/On Demand		Language Mechanics	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
61.9	61.0	36.0	55.6	64.0	58.1	60.1	59.8	62.4	68.9	69.7	69.0

- Student performance data from the 2012-13 School Report Card classifies the school as a proficient and progressing school based on the Learners Overall Accountability Score of 60.6 and a ranking at the 78th percentile, which is a significant increase from the 2011-12 overall score of 46.4 and ranking at the 14th percentile.

- Data from the 2012-13 School Report Card shows an increase in all of the five areas of the Next Generation Learners Accountability points, as shown in the table below:

Achievement		Gap		Growth		CCR		Graduation Rate	
11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13*
53.3	57.2	23.3	33.7	52.4	59.4	33.4	58.1	69.2	95.0
	+3.9		+10.4		+7.0		+24.7		+25.8

*Cohort Graduation Rate

- A comparison of the 2011-12 and the 2012-13 School Report Cards for College and Career Readiness (CCR) indicates an increase in the total points from 33.4 to 58.1. On the ACT, the percentage of students meeting benchmark increased from 43.1% to 45.3% in English. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark increased in math from 23.6% to 26.6% and decreased in reading from 41.0% to 38.1%.
- A comparison of growth data from the 2011-12 to 2012-13 School Report Cards shows an increase of 5.1 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and an increase of 9.0 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2011-12 and 2012-13 School Report Cards indicates a 12.1 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in reading and a 1.7 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in math for the non-duplicated gap group.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 44.1 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 37.5.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 31.5 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 30.8.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure B.2, "Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable," was evident or very evident in 86% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure B.3, "Student is provided exemplars of high quality work," was evident or very evident in 50% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure B.4, "Student is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks," was evident or very evident in 77% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure C.5, "Student is provided additional/alternative instruction and feedback at the appropriate level of challenge for her/his needs," was evident or very evident in 50% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure E.2, "Student responds to teacher feedback to improve understanding," was evident or very evident in 41% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure E.3, "Student demonstrates or verbalizes understanding of the lesson/content," was evident or very evident in 68% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure E.4, "Student understands how her/his work is assessed," was evident or very evident in 50% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

The following numbers of stakeholders completed the surveys referenced below: 94 parents and 324 students.

- According to parent survey data, 71.4% agree/strongly agree with the statement, "My child knows the expectations for learning in all classes."
- According to parent survey data, 64.8% agree/strongly agree with the statement, "My child is given multiple assessments to measure his/her understanding of what was taught."

- According to student survey data, 63.5% agree/strongly 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.”
- According to student survey data, 63.2% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers explain their expectations for learning and behavior so I can be successful.”
- According to student survey data, 66.3% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers use tests, projects, presentations, and portfolios to check my understanding of what was taught.”
- According to student survey data, 62.6% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers provide me with information about my learning and grades.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Evidence suggests that teachers include multiple measures to inform the ongoing modification of instruction. These measures include common assessments, MAP, EPAS, and classroom formative assessments. However, evidence suggests inconsistent use of exemplars to inform students.

3.7	Mentoring, coaching, and induction programs support instructional improvement consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 3
Performance levels			
	4	All school personnel are engaged in systematic mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
X	3	School personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	2	Some school personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	1	Few or no school personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	4	These programs set high expectations for all school personnel and include valid and reliable measures of performance.	
X	3	These programs set expectations for all school personnel and include measures of performance.	
	2	These programs set expectations for school personnel.	
	1	Limited or no expectations for school personnel are included.	
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)			
Presentation by members of the leadership team			
Self-Assessment			
Executive Summary			
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment			
KDE School Report Card			
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data			

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The School Report Card for 2012-13 indicates growth in each of the accountability areas from the 2011-12 School Report Card.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card indicates that the NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculations of the Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability are below the state average in the content areas of math and on-demand writing, while English, science, social studies, and language mechanics are just above the state average, as shown in the table below:

2012-13 Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science / Biology		Social St / US History		Writing/On Demand		Language Mechanics	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
61.9	61.0	36.0	55.6	64.0	58.1	60.1	59.8	62.4	68.9	69.7	69.0

- Student performance data from the 2012-13 School Report Card classifies the school as a proficient and progressing school based on the Learners Overall Accountability Score of 60.6 and a ranking at

the 78th percentile, which is a significant increase from the 2011-12 overall score of 46.4 and ranking at the 14th percentile.

- Data from the 2012-13 School Report Card shows an increase in all of the five areas of the Next Generation Learners Accountability points, as shown in the table below:

Achievement		Gap		Growth		CCR		Graduation Rate	
11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13*
53.3	57.2	23.3	33.7	52.4	59.4	33.4	58.1	69.2	95.0
	+3.9		+10.4		+7.0		+24.7		+25.8

*Cohort Graduation Rate

- A comparison of the 2011-12 and the 2012-13 School Report Cards for College and Career Readiness (CCR) indicates an increase in the total points from 33.4 to 58.1. On the ACT, the percentage of students meeting the benchmark increased from 43.1% to 45.3% in English. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark increased in math from 23.6% to 26.6% and decreased in reading from 41.0% to 38.1%.
- A comparison of growth data from the 2011-12 to 2012-13 School Report Cards shows an increase of 5.1 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and an increase of 9.0 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2011-12 and 2012-13 School Report Cards indicates a 12.1 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in reading and a 1.7 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in math for the non-duplicated gap group.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 44.1 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 37.5.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 31.5 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 30.8.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

The following evidence is based on 15 staff surveys:

- According to staff survey data, 76.5% agree/strongly agree with the statement, "In our school, staff members provide peer coaching to teachers."
- According to staff survey data, 76.5% agree/strongly agree with the statement, "In our school, a formal process is in place to support new staff members in their professional practice."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Lawrence County High School participates in the district "TARGET" induction and coaching program. It is a comprehensive process to support teachers in a multi-tiered approach which may span multiple years. In addition, KTIP and MAT teachers are provided a mentor within the building. Also, the principal and assistant principal provide coaching to their teachers.

3.8	The school engages families in meaningful ways in their children's education and keeps them informed of their children's learning progress	School Rating 2	Team Rating 3
Performance levels			
4	Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children's education are designed, implemented, and evaluated.		

x	3	Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children’s education are designed and implemented.
	2	Programs that engage families in their children’s education are available.
	1	Few or no programs that engage families in their children’s education are available.
	4	Families have multiple ways of staying informed of their children’s learning progress.
	3	School personnel regularly inform families of their children’s learning progress.
x	2	School personnel provide information about children’s learning.
	1	School personnel provide little relevant information about children’s learning.
Evidence Reviewed		
Presentation by members of the leadership team		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Stakeholder interviews		
Review of documents and artifacts		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The School Report Card for 2012-13 indicates growth in each of the accountability areas from the 2011-12 School Report Card.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card indicates that the NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculations of the Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability are below the state average in the content areas of math and on-demand writing, while English, science, social studies, and language mechanics are just above the state average, as shown in the table below:

2012-13 Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science / Biology		Social St / US History		Writing/On Demand		Language Mechanics	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
61.9	61.0	36.0	55.6	64.0	58.1	60.1	59.8	62.4	68.9	69.7	69.0

- Student performance data from the 2012-13 School Report Card classifies the school as a proficient and progressing school based on the Learners Overall Accountability Score of 60.6 and a ranking at the 78th percentile, which is a significant increase from the 2011-12 overall score of 46.4 and ranking at the 14th percentile.
- Data from the 2012-13 School Report Card shows an increase in all of the five areas of the Next Generation Learners Accountability points, as shown in the table below:

Achievement		Gap		Growth		CCR		Graduation Rate	
11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13*
53.3	57.2	23.3	33.7	52.4	59.4	33.4	58.1	69.2	95.0
	+3.9		+10.4		+7.0		+24.7		+25.8

*Cohort Graduation Rate

- A comparison of the 2011-12 and the 2012-13 School Report Cards for College and Career Readiness (CCR) indicates an increase in the total points from 33.4 to 58.1. On the ACT, the percentage of students meeting benchmark increased from 43.1% to 45.3% in English. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark increased in math from 23.6% to 26.6% and decreased in reading from 41.0% to 38.1%.
- A comparison of growth data from the 2011-2012 to 2012-2013 School Report Cards shows an increase of 5.1 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and an increase of 9.0 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2011-12 and 2012-13 School Report Cards indicates a 12.1 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in reading and a 1.7 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in math for the non-duplicated gap group.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 44.1 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 37.5.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 31.5 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 30.8.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

The following evidence is based on 15 staff surveys:

- According to staff survey data, 70.6% agree/strongly agree with the statement, "In our school, all school personnel regularly engage families in their children's learning progress."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

The school communicates with families in a variety of ways including but not limited to:

- Weekly Overview via Infinite Campus Portal
- Remind 101
- School and Community Days
- Website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Edmodo

In addition, the school has a comprehensive communication plan.

3.9	The school has a formal structure whereby each student is well known by at least one adult advocate in the school who supports that student's educational experience.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 3
Performance levels			
	4	School personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student and related adults.	
x	3	School personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student.	
	2	School personnel participate in a structure that gives them interaction with individual students, allowing them to build relationships over time with the student.	
	1	Few or no opportunities exist for school personnel to build long-term interaction with individual students.	
X	4	All students participate in the structure.	
	3	All students may participate in the structure.	
	2	Most students participate in the structure.	
	4	The structure allows the school employee to gain significant insight into and serve as an advocate for the student's needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.	
x	3	The structure allows the school employee to gain insight into and serve as an advocate for the student's needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.	
	2	The structure allows the school employee to gain insight into the student's needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.	
	1	Few or no students have a school employee who advocates for their needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.	
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)			
Presentation by members of the leadership team			
Self-Assessment			
Executive Summary			
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment			
KDE School Report Card			
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data			
ELEOT Classroom Observation data			
Stakeholder interviews			

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The School Report Card for 2012-13 indicates growth in each of the accountability areas from the 2011-12 School Report Card.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card indicates that the NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculations of the Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability are below the state average in the content areas of math and on-demand writing, while English, science, social studies, and language mechanics are just above the state average, as shown in the table below:

2012-13 Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science / Biology		Social St / US History		Writing/On Demand		Language Mechanics	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
61.9	61.0	36.0	55.6	64.0	58.1	60.1	59.8	62.4	68.9	69.7	69.0

- Student performance data from the 2012-13 School Report Card classifies the school as a proficient and progressing school based on the Learners Overall Accountability Score of 60.6 and a ranking at the 78th percentile, which is a significant increase from the 2011-12 overall score of 46.4 and ranking at the 14th percentile.
- Data from the 2012-13 School Report Card shows an increase in all of the five areas of the Next Generation Learners Accountability points, as shown in the table below:

Achievement		Gap		Growth		CCR		Graduation Rate	
11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13*
53.3	57.2	23.3	33.7	52.4	59.4	33.4	58.1	69.2	95.0
	+3.9		+10.4		+7.0		+24.7		+25.8

*Cohort Graduation Rate

- A comparison of the 2011-12 and the 2012-13 School Report Cards for College and Career Readiness (CCR) indicates an increase in the total points from 33.4 to 58.1. On the ACT, the percentage of students meeting benchmark increased from 43.1% to 45.3% in English. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark increased in math from 23.6% to 26.6% and decreased in reading from 41.0% to 38.1%.
- A comparison of growth data from the 2011-12 to 2012-13 School Report Cards shows an increase of 5.1 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and an increase of 9.0 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2011-12 and 2012-13 School Report Cards indicates a 12.1 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in reading and a 1.7 point increase in math for students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level for the non-duplicated gap group.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 44.1 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 37.5.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 31.5 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 30.8.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure C.1, "Student demonstrates or expresses that learning experiences are positive," was evident or very evident in 86% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure C.2, "Student demonstrates positive attitude about the classroom and learning," was evident or very evident in 86% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

The following numbers of stakeholders completed surveys: 94 parents and 15 staff members.

- According to parent survey data, 59.2% agree/strongly agree with the statement, "My child has at least one adult advocate in the school."
- According to staff survey data, 76.5% agree/strongly 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."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- All students participate in the school's Advisor/Advisee structure that provides long term interaction with the same adult for a minimum of three years. Students meet regularly with their mentor teacher, who serves as an advocate for the students. Sample activities include grade and attendance checks, student data review, and goal setting.

3.10	Grading and reporting are based on clearly defined criteria that represent the attainment of content knowledge and skills and are consistent across grade levels and courses.	School Rating 3	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)		
Presentation by members of the leadership team		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Stakeholder interviews		
Review of documents and artifacts		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

x	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Initiate a collaborative process to examine current grading policies, processes, and procedures. Use the results of this examination to revise grading policies that assure academic grades are based on content knowledge and skills and like courses have the same high expectations.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The School Report Card for 2012-13 indicates growth in each of the accountability areas from the 2011-12 School Report Card.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card indicates that the NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculations of the Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability are below the state average in the content areas of math and on-demand writing, while English, science, social studies, and language mechanics are just above the state average, as shown in the table below:

2012-13 Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science / Biology		Social St / US History		Writing/On Demand		Language Mechanics	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
61.9	61.0	36.0	55.6	64.0	58.1	60.1	59.8	62.4	68.9	69.7	69.0

- Student performance data from the 2012-13 School Report Card classifies the school as a proficient and progressing school based on the Learners Overall Accountability Score of 60.6 and a ranking at the 78th percentile, which is a significant increase from the 2011-12 overall score of 46.4 and ranking at the 14th percentile.
- Data from the 2012-13 School Report Card shows an increase in all of the five areas of the Next Generation Learners Accountability points, as shown in the table below:

Achievement		Gap		Growth		CCR		Graduation Rate	
11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13*
53.3	57.2	23.3	33.7	52.4	59.4	33.4	58.1	69.2	95.0
	+3.9		+10.4		+7.0		+24.7		+25.8

*Cohort Graduation Rate

- A comparison of the 2011-12 and the 2012-13 School Report Cards for College and Career Readiness (CCR) indicates an increase in the total points from 33.4 to 58.1. On the ACT, the percentage of students meeting benchmark increased from 43.1% to 45.3% in English. The

percentage of students meeting the benchmark increased in math from 23.6% to 26.6% and decreased in reading from 41.0% to 38.1%.

- A comparison of growth data from the 2011-12 to 2012-13 School Report Cards shows an increase of 5.1 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and an increase of 9.0 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2011-12 and 2012-13 School Report Cards indicates a 12.1 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in reading and a 1.7 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in math for the non-duplicated gap group.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 44.1 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 37.5.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 31.5 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 30.8.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure E.1, “Student is asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning,” was evident or very evident in 55% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure E.4, “Student understands how her/his work is assessed,” was evident or very evident in 50% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure E.5, “Student has opportunities to revise/improve work based on feedback,” was evident or very evident in 41% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

The following numbers of stakeholders completed surveys: 94 parents, 15 staff members and 324 students.

- According to parent survey data, 31.1% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers keep me informed regularly of how my child is being graded.”
- According to parent survey data, 46.7% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers report on my child's progress in easy to understand language.”
- According to student survey data, 33.1% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers keep my family informed of my academic progress.”
- According to student survey data, 61.97% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers fairly grade and evaluate my work.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- All classes use the same grading scale; however, there is no evidence to support that grading procedures are consistent across grade levels and courses.

3.11	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 3
Performance levels			
	4	All staff members participate in a rigorous, continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school’s purpose and direction.	
X	3	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school’s purpose and direction.	

	2	Most staff members participate in a program of professional learning that is aligned with the school's purpose and direction.
	1	Few or no staff members participate in professional learning.
	4	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school and the individual.
X	3	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school.
	2	Professional development is based on the needs of the school.
	1	Professional development, when available, may or may not address the needs of the school or build capacity among staff members.
	4	The program builds measurable capacity among all professional and support staff.
X	3	The program builds capacity among all professional and support staff.
	2	The program builds capacity among staff members who participate.
	4	The program is rigorously and systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.
	3	The program is systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.
x	2	The program is regularly evaluated for effectiveness.
	1	If a program exists, it is rarely and/or randomly evaluated.

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

Presentation by members of the leadership team

Self-Assessment

Executive Summary

Previous KDE Leadership Assessment

KDE School Report Card

AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data

ELEOT Classroom Observation data

Stakeholder interviews

Review of documents and artifacts

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The School Report Card for 2012-13 indicates growth in each of the accountability areas from the 2011-12 School Report Card.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card indicates that the NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculations of the Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability are below the state average in the content areas of math and on-demand writing, while English, science, social studies, and language mechanics are just above the state average, as shown in the table below:

2012-13 Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science / Biology		Social St / US History		Writing/On Demand		Language Mechanics	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
61.9	61.0	36.0	55.6	64.0	58.1	60.1	59.8	62.4	68.9	69.7	69.0

- Student performance data from the 2012-13 School Report Card classifies the school as a proficient and progressing school based on the Learners Overall Accountability Score of 60.6 and a ranking at the 78th percentile, which is a significant increase from the 2011-12 overall score of 46.4 and ranking at the 14th percentile.
- Data from the 2012-13 School Report Card shows an increase in all of the five areas of the Next Generation Learners Accountability points, as shown in the table below:

Achievement		Gap		Growth		CCR		Graduation Rate	
11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13*
53.3	57.2	23.3	33.7	52.4	59.4	33.4	58.1	69.2	95.0
	+3.9		+10.4		+7.0		+24.7		+25.8

*Cohort Graduation Rate

- A comparison of the 2011-12 and the 2012-13 School Report Cards for College and Career Readiness (CCR) indicates an increase in the total points from 33.4 to 58.1. On the ACT, the percentage of students meeting benchmark increased from 43.1% to 45.3% in English. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark increased in math from 23.6% to 26.6% and decreased in reading from 41.0% to 38.1%.
- A comparison of growth data from the 2011-12 to 2012-13 School Report Cards shows an increase of 5.1 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and an increase of 9.0 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2011-12 and 2012-13 School Report Cards indicates a 12.1 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in reading and a 1.7 point increase in math for students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level for the non-duplicated gap group.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 44.1 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 37.5.

- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 31.5 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 30.8.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure B.2, “Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable,” was evident or very evident in 86% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT measure B.4, “Student is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks,” was evident or very evident in 77% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

The following evidence is based on responses from 15 staff members.

- According to staff survey data, 94.1% agree/strongly 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.”
- According to staff survey data, 88.2% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all staff members participate in continuous professional learning based on identified needs of the school.”
- According to staff survey data, 88.2% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, a professional learning program is designed to build capacity among all professional and support staff members.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- The team’s observations, stakeholder interviews, and document and artifact reviews suggest that professional development is based on the needs of the school and individual teachers. Furthermore, the professional development is focused and builds capacity among professional and support staff. Last, each professional development session is evaluated using the plus/delta quality tool. Stakeholders report that professional development is flexible and targeted to department or teacher needs. Topics of recent professional development include PGES, PLC training, PLTW training, literacy cadre, hub school visits, differentiation and learning styles, data analysis, identifying target students and how to best support them, book studies with English PLCs, and Lisa Matthews for Math.

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

	3	School personnel stay current on research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related learning support services to all students.
x	2	School personnel are familiar with research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related learning support services to students within these special populations.
	1	School personnel provide or coordinate some learning support services to students within these special populations.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Presentation by members of the leadership team		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Stakeholder interviews		
Review of documents and artifacts		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Refine the Advisor/Advisee time to identify and better meet the unique learning needs of all students. Continue professional development in research-based differentiation and the unique learning needs of all students, e.g. learning styles, multiple intelligences, and personality type indicators. Develop a tool to regularly evaluate the effectiveness of the Advisor/Advisee structure.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The School Report Card for 2012-13 indicates growth in each of the accountability areas from the 2011-12 School Report Card.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card indicates that the NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculations of the Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability are below the state average in the content areas of math and on-demand writing, while English, science, social studies, and language mechanics are just above the state average, as shown in the table below:

2012-13 Next Generation Achievement Scores for Accountability

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science / Biology		Social St / US History		Writing/On Demand		Language Mechanics	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
61.9	61.0	36.0	55.6	64.0	58.1	60.1	59.8	62.4	68.9	69.7	69.0

- Student performance data from the 2012-13 School Report Card classifies the school as a proficient and progressing school based on the Learners Overall Accountability Score of 60.6 and a ranking at the 78th percentile, which is a significant increase from the 2011-12 overall score of 46.4 and ranking at the 14th percentile.
- Data from the 2012-13 School Report Card shows an increase in all of the five areas of the Next Generation Learners Accountability points, as shown in the table below:

Achievement		Gap		Growth		CCR		Graduation Rate	
11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13*
53.3	57.2	23.3	33.7	52.4	59.4	33.4	58.1	69.2	95.0
	+3.9		+10.4		+7.0		+24.7		+25.8

*Cohort Graduation Rate

- A comparison of the 2011-12 and the 2012-13 School Report Cards for College and Career Readiness (CCR) indicates an increase in the total points from 33.4 to 58.1. On the ACT, the percentage of students meeting benchmark increased from 43.1% to 45.3% in English. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark increased in math from 23.6% to 26.6% and decreased in reading from 41.0% to 38.1%.
- A comparison of growth data from the 2011-12 to 2012-13 School Report Cards shows an increase of 5.1 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and an increase of 9.0 points in the percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2011-12 and 2012-13 School Report Cards indicates a 12.1 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in reading and a 1.7 point increase in the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in math for the non-duplicated gap group.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 44.1 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 37.5.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 31.5 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 30.8.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure A.1, "Student has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs," was evident or very evident in 32% of the team's observations.

- ELEOT measure C.4, “Student is provided support and assistance to understand content and accomplish tasks,” was evident or very evident in 68% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

The following numbers of stakeholders completed surveys: 94 parents and 324 students.

- According to parent survey data, 48.6% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My child has access to support services based on his/her identified needs.”
- According to student survey data, 50.9% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school provides learning services for me according to my needs.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

The school offers a variety of support services. These include:

- Daily Advisor/Advisee time
- ESS
- Youth Service Center
- Career counselor
- Academic counselor
- Grab and Go Breakfast
- School nurse
- Pathways
- Occupational/Physical therapist
- Alternate school

Also, the school is participating in the Co-Teaching for Gap Closure initiative.

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.

It is obvious from our visit to the school and a review of documents and artifacts that school leadership and staff are intentional about their efforts to improve student achievement. It is evident that the systems work has been ingrained throughout the building and district, with the leadership and classroom teachers using systems tools to continuously improve student achievement. Stakeholders report that systems and the use of data are, "...how we do business."

Another theme that emerges includes the systematic lesson plan and common assessment check protocol that has been developed and implemented to improve teacher instruction and student achievement. In addition, it is evident that data-driven decision making is used consistently to inform instructional decisions. One example is the school's commitment to providing time and support for the teachers to analyze data with the quarterly data nights. Collaboration and shared leadership also emerge from the team's observation and document review. Examples of this include the SILT, DILT, co-teaching initiative, and improved two-way communication. Finally, multiple stakeholders report that "...we are a family" and it is evident that the administration and staff of the school support one another and work diligently to reduce the barriers for students to ultimately improve student achievement.

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 Lawrence County High School.

Deficiency 1: The principal has not held all teachers accountable for consistently delivering rigorous and high quality instruction to all students.

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

Team evidence:

- Leadership Team's presentation
- Principal's Deficiency Self-Assessment
- School documents and artifacts
- Self-Assessment
- Student performance data
- Stakeholder survey data
- ELEOT data
- Stakeholder interviews

Team comments:

The principal has implemented a number of strategies to hold all teachers accountable for the consistent delivery of rigorous and high quality instruction to all students.

Examples of these strategies include:

- Weekly lesson plan checks and walkthroughs
- Best Practice calibration walkthroughs
- Teacher coaching and feedback sessions
- Common assessment rigor analysis worksheets
- District Data Days
- Participation in the Co-Teaching for Gap Closure (CT4GC) initiative

Deficiency 2: The principal does not include all stakeholders in the school improvement process to increase student achievement.

School/District	Team	
		This deficiency has been addressed in an exemplary manner.
x	x	This deficiency has been addressed satisfactorily.
		This deficiency has been partially addressed.

		There is little or no evidence of improvement with regard to this deficiency.
--	--	---

<p>Team evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership Team’s presentation • Principal’s Deficiency Self-Assessment • School documents and artifacts • Self-Assessment • Student performance data • Stakeholder survey data • ELEOT data • Stakeholder interviews
--

<p>Team comments:</p> <p>The principal includes all stakeholders in the school improvement process to increase student achievement. Examples of this include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weekly Review via Infinite Campus • Continued refinement of the school communication plan • Using multiple modes of communication: Facebook, Twitter, e-mail, school web site, Infinite Campus, Remind 101, Automated phone messaging • Work with the Prichard Committee to increase stakeholder involvement • Use of stakeholder surveys to evaluate effectiveness of communication • Building use of plus/delta
--

Deficiency 3: The principal does not coordinate all programs and services for reducing the barriers to student learning.

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

<p>Team evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership Team’s presentation • Principal’s Deficiency Self-Assessment • School documents and artifacts • Self-Assessment • Student performance data • Stakeholder survey data • ELEOT data • Stakeholder interviews
--

<p>Team comments:</p> <p>The principal coordinates programs and services for reducing the barriers to student</p>

learning. Examples to support the coordination of these services include:

- Youth Service Center
- Career and academic counselors
- Grab and Go Breakfast
- School nurse
- Pathways
- Occupational and physical therapist
- “Close the Deal”

Deficiency 4: The principal has not developed personal organizational skills to complete all administrative tasks in a timely manner.

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

Team evidence:

- Leadership Team’s presentation
- Principal’s Deficiency Self-Assessment
- School documents and artifacts
- Self-Assessment
- Student performance data
- Stakeholder survey data
- ELEOT data
- Stakeholder interviews

Team comments:

While this deficiency was written in a specific manner for the prior principal, the current principal has addressed this deficiency in the following ways:

- Use of the school administrative manager time tracker system (SAM)
- Continuous implementation and refinement of systems work
- Leadership structures:
 - Administrative team
 - School Instructional Leadership Team (SILT)
 - Big Rock Teams
 - PLCs
 - Advisory Council
 - Calendar and Monday Message

Deficiency 5: The principal has not implemented financial planning processes to ensure the most effective, efficient, and equitable use of resources to address student needs.

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:

- Leadership Team's presentation
- Principal's Deficiency Self-Assessment
- School documents and artifacts
- Self-Assessment
- Student performance data
- Stakeholder survey data
- ELEOT data
- Stakeholder interviews

Team comments:

The principal has partially implemented financial planning processes to ensure the most effective, efficient, and equitable use of resources to address student needs. Examples to support this deficiency include:

- School budget given to principals from the district at the beginning of the school, monthly, and at the request of the principal.
- Site Based Decision Making Council (Advisory Council) allocations
- School athletic budget- reported to the board of education monthly
- School grants review
- School secretary SEEK binder

Deficiency 6: The principal has not developed a comprehensive plan to ensure that technology is an integral part of instruction.

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:

- Leadership Team's presentation
- Principal's Deficiency Self-Assessment
- School documents and artifacts
- Self-Assessment
- Student performance data
- Stakeholder survey data
- ELEOT data
- Stakeholder interviews

Team comments:

While technology available to teachers has improved, there is not a formal comprehensive plan to further increase student use of technology as an integral part of instruction. However, examples of technology integration include:

- iPad Minis
- Calculators loaded with Zoom App
- SMART boards in math classrooms
- Laptop carts
- New teacher computers
- Document cameras
- CIITS testing
- Clicker systems
- Computer programs including ALEKS, Kahn Academy, Marie Carbo, and APEX

Overall ELEOT Rating

- A. Equitable Learning
- B. High Expectations
- C. Supportive Learning
- D. Active Learning
- E. Progress Monitoring
- F. Well-Managed Learning
- G. Digital Learning

