



Internal District Review Report

Name of Institution

Reviewed: Simpson County District

Date: March 10, 2014-March 11, 2014



Introduction

The KDE Internal School/District Review is designed to:

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

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

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

The report includes:

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

Standard 3: Teaching and Assessing for Learning

Standard 3: The school/district’s curriculum, instructional design, and assessment practices guide and ensure teacher effectiveness and student learning.	District Rating for Standard 3 3.25	Team Rating for Standard 3 3
--	--	---

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

3.1	The school/district’s curriculum provides equitable and challenging learning experiences that ensure all students have sufficient opportunities to develop learning, thinking, and life skills that lead to success at the next level.	District Rating 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/district’s purpose.
	3	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide all students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
X	2	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide most students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	1	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide few or no students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	4	Evidence clearly indicates curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
X	3	There is some evidence to indicate curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
	2	There is little evidence to indicate curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
	1	There is no evidence to indicate how successful students will be at the next level.
	4	Like courses/classes have the same high learning expectations.
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)
Student performance data
Classroom observation data
Student, parent, and staff survey data
Sustainability plan
Writing plan
Resource guide for non-negotiables
Stakeholder interviews
District walkthrough data
Data analysis protocol

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 53.7 to 71.8. This resulted in an increase from the 45th percentile to the 97th percentile (2012, 2013).
- In the Achievement category, the school’s score increased from 61.5 to 68.8 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculation for reading increased from 68.0 to 71.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 61.5 to 72.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 52.7 to 56.1.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 56.8 to 64.3.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 67.6 to 78.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 72.2 to 83.5.
- In the Gap category, the school’s score increased from 35.9 to 45.1 points overall (2012, 2013):

- The NAPD calculation for reading increased from 49.0 to 61.0.
- The NAPD calculation for math increased from 36.4 to 40.6.
- The NAPD calculation for science increased from 21.1 to 32.5.
- The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 35.3 to 42.6.
- The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 37.7 to 47.8.
- The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 38.7 to 54.3.
- In the Growth category, the school's score increased from 55.2 to 63.9 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading increased from 60.5% to 64.4%.
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math increased from 49.7% to 63.4%.
- In the College and Career Readiness category, the school's score increased from 33.9 to 85.6 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The number of College Ready students increased from 64 to 125.
 - The number of Career Ready students increased from 10 to 32.
- The graduation rate increased from 81.9% to 95.3% (2012, 2013).
- On the PLAN assessment from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 67.6% to 77.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 25.2% to 37.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in reading increased from 43.3% to 55.1%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in science increased from 24.8% to 32.9%.
- On the ACT from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 50.0% to 60.2%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 31.7% to 45.9%.
 - The percentage of students meeting benchmark in reading increased from 37.6% to 49.0%.

Classroom Observation Data:

- In the Equitable Learning Environment, the statement, "Has equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support," received a rating of 3.2 on a 4-point scale, indicating that it is evident that most students have equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
- In the High Expectations Environment, the statement, "Is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable," received a rating of 3.0 on a 4-point scale, which reflects there is evidence that the activities in the classroom are challenging.
- In the Active Learning Environment, the statement, "Makes connections from content to real – life experiences," received a rating of 2.8 on a 4-point scale, suggesting that there is evidence that students have equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In surveys, 70.8% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, "My school provides me with challenging curriculum and learning experiences," indicating that a majority of all students surveyed feel their experiences with curriculum and learning are challenging.

- In surveys, 56.2% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My school prepares me to deal with issues I may face in the future,” suggesting that more than half of all students surveyed make connections to curriculum and real world application.
- In surveys, 91.3% of teachers strongly agree/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,” indicating most teachers feel the challenge level of the curriculum and connection to real-life application is much higher than reported by students.
- In surveys, 82.6% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “In our school, all stakeholders are informed of the policies, processes, and procedures related to grading and reporting,” suggesting that most teachers believe stakeholders are aware of grading and reporting process and teachers apply a common grading process in accordance with grading policies and procedures.
- In surveys, 61.5% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers provide an equitable curriculum that meets his/her learning needs,” suggesting that more than half of parents feel the curriculum is presented to their children based on individual learning needs.
- In surveys, 64.6% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers give work that challenges my child,” indicating that more than half of parents feel the curriculum is challenging. This presents a discrepancy between student and parent surveys regarding the challenge level of the curriculum.
- In surveys, 41.5% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers keep me informed regularly of how my child is being graded,” suggesting that less than half of all parents feel regularly informed of grading policies/procedures. This indicates a discrepancy between teachers and parents regarding all stakeholders being informed of policies, process, and procedures related to grading and reporting.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review indicates district leadership consistently participates in walkthroughs collecting evidence of engaging and challenging learning activities.
- An artifact review indicates district leadership has provided professional development focusing on learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills that align with the school’s purpose.
- An artifact review indicates the school participates in data analysis resulting in learning activities that are individualized for each student in a way that supports achievement of expectations.
 - The superintendent presentation and stakeholder interviews reveal district monitoring protocols/comprehensive meeting plan (site visits, Instructional Leadership Team Meetings, School Leadership Team Meetings, Leadership Retreat, regularly scheduled board reports, Student Support Teams, PLC/data analysis, Learning Community Days).
- An artifact review and stakeholder interviews reveal that Academic Time, a daily block of time devoted to mentoring, including College and Career Readiness, is utilized to provide all students opportunities to develop learning, thinking, and life skills that lead to success at the next level.
- An artifact review and stakeholder interviews reveal the graduate follow-up survey which indicated that 92.5% of graduating seniors experience successful transition into post-secondary activities.
- An artifact review indicates the district has adopted the Quality Core curriculum, which is monitored and adjusted as needed through the district’s comprehensive meeting plan.
- Stakeholder interviews reveal community partnership resulted in increased opportunities for students to experience successful preparation for the next level, including but not limited to dual credit opportunities, employment opportunities, and service learning opportunities.

3.2	Curriculum, instruction, and assessment are monitored and adjusted systematically in response to data from multiple assessments of student learning and an examination of professional practice.	District Rating 4	Team Rating 4
-----	--	----------------------	------------------

Performance levels

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

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

Student performance data
Classroom observation data
Student and staff survey data
SIG application
Assessment timeline
Quarterly Report
Data analysis (DIAL)
Student assignment plans

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 53.7 to 71.8. This resulted in an increase from the 45th percentile to the 97th percentile (2012, 2013).
- In the Achievement category, the school’s score increased from 61.5 to 68.8 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculation for reading increased from 68.0 to 71.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 61.5 to 72.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 52.7 to 56.1.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 56.8 to 64.3.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 67.6 to 78.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 72.2 to 83.5.
- In the Gap category, the school’s score increased from 35.9 to 45.1 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD calculation for reading increased from 49.0 to 61.0.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 36.4 to 40.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 21.1 to 32.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 35.3 to 42.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 37.7 to 47.8.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 38.7 to 54.3.

- In the Growth category, the school’s score increased from 55.2 to 63.9 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading increased from 60.5% to 64.4%.
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math increased from 49.7% to 63.4%.
- In the College and Career Readiness category, the school’s score increased from 33.9 to 85.6 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The number of College Ready students increased from 64 to 125.
 - The number of Career Ready students increased from 10 to 32.
- The graduation rate increased from 81.9% to 95.3% (2012, 2013).
- On the PLAN assessment from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 67.6% to 77.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 25.2% to 37.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in reading increased from 43.3% to 55.1%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in science increased from 24.8% to 32.9%.
- On the ACT from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 50.0% to 60.2%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 31.7% to 45.9%.
 - The percentage of students meeting benchmark in reading increased from 37.6% to 49.0%.

Classroom Observation Data:

- In the Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment, the statement, “Is asked and/or quizzed about individual learning,” receive a rating of 2.7 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 3.0 on a 4-point scale, suggesting that the curriculum is appropriate and rigorous as evident by the higher level questioning observed in some classes.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In surveys, 72.6% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My school gives me multiple assessments to check my understanding of what was taught,” indicating that a majority of students feel they are given multiple assessments to assess understanding of the curriculum.
- In surveys, 87.0% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment based on data from student assessments and examination of professional practice,” suggesting that most teachers are utilizing student assessment information to adjust practice to meet the needs of their students.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review indicates the district has provided curriculum specialists to ensure district initiatives are implemented throughout all schools.
- An artifact review indicates the school reports CSIP (Comprehensive School Improvement Plan) progress notes to the district board of education three times per year.

- An artifact review indicates middle and high schools meet quarterly for Laying the Foundations vertical alignment.
- An artifact review indicates students who participate in Gap Support Meetings also meet with district leadership staff.
- An artifact review indicates multiple measures of assessment are utilized to identify individual student needs.
- The superintendent presentation and stakeholder interviews reveal district monitoring protocols/comprehensive meeting plan (site visits, Instructional Leadership Team Meetings, School Leadership Team Meetings, Leadership Retreat, regularly scheduled board reports, Student Support Teams, PLC/data analysis, Learning Community Days).

3.3	Teachers engage students in their learning through instructional strategies that ensure achievement of learning expectations.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 3
Performance levels			
	4	Teachers are consistent and deliberate in planning and using instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.	
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)			
Student performance data			
Classroom observation data			
Student, parent, and staff survey data			

Formative Assessment Academy
Writing plan (LDC/MDC scale-up)
Instructional overview
District unit plan template
District PD offerings
District comprehensive meeting plan

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 53.7 to 71.8. This resulted in an increase from the 45th percentile to the 97th percentile (2012, 2013).
- In the Achievement category, the school’s score increased from 61.5 to 68.8 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculation for reading increased from 68.0 to 71.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 61.5 to 72.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 52.7 to 56.1.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 56.8 to 64.3.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 67.6 to 78.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 72.2 to 83.5.
- In the Gap category, the school’s score increased from 35.9 to 45.1 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD calculation for reading increased from 49.0 to 61.0.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 36.4 to 40.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 21.1 to 32.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 35.3 to 42.6.

- The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 37.7 to 47.8.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 38.7 to 54.3.
- In the Growth category, the school's score increased from 55.2 to 63.9 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading increased from 60.5% to 64.4%.
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math increased from 49.7% to 63.4%.
- In the College and Career Readiness category, the school's score increased from 33.9 to 85.6 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The number of College Ready students increased from 64 to 125.
 - The number of Career Ready students increased from 10 to 32.
- The graduation rate increased from 81.9% to 95.3% (2012, 2013).
- On the PLAN assessment from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 67.6% to 77.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 25.2% to 37.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in reading increased from 43.3% to 55.1%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in science increased from 24.8% to 32.9%.
- On the ACT from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 50.0% to 60.2%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 31.7% to 45.9%.
 - The percentage of students meeting benchmark in reading increased from 37.6% to 49.0%.

Classroom Observation Data:

- In the Equitable Learning Environment, the statement, "Has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs," received a score of 2.5 on a 4-point scale, which reflects there is some evidence within the classroom that teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs. Learning centers and student choice were observed in some classrooms.
- In the High Expectations Environment, the statement, "Is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks," received a score of 3.0 on a 4-point scale, indicating that it is evident that teachers use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.
- In the Active Learning Environment, the statement, "Is actively engaged in the learning activities," received a score of 3.2 on a 4-point scale, which reflects it is evident that teachers use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.
- The Digital Learning Environment received an overall score of 1.6 on a 4-point scale, suggesting teachers sometimes use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In surveys, 60.5% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, "My school motivates me to learning new things," suggesting that more than half of students feel motivated to learn new information.

- In surveys, 35.9% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my teachers change their teaching to meet my learning needs,” suggesting that few students feel the curriculum is adjusted to meet their individual needs. This creates a discrepancy between students and teachers regarding adjustment of curriculum to meet individual learning needs and indicates interventions provide only for a select group of students and are not available for all students.
- In surveys, 82.6% of teachers strongly agree/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,” indicating a majority of teachers use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills.
- In surveys, 76.7% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students,” suggesting that a majority of teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students when necessary.
- In surveys, 82.6% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use a variety of technologies as instructional resources,” indicating that a majority teachers use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.
- In surveys, 56.9% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers use a variety of teaching strategies and learning activities,” suggesting that over half of all parents report that teachers utilize varied instructional strategies and resources to meet the needs of students.
- In surveys, 46.5% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers meet his/her learning needs by individualizing instruction,” indicating that less than half of parents agree that teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students when necessary. This indicates a discrepancy between parents and teachers regarding the personalization of instruction to meet the individual learning needs of students.
- In surveys, 46.9% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My child sees a relationship between what is being taught and his/her everyday life,” suggesting that less than half of parents report that students acknowledge real-world application of the content. This suggests a discrepancy between students and teachers regarding the relevance of instruction.
- In surveys, 69.2% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My child has up-to-date computers and other technology to learn,” indicating that more than half of parents believe their child has access to necessary technological tools to experience success.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review indicates the district has provided technological infrastructure as well as hired a technology resource teacher to support student engagement and provide professional growth opportunities to teachers.
- An artifact review reveals a Personalized Learning Plan, which includes strategies that indicate teachers will receive professional growth opportunities on implementing Thoughtful Classroom and John Antonetti’s instructional strategies.
- An artifact review indicates data analysis utilized to identify Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III students and create learning plans aligned with each student need.
- An artifact review indicates staff receives training in strategies such as Thoughtful Education, John Antonetti’s engagement strategies, literacy strategies, Balanced Assessment strategies, formative assessment, CIITS, IC (Infinite Campus), and technology integration.
- An artifact review and stakeholder interviews reveal district personnel participate in school walkthroughs and PGES (Professional Growth and Effectiveness System) Blitz focusing on engaging and rigorous teaching strategies aligned with PGES.

3.4	School/district leaders monitor and support the improvement of instructional practices of teachers to ensure student success.	District Rating 4	Team Rating 4
-----	---	----------------------	------------------

Performance levels

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

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

Student performance data
Classroom observation data
District walkthrough data
Secondary Leadership Team meeting agenda and minutes
Instructional Leadership Team meeting agenda and minutes
Site visit notes
CIA meeting agenda and notes
Unit analysis rubric
District comprehensive meeting plan

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 53.7 to 71.8. This resulted in an increase from the 45th percentile to the 97th percentile (2012, 2013).
- In the Achievement category, the school’s score increased from 61.5 to 68.8 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculation for reading increased from 68.0 to 71.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 61.5 to 72.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 52.7 to 56.1.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 56.8 to 64.3.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 67.6 to 78.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 72.2 to 83.5.
- In the Gap category, the school’s score increased from 35.9 to 45.1 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD calculation for reading increased from 49.0 to 61.0.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 36.4 to 40.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 21.1 to 32.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 35.3 to 42.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 37.7 to 47.8.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 38.7 to 54.3.
- In the Growth category, the school’s score increased from 55.2 to 63.9 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading increased from 60.5% to 64.4%.
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math increased from 49.7% to 63.4%.
- In the College and Career Readiness category, the school’s score increased from 33.9 to 85.6 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The number of College Ready students increased from 64 to 125.
 - The number of Career Ready students increased from 10 to 32.
- The graduation rate increased from 81.9% to 95.3% (2012, 2013).
- On the PLAN assessment from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 67.6% to 77.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 25.2% to 37.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in reading increased from 43.3% to 55.1%.

- The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in science increased from 24.8% to 32.9%.
- On the ACT from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 50.0% to 60.2%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 31.7% to 45.9%.
 - The percentage of students meeting benchmark in reading increased from 37.6% to 49.0%.

Classroom Observation Data:

- The Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment received an overall rating of 2.8 on a 4-point scale indicating it is almost evident that school leaders monitor instructional practices through supervision and evaluation procedures.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review indicates district leadership has a system to ensure sustained collaboration and support with the school.
- An artifact review indicates the district provides training to employees in strategies such as Thoughtful Education, John Antonetti’s engagement strategies, literacy strategies, Balanced Assessment system, formative assessment, CIITS, IC, and technology implementation.
- Stakeholder interviews reveal that district and school leadership participate in PGES Blitz, focusing on targeted PGES components. Feedback and resources are provided based on analysis of PGES Blitz data.
 - The superintendent presentation and stakeholder interviews reveal district monitoring protocols/comprehensive meeting plan (site visits, Instructional Leadership Team Meetings, School Leadership Team Meetings, Leadership Retreat, regularly scheduled board reports, Student Support Teams, PLC/data analysis, Learning Community Days).
 - Stakeholder interviews reveal awareness of data monitoring procedures by the board of education through a reporting process initiated by district and school personnel.

3.5	Teachers participate/system operates in collaborative learning communities to improve instruction and student learning.	District Rating 4	Team Rating 4
Performance levels			
X	4	All members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule.	
	3	All members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally.	
	2	Some members of the school/district staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally.	
	1	Collaborative learning communities randomly self-organize and meet informally.	

X	4	Frequent collaboration occurs across grade levels and content areas.
	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.
X	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.
	2	Staff members promote discussion about student learning.
	1	Staff members rarely discuss student learning.
	4	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching are a part of the daily routine of school/district staff members.
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/district personnel.
	2	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching sometimes occur among school/district personnel.
	1	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching rarely occur among school/district personnel.
X	4	School/district personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
	3	School/district personnel indicate that collaboration causes improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
	2	School/district personnel express belief in the value of collaborative learning communities.
	1	School/district personnel see little value in collaborative learning communities.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Student performance data		
Parent and staff survey data		
Learning Community Days protocol		
Sample department meeting agenda and minutes		
CSIP		
District comprehensive meeting plan		
LDC/MDC teacher product timeline		
Leader In Me		
Student Support Team		
Personalized Learning Team		

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 53.7 to 71.8. This resulted in an increase from the 45th percentile to the 97th percentile (2012, 2013).
- In the Achievement category, the school’s score increased from 61.5 to 68.8 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculation for reading increased from 68.0 to 71.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 61.5 to 72.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 52.7 to 56.1.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 56.8 to 64.3.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 67.6 to 78.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 72.2 to 83.5.
- In the Gap category, the school’s score increased from 35.9 to 45.1 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD calculation for reading increased from 49.0 to 61.0.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 36.4 to 40.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 21.1 to 32.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 35.3 to 42.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 37.7 to 47.8.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 38.7 to 54.3.
- In the Growth category, the school’s score increased from 55.2 to 63.9 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading increased from 60.5% to 64.4%.
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math increased from 49.7% to 63.4%.
- In the College and Career Readiness category, the school’s score increased from 33.9 to 85.6 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The number of College Ready students increased from 64 to 125.
 - The number of Career Ready students increased from 10 to 32.
- The graduation rate increased from 81.9% to 95.3% (2012, 2013).

- On the PLAN assessment from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 67.6% to 77.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 25.2% to 37.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in reading increased from 43.3% to 55.1%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in science increased from 24.8% to 32.9%.
- On the ACT from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 50.0% to 60.2%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 31.7% to 45.9%.
 - The percentage of students meeting benchmark in reading increased from 37.6% to 49.0%.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In surveys, 89.1% of teachers strongly agree/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),” indicating that a majority of teachers report having received the training necessary to successfully participate in professional learning communities.
- In surveys, 41.5% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers work as a team to help my child learn,” suggesting that less than half of parents acknowledge or are aware that their children’s teachers work collaboratively in professional learning communities to ensure learning occurs.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review indicates the CSIP calls for bi-weekly guided planning meetings with administrators and teachers.
- An artifact review indicates students are assigned Academic Time based on data analysis.
 - The district presentation and stakeholder interviews revealed district monitoring protocols/comprehensive meeting plan (site visits, Instructional Leadership Team Meetings, School Leadership Team Meetings, Leadership Retreat, regularly scheduled board reports, Student Support Teams, PLC/data analysis, Learning Community Days) focusing on improved classroom instruction and increased student achievement.
- Stakeholder interviews reveal that teachers and administrators participate in bi-weekly guided planning meetings.
- Stakeholder interviews reveal that core content teams meet in professional learning communities bi-weekly focusing on common formative assessments and data analysis.

3.6	Teachers implement the school/system’s instructional process in support of student learning.	District Rating 2	Team Rating 2
-----	--	----------------------	------------------

Performance levels

	4	All teachers systematically use an instructional process that clearly informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
	3	All teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
X	2	Most teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
	1	Few teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
	4	Exemplars are provided to guide and inform students.
	3	Exemplars are often provided to guide and inform students.
X	2	Exemplars are sometimes provided to guide and inform students.
	1	Exemplars are rarely provided to guide and inform students.
	4	The process requires the use of multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction and provide data for possible curriculum revision.
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.
	3	The process provides students with specific and timely feedback about their learning.
X	2	The process provides students with feedback about their learning.
	1	The process provides students with minimal feedback of little value about their learning.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Student performance data		
Classroom observation data		
Student, parent, and staff survey data		
District unit plan template		
Guided planning protocol		
Systems of best practice		
Teacher Leader meeting protocol		
New teacher training protocol		

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

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

- Review of documents and artifacts

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

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

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

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Monitor and support an instructional process which clearly informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance. District leadership ensures that the process includes exemplars to guide and inform students as well as multiple measures, including formative assessments, and that teachers provide specific and timely feedback.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 53.7 to 71.8. This resulted in an increase from the 45th percentile to the 97th percentile (2012, 2013).
- In the Achievement category, the school’s score increased from 61.5 to 68.8 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculation for reading increased from 68.0 to 71.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 61.5 to 72.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 52.7 to 56.1.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 56.8 to 64.3.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 67.6 to 78.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 72.2 to 83.5.
- In the Gap category, the school’s score increased from 35.9 to 45.1 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD calculation for reading increased from 49.0 to 61.0.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 36.4 to 40.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 21.1 to 32.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 35.3 to 42.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 37.7 to 47.8.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 38.7 to 54.3.
- In the Growth category, the school’s score increased from 55.2 to 63.9 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading increased from 60.5% to 64.4%.
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math increased from 49.7% to 63.4%.
- In the College and Career Readiness category, the school’s score increased from 33.9 to 85.6 points overall (2012, 2013):

- The number of College Ready students increased from 64 to 125.
- The number of Career Ready students increased from 10 to 32.
- The graduation rate increased from 81.9% to 95.3% (2012, 2013).
- On the PLAN assessment from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 67.6% to 77.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 25.2% to 37.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in reading increased from 43.3% to 55.1%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in science increased from 24.8% to 32.9%.
- On the ACT from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 50.0% to 60.2%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 31.7% to 45.9%.
 - The percentage of students meeting benchmark in reading increased from 37.6% to 49.0%.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In surveys, 64.1% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my teachers provide me with information about my learning and grades,” suggesting that more than half of students are provided feedback regarding their learning and grades.
- In surveys, 87.0% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use a process to inform students of their learning expectations and standards of performance,” indicating that most teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
- In surveys, 54.4% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school provide students with specific and timely feedback about their learning,” suggesting about half of teachers implement a process that provides students with specific and timely feedback about their learning.
- In surveys, 80.4% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use multiple types of assessments to modify instruction and to revise the curriculum,” indicating that most teachers implement a process that includes multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction and provide data for possible curriculum revision.
- In surveys, 82.3% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My child knows the expectations for learning in all classes,” suggesting that most parents believe teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
- In surveys, 63.9% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My child is given multiple assessments to measure his/her understanding of what was taught,” indicating that more than half of parents feel teachers utilize a process that includes multiple measures, including formative assessments, to measure students’ understanding of what was taught. There is a discrepancy between teachers and parents relating to the use of multiple assessments to determine students’ mastery of standards in the classroom.
- In surveys, 61.3% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my teachers use a variety of teaching methods and learning activities to help me develop the skills I will need to succeed,” indicating more than half of all students are exposed to a variety of teaching methods or believe the teaching methods they are exposed to develop the necessary skills to be successful.

- In surveys, 66.2% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my teachers explain their expectations for learning and behavior so I can be successful,” suggesting that more than half of all students report being aware of teacher expectations for learning and behavior.
- In surveys, 71.5% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my teachers use test, projects, presentations, and portfolios to check my understanding of what was taught,” indicating that a majority of students report the use of multiple measures to check understanding of content.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review indicates the school utilizes guided planning documents.
- An artifact review indicates a district-provided unit planning template.
- An artifact review indicates there is a process in which administrators and teachers meet bi-weekly to focus on guided planning.
- An artifact review indicates students are assigned Academic Time based on data analysis of multiple sources of data.
- An artifact review indicates there are systems and protocols in place to support district non-negotiables.
- An artifact review indicates that district leadership consistently participates in school walkthroughs.
- Stakeholder interviews reveal that exemplars are provided in some departments more than others and are not consistently utilized.
- Stakeholder interviews reveal that district leadership participates in walkthroughs and PGES Blitz focusing on rigorous and engaging instructional strategies.
- Stakeholder interviews reveal that most teachers use an instructional process that informs students of learning expectations and standards of performance.
- Stakeholder interviews reveal that while teachers provide feedback on multiple assessment measures, not all feedback is provided in a timely manner.

3.7	Mentoring, coaching, and induction programs support instructional improvement consistent with the school/system’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning.	District Rating 4	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	All school/district personnel are engaged in systematic mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	3	School/district personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
X	2	Some school/district personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	1	Few or no school/district personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school/district’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	

	4	These programs set high expectations for all school/district personnel and include valid and reliable measures of performance.
	3	These programs set expectations for all school/district personnel and include measures of performance.
X	2	These programs set expectations for school/district personnel.
	1	Limited or no expectations for school/district personnel are included.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Student performance data		
Staff survey data		
New teacher training protocol		
School mentoring program		
Guided planning protocol		
Peer observation request template		
Sample teacher professional development		
Sample teacher Chat and Chew		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Establish and implement a process in which all school personnel are engaged in systematic mentoring, coaching and induction programs consistent with the district's values and beliefs about teaching, learning and the conditions that support learning. District leadership ensures that district personnel directly support these programs, which include valid and reliable measures of performance. Ensure coaching and mentoring programs are available for all teachers, based on individual needs, regardless of level of experience.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school's academic index grew from 53.7 to 71.8. This resulted in an increase from the 45th percentile to the 97th percentile (2012, 2013).
- In the Achievement category, the school's score increased from 61.5 to 68.8 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculation for reading increased from 68.0 to 71.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 61.5 to 72.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 52.7 to 56.1.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 56.8 to 64.3.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 67.6 to 78.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 72.2 to 83.5.
- In the Gap category, the school's score increased from 35.9 to 45.1 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD calculation for reading increased from 49.0 to 61.0.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 36.4 to 40.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 21.1 to 32.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 35.3 to 42.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 37.7 to 47.8.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 38.7 to 54.3.
- In the Growth category, the school's score increased from 55.2 to 63.9 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading increased from 60.5% to 64.4%.
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math increased from 49.7% to 63.4%.
- In the College and Career Readiness category, the school's score increased from 33.9 to 85.6 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The number of College Ready students increased from 64 to 125.
 - The number of Career Ready students increased from 10 to 32.
- The graduation rate increased from 81.9% to 95.3% (2012, 2013).
- On the PLAN assessment from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 67.6% to 77.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 25.2% to 37.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in reading increased from 43.3% to 55.1%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in science increased from 24.8% to 32.9%.
- On the ACT from 2011-12 to 2012-13,

- The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 50.0% to 60.2%.
- The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 31.7% to 45.9%.
- The percentage of students meeting benchmark in reading increased from 37.6% to 49.0%.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In surveys, 76.1% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “In our school, staff members provide peer coaching to teachers,” suggesting most teachers are engaged in mentoring or coaching programs.
- In surveys, 76.1% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “In our school, a formal process is in place to support new staff members in their professional practice,” indicating that a majority of teachers report the school has a formal process for inducting new staff members and providing support related to their professional practice.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review indicates there are systems and protocols in place to provide mentor-led professional development activities for teachers with 2 or less years of experience or for those who are new to the district.
- An artifact review indicates the district provides financial resources to support the mentoring program.
- Stakeholder interviews and an artifact review reveal the district lacks valid and reliable measures of performance for all teachers.
- Stakeholder interviews reveal no formal, systematic process for identifying teachers’ needs for mentoring/coaching.

3.8		The school/system engages families in meaningful ways in their children’s education and keeps them informed of their children’s learning progress.	District Rating 4	Team Rating 3
Performance levels				
	4	Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children’s education are designed, implemented, and evaluated.		
X	3	Programs that engage families in meaningful ways in their children’s education are designed and implemented.		
	2	Programs that engage families in their children’s education are available.		
	1	Few or no programs that engage families in their children’s education are available.		
X	4	Families have multiple ways of staying informed of their children’s learning progress.		
	3	School/district personnel regularly inform families of their children’s learning progress.		
	2	School/district personnel provide information about children’s learning.		
	1	School/district personnel provide little relevant information about children’s learning.		
Evidence Reviewed				
Student performance data				
Student, parent, and staff 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/District Report Card
- AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
- ELEOT Classroom Observation data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 53.7 to 71.8. This resulted in an increase from the 45th percentile to the 97th percentile (2012, 2013).
- In the Achievement category, the school’s score increased from 61.5 to 68.8 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculation for reading increased from 68.0 to 71.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 61.5 to 72.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 52.7 to 56.1.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 56.8 to 64.3.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 67.6 to 78.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 72.2 to 83.5.
- In the Gap category, the school’s score increased from 35.9 to 45.1 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD calculation for reading increased from 49.0 to 61.0.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 36.4 to 40.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 21.1 to 32.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 35.3 to 42.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 37.7 to 47.8.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 38.7 to 54.3.
- In the Growth category, the school’s score increased from 55.2 to 63.9 points overall (2012, 2013):

- The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading increased from 60.5% to 64.4%.
- The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math increased from 49.7% to 63.4%.
- In the College and Career Readiness category, the school's score increased from 33.9 to 85.6 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The number of College Ready students increased from 64 to 125.
 - The number of Career Ready students increased from 10 to 32.
- The graduation rate increased from 81.9% to 95.3% (2012, 2013).
- On the PLAN assessment from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 67.6% to 77.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 25.2% to 37.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in reading increased from 43.3% to 55.1%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in science increased from 24.8% to 32.9%.
- On the ACT from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 50.0% to 60.2%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 31.7% to 45.9%.
 - The percentage of students meeting benchmark in reading increased from 37.6% to 49.0%.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In surveys, 43.6% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, "All of my teachers keep my family informed of my academic process," indicating that less than half of all students report communication from the school to their families regarding their academic progress.
- In surveys, 48.5% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, "My school offers opportunities for my family to become involved in school activities and my learning," suggesting that less than half of all students report family awareness of opportunities to become involved in school activities and student learning.
- In surveys, 60.9% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, "In our school, all school personnel regularly engage families in their children's learning progress," suggesting that over half of all teachers report the availability of programs that engage families in their children's education.
- In surveys, 46.2% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, "All of my child's teachers help me to understand my child's progress," indicating that less than half of parents report that teachers communicate with families regarding student learning progress.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review indicates multiple programs/resources designed to engage families are available.
- An artifact review indicates families are provided multiple means of accessing student performance information.
- An artifact review indicated minimal evidence to support evaluation of family engagement programs.
- Stakeholder interviews reveal that the district has strong community engagement programs that have resulted in positive impact on the school and student performance; however, there is

limited evidence to support the level of family involvement and/or impact of family involvement.

Other pertinent information:

- While there is strong evidence the district has provided multiple programs/opportunities to engage families in the instructional process, less than half of parents who responded to the survey report being informed of their children’s learning progress, indicating they may not be aware of the variety of engagement opportunities.

3.9	The school/system has a formal structure whereby each student is well known by at least one adult advocate in the school/system who supports that student’s educational experience.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 3
-----	---	----------------------	------------------

Performance levels

	4	School/district personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student and related adults.
X	3	School/district personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student.
	2	School/district personnel participate in a structure that gives them interaction with individual students, allowing them to build relationships over time with the student.
	1	Few or no opportunities exist for school/district personnel to build long-term interaction with individual students.
X	4	All students participate in the structure.
	3	All students may participate in the structure.
	2	Most students participate in the structure.
	4	The structure allows the school/district employee to gain significant insight into and serve as an advocate for the student’s needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	3	The structure allows the school/district employee to gain insight into and serve as an advocate for the student’s needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
X	2	The structure allows the school/district employee to gain insight into the student’s needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	1	Few or no students have a school/district employee who advocates for their needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.

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

Student performance data
Student, parent, and staff survey data
Academic Time
Student Support Team
Superintendent presentation
District team intervention

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

- Self-Assessment

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 53.7 to 71.8. This resulted in an increase from the 45th percentile to the 97th percentile (2012, 2013).
- In the Achievement category, the school’s score increased from 61.5 to 68.8 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculation for reading increased from 68.0 to 71.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 61.5 to 72.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 52.7 to 56.1.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 56.8 to 64.3.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 67.6 to 78.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 72.2 to 83.5.
- In the Gap category, the school’s score increased from 35.9 to 45.1 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD calculation for reading increased from 49.0 to 61.0.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 36.4 to 40.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 21.1 to 32.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 35.3 to 42.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 37.7 to 47.8.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 38.7 to 54.3.
- In the Growth category, the school’s score increased from 55.2 to 63.9 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading increased from 60.5% to 64.4%.
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math increased from 49.7% to 63.4%.
- In the College and Career Readiness category, the school’s score increased from 33.9 to 85.6 points overall (2012, 2013):

- The number of College Ready students increased from 64 to 125.
- The number of Career Ready students increased from 10 to 32.
- The graduation rate increased from 81.9% to 95.3% (2012, 2013).
- On the PLAN assessment from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 67.6% to 77.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 25.2% to 37.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in reading increased from 43.3% to 55.1%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in science increased from 24.8% to 32.9%.
- On the ACT from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 50.0% to 60.2%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 31.7% to 45.9%.
 - The percentage of students meeting benchmark in reading increased from 37.6% to 49.0%.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In surveys, 48.2% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My school makes sure there is at least one adult who knows me well and shows interest in my education and future,” suggesting that less than half of all students feel there is a structure that gives teachers long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student and related adults.
- In surveys, 69.6% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “In our school, a formal structure exists so that each student is well known by at least one adult advocate in the school who supports that student’s educational experience,” indicating that more than half of teachers report there is a structure in place that allows the school employee to gain significant insight into and serve as an advocate for each student’s needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
- In surveys, 63.9% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My child has at least one adult advocate in the school,” suggestion that more than half of parents feel their child is supported by and connected to at least one adult advocate in the school.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review indicates an intensive mentoring program designed to meet the needs of 7-10 students.
- An artifact review indicates multiple student-student peer programs available to students based on need.
- Stakeholder interviews revealed that all school-based staff members participate in Academic Time, which is utilized to support students based on academic need as well as build sustained relationships.
- Stakeholder interviews revealed the impact of the Student Support Team, focusing on ECE, 504, ESL, Gap, attendance issues, and behavior issues. Student Support Team members work with about 25 students each (total of about 200) on attendance, grades, and behavior referrals. Data is monitored and reported to the board of education each trimester.

Other pertinent information:

- While there is evidence that all students participate in Academic Time, creating opportunities to build relationships with adults, there is limited evidence that all students receive the same level of advocacy afforded the students involved with the Student Support Team.

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

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

- Self-Assessment

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Review and update the district grading policy to ensure clearly defined criteria that represent attainment of content knowledge and skills that are consistent across grade levels and courses. Ensure district policy mandates formal systems of annual review of grading policy at the school level. Ensure 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.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 53.7 to 71.8. This resulted in an increase from the 45th percentile to the 97th percentile (2012, 2013).
- In the Achievement category, the school’s score increased from 61.5 to 68.8 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculation for reading increased from 68.0 to 71.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 61.5 to 72.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 52.7 to 56.1.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 56.8 to 64.3.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 67.6 to 78.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 72.2 to 83.5.
- In the Gap category, the school’s score increased from 35.9 to 45.1 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD calculation for reading increased from 49.0 to 61.0.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 36.4 to 40.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 21.1 to 32.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 35.3 to 42.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 37.7 to 47.8.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 38.7 to 54.3.

- In the Growth category, the school’s score increased from 55.2 to 63.9 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading increased from 60.5% to 64.4%.
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math increased from 49.7% to 63.4%.
- In the College and Career Readiness category, the school’s score increased from 33.9 to 85.6 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The number of College Ready students increased from 64 to 125.
 - The number of Career Ready students increased from 10 to 32.
- The graduation rate increased from 81.9% to 95.3% (2012, 2013).
- On the PLAN assessment from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 67.6% to 77.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 25.2% to 37.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in reading increased from 43.3% to 55.1%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in science increased from 24.8% to 32.9%.
- On the ACT from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 50.0% to 60.2%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 31.7% to 45.9%.
 - The percentage of students meeting benchmark in reading increased from 37.6% to 49.0%.

Classroom Observation Data:

- The Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment received an overall rating of 2.8 on a 4-point scale, indicating there is some evidence that students receive specific and timely feedback about their learning.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In surveys, 58.9% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my teachers fairly grade and evaluate my work,” suggesting that over 40% of students may feel grading policies, processes, and procedures are implemented inconsistently across grade levels and courses.
- In surveys, 73.9% of teachers strongly agree/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,” indicating that a majority of teachers report grading policies, processes, and procedures are implemented consistently across grade levels and courses. This notes a discrepancy between students and teachers regarding the consistent implementation and/or equity related to evaluation, grading, or reporting of student grades.
- In surveys, 60.8% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All of my child’s teachers report on my child’s progress in easy to understand language,” suggesting that more than half of parents report awareness of the policies, processes, and procedures associated with grading and/or student learning progress.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review indicates multiple resources such as Parent Portal and Family Nights that are available for families.

- Stakeholder interviews revealed that not all teachers assign grades based on content mastery, with grades sometimes assigned based on completion and/or possession of materials. Interviewees also reported grades are updated in Infinite Campus infrequently by some teachers.
- Stakeholder interviews revealed a lack of a formalized process and/or protocol for reviewing/revising policies related to grading.

3.11	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning.	District 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/district's purpose and direction.
	3	All staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district's purpose and direction.
	2	Most staff members participate in a program of professional learning that is aligned with the school/district's purpose and direction.
	1	Few or no staff members participate in professional learning.
X	4	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school/district and the individual.
	3	Professional development is based on an assessment of needs of the school/district.
	2	Professional development is based on the needs of the school/district.
	1	Professional development, when available, may or may not address the needs of the school/district or build capacity among staff members.
	4	The program builds measurable capacity among all professional and support staff.
X	3	The program builds capacity among all professional and support staff.
	2	The program builds capacity among staff members who participate.
	4	The program is rigorously and systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.
	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.

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

Student performance data
Staff survey data
Professional development sign in sheets
Chat and Chew
Apps and Appetizers
District personnel interviews
Professional development days
Professional Learning Community Days
District comprehensive meeting plan

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 53.7 to 71.8. This resulted in an increase from the 45th percentile to the 97th percentile (2012, 2013).
- In the Achievement category, the school’s score increased from 61.5 to 68.8 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculation for reading increased from 68.0 to 71.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 61.5 to 72.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 52.7 to 56.1.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 56.8 to 64.3.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 67.6 to 78.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 72.2 to 83.5.
- In the Gap category, the school’s score increased from 35.9 to 45.1 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD calculation for reading increased from 49.0 to 61.0.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 36.4 to 40.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 21.1 to 32.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 35.3 to 42.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 37.7 to 47.8.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 38.7 to 54.3.
- In the Growth category, the school’s score increased from 55.2 to 63.9 points overall (2012, 2013):

- The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading increased from 60.5% to 64.4%.
- The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math increased from 49.7% to 63.4%.
- In the College and Career Readiness category, the school's score increased from 33.9 to 85.6 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The number of College Ready students increased from 64 to 125.
 - The number of Career Ready students increased from 10 to 32.
- The graduation rate increased from 81.9% to 95.3% (2012, 2013).
- On the PLAN assessment from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 67.6% to 77.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 25.2% to 37.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in reading increased from 43.3% to 55.1%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in science increased from 24.8% to 32.9%.
- On the ACT from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 50.0% to 60.2%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 31.7% to 45.9%.
 - The percentage of students meeting benchmark in reading increased from 37.6% to 49.0%.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In surveys, 89.1% of teachers strongly agree/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," indicating that most teachers participate in a program of professional learning communities.
- In surveys, 95.7% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, "In our school, all staff members participate in continuous professional learning based on the identified needs of the school," suggesting that teachers participate in a program that is systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.
- In surveys, 93.5% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, "In our school a professional learning program is designed to build capacity among all professional and support staff members," indicating that most teachers participate in a program that builds capacity among all professional and support staff

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review indicates the existence of a district-supported continuous program of professional learning that is aligned with the school's purpose and direction.
- An artifact review indicates a variety of professional growth opportunities made available to teachers based on individual need.
- Stakeholder interviews revealed the program is regularly evaluated (annually) for effectiveness.

3.12	The school/system provides and coordinates learning support services to meet the unique learning needs of students.	District Rating 3	Team Rating 3
------	---	----------------------	------------------

Performance levels

X	4	School/District personnel systematically and continuously use data to identify unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency as well as other learning needs (such as second languages).
	3	School/District personnel use data to identify unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency as well as other learning needs (such as second languages).
	2	School/District personnel use data to identify unique learning needs of special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs (such as second languages).
	1	School/District personnel identify special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs (such as second languages).
	4	School/District personnel stay current on research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related individualized learning support services to all students.
	3	School/District personnel stay current on research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related learning support services to all students.
X	2	School/District personnel are familiar with research related to unique characteristics of learning (such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type indicators) and provide or coordinate related learning support services to students within these special populations.
	1	School/District personnel provide or coordinate some learning support services to students within these special populations.

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

Student performance data
Classroom observation data
Student, parent, staff survey data
Academic Time
Student Support Team
Key Metrics
District comprehensive meeting plan

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 53.7 to 71.8. This resulted in an increase from the 45th percentile to the 97th percentile (2012, 2013).
- In the Achievement category, the school’s score increased from 61.5 to 68.8 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD (Novice Apprentice Proficient Distinguished) calculation for reading increased from 68.0 to 71.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 61.5 to 72.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 52.7 to 56.1.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 56.8 to 64.3.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 67.6 to 78.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 72.2 to 83.5.
- In the Gap category, the school’s score increased from 35.9 to 45.1 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The NAPD calculation for reading increased from 49.0 to 61.0.
 - The NAPD calculation for math increased from 36.4 to 40.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for science increased from 21.1 to 32.5.
 - The NAPD calculation for social studies increased from 35.3 to 42.6.
 - The NAPD calculation for writing increased from 37.7 to 47.8.
 - The NAPD calculation for language mechanics increased from 38.7 to 54.3.
- In the Growth category, the school’s score increased from 55.2 to 63.9 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in reading increased from 60.5% to 64.4%.
 - The percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth in math increased from 49.7% to 63.4%.
- In the College and Career Readiness category, the school’s score increased from 33.9 to 85.6 points overall (2012, 2013):
 - The number of College Ready students increased from 64 to 125.
 - The number of Career Ready students increased from 10 to 32.
- The graduation rate increased from 81.9% to 95.3% (2012, 2013).
- On the PLAN assessment from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 67.6% to 77.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 25.2% to 37.3%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in reading increased from 43.3% to 55.1%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in science increased from 24.8% to 32.9%.

- On the ACT from 2011-12 to 2012-13,
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English increased from 50.0% to 60.2%.
 - The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 31.7% to 45.9%.
 - The percentage of students meeting benchmark in reading increased from 37.6% to 49.0%.

Classroom Observation Data:

- The Supportive Learning Environment received an overall score 3.0 on a 4-point scale indicating it is evident that classroom teachers create a positive classroom environment that provides support and assistance to ensure students understand content.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In surveys, 59.2% of students strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My school provides learning services for me according to my need,” indicating that more than half of all students feel systems exist that provide and coordinate learning support services to meet the unique learning needs of all students.
- In surveys, 89.1% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “In our school, related learning services are provided for all students based on their needs,” suggesting that most school personnel provide or coordinate some learning support services to students based on individual need.
- In surveys, 80.4% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “ In our school, all staff members use student data to address the unique learning needs of all students,” suggesting that a majority of teachers are utilizing data to identify unique learning needs of special populations of students based on proficiency and/or other learning needs.
- In surveys, 56.2% of parents strongly agree/agree with the statement, “My child has access to support services based on his/her identified needs,” suggesting that a little more than half of parents believe their children have access to learning support services to meet their unique learning needs. There is a discrepancy between parents and teachers regarding student access to such support services.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- An artifact review indicates the school utilizes multiple assessment measures to identify and support the unique learning needs of students.
- Stakeholder interviews reveal the district collaborates with school personnel to systematically and continuously use data to identify unique learning needs of all students at all levels of proficiency as well as other learning needs

Other pertinent information:

- While there is evidence to support the district’s engagement of teachers in the utilization of research-based instructional strategies, there is little evidence indicating district or teachers utilize 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.

Standard 3 Powerful Practices (Level 4 Ratings)

Provide evidence to support the “4” rating and the justification for the Powerful Practice below.

Indicators

3.2/3.4/3.5

The superintendent has intentionally aligned district level resources to aid in the development of a comprehensive system to lead, serve and support the academic framework at the high school. This framework is built on a collaborative model so that at every level (classroom, department, building leadership, and district leadership) systems are in place to collect and analyze data which then results in revisions to both curriculum and instructional practice leading to increases in student achievement. The district provided the funding for the high school to make use of the STAR progress monitoring tool to aid in the collection of additional data throughout the school year to provide for multiple measures related to student achievement.

The superintendent ensures effective monitoring of curriculum, instruction, and assessment through the district comprehensive meeting plan which includes site visits, ILTM’s (Instructional Leadership Team Meetings), SLTM’s (School Leadership Team Meetings), Leadership Retreat, regularly scheduled BOE Reports, Student Support Teams, PLC data analysis, and Learning Community Days. This comprehensive system ensures the instructional practices at the high school 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.

The superintendent reorganized district level staffing allowing Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Specialists to act as district liaisons to the district office position responsible for teacher quality and support. The reorganization of district personnel coupled with the comprehensive meeting plan designed to monitor and support instructional practice at every level indicates a foundational understanding of systems work which requires progress monitoring aimed at ensuring continuous school improvement.

Student Performance Data:

- The school’s academic index grew from 53.7 to 71.8. This resulted in an increase from the 45th percentile to the 97th percentile.
- In the Achievement category, the school’s score increased from 61.5 to 68.8 points overall (2012, 2013).
- In the Gap category, the school’s score increased from 35.9 to 45.1 points overall (2012, 2013).
- In the Growth category, the school’s score increased from 55.2 to 63.9 points overall (2012, 2013).
- In the College and Career Readiness category, the school’s score increased from 33.9 to 85.6 (2012, 2013).
- The graduation rate increased from 81.9% to 95.3% (2012, 2013).
- The graduate follow-up survey indicated that 92.5% of graduating seniors experience successful transition into post-secondary activities.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- In surveys, 87.0% of teachers strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment based on data from student assessments and examination of professional practice,” suggesting that most teachers are utilizing student assessment information to adjust practice to meet the needs of their students.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review

- An artifact review indicates district leadership consistently participates in walkthroughs collecting evidence of engaging and challenging learning activities.
- An artifact review indicates district leadership has provided professional development focusing on learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills that align with the school's purpose.
- An artifact review indicates the district ensures the school participates in data analysis resulting in learning activities that are individualized for each student in a way that supports achievement of expectations
 - The superintendent presentation and stakeholder interview reveal district monitoring protocols/comprehensive meeting plan (site visits, Instructional Leadership Team Meetings, School Leadership Team Meetings, Leadership Retreat, regularly scheduled board reports, Student Support Teams, PLC/data analysis, Learning Community Days)
- An artifact review indicates the district has adopted the Quality Core curriculum, which is monitored and adjusted as needed through the district's comprehensive meeting plan.

BENCHMARK CRITERIA FROM 2011-12 DISTRICT LEADERSHIP DIAGNOSTIC REVIEW

Other pertinent information **from previous diagnostic review report that serve as benchmarks:**

The 2011-12 District Leadership Diagnostic Review for Simpson County identified six deficiencies in practice needing attention by district level staff. This powerful practice addresses three of the deficiencies listed below relative to the recommended next steps provided to the district by the diagnostic review team:

2011-12 Deficiency 2 (SUCCESSFULLY ADDRESSED 2013-14): District leadership does not have the organizational structure in place to effectively support the high school in improving student performance.

2011-12 Team comments: District leadership should review the current organizational structure including allocation of district resources and support to the high school. An intentional focus should be directed toward how these resources can be effectively and consistently used to achieve federal, state and local goals for student achievement. A systematic process should be developed for monitoring and evaluating the impact of all district resources in attaining the improvement goals identified in the comprehensive district and high school improvement plans.
2013-14 This deficiency has been addressed in an exemplary manner.

2011-12 Deficiency 4: (SUCCESSFULLY ADDRESSED 2013-14): District leadership has not clearly defined roles and responsibilities of district staff for collecting, managing and analyzing achievement data.

2011-12 Team comments: District leadership should develop a data management system that ensures reliable data are analyzed and disaggregated. The results of the analysis should be provided to the board of education, school councils and appropriate personnel at all levels and should drive decision making. These data should be used to establish benchmarks and performance goals for school improvement and shared with district stakeholders.
2013-14: This deficiency has been addressed in an exemplary manner.

2011-12 Deficiency 5: (SUCCESSFULLY ADDRESSED 2013-14) District leadership has not developed a systemic process for monitoring district initiatives or resources.

2011-12 Team comments: District leadership should develop a systematic process for monitoring the implementation and impact of district-initiated programs at the high school. District

leadership should set specific goals and expectations and intentionally focus initiatives on research-based strategies. This process should include measures to determine the impact of resources and professional development provided by these initiatives on achieving academic, instructional and organizational goals and to inform decision making regarding the continuation, revision or elimination of these initiatives. District leadership should collaborate with school leadership and all teachers in deciding on programs or initiatives to use at the high school and the professional development necessary to strengthen instructional practices and improve student achievement.

2013-14: This deficiency has been addressed in a satisfactory manner.

FINAL COMMENTS

The superintendent has intentionally aligned district level resources to aid in the development of a comprehensive system to lead, serve and support the academic framework at the high school. This framework is built on a collaborative model so that at every level (classroom, department, building leadership, and district leadership) systems are in place to collect and analyze data which then results in revisions to both curriculum and instructional practice leading to increases in student achievement. This comprehensive system moves beyond support at the high school to include a K12 frame of reference allowing for vertical alignment of practices, common vocabulary across schools, and an intentional district focus on continuous school improvement that impacts every student in the district.

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.

Collaboration

A culture of collaborative learning cuts across the district including leaders, teachers, students, parents, and community members. This collaborative culture permeates all aspects of the district's efforts to allocate resources (time, talent, finances) to the high school to support student learning. The district collaborates with the community to support teachers by engaging business partners to lend support through internships, mentoring opportunities, funding for scholarships and school-based initiatives. The district supports collaboration at the high school through the establishment of an infrastructure to support teaching and learning including a district level liaison (CIA Specialist), as well as structures and supports allowing for teacher PLCs (professional learning communities), data analysis days, Learning Community Days and new teacher mentors.

Continuous School Improvement and Systems Alignment

Continuous School Improvement is a culture of improvement which constantly examines new data and information and responds accordingly revising programs, plans, and initiatives as required by the data review. Clear evidence exists that the district has worked to establish a continuous school improvement mindset in every building in the system as well as at the district office, board of education, and the community at large. The superintendent has established a comprehensive system to support the academic framework at the high school leading to a strong model of goal setting, action planning, implementation, monitoring and analysis, review, and revision which combine to form a cycle of continuous improvement. The alignment of district level supports addressing the deficiencies from the 2011-12 District Leadership Diagnostic Report resulted in the district addressing four of the six deficiencies in an exemplary manner. The superintendent should be commended for his leadership in this area.

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 Simpson County School District.

Deficiency 1: The superintendent has not created or communicated a sense of urgency for improving student achievement at the high school.

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:

- Student performance data
- Quarterly Report
- Reinforces common student centered vision/mission
- Key Metric – SMART goals established, data review periodically, results publicized.
- Board policy mandating CCR status for graduation effective with Class of 2014
- Community-based presentations with various stakeholder groups
- Community-based partnerships indicating community wide awareness and support.
- After-hours CTE program
- Reorganization of central office to support student achievement
- District non-negotiables

Team comments:

- The superintendent replaced the principal at the high school following the 2011-12 Leadership Diagnostic determination that the sitting principal did not have the capacity to lead the turnaround work at the high school. This action established both a sense of urgency for change at the high school and the superintendent's support of change at the high school
- The superintendent ensures opening day activities for all district staff, including all high school staff, establish a common vision through a common message of, "...Simpson County...A great place to learn, where kids matter most." The superintendent has provided evidence that "non-negotiables" have been developed at the district level ensuring student-centered classrooms in every building in the district, including the high school and that these non-negotiables have been shared with all staff and are monitored through building-level and district-level walkthroughs and observations.
- The superintendent has engaged in a series of community-based meetings to share and discuss the successes and challenges of the district, including the

high school. He has cultivated community partnerships allowing the district the means to provide added resources, including time, talent and funds, to the high school academic program. Business partnerships developed by the superintendent have resulted in a scholarship fund to allow high school students to participate in dual credit opportunities tuition-free. The local Education Excellence Foundation regularly provides grants to schools to fund various initiatives.

- Community outreach by the superintendent has resulted in businesses recognizing and promoting high school achievement including billboards and local community signage highlighting the high school's distinguished rating.

Deficiency 2: District leadership does not have the organizational structure in place to effectively support the high school in improving student 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:

- Organizational plan – teaching & learning division
- Comprehensive meeting schedule (central office leadership; school based leadership; student and community partnerships)
- Clearly outlined continuous improvement process
- Clearly outlined metrics and data review schedule
- District resource allocation to the high school to support continuous improvement process

Team comments:

- The superintendent has intentionally aligned district level resources to aid in the development of a comprehensive system to lead, serve and support the academic framework at the high school. This framework is built on a collaborative model so that at every level (classroom, department, building leadership, and district leadership) systems are in place to collect and analyze data which then results in revisions to both curriculum and instructional practice leading to increases in student achievement.
- The district provided the funding for the high school to make use of the STAR progress monitoring tool to aid in the collection of additional data throughout the school year to provide for multiple measures related to student achievement.
- The CDIP revision included students, parents, community members, SBDM members and board of education members along with district-level leadership ensuring a broad range of stakeholder engagement.
- The superintendent leads quarterly reviews by the district leadership team and the board of education as to progress of the district on multiple measures as well as a review of district resources aimed at increasing student achievement.

Deficiency 3: The superintendent does not hold all staff members accountable for the success or failure of students at Franklin-Simpson High School.

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 removed
- Principal evaluated with 360 Feedback
- District walkthrough schedule/PGES Blitz
- District monitoring protocols/comprehensive meeting plan (site visits, Instructional Leadership Team Meetings, School Leadership Team Meetings, Leadership Retreat, regularly scheduled board reports, Student Support Teams, PLC/data analysis, Learning Community Days)

Team comments:

- The superintendent has created structures and supports to allow all staff to participate in professional growth opportunities.
- All staff is required to participate in job-embedded professional growth opportunities at the high school.
- Building-level leadership is required to participate as District Instructional Leadership Team members.
- The district provides the resources so that all principals participate in 360 feedback.
- The superintendent has in place a structure ensuring a comprehensive meeting plan with appropriate protocols resulting in increased levels of accountability for building leaders, teachers, and staff.
- The superintendent is an active participant on school site team visits, professional growth meetings, district Instructional Leadership Team Meetings, and board of education meetings.

Deficiency 4: District leadership has not clearly defined roles and responsibilities of district staff for collecting, managing, and analyzing achievement data.

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:

- Organizational plan – teaching and learning division
- Quarterly Reports
- Key Metric – SMART goals established, data reviewed periodically, results publicized.
- District Monitoring Protocols/Comprehensive Meeting Plan (site visits, Instructional Leadership Team Meetings, School Leadership Team Meetings, Leadership Retreat, regularly scheduled board reports, Student Support Teams, PLC/data analysis, Learning Community Days)
- 30/60/90 plans
- CSIP/CDIP

Team comments:

- The superintendent has reorganized the district office to better lead, serve and support all schools in the district, including the high school. The reorganization includes a district level position of teacher quality and support which allows for direct supervision of and collaboration with the building level Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Specialists (CIA) assigned to each building in the district. This position also serves as District Assessment Coordinator and Professional Development Coordinator.
- A district-level position at the high school, known as the CIA, serves as the district liaison between the high school and the district office for the purposes of instructional monitoring and support.
- The superintendent has developed a comprehensive system of support for all schools, including the high school, resulting in frequent monitoring of instructional data, intervention data, and student performance data. Additionally, the system of support includes a sophisticated meeting structure allowing the district personnel to not only monitor but participate as partners in school improvement initiatives.

Deficiency 5: District leadership has not developed a systematic process for monitoring district initiatives or resources.

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:

- Organizational plan – teaching and learning division
- District monitoring protocols/comprehensive meeting plan (site visits, Instructional Leadership Team Meetings, School Leadership Team Meetings, Leadership Retreat, regularly scheduled board reports, Student Support Teams, PLC/data analysis, Learning Community Days)
- Professional development on research based strategies
- District/school collaboration to provide for individual needs of teachers
- District system for school BOE reporting on a regular basis

- District walkthrough schedule/PGES Blitz
- Quarterly Report
- PGES rollout plan
- 30/60/90 plans
- CSIP/CDIP

Team comments:

- The superintendent has established a comprehensive system to lead, serve and support the schools in his district. The reorganization of the district office has led to increased accountability in terms of both personnel and resources.
- The superintendent reports to the board of education quarterly on progress in all schools, including the high school quarterly reporting tool used by the Kentucky Department of Education. Achievement data and progress toward performance goals are analyzed at the district level and additional resources are allocated as required to meet the learning needs at the high school.
- The district included the high school in the Race To The Top district grant (GRREC and OVEC) and the reporting and resource allocation required by that grant initiative has been incorporated into the district protocols established by the superintendent.

Deficiency 6: District leadership has not involved all stakeholders in meaningful ways to have an impact 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:

- Parent forums and meetings
- BOE/SBDM joint meetings
- Community-based presentations with various stakeholder groups
- Community-based partnerships indicating community wide awareness and support (SKYCTC Partnerships, Rotary Club, Chamber of Commerce, Prichard Committee)
- District communication plan (website, social media – Facebook, Twitter, radio shows, newspaper articles)
- Data retreats
- Learning Community Days
- Stakeholder surveys (AdvancED, TELL, Student Voice, climate/culture)
- Open Houses
- Parent/teacher conferences
- Wildcat Orientation
- Operation Preparation
- Boys & Girls Club
- Bridge Academy

Team comments:

The superintendent has deliberately engaged multiple stakeholder groups in various aspects of the work of the district. The superintendent has

- ensured an active partnership with the local Education Excellence Foundation to support initiatives at the building level, including the high school
- engaged the business community as a partner in the work of enhancing the work at the high school
 - Rotary Club welcoming luncheon for new teachers
 - Five Business Partnership Group to guarantee tuition-free dual credit coursework for students
- included parents as partners in the revision of the CDIP
- included students as partners in the revision of the CDIP
- established a Superintendent Student Advisory Council at the district level
- created a climate of collaboration and partnership in and among businesses and community groups in support of the schools
- engaged parents at the high school through forums designed to inform them of the work of school improvement and solicit their feedback relative to that work
- involved parents as partners at the high school through the support of multiple opportunities for parents including conference days, orientation sessions, assessment debriefings, and family nights at the high school
- presented the work of the district to local community groups and regional groups, including conference presentations at Western Kentucky University

The superintendent should be commended for his efforts to engage the community-at-large in the life of school district.

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

