



Internal School Review Report

Name of Institution

Reviewed: Pulaski County High School

Date: April 21, 2014-April 22, 2014

School Principal: Michael Murphy



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

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

Standard: 3 The school’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.	School 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.		
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 leadership team members
Self-assessment
Executive Summary
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
KDE School Report Card
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"/>	Opportunity for Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 97% for the 2012-13 school year.
- The school’s achievement score increased from 62.3 in 2011-12 to 65.7 in 2012-13 for an increase of 3.4 points for the year.
- The school’s NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculation in mathematics increased from 58.1 in 2011-12 to 60.9 in 2012-13 which is 5.3 points above the state average. Although the NAPD calculation in reading decreased from 67.2 in 2011-12 to 64.1 in 2012-13 the score is 3.1 points above the state average.
- The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in science from 27.6% in 2011-12 to 44.0% in 2012-13 for an increase of 16.4 percentage points for the year. The school increased the percentage of students performing at the

proficient or distinguished levels in social studies from 44.1% in 2011-12 to 54.7% in 2012-13 for an increase of 10.6 percentage points for the year.

- Student performance data on the 2013 KPREP EOC (end-of-course) assessments are above the state average in all areas except language mechanics with a score of 50.7% which is slightly below the state average of 51.4%.
- Achievement and gap scores from the 2012-13 School Report Card are above the state average in all areas with math above the state average by 11.6 points and writing above the state average by 11.5 points.
- ACT scores are above the state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 74.6% of students surveyed indicated they agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school provides me with a challenging curriculum and learning environment.”
- 88.5% of staff surveyed indicated they agree/strongly agree with the statement, “Challenging curriculum and learning experiences provide equity for all students in the development of learning, thinking and life skills”.
- 73.1% of parents surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers provide an equitable curriculum that meets his/her learning needs.”
- 73.1% of parents surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All my child’s teachers give work that challenges my child.”
- 93.8% of teachers surveyed indicate they are provided supports (i.e. instructional coaching, professional learning communities, etc.) which translate to improvements in instructional practices by the teacher.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Through the review of documents and stakeholder interviews it is evident the school has worked to vertically align curriculum in all core classes from sixth to twelfth grade. The school has developed protocol through PLCs (professional learning communities) and PDSAs (Plan-Do-Study-Act) for examining student work to ensure multiple measures of instruction are used to meet the needs of every student.
- Course syllabi and descriptions are required so that students and parents can be educated on the various courses that the school offers.
- The administration performs regularly scheduled walkthroughs and offers feedback to teachers so that immediate improvement occurs for instructional practices.

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
Performance levels			
	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.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Presentation by leadership team members		
Self-assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
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"/>	Opportunity for Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 97% for the 2012-13 school year.
- The school’s achievement score increased from 62.3 in 2011-12 to 65.7 in 2012-13 for an increase of 3.4 points for the year.
- The school’s NAPD calculation in mathematics increased from 58.1 in 2011-12 to 60.9 in 2012-13 which is 5.3 points above the state average. Although the NAPD calculation in reading decreased from 67.2 in 2011-12 to 64.1 in 2012-13 the score is 3.1 points above the state average.
- The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in science from 27.6% in 2011-12 to 44.0% in 2012-13 for an increase of 16.4 percentage points for the year. The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies from 44.1% in 2011-12 to 54.7% in 2012-13 for an increase of 10.6 percentage points for the year.
- Student performance data on the 2013 KPREP EOC assessments are above the state average in all areas except language mechanics with a score of 50.7% which is slightly below the state average of 51.4%.
- Achievement and gap scores from the 2012-13 School Report Card are above the state average in all areas with math above the state average by 11.6 points and writing above the state average by 11.5 points.
- ACT scores are above the state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.

Classroom Observation Data:

- In the Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment the statement, “Is asked and/or is quizzed about individual learning,” received a rating of 2.0 on a 4-point scale indicating it is somewhat evident that students are questioned regarding their learning.
- In the High Expectations Environment the statement, “Is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable” received a rating of 2.2 on a 4-point scale suggesting that the curriculum is somewhat appropriate and rigorous.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 74.1% of students surveyed agree/strongly agree that their school gives multiple assessments to check for understanding.

- 88.5% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction and assessment based on data from student assessment and examination of professional practice.”
- 97% of teachers use assessment data to inform their instruction.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- According to interviews and stakeholder data a regular walkthrough schedule was created for the administrative staff to monitor, provide feedback, and offer suggestions to teachers to better instructional practices. Feedback often occurs individually through departmental PLCs and through peer mentors. PLCs are scheduled and protocols for developing PLC practices are required for each meeting.
- A regular school-wide assessment schedule using MAP is provided three times per year. MAP data is disaggregated with information used to determine PLC practices and for developing multiple instructional strategies.

3.3	Teachers engage students in their learning through instructional strategies that ensure achievement of learning expectations.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	Teachers are consistent and deliberate in planning and using instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
	3	Teachers plan and use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
X	2	Teachers sometimes use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
	1	Teachers rarely or never use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
	4	Teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of each student.	
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.	
	3	Teachers use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.	
X	2	Teachers sometimes use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.	
	1	Teachers rarely or never use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.	

Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)
Presentation by leadership team members
Self-assessment
Executive Summary
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
KDE School Report Card
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	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Devise a plan to ensure teachers engage students and learning through multiple instructional strategies to ensure achievement of learning expectations.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 97% for the 2012-13 school year.
- The school’s achievement score increased from 62.3 in 2011-12 to 65.7 in 2012-13 for an increase of 3.4 points for the year.

- The school's NAPD calculation in mathematics increased from 58.1 in 2011-12 to 60.9 in 2012-13 which is 5.3 points above the state average. Although the NAPD calculation in reading decreased from 67.2 in 2011-12 to 64.1 in 2012-13 the score is 3.1 points above the state average.
- The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in science from 27.6% in 2011-12 to 44.0% in 2012-13 for an increase of 16.4 percentage points for the year. The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies from 44.1% in 2011-12 to 54.7% in 2012-13 for an increase of 10.6 percentage points for the year.
- Student performance data on the 2013 KPREP EOC assessments are above the state average in all areas except language mechanics with a score of 50.7% which is slightly below the state average of 51.4%.
- Achievement and gap scores from the 2012-13 School Report Card are above the state average in all areas with math above the state average by 11.6 points and writing above the state average by 11.5 points.
- ACT scores are above the state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.

Classroom Observation Data:

- In the Active Learning Environment the statement, "Is actively engaged in the learning activities," received a score of 2.1 on a 4-point scale.
- In the Digital Learning Environment the overall score was a 1.4 on a 4-point scale suggesting technology usage in the classroom is limited.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- While 62.1% of students agree/strongly agree that their school motivates them to learn new things, 25.9% were neutral.
- 80.8% of staff surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, "All teachers in our school personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students."
- 84.6% of staff surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, "All teachers in our school use a variety of technologies as instructional resources."
- 69.7% of parents surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, "All my child's teachers use a variety of teaching strategies and learning activities."
- 62.6% of parents surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, "All my child's teachers meet his/her learning needs by individualizing instruction."
- 66.1% of parents surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, "My child sees a relationship between what is being taught and his/her everyday life."
- 75.4% of teachers agreed that they have autonomy to make decisions about instructional delivery (i.e. pacing, materials, and pedagogy).

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- According to interviews and documents multiple measures are taken to ensure that teachers know and use many instructional strategies. PLCs and PDSAs indicate teachers use varied instructional strategies to increase student engagement.
- Teachers engage students through the use of technology, hands-on and collaborative activities, RTI (Response to Intervention) based upon student needs, literacy and math programs geared towards student needs, and through before, during and after school activities.

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

Performance levels

	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.

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

Presentation by leadership team members
Self-assessment
Executive Summary
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
KDE School Report Card
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"/>	Opportunity for Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 97% for the 2012-13 school year.
- The school’s achievement score increased from 62.3 in 2011-12 to 65.7 in 2012-13 for an increase of 3.4 points for the year.
- The school’s NAPD calculation in mathematics increased from 58.1 in 2011-12 to 60.9 in 2012-13 which is 5.3 points above the state average. Although the NAPD calculation in reading decreased from 67.2 in 2011-12 to 64.1 in 2012-13 the score is 3.1 points above the state average.
- The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in science from 27.6% in 2011-12 to 44.0% in 2012-13 for an increase of 16.4 percentage points for the year. The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies from 44.1% in 2011-12 to 54.7% in 2012-13 for an increase of 10.6 percentage points for the year.
- Student performance data on the 2013 KPREP EOC assessments are above the state average in all areas except language mechanics with a score of 50.7% which is slightly below the state average of 51.4%.
- Achievement and gap scores from the 2012-13 School Report Card are above the state average in all areas with math above the state average by 11.6 points and writing above the state average by 11.5 points.
- ACT scores are above the state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.

Classroom Observation Data:

- The Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment received an overall rating of 2.0 on a 4-point scale suggesting there is evidence that school leaders actively monitor instructional practice in the classroom.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 92.4% of teachers surveyed agree that they are encouraged to try to new things to improve instruction.
- 90.9% of teachers agree that they receive feedback that can help them improve teaching.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- According to interviews and stakeholder data a regular walkthrough schedule was created for the administrative staff to monitor, provide feedback, and offer suggestions to teachers to

better instructional practices. Feedback often occurs individually through departmental PLCs and through peer mentors. PLCs are scheduled and protocols for developing PLC practices are required for each meeting.

- A regular school-wide assessment schedule using MAP is provided three times per year. MAP data is disaggregated with information used to determine PLC practices and for developing multiple instructional strategies.

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

Performance levels

X	4	All members of the school staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule.
	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.
X	3	Staff members have been trained to implement a formal process that promotes discussion about student learning.
	2	Staff members promote discussion about student learning.
	1	Staff members rarely discuss student learning.
	4	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching are a part of the daily routine of school 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 leadership team members		
Self-assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
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"/>	Opportunity for Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 97% for the 2012-13 school year.
- The school’s achievement score increased from 62.3 in 2011-12 to 65.7 in 2012-13 for an increase of 3.4 points for the year.
- The school’s NAPD calculation in mathematics increased from 58.1 in 2011-12 to 60.9 in 2012-13 which is 5.3 points above the state average. Although the NAPD calculation in reading

decreased from 67.2 in 2011-12 to 64.1 in 2012-13 the score is 3.1 points above the state average.

- The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in science from 27.6% in 2011-12 to 44.0% in 2012-13 for an increase of 16.4 percentage points for the year. The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies from 44.1% in 2011-12 to 54.7% in 2012-13 for an increase of 10.6 percentage points for the year.
- Student performance data on the 2013 KPREP EOC assessments are above the state average in all areas except language mechanics with a score of 50.7% which is slightly below the state average of 51.4%.
- Achievement and gap scores from the 2012-13 School Report Card are above the state average in all areas with math above the state average by 11.6 points and writing above the state average by 11.5 points.
- ACT scores are above the state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 88.5% of staff surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school have been trained to implement a formal process that promotes discussion about student learning.”
- 63.3% of parents surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All my child’s teachers work as a team to help my child learn.”
- 95.5% of teachers surveyed agree that they work in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices.
- 92.3% of teachers surveyed agree that professional learning opportunities are aligned with the school’s improvement plan.
- 69.7% of teachers surveyed agree that professional development provides ongoing opportunities for teachers to work with colleagues to refine teaching practices.
- 83.1% of teachers surveyed agree that professional development enhances teacher’s ability to improve student learning.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- According to stakeholder interviews, artifacts and documents, the school has developed PLC protocols and schedules for regular meetings that include all subject areas and teachers.
- According to PLC agendas, teachers regularly collaborate to discuss instructional strategies, assessments, and to analyze student work.
- According to stakeholder interviews, PLC meetings are often used collaboratively for the creation of materials that directly impact student learning.

3.6	Teachers implement the school/system’s instructional process in support of student learning.	School 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)

Presentation by leadership team members
Self-assessment
Executive Summary
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
KDE School Report Card
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"/>	Opportunity for Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 97% for the 2012-13 school year.
- The school’s achievement score increased from 62.3 in 2011-12 to 65.7 in 2012-13 for an increase of 3.4 points for the year.
- The school’s NAPD calculation in mathematics increased from 58.1 in 2011-12 to 60.9 in 2012-13 which is 5.3 points above the state average. Although the NAPD calculation in reading decreased from 67.2 in 2011-12 to 64.1 in 2012-13 the score is 3.1 points above the state average.
- The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in science from 27.6% in 2011-12 to 44.0% in 2012-13 for an increase of 16.4 percentage points for the year. The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies from 44.1% in 2011-12 to 54.7% in 2012-13 for an increase of 10.6 percentage points for the year.
- Student performance data on the 2013 KPREP EOC assessments are above the state average in all areas except language mechanics with a score of 50.7% which is slightly below the state average of 51.4%.
- Achievement and gap scores from the 2012-13 School Report Card are above the state average in all areas with math above the state average by 11.6 points and writing above the state average by 11.5 points.
- ACT scores are above the state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.

Classroom Observation Data:

- In the High Expectations Environment the statement, “Knows and strives to meet the high expectations established by the teacher,” received a 2.3 on a 4-point scale. In the High Expectations Environment the statement, “Is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging and attainable,” received a 2.4 on a 4-point scale.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

According to student survey data,

- 70.3% of students agree/strongly agree that teachers explain expectations for learning and behavior.
- 72.4% of students agree/strongly agree that teachers use multiple methods to check for understanding.

- 70.5% of students agree/strongly agree that teachers provide information about learning and grades.
- 82.7% of staff surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use a process to inform students of their learning expectations and standards of performance.”
- 78.8% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school provide students with specific and timely feedback about their learning.”
- 83.6% of parents surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My child knows the expectations for learning in all classes.”
- 74.3% of parents surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My child is given multiple assessments to measure his/her understanding of what was taught.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- According to stakeholder interviews and documentation the administration has developed specific processes in support of teaching and learning. Teachers use formats for unit planning that include standards along with assessments, instructional strategies, and “can do” statements. Formal processes and procedures have been developed for PLCs that are school wide, departmentalized, or collaborative. Processes for walkthrough administration, teacher feedback, and data analysis have been created. PDSA methods are used to guide in problem solving and decision making both by the administration and teachers. A regular MAP testing process and schedule have been created by the administration that includes data review and changes in instructional practice.

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 2	Team Rating 3
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.	
X	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.	
	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.	
X	3	These programs set expectations for all school personnel and include measures of performance.	
	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 leadership team members
Self-assessment
Executive Summary
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
KDE School Report Card
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"/>	Opportunity for Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 97% for the 2012-13 school year.
- The school’s achievement score increased from 62.3 in 2011-12 to 65.7 in 2012-13 for an increase of 3.4 points for the year.
- The school’s NAPD calculation in mathematics increased from 58.1 in 2011-12 to 60.9 in 2012-13 which is 5.3 points above the state average. Although the NAPD calculation in reading decreased from 67.2 in 2011-12 to 64.1 in 2012-13 the score is 3.1 points above the state average.
- The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in science from 27.6% in 2011-12 to 44.0% in 2012-13 for an increase of 16.4 percentage points for the year. The school increased the percentage of students performing at the

proficient or distinguished levels in social studies from 44.1% in 2011-12 to 54.7% in 2012-13 for an increase of 10.6 percentage points for the year.

- Student performance data on the 2013 KPREP EOC assessments are above the state average in all areas except language mechanics with a score of 50.7% which is slightly below the state average of 51.4%.
- Achievement and gap scores from 2012-13 School Report Card are above the state average in all areas with math above the state average by 11.6 points and writing above the state average by 11.5 points.
- ACT scores are above state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 65.4% of staff agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, staff members provide peer coaching to teachers.”
- 80.8% of staff surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, a formal process is in place to support new staff members in their professional practice.”
- 93.8% of teachers surveyed agree they are provided supports (i.e. instructional coaching, professional learning communities, etc.) which translate to improvements in instructional practices by teachers.
- 90.9% of teachers surveyed agree that they receive feedback that can help them improve teaching.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Through stakeholder interviews and the review of documents and artifacts, the school has developed multiple professional development opportunities to assist new or struggling teachers. Regularly scheduled PLCs provide opportunities for immediate and direct assistance on issues related to instruction and classroom management.

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 4	Team Rating 3
Performance levels			
	4	Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children’s education are designed, implemented, and evaluated.	
	3	Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children’s education are designed and implemented.	
X	2	Programs that engage families in their children’s education are available.	
	1	Few or no programs that engage families in their children’s education are available.	
	4	Families have multiple ways of staying informed of their children’s learning progress.	
X	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.	
Evidence Reviewed			
Presentation by leadership team members			
Self-assessment			

Executive Summary
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
KDE School Report Card
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"/>	Opportunity for Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 97% for the 2012-13 school year.
- The school’s achievement score increased from 62.3 in 2011-12 to 65.7 in 2012-13 for an increase of 3.4 points for the year.
- The school’s NAPD calculation in mathematics increased from 58.1 in 2011-12 to 60.9 in 2012-13 which is 5.3 points above the state average. Although the NAPD calculation in reading decreased from 67.2 in 2011-12 to 64.1 in 2012-13 the score is 3.1 points above the state average.
- The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in science from 27.6% in 2011-12 to 44.0% in 2012-13 for an increase of 16.4 percentage points for the year. The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies from 44.1% in 2011-12 to 54.7% in 2012-13 for an increase of 10.6 percentage points for the year.

- Student performance data on the 2013 KPREP EOC assessments are above the state average in all areas except language mechanics with a score of 50.7% which is slightly below the state average of 51.4%.
- Achievement and gap scores from the 2012-13 School Report Card are above the state average in all areas with math above the state average by 11.6 points and writing above the state average by 11.5 points.
- ACT scores are above state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- While 56.2% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, “My school offers opportunities for my family to become involved in school activities and my learning,” 42.3% are neutral or disagree.
- 46.2% of staff surveyed are either neutral or disagree with the statement, “In our school, all school personnel regularly engage families in their children’s learning progress.”
- 67.7% of parents surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All my child’s teachers help me to understand my child’s progress.”
- 92.9% of teachers surveyed agree that their school maintains clear, two-way communication with the community.
- 97% of teachers surveyed agree that teachers provide parents/guardians with useful information about student learning.
- 83.1% of teachers surveyed agree that parents/guardians know what is going on in the school.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- According to a review of documents and artifacts along with stakeholder interviews, there is limited evidence to indicate a systematic process for engaging families with the school in conversations pertaining to students’ educational experiences. Although information indicates the school informs parents of pertinent information there is limited information indicating engagement. Survey data indicates that while opportunities for parental involvement are made available there is confusion among staff and students about the level and depth of engagement opportunities offered to parents.

3.9	The school/system 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 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	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.	
X	3	All students may participate in the structure.	

	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 leadership team members		
Self-assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
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	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Develop and implement a formal structure whereby each student is well known by one adult advocate in the school who supports that student's educational experience. The structure should include all students and provide long-term interaction over time to support learning, thinking, and life skills.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 97% for the 2012-13 school year.
- The school's achievement score increased from 62.3 in 2011-12 to 65.7 in 2012-13 for an increase of 3.4 points for the year.
- The school's NAPD calculation in mathematics increased from 58.1 in 2011-12 to 60.9 in 2012-13 which is 5.3 points above the state average. Although the NAPD calculation in reading decreased from 67.2 in 2011-12 to 64.1 in 2012-13 the score is 3.1 points above the state average.
- The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in science from 27.6% in 2011-12 to 44.0% in 2012-13 for an increase of 16.4 percentage points for the year. The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies from 44.1% in 2011-12 to 54.7% in 2012-13 for an increase of 10.6 percentage points for the year.
- Student performance data on the 2013 KPREP EOC assessments are above the state average in all areas except language mechanics with a score of 50.7% which is slightly below the state average of 51.4%.
- Achievement and gap scores from the 2012-13 School Report Card are above the state average in all areas with math above the state average by 11.6 points and writing above the state average by 11.5 points.
- ACT scores are above the state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to students survey data 46.3% of students are neutral or disagree 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."
- 32.7% of staff surveyed are neutral or disagree 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."
- 72.6% of parents surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, "My child has at least one adult advocate in the school."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- While 72.6% of the parents agree that their child has at least one adult advocate in the school, according to student data 46.3% of students disagree or are neutral with this statement. In addition, 32.7% of staff surveyed disagree or are neutral 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." While multiple structures are in place to advocate for specific groups of children there is no formal structure in place that advocates for every child.

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 leadership team members
Self-assessment
Executive Summary
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
KDE School Report Card
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"/> | Opportunity for Improvement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Improvement Priority |
-

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 97% for the 2012-13 school year.
- The school’s achievement score increased from 62.3 in 2011-12 to 65.7 in 2012-13 for an increase of 3.4 points for the year.
- The school’s NAPD calculation in mathematics increased from 58.1 in 2011-12 to 60.9 in 2012-13 which is 5.3 points above the state average. Although the NAPD calculation in reading decreased from 67.2 in 2011-12 to 64.1 in 2012-13 the score is 3.1 points above the state average.
- The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in science from 27.6% in 2011-12 to 44.0% in 2012-13 for an increase of 16.4 percentage points for the year. The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies from 44.1% in 2011-12 to 54.7% in 2012-13 for an increase of 10.6 percentage points for the year.
- Student performance data on the 2013 KPREP EOC assessments are above the state average in all areas except language mechanics with a score of 50.7% which is slightly below the state average of 51.4%.
- Achievement and gap scores from the 2012-13 School Report Card are above the state average in all areas with math above the state average by 11.6 points and writing above the state average by 11.5 points.
- ACT scores are above state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.

Classroom Observation Data:

- In the Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment the statement, “Is asked and/or is quizzed about individual learning,” received a rating of 2.0 on a 4-point scale indicating it is somewhat evident that students are questioned regarding their learning.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to student survey data, 48.3% of students are neutral or disagree with the statement, “All my teachers keep my family informed of my academic progress.”
- 88.5% of staff surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use consistent common grading and reporting policies across grade levels and courses based on clearly defined criteria.”
- 75% of staff surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all stakeholders are informed of policies, processes, and procedures related to grading and reporting.”
- 39.6% of parents surveyed are neutral or disagree with the statement, “All my child’s teachers keep me informed regularly of how my child is being graded.”
- 71.5% of parents surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All my child’s teachers report on my child’s progress in easy to understand language.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- According to stakeholder interviews and a review of documents, grading and reporting policies are in place. Multiple examples of syllabi clearly indicate grading policies are consistent across grade levels and are based upon the attainment of content knowledge and skills. Parent stakeholder data indicates some parents remain uninformed about grading practices at the school.

3.11		All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 3
Performance levels				
X	4	All staff members participate in a rigorous, continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school’s purpose and direction.		
	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.
X	3	The program is systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.
	2	The program is regularly evaluated for effectiveness.
	1	If a program exists, it is rarely and/or randomly evaluated.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Presentation by leadership team members		
Self-assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
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"/>	Opportunity for Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 97% for the 2012-13 school year.
- The school's achievement score increased from 62.3 in 2011-12 to 65.7 in 2012-13 for an increase of 3.4 points for the year.
- The school's NAPD calculation in mathematics increased from 58.1 in 2011-12 to 60.9 in 2012-13 which is 5.3 points above the state average. Although the NAPD calculation in reading decreased from 67.2 in 2011-12 to 64.1 in 2012-13 the score is 3.1 points above the state average.
- The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in science from 27.6% in 2011-12 to 44.0% in 2012-13 for an increase of 16.4 percentage points for the year. The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies from 44.1% in 2011-12 to 54.7% in 2012-13 for an increase of 10.6 percentage points for the year.
- Student performance data on the 2013 KPREP EOC assessments are above the state average in all areas except language mechanics with a score of 50.7% which is slightly below the state average of 51.4%.
- Achievement and gap scores from the 2012-13 School Report Card are above the state average in all areas with math above the state average by 11.6 points and writing above the state average by 11.5 points.
- ACT scores are above state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 88.5% of staff surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, "All teachers in our school participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally across grade levels and content areas."
- 96.2% of staff surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, "In our school, all staff members participate in continuous professional learning based on identified needs of the school."
- 82.1% of teachers surveyed agree that an appropriate amount of time is provided for professional development.
- 90.3% of teachers surveyed agree that professional development offerings are data-driven.
- 77.6% of teachers surveyed agree that sufficient resources are available for professional development in the school.
- 95.5% of teachers surveyed agree that they are encouraged to reflect on their own practice.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- According to interviews and a review of documents professional development is often offered through PLCs. PDSAs are used to create topics for professional development based upon the needs of the school and individual teachers. The school is intentional in using professional development time to increase teachers' knowledge of instructional strategies, data analysis and assessments. The impact of professional development is monitored through walkthrough data and unit lesson plans. Often professional development is delivered by faculty and staff and 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
------	---	--------------------	------------------

Performance levels

	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.

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

Presentation by leadership team members
Self-assessment
Executive Summary
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
KDE School Report Card
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"/>	Opportunity for Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school was classified as a distinguished high school based on its percentile rank of 97% for the 2012-13 school year.
- The school’s achievement score increased from 62.3 in 2011-12 to 65.7 in 2012-13 for an increase of 3.4 points for the year.
- The school’s NAPD calculation in mathematics increased from 58.1 in 2011-12 to 60.9 in 2012-13 which is 5.3 points above the state average. Although the NAPD calculation in reading decreased from 67.2 in 2011-12 to 64.1 in 2012-13 the score is 3.1 points above the state average.
- The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in science from 27.6% in 2011-12 to 44.0% in 2012-13 for an increase of 16.4 percentage points for the year. The school increased the percentage of students performing at the proficient or distinguished levels in social studies from 44.1% in 2011-12 to 54.7% in 2012-13 for an increase of 10.6 percentage points for the year.
- Student performance data on the 2013 KPREP EOC assessments are above the state average in all areas except language mechanics with a score of 50.7% which is slightly below the state average of 51.4%.
- Achievement and gap scores from the 2012-13 School Report Card are above the state average in all areas with math above the state average by 11.6 points and writing above the state average by 11.5 points.
- ACT scores are above state average in all areas except math which is only .1 below the state average.

Classroom Observation Data:

- In the Supportive Learning Environment the statement, “Is provided support and assistance to understand content and accomplish tasks,” was rated a 2.6 on a 4-point scale.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to student survey data 34.4% of students are neutral or do not believe their school provides them with learning services that meet their needs.
- 88.5% of staff surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, staff members use student data to address the unique learning needs of all students.”
- 88.5% of staff surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, related learning support services are provided for all students based on their needs.”
- 78.2% of parents surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My child has access to support services based on his/her identified need.”

- 74.6% of teachers surveyed agree that they have sufficient instructional time to meet the needs of all students.
- 86.6% of teachers surveyed agree that they have sufficient access to instructional technology, including computers, printers, software and internet access.
- 81.8% of teachers surveyed agree that they have sufficient access to a broad range of professional support personnel.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews, documents and artifacts indicate that school personnel regularly use data to determine the learning needs of students. The school has developed multiple support programs and services such as before, during, and after school tutoring, embedded RTI (Response to Intervention) systems, student mentoring, GEAR Up coaching, FRYSC (Family Resource and Youth Service Centers), guidance counselors, and CCR (College and Career Readiness) coaching and mentoring.

Standard 3 Overview

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

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

One theme that has emerged from the Internal Review at the school is administration has developed an extensive PLC process that includes every teacher in the building with a specific focus on improving instructional practice, opportunities for data disaggregation, direct conversations about students and student learning, and opportunities for coaching and mentoring. The PLC process also allows the administration unique opportunities for in-depth conversations with teachers and monitoring of school practices.

Another theme at the school is the extensive use of the PDSA decision making process. It is evident through interviews, artifact reviews and observations that faculty and staff understand, implement, and effectively use the PDSA process.

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 Pulaski County High School.

Deficiency 1: The principal does not hold himself and all staff members accountable for the success or failure of each and every student at Pulaski County High School.

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
- Self-Assessment
- Stakeholder survey data
- School documents and artifacts
- ELEOT data
- Student performance data
- Stakeholder interviews

Team comments:

The principal has taken extensive measures to hold himself and his staff members accountable for the success and failures of every student at the school.

- "Name and Claim"
- Before, during and after school tutoring
- Three week progress reports
- GEAR Up
- RTI
- PLCs
- Coaching/mentoring
- CIITS
- Common assessments
- Learning targets
- Scheduled walkthroughs
- PBIS (Positive Behavior and Interventions and Supports)

Deficiency 2: The principal does not monitor classroom instruction to ensure teachers are creating learning environments where students are active participants and engaged in authentic, rigorous learning tasks.

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.

<p>Team evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal's presentation • Self-assessment • Stakeholder survey data • School documents and artifacts • ELEOT data • Student performance data • Stakeholder interviews
<p>Team comments:</p> <p>The principal has taken multiple measures in conjunction with the leadership team to monitor classroom instruction and to ensure teachers are creating learning environments where students are active participants and engaged in authentic, rigorous learning tasks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walkthroughs • TPGES pilot • Curriculum alignment • PLC protocols • Unit lesson planning • Data analysis

Deficiency 3: The principal does not ensure a focus of high expectations for staff and students.

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

<p>Team evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal's presentation • Self-Assessment • Stakeholder survey data • School documents and artifacts • ELEOT data • Student performance data • Stakeholder interviews
<p>Team comments:</p> <p>The principal does ensure a focus of high expectations for students and staff.</p>

- PLCs
- Walkthroughs
- PBIS
- Continuous Classroom Improvement protocol
- Assessment protocol
- Scheduling protocol
- “Name and Claim”
- CCR goals
- GEAR Up/Link Up

Deficiency 4: The principal has not ensured data are continuously collected, analyzed, and used to impact 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
- Self-Assessment
- Stakeholder survey data
- School documents and artifacts
- ELEOT data
- Student performance data
- Stakeholder interviews

Team comments:

The principal has ensured data are collected, analyzed and used to impact student achievement.

- PBIS
- Longitudinal data
- Quarterly Reports
- EPAS data
- Merge documents
- PDSAs
- Formative assessments
- Plus/Deltas
- Survey data

Deficiency 5: The principal has not defined an intentional plan to promote parent and community involvement.

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

		manner.
X		This deficiency has been addressed satisfactorily.
	X	This deficiency has been partially addressed.
		There is little or no evidence of improvement with regard to this deficiency.

Team evidence:

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

Team comments:

The principal has somewhat planned to promote parent and community involvement.

- GEAR Up
- Maroon Memo
- Communication plan

Deficiency 6: The principal and school council do not exercise their full responsibilities and authority to manage school resources and make planning and operational decisions to maximize school performance.

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
- Self-Assessment
- Stakeholder survey data
- School documents and artifacts
- ELEOT data
- Student performance data
- Stakeholder interviews

Team comments:

While the school council has been placed in an advisory status the principal has exercised responsibility and authority in managing school resources and making planning and operational decisions to maximize school performance.

- CSIP
- Quarterly Reports
- Systems approach

- Continuous improvement

Overall ELEOT Rating

- A. Equitable Learning
- B. High Expectations
- C. Supportive Learning
- D. Active Learning
- E. Progress Monitoring
- F. Well-Managed Learning
- G. Digital Learning

