



Internal District Review Report

Name of Institution

Reviewed: Lawrence County School District

Date: March 10, 2014-March 11, 2014



Introduction

The KDE Internal School/District Review is designed to:

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

The report reflects the team's analysis of 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/district’s curriculum, instructional design, and assessment practices guide and ensure teacher effectiveness and student learning.	School Rating for Standard 3 2.67	Team Rating for Standard 3 2.67
--	--	--

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

3.1	The school/district’s curriculum provides equitable and challenging learning experiences that ensure all students have sufficient opportunities to develop learning, thinking, and life skills that lead to success at the next level.	District Rating 3	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/district’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/District Report Card
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/District Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The School 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.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 interviews, document and artifact review:

- Systems have been established for participation of all teachers in professional learning communities (PLCs). Protocols for review of data and revision of curriculum are in place. Instructional support is provided to improve classroom practices (TARGET program, KTIP, and instructional rounds).

3.2	Curriculum, instruction, and assessment are monitored and adjusted systematically in response to data from multiple assessments of student learning and an examination of professional practice.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 3
-----	--	----------------------	------------------

Performance levels

	4	Using data from multiple assessments of student learning and an examination of professional practice, school/district personnel systematically monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district's goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.
X	3	Using data from student assessments and an examination of professional practice, school/district personnel monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district's goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.
	2	School/district personnel monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure for vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district's goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.
	1	School/district personnel rarely or never monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school/district's goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.
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/district'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/district'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/district's purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
	1	There is little or no evidence that the continuous improvement process is connected with vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school/district's purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

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, 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:

- Data system protocols are well established to review data across the district on a regular basis (bi-weekly meetings). Data from classroom learning checks, formative and summative assessments are reviewed via the PLC process. Instructional and curricular modifications are made based on data collected.

3.3	Teachers engage students in their learning through instructional strategies that ensure achievement of learning expectations.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	Teachers are consistent and deliberate in planning and using instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
	3	Teachers plan and use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
X	2	Teachers sometimes use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	

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

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

Presentation by members of the leadership team

Self-Assessment

Executive Summary

Previous KDE Leadership Assessment

KDE School/District Report Card

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Seek ways to increase the use of engaging techniques that make students active learners in their educational process and strive to reduce the amount of teacher-driven instruction. Investigate and implement engaging instructional strategies in all classrooms that make students true partners in their education (such as student data notebooks, effective use of ILP).

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.1, "Student knows and strives to meet the high expectations established by the teacher," 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.
- 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 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:

- Observations of lessons confirmed the need for greater student involvement in the learning process and an increased effort toward student-directed learning. While students were compliant and well-behaved, many lessons observed were teacher-directed.

3.4	School/district leaders monitor and support the improvement of instructional practices of teachers to ensure student success.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 3
-----	---	----------------------	------------------

Performance levels

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

TELL Survey (TELL Kentucky 2013)

- 91.8% of teachers believe they are held to high professional standards for delivering instruction.
- 79.6% of teachers received feedback that can help them improve teaching.
- 86.5% of teachers reported that evaluation procedures are consistent.
- 91.7% of teachers reported they are encouraged to reflect on their own practice.
- 78.2 of teachers reported that professional development enhances their abilities to improve student learning.

Classroom Observation Data:

- 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.3, “Student Is actively engaged in the learning activities,” was evident or very evident in 73% 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.

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, 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 staff survey data, 94.1% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use a process to inform students of their learning expectations and standards of performance.”
- According to staff survey data, 88.2% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school provide students with specific and timely feedback about their learning.”

- According to staff survey data, 88.2% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use multiple types of assessments to modify instruction and to revise the curriculum.”
- 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.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Teacher professional growth plans are completed, reviewed and utilized for determining some professional development activities. Instructional walkthroughs are conducted on a regular basis with data being collected and utilized to improve instructional practices through initiatives such as the TARGET program, KTIP, and instructional coaching sessions.

3.5	Teachers participate/system operates in collaborative learning communities to improve instruction and student learning.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 3
Performance levels			
	4	All members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule.	
X	3	All members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally.	
	2	Some members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally.	
	1	Collaborative learning communities randomly self-organize and meet informally.	
	4	Frequent collaboration occurs across grade levels and content areas.	
X	3	Collaboration often occurs across grade levels and content areas.	
	2	Collaboration occasionally occurs across grade levels and content areas.	
	1	Collaboration seldom occurs across grade levels and content areas.	
X	4	Staff members implement a formal process that promotes productive discussion about student learning.	
	3	Staff members have been trained to implement a formal process that promotes discussion about student learning.	
	2	Staff members promote discussion about student learning.	
	1	Staff members rarely discuss student learning.	
	4	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching are a part of the daily routine of school/district staff members.	
X	3	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching occur regularly among	

		most school/district personnel.
	2	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching sometimes occur among school/district personnel.
	1	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching rarely occur among school/district personnel.
	4	School/district personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
X	3	School/district personnel indicate that collaboration causes improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
	2	School/district personnel express belief in the value of collaborative learning communities.
	1	School/district personnel see little value in collaborative learning communities.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Presentation by members of the leadership team		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey 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/District Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

TELL Survey (TELL Kentucky 2013)

- 92.8% of teachers reported they work in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices.
- 85.0% of teachers reported that provided supports (i.e. instructional coaching, professional learning communities, etc.) translate to improvements in instructional practices by teachers.

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, 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:

- Professional learning communities (PLCs) have been established district-wide. Protocols for PLC processes and procedures have been established and implemented. Data is collected and reviewed in PLCs and utilized to make instructional decisions to improve student success at all levels.

3.6	Teachers implement the school/system’s instructional process in support of student learning.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	All teachers systematically use an instructional process that clearly informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.	
	3	All teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.	
X	2	Most teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.	
	1	Few teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.	
	4	Exemplars are provided to guide and inform students.	
	3	Exemplars are often provided to guide and inform students.	
X	2	Exemplars are sometimes provided to guide and inform students.	
	1	Exemplars are rarely provided to guide and inform students.	
x	4	The process requires the use of multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction and provide data for possible curriculum revision.	
	3	The process includes multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the	

		ongoing modification of instruction and provide data for possible curriculum revision.
	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/District Report Card		
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/District Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

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

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

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

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Develop and deploy a plan to consistently inform students of learning expectations and provide exemplars to guide student work. While systems for improvement have been established district-wide, further training to increase understanding of the systems approach to school improvement is needed to ensure that all systems are implemented with fidelity. Maintaining the district's current focus on systems implementation is critical as district leadership shifts in the coming year.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The School Report Card for 2012-13 indicates growth in each of the accountability areas from the 2011-2012 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.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 68% 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, 15 staff members, 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 staff survey data, 94.1% agree/strongly agree with the statement, "All teachers in our school use a process to inform students of their learning expectations and standards of performance."
- According to staff survey data, 88.2% agree/strongly agree with the statement, "All teachers in our school provide students with specific and timely feedback about their learning."
- According to staff survey data, 88.2% agree/strongly agree with the statement, "All teachers in our school use multiple types of assessments to modify instruction and to revise the curriculum."
- 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:

- The district's commitment to the systems approach to school improvement is commendable. Leadership's continued efforts to maintain a focus on systems implementation have garnered significant academic gains for students.

3.7	Mentoring, coaching, and induction programs support instructional improvement consistent with the school/system's values and beliefs about teaching and learning.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 3
-----	---	----------------------	------------------

Performance levels

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

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, 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:

- The district-initiated TARGET (Training and Resources for Growing Effective Teachers) program provides multiple levels of support to new teachers, teachers new to the district and teachers in need of instructional support in the classroom. There are four TARGET teachers in the district who provide classroom support and coaching, professional development, and mentoring to teachers in the TARGET Program.

3.8		The school/system engages families in meaningful ways in their children’s education and keeps them informed of their children’s learning progress.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 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.		
X	3	School/district personnel regularly inform families of their children’s learning progress.		
	2	School/district personnel provide information about children’s learning.		
	1	School/district 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
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey 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/District Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Classroom Observation Data:

- 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.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, 15 staff members, and 324 students.

- According to parent survey data, 40.2% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers help me to understand my child’s progress.”
- 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.”
- According to student survey data, 38.0% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school offers opportunities for my family to become involved in school activities and my learning.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Central office administrative staff members spend four days at each school in the district during the school year. This is the first year of implementation for the Town Hall days, with plans for two days at each school next year. During these school visits, central office staff visit classrooms, talk to students and teachers to solicit feedback for improvement and conduct Town Hall style meetings at the end of the school day. The meetings are open to the public and provide an open forum for parents and community members to offer feedback.

3.9	The school/system has a formal structure whereby each student is well known by at least one adult advocate in the school/district who supports that student's educational experience.	District Rating 1	Team Rating 2
-----	---	----------------------	------------------

Performance levels

	4	School/district personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student and related adults.
	3	School/district personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student.
x	2	School/district personnel participate in a structure that gives them interaction with individual students, allowing them to build relationships over time with the student.
	1	Few or no opportunities exist for school/district personnel to build long-term interaction with individual students.
	4	All students participate in the structure.
	3	All students may participate in the structure.
x	2	Most students participate in the structure.
	4	The structure allows the school/district employee to gain significant insight into and serve as an advocate for the student's needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	3	The structure allows the school/district employee to gain insight into and serve as an advocate for the student's needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
x	2	The structure allows the school/district employee to gain insight into the student's needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	1	Few or no students have a school/district employee who advocates for their needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Develop and deploy an intentional advocacy program whereby all students are known by an adult advocate.

Supporting Evidence

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 the surveys referenced below: 94 parents, 15 staff members, and 324 students.

- 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.”
- According to student survey data, 47.2% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school makes sure there is at least one adult who knows me well and shows interest in my education and future.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Currently, there is an Advisor/Advisee program at both the middle school and high school. These programs utilize the resources in the Advising Toolkit to work with students. During interviews conducted with school employees, it was revealed that the process of completing the self-assessment provided awareness to the lack of a focused student advocacy program across the district. Even though students were known individually by their performance data and through participation in special programs, no intentional advocacy program existed. Since completion of the self-assessment, the district has applied for and received grant funding for an advocacy/advisory program (Check and Connect).

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

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

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 the surveys referenced below: 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 staff survey data, 82.4% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use consistent common grading and reporting policies.”
- According to staff survey data, 82.4% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all stakeholders are informed of policies, processes, and procedures related to grading and reporting.”
- 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, 62.0% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers fairly grade and evaluate my work.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- While there are processes and protocols in place to review student data and assessment performance, determination for grades is not consistent within all contents and grade levels. The district has recently deployed a multi-year plan to implement standards-based grading across the district. Currently standards-based grading exists in pockets.

3.11		All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 3
Performance levels				
	4	All staff members participate in a rigorous, continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district’s purpose and direction.		
X	3	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district’s purpose and direction.		
	2	Most staff members participate in a program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district’s purpose and direction.		
	1	Few or no staff members participate in professional learning.		
	4	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school/district and the individual.		
X	3	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school/district.		
	2	Professional development is based on the needs of the school/district.		
	1	Professional development, when available, may or may not address the needs of the school/district or build capacity among staff members.		
	4	The program builds measurable capacity among all professional and support staff.		
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.		
X	3	The program is systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.		
	2	The program is regularly evaluated for effectiveness.		
	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
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
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/District Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

TELL Survey (TELL KY 2013)

- 88.5 % of teachers report that professional development offerings are data-driven.
- 92.5 % of teachers report that professional learning opportunities are aligned with the school’s improvement plan.

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, 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 systems approach to school improvement facilitates continuous improvement for all staff. Through analysis of data, instructional needs are identified and structures are in place (TARGET Program, instructional coaching) to support teachers in improving classroom practice. There are district –wide initiatives that involve all teachers (curriculum alignment, PGES) and professional learning days are provided for ensuring teachers have the training necessary to implement these initiatives.

3.12	The school/system provides and coordinates learning support services to meet the unique learning needs of students.		District Rating 3	Team Rating 3
Performance levels				
X	4	School/district personnel systematically and continuously use data to identify unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency as well as other learning needs (such as second languages).		
	3	School/district personnel use data to identify unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency as well as other learning needs (such as second languages).		
	2	School/district personnel use data to identify unique learning needs of special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs (such as second languages).		
	1	School/district personnel identify special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs (such as second languages).		
	4	School/district personnel stay current on research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related individualized learning support services to all students.		
	3	School/district personnel stay current on research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related learning support services to all students.		
X	2	School/district personnel are familiar with research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related learning support services to students within these special populations.		
	1	School/district personnel provide or coordinate some learning support services to students within these special populations.		
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)				
Presentation by members of the leadership team				
Self-Assessment				
Executive Summary				
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment				
KDE School/District Report Card				
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/District Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

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 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 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 interviews, document and artifact review:

- All school personnel are involved with well-defined data review processes to design and implement a comprehensive instructional program that encourages active participation of all stakeholders to provide a high quality education for all students. The district office houses a data room where all students’ math and reading data is represented and analyzed to guide improvement efforts.

Standard 3 Overview

A brief narrative overview concludes the team's analysis and review of the standard. This overview consists of two components:

Themes that have emerged from the team's review of the standard.

The district has implemented a comprehensive systems approach to school improvement. Protocols and procedures have been developed and implemented to review and analyze data, with this analysis informing needed changes in the educational program provided to students. It is evident that teaching staff receive district support to make improvements to instructional practices through on-going job-embedded professional development and a multi-tiered, multi-year teacher support program (TARGET). There is a culture of intentionality that permeates the district. Intentional focus on data, intentional focus on improved instruction, and intentional focus on refining systems for school improvement all contribute to enhanced achievement for the students of the district.

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 District.

Deficiency 1: Expectations for student performance among school and community members are insufficient to support high achievement among all students.

School/District	Team	
X		This deficiency has been addressed in an exemplary manner.
	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.

District evidence:

- District/School 45-day Planning and Reporting Systems (Quarterly)
- Quarterly (45-day) communication plan
- College and Career Readiness data sharing parent sessions (quarterly)
- Quarterly parent involvement meetings
- Joint meetings with SBDM and board of education

Team evidence: Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure B.1, "Student knows and strives to meet the high expectations established by the teacher," 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.
- 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.

Team comments:

While classroom visit data indicates a positive percentage of classrooms where rigor and expectations are high, this was not consistent among all classrooms and true for all students. While evidence indicates work has been focused in this area, continued work on increasing expectations and improving classroom practice should remain a focus.

Deficiency 2: Teachers do not clearly communicate or model for students what is expected of them to reach proficiency.

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.

District evidence:

- District Classroom Observation Process and Protocol
- Teacher instructional coaching records
- Principal instructional records
- TARGET instructional coaching records
- Lesson planning systems and processes
- Districtwide common assessments
- Individual student goal setting
- Professional learning communities (PLCs)

Team evidence:

- 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.

Team comments:

The team noted the use of exemplars and posted learning targets in some classrooms. These practices were not consistent throughout the high school.

Deficiency 3: District leadership does not monitor to ensure classroom instruction is rigorous, differentiated and sufficient to promote high student growth and 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.

District evidence:

- District classroom observation processes
- Systems monitoring process
- District Curriculum-Assessment-Instructional Protocol
- District and school professional learning communities (LCIT, SILT, PLC)
- Quarterly 45-day planning and reporting process
- Lawrence County System of Intervention (LCSI)

Team evidence:

Structures in place to support improvement of instructional practice:

- School Instructional Leadership Team (SILT)
- District Instructional Leadership Team (DILT)
- TARGET Program

Team comments: The district has implemented several initiatives to improve instructional practice in schools across the district (SILT, DILT). Teachers receive frequent feedback on instructional practice and support through district initiatives (TARGET) to improve noted deficient areas and to induct new instructional staff to the district.

Deficiency 4: District leadership does not systematically ensure that professional development offered in the district results in significant improvement in practice.

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.

District evidence:

- District and school team structure for professional learning
- Principal and teacher Professional Growth Plans
- District teacher development process
- Systems monitoring-support
- 45-day planning and reporting system (quarterly) and BIG ROCK 45-day school improvement plans
- TARGET instructional support records
- Instructional support records

Team evidence:

- Professional development forms
- Professional development plus/delta

According to TELL Survey (TELL Kentucky 2013) results,

- 91.8% of teachers believe they are held to high professional standards for delivering instruction.
- 79.6% of teachers received feedback that can help them improve teaching.
- 86.5% of teachers reported that evaluation procedures are consistent.
- 91.7% of teachers are encouraged to reflect on their own practice.
- 78.2% of teachers reported that professional development enhances their abilities to improve student learning.
- 88.5% of teachers report that professional development offerings are data driven.
- 92.5% of teachers report that professional learning opportunities are aligned with the school's improvement plan.

Team comments:

Initially, the district implemented a professional development feedback form to evaluate professional development. Based on feedback from teachers, the form was determined not to meet the needs for improving professional development. The success of the plus/delta systems tool led the district in revising how the district received feedback on professional development. The plus/delta tool is used frequently to determine needed growth areas and determine needs for professional development. Recently, both the Measures for Academic Progress (MAP) and the Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS) training have been provided based on response to teacher input.

Deficiency 5: District leadership is not held accountable to ensure instruction in all classrooms is sufficiently rigorous and relevant to result in high student growth and 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.

District evidence:

- TPGES
- PPGES
- Coaching training
- Systems monitoring-support
- Principal site visit feedback
- Principal evaluation documentation
- School Administration Management Systems (SAMs)

Team evidence:

Structures in place to support improvement of instructional practice:

- School Instructional Leadership Team (SILT)
- District Instructional Leadership Team (DILT)
- Town Hall days

Team comments:

Student data for every child in the district is displayed in the central office conference room. Principals are responsible for updating this data as assessments are administered. Bi-weekly leadership meetings are conducted in the central office conference room and every department in the district is responsible for displaying data for their individual departments (transportation, technology, food service, etc.) and intentional discussions, focused on how all data impacts student performance data are held during these meetings. In addition, the district has implemented several initiatives to improve instructional practice in schools across the district (SILT, DILT). Teachers receive frequent feedback on instructional practice and support through district initiatives (TARGET) to improve noted deficient areas and to induct new instructional staff to the district.

Deficiency 6: The superintendent has not maximized use of the individual growth plan process to target and improve leadership skill deficiencies of district and school administrators.

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.

District evidence:

- Principal and teacher Professional Growth Plans
- Administration PGP
- PPGES

Team evidence:

- Organizational chart for district responsibilities
- Pilot of PPGES in three schools

Team comments:

District leadership has implemented a systems approach to school improvement. Through this implementation, restructuring and aligning of duties has occurred at the central office. Due to retirement, some positions under the former system were left vacant, however with the new alignment of duties, those positions were not filled, but central office duties were restructured. Teacher and administrative professional growth plans are reviewed and revisited during coaching sessions and evaluation meetings. Plans are in place to fully implement PPGES in the coming school year, pending board and state department approval.

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

