



Internal District Review Report

Name of Institution

Reviewed: Metcalfe County District

Date: February 12, 2014-February 13, 2014



Introduction

The KDE Internal School/District Review is designed to:

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

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

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

The report includes:

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

Standard 3: Teaching and Assessing for Learning

Standard: The school/district’s curriculum, instructional design, and assessment practices guide and ensure teacher effectiveness and student learning.	District Rating for Standard 3 2.67	Team Rating for Standard 3 2.75
--	--	--

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

3.1	The school/district’s curriculum provides equitable and challenging learning experiences that ensure all students have sufficient opportunities to develop learning, thinking, and life skills that lead to success at the next level.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 3
-----	--	---------------------------------	-----------------------------

Performance levels

	4	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide all students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills that align with the school’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.
x	3	Like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations.
	2	Most like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations.
	1	Like courses/classes do not always have the same learning expectations.
	4	Learning activities are individualized for each student in a way that supports achievement of expectations.
x	3	Some learning activities are individualized for each student in a way that supports achievement of expectations.

2	Little individualization for each student is evident.
1	No individualization for students is evident.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)	
Metcalfe District Internal Self-Assessment	
Deficiencies from the 2011 Metcalfe Leadership Scholastic Audit	
KDE School/District Report Card data	
Advanc-ED 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	
District curriculum documentation	
CIITS lesson plan documentation	

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The accountability score of Metcalfe County High School increased from 60.6 in 2011-12 to 64.4 in 2012-13 for an increase of 3.8 points of growth for the year.
- The school’s accountability percentile rank increased from 78% in 2011-12 to 90% in 2012-13 for an increase of 12 percentage points for the year.

- Math scores increased from 67.8 in 2011-12 to 86.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 18.2 points for the year.
- Social studies scores increased from 39.6 in 2011-12 to 63.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 23.4 points for the year.
- The percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in math increased from 47.7 in 2011-12 to 66.4 in 2012-13 for an increase of 18.7 percentage points for the year.
- The percentage of students performing in the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies increased from 28.6 in 2011-12 to 57.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 28.4 percentage points for the year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item indicator B.2, "Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable," was evident or very evident in 89% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item indicator B.4, "Student is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks," was evident or very evident in 83% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item indicator B.5, "Student is asked and responds to questions that require higher order thinking (e.g., applying, evaluating, synthesizing)" was evident or very evident in 66% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 69.9% of the parents participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement that "All of my child's teachers provide an equitable curriculum that meets his/her learning needs."
- 78.3% of the parents participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement that "All of my child's teachers give work that challenges my child."
- 92.3% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement that "In our school, challenging curriculum and learning experiences provide equity for all students in the development of learning, thinking, and life skills."
- 75.5% of the students participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement that "My school provides me with challenging curriculum and learning experiences."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- A review of district and school documentation reveals that additional attention is placed on the RTI program to enable all students opportunities for intervention or enrichment in the area of reading. The RTI Coach continually monitors and communicates proficiency measure data to classroom teachers for discussions regarding revising student RTI placement.
- PLC meeting agendas and minutes and stakeholder interviews indicate that teachers engage in professional discussions about instructional strategies and are often led by teacher leaders. The goal of these discussions is to develop higher level thinking skills in each student and meet each student's learning needs.

Other pertinent information:

Evidence taken from superintendent's presentation:

- In 2010, the high school was ranked 222 out of 231 Kentucky High Schools and is currently ranked 64th based on Kentucky's assessment system.
- Math scores were 227 of 231 in the first year as a PLA school. This year the school is ranked in the top ten Kentucky high schools in math.
- The school's CCR ranking has been above state norms for two years.
- Graduation rate has improved from 76% to 91%.
- The number of students taking AP exams increased from 54 to 150 last spring.

- 66.4% of students at the school showed growth in reading and math (highest of all priority schools)
- The school was one of 32 priority high schools that had student performance growth above the state average in reading and math.
- The CCR rate increased each year for the last 3 years and met the target.
- 51.5% of students met the ACT math benchmark in 2013. The percentage of students meeting the math benchmark is above the state mean.
- The school did not meet the AFGR goal.
- The school's overall accountability score in 2012 was 60.6; in 2013 the score rose 3.8 points to 64.4.
- The percentile rank in 2012 was at the 78th percentile, which increased to the 90th percentile in 2013, representing a gain of 12 percentage points.
- The school and district have been designated as a distinguished high school and a proficient district.

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

Performance levels

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

2	There is limited evidence that the continuous improvement process ensures vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school/district's purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
1	There is little or no evidence that the continuous improvement process is connected with vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school/district's purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

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

Metcalfe District Internal Self-Assessment
Deficiencies from the 2011 Metcalfe Leadership Scholastic Audit
KDE School/District Report Card data
Advanc-ED 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
Curriculum documentation (guides, processes, plans)
MAP data collection, interpretation, and instructional implementation
School/District proficiency measures
Guided Planning documentation and protocol/ PLC protocol and norms

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
	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school's accountability percentile rank increased from 78% in 2011-12 to 90% in 2012-13 for an increase of 12 percentage points for the year.
- The school's achievement score increased from 58.2 in 2011-12 to 65.1 in 2012-13 for an increase of 6.9 points for the year.
- The school's math scores increased from 67.8 in 2011-12 to 86.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 18.2 points for the year.
- Social studies scores increased from 39.6 in 2011-12 to 63.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 23.4 points for the year.
- The percentage of students performing in the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies increased from 28.6 in 2011-12 to 57.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 28.4 points for the year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item descriptor B.2, "Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable," was evident or very evident in 89% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item descriptor E.1, "Student is asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning," was evident or very evident in 72% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 92.2% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or 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."
- 74.2% of the students participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, "My school gives me multiple assessments to check my understanding of what was taught."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- There is strong evidence indicating curriculum, instruction, and assessment are consistently monitored to ensure alignment with the district and school goals for student achievement and instruction. This is noted in guided planning sessions, using a set protocol, and planning meetings that targeted CSIP/CSIP goal, strategy, and activity discussions.
- The guided planning process prompts a monitoring/coaching process that provides a consistent venue for providing instructional feedback to all teachers.
- Stakeholder interviews and RTI documentation confirms that multiple data sources (MAP and proficiency measures) are used to assign students to RTI classes.

Other pertinent information:

- On the 2013 TELL Survey, 99.3% of the teachers indicated that school leadership facilitates using data to improve student learning as compared to 97.7% in 2011.
- On the 2013 TELL survey, 97.4% of the teachers indicated that teachers receive feedback that can help them improve teaching as compared to 88.2% in 2011.
- On the 2013 TELL survey, 94.7% of the teachers indicated they use assessment data to inform their instruction as compared to 90.9% in 2011.

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

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.
x	3	Teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students when necessary.
	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.
x	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.
	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)

Metcalfe District Internal Self-Assessment
Deficiencies from the 2011 Metcalfe Leadership Scholastic Audit
KDE School/District Report Card data
Advanc-ED 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
Findings from district walkthroughs at the school level
PD plans
Instructional strategy binder; agendas and minutes from Guided Planning and PLC meetings

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s math scores increased from 67.8 in 2011-12 to 86.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 18.2 points for the year.
- Social studies scores increased from 39.6 in 2011-12 to 63.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 23.4 points for the year.
- Overall gap performance increased from 37.8 in 2011-12 to 42.1 in 2012-13 for an increase of 4.3 points for the year.
- The percentage of 11th graders meeting the CPE/ACT English benchmark increased from 34% in 2011-2012 to 50% in 2012-2013 for an increase of 16 percentage points for the year.
- The percentage of 11th graders meeting the CPE/ACT reading benchmark increased from 32% in 2011-2012 to 42.7% in 2012-2013 for an increase of 10.7 percentage points for the year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item descriptor B.1, “Student knows and strives to meet the high expectations established by the teacher,” was evident or very evident in 89% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item descriptor B.4, “Student is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks,” was evident or very evident in 83% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item descriptor B.5, “Student is asked and responds to questions that require higher order thinking (e.g., applying, evaluating, synthesizing),” was evident or very evident in 66% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item descriptor D.1, “Student has several opportunities to engage in discussions with teacher and other students,” was evident or very evident in 77% of the team's observations.

- ELEOT item descriptor D.3, “Student Is actively engaged in the learning activities,” was evident or very evident in 94% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item descriptor G.1, “Student uses digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning,” was evident or very evident in 61% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 67.5% of the parents participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers use a variety of teaching strategies and learning activities.”
- 61.5% of the parents participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “My child sees a relationship between what is being taught and his/her everyday life.”
- 89.2% of the parents participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “My child has up-to-date computers and other technology to learn.”
- 89.7% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students.”
- 87.2% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or 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.”
- 68.0% of the students participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “My school motivates me to learn new things.”
- 36.2% of the students participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers change their teaching to meet my learning needs,” indicating that 63.8% of the students participating in the survey are neutral or disagree/strongly disagree with the statement.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Evidence from planning documents (instructional strategy binder) indicates teachers participate in discussions promoting the sharing of instructional strategies.

Other pertinent information:

- On the 2013 TELL Survey, 92.1% of the teachers indicated they are provided supports (i.e. instructional coaching and professional learning communities) to translate improvements into instructional practices as compared to 79.4% in 2011.

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

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

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

Metcalfe District Internal Self-Assessment
Deficiencies from the 2011 Metcalfe Leadership Scholastic Audit
KDE School/District Report Card data
Advanc-ED 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
Curriculum maps
Supervision and evaluation procedures
Lesson plan monitoring
District walkthrough and evaluation documentation
Use and monitoring of PD360
Guided Planning documentation and protocols / PLC planning and PLC norms

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The accountability percentile rank increased from 78% in 2011-12 to 90% in 2012-13 for an increase of 12 percentage points for the year.
- The school received the growth bonus in math because a greater percentage of students scored at the distinguished level (18.7%) than at the novice level (6.5%).
- Overall gap performance increased from 37.8 in 2011-12 to 42.1 in 2012-13 for an increase of 4.3 points for the year.
- The gap group's math scores increased from 42.1 in 2011-12 to 57.1 in 2012-13 for an increase of 15.0 points for the year.
- The gap group's social studies scores increased from 27.6 in 2011-12 to 44.8 in 2012-13 for an increase of 17.2 points for the year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item descriptor B.5, "Student is asked and responds to questions that require higher order thinking (e.g., applying, evaluating, synthesizing)," was evident or very evident in 66% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item descriptor D.3, "Student is actively engaged in the learning activities," was evident or very evident in 94% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item descriptor E.3, "Student demonstrates or verbalizes understanding of the lesson/content," was evident or very evident in 89% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Evidence suggests there is a formalized evaluation process in which teachers receive feedback for improvement on a frequent basis. Also, interviews indicate that the evaluations are tied directly to Professional Growth Plans.

Other pertinent information:

- On the 2013 TELL survey, 100.0% of the teachers indicated school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns related to instructional practices and support as compared to 90.9% in 2011.

3.5	Teachers participate/system operates in collaborative learning communities to improve instruction and student learning.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	All members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule.	
	3	All members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally.	
2	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.
x	3	School/district personnel indicate that collaboration causes improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
	2	School/district personnel express belief in the value of collaborative learning communities.
	1	School/district personnel see little value in collaborative learning communities.

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

Metcalfe District Internal Self-Assessment

Deficiencies from the 2011 Metcalfe Leadership Scholastic Audit

KDE School/District Report Card Data

Advanc-ED 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

PLC agendas and minutes

Program Review monitoring

PGES documentation

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

x	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Develop and implement a formal process districtwide (primary, intermediate, middle, and high) that promotes discussion about student learning and analysis of student assessment data through the use of collaborative learning communities across grade levels and content areas. Use the collaborative learning communities to ensure teachers learn from, use, and discuss the results of inquiry practices and improve instructional practice and student performance.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The accountability percentile rank increased from 78% in 2011-12 to 90% in 2012-13 for an increase of 12 percentage points for the year.
- The achievement score rose from 58.2 in 2011-12 to 65.1 in 2012-13 for an increase of 6.9 points for the year.
- The percentage of 11th graders meeting the CPE/ACT English benchmark increased from 34.0 in 2011-12 to 50.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 16.0 percentage points for the year.
- The percentage of 11th graders meeting the CPE/ACT reading benchmark rose from 32.0 in 2011-12 to 42.7 in 2012-13 for an increase of 10.7 percentage points for the year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item indicator B.2, “Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable,” was evident or very evident in 89% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item indicator B.4, “Student is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks,” was evident or very evident in 83% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 59.0% of the parents participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers work as a team to help my child learn,” leaving 41.0% of the parents participating in the survey giving neutral, disagree or strongly disagree responses to the statement.

- 79.5% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school have been trained to implement a formal process that promotes discussion about student learning (e.g., action research, examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching).”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review and stakeholder interviews indicate that it is evident professional learning communities are functioning at the high school level and that the district has fully supported this process; however, this process remains in the initial phase of deployment in the feeder schools.

Other pertinent information:

- On the 2013 TELL Survey 92.3% of the teachers indicated they work in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices as compared to 79.4% in 2011.

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

	2	The process provides students with feedback about their learning.
	1	The process provides students with minimal feedback of little value about their learning.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Metcalf District Internal Self-Assessment		
Deficiencies from the 2011 Metcalfe Leadership Scholastic Audit		
KDE School/District Report Card data		
Advanc-ED 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		
Examples of assessments illustrating modification of instruction		
Lesson plans in CIITS		
Student progress monitoring through the use of the school proficiency measure and MAP		
Learning target documentation		
Instructional modification resulting from progress monitoring		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- Math scores rose from 67.8 in 2011-12 to 86.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 18.2 points for the year.

- Social studies scores increased from 39.6 in 2011-12 to 63.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 23.4 points for the year.
- The percentage of students performing in the proficient or distinguished level in math increased from 47.7% in 2011-12 to 66.4% in 2012-13 for an increase of 18.7 points for the year.
- The percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished level in social studies increased from 28.6% in 2011-12 to 57.0% in 2012-2013 for an increase of 28.4 percentage points for the year.
- The overall gap performance rose from 37.8 in 2011-12 to 42.1 in 2012-13 for an increase of 4.3 points for the year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item descriptor B.2, "Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable," was evident or very evident in 89% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item descriptor B.4, "Student is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks," was evident or very evident in 83% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item descriptor C.5, "Student is provided additional/alternative instruction and feedback at the appropriate level of challenge for her/his needs," was evident or very evident in 78% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item descriptor E.2, "Student responds to teacher feedback to improve understanding," was evident or very evident in 94% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item descriptor E.3, "Student demonstrates or verbalizes understanding of the lesson/content," was evident or very evident in 89% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 86.8% of the parents participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, "My child knows the expectations for learning in all classes."
- 75.9% of the parents participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, "My child is given multiple assessments to measure his/her understanding of what was taught."
- 87.2% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, "All teachers in our school use a process to inform students of their learning expectations and standards of performance."
- 87.2% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, "All teachers in our school provide students with specific and timely feedback about their learning."
- 82.1% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, "All teachers in our school use multiple types of assessments to modify instruction and to revise the curriculum."
- 69.9% of the students participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, "All of my teachers explain their expectations for learning and behavior so I can be successful."
- 78.7% of the students participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, "All of my teachers use tests, projects, presentations, and portfolios to check my understanding of what was taught."
- 68.5% of the students participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, "All of my teachers provide me with information about my learning and grades."

Other pertinent information:

- On the 2013 TELL Survey, 99.3% of the teachers indicated teachers are held to high professional standards for delivering instruction as compared to 96.9% in 2011.

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

Performance levels

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

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

Metcalfe District Internal Self-Assessment
Deficiencies from the 2011 Metcalfe Leadership Scholastic Audit
KDE School/District Report Card data
Advanc-ED 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
Meeting agendas and minutes reflecting feedback
Documentation illustrating teacher induction program
PGES rollout documentation
TELL Survey
Guiding Planning Session agendas and minutes
New teacher orientation documentation
Faculty meeting documentation

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

x	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Develop a teacher mentoring program to support all teachers in the improvement of their craft through one-on-one coaching, modeling, and observation that is consistent with the district’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning. Monitor the implementation of the program to ensure it has high expectations for participation, content, and application and that the program is measured for effectiveness.

Supporting Evidence

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 69.2% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, staff members provide peer coaching to teachers.”
- 84.6% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, a formal process is in place to support new staff members in their professional practice.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Interviews and evidence suggest that there are limited opportunities for mentoring, coaching, and induction programs provided at the district level. There was documented evidence of a new teacher orientation hosted at the beginning of school, but further support and nurturing for beginning teachers is not a consistent practice.

Other pertinent information:

- On the 2013 TELL Survey, 91.9% of the teachers indicated school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns related new teacher support as compared to 81.2% in 2011.
- On the 2013 TELL survey, 100.0% of the teachers indicated the faculty and leadership have a shared vision as compared to 88.2% in 2011.

3.8	The school/system engages families in meaningful ways in their children’s education and keeps them informed of their children’s learning progress.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 3
Performance levels			
	4	Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children’s education are designed, implemented, and evaluated.	
x	3	Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children’s education are designed and implemented.	
	2	Programs that engage families in their children’s education are available.	
	1	Few or no programs that engage families in their children’s education are available.	
	4	Families have multiple ways of staying informed of their children’s learning progress.	
x	3	School/district personnel regularly inform families of their children’s learning progress.	
	2	School/district personnel provide information about children’s learning.	
	1	School/district personnel provide little relevant information about children’s learning.	
Evidence Reviewed			
Metcalf District Internal Self-Assessment			
Deficiencies from the 2011 Metcalfe Leadership Scholastic Audit			
KDE School/District Report Card data			
Advanc-ED 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			
Metcalf District Internal Self-Assessment			
Documentation of varied activities and communication with families			
District student recognitions			
One Call System documentation			
District website and cable channel			
High School Readiness Night/ Preview Night			

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The accountability score increased from 60.6 in 2011-12 to 64.4 in 2012-13 for an increase of 3.8 points of growth for the year.
- The accountability percentile rank increased from 78% in 2011-12 to 90% in 2012-13 for an increase of 12% for the year.
- The school/district’s achievement score rose from 58.2 in 2011-12 to 65.1 in 2012-13 for an increase of 6.9 points for the year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item descriptor E.2, “Student responds to teacher feedback to improve understanding,” was evident or very evident in 94% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item descriptor E.4, “Student understands how her/his work is assessed,” was evident or very evident in 77% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 56.6% of the parents participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers help me to understand my child’s progress,” indicating that 43.4% of the parents participating in the survey responded that they are neutral, disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.
- 82.1% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all school personnel regularly engage families in their children’s learning progress.”
- 58.0% of the students participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “My school offers opportunities for my family to become involved in school activities and my learning,” indicating that 42.0% of the students participating in the survey responded that they are neutral, disagree with or strongly disagree with the statement.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review and stakeholder interviews indicated that there are multiple methods in which the district/school communicates with families. Methods include: parent/guardian email distribution lists, One Call system, REMIND 101, Chamber listserv, district and school website, local newspaper and radio coverage, and Facebook and Twitter accounts. A formalized district communication plan has not been developed but is planned in conjunction with a future strategic planning process in the district.

Other pertinent information:

- On the 2013 TELL Survey, 97.4% of the teachers indicated school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns related to community support and involvement as compared to 97.0% in 2011.

3.9	The school/system has a formal structure whereby each student is well known by at least one adult advocate in the school/system who supports that student's educational experience.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	School/district personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student and related adults.	
	3	School/district personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student.	
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)			
Metcalfe District Internal Self-Assessment			
Deficiencies from the 2011 Metcalfe Leadership Scholastic Audit			
KDE School/District Report Card Data			
Advanc-ED 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			
List of students matched to adults who advocate on their behalf			
Support staff provided by district and GEAR UP: CCR Counselor, College and Career Coaches			

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

x	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Develop and implement a formal structure in which each student is connected to an adult advocate in schools who support 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

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item descriptor C.1, “Student demonstrates or expresses that learning experiences are positive,” was evident or very evident in 100% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item descriptor C.2, “Student demonstrates positive attitude about the classroom and learning,” was evident or very evident in 89% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 75.9% of the parents participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “My child has at least one adult advocate in the school.”
- 92.3% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or 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.”
- 59.7% of the students participating in the survey agree or 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,” indicating that 40.3% of the students participating in the survey gave a neutral, disagree or strongly disagree response to the statement.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews indicate that there are adults in the building that students can turn to in time of need, but currently no formal structure exists to provide intentional interactions between staff and students in an advocacy role.
- Evidence suggests that a formal, documented structure is needed to further develop one-on-one interaction to foster individualized and personalized action to further enhance relationships between administration, faculty, and students.

Other pertinent information:

- On the 2013 TELL survey, 97.4% of the teachers indicated there is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect in the school as compared to 85.7% in 2011.

3.10	Grading and reporting are based on clearly defined criteria that represent the attainment of content knowledge and skills and are consistent across grade levels and courses.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 3
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.	
x	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.	
	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.	
x	3	Stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures.	
	2	Most stakeholders are aware of the policies, processes, and procedures.	
	4	The policies, processes, and procedures are formally and regularly evaluated.	
x	3	The policies, processes, and procedures are regularly evaluated.	
	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)			
Metcalf District Internal Self-Assessment			

Deficiencies from the 2011 Metcalfe Leadership Scholastic Audit
KDE School/District Report Card data
Advanc-ED 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
Metcalfe County High School Quarterly Report
Grading policy, processes, and procedures (failure intervention plans)
District quality control procedures for the monitoring of grading practices across all schools
Communication of district and school procedures through handbooks and One Call system

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
	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s accountability score increased from 60.6 in 2011-12 to 64.4 in 2012-13 for an increase of 3.8 points of growth for the year.
- The accountability percentile rank rose from 78% in 2011-12 to 90% in 2012-13 for an increase of 12 percentage points for the year.
- The school’s achievement score increased from 58.2 in 2011-12 to 65.1 in 2012-13 for an increase of 6.9 points for the year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item descriptor E.1, “Student is asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning,” was evident or very evident in 72% of the team's observations.

- ELEOT item descriptor E.4, “Student understands how her/his work is assessed,” was evident or very evident in 77% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item descriptor E.5, “Student has opportunities to revise/improve work based on feedback,” was evident or very evident in 72% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 48.2% of the parents participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers keep me informed regularly of how my child is being graded,” indicating that 51.8% of the parents participating in the survey gave a response of neutral, disagree or strongly disagree to the statement.
- 62.7% of the parents participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers report on my child's progress in easy to understand language.”
- 89.7% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use consistent common grading and reporting policies.”
- 89.7% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all stakeholders are informed of policies, processes, and procedures related to grading and reporting.”
- 53.6% of the students participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers keep my family informed of my academic progress, indicating that 46.4% of the students participating in the survey gave a response of neutral, disagree or strongly disagree to the statement.
- 66.0% of the students participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers fairly grade and evaluate my work.”

Other pertinent information:

- On the 2013 TELL Survey, 100.0% of the teachers indicated the faculty and leadership have a shared vision as compared to 88.2% in 2011.

3.11	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 3
Performance levels			
	4	All staff members participate in a rigorous, continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district’s purpose and direction.	
x	3	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district’s purpose and direction.	
	2	Most staff members participate in a program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district’s purpose and direction.	
	1	Few or no staff members participate in professional learning.	
	4	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school/district and the individual.	
x	3	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school/district.	
	2	Professional development is based on the needs of the school/district.	
	1	Professional development, when available, may or may not address the needs of the school/district or build capacity among staff members.	
	4	The program builds measurable capacity among all professional and support staff.	

x	3	The program builds capacity among all professional and support staff.
	2	The program builds capacity among staff members who participate.
	4	The program is rigorously and systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.
x	3	The program is systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.
	2	The program is regularly evaluated for effectiveness.
	1	If a program exists, it is rarely and/or randomly evaluated.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Metcalf District Internal Self-Assessment		
Deficiencies from the 2011 Metcalf Leadership Scholastic audit		
KDE School/District Report Card data		
Advanc-ED 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		
Documentation of district monitoring of professional development		
Guided Planning documentation		
District Data Day documentation		
Documentation of district use of PD360		
Documentation of district use of GRREC professional development opportunities		
PD 360 and Observation 360		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item indicator B.2, “Student is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable,” was evident or very evident in 89% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item indicator B.4, “Student is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks,” was evident or very evident in 83% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 87.2% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or 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.”
- 89.8% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all staff members participate in continuous professional learning based on identified needs of the school.”
- 89.8% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, a professional learning program is designed to build capacity among all professional and support staff members.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review indicates that leadership meetings, faculty meetings, PLC meetings, and guided planning sessions are instrumental in providing professional learning opportunities for faculty.

Other pertinent information:

- On the 2013 TELL Survey, 64.1% of the teachers indicated that “In this school, follow up is provided for professional development,” as compared to 61.9% in 2011.
- On the 2013 TELL survey, 73.0% of the teachers indicated that “Sufficient resources are available for professional development in my school,” as compared to 68.5% in 2011.
- On the 2013 TELL survey, 81.8% of the teachers indicated that “Teachers have sufficient training to fully utilize instructional technology,” as compared to 63.1% in 2011.

3.12	The school/system provides and coordinates learning support services to meet the unique learning needs of students.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 3
Performance levels			
	4	School/district personnel systematically and continuously use data to identify unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency as well as other learning needs (such as second languages).	
	3	School/district personnel use data to identify unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency as well as other learning needs (such as second languages).	
x	2	School/district personnel use data to identify unique learning needs of special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs (such as second languages).	
	1	School/district personnel identify special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs (such as second languages).	

	4	School/district personnel stay current on research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related individualized learning support services to all students.
x	3	School/district personnel stay current on research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related learning support services to all students.
	2	School/district personnel are familiar with research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related learning support services to students within these special populations.
	1	School/district personnel provide or coordinate some learning support services to students within these special populations.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Metcalf District Internal Self-Assessment		
Deficiencies from the 2011 Metcalfe Leadership Scholastic Audit		
KDE School/District Report Card data		
Advanc-ED 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		
Documentation supporting the implementation of programs addressing individual student learning needs, such as FIP		
Documents illustrating data disaggregation of student gap groups		
Documentation of district learning support structures		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The overall gap performance increased from 37.8 in 2011-12 to 42.1 in 2012-13 for an increase of 4.3 points for the year.
- The gap math scores rose from 42.1 in 2011-12 to 57.1 in 2012-13 for an increase of 15.0 points for the year.
- The gap social studies scores increased from 27.6 in 2011-12 to 44.8 in 2012-13 for an increase of 17.2 points for the year.
- The gap writing scores increased from 40.4 in 2011-12 to 43.7 in 2012-13 for an increase of 3.3 points for the year.
- The free/reduced meals gap math scores increased from 43.2 in 2011-12 to 56.5 in 2012-13 for an increase of 13.3 points for the year.
- The free/reduced meals gap social studies scores increased from 27.6 in 2011-12 to 45.5 in 2012-13 for an increase of 17.9 points for the year.
- The free/reduced meals gap writing scores rose from 39.9 in 2011-12 to 44.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 4.1 points for the year.

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT item indicator C.4, "Student is provided support and assistance to understand content and accomplish tasks," was evident or very evident in 100% of the team's observations.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 75.9% of the parents participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, "My child has access to support services based on his/her identified needs."
- 89.8% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, "In our school, related learning support services are provided for all students based on their needs."
- 89.8% of the staff members participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, "In our school, all staff members use student data to address the unique learning needs of all students."
- 61.9% of the students participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, "My school provides learning services for me according to my needs."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- A review of artifacts provided strong evidence of a system for school personnel to systematically and continuously use data to identify the unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency, especially noted in RTI planning documentation and meeting agendas and minutes.

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 Metcalfe County District produced several consistent themes that were present in all twelve indicators of Standard 3 (Teaching and Assessing for Learning.) The district as well as the high school has initiated multiple processes and protocols designed to improve instruction for all students and lead to greater student success.

There are a variety of initiatives being implemented at the high school. Two that indicate a great deal of Impact on the gains in the district are **guided planning** and **data-based decision making**. **Guided planning**, with the weekly meetings between a school administrator and each individual staff member, promotes individual improvement through a coaching model that impacts nearly all of the indicators in Standard 3. There is a set protocol used that leads the administrator and staff member through a lesson design and a discussion of standards, assessments, instructional activities, data interpretation, and classroom intervention planning.

Surveys, document review and interviews indicate that **data** is collected frequently, analyzed and used to guide instructional change in the district. Components of results-driven improvement planning exist, such as the quarterly reporting of progress and the use of formative assessments at the high school level.

Data (state assessments, classroom assessments, and instructional monitoring data) does appear to be used to guide continuous improvement in curriculum and instruction at the school or classroom levels. For example, the school has strategically planned a robust RTI program for students to help close the achievement gap. Continual review of data from MAP assessments and proficiency measures help to determine the appropriate placement for all students based on skill deficit areas. Documentation as well as interviews with the professional staff reveals that the degree to which data is used at the school and classroom levels to drive decision-making is consistently apparent. It is also noted that a Failure Intervention Plan (FIP) is developed for all failing students.

It is evident that the district has processes and systems in place to provide for continuous quality monitoring, including monitoring for instructional effectiveness. Performance data and observations strongly suggest that a continuous monitoring system is intact at both the district level and at the high school level. It is noted that the district provides support in the completion of the Quarterly Reporting process as mandated by the Department of Education. It is also continually monitored to gauge student achievement or areas that may need additional attention for next steps.

Beyond the tangible evidence gleaned from documentation, observation, surveys and interviews are the cultural elements that are not always easy to measure. The surveys, interviews and, to some degree, the observations indicate a passion for the children in

Metcalfe County schools. Everyone the team interviewed indicated positive emotion for the community, the children, the schools and the district. Interviews with a wide variety of stakeholders overwhelmingly indicate a substantial improvement in climate and culture due to the superintendent being highly visible and his approach on providing transparent communication throughout the district. These same interviews indicate a foundational approach to build leadership capacity by the superintendent which can be improved upon. There have also been positive efforts in nurturing the relationship between the school system and the community to enhance stakeholder involvement, especially with corporate and civic organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce and the District Community Partner Committee.

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 Metcalfe County School District.

Deficiency 1: District leadership has not ensured that school leadership implements a comprehensive and effective Response to Intervention program.

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.

School evidence:

- MCHS has established an RTI block that meets daily.
- District-provided MAP assessments are used as one measure for student placement in RTI.
- District walkthrough data assist in the evaluation of effectiveness of the RTI block.
- The district has provided extra assistance through staffing to assist in the creation of an RTI coordinator.
- The district coordinates administrative conversations on RTI through monthly administration meetings and through the support of the Special Education Coordinator.

School comments:

Because of the intense focus on the specific reading skills for students, students have shown improvement gains and students are moved to another reading group as needed. There is an intentional focus on keeping track of student progress with various assessments/observations to help make informed decisions.

Team evidence:

- RTI schedule
- RTI meeting agendas and minutes
- Interviews with stakeholders
- Student performance data
- District walkthrough data reflecting RTI monitoring
- Administrator Team Meeting agendas and minutes
- Stakeholder interviews

Team comments:

District leadership has ensured that school leadership has initiated a schoolwide RTI program that allows for placement of students based on individual need with adaptability for students to transition as performance deficiencies are addressed. It is noted that a universal screener, MAP, is used to target skill deficit areas. There is an RTI Coach that is assigned to the high school that meets weekly with teachers to

disaggregate and interpret the data generated from the proficiency measures and other assessments that target selected standards. Students are regrouped every three weeks, and more often as needed, to meet individual learning needs. It is evident that there is a system in place that fosters the implementation and monitoring of the processes within this program.

Deficiency 2: The superintendent has not maximized the evaluation process.

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.

School evidence:

- The new superintendent has taken several opportunities to discuss evaluation expectations with administrators through administrative meetings, one on one conversations, and is a frequent visitor to all schools.
- The district has developed a comprehensive evaluation plan that covers all district employees and requires yearly evaluations of teachers.
- The district has supported MCHS in the implementation of the new PGES system as MCHS is a pilot school.
- The district has provided personnel to facilitate and manage the new PGES system.
- Observation 360 walkthroughs continue on the school level with monitoring of the walkthroughs at the district level.

School comments:

The expectation is for all evaluations to be completed according to our district policy as well as for the pilot PGES staff. Our other three schools are also participating in the pilot with two teachers at each school.

Team evidence:

- Meeting agendas reflecting discussions regarding evaluation process
- Stakeholder interviews
- District Evaluation Plan
- PGES implementation documentation
- District walkthrough documentation
- PD360 monitoring documentation

Team comments:

It is evident that a structured system is in place for the evaluation process. Expectations for the evaluation process are clearly communicated by the superintendent to ensure that all district and school administrators develop and utilize their capacities to provide exemplary leadership for the instructional practice in the district. The superintendent likewise monitors the professional growth of administrators

through formal evaluations and provides specific meaningful feedback to administrators on a regular basis. The district meets all requirements of the evaluation system described in the District Evaluation Policy, and is furthermore, piloting both the PPGES and TPGES in the district.

Deficiency 3: District leadership has not clearly communicated a multifaceted plan to sustain continuous and comprehensive school improvement.

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.

School evidence:

- The district and school have cooperatively designed a Sustainability Plan for continued improvement. This plan focuses on cognitive and non-cognitive data while offering sustaining financial resources for its continued implementation. The plan is monitored regularly through LT meetings.
- The district and school have developed vision statements based upon expectations of continuous improvement.
- The district has provided personnel to assist in sustaining academic gains that have been made at the high school.
- An expectation to discuss assessments and curriculum to ensure student needs are being met. On January 20, the superintendent and two curriculum directors met with the principal to discuss the Winter 2014 MAP assessment and how the results are being used to meet student weaknesses.

School comments:

School administrators have guided planning sessions weekly with teachers to discuss proficiency measures, curriculum pacing guides, classroom instructional strategies, and lesson plans. Any curriculum issues are addressed one-on-one with each teacher.

Team evidence:

- Evidence of planning sessions for CDIP/CSIP planning
- District input into school's 30-60-90 day planning
- Sustainability Plan
- District and school vision statements
- District support staff involvement in communicating school improvement expectations
- Data disaggregation discussions between district and school
- Stakeholder interviews

Team comments:

District leadership provides clear expectations for the planning process and continuous school improvements for administrators. Regular district sessions are hosted to ensure

the requirements of the CDIP/CSIP. These events ensure the alignment of all planning efforts to support the district’s mission and vision. There is also evidence through artifact review and discussions pertaining to a Sustainability Plan (guided planning, lesson plan development, proficiency measures, assessments, data disaggregation, 30-60-90 day planning, walk-throughs, Leadership Team, Quarterly Reports, PLCs, CCR data spreadsheets, and RTI) to further identify programs that need to be sustained in order to support the systems and processes that are currently in place that enhance student achievement. Also, the superintendent has created an organizational structure within the central office that further supports systems at the school level.

Deficiency 4: District leadership has not established a formal, comprehensive, and ongoing process to quantifiably measure the impact of strategies and allocated resources on student achievement.

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.

School evidence:

- The district has established standard PD days (4 per year) that are designed to focus on data analysis and instructional strategies. Each school with district assistance develops a plan for analysis and continued monitoring.
- The district regularly evaluates school programs for cognitive and non-cognitive impact and makes adjustments to resources accordingly. Conversations with principals about program performance occur regularly through administrative meetings and LT meetings to discuss the impact of strategies and allocated resources to support student achievement.
- District leadership attends after school PLCs on a regular basis where teachers present instructional strategies, engage in assessment data impact conversations, and use data walls/boards to discuss/move/add students as different assessments are examined.

School comments:

Teachers at the high school understand the format of after school PLCs and guided planning sessions with the focus being on student achievement.

Team evidence:

- Stakeholder interviews
- District PD agendas and minutes
- District PD plan
- Documentation illustrating ongoing monitoring of 30-60-90 plans, Quarterly Reports, and CSIP development denoting progress checks
- PLC agendas and minutes reflecting involvement and ongoing school planning processes

Team comments:

The efforts of the Director of Secondary Education, with support staff, to improve the interaction between the district and the high school have enhanced the district's ability to monitor and support the continuous improvement process both at the high school and at the district level. This interaction has created an opportunity to have relevant discussions pertaining to the impact of individual and improvement strategies and the use of allocated resource on instructional practices for student achievement. The Director of Secondary Education, with support staff, is instrumental in monitoring and providing feedback for 30-60-90 day planning, Quarterly Report submissions, and CSIP development while monitoring progress towards implementation.