Trumbull Public Schools
TRI-STATE VISIT

2017

Writing Across the Curriculum, October 11-13, 2017

Table of Contents

Trumbull Public Schools
TRI-STATE VISIT

2017

Writing Across the Curriculum, October 11-13, 2017

Diantha Barone, Co-leader
ELA Supervisor, 7-12
Port Chester
Port Chester High School
One Tamarack Road, Port Chester, NY 10573
914-934-7950
dbarone@portchesterschools.org

Joan Mast, Co-leader
Assistant Superintendent
Scotch Plains
Scotch Plains-Fanwood Public Schools
Evergreen Ave. and Cedar St., Scotch Plains, NJ 07076
908-232-6161
jmast@spfk12.org

Erin Brown
Grade K Teacher
Darien
Holmes Elementary School
18 Hoyt Street, Darien, CT 06820
203-353-4371 x4474
ebrown@darienps.org

Carolyn Huminski
English, Instructional Leader
Easton-Redding
Joel Barlow High School
100 Black Rock Turnpike, Redding, CT 06896
203-938-2508 x1170
chuminski@er9.org

Stephanie Pierson-Ugol
Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessments
Easton-Redding
Easton-Redding Public Schools
654 Morehouse Road, Easton, CT 06612
203-261-2513
spiersonugol@er9.org

Brian Terry
Science, Chair
Hewlett-Woodmere
George W. Hewlett High School
60 Evenit Avenue, Hewlett, NY 11567
516-792-4100
bterry@hewlett-woodmere.net

Karen B. Griffin
Reading Teacher
Mt. Pleasant
Hawthorne Elementary School
225 Memorial Drive, Hawthorne, NY 10532
914-769-8536
kgriffin@mtplcsd.org

Nicole Kingston
Literacy Specialist
New Canaan
South School
8 Farm Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
203-594-4335
Nicole.kingston@ncps-k12.org

Mary Johnson
Principal
North Salem
Pequenakonck Elementary School
173 June Road, North Salem, NY 10560
914-669-5317 x3041
mjohnson@northsalemschools.org

Andrea Pompey
Assistant Principal
Pearl River
Pearl River High School
275 East Central Avenue, Pearl River, NY 10965
845-620-3847
apompey@pearlriverschools.org

Kathleen Farrell
Grade 2 Teacher
Scotch Plains
Evergreen Elementary School
2280 Evergreen Avenue, Scotch Plains, NJ 07076
908-889-5331
kfarrell@spfk12.org

Rebecca Marsick
ELA Teacher
Westport
Staples High School
70 North Avenue, Westport, CT 06880
203-341-1423
rmarsick@westport.k12.ct.us

Darren Bruce
Writing Specialist Teacher
New Canaan
South School
8 Farm Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
203-594-4000 x9404
darren.bruce@ncps-k12.org

Karen Scalzo
Curriculum Coordinator, Writing
New Canaan
Saxe Middle School
468 South Avenue, New Canaan, CT 06840
203-594-4574
karen.scalzo@ncps-k12.org

Victoria Lodewick
Kindergarten Teacher
North Salem
Pequenakonck Elementary School
173 June Road, North Salem, NY 10560
914-669-5317 x3109
vlodewick@northsalemschools.org

Susan Luft
Grade 5 Teacher
Scarsdale
Fox Meadow Elementary School
59 Brewster Road, Scarsdale, NY 10583
914-721-2720
sluft@scarsdaleschools.org

Elizabeth McKenna
Social Studies Teacher
Scotch-Plains
Scotch Plains-Fanwood High School
667 Westfield Road, Scotch Plains, NJ 07076
908-889-8600
emckenna@spfk12.org

Gina Dignon
ELA Teacher
Wilton
Wilton High School
395 Danbury Road, Wilton, CT 06897
203-762-0381
dignong@wiltonps.org

Lauren Feltz
Principal
Wilton
Middlebrook School
131 School Road, Wilton, CT 06897
203-762-8388 x5244
lfeltz@wiltonps.org

Charles Smith
Assistant Superintendent
Wilton
Wilton Public Schools
395 Danbury Road, Wilton, CT 06897
203-762-3381
smithc@wiltonps.org

TRI-STATE LIAISONS:

Kathleen Reilly
Director of Training
Tri-State Consortium
203-762-2004
kathleenreillyct@gmail.com

Martin G. Brooks
Executive Director
Tri-State Consortium
631-478-9954
mgbrooks@optonline.net

Executive Summary

"*The Trumbull Public School System, in partnership with the community, strives to meet the educational needs of all students within a challenging and supportive academic environment that empowers each student to become a lifelong learner and to live and participate in a democratic, diverse and global society.*" **District Mission**

On October 11-13, 2018, the Trumbull Public School District invited a visiting team representing Tri-State Consortium member districts to return to continue the study of its current approach to the teaching of writing, K-12. This visit built upon the February 2016 Consultancy, when another Tri-State team benchmarked the writing curriculum decision-making process.

Trumbull is a longstanding valued member of the Tri-State Consortium. Our mission statement describes, *"...a dynamic learning organization of public school districts that values systems thinking as the foundation for continuous improvement. The Consortium assists its member districts in using quantitative and qualitative data to enhance student performance and to build a rigorous framework for planning, assessment, and systemic change. Collaborating as colleagues and critical friends, Consortium members apply the standards of the Tri-State model to benchmark member district's progress in advancing teaching and learning."* As we

move through our third decade, our core beliefs remain focused on authentic and interdisciplinary teaching and learning, and purposeful assessment practices that are directly linked to optimal student performance.

On the opening day of our visit, Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Gary A. Cialfi; Dr. Jonathan Budd, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment; Dr. Michael McGrath, Assistant Superintendent; Matthew Kuroghlian, a student board member, ELA district leaders; building leadership members, as well as staff from across the district welcomed the Tri-State team. The team was further welcomed by the community with greetings from the local Selectman and BOE members. Trumbull stakeholders believe that this school system should be a part of the community, rather than apart from the community, and we were immediately impressed with this most inclusive environment. The Board Room display of student writing in all genres and phases of moving from initial ideas through drafting, editing, and revision was quite impressive! The "Quote Tree" inspired us, too, as we debriefed; the student writing samples ranged from Pre-K - 6, for the most part, and set the tone for our inquiries and understanding.

Prior to our arrival, the district Steering Committee developed one Essential Question with three inquiry points that centered on the continued district focus on the link between continuous improvement of student writing and critical and creative thinking. The Essential Question is designed to guide the visit team by directing our thinking to the main considerations of the writing program, K-12. It also provides the framework for the Consultancy protocol that occurs on the second day in the form of a shared conversation between team members and district representatives. The responses to these inquiries frame this report, and they are meant to assist the district in its future planning of the systematic teaching of writing, K-12. In the spirit of collegiality, the team provides feedback that is intended to help this high performing district continue to move educational opportunities in writing to the next phase of implementation. This question with three sub-categories establishes a global view of the district's central focus of critical/creative thinking skills. To

examine writing K-12, we have provided reflection on each category of the district's essential question.

Essential Question:

To what extent does our current approach to the teaching of writing, K-12:

(a) reflect instructional strategies that are consistent and focused on critical/creative thinking skills;

(b) use a variety of assessment data to inform instruction; and

(c) include appropriate professional learning to support our approach?

(a) To what extent does our current approach to the teaching of writing, K-12, reflect instructional strategies that are consistent and focused on critical/creative thinking skills?

Within the Trumbull school system, students and teachers have a shared understanding that the writing process requires reflection and revision in order to make thoughtful decisions as thinkers and writers. The student-centered approach at the elementary level is cultivating a sense of ownership over students' writing, empowering students to make thoughtful, purposeful decisions about their own learning. The team was most impressed with the elementary students' abilities to explain the how's and why's of their writing processes. There is evidence of student reflection and goal-setting across disciplines, often directly aligned to teacher-created checklists and rubrics. In its initial stage of implementation that focuses on K-6, we commend the district for embedding critical/creative thinking in a research-based environment of metacognitive instructional practices. During the next phase of implementation, the central focus might be on a collaborative, research-based decision-making process to explore whether the district is interested in moving the workshop model into the secondary grades, and if it is, engaging the middle and high school faculties in discussions about how this work might occur and what it will look like: e.g., where in the curriculum will writing

live? This shift in approach will require additional professional learning opportunities for the secondary teachers, which we will discuss more deeply in answering the third question, and more ongoing, in-classroom support for them, as well.

Another question for the district to consider is the ways in which its initiative in writing might apply to reading. Is the district interested in using the readers' workshop model, and if it is, how and when will that be introduced, and what staffing and structural changes will its introduction necessitate?

Clearly, the middle and high schools have designed instruction to ensure that student choice is a critical component in advancing their own learning. Middle and high school students have a wide range of rich opportunities to think critically and creatively. Although a metacognitive environment seems more intuitive in the secondary classroom, we suggest the district agree on a common definition of metacognition, creative and critical thinking, and collaborate to identify exemplars of this focus as support for students. The process of identifying systemic instructional practices and design experiences that purposefully promote critical thinking across the disciplines, seems to be a natural part of the next steps in middle and high schools.

As students who have been writing through the workshop approach age up into grades 7-12 we think it will be important for the teachers in those grades to proactively plan for their arrival. These students will bring with them a different set of expectations and abilities. It could be helpful to provide time for teachers in these grades to visit the elementary schools to observe first-hand the kind of writing these students are producing.We also think it will be important for the district to consider how it will gauge the success of its writing initiative - how will it know that the work is resulting in the quality of student writing it is designed to produce? On what data and/or evidence will the district rely? One suggestion we offer is engaging student voice in this process, through focus groups, interviews and surveys. The students know a lot about writing in the district and can share much useful information.

(b) To what extent does our current approach to the teaching of writing, K-12, use a variety of assessment data to inform instruction?

Almost all school districts struggle with the disconnection between what they profess to value and what they actually assess. Throughout our visit in Trumbull, in our conversations with parents, teachers, and students, we consistently heard their awareness of and pride in the qualitative data collected by teachers that acknowledges the growth in student stamina and productivity in writing. It should be noted that the pride and ownership of observed student growth is central to success in terms of stakeholder support. The Trumbull teaching community has embraced this initiative and has used this growth to fuel their research-based instructional decisions. The elementary teachers engaged in implementing the writing workshop model have produced strong results, although the district, like most districts, is struggling to identify ways to capture this evidence. There were multiple examples of evidence from teacher interviews, classroom observations, examining student work, that the workshop model is a strength of the educational day and is leading to more creative and critical thinking in their students. To reiterate a point we made in answering the first question, figuring out how to collect evidence related to this perception will be an important next step for the district.

In addition, there is evidence that K-12 teachers, particularly in the 7-12 content areas, are creating thoughtful, high-quality assignments and tasks that include critical and creative thinking. The process of implementation at the K-6 level is systemic, uses common assessment criteria for student work, and has common pre and post assessments for each unit of study that inform instructional decisions based on student work. Writing in grades 7-12 is not as coherently tied together by a common approach.

K-6 teachers report improved student results around stamina, craft, and enthusiasm for writing, although the program is only in its second year of implementation. In our own observations, students were clearly engaged in and articulate about their writing and learning of writing. The

visit team had questions about writing transition points for students: what happens as they change schools and approaches?

As K-6 teachers continue to become comfortable with the structures and philosophy of the Workshop model , we encourage them to help students apply their newly acquired writing skills in other content areas. The district might consider designing cross-disciplinary rubrics or streamlining the rubrics that are currently used in order to facilitate an analysis of performance over time. The district also might consider creating a district-wide definition of performance-based assessment to coordinate the use of assessments across the district and evaluate how these assessments are being used, particularly in grades 7-12. The district might also consider consistent language around writing across disciplines; this practice will facilitate the transfer and application of knowledge about writing in all subjects. The district might consider at what grade levels student benchmarking in writing and critical and creative thinking should take place in order to monitor student growth, and to decide the form that benchmarking might take. Then, giving teachers time to create and assess these tasks will allow them to align expectations of both student writing and performance based tasks, with the intent to inform curricular decisions. The district may want to consider expanding the use of additional tools, including digital, in order to systematically capture and track student growth as reflective practitioners. Some tools may include: anchor papers/mentor texts, benchmarks, electronic portfolios. This type of documentation will help tell the district both tell and show its story of student success.

The current practice of reviewing the various assessments is helpful to inform instruction and focus support. There is evidence of data analysis of different assessments within many teachers' classrooms. The special education teachers conduct data meetings on a regular basis to address the needs of the student population. There is some evidence at the elementary level that the teachers meet periodically to establish consistent inter-rater reliability.

To continue to provide teachers tools to expand their use of data to inform instruction, the district may consider setting writing goals that are specific to data analysis to improve curriculum and instructional practices across the grade levels and disciplines. Once goals are established, the district may want to think about designing a structure and protocol for analysis that facilitates these changes both in the written and implemented curricula in an appropriate and timely manner, K-12.

In examining qualitative and quantitative data, Trumbull may want to focus on generating data that will help the system to understand the impact of its decisions and practices, such as survey results generated from parents, teachers, administrators, and the students, common benchmark assessments, and/or portfolio reviews. As standardized assessment scores are analyzed by staff, teachers may want to engage in a crosswalk between how students score on standardized assessments and how they perform in the classroom. The system could further the work by identifying desired district procedures that can communicate this information to parents in order to support each child's progress. Here, again, the district may want to consider ways to capture evidence about the impact of the district's writing initiative, including impressionistic and anecdotal evidence. For example, how is writing incorporated into the various disciplines? The district could consider setting district and building goals and action plans derived from the analysis of data from multiple sources. With the district focus on student-centered work, teachers can continue to develop and incorporate performance based assessments into their classes.

During our classroom observations and interviews, we found that teachers across the district integrate a variety of rubrics that are either aligned to a specific program, teacher designed, class designed, department designed or taken from College Board rubrics. The team suggests that consistent methods of showing student growth might be considered through the analysis of existing pre and post testing. The district is moving towards electronic tools such as Infinite Campus to provide a district wide structure to show student growth. At the elementary level students use age-appropriate check lists to self-assess their own writing. Report Cards are only

one method of providing feedback of student progress. Teachers value the time to work with colleagues across grade levels and departments to continue moving towards consistent feedback in student progress. Creating time and support structures for this work is an ongoing challenge. When teachers have time to review student work samples together, they can link their observations to common assessment rubrics and establish grading norms. In our experience, a clear consistent set of criteria that defines good writing will emerge, organically.

(c) To what extent does our current approach to the teaching of writing, K-12, include appropriate professional learning to support our approach?

Trumbull School district has planned a pedagogical shift in the implementation of writing instruction K-6 with the use of the Writing Workshop model with Teachers College Writing Units of Study (TCWUOS). A systematic process was evidenced for district educators to collaborate, develop, articulate, and align the curriculum and instruction in these grades. Much professional development was conducted through the process that utilized summer work time with experts familiar with Teachers College Reading and Writing Project (TCRWP) and in-district coaches and experts. The collegial teams had the opportunity to examine their curriculum and make changes accordingly. Changes included teaching practices and classroom environment structures to support the shift in pedagogy.

As stated earlier, there is also clear evidence of a systematic process to collect and analyze student performance data from multiple sources. In grades K-6, teachers conduct regular assessments of student work. They begin with on-demand assessments of the teaching of writing before, during, and after a unit of study. Individual student writing is analyzed on the grade level using learning progressions aligned to individual genre rubrics. Once analyzed, a focus for individual instruction is determined. This allows for a systematic process that links student performance data to exemplars that can ensure optimal student results. Teachers

continue to develop their skills as teachers of writing through stated personal professional goals such as improving strength in the practice of student conferring.

To create a district wide systemic process that builds upon the systematic process that is in place for the collaborative development, articulation, and alignment of curriculum and instruction in regard to writing across the curriculum, the district may want to consider continued support for teachers through ongoing professional development in the development of writing instruction according to the WUOS. Opportunities for teachers to collaborate as they dig deeply into the WUOS, to explore the vertical alignment of the progressions across grades, to experience how students progress in writing across the disciplines would be helpful in assisting teachers to further knowledge of the vision, tools, and professional learning. The exploration of the use of WUOS rubrics as performance data across the disciplines could be an important additional professional learning opportunity.

 Currently, Trumbull effectively uses the professional learning structures previously established district-wide, in a focused, consistent way. The district offers professional learning days to provide teachers and administrators with opportunities to continue the vision and provide teacher voice in the process: Communities of Practice, K-5 Writing Council, and their teacher goal-setting and evaluation system to achieve its professional learning goals. At the elementary level, teachers expressed their excitement and felt supported by the professional development provided. According to teachers, the district invited them to share their understandings through solicited feedback that will tailor future professional development to teachers' needs.

In furthering this work, the district may want to create a plan for implementation that focuses Language Arts instruction on a Workshop model with the same level of communication and support for 6-12 teachers as the K-5 staff has had, assuming the desire is to move the writing initiative to the secondary level. There is some evidence that 6-12 teachers have been given professional learning experiences focused on writing, but those teachers have not been given the opportunity to yet explore the workshop approach across the levels and courses as deeply

and as systematically as the elementary teachers. Also, the district may wish to consider implementing an equitable system to train teachers new to the grade level or who have not been directly involved in the training. Another recommendation would be to consider providing teachers additional professional learning opportunities or experiences where teachers can collaborate with teacher leaders in their buildings as well as with teachers in other buildings and at different levels.

Given the tenuous nature of funding for education in Connecticut, and the struggle that many districts are likely to encounter in providing additional services for teachers and students, our sense is that the district would benefit by focusing on the development of greater internal capacity to lead the writing initiative. There are many enthused and competent teachers who are ready to take on additional responsibility as leaders.

Also, the building leaders (principals and assistant principals) with whom we met expressed strong support for the writing initiative and a desire to enhance their own knowledge and skills around the workshop approach. Providing ongoing support for the building leaders to take a greater role in leading this change effort will yield significant benefit.

Clearly, the district is committed to developing a process for improving student writing over time that is inclusive of all students. There are currently policies and practices in place that use clear criteria to outline a range of supports for students at all levels. This is evident in the identification of students enrolled in the Literacy Workshop 1, the talented and gifted program, the ESL program, and the multiple levels at the high school: CP, ACP, Honors, and AP. There is access to programs that meet various student needs; specifically ,the Trumbull Regional Agriscience/Biotechnology Program and the Trumbull Alternate School. The district professional development plan is open to all teachers K-12 to receive training in the Writer's Workshop model. Additionally, teachers are given time to collaborate and have support through the literacy consultants, Writing Council, Communities Of Practice, and Professional Learning Communities.

The district may want to consider creating and maintaining a consistent standard for teachers to provide feedback on various levels of student writing and used to inform instruction for students across disciplines. This could be accomplished by allowing time for teachers time to analyze data, score writing pieces and determine next steps for writing instruction. Teachers would benefit from more professional learning targeted at improving student writing and reviewing successful practices and ways of implementation. This could be helpful for those who did not participate in the initial summer writing PD and for all teachers at the high school level. A common language or universal rubric would allow equity across all subjects. The consistent support for the Special Education, ELL, and Library/Media Specialists to develop modifications designed to support varying learners' needs will continue to benefit the district.

The district has developed and cultivated positive focus, change, and energy around writing instruction with on-site TCRWP summer institutes and collaboratively written curriculum maps, K-6; this vision has been well articulated throughout the district and communicated to the broader community. The volunteer attendance of teachers for the summer professional learning shows evidence of ownership of the district's shared vision.

Trumbull may want to continue to support the vision for writing instruction in the middle and high schools that is consistent with the district's plans and processes by: considering to review and revise the professional development model to offer consistent and embedded professional learning for teachers from literacy consultants; continuing to create and calibrate internal student assessments to measure the effectiveness of the implementation of the district's vision for writing instruction; and broadening the involvement of educators in the district to embed more widespread ownership of the district's vision for writing instruction.

The extensive multi-pronged approach of Professional Development provided in implementing Writing Workshop is celebrated by all stakeholder groups. Teachers volunteered to attend training during the summer, resources were provided, turn-key professional development was

encouraged, Sister Schools and Communities of Practice (COP) were engaged in dialogue, and a writing council was established. Teachers felt heard. Pacing guides, including a flex week, provided a roadmap for teachers. All that was done at the elementary level ensured success of this initiative. Moving forward, the professional community would like to see this level of support continued.   The support that writing coaches bring to all levels is valuable and continued increased support would be beneficial. It is clear that the district made writing a priority, particularly at the K-6 level a decision that has changed the learning outcomes for students. Trumbull Public Schools have launched a highly successful curriculum innovation in writing. They are encouraged to continue to support this work at all levels.

Further, the team recognized the strong foundation that is in place at the K-5 level with respect to the Writing Workshop model, and we suggest that the next level of work should center on the practice of teacher-student conferring.   Additionally, knowing that both spelling and grammar are currently addressed in ways to meet both individual and specific class needs, it is important to develop a district approach that includes the learning progressions of these foundational skills. Certainly, parents will benefit from a clearly defined philosophy that reflects the pathways in place for students to master these foundational skills. Now that writing is well underway, a consistent Reading Workshop implementation for district consistency is a natural next step.   Continued training in the Teachers College format would be embraced and celebrated by teachers and principals. At the high school level, given the breadth of the social studies curriculum would it be possible to restructure learning to be more thematic rather than linear? Reviewing these types of curriculum structures, particularly at the high school, could identify opportunities for more in depth thematic writing. Teachers are interested in supporting pedagogy that would encourage students writing to transfer to all content areas.

Before closing, we want to comment about the district's approach to implementing its writing initiative. In the year and a half since our initial pre-visit Consultancy on writing, a significant amount of change has occurred, and the staff and leadership team feel justifiably proud of the work that has taken place. Our sense is that this work has been driven by a carefully crafted mix

of planned and organic structures. The staff recognizes that district goals were developed around writing, but the teachers don't feel that they were coerced to move toward those goals - they perceive that they've had voice in the movement, and thus, collectively, are quite supportive … which helps explain the significant changes in such a short time. As the district moves towards its next level of work in writing, it will need to re-examine the balance between planned and organic activities to determine how to engage the staff and maintain strong support, while simultaneously maintaining momentum toward a new set of goals.

Finally, the team thanks everyone who welcomed us, the Long Hill staff that tended to our creature comforts of good food and chocolate, and the overall and impressive sense that the district is working very hard to do the best for all students. We left Trumbull feeling inspired, impressed, and confident that the palpable momentum that we experienced as we moved through the schools and classrooms, is the norm for this staff of professionals. We look forward to our follow-up to this visit in two years when we will have the chance to learn which of our recommendations for growth have been integrated.

Commendations and Recommendations

Performance Based Assessment

Commendations
- There is evidence that K-12 teachers, particularly in the 7-12 content areas, are creating thoughtful, high-quality assignments and tasks that include critical and creative thinking.
- It is clear at the K-6 level that the abundance of writing is directly linked to Writing Workshop, which reflects the district's focus on this new instructional approach.
- The process of implementation at the K-6 level is systemic, uses common assessment criteria for student work, and has common pre and post assessments for each unit of study that inform instructional decisions based on student work.

- The use of the K-5 Math exemplars provide opportunities for both writing and critical thinking.

- K-6 teachers report improved student learning, greater student stamina, enhanced craft, and enthusiasm for writing, although the program is only in its second year of implementation. In our observations, students were clearly engaged in and articulate about their writing.

Recommendations

- Consider an internal audit to identify common performance-based assessments K-12 across content areas to ensure consistency in teacher approach and student learning outcomes.

- As K-6 teachers become more comfortable with the structures and philosophy of Writing Workshop, we encourage them to help students apply their newly acquired writing skills across content areas. The district might consider cross-disciplinary rubrics or streamlining the rubrics that are used in order to facilitate an analysis of performance over time.

- Consider creating a district-wide definition of performance-based assessment to evaluate how these assessments are being used throughout the system, particularly in grades 7-12. Also, consider engaging the staff in discussions about the differences between performance based tasks and performance based assessments.

- Consider the practice of consistent language around writing across disciplines; this will facilitate the transfer and application of knowledge about writing in other disciplines.

- Consider identifying specific grade levels to benchmark student writing progress and critical and creative thinking in order to monitor student growth. Collaborative time to create and score these tasks will allow teachers to align expectations and understandings of both student writing and performance based tasks.

Metacognition

Commendations

- Students and teachers understand writing as a process that requires reflection and revision in order to make thoughtful decisions as thinkers and writers.

- The student-centered approach at the elementary level is cultivating a sense of ownership, empowering students to both make and articulate thoughtful decisions about their own learning.

- Students recognize that expectations around writing have changed.

Recommendations

- Consider expanding the range and frequency of writing opportunities, in the secondary level, that are specifically designed to ensure that student choice is a critical component in advancing their own learning.

- Explore a common definition of metacognition connected to creative and critical thinking, in order to identify instructional practices and design assured experiences that promote critical thinking across the disciplines.

- Consider the consistent use of additional tools, including digital, in order to systematically capture students' writing portfolios and track their growth as reflective practitioners. Some tools may include: anchor papers, mentor texts, benchmarks, electronic portfolios.

Student Performance Data

Commendations

- The formal review of the wide variety of assessments is a productive and reflective practice to inform instruction and focus support.

- Many teachers utilize different assessments within classrooms and analyze student progress.

- Scheduled data meetings with Special Educators are in place to ensure that all student needs are considered and included.

- Elementary level teachers collaborate to analyze student performance data with the

intent of establishing consistent inter-rater reliability.

Recommendations
- Consider designing writing goals specific to data analysis to improve curriculum and instructional practices across the grade levels and disciplines. Use these goals to implement changes both in the written and implemented curricula in an appropriate and timely manner.
- Consider generating data that will help the system understand the impact of its decisions and practices, such as survey results and focus groups with parents, teachers, administrators, and the students, common benchmark assessments, and/or portfolio reviews.
- Consider a cross-walk between how students score on standardized assessments and their classroom performance.
- Consider engaging the staff to review ways to capture evidence about the impact of the district's writing initiative, including impressionistic and anecdotal evidence.
- Consider setting district and building goals/action plans derived from the analysis of a wide range of available student performance data including anecdotal data.

Curriculum and Instruction

Commendations
- Trumbull School district strategically designed a pedagogical shift in the implementation of writing instruction, K-6, with the adoption of the Writing Workshop model that includes the Teachers College Writing Units of Study (TCWUOS).
- The district supports opportunities for educators to collaborate, develop, articulate, and align the curriculum and instruction in grades K-6.
- There is also clear evidence of a systematic process to collect and analyze student performance data from some sources to optimize student learning. Teachers conduct regular assessment of student work including *On Demand* assessments of writing before, during, and after a unit of study.

- Individual student writing is analyzed on the grade level learning progressions according to individual genre rubrics. Once analyzed, individual instruction focus is determined.
- Teachers continue to develop their skills as teachers of writing through continued professional goals such as improving strength in the practice of student conferring.

Recommendations
- Consider a district wide systemic process that builds upon the current practice that is in place for the collaborative development, articulation, and alignment of curriculum and instruction in writing across the curriculum.
- Consider whether, and how, to move the writing initiative into the secondary grades.
- Design opportunities for teachers to unpack WUOS and to explore as teams the vertical alignment of the progressions across grades; include the relationship of how students' progress in writing links to content area writing across the disciplines.

Professional Learning

Commendations
- We commend the district's success in maximizing Professional Learning Opportunities within existing structures such as designated professional development days, Communities of Practice, the K-5 Writing Council, and the teacher goal-setting and evaluation system to achieve its professional learning goals.
- Elementary teachers are enthusiastic and feel supported by robust professional development opportunities. They feel the district has been responsive by soliciting feedback to tailor future professional development to teachers' needs.
- District K-5 schools are commended for the successful implementation of the writing workshop approach as evidenced by teacher interviews, classroom visits, and looking at student work.
- Professional development was conducted through the summer work time process with experts from Teachers College Reading and Writing Project (TCRWP) and in district coaches and experts.

- Collegial teams examine their curriculum to make needed changes such as teaching strategies and the classroom environment to support a shift in pedagogy.

Recommendations
- Consider providing scheduled opportunities for teachers of writing at all levels to explore the workshop model as deeply and as systematically as the elementary teachers.
- Consider providing ongoing opportunities to train teachers new to the grade or who were not involved in the original training.
- Consider providing teachers more professional learning opportunities to learn from each other. (For example, an elementary teacher visiting a middle or high school classroom, and vice versa).
- Consider establishing a process to facilitate communications with parents about their child's progress that focuses on multiple indicators of growth

Equitable Support

Commendations
- The district is committed to developing a process for improving student writing over time that is inclusive of all students. Teachers received consistent professional development by consultants from Teacher's College in The Writer's Workshop model to ensure equitable and uniform programming for students K-6.
- There are policies and practices in place that use clear criteria to outline a range of supports for students at all levels. This is evident in the identification of students to be enrolled in the Literacy Workshop, the TAG program, the ESL program, and the multiple levels at the high school: CP, ACP, Honors, and AP.
- There is open access to programs which meet various student needs such as the Trumbull Regional Agriscience/Biotechnology Program and the Trumbull Alternate School.
- The district professional development plan is open to all teachers K-12 to receive

training in the Writer's Workshop model. Teachers are given time to collaborate and continued support is evident in interviews with the literacy consultants, Writing Council, Communities of Practice, and PLCs.

Recommendations
- Consider creating and maintaining a consistent standard for teachers to give feedback on various levels of student writing and to use data to inform instruction for students across disciplines.
- Consider allowing time for teachers to specifically look at data, to look at and score writing pieces and determine next steps for writing instruction.
- Consider providing more professional learning targeted at improving student writing and reviewing best practices and ways of implementation. This is especially important for those who did not participate in the initial summer writing PD and for all teachers at the high school level.
- Continue to review and refine a common definition of how creative and critical thinking skills are applied to written assessments and assignments at all levels and across all disciplines to ensure consistency in an effort to increase student writing performance.
- Consider identifying a common language or rubric to reflect equity across all subjects and ensure that all students are being assessed consistently.
- Continue to provide support for the Special Education, ELL, and Library/Media Specialists to develop modifications and support varying learners needs.

Shared Vision

Commendations
- The district has developed and cultivated positive focus, change and energy around writing instruction with on-site TCRWP summer institutes and collaboratively written curriculum maps, K-6 ; this vision has been well articulated throughout the district and efforts are in place to communicate the vision with the broader community.

- The district has in place systematic and predictable structures for teachers to support instructional practices and collaboration connected to the vision for writing instruction.
- Improvements in student learning, such as increased volume of writing, stamina, and engagement in the writing process is evident through observations, formative assessments and through some calibration of reviewing student writing; the voluntary attendance of teachers over the summer for professional learning shows evidence of ownership of the district's shared vision.

Recommendations
- Continue to support the vision for writing instruction in the middle and high schools that is consistent with the district's plans and processes.
- Consider reviewing and revising the professional development model to offer consistent and embedded professional learning for teachers from literacy consultants and/or home-grown experts.
- Continue to create and calibrate internal student assessments to measure the effectiveness of the implementation of the district's vision for writing instruction.
- Consider broadening the involvement of educators in the district so there can be more widespread ownership of the district's vision for writing instruction.

Parents and Community

Commendations
- The district is commended for the efforts to sharing the vision and encouraging the active involvement from parents and community members. Community involvement is reflected in the annual budget provisions that support this change.
- We commend the Elementary School Leaders for their active and energetic involvement in the development of brochures, newsletters, parent information sessions, Board of

Education presentations, and accessible websites that are directly linked to the goals and implementation of the K-12 writing program.

Recommendations

- The district has provided a wealth of information on the website, and we encourage the district to continue sharing content and promote its use.

- Parents interviewed across the district are aware of the shift in student writing focus, and most describe the middle and high school writing results in positive and reflective conversations.

- Although there is evidence of shared information between schools and the community, the district might consider a public celebration of the "life of a student writer in Trumbull", K-12.

- Some parents mentioned grammar, spelling, cursive writing and keyboarding as issues of concern. Consider educating parents about the attention given to these matters through the current writing approach.

Performance-based Assessment

Student Performance – Indicator # 1

Educators utilize performance-based assessments that enable students to demonstrate their capacity to transfer and apply knowledge. These assessments demonstrate the degree to which students integrate knowledge, skills, and higher-level thinking both within and across disciplines. Student work is evaluated based on common criteria, and results are analyzed and used over time to inform curriculum and instruction.

Approach	*Implementation*	*Results*
There is no process evident.	**There is no evidence of implementation.**	**There is no evidence of results.**
There is a foundational process to use performance-based assessments that enable students to demonstrate, transfer and apply knowledge, skills and higher level thinking within and across disciplines. Student work is evaluated based on common criteria. • *Evidence of a foundational process to create and use performance-based assessments.* • *Evidence that the foundational process enables students to demonstrate, transfer and apply knowledge, skills and higher level thinking.* • *Evidence that the foundational process includes evaluation of student work based on common criteria.*	**Individual educators use performance-based assessments that enable students to demonstrate, transfer and apply knowledge, skills, and higher level thinking within and across disciplines. Some educators evaluate student work based on common criteria.** • *Evidence that individual educators use performance-based assessments that meet established design criteria.* • *Evidence that these assessments enable students to demonstrate, transfer and apply knowledge, skills and higher level thinking within and across disciplines.* • *Evidence that individual educators evaluate student work based on common criteria.*	**Some improvement in student learning is related (in part) to the use of performance assessments that are evaluated based on common criteria.** • *Evidence of improved student learning linked (in part) to the use of performance-based assessments.* • *Evidence of improved student learning linked (in part) to evaluation based on common criteria.*

Performance-based Assessment		
Student Performance – Indicator # 1 (*continued*)		
Approach	*Implementation*	*Results*
There is a systematic process for the use of performance-based assessments that enable students to demonstrate their capacity to transfer and apply knowledge, skills and higher level thinking within and across disciplines. Student work is evaluated based on common criteria. • *Evidence that a common understanding of performance-based assessments exists within the district.* • *Evidence of a systematic process to use performance-based assessments that enable students to demonstrate, transfer and apply knowledge, skills and higher level thinking both within and across disciplines.* • *Evidence of a systematic plan to evaluate student work using common criteria.*	**Many educators use a variety of performance-based assessments that enable students to demonstrate their capacity to transfer and apply knowledge, skills and higher level thinking within and across disciplines. Many educators evaluate student work based on common criteria.** • *Evidence that up to half (50 %) of educators are using performance-based assessments that enable students to transfer and apply knowledge, skills, and higher level thinking within and across disciplines.*	**Measurable improvement in student learning related (in part) to the use of performance assessments that enable students to demonstrate their capacity to transfer and apply knowledge, skills and higher level thinking within and across disciplines.** • *Evidence of measurable improvement in student learning linked (in part) to the use of performance-based assessments.* • *Evidence of measurable student improvement linked to the analysis of performance-based assessment results, using common criteria*
There is a systemic process for the use of performance-based assessments that enable students to demonstrate their capacity to transfer and apply knowledge, skills and higher level thinking within and across disciplines. Student work is evaluated on common based on common criteria and results are analyzed and used over time to inform curriculum and instruction decisions. • *Evidence of a systemic process to use performance-based assessments that enable students to demonstrate, transfer and apply knowledge, skills and higher level thinking within and across disciplines.* • *Evidence that student work is evaluated based on common criteria.* • *Evidence of a plan to analyze results over time to inform curriculum and instruction decisions.*	**Most educators use performance-based assessments that enable students to demonstrate their capacity to transfer and apply knowledge, skills and higher level thinking within and across disciplines. Most educators use common criteria to evaluate student work, and analyze results to inform curriculum and instruction decisions.** • *Evidence that up to 75% of educators use performance-based assessments that enable students to demonstrate the capacity to transfer and apply knowledge, skills and higher level thinking within an across disciplines.* • *Evidence that this information is used to inform decisions about curriculum and instruction.*	**Significant improvement in student learning is sustained over time and related (in part) to the use of performance-based assessments that enable students to demonstrate their capacity to transfer and apply knowledge, skills, and higher level thinking within and across disciplines.** • *Evidence of significant improvement in student learning linked (in part) to the use of performance-based assessments.* • *Evidence of significant improvement in student learning linked in part to the capacity to transfer and apply knowledge, skills and higher level thinking within and across disciplines.* • *Evidence that significant improvement in student learning is sustained over time.*

Performance-based Assessment		
Student Performance – Indicator # 1 (*continued*)		
Approach	*Implementation*	*Results*
There is a systemic, district-wide process for the use of performance-based assessments to enable students to demonstrate their capacity to transfer and apply knowledge, skills and higher level thinking within and across disciplines. Student work is evaluated based on common criteria and results are analyzed and used over time to inform curriculum and instruction. The process is reviewed and revised periodically based on current research and district analysis of performance-based assessments. • *Evidence of a systemic, district-wide process to use performance-based assessments.* • *Evidence that the process is reviewed and refined periodically, based on current research and district analysis of performance-based assessments.*	**All educators systematically use performance-based assessments that enable students to demonstrate their capacity to transfer and apply knowledge, skills, and higher level thinking within and across disciplines. All educators evaluate student work based on common criteria, and analyze student results to inform curriculum and instruction decisions.** • *Evidence that all educators are using performance-based assessments that enable students to demonstrate their capacity to transfer and apply knowledge, skills and higher level thinking within and across disciplines.* • *Evidence that all educators evaluate that student work based on common criteria.* • *Evidence that all educators analyze student results to inform curriculum and instruction decisions.*	**Significant improvement in student learning sustained over time is related to the use of performance-based assessments that enable students to demonstrate their capacity of transfer and apply knowledge, skills and higher level thinking. Improved student performance is attributable to the use of common criteria and analysis of results, and supported by local, regional and national measures of excellence.** • *Evidence of improved student learning linked to the use of performance assessments.* • *Evidence of how that improvement is measured using local, regional and national measures of excellence.* • *Evidence that the improvement is sustained over time.*

Student Metacognition in the Learning Process
Student Performance – Indicator #2

Educators design and implement a learning environment that enables students to engage in metacognition continuously and systematically. As a result, students build the capacity over time to assess, reflect upon and make choices that advance their own learning.

Approach	*Implementation*	*Results*
There is no process evident.	There is no evidence of implementation.	There is no evidence of results.
There is a foundational process to design a learning environment that enables students to engage in metacognition. • *Evidence of a foundational process to design a learning environment that enables students to engage in metacognition.*	Individual educators design and intentionally implement a learning environment that enables students to engage in metacognition. • *Evidence that individual educators design and implement a learning environment that enables students to engage in metacognition.* • *Evidence that individual educators provide some opportunities for students to make choices about their learning.*	Some improvement in student performance is attributable (in part) to the design and implementation of a learning environment that enables students to engage in metacognition. • *Evidence of improved learning and student performance linked (in part) to a learning environment that enables students to engage in metacognition.*
There is a systematic process to design a learning environment that enables students to engage in metacognition continuously and systematically. This process includes student reflection, choice and self-assessment. • *Evidence that a common understanding of metacognition exists within the district.* • *Evidence of a systematic process that enables students to engage in metacognition.* • *Evidence that the process includes student reflection, choice, and self-assessment*	Many educators design and implement a learning environment that enables students to engage in metacognition systematically. Many educators provide opportunities for student reflection, choice, and self-assessment. • *Evidence that up to half (50%) of educators design and implement a learning environment that enables students to engage in metacognition continuously and systematically.* • *Evidence that up to half (50%) of educators provide opportunities for student reflection, choice, and self-assessment.* • *Evidence that up to half (50%) of educators inform instruction based upon students' reflections, self-assessment and choice.*	Measurable improvement in student performance is attributable (in part) to the design and implementation of a learning environment that enables students to engage in metacognition systematically. • *Evidence of measurable improvement in student learning and performance linked (in part) to a learning environment that enables students to engage in metacognition continuously and systematically.* • *Evidence of measurable improvement in student learning and performance linked (in part) to a learning environment that provides opportunities for reflection, choice, and self-assessment.*

Student Metacognition in the Learning Process		
Student Performance – Indicator #2 *(continued)*		
Approach	*Implementation*	*Results*
There is a systemic process that enables students to engage in metacognition continuously and systematically. The learning environment is designed to enable students to build the capacity to assess and reflect upon their learning and make choices that advance their learning. • *Evidence of a systemic process that enables students to engage in metacognition continuously and systemically.* • *Evidence of a systemic process to design a learning environment that enables students to build the capacity to assess and reflect upon their learning and make choices that advance their learning.*	**Most educators design and implement a learning environment that enables students to engage in metacognition continuously and systematically. Educators enable students to build the capacity to assess, reflect upon their learning, and make choices that advance their learning.** • *Evidence that up to 75% of educators design and implement a learning environment that enables students to engage in metacognition continuously and systemically.* • *Evidence that up to 75% of educators enable students to build the capacity to assess and reflect upon their learning, and make choices that advance their learning.*	**Students' capacity to assess, reflect upon and make choices that advance their learning is attributable (in part) to the design and implementation of a learning environment that enables them to engage in metacognition continuously and systematically. Significant improvement in student performance is sustained over time.** • *Evidence of significant improvement in student learning and performance resulting (in part) from continuous and systemic engagement in metacognition.* • *Evidence of significant improvement in student learning and performance linked (in part) to their capacity to assess, reflect upon and make choices that advance their learning.* • *Evidence of significant improvement in student learning and performance being sustained over time.*
There is a systemic, district-wide process that enables students to engage in metacognition continuously and systematically. The design of the learning environment enables students to build the capacity to assess, reflect upon and make choices that advance their learning. The process is reviewed and revised, periodically, based on current research and district analysis of student metacognition data. • *Evidence of a systemic, district-wide process that enables students to engage in metacognition continuously and systemically.* • *Evidence that the design of the learning environment enables teachers to make instructional choices based upon student metacognitive data.* • *Evidence that the process is reviewed and revised, periodically, based on current research and analysis of student metacognition data.*	**All educators design and implement a learning environment that enables students to engage in metacognition, continuously and systematically. All educators enable students to build the capacity to assess and reflect upon their learning, and make choices that advance their learning.** • *Evidence that all educators design and implement a learning environment that enables students to engage in metacognition continuously and systemically.* • *Evidence that the learning environment enables students to build the capacity to assess, reflect upon and make choices that advance their learning.* • *Evidence that educators adjust instruction based upon the analysis of student metacognition data.*	**Significant improvement in student performance, sustained over time, is attributable to the design and implementation of a learning environment that enables them to engage in metacognition continuously and systematically. Students build the capacity to assess, reflect upon and make choices that advance their learning.** • *Evidence of significant improvement in student learning and performance resulting from continuous and systemic engagement in metacognition.* • *Evidence of significant improvement in student learning and performance resulting from the capacity to assess and reflect upon their learning, and make choices that advance their learning.* • *Evidence of how that improvement is measured against local and national measures of excellence.*

Student Performance Data

Student Performance - Indicator #3

Norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests provide data on student knowledge and higher level thinking. The district has in place a system for collecting, analyzing and disseminating student performance data to teachers and administrators. Teachers and administrators use these data collaboratively to make informed decisions on improving student performance.

Approach	*Implementation*	*Results*
There is no process evident.	There is no evidence of implementation.	There is no evidence of results.
There is a foundational process for using norm-referenced and criterion-referenced test data to analyze student knowledge and higher level thinking. The data are disseminated to administrators and teachers. • *Evidence of a foundational process to analyze norm-referenced and criterion-referenced test data.* • *Evidence that the data are used to analyze student knowledge and higher level thinking.* • *Evidence that the data are disseminated to administrators and teachers.*	Individual educators analyze data from norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests to make informed decisions on improving student performance and higher level thinking. • *Evidence that individual educators analyze student performance data from norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests.* • *Evidence that the individual educators use data to analyze student knowledge and higher level thinking and to inform curricular and instructional decisions.*	Some improvement in student knowledge and higher level thinking is related (in part) to the analysis of data from norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests. • *Evidence of improved student learning and higher level thinking related (in part) to the analysis of student performance data from norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests.*
There is a systematic process for using norm-referenced and criterion-referenced test data to analyze student performance over time. The data are used to measure, monitor, and improve student knowledge and higher level thinking. The data are disseminated to administrators and teachers. • *Evidence that norm-referenced and criterion-referenced test data are analyzed systematically over time.* • *Evidence that the data are disseminated to administrators and teachers and used to measure, monitor, and improve student knowledge and higher level thinking.*	Many educators collaborate, over time, to analyze data from norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests to make informed decisions about curriculum, instruction, student knowledge and higher level thinking. • *Evidence that up to half (50%) of educators collaborate to analyze student performance data over time.* • *Evidence that up to half (50%) of educators use data from norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests to analyze student knowledge and higher level thinking.* • *Evidence that up to half (50%) of educators use data to inform curricular and instructional decisions.*	Measurable improvement in student learning is related (in part) to the analysis of data from norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests. The analysis is linked to decisions about curriculum, instruction, student knowledge and higher level thinking • *Evidence that measurable improvement in student knowledge and higher level thinking are related (in part) to the analysis of norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests over time.* • *Evidence that the test data are used to make curricular and instructional decisions on improving student performance.*

Student Performance Data		
Student Performance—Indicator #3 (*continued*)		
Approach	*Implementation*	*Results*

There is a systemic process for using norm-referenced and criterion-referenced test data to monitor student performance over time and to disaggregate data from norm-referenced and criterion referenced tests. The data are used to improve the learning environment, student knowledge, and higher level thinking. The data are disseminated, systemically, to administrators and teachers.
  • *Evidence of a systemic process to analyze student performance data from norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests.*
  • *Evidence that test data are disaggregated and analyzed over time.*
  • *Evidence that the data analysis is linked to the learning environment, student knowledge, and higher level thinking.*
  • *Evidence of a systemic process to disseminate data to administrators and teachers.*
	Most educators collaborate to disaggregate and analyze data from norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests over time as part of a sustained effort to make informed decisions about curriculum, instruction, student knowledge and higher-level thinking.
	  • *Evidence that up to 75% of educators collaborate to disaggregate and analyze norm-referenced and criterion-referenced test data over time.*
	  • *Evidence that up to 75% of educators use data analysis in a sustained effort to make informed curricular and instructional decisions.*
		Significant improvement in student learning sustained over time is related (in part) to the use and analysis of student performance data from norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests and other forms of assessment.
		  • *Evidence of significant improvement in student learning related (in part) to the analysis of tests and student performance data over time.*
		  • *Evidence that improvement is measured using multiple forms of assessment data.*
		  • *Evidence that the improvement in student learning is sustained over time.*

There is a systemic, district-wide process that integrates and monitors student performance data from multiple assessments over time. The disseminated data are used to improve the learning environment, student learning, and higher level thinking through formal cycles of review and revision based on current research.
  • *Evidence of a systemic, district-wide process that integrates and monitors student performance data into the teaching and learning cycle.*
  • *Evidence of data analysis and disaggregation of student performance from multiple assessments over time. Evidence that the process is reviewed and refined based on current research.*
	All educators collaborate to disaggregate and analyze student performance data from multiple sources over time. All educators are involved in a sustained effort to make informed decisions about curriculum and instruction across grades and subject areas.
	  • *Evidence that all educators collaborate to disaggregate and analyze student performance data over time.*
	  • *Evidence that all educators use data from multiple sources to analyze student performance and to inform curriculum and instruction across grades and subject levels.*
	  • *Evidence that the use of data is part of a sustained effort to improve curriculum, instruction, and student performance through formal cycles*
		Significant improvement in student learning is sustained over time and related to the use and analysis of student performance data. Student performance is benchmarked against local, regional, and national measures of performance.
		  • *Evidence of significant improvement in student learning related to the sustained analysis of tests and performance data over time.*
		  • *Evidence of how that improvement is measured using local, regional, and national benchmarks.*

| | of evaluation. | |

Teachers and administrators collaborate and develop an articulated and aligned curriculum that ensures optimal student results. Assessment data from multiple sources are analyzed by teachers and administrators when making curricular and instructional decisions.   In their planning, teachers purposefully select from a variety of teaching techniques and tools to help students improve and they differentiate curriculum and instruction to address all students' learning needs.

Approach	*Implementation*	*Results*
There is no process evident.	**There is no evidence of implementation**.	**There is no evidence of results**.
There is a foundational process for educators to collaborate in developing, articulating, and aligning curriculum and instruction, K-12. Educators analyze student assessment data from multiple sources and select from a variety of teaching materials and instructional strategies that ensure optimal student results. • *Evidence of a foundational process for educators to collaborate to develop, articulate, and align curriculum and instruction, K-12.* • *Evidence of a foundational process to link data analysis to decisions about teaching materials and instructional strategies that ensure optimal student results.* • *Evidence of a foundational process of differentiating instruction to address the learning needs of all students.*	**Individual educators collect and analyze student assessment data from multiple sources and collaborate to develop, articulate, and align curriculum and instruction, K-12. Data are used to select appropriate teaching materials and instructional strategies that support differentiation, and to make curricular and instructional decisions to ensure optimal student results.** • *Evidence that individual educators collect and analyze student assessment data from multiple sources.* • *Evidence that individual educators collaborate to develop, articulate, and align curriculum and instruction, K-12.* • *Evidence that individual educators differentiate curriculum and instruction to address the learning needs of all students.* • *Evidence that individual educators analyze data to select appropriate teaching materials and instructional strategies that ensure optimal student results.*	**Some improvement in student learning is related (in part) to the link between educators' collaboration and analysis of multiple forms of student assessment data to make curricular and instructional decisions, K-12.** • *Evidence of improved student learning related (in part) to educators' analysis of multiple forms of student assessment data.* • *Evidence of improved student learning linked (in part) to curricular and instructional decisions that ensure optimal student results.*

Curriculum and Instruction
Internal Support – Indicator # 4 (*continued*)

Approach	Implementation	Results
There is a systematic process used for educators to collaborate in developing, articulating, and aligning curriculum and instruction, K-12. Educators collaborate to collect and analyze multiple forms of data to ensure optimal student results and to make curricular and instructional decisions. • *Evidence that a common understanding of differentiated instruction exists within the district.* • *Evidence of a systematic process to collect and analyze student performance data from multiple sources.* • *Evidence of a systematic process to link student performance data to decisions about teaching materials and instructional strategies to ensure optimal student results.* • *Evidence of designated standards used to guide analysis of student assessment data.* • *Evidence of systematic differentiation of instruction to address the learning needs of all students.*	**Many educators systematically collect and analyze student assessment data from multiple sources and collaborate to develop, articulate, and align curriculum and instruction, K-12. Educators purposefully select teaching materials and instructional strategies that differentiate to ensure optimal student results.** • *Evidence that up to half (50%) of educators collaborate to develop, articulate and align curriculum and instruction, K-12.* • *Evidence that up to half (50%) of educators collect and analyze student assessment data from multiple sources to make curricular and instructional decisions.* • *Evidence of designated standards used to guide the analysis of student assessment data.* • *Evidence that educators use the data to purposefully select teaching materials and instructional strategies that differentiate to ensure optimal student results.*	**Measurable improvement in student learning is related (in part) to the link between a clearly developed, articulated, and aligned curriculum and the systematic use of data analysis from multiple sources to ensure optimal student results.** • *Evidence of measurable improvement in student learning related (in part) to educators' use of assessment data to make curricular and instructional decisions.* • *Evidence of designated standards used to guide the analysis of student assessment data, and to differentiate instruction that ensures optimal student results.*

Curriculum and Instruction		
Internal Support – Indicator # 4 (*continued*)		
Approach	*Implementation*	*Results*
There is a systemic process for educators to collaborate to develop, articulate, and align curriculum and instruction, K-12. This process is directly linked to the analysis of multiple forms of student assessment data when making curriculum and instruction decisions to ensure optimal student results. • *Evidence of a systemic process for educators to collaborate to develop, articulate and align curriculum and instruction, K-12.* • *Evidence that the systemic process is linked to curriculum and instruction decisions to ensure optimal student results.* • *Evidence of a cycle to review and refine designated standards to guide the analysis of student assessment data.* • *Evidence of systemic differentiation of instruction to address the learning needs of all students.*	**Most educators collaborate in the systemic analysis of student assessment data from multiple sources and to plan, develop, articulate, and align curriculum and instruction, K-12. Student performance data analysis is used to plan, implement, and review curriculum and instruction decisions and to select teaching materials and instructional strategies that ensure optimal student results.** • *Evidence that up to 75% of educators collaborate in the systemic analysis of student assessment data from multiple sources.* • *Evidence that the collaboration extends across grade levels and content areas.* • *Evidence that up to 75% of educators use data to select appropriate teaching materials and instructional strategies to differentiate and ensure optimal student results.* • *Evidence that the designated standards used to guide analysis of student assessment data are reviewed.*	**Significant improvement in student learning is sustained over time and related (in part) to the link between the systemic, collaborative analysis of student assessment data and optimal student results.** • *Evidence that significant improvement in student learning is linked (in part) to curriculum and instruction decisions that ensure optimal student results.* • *Evidence that significant improvement in student learning is sustained over time and is linked (in part) to the systemic analysis of multiple sources of assessment data.*
There is a systemic, district-wide process for educators to collaborate in the ongoing planning, development, articulation and alignment of curriculum and instruction, K-12. The systemic, district-wide analysis of student assessment data from multiple sources is directly linked to decisions about teaching materials and instructional strategies. The process is continually monitored and improved based on a formal cycle of review, shared experience, current research, new knowledge and feedback from multiple sources. • *Evidence of a systemic, district-wide process for educators to collaborate to plan, develop, articulate and align curriculum and instruction, K-12.*	**All educators collaborate with colleagues across grade and content levels in the systemic analysis of multiple forms of student assessment data. All educators use student performance data to purposefully plan and select appropriate teaching materials and instructional strategies that differentiate to ensure optimal student results** • *Evidence that all educators collaborate across grade levels and content areas to collect, analyze, and review multiple forms of student assessment data.* • *Evidence that all educators plan and select teaching*	**Significant improvement in student learning is sustained over time and consistent with local, national and international standards of excellence. Improved student achievement results are related to systemic, district-wide developed, articulated, and aligned curriculum, instruction, and data analysis from multiple sources.** • *Evidence of significantly improved student learning related to a planned, developed, articulated and aligned curriculum that is systemic and district-wide, and ensures optimal student results.*

	materials and instructional.	• *Evidence that improved*

Curriculum and Instruction		
Internal Support – Indicator # 4 (*continued*)		
Approach	***Implementation***	***Results***

• *Evidence that the process involves the systemic, district-wide analysis of multiple forms of student assessment data to make curricular and instructional decisions.*
• *Evidence that the process is continually monitored and revised based on current research, shared experience, and feedback from multiple sources.*
• *Evidence of systemic, district-wide differentiation of instruction to address the learning needs of all students.*
	strategies based on systemic data analysis.
	   • *Evidence that all educators use data analysis and designated standards and benchmarks to make curriculum and instruction decisions and to ensure optimal student results.*
		student learning is sustained over time.
		   • *Evidence that student improvement is consistent with local, national and international standards of excellence.*

The professional learning plan is based on current student and teacher needs linked to district goals. Professional learning is embedded, collaborative, and reflective. The district is attentive to providing the time and resources for this learning to take place. Professional learning is evaluated using a supervision and evaluation process that focuses on the efficacy of instruction and attendant growth in student learning.

Approach	Implementation	Results
There is no process evident.	There is no evidence of implementation.	There is no evidence of results.
There is a foundational professional learning process that is based on current student and teacher needs related to district goals. This process is embedded, collaborative and reflective. • *Evidence of a foundational professional learning process based on current student/teacher needs and linked to district goals.* • *Evidence that the district provides time and resources to ensure embedded professional learning.* • *Evidence that professional learning is designed to be collaborative and reflective.*	Individual educators are involved in professional learning that is embedded, collaborative and reflective and based on teacher and student needs related to district goals. • *Evidence that individual educators are participating in professional learning that is embedded, collaborative, reflective and linked to student and teacher needs and district goals.* • *Evidence that educators have the time and resources to participate in district professional learning.* • *Individual educators participate in professional learning that is focused on improved student learning.*	Some improvement in student learning related (in part) to the link between professional learning and district goals. • *Evidence of improved student learning is related (in part) to the link between professional learning and student needs.*
There is a systematic professional learning process that is based on student and teacher needs related to district goals. Professional learning is embedded, collaborative and reflective; it is systematically evaluated. • *Evidence of a systematic process for professional learning that is linked to student/teacher needs and district goals.* • *Evidence that professional learning is systematically evaluated and focused on improved student learning.* • *Evidence that the supervision and evaluation process is linked to professional learning, student learning and district goals.*	Many educators participate in professional learning that is embedded, collaborative, reflective and based on teacher and student needs related to district goals. • *Evidence that up to 50% of educators regularly participate in professional learning that is embedded, collaborative and reflective.* • *Evidence that up to 50% of educators are provided time to participate in professional learning that is focused on student/teacher needs and aligned with district goals.* • *Evidence that up to 50% of educators align professional learning goals and instructional*	==Measurable improvement in student learning is related (in part) to district goals linked to professional learning that is embedded, collaborative and reflective.== • ==*Evidence of measurable improvement in student learning related (in part) to professional learning that is embedded, collaborative and reflective.*== • ==*Evidence of how improvement in student learning is measured.*==

	strategies with student learning.	

Professional Learning		
Internal Support – Indicator # 5 *(continued)*		

Approach	*Implementation*	*Results*
There is a systemic professional learning process that is based on student and teacher needs related to district goals. Sustained professional learning is embedded, collaborative and reflective. Professional learning is reviewed and revised over time and is linked to the district plan for supervision and evaluation. • *Evidence of a systemic professional learning process that is based on student/teacher needs related to district goals.* • *Evidence that the systemic process is periodically revisited and refined.* • *Evidence that the professional learning plan is directly linked to the district supervision and evaluation process.*	**Most educators participate in professional learning that is systemic and based on student/teacher needs related to district goals. Educators consistently link professional goals to student learning.** • *Evidence that up to 75% of educators participate in systemic, on-going, scheduled professional learning that is embedded, collaborative and reflective.* • *Evidence that up to 75% of educators are provided time to participate in systemic professional learning that is focused on student/ teacher needs and aligned with district goals.* • *Evidence that up to 75% of educators align professional learning goals and instructional strategies to promote optimal student results.*	**Significant improvement in student learning related (in part) to educators' participation in systemic professional learning that is embedded, collaborative, reflective and related to student needs. Student growth is directly linked to systematic, sustained professional learning.** • *Evidence that significant improvement in student learning is sustained over time.* • *Examples of how significant improvement is measured using data from multiple sources.*
There is a systemic, district-wide professional learning process in place that is based on teacher/student needs related to district goals. Time and resources are provided to ensure that professional learning is embedded, collaborative and reflective. The plan is evaluated using a supervision and evaluation process that focuses on optimal student results. The professional learning plan is reviewed and revised based on current research and district analysis of professional learning. • *Evidence of a systemic, district-wide professional learning process related to district goals.* • *Evidence that the process is sustained over time.* • *Evidence that the revisions are based on current research and analysis of the district's professional learning process.*	**All educators participate in professional learning that is systemic, district-wide, and based on student and teacher needs related to district goals. Educators consistently link professional goals to decisions about instructional strategies that promote optimal student learning.** • *Evidence that all educators participate in ongoing scheduled professional learning that is embedded, collaborative and reflective.* • *Evidence that all educators are provided time to participate in professional learning that is focused on student and teacher needs and aligned with district goals.* • *Evidence that all educators align professional learning goals and instructional strategies to promote optimal student results.* • *Evidence that all educators analyze current research and practices to inform instructional decisions.*	**Significant improvement in student learning is related to educators' participation in systemic, district-wide professional learning that is embedded, collaborative, reflective and related to student needs. Student learning is directly linked to professional learning.** • *Evidence that significant improvement in student learning is sustained over time.* • *Examples of how significant improvement is measured using data from multiple sources.* • *Examples of how significant improvement is benchmarked against local and national best practices.*

Equitable Support for Student Needs
Student Performance Indicator #6

Processes and practices are in place in the district that identify and meet students' academic and non-academic needs. These processes and practices are informed by data gathered from a variety of sources and are aligned with student learning goals for students at all performance levels. Policies and practices that govern student access to all programs are non-discriminatory and set high expectations that challenge each student. All students have equitable access to all programs.

Approach	*Implementation*	*Results*
There is no process evident.	There is no evidence of implementation.	There is no evidence of results.
There is a foundational process to identify students' academic and non-academic needs through policies and practices informed by data from a variety of sources. • *Evidence of a foundational process to identify students' academic and non-academic needs.* • *Evidence that processes and practices are informed by data analysis from a variety of sources and aligned with student learning goals.*	Individual educators analyze data from a variety of sources to meet students' academic and non-academic needs. Data analysis is used to align policies and practices with learning goals of students at all performance levels. • *Evidence that individual educators analyze data from a variety of sources to meet students' academic and non- academic needs.* • *Evidence that the foundational processes and practices are informed by data analysis and aligned with student learning goals at all performance levels.*	Some improvement in student performance is attributable (in part) to the alignment of policies and practices with student learning goals. Data from a variety of sources are analyzed and used to ensure students' equitable access to all programs. • *Evidence that some improvement in student learning is attributable (in part) to the alignment of policies and practices with student learning goals.* • *Evidence that data from a variety of sources are analyzed and used to ensure equitable access to all programs.*
There is a systematic process that identifies students' academic and non-academic needs. Data from a variety of sources are analyzed and aligned with student learning goals to ensure non-discriminatory, equitable access to all programs for students at all performance levels. High expectations challenge all students. • *Evidence that the systematic process sets high expectations that challenge students at all performance levels.* • *Evidence that the systematic process is non-discriminatory and ensures that students at all performance levels have equitable access to all programs.*	**Many educators analyze data from a variety of sources to meet students' academic and non-academic needs. The data analysis is aligned with student learning goals, ensures equitable access to all programs. High expectations challenge students at all performance levels.** • *Evidence that up to half (50%) of educators analyze data to identify and meet students' academic and non-academic needs.* • *Evidence that up to half (50%) of educators analyze data from a variety of sources.* • *Evidence that data analysis is aligned with student learning goals and used to set high expectations that challenge each student.* • *Evidence that students at all performance levels have*	**Measurable improvement in student performance is attributable (in part) to the analysis of data aligned with student learning goals. The data are used to ensure equitable access to all programs and to set high expectations that challenge students at all performance levels.** • *Evidence that measurable improvement in student learning is attributable (in part) to data analysis from a variety of sources.* • *Evidence that the systematic data analysis process is non-discriminatory, used to ensure equitable access to all programs, and sets high expectations that challenge students at all performance levels.*

Equitable Support for Student Needs		
Student Performance Indicator #6 (continued)		
Approach	*Implementation*	*Results*
	equitable access to all programs.	
There is a systemic process that identifies student academic and non-academic needs. Data from a variety of sources, aligned with student learning goals, are analyzed to ensure all students have non-discriminatory, equitable access to all programs. The systemic process includes setting high expectations that challenge students at all performance levels and is periodically reviewed and revised. • *Evidence that the systemic process is periodically reviewed and revised.*	Most educators analyze data to meet students' academic and non-academic needs at all performance levels. Data analyses are aligned with student learning goals to ensure equitable access to all programs and to challenge students to meet high expectations at all performance levels. • *Evidence that up to 75% of educators analyze data from a variety of sources to meet the academic and non- academic needs of students at all performance levels.*	Significant improvement in student performance is attributable (in part) to the analysis of data aligned with student goals, and is sustained over time. Data are analyzed to ensure equitable access to all programs for students at all performance levels. • *. Evidence of significant and sustained improvement in student learning linked (in part) to data analysis.* • *Evidence of significant improvement in student learning linked (in part) to high expectations that challenge students at all performance levels.* *Evidence of significant improvement in student learning attributable (in part) to equitable access to all programs.*
There is a systemic, district-wide process to analyze data from a variety of sources to meet students' academic and non-academic needs. This process is aligned with student learning goals to ensure equitable access to all programs for students at all performance levels. High expectations are set that challenge each student. The process is formally reviewed and revised based on current research. • *Evidence that the process is formally reviewed and revised based on current research.*	All educators analyze data from a variety of sources to meet students' academic and non-academic needs. The data and analyses are aligned with student learning goals and used to set high expectations that challenge students at all performance levels. Students at all performance levels have equitable access to all programs. • *Evidence that all educators systemically analyze student performance data from a variety of sources to ensure high expectations that challenge students at all performance levels.*	Significant improvement in student learning sustained over time is linked to the systematic analysis of data aligned with student learning goals and high expectations that challenge students at all performance levels. The data are used to ensure all students have equitable access to all programs. • *Evidence that significant improvement in student learning is sustained over time.* • *Evidence of the link among equitable access, high expectations that challenge students, and significant improvement in student learning and performance.*

Shared vision and goals focused on student performance have been developed with the staff and community, are well articulated, clearly communicated, and consistently pursued throughout the district and school community.   This vision expects, supports, and recognizes change and creativity. It values and encourages progressive innovation that leads toward higher student achievement.   Data are utilized to support decisions for change. This includes a process to review work and learn from experimentation.

Approach	*Implementation*	*Results*
There is no process evident.	**There is no evidence of implementation**.	**There is no evidence of results.**
There is a foundational process to build a shared vision with staff and community to establish goals focused on student performance. This process encourages progressive innovation that leads toward higher student achievement. • *Evidence of a foundational process to build a shared vision and establish goals focused on student performance.* • *Evidence of a foundational process to encourage progressive innovation.*	**Individual educators and community members collaborate to pursue a shared vision and goals that are focused on student performance. The vision expects, supports, and recognizes change, creativity and progressive innovation.** • *Evidence that individual educators and community members collaborate to pursue a shared vision and goals that are focused on improved student performance.* • *Evidence that individual educators are engaged in progressive innovation that leads toward higher student achievement.*	**Some improvement in student performance is attributable (in part) to a shared vision and goals focused on student performance and to innovative programs and practices.** • *Evidence of improved student learning related (in part) to a shared vision and goals focused on student performance and to innovative programs and practices.*
There is a systematic process to build a shared vision and goals with staff and community that are focused on student performance. The vision and goals are articulated, communicated and pursued throughout the district and school community. This process values and encourages change, creativity, and progressive innovation that lead toward higher student achievement. • *Evidence of a systematic process to build a shared vision and goals focused on student performance.* • *Evidence of a systematic process that ensures the vision and goals are articulated and communicated throughout the*	**Many educators and community members collaborate to support the systemic shared vision and goals that are focused on student performance. The vision expects, supports, and recognizes change, creativity and progressive innovation. Many educators value change, creativity, and progressive innovation that leads toward higher student achievement. Data are analyzed to support decisions for change.** • *Evidence that up to half of (50%) the educators and community members support the systemic shared vision and goals.* • *Evidence that up to half (50%)*	**Measurable improvement in student learning is related (in part) to a shared vision and related goals and is suggested by data from multiple sources. Measurable improvement is a result (in part) of innovative programs and practices.** • *Evidence of how measurable improvement in student learning related (in part) to a shared vision and related goals is measured.* • *Evidence of how measurable improvement in student learning related (in part) to innovative programs and practices is measured and tracked.*

Approach	Implementation	Results
district and community. • *Evidence of a systematic process that encourages change, creativity and progressive innovation.*	*Of the educators value change, creativity and progressive innovation.* • *Evidence that change and innovation are linked to data analysis*	
There is a systemic process for building a shared vision and goals with staff and community. The vision and related goals are well articulated, communicated and pursued throughout the district and community. This process values change and creativity and encourages progressive innovation. Data are analyzed to support decisions for change. The process is periodically reviewed and revised based on current research. • *Evidence that data are analyzed to support decisions for change.* • *Evidence that the process is periodically reviewed and revised based on current research.*	**Most educators and community members collaborate to support the systemic shared vision and goals that are focused on student performance. The vision expects, supports, and recognizes change, creativity and progressive innovation. Many educators value change, creativity, and progressive innovation that leads toward higher student achievement. Data are analyzed to support decisions for change.** • *Evidence that up to 75% of educators support the district vision and goals focused on student performance.* • *Evidence that up to 75% of educators value change, creativity and progressive innovation.*	**Significant improvement in student learning, sustained over time, is related to a shared vision and related goals and to innovative programs, practices, and analysis of student performance data.** • *Evidence of significant improvement in student achievement related to a shared vision and goals and to innovative programs and practices.* • *Evidence that significant improvement in student learning is sustained over time.*
There is a systemic, district-wide process for building a shared vision with staff and community and establishing related goals that are well articulated, communicated, and consistently pursued throughout the district and school community. This systemic, district-wide process is formally reviewed and revised based on current research. • *Evidence of a systemic, district-wide process to build a shared vision and related goals.* • *Evidence that the systemic, district-wide process is formally reviewed and revised based on current research.*	**All educators and members of the community collaborate to support the systemic and district-wide vision and related goals focused on student performance. All educators are actively engaged in the development, testing, evaluating and sharing of new tools, techniques and instructional strategies focused on improving student achievement. Change and program innovations are expected, on-going and are derived from multiple assessments.** • *Evidence that all educators understand and support the vision and goals.* • *Evidence that all educators share a sense of responsibility for realizing the vision and goals.* • *Evidence that all educators are engaged in programs focused on realizing the vision*	**Significant improvement in student performance, sustained over time, is related to a shared vision and is benchmarked against local and national measures of excellence. Significant improvement in student achievement, sustained over time, is a result of innovative programs and practices.** • *Evidence of significantly improved student leaning sustained over time and related to the shared vision and goals and to innovative programs and practices.* • *Evidence of how significant improvement is benchmarked against local and national measures of excellence.*

Shared Vision and Environment for Change		
Internal Support – Indicator # 7 (*continued*)		
Approach	**Implementation**	**Results**
	and goals. • *Evidence that all educators collaborate in developing, testing, evaluating and sharing new tools, techniques and strategies.* • *Evidence that the innovations are expected, ongoing and linked to the analysis of assessment data.*	

The active involvement of parents and the community and ongoing communication among all constituent groups are encouraged and utilized to improve student learning. A wide range of community resources extends the classroom and enriches the educational experience of students. The budget development process supports the mission, vision and goals of the district and is aligned with efforts to improve student performance.

Approach	Implementation	Results
There is no process evident.	There is no evidence of implementation.	There is no evidence of results.
There is a foundational process that encourages the active involvement of and communication with parents, community and educators. The budget process supports the district mission, vision and goals and is aligned with efforts to improve student performance. • Evidence of a foundational process for active involvement and ongoing communication among constituent groups. • Evidence of a foundational budget process that supports the district mission, vision and goals and is aligned with efforts to improve student performance.	Individual educators are actively involved with parents and community members in conversations focused on improved teaching and learning. Opportunities for parents to communicate with educators are aligned with district efforts to improve student performance. • Evidence that individual educators, parents, and community members have opportunities for ongoing communication focused on student learning. • Evidence that individual educators, parents and community members communicate to support programs focused on improved student performance.	The active involvement and two-way communication among educators, parents and community members are linked (in part) to some improvement in student learning. • . Evidence of improved student learning linked (in part) to communication between parents, community members and educators.
There is a systematic process for the active involvement of parents and community members, and ongoing communication among parents, community members, and educators. The systematic process includes developing a budget that supports the district mission, vision and goals. A wide range of community resources extends the classroom experience and is aligned with efforts to improve student performance. • *Evidence of a systematic process that encourages two-way communication between parents/community and educators.* • *Evidence of a systematic*	**Many educators communicate with parents and community members to improve student learning. Parents and community members support the budget, the mission, vision and goals of the district and provide resources that extend the classroom experience.** • *Evidence that up to half (50%) of parents, community members and educators are actively involved in ongoing communication to improve student learning.* • *Evidence that a wide range of community resources extends and enriches the classroom experience.* • *Evidence that the district*	**The active involvement of the parents and community members in the education process is recognized, along with programs supported by the district budget, as contributing (in part) to measurable improvement in student learning as assessed by classroom and district data from multiple sources.** • *Evidence of measurable improvement in student learning linked (in part) to the active involvement of parents/ community members.* • *Evidence of measurable improvement in student learning linked (in part) to programs supported by the district budget.*

Parent and Community Support		
External Support – Indicator #8 (*continued*)		
Approach	*Implementation*	*Results*
<mark>*process for developing a budget that supports the district mission, vision, and goals.* • *Evidence of community resources that extend and enrich the classroom experience.*</mark>	<mark>*mission, vision and goals are aligned with educators' efforts to improve student performance.*</mark>	

There is a systemic process to encourage the active involvement of and communication between parents and community members and educators. The budget development process supports the district mission, vision and goals and is aligned with efforts to improve student performance. A wide range of community resources extends and enriches the classroom experience and is aligned with efforts to improve student performance.
  • *Evidence of a systemic process that encourages the active involvement of parents and community members.*
  • *Evidence that there is a systemic process at all grade levels and departments to maintain consistent, productive communication with parents.*
  • *Evidence that the budget development process is aligned with efforts to improve student performance.*
	Most parents and community members are actively involved in ongoing communication with educators to improve student learning. The budget development process supports the district mission, vision and goals and is aligned with efforts to improve student performance.
	  • *Evidence that up to 75% of parents and community members have the opportunity to become involved in programs that are supported by the Board and are aligned with efforts to improve student performance.*
	  • *Evidence that up to 75% of parents and many community members consistently support the district mission, vision and goals.*
		The active involvement of the parents and community members in the education process is recognized, along with programs supported by the district budget, as contributing (in part) to significant improvement in student learning sustained over time.
		  • *Evidence that significant improvement in student learning is related (in part) to parent and community support and is sustained over time.*

There is a systemic, district-wide process for the active involvement of and communication among parents, community members and educators. The budget development process is systemic and district-wide, is aligned with the district mission, vision, and goals, and is aligned with efforts to improve student achievement. A wide range of community resources extends and enriches the classroom experience. These processes are periodically reviewed and revised based on current research.
  • *Evidence of a systemic, district-wide process for active*
	All parents and community members are afforded opportunities to be actively involved in ongoing communication with educators to improve student learning. Community resources provide enrichment that extends the classroom experience for all students. The budget development process supports the district mission, vision and goals and is aligned with efforts to improve student performance.
	  • *Evidence that all parents and community members are afforded opportunities to be actively involved in ongoing communication with educators.*
		The active involvement of parents and community members in ongoing two-way communication with educators is linked to significant improvement in student learning sustained over time. There is consistent community support for programs aligned with efforts to improve student performance and based on local and national measures of excellence.
		  • *Evidence that significant improvement in student performance is benchmarked against local, regional, and national measures of excellence.*

Parent and Community Support		
External Support – Indicator #8 (*continued*)		
Approach	***Implementation***	***Results***
involvement and two-way communication between parents/community members and educators. • *Evidence that the budget development process is systemic, district-wide, and aligned with the district mission, vision and goals of improved student performance.* • *Evidence that these processes are periodically reviewed and revised*	• *Evidence that all parents and community members are aware of the district mission, vision and goals and are afforded opportunities to inform and support these goals.*	