



Internal School Review Report

Name of Institution

Reviewed: Western Middle School

Date: January 28, 2014- January 29, 2014

School Principal: Kym Rice



Introduction

The KDE Internal School Review is designed to:

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

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

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

The report includes:

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

Standard 3: Teaching and Assessing for Learning

Standard: The school’s curriculum, instructional design, and assessment practices guide and ensure teacher effectiveness and student learning.	School Rating for Standard 3 2.67	Team Rating for Standard 3 2.25
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------

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

3.1	The school/district’s curriculum provides equitable and challenging learning experiences that ensure all students have sufficient opportunities to develop learning, thinking, and life skills that lead to success at the next level.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 2
-----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------

Performance levels

	4	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide all students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills that align with the school’s purpose.
	3	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide all students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
X	2	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide most students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	1	Curriculum and learning experiences in each course/class provide few or no students with challenging and equitable opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.
	4	Evidence clearly indicates curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
X	3	There is some evidence to indicate curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
	2	There is little evidence to indicate curriculum and learning experiences prepare students for success at the next level.
	1	There is no evidence to indicate how successful students will be at the next level.
	4	Like courses/classes have the same high learning expectations.
X	3	Like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations.
	2	Most like courses/classes have equivalent learning expectations.
	1	Like courses/classes do not always have the same learning expectations.
	4	Learning activities are individualized for each student in a way that supports achievement of expectations.

	3	Some learning activities are individualized for each student in a way that supports achievement of expectations.
X	2	Little individualization for each student is evident.
	1	No individualization for students is evident.

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

Self-Assessment

Executive Summary

Previous KDE Leadership Assessment

KDE School Report Card

AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data

ELEOT Classroom Observation data

Stakeholder interviews

Review of documents and artifacts

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Evaluate learning experiences in all classes to ensure curriculum, assessment and instruction are rigorous, challenging, and equitable in order for all students to have sufficient opportunities to develop learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills. Analyze data results of this process and monitor to ensure identified changes become systemic and that increases in student achievement continue.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The 2012-13 School Report Card data indicates College and Career Readiness increased from 10.8% in 2011-12 to 23.7% in 2012-13.

- **Percentage Meeting EXPLORE Benchmarks**

	2011-2012	2012-2013
English	18.3%	45.2% (increased but 9.1 percentage points below the district score and 20.8 percentage points below the state score)
Reading	5.4%	19.4% (increased but 12.8 percentage points below district score and 22.2 percentage points below state score)
Math	8.6%	6.5% (decreased from 2011-12 scores and 19.9 percentage points below district and 27.4 percentage points below state score)

The above data suggests that more rigorous instructional practices and more effective use of formative assessments to gauge student progress are needed.

Classroom Observation Data:

- The Equitable Learning Environment item descriptor A.1, “Has differentiated learning opportunities and activities to meet her/his needs,” was rated 1.8 on a 4-point scale. Instructional practices need to offer more rigorous, differentiated instructional strategies, which include higher order questioning, increased student use of available technology, and collaborative learning opportunities within the classroom environment for all students.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- The survey data below indicates that teachers and students are comfortable with the degree of rigor in student learning experiences; however, student performance data indicates that growth is needed in this area.
 - According to the student survey, 82% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school provides me with challenging curriculum and learning experiences.”
 - According to the student survey, 76% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school prepares me to deal with issues I may face in the future. “
 - According to the staff survey, 90% of staff members agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, challenging curriculum and learning experiences provide equity for all students in the development of learning, thinking, and life skills.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- According to stakeholder interviews, a need was expressed for aligning the arts curriculum to the core content curriculum (e.g., a more effective use of literacy strategies within the arts classes).
- The Self-Assessment Report states the need for all teachers to fully implement literacy strategies in content areas.

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

Performance levels

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

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

Self-Assessment
Executive Summary
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment
KDE School Report Card
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data
ELEOT Classroom Observation data
Stakeholder interviews
Review of school documents and artifacts
2013 TELL Survey

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The 2012-13 School Report Card reflects the school ranked in the 38th percentile in comparison to the 4th percentile in 2011-12.

Classroom Observation Data:

- The classroom observation data below indicates that the stage has been set for student learning; however, formative assessments and the students’ understanding of how their work is assessed are areas for growth.
 - Classroom observation data on the High Expectations Environment item descriptor B.1, “Knows and strives to meet the high expectations established by the teacher,” was rated 2.7 on a 4-point scale.
 - Classroom observation data on the Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment item descriptor E.1, “Is asked and/or quizzed about individual progress/learning,” was rated 1.7 on a 4-point scale.
 - Classroom observation data on the Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment item descriptor E.4, “Understands how her/his work is assessed,” was rated 1.6 on a 4-point scale.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to the student survey, 89% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement “My school gives me multiple assessments to check my understanding of what was taught.”

- According to the staff survey, 90% of teachers agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school monitor and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment based on data from student assessments and examination of professional practices.”
- According to the staff survey, 87% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school all staff members use student data to address the unique learning needs of all students.”
- According to the staff survey, 87% strongly agree/agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use multiple types of assessments to modify instruction and to revise the curriculum.”
- The 2013 Teaching, Empowering, Leading and Learning (TELL) Survey results indicate 100% of teachers agree/strongly agree that “teachers use assessment data to inform their instruction.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews and lesson plan reviews indicate the use of multiple assessments (i.e., pre-assessments and post-assessments).
- Stakeholder interviews and artifact reviews reveal that learning checks are scheduled throughout the year, student needs are identified, and an instructional plan to address student needs is developed.
- The school’s Quarterly Report indicates a variety of assessments are used across content areas, including pre/post assessments, district common assessments, MAP, and ongoing progress monitoring.

Other pertinent information:

- PLC meetings are conducted weekly in all content areas, which include collaborative data analysis, identification of skill deficits, and revision of instructional plans. These meetings are supported by school leadership.

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

	3	Teachers use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.
X	2	Teachers sometimes use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.
	1	Teachers rarely or never use instructional strategies that require students to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Stakeholder interviews		
Review of documents and artifacts		
2013 TELL Survey		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Review the instructional process to ensure that teachers are providing all students with multiple opportunities to apply knowledge and skills, integrate content and skills with other disciplines, and use technologies as instructional resources and learning tools that result in achievement of learning expectations. Ensure that the process includes well-documented methods for monitoring the instructional process and providing feedback to teachers on the effective use of instructional strategies to promote rigorous and scaffolded learning.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- According to the 2012-13 School Report Card, the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in reading was 44.8% for the school, compared to 42.1% and 51.1% for the district and state, respectively.
- According to the 2012-13 School Report Card, the percentage of students scoring at the proficient/distinguished level in math was 30.9% for the school, compared to 33.2% and 40.7% for the district and state, respectively.

Classroom Observation Data:

- Observation data revealed that teachers personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of groups of students when necessary; however, this appears to be rarely done on an individual basis within the classroom environment.
 - Classroom observation data on the Equitable Learning Environment item descriptor A.1, “Has differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs,” was rated 1.8 on a 4-point scale.
 - Classroom observation data on the High Expectations Environment item descriptor B.2, “Is tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable” was rated 2.7 on a 4-point scale.
 - Classroom observation data on the High Expectations Environment item descriptor B.4, “Is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks” was rated 2.6 on a 4-point scale.
 - Classroom observation data on the High Expectations Environment item descriptor B.5, “Is asked and responds to questions that require higher order thinking (e.g., applying, evaluating, synthesizing),” was rated 2.3 on a 4-point scale.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to the student survey, 59% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers change their teaching to meet my learning needs,” suggesting that over one-third of the students do not believe that all teachers adapt instructional practices to address student learning needs.
- According to the staff survey, 87% of staff members agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school personalize instructional strategies and interventions to address individual learning needs of students.” Additionally, 90% responded that they agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school regularly use instructional strategies that require student collaboration, self-reflection, and development of critical thinking skills,” suggesting that teachers believe that current instructional practices are varied sufficiently to meet the needs of students.
- According to the staff survey, 81% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use a variety of technologies as instructional resources.”
- According to 2013 TELL Survey results, 93% of teachers agree/strongly agree that the curriculum taught in the school is aligned with the Common Core Standards.

- According to 2013 TELL Survey results, 41% of teachers disagree/strongly disagree that “teachers have sufficient training to fully utilize instructional technology.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews revealed that scheduling changes have been made to the master schedule to allow for embedded professional development opportunities for identified areas. Currently, differentiated instruction is being addressed with most staff members.
- Stakeholder interviews revealed that there continues to be a need for increased classroom rigor, higher order and critical thinking skills, and more alignment between core content areas and the arts program.

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

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

- Self-Assessment

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- A review of 2012-13 School Report Card data shown below demonstrates an increase in student achievement, which indicates that school leaders monitor and support the improvement of instructional practices to promote student success.

Accountability	2011-2012 SRC	2012-2013 SRC
Achievement	46.6 / weighted score 13.0	63.4 / weighted score 17.8
Gap	21.5 / weighted score 6.0	40.1 / weighted score 11.2
Growth	58.1 / weighted score 16.3	65.4 / weighted score 18.3
CCR	10.8 / weighted score 1.7	23.7 / weighted score 3.8
AMO		AMO Goal: 38.0 Accountability Score: 51.1 High Progress School

- The 2012-13 School Report Card data and designation as a High Progress School provide evidence that school leaders are monitoring student engagement in the learning process.
- The 2012-13 School Report Card data indicates a reduction in novice scores and an increase in proficient/distinguished scores in all content areas.

Classroom Observation Data:

- According to classroom observation data, the High Expectations Environment item descriptor B.4, “Is engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks,” rated 2.6 on a 4-point scale.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to the principal interview and stakeholder interviews the 2013-14 master schedule has been adjusted to address a concern on the 2013 TELL Survey, which indicated that 34% of

teachers disagree/strongly disagree with the statement, “Teachers have sufficient instructional time to meet the needs of all students.”

- According to the principal interview and stakeholder interviews the 2013-14 master schedule has been adjusted to address a concern on the 2013 TELL Survey, which indicated that 32% of teachers disagree/strongly disagree that the leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns related to the use of time in the school.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- The Quarterly Report indicates that teachers who provide intervention instruction meet with the Goal Clarity coach to adjust student plans for instruction.
- Principal and teacher interviews reflected regular one-on-one data conferences are being conducted with all teachers to reflect on instructional practices and obtain feedback on needed support in regard to classroom practices.

Other pertinent information:

- Analysis of walkthrough data indicates instructional practices are monitored by school leaders.
- Stakeholder interviews, meeting agendas/minutes, and other artifact reviews indicate that school leadership has developed processes to develop, monitor, and support the continuous improvement process. Teachers who were interviewed articulated a clear plan to address student learning and achievement. However, this plan is in the beginning stages and lacks consistency in implementation to address varied and effective instructional practices in all classrooms.

3.5	Teachers participate/system operates in collaborative learning communities to improve instruction and student learning.	School Rating 3	Team Rating 3
Performance levels			
	4	All members of the school staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule.	
X	3	All members of the school staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally.	
	2	Some members of the school staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally.	
	1	Collaborative learning communities randomly self-organize and meet informally.	
	4	Frequent collaboration occurs across grade levels and content areas.	
X	3	Collaboration often occurs across grade levels and content areas.	
	2	Collaboration occasionally occurs across grade levels and content areas.	
	1	Collaboration seldom occurs across grade levels and content areas.	
	4	Staff members implement a formal process that promotes productive discussion about student learning.	
	3	Staff members have been trained to implement a formal process that promotes discussion about student learning.	
X	2	Staff members promote discussion about student learning.	
	1	Staff members rarely discuss student learning.	
	4	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the	

		examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching are a part of the daily routine of school staff members.
X	3	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching occur regularly among most school personnel.
	2	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching sometimes occur among school personnel.
	1	Learning from, using, and discussing the results of inquiry practices such as action research, the examination of student work, reflection, study teams, and peer coaching rarely occur among school personnel.
	4	School personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
X	3	School personnel indicate that collaboration causes improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
	2	School personnel express belief in the value of collaborative learning communities.
	1	School personnel see little value in collaborative learning communities.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Stakeholder interviews		
Review of school documents and artifacts		
2013 TELL Survey		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- Based on information from the 2012-13 School Report Card, student performance data suggests that the current professional learning community (PLC) structure is supporting the continuous improvement of student performance and professional practice.

Achievement Breakdown	2011-2012 % P+D	2012-2013 %P+D
Reading	30.8	44.8
Math	20.3	30.9
Science	31.5	55.6
Social Studies	14.3	40.7
Writing	16.0	38.5
Language Mechanics	25.5	32.8

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT classroom observation data indicates effective instructional practices are being implemented to some degree within the school but are not systemic at this point in time.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to TELL Survey results, 96% of teachers report that they “work in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices.”
- According to staff survey results, 93% agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally across grade levels and content areas.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- The Self-Assessment states, “Teachers are also being very intentional with using data to make changes to instructional practices when necessary. This is being accomplished through weekly, if not daily professional learning community meetings.” However, there is a need for teachers “to continue to refine the PLC process in place to ensure there is a systematic focus on student achievement” suggesting more consistency is needed in the current process.
- According to the Quarterly Report, the language arts department works with teachers in other content areas to provide opportunities for writing across the curriculum. This was substantiated as a priority during stakeholder interviews.
- PLC agendas indicate teachers are working collaboratively to analyze student data and make revisions to instructional practices.

3.6	Teachers implement the school/system's instructional process in support of student learning.	School Rating 3	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.	
	2	Exemplars are sometimes provided to guide and inform students.	
X	1	Exemplars are rarely provided to guide and inform students.	
	4	The process requires the use of multiple measures, including formative assessments, to inform the ongoing modification of instruction and provide data for possible curriculum revision.	
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)			
Self-Assessment			
Executive Summary			
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment			
KDE School Report Card			
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data			
ELEOT Classroom Observation data			
Stakeholder interviews			
Review of documents and artifacts			

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Revise the current system to ensure the established school instructional process provides students with specific and immediate feedback for learning. Incorporate exemplars into daily instructional lessons as well as varied formative assessment processes to inform instruction and monitor student understanding of required content. Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the system through evidence of increased student success.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- According to the 2012-13 School Report Card, there are increases in student achievement in all assessed content areas, providing evidence that teachers are implementing the instructional process to support student learning.
- The following performance data reflects that the school’s instructional process is not implemented with fidelity by all teachers in the school.
 - According to the 2012-13 School Report Card, 55.2% of students are scoring at the novice/apprentice level in reading achievement.
 - According to the 2012-13 School Report Card, 61.5% of students are scoring at the novice/apprentice level in writing achievement.
 - According to the 2012-13 School Report Card, 69.1% of students are scoring at the novice/apprentice level in math achievement.

Classroom Observation Data:

- Classroom observation data on the High Expectations Environment item descriptor B.3, “Is provided exemplars of high quality work,” was rated 1.4 on a 4-point scale.

- Classroom observation data on the Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment item descriptor E.4, “Understands how her/his work is assessed,” was rated 1.6 on 4-point scale.
- Classroom observation data on the Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment item descriptor E.5, “Has opportunities to revise/improve work based on feedback,” was rated 1.7 on a 4-point scale.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to the student survey, 85% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All my teachers use a variety of teaching methods and learning activities to help me develop the skills I will need to succeed.”
- According to the student survey, 83% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers use tests, projects, presentations, and portfolios to check my understanding of what was taught.”
- According to the staff survey, 87% of staff members agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use multiple types of assessments to modify instruction and to revise the curriculum.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- According to evidence in the Quarterly Report, teachers implement RtI in reading and math through ESS and additional math and ELA classes for students who did not meet benchmarks on MAP.
- Although stakeholder interviews reflected there were opportunities for student self-reflection and revisions based on feedback, there is limited data to show this is taking place.
- Teachers could articulate the school’s instructional process and the changes being addressed in their instructional practices to better meet the needs of students.

3.7	Mentoring, coaching, and induction programs support instructional improvement consistent with the school/system’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning.	School Rating 2	Team Rating 2
Performance levels			
	4	All school personnel are engaged in systematic mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	3	School personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
X	2	Some school personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	1	Few or no school personnel are engaged in mentoring, coaching, and induction programs that are consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the conditions that support learning.	
	4	These programs set high expectations for all school personnel and include valid and reliable measures of performance.	
	3	These programs set expectations for all school personnel and include measures of performance.	
X	2	These programs set expectations for school personnel.	

1	Limited or no expectations for school personnel are included.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)	
Self-Assessment	
Executive Summary	
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment	
KDE School Report Card	
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data	
ELEOT Classroom Observation data	
Stakeholder interviews	
Review of documents and artifacts	

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Opportunity for Improvement

Engage in a collaborative process to design a program where all school personnel are engaged in systematic mentoring, coaching, and induction opportunities that are consistent with the school’s values and beliefs about teaching and learning. A formalized structure is needed to support instructional improvement for all staff.

Supporting Evidence

Classroom Observation Data:

- Classroom observations revealed that highly effective instructional practices were evident/very evident in approximately 40% of classrooms. The school is encouraged to establish a framework

for coaching and mentoring that would build instructional capacity from these “pockets of excellence.”

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- 58% of staff members surveyed agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, staff members provide peer coaching to teachers.”
- According to the staff survey, 74% of staff members agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, a formal process is in place to support new staff members in their professional practice.” However, this was not supported by stakeholder interviews.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Documents show that peer walkthroughs are being conducted to gather information on the use of learning targets, posting of standards, questioning techniques, differentiation, and other instructional practices.
- The Quarterly Report indicates that teachers who provide intervention instruction meet with the Goal Clarity coach to adjust student plans for instruction.
- Stakeholder interviews reflected that with the exception of KTIP, no formalized structure is in place for all staff to receive mentoring, coaching and induction support.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Using a collaborative process, design and implement an intentional plan to meaningfully engage parents in their children’s education and keep them informed of their children’s progress. Ensure that the school reflects on the success of this plan and regularly evaluates it to determine if stated goals are being met.

Supporting Evidence

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to the student survey, 81% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers keep my family informed of my academic progress.”
- According to the student survey, 78% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school offers opportunities for my family to become involved in school activities and my learning.”
- According to the staff survey, 74% of staff members agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all school personnel regularly engage families in their children’s learning progress.”
- According to 2013 TELL Survey results, 44% of staff members agree/strongly agree that “Parents/guardians are influential decision makers in this school.”
- According to 2013 TELL Survey results, 93% of staff members agree/strongly agree that “This school does a good job of encouraging parent/guardian involvement.”
- The number of parents responding to the AdvancED survey was below the required minimum of 20% indicating a lack of parental involvement and input at Western Middle School. Therefore, this team did not consider parent survey data given that the sample size was considered to be insufficient.

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews revealed that the Advisory Council had been functioning on a limited basis at this point in the school year. The reason given for the Council not being fully functional was based on a parent vacancy that the Council had not been able to fill until just recently.
- Stakeholder interviews indicated that parent volunteers serve the school on a regular basis.
- Parent interviews revealed that parents do have opportunities to be involved in school activities and workshops are held specifically for parents.
- Stakeholder interviews indicated that newsletters were being sent to homes, in addition to progress reports and report cards. One Call is also being utilized to contact parents and share information.
- Staff, administration, and parents also revealed during interviews that initiatives such as “Coffee with Counselors, Pastries with Principals, and Showcasing of the Arts” were being employed to connect with parents.

Other pertinent information:

- There was no indication of a plan to specifically target parent engagement, and evidence could not be found that suggested any parent program/initiative has been evaluated for results.

3.9	The school/system has a formal structure whereby each student is well known by at least one adult advocate in the school who supports that student’s educational experience.	School Rating 1	Team Rating 1
Performance levels			
	4	School personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student and related adults.	
	3	School personnel participate in a structure that gives them long-term interaction with individual students, allowing them to build strong relationships over time with the student.	
	2	School personnel participate in a structure that gives them interaction with individual students, allowing them to build relationships over time with the student.	
X	1	Few or no opportunities exist for school personnel to build long-term interaction with individual students.	
	4	All students participate in the structure.	
	3	All students may participate in the structure.	
X	2	Most students participate in the structure.	
	4	The structure allows the school employee to gain significant insight into and serve as an advocate for the student’s needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.	
	3	The structure allows the school employee to gain insight into and serve as an advocate for the student’s needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.	
	2	The structure allows the school employee to gain insight into the student’s needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.	
X	1	Few or no students have a school employee who advocates for their needs regarding learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.	
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)			

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Improvement Priority

Develop and implement a formal structure to provide each student with an adult advocate, ensuring the advocate focuses on the development of the student’s learning skills, thinking skills, and life skills.

Supporting Evidence

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to the student survey, 66% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “My school makes sure there is at least one adult who knows me well and shows interest in my education and future.”
- According to the staff survey, 61% of staff members agree/strongly 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.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- In the Self-Assessment completed by the school, no evidence was given to indicate that the school has a formal structure for students to have an adult advocate.
- Stakeholder interviews consistently indicated that there was no formal structure whereby each student is well known by at least one adult advocate.
- The principal indicated that the Student Success coach works with identified students on a regular basis to address their needs.
- The principal interview revealed that administrators work with students in small groups to address specific needs; however, there is no identified structure within the school to ensure that all students have an adult advocate.

Other pertinent information:

- No evidence could be found to indicate there was a formal structure to provide an advocate for each child in Western Middle School.

3.10	Grading and reporting are based on clearly defined criteria that represent the attainment of content knowledge and skills and are consistent across grade levels and courses.	School Rating 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.	
	3	The policies, processes, and procedures are regularly evaluated.	
	2	The policies, processes, and procedures may or may not be evaluated.	

X	1	No process for evaluation of grading and reporting practices is evident.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Stakeholder interviews		
Review of documents and artifacts		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Devise and deploy a common grading system based on clearly defined criteria that represent the attainment of content knowledge and skills. This system should be implemented across all grade levels and courses and evaluated on a regular basis.

Supporting Evidence

Classroom Observation Data:

- According to classroom observation data, instances in which a student “understands how his/her work is assessed” were evident in only 11% of classrooms observed. This appears to

indicate that in many situations, students are not clear regarding the criteria on which their work will be assessed.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to the student survey, 82% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All of my teachers fairly grade and evaluate my work.”
- According to the staff survey, 81% of staff members agree/strongly agree with the statement, “All teachers in our school use consistent common grading and reporting policies across grade levels and courses based on clearly defined criteria.”
- According to the staff survey, 84% of staff members agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all stakeholders are informed of policies, processes, and procedures related to grading and reporting.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Although teacher and student survey data indicate these stakeholder groups are fairly comfortable with current grading practices, interviews revealed otherwise in many instances.
 - Stakeholder interviews revealed grading is not consistent across grade levels and courses at the present time. It was indicated during interviews that the school has an interest in moving toward standards-based grading in the future.
- Documents reviewed indicate a calendar exists for distribution of student progress reports and report cards.
- Documents indicate that teachers are “to follow the Board’s SSP & G” related to grading policies and practices.

Other pertinent information:

- There was no indication that grading policies, processes and procedures are formally and regularly evaluated.

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

X	2	The program builds capacity among staff members who participate.
	4	The program is rigorously and systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.
	3	The program is systematically evaluated for effectiveness in improving instruction, student learning, and the conditions that support learning.
	2	The program is regularly evaluated for effectiveness.
X	1	If a program exists, it is rarely and/or randomly evaluated.
Evidence Reviewed (list presentations, interviews, observations, artifacts)		
Self-Assessment		
Executive Summary		
Previous KDE Leadership Assessment		
KDE School Report Card		
AdvancED Stakeholder Survey data		
ELEOT Classroom Observation data		
Stakeholder interviews		
Review of documents and artifacts		
2013 TELL Survey		

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

X	Opportunity for Improvement
	Improvement Priority

Opportunity for Improvement

Revise the current professional development program to include all teachers in a rigorous program for professional learning. The program should be based on a professional needs survey targeting short term and long term professional needs of the school and individuals within the school. Ensure the professional development program is evaluated to determine its effectiveness.

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- The following School Report Card data indicates that student performance is improving at Western Middle School:

Achievement Breakdown	2011-2012 % P+D	2012-2013 %P+D
Reading	30.8	44.8
Math	20.3	30.9
Science	31.5	55.6
Social Studies	14.3	40.7
Writing	16.0	38.5
Language Mechanics	25.5	32.8

- While the school has begun to turn its attention to embedded professional development and focus on such topics as questioning techniques and literacy strategies, there appears to be an emerging sense of urgency for the staff to ramp up their professional toolkit to address student needs.

Classroom Observation Data:

- Classroom observations indicate that a rigorous professional development program has not yet fully materialized at Western Middle School as noted by the following observation data:
 - Student questioning strategies “requiring the student to respond to higher order thinking (e.g., applying, evaluating, synthesizing)” were evident in only 42% of classrooms.
 - “Differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs (student needs)” were evident/very evident in only 22% of the classrooms observed.
 - Instances in which students were “tasked with activities and learning that are challenging but attainable” were evident/very evident in 63% of classrooms.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to the staff survey, 94% of staff members agree/strongly 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.”
- According to the staff survey, 94% of staff members agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, all staff members participate in continuous professional learning based on identified needs of the school.
- According to the staff survey, 77% of staff members agree/strongly agree with the statement, “In our school, a professional learning program is designed to build capacity among all professional and support staff members.”
- The 2013 TELL Survey results indicate that 50% of staff surveyed agree/strongly agree that “professional development is differentiated to meet the needs of individual teachers.”

Districtwide, 74% of staff that took the TELL Survey indicated that they agree/strongly agree with the same statement.

- 2013 TELL Survey results indicate that 63% of staff members surveyed agree/strongly agree that “Professional Development is evaluated and results are communicated to teachers.”

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- The Embedded Professional Development (EPD) calendar for January 2014 shows a strong emphasis on using differentiation to meet the needs of students.
- Stakeholder interviews consistently revealed the school has not conducted a needs assessment to inform the school’s professional development plan. The current plan appears to have been developed by school leadership with little if, any input, from the faculty. Interviews revealed that professional development opportunities are based on “dialogue on what kids need and walkthrough data.”
- Documents and interviews indicate that the school has developed an Embedded Professional Development (EPD) program that is available to staff during regular school hours.
- Stakeholder interviews revealed that the current professional development program is not being evaluated.

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

ELEOT Classroom Observation data
Stakeholder interviews
Review of documents and artifacts

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

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

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

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

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

(Check one)

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

Supporting Evidence

Student Performance Data:

- As noted in the chart below, the school met its Delivery Target with the non-duplicated gap group and exceeded the performance of both the district and the state.

Non-Duplicated Gap Group Targets - Combined Reading and Mathematics - Percentage Proficient/Distinguished																			
		2011-2012			2012-2013			2013-2014			2014-2015			2015-2016			2016-2017		
Level	Target Type	School	District	State															
	Delivery Target	23.8	25.0	31.8	31.4	32.5	38.6	39.0	40.0	45.4	46.7	47.5	52.3	54.3	55.0	59.1	61.9	62.5	65.9
► Middle School - Gap Group (non-duplicated)	Actual Score	23.8	25.0	31.8	35.6	27.2	34.3												

Classroom Observation Data:

- ELEOT observation data shows that it was evident/very evident that each student has “differentiated learning opportunities and activities that meet her/his needs” in 22% of

classrooms. Although this is a low percentage, there is evidence that the school has turned its attention to focusing on differentiated instruction based on student need. January's professional development calendar shows a strong focus on this area indicating the school is aware of its need for expanding its knowledge and use of differentiated instructional strategies.

Stakeholder Survey Data:

- According to the student survey, 73% of students agree/strongly agree with the statement, "My school provides learning services for me according to my needs."
- According to the staff survey, 81% of staff members agree/strongly agree with the statement, "In our school, related learning support services are provided for all students based on their needs."
- According to the staff survey, 87% of staff members agree/strongly agree with the statement, "In our school, all staff members use student data to address the unique learning needs of all students."

Stakeholder interviews, document and artifact review:

- Stakeholder interviews consistently concurred with the survey data above, indicating that teachers are changing their instruction based on the analysis of student data. Teachers were able to articulate details about initiatives such as "Flip-Flop Friday", intervention data tracking, and "reteach days" based upon student performance data.
- Student interviews in particular, revealed that some teachers are attuned to learning styles and use varied instructional strategies to address student needs.
- Student interviews also indicated that Western Middle School embraces diversity and challenges students to be successful while holding a high level of expectation for academic performance.

Other pertinent information:

- The school has numerous resources dedicated to target English as a Second Language (ESL) student achievement including ESL teachers, interpreters, READ 180, and SYSTEM 44. Intervention classes are offered to specifically target this population in an effort to address their academic needs.

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.

Western Middle School is working to improve academic achievement and as evidenced from the most recent results in the School Report Card, the school's efforts are beginning to reap rewards. Under the leadership of a new principal (less than a year in the position), the school appears to be poised for even a stronger performance in the future. Moving up from an overall score of 37.0 in 2012 to 51.1 in 2013 and rising from the 4th percentile to the 38th percentile in the same year, Western could be considered to be an emerging school. Students, staff, and parents voiced confidence in their new leader and the school's faculty while expressing a desire to capitalize on the potential of what the school can achieve.

The following themes emerged during the team's review of Standard 3:

- Continuous Improvement Process
 - Student Engagement
 - Classroom observations and student interviews revealed that students are increasingly becoming more engaged in the learning process and prepared for the high expectations that come with being a magnet school.
 - Parent interviews praised the current school leadership and the changes in the culture of the school, increased student expectations and preparedness for student success at the next level.
 - Teachers have implemented a wide variety of instructional strategies to increase student engagement.
 - EPD has sought to help teachers expand their toolkit of strategies to enhance student engagement and student success.
 - Data Conferences
 - The principal's practice of conducting individual teacher data conferences to review and reflect on student achievement appears to be leading to increased results.
- Personalization
 - Rigorous, differentiated instructional practices
 - While PLC groups are receiving embedded professional development on differentiated strategies, implementation has not become systemic or consistent.
 - Classroom observations reflected the need for more rigorous instruction which includes critical thinking opportunities for all students.
 - District leadership, school leadership, and staff recognize the need for higher order, scaffolded questions.
 - While technology concerns have been addressed by school leadership, there continues to be a lack of teacher and student use of technological tools. Additional technology professional development for teachers was identified as a need in survey data and in stakeholder interviews.

- Teachers were able to articulate the process for analyzing student data and discussed changes to their instruction based on the results of analyzing the data; however, differentiated instruction was not widely observed in classrooms.
- Stakeholder Involvement
 - Absence of family engagement
 - Many families are not engaged in meaningful ways in their children’s education. Efforts have been initiated to improve the involvement of families in PTSA, volunteer opportunities, and other child centered activities, but positive results are only minimally evident. This was further evidenced by the failure to achieve the minimum number of parent surveys for the Internal Review Process.
 - The School Advisory Council has only met once since spring 2013. Stakeholder interviews indicated the need for a parent representative which has now been resolved. The principal recognizes the critical need for Advisory Council involvement and has scheduled a meeting in February.

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 Western Middle School.

Deficiency 1: The principal does not effectively monitor ongoing job-embedded professional development to improve teaching practices and raise student academic achievement.

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

School evidence:

- EPD calendar/topics
- Sign in sheets

School comments:

Intentional walk through focus has assisted teachers and administrators in determining whether PD practices and learning are fluid to the classroom. There is collaboration in the walkthrough process. The leadership team does not talk specifically about the benefits of EPD. Teachers should be provided with more consistent walkthrough feedback data.

Team evidence:

- Stakeholder interviews
- Staff survey data
- EPD calendar
- Lack of a professional development needs assessment
- Lack of a formalized professional development plan

Team comments:

- Artifact review and stakeholder interviews reflected that no formalized professional development needs assessment, professional development plan, or evaluation process to determine impact on instructional practices has been created.
- Stakeholder interviews reflected that not all certified and classified staff participated in job embedded professional development due to scheduling; this is an area that needs to be addressed.
- The principal interview reflected that professional development to date has emerged from walkthrough data and the School Improvement Plan.
- Staff survey data indicates that 77% of the staff agree/strongly agree the professional learning program is designed to build capacity among all

professional and support staff members.

Deficiency 2: The principal has not ensured teachers deliver student-centered, rigorous, and differentiated instruction that meets the learning needs of all students.

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

School evidence:
 Walkthrough data; peer observation data; EPD agenda; questioning strategies; no-opt out; conference agendas; PLC agendas; minutes; data analysis templates; PDSA plans; collected lesson plans; interdisciplinary projects; MAP data; intervention classes; content literacy assignments; master schedule; math camps; College/Career Readiness camp; extended day

- Team evidence:
- Student performance data
 - Stakeholder Feedback Diagnostic
 - Stakeholder interviews
 - Stakeholder surveys
 - Classroom observation data
 - Walkthrough data
 - Master schedule
 - EPD calendar

- Team comments:
- 2012-13 EXPLORE data reflected increases in the percentage of students meeting benchmarks in English, reading and science but percentages are still below the district and state averages.
 - 2012-13 EXPLORE data reflected a decrease from 8.6% to 6.5% in math performance from the 2011-12 assessment.
 - Stakeholder interviews suggest that school leadership holds high academic expectations for both students and teachers.
 - Classroom observations reveal that the High Expectations Learning Environment received an overall rating of 2.3 on a 4-point scale. The degree to which students were, “engaged in rigorous coursework, discussion, and/or tasks,” was either not observed or partially observed in 42% of classrooms.
 - Observations also revealed that the degree to which students are exposed to questioning “that requires higher order thinking (e.g., applying, evaluating, synthesizing)” was partially observed or not observed in 58% of classrooms.
 - The master schedule revealed that scheduling adjustments have been made to offer more student opportunities for individualized interventions during the school day as well as extended day opportunities on Mondays and Wednesdays.
 - Walkthrough data revealed the need for higher order questioning and rigorous,

differentiated instructional practices. The EPD calendar and stakeholder interviews indicated these are recognized as priority areas.

- On the Stakeholder Feedback Diagnostic, “Areas in Need of Improvement” indicates that “specifically focusing on ensuring that all students are provided with a challenging curriculum and learning experience” was an area that had the overall lowest level of satisfaction.

Deficiency 3: The principal does not hold staff members accountable for creating a culture of high academic expectations for all students.

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.

School evidence:

Math enrichment; literacy in content areas; extended day program; honor roll celebration; interventions; math camp; grade level PLCs; data review meetings with the principal; student of the month recognition; Reading Counts; walkthrough data shared with staff; administrative participation in team meetings

School comments:

AP students need to be challenged more. Provide more specific interventions for apprentice students, making sure to address the needs of all students.

Team evidence:

- Student performance data
- Stakeholder interviews
- Principal presentation and interview
- Administrative team and PLC meeting agendas/minutes
- Staff recognition program
- School leadership and peer observation data
- Master schedule

Team comments:

- Student performance data based on the 2012-13 School Report Card reflected increases in scores in all content areas.
- Job embedded professional development is offered regularly during PLC meetings.
- Stakeholder interviews revealed that all stakeholders believe that the principal has high expectations for all students which have produced a positive culture for teaching and learning.
- Data conferences are conducted with each teacher one-on-one with the principal on a regular basis to provide support and guidance for the continuous improvement process.
- Certified and classified staff recognition has been implemented.

- Peer observations are conducted by all staff during planning times. Data is compiled and shared with the staff and used to inform EPD.
- ELEOT data reflected an overall rating in the High Expectations Environment of 2.3 on a 4-point scale.

Deficiency 4: The principal has not engaged all certified and classified staff in decision-making and problem-solving.

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

School evidence:

Administrative team meeting minutes; principal weekly calendar to staff; PLC meeting minutes and agendas; committee meeting minutes and agendas

School comments:

A strong focus on routine faculty meetings; opinions from staff are sought, valued and appreciated; principal has an open door policy; committees include a variety of representatives; planning and set up of intervention are collaborative efforts; planning of literacy block is collaborative; all staff are included in professional development days. Classified staff should be engaged more (when relevant); provide a suggestion box for staff to share concerns/suggestions; conduct a survey from all staff in order to receive feedback, support, and ideas regarding school issues

Team evidence:

- Leadership Addendum
- Stakeholder interviews
- Meeting agendas/minutes/sign in sheets

Team comments:

- Leadership Addendum school comments (note above) states the need for classified staff to be more engaged in decision making and problem solving within the school.
- The principal interview reflected the need for more stakeholder input. This has prompted establishing a suggestion box.
- Meeting documentation did not reflect classified staff involvement on a regular basis.

Deficiency 5: The principal has not engaged all stakeholder groups, particularly families, to work collaboratively in decision-making and problem-solving for school improvement and student achievement.

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

School evidence:

School newsletter; teacher websites; team homework list; parents assisting during testing; PTSA; Showcase of Schools; Facebook/Twitter pages; school video on YouTube; email blasts through Infinite Campus; SBDM advisory council; parent volunteer hours; summer reading; teacher syllabus; One Call Now

School comments:

PTSA has increased membership and is more actively involved in many aspects of the school. The school offers weekly tours to prospective students, and various community groups often tour and hold meetings at the school.

Team evidence:

- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documents and artifacts provided by the school
- Self-Assessment
- Stakeholder Feedback Diagnostic
- Stakeholder survey data
- The Missing Piece

Team comments:

- According to the Stakeholder Feedback Diagnostic, the “Areas in Need of Improvement” states “findings from other stakeholder feedback sources indicate the need to ensure that all stakeholders are communicated with regarding occurrences in the school building. Parents want to be included in as contributors to our society.”
- A “2” rating on indicator 3.8 suggests that the school is improving in the area of informing families of their child’s learning progress, however as noted in the following bulleted statement, actively involving stakeholder groups and particularly families in the decision making process via the Advisory Council actually regressed this school year.
- Stakeholder interviews revealed that the Advisory Council has basically been inoperable during this school year. This appears to be somewhat of a step backwards compared to last year as interviews indicated that the Advisory Council met regularly during the 2012-13 school year. This is a strong indicator that stakeholder involvement in the decision making process is lacking.
- Interviews revealed that there had been no recent review of Council policies.
- Interviews indicated that the school’s PTSA is meeting on a regular basis and at least one administrator is in attendance.
- Parent survey data was not was not considered in this report because the

sample size of parents completing the survey was insufficient. Less than fifty parents completed the survey and the minimum requirement was 20% of parents. Here again, parental input on a process intended to improve the school was missed due to a lack of involvement.

- Parents interviewed spoke very positively about school administrators and the direction the school is currently heading.
- According to The Missing Piece, in response to the statement, “School council and committees facilitate broad parent participation by actively recruiting diverse membership, providing interpreters and translated materials when needed, setting convenient meeting times, and seeking wide parent input. At least 40 percent of parents vote in SBDM election,” the school rated itself as apprentice.
- Additionally, the Stakeholder Feedback Diagnostic revealed, “Other stakeholder feedback sources show that a governing body is an area that all stakeholders would like to see improvement.”

Deficiency 6: The principal has not ensured technology is used to enhance student learning experiences.

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

School evidence:

Updated internet connectivity; addition of a technology resource teacher; 3 fully functioning computer labs; televisions in hallways and cafeteria; state of the art sound and light system in auditorium; online assessments; individual learning plans; parent portal

Team evidence:

- Stakeholder interviews
- Classroom observation data
- TELL Survey data
- Review of documents and artifacts
- Self-assessment

Team comments:

- According to ELEOT observation data the Digital Learning Environment had the lowest rating of the seven effective learning environments observed in the school.
- Interviews revealed that the school has recently focused on the technology infrastructure of the building, securing needed equipment and technological tools to use for teaching. A desire was expressed to now shift the emphasis to target the effective use instructional technological tools/aids.
- ELEOT observation data revealed that student “use of digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning”

scored a 1.2 on a scale of 1 – 4 with 1 indicating “not observed” and 4 indicating a “very evident” rating.

- 2013 TELL Survey data indicates that 41.4% of teachers agree that they “have sufficient access to instructional technology, including computers, printers, software, and internet access.” This compares to 82.4% for the district.
- Classroom and school observations revealed that some technology resources were available in classrooms and school but were seldom used by students.