



# Internal District Review Report

**Name of Institution**

**Reviewed:** Lee County School District

**Date:** February 25, 2014-February 26, 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

<b>Standard: The school/district’s curriculum, instructional design, and assessment practices guide and ensure teacher effectiveness and student learning.</b>	District Rating for Standard 3  <b>2.33</b>	Team Rating for Standard 3  <b>1.92</b>
--	--	--

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

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

**Performance levels**

	4	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide all students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills that align with the school/district’s purpose.
	3	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide all students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
x	2	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide most students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	1	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide few or no students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	4	Evidence clearly indicates curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
x	3	There is some evidence to indicate curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
	2	There is little evidence to indicate curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
	1	There is no evidence to indicate how successful students will be at the next level.
	4	Like courses/classes have the same high learning expectations.
	3	Like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations.
	2	Most like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations.
X	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)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### Opportunity for Improvement

**Ensure the curriculum provides differentiated learning experiences and instructional strategies purposefully designed to meet individual needs. Further ensure that curriculum and instruction challenge students to achieve learning expectations and develop important skills that prepare them for success at the next level.**

#### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The 2013 School Report Card indicates the achievement scores for accountability (NAPD--Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, Distinguished) in all content areas are below the state average except in social studies which is slightly above the state average, as shown in the table below:

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science/Biology		Soc. St./US His		Writing/On Dem		Lang. Mech.	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
51.7	61	49.3	55.6	47.4	58.1	62	59.8	64.7	68.9	66.7	69
+/-	- 9.3	+/-	-6.3	+/-	-10.7	+/-	+2.2	+/-	-2.2	+/-	-2.3

- Scores on the end-of-course assessments decreased in reading and math from 2011-12 to 2012-13, as shown in the table below:

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science/Biology		Soc. St./US His		Writing/On Dem		Lang. Mech.	
11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13
54.1	51.7	55.7	49.3	45.4	47.4	48.9	62	57.6	64.7	53.1	66.7
+/-	-2.4	+/-	-6.4	+/-	+2	+/-	+13.1	+/-	+7.1	+/-	+13.6

- The school is classified as a Proficient and Progressing school, with an Overall Accountability Score of 61.5.
- Data from the School Report Card shows an increase in scores in four of the five Next-Generation Learners Accountability categories from 2011-12 to 2012-13, 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*
52.1	55.2	31	31.9	62.8	50	62.5	81.3	68.6	89.2
+/-	+3.1	+/-	+9	+/-	-12.8	+/-	+18.8	+/-	+20.6

\*Cohort Graduation Rate

- A comparison of the College and Career Readiness (CCR) scores on the 2012 and the 2013 School Report Cards indicates an increase from 62.5 to 81.3.
- The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English on the ACT increased from 45% in 2012 to 50.6% in 2013. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark decreased in math from 33.8% to 31.3% and in reading from 37.5% to 31.3% (2012, 2013).
- A comparison of growth data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards shows a decrease of 14.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and a decrease of 10.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards indicates a decrease of 1.2 percentage points in reading and a decrease of 9.7 percentage points in math for students scoring at the proficient and distinguished levels for the non-duplicated gap group. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level in reading increased by 1.5 points and the percentage of students scoring at the novice level in math increased by 4.2 points. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level is significant in reading and math.
- The Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 47.7 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 36.2.
- The Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 41.4 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 29.5.

#### Classroom Observation Data:

- Classroom observation data does not suggest that the curriculum establishes high expectations or differentiates instruction to prepare students for the next level. All seven ELEOT Learning Environments received a rating of 2.4 or lower on a 4-point scale, as shown in the table below:

Equitable Learning	2.1*
High Expectations	1.9
Supportive Learning	2.4
Active Learning	2.1
Progress Monitoring	2.1

Well-Managed Learning	2.4
Digital Learning	1.5

\*using a 4-point scale

- Instances in which students had “differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs” were evident or very evident in 24% of the classrooms.
- Instances in which students were “tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable” were evident or very evident in 24% of the classrooms.
- Instances in which students were “engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks” were evident/very evident in 18% of the classrooms.

#### Stakeholder Survey Data:

- There is mixed staff and student survey data regarding the existence of a challenging curriculum with high expectations. For example:
  - 73.7% of staff 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,” suggesting staff members are somewhat satisfied with the curriculum they are providing students.
  - 60.8% of students surveyed indicated that they agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school provides me with challenging curriculum and learning experiences,” suggesting almost 40% of students do not perceive a challenging curriculum is in place.
  - 45.9% of students surveyed indicated that they agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school prepares me to deal with issues I may face in the future,” suggesting more than half the students do not feel the school has prepared them to deal with issues they may face in the future.
  - 28.6% of students surveyed indicated that they agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers change their teaching to meet my learning needs,” suggesting more than 70% of the students do not agree that their learning needs are being met.

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

- Stakeholder interviews and review of lesson plans reveal few teachers intentionally address the unique learning needs of all students through differentiated instruction and the effective implementation of co-teaching models.
- A review of documents reveals the district has provided opportunities for vertical alignment meetings.
- The high school has developed curriculum documents and pacing guides for all contents. However, adjustment of the curriculum to meet needs of students is not apparent.

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

	3	Using data from student assessments and an examination of professional practice, school/district personnel monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district's goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.
X	2	School/district personnel monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure for vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district's goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.
	1	School/district personnel rarely or never monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school/district's goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.
	4	There is a systematic, collaborative process in place to ensure alignment each time curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.
	3	There is a process in place to ensure alignment each time curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.
X	2	A process is implemented sometimes to ensure alignment when curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.
	1	No process exists to ensure alignment when curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments are reviewed or revised.
	4	The continuous improvement process has clear guidelines to ensure that vertical and horizontal alignment as well as alignment with the school/district's purpose are maintained and enhanced in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
	3	The continuous improvement process ensures that vertical and horizontal alignment as well as alignment with the school/district's purpose are maintained and enhanced in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
X	2	There is limited evidence that the continuous improvement process ensures vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district's purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
	1	There is little or no evidence that the continuous improvement process is connected with vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school/district's purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

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

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

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

- Self-Assessment
- Executive Summary
- Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
- KDE School Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews

- Review of documents and artifacts

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### Opportunity for Improvement

**Develop and communicate a systematic process to analyze data from multiple assessments of learning to improve professional practice and student success. Monitor and evaluate this process regularly to ensure curriculum, instruction, and assessments are vertically and horizontally aligned with the school/district’s purpose for improving teaching and learning.**

#### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The 2013 School Report Card indicates the achievement scores for accountability (NAPD--Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, Distinguished) in all content areas are below the state average except in social studies which is slightly above the state average, as shown in the table below:

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science/Biology		Soc. St./US His		Writing/On Dem		Lang. Mech.	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
51.7	61	49.3	55.6	47.4	58.1	62	59.8	64.7	68.9	66.7	69
+/-	-9.3	+/-	-6.3	+/-	-10.7	+/-	+2.2	+/-	-2.2	+/-	-2.3

- Scores on the end-of-course assessments decreased in reading and math from 2011-12 to 2012-13, as shown in the table below:

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science/Biology		Soc. St./US His		Writing/On Dem		Lang. Mech.	
11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13
54.1	51.7	55.7	49.3	45.4	47.4	48.9	62	57.6	64.7	53.1	66.7
+/-	-2.4	+/-	-6.4	+/-	+2	+/-	+13.1	+/-	+7.1	+/-	+13.6

- The school is classified as a Proficient and Progressing school, with an Overall Accountability Score of 61.5.
- Data from the School Report Card shows an increase in scores in four of the five Next-Generation Learners accountability categories from 2011-12 to 2012-13, 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*
52.1	55.2	31	31.9	62.8	50	62.5	81.3	68.6	89.2
+/-	+3.1	+/-	+9	+/-	-12.8	+/-	+18.8	+/-	+20.6

\*Cohort Graduation Rate

- A comparison of the College and Career Readiness (CCR) scores on the 2012 and the 2013 School Report Cards indicates an increase from 62.5 to 81.3.
- The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English on the ACT increased from 45% in 2012 to 50.6% in 2013. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark decreased in math from 33.8% to 31.3% and in reading from 37.5% to 31.3% (2012, 2013).
- A comparison of growth data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards shows a decrease of 14.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and a decrease of 10.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards indicates a decrease of 1.2 percentage points in reading and a decrease of 9.7 percentage points in math for students scoring at the proficient and distinguished levels for the non-duplicated gap group. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level in reading increased by 1.5 points and the percentage of students scoring at the novice level in math increased by 4.2 points. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level is significant in reading and math.
- The Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 47.7 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 36.2.
- The Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 41.4 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 29.5.

#### Classroom Observation Data:

- Instances in which students were “asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning” were evident/very evident in 35% of the classrooms.
- Instances in which students demonstrated or verbalized “understanding of the lesson/content” were evident/very evident in 30% of the classrooms.
- Instances in which students were “tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable” were evident/very evident in 24% of the classrooms.
- Instances in which students were “engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks” were evident/very evident in 18% of the classrooms.
- Instances in which students were “provided additional/alternative instruction and feedback at the appropriate level of challenge for her/his needs” were evident/very evident in 29% of the classroom.

#### Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to the staff survey, 84.2% of staff 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,” suggesting most staff are well-satisfied with this statement.
- According to the student survey, 63.9% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school gives me multiple assessments to check my understanding of what was taught,” suggesting more than one third of the students disagree or are ambivalent about the statement.

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

- Horizontal and vertical alignment meetings have occurred and are scheduled on a regular basis according to interviews.

- Curriculum maps and instructional units reveal challenging and equitable learning opportunities are rarely reflected in the documents. The review of curriculum maps also revealed little or no instructional activities for units or the curriculum taught with the exception of the English department.

3.3	Teachers engage students in their learning through instructional strategies that ensure achievement of learning expectations.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	4	Teachers are consistent and deliberate in planning and using instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
	3	Teachers plan and use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
X	2	Teachers sometimes use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
	1	Teachers rarely or never use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
	4	Teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of each student.	
	3	Teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students when necessary.	
X	2	Teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of groups of students when necessary.	
	1	Teachers seldom or never personalize instructional strategies.	
	4	Teachers consistently use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.	
	3	Teachers use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.	
X	2	Teachers sometimes use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.	
	1	Teachers rarely or never use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.	
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>			
Self-Assessment			
Executive Summary			
KDE School/District Report Cards			
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data			
ELEOT Classroom Observation data			
Review of documents and artifacts			
Stakeholder interviews			
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment			
Superintendent presentation			

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### Opportunity for Improvement

**Develop professional learning sessions that will provide teachers with a collection of instructional strategies and best practices that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills. Professional development should focus on differentiation to meet the individual needs of students and teachers. Monitor practices regularly for effectiveness and make adjustments based on student performance and individual learning needs.**

#### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The 2013 School Report Card indicates the achievement scores for accountability (NAPD--Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, Distinguished) in all content areas are below the state average except in social studies which is slightly above the state average, as shown in the table below:

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science/Biology		Soc. St./US His		Writing/On Dem		Lang. Mech.	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
51.7	61	49.3	55.6	47.4	58.1	62	59.8	64.7	68.9	66.7	69
+/-	-9.3	+/-	-6.3	+/-	-10.7	+/-	+2.2	+/-	-2.2	+/-	-2.3

- Scores on the end-of-course assessments decreased in reading and math from 2011-12 to 2012-13, as shown in the table below:

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science/Biology		Soc. St./US His		Writing/On Dem		Lang. Mech.	
11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13
54.1	51.7	55.7	49.3	45.4	47.4	48.9	62	57.6	64.7	53.1	66.7
+/-	-2.4	+/-	-6.4	+/-	+2	+/-	+13.1	+/-	+7.1	+/-	+13.6

- The school is classified as a Proficient and Progressing school, with an Overall Accountability Score of 61.5.
- Data from the School Report Card shows an increase in scores in four of the five Next-Generation Learners accountability categories from 2011-12 to 2012-13, 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*
52.1	55.2	31	31.9	62.8	50	62.5	81.3	68.6	89.2
+/-	+3.1	+/-	+9	+/-	-12.8	+/-	+18.8	+/-	+20.6

\*Cohort Graduation Rate

- A comparison of the College and Career Readiness (CCR) scores on the 2012 and the 2013 School Report Cards indicates an increase from 62.5 to 81.3.
- The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English on the ACT increased from 45% in 2012 to 50.6% in 2013. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark decreased in math from 33.8% to 31.3% and in reading from 37.5% to 31.3% (2012, 2013).
- A comparison of growth data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards shows a decrease of 14.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and a decrease of 10.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards indicates a decrease of 1.2 percentage points in reading and a decrease of 9.7 percentage points in math for students scoring at the proficient and distinguished levels for the non-duplicated gap group. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level in reading increased by 1.5 points and the percentage of students scoring at the novice level in math increased by 4.2 points. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level is significant in reading and math.
- The Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 47.7 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 36.2.
- The Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 41.4 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 29.5.

#### Classroom Observation Data:

ELEOT Observation data show that all seven learning environments received a rating of 2.4 or lower on a 4-point scale, as illustrated in the table below:

Equitable Learning	2.1*
High Expectations	1.9
Supportive Learning	2.4
Active Learning	2.1
Progress Monitoring	2.1
Well-Managed Learning	2.4
Digital Learning	1.5

\*using a 4 point scale

- Instances in which students were engaged in “differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs” were evident/very evident in 24% of the classrooms.

- Instances in which students were “asked and responded to questions that require higher order thinking (e.g., applying, evaluating, synthesizing)” were evident/very evident in 18% of the classrooms observed.
- Instances in which students were “provided exemplars of high quality work” were evident/very evident in 12% of the classrooms observed.
- Instances in which students were “actively engaged in the learning activities” were evident/very evident in 36% of the classrooms observed.
- Instances in which students used “technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning” were evident/very evident in 24% of the classrooms observed.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- Stakeholder survey data indicates many teachers, parents, and students are ambivalent or disagree with statements regarding instructional strategies that ensure academic achievement. For example:
  - 68% of staff members indicated that they agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use a variety of technologies as instructional resources.”
  - 74% of staff members indicated that they agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students.”
  - 79% of staff members indicated that they 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.”
  - 51% of parents indicated that they agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All my child’s teachers meet his/her learning needs by individualizing instruction.”
  - 61% of students indicated that they agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school provides me with challenging curriculum and learning experiences.”
  - 29% of students indicated that they agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers change their teaching to meet my learning needs.”
  - 46% of students indicated that they agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school prepares me to deal with issues I may face in the future.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- A review of artifacts and documents revealed limited student work samples that demonstrate high levels of learning.
- A review of teacher instructional units indicates few teachers intentionally plan for differentiation to meet individualized learning needs.

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

		school/district's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.
	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.
X	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.
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
KDE School/District Report Cards		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Review of documents and artifacts		
Stakeholder interviews		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
Superintendent presentation		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

## Improvement Priority

Regularly monitor and assess instructional strategies of teachers to ensure practices 1) are aligned with the school/district's beliefs, 2) are congruent with the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaging all students, and 4) incorporate content-specific standards of professional practice to ensure student success. Communicate expectations for implementing improvement strategies with teachers and school/district leadership to ensure increased student achievement.

### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The 2013 School Report Card indicates the achievement scores for accountability (NAPD--Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, Distinguished) in all content areas are below the state average except in social studies which is slightly above the state average, as shown in the table below:

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science/Biology		Soc. St./US His		Writing/On Dem		Lang. Mech.	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
51.7	61	49.3	55.6	47.4	58.1	62	59.8	64.7	68.9	66.7	69
+/-	-9.3	+/-	-6.3	+/-	-10.7	+/-	+2.2	+/-	-2.2	+/-	-2.3

- The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English on the ACT increased from 45% in 2012 to 50.6% in 2013. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark decreased in math from 33.8% to 31.3% and in reading from 37.5% to 31.3% (2012, 2013).
- A comparison of growth data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards shows a decrease of 14.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and a decrease of 10.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher growth in math.
- According to the 2013 School Report Card, 48% of juniors at the school made typical or higher growth in reading. However, 56.9% of juniors across the state made typical or higher growth in reading.
- According to the 2013 School Report Card, 52% of juniors at the school made typical or higher growth in math. However, 57.3% of juniors across the state made typical or higher growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards indicates a decrease of 1.2 percentage points in reading and a decrease of 9.7 percentage points in math for students scoring at the proficient and distinguished levels for the non-duplicated gap group. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level in reading increased by 1.5 points and the percentage of students scoring at the novice level in math increased by 4.2 points. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level is significant in reading and math.
- The Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 47.7 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 36.2.
- The Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 41.4 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 29.5.

Classroom Observation Data:

- Instances in which students were “actively engaged in the learning activities” were evident/very evident in 36% of the classrooms.
- Instances in which students had “several opportunities to engage in discussions with teacher and other students” were evident/very evident in 35% of the classrooms.
- Instances in which students used “digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning” were evident/very evident in 12% of the classrooms.
- Instances in which students were “engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or task were evident/very evident in 18% of the classrooms.

- Instances in which students are “asked and respond to questions that require higher order thinking (e.g. applying, evaluating, synthesizing)” were evident/very evident in 18% of the classrooms.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- The review of documents and interviews revealed that leadership observations take place on a regular basis. However, this practice has not resulted in teachers consistently engaging all students through the use of rigorous and effective instructional practices.
- A review of documents indicated the focus of professional development will be in teachers’ areas of expertise and best instructional practices. However, interviews and observations revealed the training has not transferred into improved teacher pedagogy that has had a direct impact on student achievement.

3.5		System operates in collaborative learning communities to improve instruction and student learning.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>				
	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.		
	3	Collaboration often occurs across grade levels and content areas.		
x	2	Collaboration occasionally occurs across grade levels and content areas.		
	1	Collaboration seldom occurs across grade levels and content areas.		
	4	Staff members implement a formal process that promotes productive discussion about student learning.		
x	3	Staff members have been trained to implement a formal process that promotes discussion about student learning.		
	2	Staff members promote discussion about student learning.		
	1	Staff members rarely discuss student learning.		
	4	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching are a part of the daily routine of school/district staff members.		
	3	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching occur regularly among most school/district personnel.		
	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.		

X	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.
	3	School/district personnel indicate that collaboration causes improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
X	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)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

## Opportunity for Improvement

**Review and refine the current collaborative learning community structure to develop a clearly defined process for improved instructional practice and student learning. Monitor the collaborative learning communities to ensure they include analysis of results (action research), examination of student work, reflection, study teams and peer coaching.**

### Supporting Evidence

#### Student Performance Data:

Performance data suggests that the impact professional learning communities are having on improving instruction and ensuring student success is not apparent. For example:

- The percentages of students meeting ACT benchmarks are lower than the percentages of students meeting benchmarks across the state, as shown in the table below:

Percent Meeting ACT Benchmarks						
	English		Reading		Math	
2012-13	State	School	State	School	State	School
%	53.1	50.6	39.6	31.3	44.2	31.3
+/-		-2.5		-8.3		-12.9

- A comparison of growth data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards shows a decrease of 14.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and a decrease of 10.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards indicates a decrease of 1.2 percentage points in reading and a decrease of 9.7 percentage points in math for students scoring at the proficient and distinguished levels for the non-duplicated gap group. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level in reading increased by 1.5 points and the percentage of students scoring at the novice level in math increased by 4.2 points. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level is significant in reading and math.
- The Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 47.7 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 36.2.
- The Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 41.4 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 29.5.

#### Classroom Observation Data:

- The overall ratings for the classroom observation environments suggest that professional learning communities are not effective in improving instructional practices and ensuring student success. All seven ELEOT Learning Environments received a rating of 2.4 or lower on a 4-point scale, as shown in the table below:

Equitable Learning	2.1
High Expectations	1.9
Supportive Learning	2.4
Active Learning	2.1
Progress Monitoring	2.1
Well-Managed Learning	2.4
Digital Learning	1.5

\*using a 4 point scale

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to the staff survey, 57.9% of staff 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,” suggesting that over 40% of teachers do not perceive they have had adequate training in this area.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- The review of PLC agenda and minutes suggests that data is used to leverage discussions and next steps to inform instructional practice (differentiation, student engagement, active learning) to increase student achievement. However, classroom observations and student performance data do not suggest it has resulted in improved instructional practices in all classrooms or increased student achievement.
- PLC minutes/agendas reveal teachers participate in collaborative learning communities that meet formally. Teachers have been trained to implement a continuous improvement process to promote discussion about student learning. PLC minutes outline the agenda but rarely document the details of the teachers’ discussions to improve instructional practices based on student data.

3.6	Teachers implement the school/system’s instructional process in support of student learning.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	4	All teachers systematically use an instructional process that clearly informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.	
	3	All teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.	
X	2	Most teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.	
	1	Few teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.	
	4	Exemplars are provided to guide and inform students.	
	3	Exemplars are often provided to guide and inform students.	
X	2	Exemplars are sometimes provided to guide and inform students.	
	1	Exemplars are rarely provided to guide and inform students.	
	4	The process requires the use of multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction and provide data for possible curriculum revision.	
	3	The process includes multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction and provide data for possible curriculum revision.	
	2	The process may include multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction.	
X	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.
	2	The process provides students with feedback about their learning.
X	1	The process provides students with minimal feedback of little value about their learning.
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
KDE School/District Report Cards		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Review of Documents and Artifacts		
Stakeholder interviews		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
Superintendent's presentation		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### **Opportunity for Improvement**

**Define and monitor a systematic school/districtwide instructional process that includes 1) clearly defined learning expectations for students, 2) exemplars to guide students, and 3) use of multiple measures including formative assessment to provide specific and timely feedback in support of student learning.**

## Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The 2013 School Report Card indicates the achievement scores for accountability (NAPD--Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, Distinguished) in all content areas are below the state average except in social studies which is slightly above the state average, as shown in the table below:

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science/Biology		Soc. St./US His		Writing/On Dem		Lang. Mech.	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
51.7	61	49.3	55.6	47.4	58.1	62	59.8	64.7	68.9	66.7	69
+/-	-9.3	+/-	-6.3	+/-	-10.7	+/-	+2.2	+/-	-2.2	+/-	-2.3

- Scores on the end-of-course assessments decreased in reading and math from 2011-12 to 2012-13, as shown in the table below:

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science/Biology		Soc. St./US His		Writing/On Dem		Lang. Mech.	
11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13
54.1	51.7	55.7	49.3	45.4	47.4	48.9	62	57.6	64.7	53.1	66.7
+/-	-2.4	+/-	-6.4	+/-	+2	+/-	+13.1	+/-	+7.1	+/-	+13.6

- The school is classified as a Proficient and Progressing school, with an Overall Accountability Score of 61.5.
- Data from the School Report Card shows an increase in scores in four of the five Next-Generation Learners accountability categories from 2011-12 to 2012-13, 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*
52.1	55.2	31	31.9	62.8	50	62.5	81.3	68.6	89.2
+/-	+3.1	+/-	+9	+/-	-12.8	+/-	+18.8	+/-	+20.6

\*Cohort Graduation Rate

- A comparison of the College and Career Readiness (CCR) scores on the 2012 and the 2013 School Report Cards indicates an increase from 62.5 to 81.3.
- The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English on the ACT increased from 45% in 2012 to 50.6% in 2013. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark decreased in math from 33.8% to 31.3% and in reading from 37.5% to 31.3% (2012, 2013).
- A comparison of growth data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards shows a decrease of 14.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and a decrease of 10.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards indicates a decrease of 1.2 percentage points in reading and a decrease of 9.7 percentage points in math for students scoring at the proficient and distinguished levels for the non-duplicated gap group. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level in reading increased by 1.5 points and the percentage of students scoring at the novice level in math increased by 4.2 points. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level is significant in reading and math.
- The Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 47.7 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 36.2.
- The Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 41.4 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 29.5.

Classroom Observation Data:

- Classroom observation data suggests that a consistent school/districtwide instructional process does not exist. For example:
  - Instances in which students were “provided exemplars of high quality work” were evident/very evident in 12% of the classrooms.
  - Instances in which students were “provided alternative/additional instruction and feedback at the appropriate level of challenge for her/his needs” were evident/very evident in 29% of the classrooms.
  - Instances in which students made “connections from content to real-life experiences” were evident/very evident in 18% of the classrooms.
  - Instances in which students were “asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning” were evident/very evident in 35% of the classrooms.
  - Instances in which students responded “to teacher feedback to improve understanding” were evident/very evident in 29% of the classrooms.
  - Instances in which students understood “how her/his work is assessed” were evident/very evident in 30% of the classrooms.
  - Instances in which students had “opportunities to revise/improve work based on feedback” were evident/very evident in 24% of the classrooms.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to staff survey data, 58% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school provide students with specific and timely feedback about their learning,” suggesting over 40% of the staff are ambivalent or disagree with this statement.
- According to staff survey data, 79% 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,” suggesting 21% of staff members are ambivalent or disagree with this statement.
- 60% of students indicated that they agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers provide me with information about my learning and grades,” suggesting 40% of the students are ambivalent or disagree with this statement.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- A review of curriculum maps reveals most curriculum maps did not include the use of multiple measures including formative assessments to provide specific and timely feedback in support of student learning.

3.7	Mentoring, coaching, and induction programs support instructional improvement consistent with the school/system’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
4	All school/district personnel are engaged in systematic mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.		
3	School/district personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.		
X 2	Some school/district personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs		

		that are consistent with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.
	1	Few or no school/district personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.
	4	These programs set high expectations for all school/district personnel and include valid and reliable measures of performance.
	3	These programs set expectations for all school/district personnel and include measures of performance.
X	2	These programs set expectations for school/district personnel.
	1	Limited or no expectations for school/district personnel are included.
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
KDE School/District Report Cards		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Review of documents and artifacts		
Stakeholder interviews		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
Superintendent’s presentation		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

## Opportunity for Improvement

Design and implement a mentoring, coaching, and induction program for all teachers to support instructional improvement consistent with the district's values and beliefs about teaching and learning. Evaluate the program with valid and reliable measures of performance.

### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The 2013 School Report Card indicates the achievement scores for accountability (NAPD--Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, Distinguished) in all content areas are below the state average except in social studies which is slightly above the state average, as shown in the table below:

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science/Biology		Soc. St./US His		Writing/On Dem		Lang. Mech.	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
51.7	61	49.3	55.6	47.4	58.1	62	59.8	64.7	68.9	66.7	69
+/-	-9.3	+/-	-6.3	+/-	-10.7	+/-	+2.2	+/-	-2.2	+/-	-2.3

- Scores on the end-of-course assessments decreased in reading and math from 2011-12 to 2012-13, as shown in the table below:

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science/Biology		Soc. St./US His		Writing/On Dem		Lang. Mech.	
11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13	11-12	12-13
54.1	51.7	55.7	49.3	45.4	47.4	48.9	62	57.6	64.7	53.1	66.7
+/-	-2.4	+/-	-6.4	+/-	+2	+/-	+13.1	+/-	+7.1	+/-	+13.6

- The school is classified as a Proficient and Progressing school, with an Overall Accountability Score of 61.5.
- Data from the School Report Card shows an increase in scores in four of the five Next-Generation Learners Accountability categories from 2011-12 to 2012-13, 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*
52.1	55.2	31	31.9	62.8	50	62.5	81.3	68.6	89.2
+/-	+3.1	+/-	+9	+/-	-12.8	+/-	+18.8	+/-	+20.6

\*Cohort Graduation Rate

- A comparison of the College and Career Readiness (CCR) scores on the 2012 and the 2013 School Report Cards indicates an increase from 62.5 to 81.3.
- The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English on the ACT increased from 45% in 2012 to 50.6% in 2013. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark decreased in math from 33.8% to 31.3% and in reading from 37.5% to 31.3% (2012, 2013).
- A comparison of growth data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards shows a decrease of 14.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and a decrease of 10.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards indicates a decrease of 1.2 percentage points in reading and a decrease of 9.7 percentage points in math for students scoring at the proficient and distinguished levels for the non-duplicated gap group. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level in reading increased by 1.5 points and the

percentage of students scoring at the novice level in math increased by 4.2 points. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level is significant in reading and math.

- The Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 47.7 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 36.2.
- The Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 41.4 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 29.5.

**Classroom Observation Data:**

- Instances in which students were provided with “differentiated learning opportunities and activities that met her/his needs” were evident/very evident in only 24% of classrooms.
- Instances in which students had “opportunities to revise/improve work based on feedback” were evident/very evident in only 24% of classrooms.
- Instances in which students “know and strive to meet the high expectations established by the teacher” were evident/very evident in only 24% of classrooms.

**Stakeholder Survey Data:**

- In surveys, 47% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, staff members provide peer coaching to teachers.”
- In surveys, 47% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, a formal process is in place to support new members in their professional practice.”

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

- The school’s Self-Assessment item, “Mentoring, coaching, and induction programs support instructional improvement consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning” was ranked a Level 1.
- Stakeholder interviews and the review of documents and artifacts revealed the lack of formal mentoring, coaching, and induction programs for all teachers. Some teachers participate in the Emerging Leaders Network that is consistent with the system’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning.

3.8	The 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 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	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/District personnel regularly inform families of their children’s learning progress.	
X	2	School/District personnel provide information about children’s learning.	
	1	School/District personnel provide little relevant information about children’s learning.	

Evidence Reviewed
Self-Assessment
Executive Summary
KDE School/District Report Cards
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
ELEOT Classroom Observation data
Review of documents and artifacts
Stakeholder interviews
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
Superintendent's presentation

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### Opportunity for Improvement

**Refine and expand communication strategies to inform parents about student progress as well as involve parents in teaching and learning. Regularly evaluate and revise strategies based on the effectiveness for involving parents as partners in the education of their students.**

### Supporting Evidence

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to student survey data, 43.1% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school offers opportunities for my family to become involved in school activities and my learning,” which suggests more than half of the students do not perceive the school has provided their families with opportunities to become involved in school activities and their learning.

- According to parent survey data, 61.5% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement “All of my child’s teachers help me to understand my child’s progress,” which suggests about 40% of the parents are ambivalent or disagree with this statement.
- According to survey data, 89.5% of staff members agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all school personnel regularly engage families in their children’s learning progress,” which suggests the majority of the staff members agree that personnel engage families in students’ learning progress.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews and review of documents suggest several opportunities and methods are used to inform parents of their children’s education. However, TELL Kentucky and stakeholder survey results (parent and student) do not support this statement.

Other pertinent information:

According to the TELL Kentucky Survey,

- Teacher agreement levels to all eight questions under “community support and involvement in your school” are below state averages.
- 59.2% of teachers agree that “parents/guardians are influential decision makers in this school” which is below the state average of 66.5%.
- 53.5% of teachers agree that “parents/guardians support teachers, contributing to their success with students.”

3.9	The school/system has a formal structure whereby each student is well known by at least one adult advocate in the school/system who supports that student’s educational experience.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	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)
Self-Assessment
Executive Summary
KDE School/District Report Cards
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
ELEOT Classroom Observation data
Review of documents and artifacts
Stakeholder interviews
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
Superintendent's presentation

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### Opportunity for Improvement

**Expand the existing structures to involve all students in formal, systematic mentoring whereby every student is well known by an adult advocate who supports that student’s educational experience.**

#### Supporting Evidence

Classroom Observation Data:

- Instances in which students demonstrated or expressed “that learning experiences are positive” were evident/very evident in 42% of the classrooms observed.
- Instances in which students demonstrated a “positive attitude about the classroom and learning” were evident/very evident in 53% of the classrooms observed.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to student survey data, 44.3% 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,” suggesting that almost 60% of the students do not perceive or are ambivalent to the existence of an adult advocacy program.
- According to staff survey data, 89.5% of staff /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,” suggesting that staff members are satisfied that the current structure is effective in ensuring that all students are well-known.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Classroom observation data does not suggest that students feel positively about their school. The Supportive Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.4 on a 4-point scale, suggesting all students may not be connected with an adult advocate.
- Stakeholder interviews and review of documents indicate some structures (i.e., GEAR UP, Principal’s ALPHA group) are in place that allow faculty and staff to gain insight into the unique academic and emotional needs of all students.

3.10	Grading and reporting are based on clearly defined criteria that represent the attainment of content knowledge and skills and are consistent across grade levels and courses.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	4	All teachers consistently use common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures based on clearly defined criteria that represent each student’s attainment of content knowledge and skills.	
	3	Teachers use common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures based on clearly defined criteria that represent each student’s attainment of content knowledge and skills.	
X	2	Most teachers use common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures based on criteria that represent each student’s attainment of content knowledge and skills.	
	1	Few or no teachers use common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures.	
	4	These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented without fail across all grade levels and all courses.	
	3	These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented consistently across grade levels and courses.	
X	2	These policies, processes, and procedures are implemented across grade levels and courses.	
	1	Policies, processes, and procedures, if they exist, are rarely implemented across grade levels or courses, and may not be well understood by stakeholders.	
	4	All stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures.	
	3	Stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures.	
X	2	Most stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures.	
	4	The policies, processes, and procedures are formally and regularly evaluated.	

	3	The policies, processes, and procedures are regularly evaluated.
	2	The policies, processes, and procedures may or may not be evaluated.
X	1	No process for evaluation of grading and reporting practices is evident.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
KDE School/District Report Cards		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey Data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Review of documents and artifacts		
Stakeholder interviews		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
Superintendent's presentation		

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

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

---

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

---

### Opportunity for Improvement

**Develop and implement a system to ensure students’ grades are based on clearly defined criteria that represents the attainment of content knowledge and skills. Regularly monitor grading and reporting practices to provide consistency across grade levels and courses.**

## Supporting Evidence

- Instances in which students are “provided exemplars of high quality work” were evident/very evident in 12% of the classrooms observed.
- Instances in which students were “asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning” were evident/very evident in 35% of the classrooms observed.
- Instances in which students responded “to teacher feedback to improve understanding” were evident/very evident in 29% of the classrooms observed.
- Instances in which students understood “how her/his work is assessed” were evident/very evident in 30% of the classrooms observed.

### Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to survey data, 42% of staff members agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all school personnel regularly engage families in their child’s learning progress,” indicating almost 60% of the staff members are ambivalent or disagree with this statement.
- According to survey data, 53% of staff members agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all stakeholders are informed of policies, processes, and procedures related to grading and reporting,” which suggests almost half of the staff members are neutral or disagree with this statement.
- According to survey data, 46% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers keep my family informed of my academic progress,” suggesting over half of the students are ambivalent or disagree with this statement.
- According to survey data, 66% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My child is given multiple assessments to measure his/her understanding of what was taught” suggesting 34% of the parents are ambivalent or disagree with this statement.
- According to survey data, 55% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All my child’s teachers keep me informed regularly of how my child is being graded,” suggesting almost half of the parents are ambivalent or disagree with the statement.
- According to survey data, 62% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers help me to understand my child’s progress,” suggesting more than one third of the parents are ambivalent or disagree with the statement.

### Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews suggest the school has common grading and reporting policies, processes, and procedures but these do not always represent each student’s attainment of content knowledge and skills.

3.11	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	4	All staff members participate in a rigorous, continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/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.
	3	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school/district.
X	2	Professional development is based on the needs of the school/district.
	1	Professional development, when available, may or may not address the needs of the school/district or build capacity among staff members.
	4	The program builds measurable capacity among all professional and support staff.
	3	The program builds capacity among all professional and support staff.
X	2	The program builds capacity among staff members who participate.
	4	The program is rigorously and systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.
	3	The program is systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.
X	2	The program is regularly evaluated for effectiveness.
	1	If a program exists, it is rarely and/or randomly evaluated.
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
KDE School/District Report Cards		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Review of documents and artifacts		
Stakeholder interviews		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
Superintendent's presentation		

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

Create and coordinate a rigorous, ongoing system of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district’s purpose and direction. Evaluate the program using a systematic and rigorous process to ensure the effectiveness of the program in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.

#### Supporting Evidence

##### Student Performance Data:

- Student performance data does not suggest that a program of professional learning is effectively impacting student achievement. For example:
  - The school’s overall accountability score increased by 6.1 points from 2011-12 to 2012-13. This increase can be directly correlated with the intentional improvements in CCR and graduation rates. However, academic performance data (Achievement, Growth, Gap) shows small increases by comparison and in some cases has actually decreased.
  - The 2013 School Report Card indicates the achievement scores for accountability (NAPD-- Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, Distinguished) in all content areas are below the state average except in social studies which is slightly above the state average, as shown in the table below:

Reading / Eng II		Math / Alg II		Science/Biology		Soc. St./US His		Writing/On Dem		Lang. Mech.	
School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
51.7	61	49.3	55.6	47.4	58.1	62	59.8	64.7	68.9	66.7	69
+/-	-9.3	+/-	-6.3	+/-	-10.7	+/-	+2.2	+/-	-2.2	+/-	-2.3

- A comparison of growth data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards shows a decrease of 14.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and a decrease of 10.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards indicates a decrease of 1.2 percentage points in reading and a decrease of 9.7 percentage points in math for students scoring at the proficient and distinguished levels for the non-duplicated gap group. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level in reading increased by 1.5 points and the percentage of students scoring at the novice level in math increased by 4.2 points. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level is significant in reading and math.
- The Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 47.7 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 36.2.
- The Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 41.4 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 29.5.

##### Classroom Observation Data:

- Classroom observation data suggests that professional learning is not effectively impacting classroom environments. All seven learning environments received a rating of 2.4 or lower on a 4-point scale, as shown in the table below:

Equitable Learning	2.1
--------------------	-----

High Expectations	1.9
Supportive Learning	2.4
Active Learning	2.1
Progress Monitoring	2.1
Well-Managed Learning	2.4
Digital Learning	1.5

\*using a 4 point scale

- Instances in which students “know and strive to meet the high expectations established by the teacher,” were evident/very evident in only 24% of classrooms.
- Instances in which students were “engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks,” were evident/very evident in only 18% of classrooms.
- Instances in which students were asked and responded to “questions that require higher order thinking (e.g., applying, evaluating, synthesizing),” were evident/very evident in only 18% of classrooms.
- Instances in which students had “differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs,” were evident/very evident in 24% of the classrooms.
- Instances in which students were “provided additional/alternative instruction and feedback at the appropriate level of challenge for her/his needs,” were evident/very evident in only 29% of the classrooms.
- Instances in which students used “digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning,” were evident/very evident in only 24% of the classrooms.

#### Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 63.2% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all staff members participate in continuous professional learning based on identified needs of the school.”
- 42.0% of staff 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.”
- 47.4% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, a formal process is in place to support new staff members in their professional practice.”
- 47.4% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, staff members provide peer coaching to teachers.”

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

- Stakeholder interviews and review of grade level or content PLC agendas indicated that all teachers participate weekly in professional learning communities. However, participation in PLCs has not transferred into the improvement of instructional practices of all teachers in all classes.
- Stakeholder interviews and review of documents indicated professional development based on the needs of the school is occurring during weekly meetings. However, the professional development is not impacting professional practice across the school.

#### Other pertinent information:

TELL Kentucky Survey data yielded the following results:

- 55% of teachers agree/strongly agree with the statement, “Professional development is evaluated and results are communicated to teachers.”
- 34% indicated they “need professional development to teach students more effectively” in the area of differentiating instruction.

- 67% indicated they “need professional development to teach students more effectively” in the area of student assessment.
- 29% indicated they “need professional development to teach students more effectively” in the area of closing the achievement gap.
- 57% indicated they “need professional development to teach students more effectively” in the area of methods of teaching.
- 46% indicated they “need professional development to teach students more effectively” in the area of reading strategies.
- 39% indicated they “need professional development to teach students more effectively” in the area of integrating technology into instruction.
- 57% indicated they “need professional development to teach students more effectively” in the area of classroom management techniques.

3.12	The school/system provides and coordinates learning support services to meet the unique learning needs of students.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	4	School/District personnel systematically and continuously use data to identify unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency as well as other learning needs (such as second languages).	
	3	School/District personnel use data to identify unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency as well as other learning needs (such as second languages).	
x	2	School/District personnel use data to identify unique learning needs of special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs (such as second languages).	
	1	School/District personnel identify special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs (such as second languages).	
	4	School/District personnel stay current on research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related individualized learning support services to all students.	
	3	School/District personnel stay current on research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related learning support services to all students.	
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.	
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>			
Self-Assessment			
Executive Summary			
KDE School/District Report Cards			
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data			
ELEOT Classroom Observation data			
Review of documents and artifacts			
Stakeholder interviews			
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment			
Superintendent’s presentation			

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### Opportunity for Improvement

**Develop a comprehensive system to continuously and effectively use data to identify and meet the unique learning needs of all students. Identify, implement, and monitor the effectiveness of researched best practices to increase student achievement.**

#### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The percentages of students meeting ACT benchmarks are lower than the percentages of students meeting benchmarks across the state, as shown in the table below:

Percent Meeting ACT Benchmark						
	English		Reading		Math	
2012-13	State	School	State	School	State	School
%	53.1	50.6	39.6	31.3	44.2	31.3
+/-		-2.5		-8.3		-12.9

- A comparison of growth data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards shows a decrease of 14.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher annual growth in reading and a decrease of 10.7 percentage points in students making typical or higher growth in math.
- A comparison of gap data from the 2012 and 2013 School Report Cards indicates a decrease of 1.2 percentage points in reading and a decrease of 9.7 percentage points in math for

- students scoring at the proficient and distinguished levels for the non-duplicated gap group. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level in reading increased by 1.5 points and the percentage of students scoring at the novice level in math increased by 4.2 points. The percentage of students scoring at the novice level is significant in reading and math.
- The Combined Reading and Math Proficiency Delivery target of 47.7 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Proficiency score was 36.2.
  - The Combined Reading and Math Gap Delivery target of 41.4 was not met. The actual Combined Reading and Math Gap score was 29.5.

#### Classroom Observation Data:

- Instances in which students had “differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs,” were evident/very evident in only 24% of classrooms.
- Instances in which students had “equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support,” were evident/very evident in only 47% of classrooms.
- Instances in which students were “tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable” were evident/very evident in only 24% of the classrooms.
- Instances in which students were “provided additional/alternative instruction and feedback at the appropriate level of challenges for her/his needs” were evident/very evident in only 29% of the classrooms.
- Instances in which students demonstrated or verbalized “understanding of the lesson/content” were evident/very evident in only 30% of the classrooms.

#### Stakeholder Survey Data

- 79% of the staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all staff members use student data to address the unique learning needs of all students,” suggesting staff members are somewhat in agreement with the statement.
- 63% of the staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, related learning support services are provided for all students bases on their needs,” suggesting over one third of staff members are ambivalent or disagree with this statement.
- 47% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school provides learning services for me according to my needs,” suggesting more than half of the students are ambivalent or disagree with this statement.
- 65% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My child has access to support services based on his/her identified needs,” suggesting one third of the parents are ambivalent or disagree with this statement.

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

- Stakeholder interviews and review of documents indicate a comprehensive system to monitor and measure the impact of all school programs and processes is not fully developed to eliminate gaps in services to ensure continuous improvement.

## 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.

The school's accountability index increased 6.1 points from the 2011-12 to the 2012-13 school year. This gain moved the school from the 57<sup>th</sup> percentile to the 81<sup>st</sup> percentile and a proficiency/progressing classification. The largest gains in the Next-Generation Accountability Model were seen in college-career readiness and in graduation rate measures. The Internal District Review team at Lee County recognized the collaborative effort by all stakeholders to achieve this type of growth. The team also identified some common themes from Standard 3 (Teaching and Assessing for Learning) to provide guidance as the school/district defines actions to be implemented to continue their school improvement efforts.

### Collaboration

- Collaboration between the district and the Area Technology Center has led to an increase in the number of students graduating career ready from Lee County High School. This type of collaboration is also evident in the number of support services the district has involved to provide wrap around services to remove nonacademic barriers to learning as a means to enhance student academic success.
- The district strategic plan has been completed and strategies have been specifically developed to increase student achievement. The process has engaged multiple community stakeholders in open forums in the development, creation and ownership of the district strategic plan. The process engages stakeholders in the review of multiple data points, development of goals and actionable strategies with measures of performance.
- Collaboration among staff members and district support staff is also evident. Stakeholder interviews indicated they work well together and have opportunities to collaborate as a team. Staff surveys indicate approximately 89% of teachers 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." However, the efforts to increase collaboration have not resulted in an increase in student performance that is consistent with state averages in achievement and gap measures on end-of-course exams. The collaboration efforts should have an intentional focus on monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of district initiatives that result in increased student achievement.

### Differentiation/Personalization

- The district has recognized the next step in their continuous improvement efforts is to improve teacher pedagogy. Differentiated learning experiences to meet the unique needs for students are limited. Instructional delivery was mainly in whole-group settings. Differentiated instruction to meet the students' individual needs was rarely seen during classroom observations.

- Classroom observation data revealed student use of technology was not observed in the majority of classrooms. Enhancing student use of technology could increase opportunities for personalized learning.

### **Continuous Improvement**

- District leadership has developed and implemented systems to drive a continuous improvement approach to focus on student learning. The district strategic planning process is a continuous improvement process that actively engages community stakeholders in the creation and ownership of the district strategic plan. The process engages stakeholders in the review of multiple data points, development of goals and actionable strategies with measures of performance.
- The district has developed 30-60-90 day plans at each school to monitor the district and school goals contained within the CDIP and strategic plan. The 30-60-90 day plans are communicated and monitored for implementation and impact as evidenced by district team meeting agendas/minutes.
- District leadership has employed the use of continuous improvement quality tools in an effort to communicate, monitor, evaluate, and engage all stakeholders in the district's improvement efforts. However, observations of classrooms indicate that these continuous improvement efforts have not resulted in teachers consistently engaging all students in all classrooms with the use of effective, varied, and rigorous instructional strategies. End-of-course and gap scores are a further indication that all teachers have not implemented the district's expectations for instructional processes in support of student learning. End-of-course and gap scores dropped in reading and math from the previous year and are below the state average in all areas except U.S. History which is slightly above the state average.
- The review of documents and stakeholder interviews indicated the need to review and refine the district's process to monitor, evaluate and adjust curriculum, instruction, assessments, and professional practice in response to classroom level assessment data. Revising and implementing a process to include the collecting and analyzing of classroom level data, setting goals, planning, implementing, and evaluating the results will provide district and school level leadership a process of continuous improvement for teachers to meet the varied learning needs of all students. Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of teaching practices, the examination of student work, reflection, and peer coaching should become a part of the district's ongoing support that is consistent with the district's beliefs about teaching and learning.

### **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 Lee County School District.

**Deficiency 1: The board of education, superintendent, district, school leadership, and staff have not accepted their responsibility in student achievement.**

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

District leadership interviews  
School Report Card  
District organizational chart  
Review of artifacts

Team comments:

Various evidence indicates the superintendent, district and school leadership, and staff have accepted their responsibility for student achievement and have implemented many systematic programs and practices. Evidence of monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the programs and practices exist, and these practices have resulted in increased performance on the state Next Generation Accountability Index. This increase is the result of the substantial increase in graduation and college and career readiness rates. However, academic performance data (Achievement, Growth, and Gap) shows small increases by comparison and in some cases has actually decreased.

**Deficiency 2: The superintendent, district, school leadership, and school staff members have not modeled a professional working environment that creates and continually develops positive relationships and promotes collaborative decision-making.**

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.

Team evidence:

District interviews  
Review of artifacts

Team comments:

District leadership has developed positive relationships among school leaders, staff, students, and community members that foster collaborative efforts and initiatives to promote student success. The school's Overall Accountability Score increased 6.1 points from the 2011-12 to the 2012-13 school year. This improvement can be directly correlated with increases in CCR and graduation rates. However, academic performance data (Achievement, Growth, and Gap) shows small increases by comparison and in some cases scores have actually decreased.

**Deficiency 3: The board of education, superintendent, and district leadership do not use the comprehensive district improvement plan as a basis of decision making in Lee County Schools.**

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:

CDIP

Strategic planning documents

Team comments:

The comprehensive district improvement plan has been completed and strategies have been specifically developed to increase student achievement. The district leadership has also developed and implemented a process for the development of the district's strategic plan. The strategic planning process has engaged multiple community stakeholders through open forums in the development, creation and ownership of the district strategic plan. The process engages stakeholders in the review of multiple data points and the development of goals and actionable strategies with measures of performance.

**Deficiency 4: District leadership does not communicate expectations for developing a fully aligned curriculum, designing rigorous, authentic assessments and delivering differentiated instructional strategies with high school leadership and staff.**

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.

<p>Team evidence:  CDIP  CSIP  Review of artifacts  Interviews  Strategic plan</p>
<p>Team comments:  District leadership clearly communicates the expectations for developing an aligned curriculum, rigorous assessments and the delivery of differentiated instructional strategies. However, classroom observations and student performance data does not reflect these efforts. Rigorous lessons, authentic assessments and differentiated instruction were rarely seen during classroom observations.</p>

**Deficiency 5: District leadership does not ensure professional development is collaboratively planned to meet the specific needs of the high school staff and to enhance and develop the skills needed to deliver a successful instructional program.**

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

<p>Team evidence:  Review of artifacts  Interviews  PLC minutes and agendas</p>
<p>Team comments:  Teachers have been provided with PGES professional development training with an emphasis on peer coaching. According to the 2013-14 professional development schedule the teachers have been given five planning days throughout the school year. Two of these days have been designated for curriculum, one day has been designated as flexible and the other days are marked for planning. Although there is evidence to support that professional development is provided, this professional learning should be based on the needs of students following the analysis of student data. In addition, the professional development should be based on individual teacher needs and monitored and measured for effectiveness.</p>

**Deficiency 6: District leadership does not monitor, provide feedback, or give follow-up support on all district and school programs.**

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

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

Team evidence:

Interviews

Review of artifacts

Leadership meetings

Board meeting presentations

Principal PLC

A-Team

Team comments:

The district has created a leadership PLC with the school administrative team that meets weekly. The district is participating and providing feedback based on walk-through observations at the high school. However, after reviewing minutes, evidence suggests that student achievement should become the main focus of the meetings. The district should also monitor, evaluate, and provide specific feedback that will lead to the development of effective next steps to increase student achievement.

# 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

