



# Internal District Review Report

**Name of Institution**

**Reviewed:** Livingston County School District

**Date:** January 14, 2014-January 15, 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/district 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  2.58	Team Rating for Standard 3  <b>2.08</b>
--	---	--

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

3.1 The school/district’s curriculum provides equitable and challenging learning experiences that ensure all students have sufficient opportunities to develop learning, thinking, and life skills that lead to success at the next level.	District Rating  2	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.
	3	There is some evidence to indicate curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
x	2	There is little evidence to indicate curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
	1	There is no evidence to indicate how successful students will be at the next level.
	4	Like courses/classes have the same high learning expectations.
	3	Like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations.
x	2	Most like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations.
	1	Like courses/classes do not always have the same learning expectations.
	4	Learning activities are individualized for each student in a way that supports achievement of expectations.
	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)
Livingston District Internal Self-Assessment
Deficiencies from the 2011 Livingston Leadership Scholastic Audit
KDE School/District Report Card Data
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)
District Presentation of Progress
Interviews with stakeholders (district personnel, school personnel, parents, students, SBDM and school board members)
Review of district documents and artifacts

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### Opportunity for Improvement

**Develop and deliver a challenging and equitable curriculum to all students in all classes in all content areas. Monitor delivery of instruction to ensure all students have sufficient opportunities to develop learning, thinking, and life skills that lead to success at the next level. Hold school leadership accountable for quality instruction in all classrooms.**

## Supporting Evidence

### Student Performance Data:

- The school’s accountability index rose from 49.3 to 59.3. This translates to a gain statewide from the 23<sup>rd</sup> percentile to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. The largest gains were seen in college-career readiness and in graduation rate. Academic gains were inconsistent.
- Student performance on the English II End-of-Course (EOC) assessment fell by 14 points.
- Student performance in language mechanics fell by 4.5 points.
- Student performance in Biology fell by 4.2 points.
- The 2011-12 gap score of 23.8 only rose to 26.6. This indicates that significant achievement gaps still exist.

### Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure B.2, “Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable,” scored a 1.7 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating. Challenging activities were not observed in many classes.

### Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 89% of teachers surveyed believe students are provided a challenging curriculum and set of learning experiences. However, only 49% of students and 56% of parents agree that the curriculum is challenging.
- Less than 40% of students surveyed believe the school prepares them for issues they may face in the future.

### Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- The district has supported the development of curriculum documents and pacing guides.
- District leadership drives curriculum and instructional improvements through their District Leadership Team.
- Vertical alignment of these documents from grades 6,7,8,9 is beginning as of January 2014.

3.2	Curriculum, instruction, and assessment are monitored and adjusted systematically in response to data from multiple assessments of student learning and an examination of professional practice.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 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.
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>		
Livingston District Internal Self-Assessment		
Deficiencies from the 2011 Livingston Leadership Scholastic Audit		
KDE School/District Report Card Data		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey Results		
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)		
District Presentation of Progress		
Interviews with stakeholders (district personnel, school personnel, parents, students, SBDM and school board members)		
Review of district documents and artifacts		

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

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

---

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

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

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

(Check one)

## Opportunity for Improvement

**Develop and communicate a process to analyze a variety of data from multiple assessments of learning to improve professional practice and student success. Include a process for monitoring the impact of improvement initiatives. Hold school leadership accountable for the effective modification of curriculum and instruction in all classrooms.**

### Supporting Evidence

#### Student Performance Data:

- The school's accountability index rose from 49.3 to 59.3. This translates to a gain statewide from the 23<sup>rd</sup> percentile to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. The largest gains were seen in college-career readiness and in graduation rate. Academic gains were inconsistent.
- Student performance on the English II EOC assessment fell by 14 points.
- Student performance in language mechanics fell by 4.5 points.
- Student performance in Biology fell by 4.2 points.
- The 2011-12 gap score of 23.8 only rose to 26.6. This indicates that significant achievement gaps still exist.

#### Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure E.1, "Student is asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning," scored a 1.9 on a 4-point scale indicating a "somewhat evident" rating.
- ELEOT measure B.2, "Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable," scored a 1.7 on a 4-point scale indicating a "somewhat evident" rating. Challenging activities were not observed in many classes.

#### Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 55% of students indicated that they are given multiple assessments to check their learning and understanding. 58% of parents responded that their students are given multiple ways to show their learning and understanding.
- 81% of teachers surveyed indicated that curriculum, instruction and assessment are monitored and adjusted based on data from student assessments.

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

- The district is using a congruency protocol for guided planning and PLC work. Several interim and formative assessments are in use. However, responses indicated that the results from these assessments are not always used to improve instruction. In addition, a variety of assessment methods were not observed in use within classrooms or lessons.

3.3	Teachers engage students in their learning through instructional strategies that ensure achievement of learning expectations.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 2
-----	---	----------------------	------------------

**Performance levels**

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

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

Livingston District Internal Self-Assessment
Deficiencies from the 2011 Livingston Leadership Scholastic Audit
KDE School/District Report Card data
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)
District Presentation of Progress
Interviews with stakeholders (district personnel, school personnel, parents, students, SBDM and school board members)
Review of district documents and artifacts

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

- Self-Assessment
- Executive Summary
- Previous KDE Leadership Assessment

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### **Opportunity for Improvement**

**Investigate and deploy engaging instructional strategies in all classrooms that make students true partners in their education. Reduce the amount of teacher-driven instruction and increase the use of engaging techniques that make students active learners. Hold school leadership accountable for the use of student-centered engaging instruction in all classrooms.**

#### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s accountability index rose from 49.3 to 59.3. This translates to a gain statewide from the 23<sup>rd</sup> percentile to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. The largest gains were seen in college-career readiness and in graduation rate. Academic gains were inconsistent.
- Student performance on the English II EOC assessment fell by 14 points.
- Student performance in language mechanics fell by 4.5 points.
- Student performance in Biology fell by 4.2 points.
- The 2011-12 gap score of 23.8 only rose to 26.6. This indicates that significant achievement gaps still exist.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure D.1, “Student has several opportunities to engage in discussions with teacher and other students,” scored a 2.3 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating. Many classrooms observed used traditional teacher-led lecture or book-work models.
- ELEOT measure D.3, “Student is actively engaged in the learning activities,” scored a 2.1 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating. Some students were engaged, while others were sitting quietly but not participating in the lesson. Others were exhibiting off-task behavior (e.g. talking, head down on desk).

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- Only 38% of students surveyed indicated that the school motivates them to learn new things.
- While 78% of teachers surveyed indicated that they personalize learning to address individual student needs, only 22 % of students and 41 % of parents believe that teachers change their teaching to meet individual student learning needs.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews indicate that student engagement is a discussion topic within district and school PLCs. Observations of lessons confirmed the need for growth in this area. Many lessons were teacher-centered and not engaging – allowing students to sit quietly or exhibit off-task behavior.

3.4	School/district leaders monitor and support the improvement of instructional practices of teachers to ensure student success.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 2
<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.	
x	2	School/district leaders monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.	
	1	School/district leaders occasionally or randomly monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school/district's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.	
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>			
Livingston District Internal Self-Assessment			
Deficiencies from the 2011 Livingston Leadership Scholastic Audit			
KDE School/District Report Card data			
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results			
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)			
District Presentation of Progress			
Interviews with stakeholders (district personnel, school personnel, parents, students, SBDM and school board members)			
Review of district documents and artifacts			

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

---

### **Opportunity for Improvement**

**Develop and implement consistent monitoring and feedback processes that ensure school leadership holds all staff members accountable for quality instruction in all classrooms. Continue to utilize district instructional resources (DLT, PLCs) to improve the quality of instruction in all classrooms.**

#### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s accountability index rose from 49.3 to 59.3. This translates to a gain statewide from the 23<sup>rd</sup> percentile to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. The largest gains were seen in college-career readiness and in graduation rate. Academic gains were inconsistent.
- Student performance on the English II EOC assessment fell by 14 points.
- Student performance in language mechanics fell by 4.5 points.
- Student performance in Biology fell by 4.2 points.
- The 2011-12 gap score of 23.8 only rose to 26.6. This indicates that significant achievement gaps still exist.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure A.1, “Student has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet his/her needs,” scored a 1.5 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating. Many lessons observed were designed for a single learning task for all students.
- ELEOT measure B.5, “Student is asked and responds to questions that require higher-order thinking,” scored a 1.7 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating. Questions posed to students were often singular-answer and involved little analysis or application of the learning.

- ELEOT measure E.3, “Student demonstrates or verbalizes understanding of the lesson/content,” scored a 2.0 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 89% of teachers surveyed believe students are provided a challenging curriculum and set of learning experiences. However, only 49% of students and 56% of parents agree that the curriculum is challenging.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews indicated that district leaders have developed a system to support the improvement of instructional practices (DLT to PLC then observed during walkthroughs/instructional rounds), but accountability for school leadership to ensure implementation of improvement initiatives in all classrooms for all students every day is not evident.

3.5	Teachers participate/system operates in collaborative learning communities to improve instruction and student learning.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
x	4	All members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule.	
	3	All members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally.	
	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.	
	3	Staff members have been trained to implement a formal process that promotes discussion about student learning.	
x	2	Staff members promote discussion about student learning.	
	1	Staff members rarely discuss student learning.	
	4	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching are a part of the daily routine of school/district staff members.	
	3	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching occur regularly among most school/district personnel.	
x	2	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching sometimes occur	

		among school/district personnel.
	1	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching rarely occur among school/district personnel.
	4	School/district personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
	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.
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>		
Livingston District Internal Self-Assessment		
Deficiencies from the 2011 Livingston Leadership Scholastic Audit		
KDE School/District Report Card data		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results		
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)		
District Presentation of Progress		
Interviews with stakeholders (district personnel, school personnel, parents, students, SBDM and school board members)		
Review of district documents and artifacts		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

## Opportunity for Improvement

**Continue district professional learning community with focus concentrating on student academic results and subsequent modifications to district plans to improve teaching and learning. Hold school leadership accountable for effective professional growth of the school/district staff by ensuring that school/district PLCs are focused on student growth and professional practice instead of information dissemination.**

### Supporting Evidence

#### Student Performance Data:

- Gap accountability scores saw increases in math and in on-demand writing over the previous year's results. However, significant decreases were noted in English II and in language mechanics.
- EOC assessment scores in English II and Biology fell for all students over the previous year.

#### Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure B.2, "Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable," scored a 1.7 on a 4-point scale indicating a "somewhat evident" rating. Challenging activities were not observed in many classes.
- ELEOT measure B.4, "Student is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussion and/or tasks," scored a 1.7 on a 4-point scale indicating a "somewhat evident" rating.

#### Stakeholder Survey Data:

- While 78% of teachers surveyed indicated they have been trained in a formal process to promote discussion about student learning, only 42% of parents responded that their children's teachers work as a team to help their children learn.

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

- Interviews with stakeholders suggest that the district is moving toward true PLC work that includes analysis of student data and instruction that is reactive to trends found in this analysis. Interviews and review of agendas suggest that PLCs have been used as mini-faculty meetings for information dissemination.

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.
	2	Exemplars are sometimes provided to guide and inform students.
x	1	Exemplars are rarely provided to guide and inform students.
	4	The process requires the use of multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction and provide data for possible curriculum revision.
	3	The process includes multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction and provide data for possible curriculum revision.
x	2	The process may include multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction.
	1	The process includes limited measures to inform the ongoing modification of instruction.
	4	The process provides students with specific and immediate feedback about their learning.
	3	The process provides students with specific and timely feedback about their learning.
x	2	The process provides students with feedback about their learning.
	1	The process provides students with minimal feedback of little value about their learning.
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>		
Livingston District Internal Self-Assessment		
Deficiencies from the 2011 Livingston Leadership Scholastic Audit		
KDE School/District Report Card data		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results		
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)		
District Presentation of Progress		
Interviews with stakeholders (district personnel, school personnel, parents, students, SBDM and school board members)		
Review of district documents and artifacts		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

---

### **Opportunity for Improvement**

**Hold school leadership accountable for the implementation of all district school improvement initiatives in all classrooms for all students. Monitor progress and provide support from the district to ensure the accountability of all school/district personnel to implement school improvements with fidelity.**

#### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s accountability index rose from 49.3 to 59.3. This translates to a gain statewide from the 23<sup>rd</sup> percentile to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. The largest gains were seen in college-career readiness and in graduation rate. Academic gains were inconsistent.
- Student performance on the English II EOC assessment fell by 14 points.
- Student performance in language mechanics fell by 4.5 points.
- Student performance in Biology fell by 4.2 points.
- The 2011-12 gap score of 23.8 only rose to 26.6. This indicates that significant achievement gaps still exist.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure E.3, “Student demonstrates or verbalizes understanding of the lesson/content,” scored a 2.0 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating. Many classes observed exhibited a lack of significant teacher-student interaction regarding understanding of content.
- ELEOT measure E.5, “Student has opportunities to revise/improve work based on feedback,” scored a 1.4 on a 4-point scale indicating a “not observed” rating. Since the predominant teaching mode was lecture, feedback was not often observed. Student work samples/exemplars exhibiting instructional feedback were rarely seen.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 85% of teachers agree that all teachers use a process to inform students of learning expectations. 78% of parents indicated that their students know the expectations for learning in their classes. However, only 50% of students agree that teachers explain their expectations for learning and behavior in all classes.
- 78% of teachers believe they provide specific and timely feedback about their learning, but only 49% of students indicated that teachers provide them information about their learning and grades.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews indicated that district leaders have developed a system to support the improvement of instructional practices (DLT to PLC then observed during walkthroughs/instructional rounds),

but accountability for school leadership to ensure implementation of improvement initiatives in all classrooms for all students every day is not evident.

- Interviews at the school and district level indicated that improvement initiatives are communicated through the DLT to the teachers. However, classroom observations did not show consistent evidence of implementation of these initiatives (e.g. learning targets, effective questioning, engaging instruction). Improvement initiatives are not implemented with fidelity and consistently monitored to determine if instruction is improving for all students.

3.7	Mentoring, coaching, and induction programs support instructional improvement consistent with the school/system's values and beliefs about teaching and learning.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 2
-----	---	----------------------	------------------

**Performance levels**

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

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

Livingston District Internal Self-Assessment
Deficiencies from the 2011 Livingston Leadership Scholastic Audit
KDE School/District Report Card data
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)
District Presentation of Progress
Interviews with stakeholders (district personnel, school personnel, parents, students, SBDM and school board members)
Review of district documents and artifacts

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### **Opportunity for Improvement**

**Initiate and support mentoring and coaching programs for teachers to help facilitate the incorporation of effective classroom strategies into their instruction. Continue to utilize TPGES in order to improve teacher performance. Hold school leadership accountable for school improvement consistent with the system’s beliefs about teaching and learning.**

#### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s accountability index rose from 49.3 to 59.3. This translates to a gain statewide from the 23<sup>rd</sup> percentile to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. The largest gains were seen in college-career readiness and in graduation rate. Academic gains were inconsistent.
- Student performance on the English II EOC assessment fell by 14 points.
- Student performance in language mechanics fell by 4.5 points.
- Student performance in Biology fell by 4.2 points.
- The 2011-12 gap score of 23.8 only rose to 26.6. This indicates that significant achievement gaps still exist.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 93% of teachers surveyed indicated that a formal support system for new staff members is in place.
- 74% of teachers said that staff members provide peer coaching to other teachers.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- The district conducts a half-day new teacher workshop to orient and communicate district expectations to new staff. New teachers participate in a book study together at the district level. Within the school, new teachers participate in content PLCs and complete their Kentucky Teacher Internship Program.

3.8	The school/system engages families in meaningful ways in their children’s education and keeps them informed of their children’s learning progress.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 2
-----	--	----------------------	------------------

**Performance levels**

	4	Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children’s education are designed, implemented, and evaluated.
	3	Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children’s education are designed and implemented.
x	2	Programs that engage families in their children’s education are available.
	1	Few or no programs that engage families in their children’s education are available.
	4	Families have multiple ways of staying informed of their children’s learning progress.
	3	School/district personnel regularly inform families of their children’s learning progress.
x	2	School/district personnel provide information about children’s learning.
	1	School/district personnel provide little relevant information about children’s learning.

**Evidence Reviewed**

Livingston District Internal Self-Assessment
Deficiencies from the 2011 Livingston Leadership Scholastic Audit
KDE School/District Report Card data
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)
District Presentation of Progress
Interviews with stakeholders (district personnel, school personnel, parents, students, SBDM and school board members)
Review of district documents and artifacts

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

---

### Opportunity for Improvement

**Develop a process for involving parents as partners in the education of their students. Continue and expand two-way (school/district-to-home and home-to-school/district) communication initiatives to inform parents about student progress as well as involve parents in teaching and learning. Develop a system where important information is shared with parents as well as students (e.g. deadlines, college information).**

#### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s accountability index rose from 49.3 to 59.3. This translates to a gain statewide from the 23<sup>rd</sup> percentile to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. The largest gains were seen in college-career readiness and in graduation rate. Academic gains were inconsistent.
- Student performance on the English II EOC assessment fell by 14 points.
- Student performance in language mechanics fell by 4.5 points.
- Student performance in Biology fell by 4.2 points.
- The 2011-12 gap score of 23.8 only rose to 26.6. This indicates that significant achievement gaps still exist.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure E.2, “Student responds to teacher feedback to improve understanding,” scored a 1.9 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.
- ELEOT measure E.4, “Student understands how his/her work is assessed,” scored a 1.4 on a 4-point scale indicating a “not observed” rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 63% of teachers surveyed responded that school personnel regularly engage families in the children’s learning. However, only 38% of students agreed that the school offers opportunities for families to be involved and less than half of the parents (47%) agreed that teachers help them understand their children’s progress.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews reflected that parents are informed about student grades through Infinite Campus progress reports. These reports are distributed approximately two weeks after mid-term and two weeks before the end of the quarter—often too late to make significant grade improvements before the end of the nine-week quarter. Some parent workshops were used to connect with parents attending.

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

**Performance levels**

	4	School/district personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student and related adults.
	3	School/district personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student.
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)**

Livingston District Internal Self-Assessment
Deficiencies from the 2011 Livingston Leadership Scholastic Audit
KDE School/District Report Card data
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)
District Presentation of Progress
Interviews with stakeholders (district personnel, school personnel, parents, students, SBDM and school board members)
Review of district documents and artifacts

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

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

- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### **Opportunity for Improvement**

**Develop and implement a formal structure where each student is connected to an adult advocate in the school/district who supports the student’s educational experience. In addition, continue to target specific students who are identified as at-risk for dropping out of school with intensive interventions designed to provide extra support for their unique needs.**

#### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s accountability index rose from 49.3 to 59.3. This translates to a gain statewide from the 23<sup>rd</sup> percentile to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. The largest gains were seen in college-career readiness and in graduation rate. Academic gains were inconsistent.
- Student performance on the English II EOC assessment fell by 14 points.
- Student performance in language mechanics fell by 4.5 points.
- Student performance in Biology fell by 4.2 points.
- The 2011-12 gap score of 23.8 only rose to 26.6. This indicates that significant achievement gaps still exist.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure C.1, “Student demonstrates or expresses that learning experiences are positive,” scored a 2.2 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.
- ELEOT measure C.2, “Student demonstrates a positive attitude about the classroom and learning,” scored a 2.4 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- Parents (75%) and teachers (63%) shared similar results when asked if students have adult advocates within the school that support the student’s educational experience. However, only 36% of students stated that there is an adult within the building that knows them well and shows interest in their future.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews indicated that the district and school use the Persistence to Graduation report to target specific students as potential dropouts and assign an in-school/district mentor to those students. There is not a process in place whereby all students have an assigned mentor.

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

**Performance levels**

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

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

Livingston District Internal Self-Assessment
Deficiencies from the 2011 Livingston Leadership Scholastic Audit
KDE School/District Report Card data
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)
District Presentation of Progress
Interviews with stakeholders (district personnel, school personnel, parents, students, SBDM and school board members)
Review of District documents and artifacts
Livingston County High School Quarterly Report

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

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

---

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

---

### **Opportunity for Improvement**

**Develop and implement a system that ensures that 1) content in lessons experienced by students is rigorous and congruent with appropriate grade-level standards and skills, 2) assessments of student understanding of this content are authentic and congruent with the rigor of the standards, and 3) grades reflect an agreement between “passing” and “proficient.”**

#### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- According to the school’s KDE Quarterly Report for the second quarter of 2013-14, freshmen students are passing a high percentage of their courses (the lowest pass rate is 84% in 9<sup>th</sup> grade ELA. However, only 26.8% of students score proficient on the English II EOC assessment—indicating that grading is not consistent with End-of-Course assessment rigor.
- MAP data for first quarter 9<sup>th</sup> grade students does not indicate a performance level consistent with the grades received as indicated above.
- Less than 50% of graduating seniors over the last two years were college ready.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure E.1, “Student is asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning,” scored a 1.9 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.
- ELEOT measure E.4, “Student understands how her/his work is assessed,” scored a 1.7 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.

- ELEOT measure E.5, “Student has opportunities to revise/improve work based on feedback,” scored a 1.4 on a 4-point scale indicating a “not observed” rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- Although 89% of teachers surveyed indicated that all teachers use consistent common grading and reporting policies, only 36% of parents surveyed indicated that teachers regularly keep them informed about how their children are graded. Consistently, only 29% of students agreed that teachers keep their families informed about students’ academic progress.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews and Quarterly Report data indicate a disconnect exists between the number of students “passing” and the number of students “proficient” on MAP and end-of-course assessments.

3.11		All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 3
<b>Performance levels</b>				
	4	All staff members participate in a rigorous, continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district’s purpose and direction.		
x	3	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district’s purpose and direction.		
	2	Most staff members participate in a program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district’s purpose and direction.		
	1	Few or no staff members participate in professional learning.		
	4	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school/district and the individual.		
x	3	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school/district.		
	2	Professional development is based on the needs of the school/district.		
	1	Professional development, when available, may or may not address the needs of the school/district or build capacity among staff members.		
	4	The program builds measurable capacity among all professional and support staff.		
	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>				
Livingston District Internal Self-Assessment				
Deficiencies from the 2011 Livingston Leadership Scholastic Audit				
KDE School/District Report Card data				

AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)
District Presentation of Progress
Interviews with stakeholders (district personnel, school personnel, parents, students, SBDM and school board members)
Review of district documents and artifacts

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s accountability index rose from 49.3 to 59.3. This translates to a gain statewide from the 23<sup>rd</sup> percentile to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. The largest gains were seen in college-career readiness and in graduation rate. Academic gains were inconsistent.
- Student performance on the English II EOC assessment fell by 14 points.
- Student performance in language mechanics fell by 4.5 points.
- Student performance in Biology fell by 4.2 points.
- The 2011-12 gap score of 23.8 only rose to 26.6. This indicates that significant achievement gaps still exist.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure B.2, “Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable,” scored a 1.7 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating. Challenging activities were not observed in many classes.

- ELEOT measure B.4, “Student is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions and and/or tasks,” scored a 1.7 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 93% of teachers surveyed reported participating in collaborative learning communities.
- 93% of teachers surveyed reported participating in continuous professional learning based on identified needs of the school.
- 96% of teachers surveyed indicated that professional learning is designed to build capacity among professional and support staff members.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews indicated that all teachers participate in professional learning communities. However, the existence of large achievement gaps and low end-of-course assessment proficiency rates indicated that these PLCs are not having the desired effect of improving instruction for all students.

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>			
Livingston District Internal Self-Assessment			
Deficiencies from the 2011 Livingston Leadership Scholastic Audit			
KDE School/District Report Card data			
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey results			
Classroom observation data (ELEOT)			
District Presentation of Progress			

Interviews with stakeholders (district personnel, school personnel, parents, students, SBDM and school board members)

Review of district documents and artifacts

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

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

---

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

---

### Opportunity for Improvement

**Develop and deploy a comprehensive system to examine all district improvement initiatives and programs to determine their impact on student success. Meet the unique needs of all students (e.g. special needs, gifted and talented, diverse backgrounds) by identifying and then intervening for student success. Hold school leadership accountable for the success of all students regardless of their unique learning needs.**

#### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s accountability index rose from 49.3 to 59.3. This translates to a gain statewide from the 23<sup>rd</sup> percentile to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. The largest gains were seen in college-career readiness and in graduation rate. Academic gains were inconsistent.
- Student performance on the English II EOC assessment fell by 14 points.
- Student performance in language mechanics fell by 4.5 points.
- Student performance in Biology fell by 4.2 points.
- The 2011-12 gap score of 23.8 only rose to 26.6. This indicates that significant achievement gaps still exist.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT measure A.1, “Student has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs,” scored a 1.5 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.
- ELEOT measure A.2, “Student has equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology and support,” scored a 2.4 on a 4-point scale indicating a “somewhat evident” rating.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 85% of teachers surveyed indicated that learning support services are provided for all students based on their needs. However, 61% of parents and 39% of students agreed that they have learning support services provided based on their identified needs.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Some programs (such as Open Campus) are examined for impact and reviewed for potential modification. Interviews indicate that a comprehensive district system to monitor and analyze the effectiveness of all improvement initiatives and programs in the district does not exist. An analysis of all programs has not been done to eliminate overlaps and gaps in services.

## Standard 3 Overview

A brief narrative overview concludes the team’s analysis and review of the standard.

### 1.) Themes that have emerged from the team’s review of the standard:

This review of the Livingston County District produced several consistent themes that were evident across all twelve indicators of Standard 3 (Teaching and Assessing for Learning.) The district has initiated multiple processes and protocols designed to improve instruction for all students and lead to greater student success. The district design to use the District Leadership Team to communicate these initiatives through school-level professional learning communities has been implemented. However, observations of classrooms at the high school indicate that these district initiatives are not implemented with fidelity within lessons.

Survey information from all groups of stakeholders reflected a consistent disconnect between the responses of teachers versus the responses of students and parents regarding the indicators in Standard 3. As a pattern, teacher responses were more positive regarding the current state of teaching and learning within the school where student and parent responses trended less positive. While the school has had some improvement in student performance as evidenced by test scores, it still lags behind the state average in multiple data measures. End-of-course assessment performance fell in multiple areas based on the previous year’s data. While celebrating the positive results, there is still a great deal of work to accomplish (especially among gap students) before all stakeholders celebrate success.

Classrooms observed tended to exhibit teacher-centered learning (e.g., lecture, book reading, worksheets to complete). Active, student-engaging learning was not observed consistently. According to ELEOT observations, the score for engaging instruction (ELEOT measure D.3) was a 2.1 on a 4-point scale – meaning that engaging instruction was “somewhat evident.” Instructional methods that allow students to actively engage with the content themselves (e.g., projects, research, student interactions, group work, investigations) instead of passively receiving it from the teacher via lecture were rarely observed.

Another trend noted was a high percentage of students passing courses yet not performing at the proficient level on standards assessments. Lessons that require students to encounter content at the rigor level of the standard followed by assessments congruent to the standard will lead to a higher percentage of agreement between the number of students who “pass” and the number of students who are “proficient.”

Finally, a disconnect exists between the communication of district-led initiatives and implementation of these initiatives at the school level for all students in all courses. If the school performance scores (especially gap scores) are to improve, district leadership must hold school leadership accountable for the implementation of improvement initiatives with fidelity. Monitoring of implementation must focus on impact, and revision and modification must become the norm when lessons are analyzed in order for all students to be successful.

**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 Livingston County School District.

**Deficiency 1: District leadership has not established an ongoing collaborative process to address curricular issues and analyze student assessment data to identify and guide needed curriculum modifications.**

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

Team evidence:

- PLC artifacts
- Interviews with stakeholders
- Student performance data

Team comments:

A process to examine student assessment data has been initiated. Curriculum documents have been created. The district DLT is active in examining curriculum and instruction issues. Current initiatives include alignment of the curriculum across grades 6, 7, 8 and 9. Performance data has shown improvement in some areas. However, a complete system of cycles of collaborative analysis of student work in all school PLCs, modification of the curriculum and measurement of impact on student achievement is not evident.

**Deficiency 2: District leadership has not developed a process to ensure professional development activities improve instructional practices and advance student achievement.**

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

Team evidence:

- Professional Development plan
- Stakeholder interviews
- Description of DLT processes

Team comments:

A process to ensure that professional development activities are needs-based and tied to improvement goals has been developed. PD surveys are administered at the completion of each activity. However, a comprehensive monitoring system that measures the impact of all professional development activities upon student achievement has not yet been implemented.

**Deficiency 3: District leadership has not required high school leadership to establish an effective intervention program to address the individual needs of students.**

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:

- District Rtl plan
- Interviews with stakeholders
- Student performance data (specifically gap data)

Team comments:

A district Rtl plan exists. District support is given to Rtl implementation. Intervention programs (ALEKS, Reading Plus) are in place. The effectiveness of these intervention programs and their impact on student achievement is not apparent (i.e. still have large gaps in accountability scores).

**Deficiency 4: District leadership has not ensured high school leadership provides ongoing explicit and specific feedback to teachers regarding professional practices.**

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

Team evidence:

- Interviews with stakeholders
- Instructional rounds data
- Walkthrough data
- Description of instructional rounds and walkthrough processes
- DLT agendas
- Guided planning process description

- Classroom observations/ELEOT data

Team comments:

District collaborates with high school leadership to implement regular walkthrough and instructional rounds cycles. Identified needs are discussed in DLT meetings and improvement initiatives are chosen. DLT members then communicate improvement initiatives as expectations for staff through PLCs. Subsequent walkthroughs by district and school leaders examine the impact of these improvement initiatives at the classroom level. However, classroom observations reflect that some of these district expectations (i.e. learning targets, questioning techniques) are not implemented with fidelity.

**Deficiency 5: District leadership does not sufficiently evaluate the impact of district improvement strategies, programs, or resource allocations to determine the extent to which desired results are achieved.**

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

Team evidence:

- Interviews with stakeholders
- Description of district monitoring processes

Team comments:

District and school leaders referenced the use of student performance data in turnaround meetings as well as school and district PLCs. A systematic evaluation system to effectively evaluate the impact of all strategies, programs and allocations was not apparent. Many improvement initiatives have been implemented, but a monitoring system that ensures full implementation of all improvement initiatives is not in place.

