



# Internal School Review Report

**Name of Institution**

**Reviewed:** Metcalfe County High School

**Date:** February 12, 2014-February 13, 2014

**School Principal:** Kelly Bell



## Introduction

The KDE Internal School Review is designed to:

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

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

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

The report includes:

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

## Standard 3: Teaching and Assessing for Learning

<b>Standard: The school’s curriculum, instructional design, and assessment practices guide and ensure teacher effectiveness and student learning.</b>	School Rating for Standard 3  3.00	Team Rating for Standard 3  <b>2.83</b>
---	---	--

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

3.1	The school’s curriculum provides equitable and challenging learning experiences that ensure all students have sufficient opportunities to develop learning, thinking, and life skills that lead to success at the next level.	School Rating  3	Team Rating  <b>3</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’s purpose.
X	3	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide all students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	2	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide most students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	1	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide few or no students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	4	Evidence clearly indicates curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
X	3	There is some evidence to indicate curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
	2	There is little evidence to indicate curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
	1	There is no evidence to indicate how successful students will be at the next level.
	4	Like courses/classes have the same high learning expectations.
X	3	Like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations.
	2	Most like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations.
	1	Like courses/classes do not always have the same learning expectations.
	4	Learning activities are individualized for each student in a way that supports achievement of expectations.
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)	
Presentation by members of the leadership team	
Self-Assessment	
Executive Summary	
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment	
KDE School Report Card	
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data	
ELEOT Classroom Observation data	
Stakeholder interviews	
Review of documents and artifacts	
TELL Survey data	

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 90% for the 2012-13 school 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 NAPD calculation in mathematics increased from 67.8 in 2011-12 to 86.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 18.2 points for the year. The 2012-13 score was 30.4 points above the state mean of 55.6.
- 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%).

- The school increased the percentage of students performing in the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies 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 descriptor A.2, “Student has equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support,” was evident or very evident in 100% of the team’s observations.
- 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.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 76.5% of the students participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “My school provides me with challenging curriculum and learning experiences.”
- 78.3% of the parents participating in the survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “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, “In our school, challenging curriculum and learning experiences provide equity for all students in the development of learning, thinking, and life skills.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews indicate that guided planning occurs with all teachers on a weekly basis and lesson plan feedback is given to each teacher with the expectation that suggested changes are made. In addition, walkthrough data and feedback is shared immediately to support the continuous improvement of instruction and pacing guides are checked by administration three times per year. The school’s focus on learning strategies, with an emphasis on math and literacy, ensures students are developing learning, thinking, and life skills.

3.2	Curriculum, instruction, and assessment are monitored and adjusted systematically in response to data from multiple assessments of student learning and an examination of professional practice.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 3
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	4	Using data from multiple assessments of student learning and an examination of professional practice, school personnel systematically monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.	
X	3	Using data from student assessments and an examination of professional practice, school personnel monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.	
	2	School personnel monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure for vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.	
	1	School personnel rarely or never monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school’s goals for achievement and instruction and statement of purpose.	

	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's purpose are maintained and enhanced in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
X	3	The continuous improvement process ensures that vertical and horizontal alignment as well as alignment with the school's purpose are maintained and enhanced in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
	2	There is limited evidence that the continuous improvement process ensures vertical and horizontal alignment and alignment with the school's purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
	1	There is little or no evidence that the continuous improvement process is connected with vertical and horizontal alignment or alignment with the school's purpose in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>		
Presentation by members of the leadership team		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Stakeholder interviews		
Review of documents and artifacts		
TELL Survey data		

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

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

---

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

---

### Supporting Evidence

#### Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 90 for the 2012-13 school 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 NAPD calculation in mathematics increased from 67.8 in 2011-12 to 86.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 18.2 points for the year. The 2012-13 score was 30.4 points above the state mean of 55.6.
- The school received the growth bonus in math because a larger percentage of students scored at the distinguished level (18.7%) than at the novice level (6.5%).
- The school increased the percentage of students performing in the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies 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 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:

- 92.3% of the staff members participating in the AdvancED 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."

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

- Stakeholder interviews indicate that walkthrough data is regularly used to monitor, provide feedback, and suggest adjustments to curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Further, the guided planning process, a collaborative process between administration and individual teachers, is used to provide feedback for all teachers in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and assessment. In addition, the process is designed to build capacity within the teachers, allowing the administrative team to offer more support with newer or struggling teachers. Pacing guide checks, lesson plan feedback, the Response to Intervention plan, and proficiency measures are all used to ensure teachers and administration are using multiple measures of data to improve student learning.

3.3	Teachers engage students in their learning through instructional strategies that ensure achievement of learning expectations.	School 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.
x	3	Teachers plan and use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.
	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)**

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

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

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

- Stakeholder interviews
  - Review of documents and artifacts
- 

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

---

### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 90 for the 2012-13 school 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 NAPD calculation increased in mathematics from 67.8 in 2011-12 to 86.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 18.2 points for the year. The 2012-13 score was 30.4 points above the state mean of 55.6.
- The school received the growth bonus in math because a larger percentage of students scored at the distinguished level (18.7%) than at the novice level (6.5%).
- The school increased the percent of students performing in the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies 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.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 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 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 indicator D.3, “Student is actively engaged in the learning activities,” was evident or very evident in 94% 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 regularly use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.”
- 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.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- A review of school documents and stakeholder interviews highlight multiple efforts to engage students such as strategies binders, PLC work, Rtl, literacy and math strategies, concept skills, and triggers. These strategies clearly reflect the school's focus on improved student engagement.

3.4	School leaders monitor and support the improvement of instructional practices of teachers to ensure student success.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 3
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	4	School leaders formally and consistently monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures beyond classroom observation to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.	
X	3	School leaders formally and consistently monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.	
	2	School leaders monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.	
	1	School leaders occasionally or randomly monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures to ensure that they 1) are aligned with the school's values and beliefs about teaching and learning, 2) are teaching the approved curriculum, 3) are directly engaged with all students in the oversight of their learning, and 4) use content-specific standards of professional practice.	
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>			
Presentation by members of the leadership team			
Self-Assessment			
Executive Summary			
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment			
KDE School Report Card			
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data			
ELEOT Classroom Observation data			
Stakeholder interviews			
Review of documents and artifacts			
TELL Survey data			

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

---

### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 90 for the 2012-13 school 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 NAPD calculation increased in mathematics from 67.8 in 2011-12 to 86.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 18.2 points for the year. The 2012-13 score was 30.4 points above the state mean of 55.6.
- The school received the growth bonus in math because a larger percentage of students scored at the distinguished level (18.7%) than at the novice level (6.5%).
- The school increased the percent of students performing in the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies 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 D.3, “Student is actively engaged in the learning activities,” was evident or very evident in 94% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item indicator 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:

- A review of school documents and stakeholder interviews clearly emphasized that school leaders monitor and support the improvement of instructional practices of teachers to ensure student success on a daily, period to period basis. For example, administration meets with each teacher weekly for the guided planning sessions, while the walkthrough schedule and immediate teacher feedback reflect the daily efforts to monitor instructional practices. Pacing guide and proficiency measure checks further highlight the intentional focus on improving instructional practices to ensure student success.

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

**Performance levels**

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

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

Presentation by members of the leadership team

Self-Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 90 for the 2012-13 school year.
- The school increased their achievement score from 58.2 in 2011-12 to 65.1 in 2012-13 for an increase of 6.9 points for the year.
- The school increased their NAPD calculation in mathematics from 67.8 in 2011-12 to 86.0 in 2012-2013 for an increase of 18.2 points for the year. The 2012-13 score was 30.4 points above the state mean of 55.6.
- The school received the growth bonus in math because a larger percentage of students scored at the distinguished level (18.7%) than at the novice level (6.5%).
- The school increased the percent of students performing in the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies from 28.6% in 2011-12 to 57.0% in 2012-13 for an increase of 28.4% 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:

- 79.49% of the staff members participating in the AdvancED 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:

- Stakeholder interviews and review of documents and artifacts indicate that teachers participate in professional learning communities (PLC) every other week. This evidence also suggests that teachers regularly collaborate across grade levels and content areas to discuss student learning. Stakeholders report analyzing data at each PLC and often creating products at the close of each PLC. These products include data boards and revised Rtl groupings. PLC norms are present in the meeting room and stakeholders report these norms are followed. In addition, stakeholders indicate the belief that the PLCs and other collaborative efforts in the school are the reasons for such increased student achievement.

3.6	Teachers implement the school/system’s instructional process in support of student learning.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 3
<b>Performance levels</b>			
	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.
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>		
Presentation by members of the leadership team		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Stakeholder interviews		
Review of documents and artifacts		
TELL Survey data		

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

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

---

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

## Supporting Evidence

### Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 90 for the 2012-13 school 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 NAPD calculation increased in mathematics from 67.8 in 2011-12 to 86.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 18.2 points for the year. The 2012-13 score was 30.4 points above the state mean of 55.6.
- The school received the growth bonus in math because a larger percentage of students scored at the distinguished level (18.7%) than at the novice level (6.5%).
- The school increased the percentage of students performing in the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies 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 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 indicator E.2, "Student responds to teacher feedback to improve understanding," was evident or very evident in 94% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item indicator E.3, "Student demonstrates or verbalizes understanding of the lesson/content," was evident or very evident in 89% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item indicator 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:

- 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."
- 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."
- 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."

### Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews and document reviews indicate that teachers systematically use the school's instructional process in support of learning. For example, teachers are provided lesson plan feedback with the clear expectation that required changes be made and resubmitted. The guided planning process is weekly, focused, and intentional in its efforts to support student learning. In addition, the proficiency measures are required to mirror assessments students will encounter in EOC, EPAS, KOSSA, and other accountability measures. These proficiency measures require a number of multiple choice questions and an open response with rubric, all evaluated by administration before being administered.

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

**Performance levels**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

---

### **Opportunity for Improvement**

**Develop, implement, and monitor formal mentoring and induction programs. These programs should support instructional improvement consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning and should be regularly evaluated for program effectiveness.**

#### **Supporting Evidence**

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 90 for the 2012-13 school 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 NAPD calculation increased in mathematics from 67.8 in 2011-12 to 86.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 18.2 points for the year. The 2012-13 score was 30.4 points above the state mean of 55.6.
- The school received the growth bonus in math because a larger percentage of students scored at the distinguished level (18.7%) than at the novice level (6.5%).
- The school increased the percent of students performing in the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies from 28.6% in 2011-12 to 57.0% in 2012-13 for an increase of 28.4 percentage points for the year.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- Although 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 and the review of school documents does not support the existence of a formal process.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews indicate that school personnel receive coaching through guided planning sessions. These are differentiated for new staff members. Also, new staff members are assigned a teacher mentor who informally provides support. However, the team did not see evidence to suggest the existence of a formal, documented induction/mentoring program that is evaluated for its effectiveness.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

### Supporting Evidence

**Student Performance Data:**

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 90 for the 2012-13 school 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 NAPD calculation increased in mathematics from 67.8 in 2011-12 to 86.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 18.2 points for the year. The 2012-13 score was 30.4 points above the state mean of 55.6.
- The school received the growth bonus in math because a larger percentage of students scored at the distinguished level (18.7%) than at the novice level (6.5%).
- The school increased the percent of students performing in the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies 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 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:**

- 82.1% of the staff members participating in the AdvancED survey agree or strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all school personnel regularly engage families in their children’s learning progress.”

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

- Stakeholder interviews and the review of school documents indicate that school personnel have designed and implemented a variety of strategies to engage families. For example, failure intervention plans (FIPs) are created every three weeks for all students failing a course. These plans are reviewed by administration, shared in guided planning and PLCs, and sent home to parents. In addition, the clear expectation is that teachers make parent contacts before FIPs are sent to inform parents of their students’ progress. Other strategies to engage parents include One Call, schedule preview night, tailgating at sporting events, REMIND 101, emails, school Twitter, and teacher responsiveness to parent emails.

3.9	The school has a formal structure whereby each student is well known by at least one adult advocate in the school who supports that student’s educational experience.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 2
<b>Performance levels</b>			
4	School personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with		

		individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student and related adults.
	3	School personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student.
X	2	School personnel participate in a structure that gives them interaction with individual students, allowing them to build relationships over time with the student.
	1	Few or no opportunities exist for school personnel to build long-term interaction with individual students.
	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 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 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 employee to gain insight into the student's needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	1	Few or no students have a school employee who advocates for their needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.

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

Presentation by members of the leadership team

Self-Assessment

Executive Summary

Previous KDE Leadership Assessment

KDE School Report Card

AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data

ELEOT Classroom Observation data

Stakeholder interviews

Review of documents and artifacts

TELL Survey data

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

---

### **Opportunity for Improvement**

**Develop, implement, and monitor a formal structure whereby each student is well known by at least one adult advocate in the school who supports that student’s educational experience. The program should build long term interaction with individual students and advocate for each student’s needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills. This structure should be regularly evaluated for effectiveness.**

### **Supporting Evidence**

#### Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 90 for the 2012-13 school 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 NAPD calculation increased in mathematics from 67.8 in 2011-12 to 86.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 18.2 points for the year. The 2012-13 score was 30.4 points above the state mean of 55.6.
- The school received the growth bonus in math because a larger percentage of students scored at the distinguished level (18.7%) than at the novice level (6.5%).
- The school increased the percent of students performing in the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies 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 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:

- 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.”

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

- Stakeholder interviews and a review of school documents indicate that the staff members are strong advocates for students. However, the evidence does not support that a formal structure exists to ensure each student is well known by at least one adult advocate in the school who supports the student’s needs regarding life skills.

3.10	Grading and reporting are based on clearly defined criteria that represent the attainment of content knowledge and skills and are consistent across grade levels and courses.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 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)**

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

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

- Self-Assessment

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 90 for the 2012-13 school 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 NAPD calculation increased in mathematics from 67.8 in 2011-12 to 86.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 18.2 points for the year. The 2012-13 score was 30.4 points above the state mean of 55.6.
- The school received the growth bonus in math because a larger percentage of students scored at the distinguished level (18.7%) than at the novice level (6.5%).
- The school increased the percent of students performing in the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies 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 E.4, “Student understands how her/his work is assessed,” was evident or very evident in 77% of the team's observations.
- ELEOT item indicator 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:

- 89.7% of the staff members participating in the AdvancED 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.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews and review of school documents indicate the presence of council policies regarding grading and reporting. In addition, syllabi clearly indicate the policies are implemented across the school. Stakeholder interviews also indicate the awareness of the policies by teachers, students, and parents.

3.11	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning.	School 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's purpose and direction.	
X	3	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school's purpose and direction.	
	2	Most staff members participate in a program of professional learning that is aligned with the school's purpose and direction.	
	1	Few or no staff members participate in professional learning.	
	4	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school and the individual.	
X	3	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school.	
	2	Professional development is based on the needs of the school.	
	1	Professional development, when available, may or may not address the needs of the school or build capacity among staff members.	
	4	The program builds measurable capacity among all professional and support staff.	
X	3	The program builds capacity among all professional and support staff.	
	2	The program builds capacity among staff members who participate.	
	4	The program is rigorously and systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	3	The program is systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
X	2	The program is regularly evaluated for effectiveness.	
	1	If a program exists, it is rarely and/or randomly evaluated.	
<b>Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)</b>			
Presentation by members of the leadership team			
Self-Assessment			
Executive Summary			
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment			
KDE School Report Card			
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data			
ELEOT Classroom Observation data			
Stakeholder interviews			
Review of documents and artifacts			
TELL Survey data			

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 90 for the 2012-13 school 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 NAPD calculation increased in mathematics from 67.8 in 2011-12 to 86.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 18.2 points for the year. The 2012-13 score was 30.4 points above the state mean of 55.6.
- The school received the growth bonus in math because a larger percentage of students scored at the distinguished level (18.7%) than at the novice level (6.5%).
- The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies 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.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 89.8% of the staff members participating in the AdvancED 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 AdvancED 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:

- Stakeholder interviews and review of school documents highlight the intentionality of professional learning in the PLCs. PLC time is not only used to analyze data, but it is also used to share instructional strategies, with the expectation that these strategies are seen in the upcoming lesson plans and walkthroughs. In addition, the leadership often asks teachers to share strategies they have used with success, therefore building leadership and instructional capacity within their teachers. Other sources of evidence include walkthrough data, the use of PD 360, and stakeholder feedback stating that professional learning is sometimes tailored to individual needs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

### Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 90 for the 2012-13 school 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 NAPD calculation increased in mathematics from 67.8 in 2011-12 to 86.0 in 2012-13 for an increase of 18.2 points for the year. The 2012-13 score was 30.4 points above the state mean of 55.6.
- The school received the growth bonus in math because a larger percentage of students scored at the distinguished level (18.7%) than at the novice level (6.5%).
- The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies 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 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 AdvancED 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 AdvancED 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.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews and review of school documents clearly indicate that school personnel systematically and continually use data to identify the learning needs of all students. One example is the Response to Intervention program. Multiple measures of data are used on at least a three week cycle to determine the RtI placements. Other evidence to support the systematic and continuous use of data to support the individual needs of each students include stakeholder interviews regarding the services of the Family Resource and Youth Service Center, GEARUP coach, CCR coach, counselors, Life Skills counselor, and migrant personnel.

### **Standard 3 Overview**

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

One theme that has emerged from the Internal Review at Metcalfe County High School is **clear expectations**. Leadership has developed, implemented, and monitored the non-negotiables and teachers follow a common instructional process. This is evident from classroom observations and review of school documents and artifacts.

Another theme is **intentionality in monitoring instruction and student achievement**. Guided planning sessions occur weekly; teachers submit lesson plans and receive feedback from administrators, and walkthroughs are conducted regularly which include timely feedback. Proficiency measures are developed by teachers and submitted to leadership for approval prior to administration. Data is reviewed during guided planning sessions and used to adjust instruction. The Response to Intervention structure at the school is data-driven and regularly monitored, creating a fluid entrance and exit for students based on individualized data.

#### **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 High School.

**Deficiency 1: The principal does not actively engage all stakeholders in fostering a school community focused on student achievement.**

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

**Team Evidence:**

- Principal's presentation
- Principal's Deficiency Self-Assessment
- School documents and artifacts
- Self-assessment
- Student performance data
- Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT data
- Stakeholder interviews

**Team Comments:**

The principal has taken many steps to actively engage all stakeholders in fostering a school community focused on student achievement. Examples include:

- Implementation and refinement of professional learning communities
- Guided planning process and lesson plan feedback
- Active committee structure
- Multiple modes of communication (e.g., One Call, website, email, Twitter, local newspaper)
- Reward policies and celebrations
- Grade checks and failure intervention plans shared with stakeholders

**Deficiency 2: The principal and administrative team has not empowered teachers as partners in decision making.**

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

**Team Evidence:**

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

**Team Comments:**

The principal and administrative team have empowered teachers as partners in decision making. Examples of this include:

- Active committee structure
- Teacher engagement in 30-60-90 day planning process
- Teacher involvement in determination of Rtl placement and instruction
- Guided planning process
- Teacher input is solicited for crafting meeting agendas

**Deficiency 3: The principal does not have an effective comprehensive process to evaluate programs and resources on student achievement.**

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

**Team evidence:**

- Principal's presentation
- Principal's Deficiency Self-Assessment
- School documents and artifacts

- Self-Assessment
- Student performance data
- Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT data
- Stakeholder interviews

Team comments:

The principal does evaluate the effect of programs and resources on student achievement. Examples of this include:

- Quarterly Report process
- 30-60-90 day planning process
- Data disaggregation
- Response to Intervention
- Principal consistently directs teachers to consider how requests impact student achievement.

**Deficiency 4: The principal has not ensured that all teachers deliver rigorous, student centered instruction and assessment activities that have a positive impact on student achievement.**

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

Team evidence:

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

Team comments:

The principal has ensured that teachers deliver rigorous, student centered instruction and assessment activities that have a positive impact on student achievement.

Examples of this include:

- Guided planning process
- Monitoring of proficiency measures
- Lesson plan feedback

- School assessments mirror accountability measures (e.g., PLAN, ACT, AP, EOC, KOSSA)
- Use of Rtl time for assessment purposes