In the following report, Hanover Research examines district evaluation practices for curriculum and instruction divisions, including practices for evaluating the general office, curriculum coordinators, special education support staff, and English language learner support staff. The report includes a profile of a district, Lubbock Independent School District, which evaluates the progress of curriculum coordinators, special education staff, and English language learner staff through quantitative and qualitative key performance indicators. The report concludes with an overview of best practices in district-level organization for curriculum and instruction departments.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND KEY FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, research has repeatedly shown that central school districts play a crucial role in the quality of curricular and instructional support at the school level. The curriculum and instruction office is responsible for implementing a consistent curriculum, ensuring best practices are employed in the classroom, and facilitating equitable access to high-quality education for all students, including those involved in special education and English language learner programs.

The following report is organized into the following sections:

- **Section I: Evaluation Practices for District Office and Staff** examines district practices for the evaluation of curriculum and instruction departments within the central district office, including the general office and specialized roles within curriculum and instruction: curriculum coordinators, special education support staff, and English language learner support staff.

- **Section II: District Profile** provides a profile of the Lubbock Independent School District (LISD) and evaluates its district-level instructional staff progress through quantitative and qualitative key performance indicators.

- **Section III: Best Practices for Curriculum and Instruction Office Organization** provides an overview of best practices for district-level organization for curriculum and instruction support, including the role of the curriculum and instruction office, the elimination of bureaucratic inefficiencies, and the adoption of a customer-service orientation to support the efforts of individual schools. The final section concludes with two profiles of districts with exemplary district-level organization for curricular and instructional support: Bridgeport Public Schools in Bridgeport, Connecticut, and Jefferson County Public Schools in Louisville, Kentucky.
KEY FINDINGS

- Districts generally evaluate the efforts of curriculum and instruction departments, as well as the administrators in charge of curriculum and instruction, based upon criteria including curriculum coherence, consistency, and alignment to state and district standards, use of research-based best practices for instruction, and efforts to target support to specific school needs. While some district assessment is carried out through self-assessment tools, special education and English language learner programs are typically assessed using stakeholder focus groups, interviews, and surveys, as well as student growth data and other measures of student performance.

- Most districts use student achievement data not only to evaluate the impact of curricular and instructional support to teachers, but also to target areas of need and plan future support. Student achievement data allows district curriculum and instruction offices to hone in on potential areas of need for professional development and further instructional support.

- Individuals within curriculum and instruction departments, including curriculum coordinators, special education staff, and English language learner specialists, are typically evaluated based upon content knowledge, implementation of research-based strategies for instruction, incorporation of specific school and district needs and goals, ability to create a positive environment to support instructional improvement, success in collaborative work with teaching staff, and professional job performance. Most evaluation processes are carried out through the use of rubrics or other evaluation tools by the individual’s direct supervisor or another evaluator.

- Although Lubbock Independent School District uses some quantitative key performance indicators to hold curriculum and instruction staff accountable for quality job performance, this is a rare practice. District evaluation of instructional support staff tends to rely more heavily on qualitative measures, including supervisor observations and interviews, or on semi-quantitative measures, including survey and focus group results.

- Although research is unclear about the optimal organizational structure for curriculum and instruction divisions within the central office, school districts can improve instructional support to individual schools by eliminating bureaucratic inefficiencies and adopting a customer-service orientation. Creating a collaborative environment, both within the district and between the district and the schools, allows district instructional staff to employ coherent and consistent strategies for high-quality instruction, target specific needs of individual schools, mobilize needed resources, and quickly solve school-level problems.
SECTION I: EVALUATION PRACTICES FOR DISTRICT OFFICE AND STAFF

The following section examines common district practices for evaluating the effectiveness of curriculum and instruction departments. The first subsection details practices for evaluation of the general office, while the following three sections examine the practices surrounding the evaluation of specific individuals within the curriculum and instruction department, including curriculum coordinators, special education support staff, and bilingual education support staff.

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION DEPARTMENT EVALUATION

According to a 2004 report on the characteristics of school districts that were able to improve student achievement in the previous two decades, district leadership in providing quality instruction and learning is essential.\(^1\) The role of the central school district in improving school districts through curricular and instructional support included: setting high expectations and accountability for adults, coordinating and aligning district curriculum and assessment and ensuring alignment with state and district standards, creating coherent and embedded professional development opportunities, and promoting overall high quality instruction.\(^2\)

In addition to planning and implementing reform initiatives, evaluation of academic programs created and implemented by the curriculum and instruction office or division is an essential step in effective curricular and instructional leadership.\(^3\) Accordingly, a 2013 report on improving district leadership in large school districts recommends that curriculum and instruction office staff take the following actions while evaluating and revising the district’s strategic plan:\(^4\)

- Put in place powerful data systems that are easy to access and query and that house multiple data sources;
- Provide time to meet and review data at various system levels and adjust strategies as needed;
- Implement frequent monitoring processes like structured walk-throughs to gauge implementation and progress to support needs;
- Implement frequent formative assessments to provide timely diagnostic information on mastery of what is taught; and

---

- Create an overarching accountability tool to help organize the process of reviewing and responding to data and include innovative models within the tool.

While student achievement data collection can help curriculum and instruction departments within the district office target specific areas of need within schools, a large number of factors that cannot be attributed to central office efforts alone affect student achievement.\(^5\) In order to evaluate the efforts of district curriculum and their instruction department, districts need to consider a variety of quality indicators for effective leadership and best practices for instruction. Some districts and states provide clear evaluation criteria for the quality of curricular and instructional functions at the district office level. For example, the Idaho Department of Education provides districts with a “self-assessment tool” to determine whether or not the district office accomplishes its missions and goals. Quality indicators relating to district curriculum and instruction offices are listed in Figure 1.1 below.

**Figure 1.1 Quality Indicators for District Office Assessment: Curriculum and Instruction Functions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRICULUM</th>
<th>INSTRUCTION</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A written curriculum is provided and utilized for each subject area.</td>
<td>• The district policies and procedures address:</td>
<td>• The district participates in the annual statewide student assessment program as required by Administrative Rules.</td>
<td>• The district involves staff in the development and implementation of district professional development plans that align with the goals defined in the district strategic plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The district effectively implements a well-defined plan for the review and adoption of curriculum and materials.</td>
<td>• A parent-approved student learning plan by the end of eighth grade or by age 14 for special education students regardless of grade level. (N/A for K-7)</td>
<td>• The district regularly monitors student achievement.</td>
<td>• Professional development is an integral part of and aligned with the district strategic plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The district selects primary curricular materials for all subject areas from the Idaho Adoption Guide as approved by the State Board of Education.</td>
<td>• An individual learning plan that is aligned with the Idaho Content Standards for limited English proficient students who require testing accommodations.</td>
<td>• The district uses data to improve student performance, facilitate high quality instruction and provide appropriate intervention.</td>
<td>• The district has ensured that time and resources are made available to staff in order to meet professional development needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The district effectively implements a well-defined plan for the integration of technology into its curriculum, instruction and assessments.</td>
<td>• A current individual education plan that is aligned with the Idaho Content Standards for all special education students.</td>
<td>• The district communicates district and school progress in achieving all district-wide expectations for student learning to the community.</td>
<td>• The district provides the organizational structure, support, time, and resources to schools in order to meet the objectives of individual and school-wide professional development plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Curricular coordination and articulation shall be evident between and among all academic areas and schools in the district.</td>
<td>• A current individual education plan that is aligned with the Idaho Content Standards for all special education students.</td>
<td>• Allocation of instructional time to support student learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The district shall commit time, financial resources and personnel to curriculum development, evaluation, and revision.</td>
<td>• Allocation of instructional time to support student learning.</td>
<td>• The district endeavors to meet the teacher/student ratios and teacher loads recommended by the state.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Idaho Department of Education\(^6\)

---

\(^5\) Ibid, p. 127.

Curriculum and instruction leadership at the district level is led by central office administrators, sometimes including superintendents of curriculum and instruction, chief academic officers, and/or curriculum directors. While all administrators are responsible, directly or indirectly for advancing the district goals to improve student success and achievement, administrators that deal directly with curriculum and instruction are charged with taking specific actions to improve teaching and learning in district schools.

The Council of Chief State School Officers offers a model for district leadership evaluation across six key performance expectations, the most central and overarching of which is “teaching and learning” (see Figure 1.2). The performance standards for teaching and learning emphasize coordinating and distributing responsibilities for quality assurance, ensuring coherence across the curriculum and instructional system, and development of a professional culture that recognizes and implements targeted learning objectives and uses appropriate and equitable differentiation. Under the system, central office instructional leaders are evaluated based upon three elements: strong professional culture, rigorous curriculum and instruction, and assessment and accountability. In order to support a strong professional culture, administrators should support teacher learning and align efforts to school and district vision and goals. Administrators in the curriculum and instruction office can ensure rigorous curricula by creating district-wide material that is aligned to content standards, incorporates high-quality research and data-based strategies for instruction, and includes appropriate differentiation for students of varying levels of ability. The final element — “assessment and accountability” — requires leaders to “make appropriate, sound use of assessments, performance management, and accountability strategies to achieve vision, mission, and goals.”

The Washington Association of School Administrators offers additional evaluation criteria specifically for Central Office administrators, including those involved in curriculum and learning. Figure 1.3 on the following page displays the WASA framework for central office administrator performance standards related to curriculum and instruction, including

---

10 Ibid, pp. 16-18.
quality classroom instruction, coordinated and aligned curriculum development, and 
coordinated and job-embedded professional development. Each category contains 
standards for knowledge and skills, actions taken to support skills, and evidence and 
measures to assess performance.

Figure 1.3 Central Office Administrators Quality Indicators for Curriculum and Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS</th>
<th>SUPPORT TO SCHOOLS</th>
<th>EVIDENCE AND MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUALITY CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Articulates the district’s instructional framework to ensure student achievement.</td>
<td>✓ Clearly communicates the instructional framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Makes district decisions within the context of the instructional framework.</td>
<td>✓ Models effective instructional practices in district/building meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Monitors and supports classroom practices and provides guidance for improving teaching and learning.</td>
<td>✓ Participates and supports regular schedule of classroom walkthroughs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Leads district framework process across the district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Provides training for leaders and teachers to ensure consistent application of the instructional framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Instructional framework evident in buildings, classroom, and practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Reviews records of district decisions in regard to instructional practice. Has and uses a framework for walkthroughs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Collects walk-through data showing classroom practices consistent with the instructional framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Training schedules, lesson plans, meeting notes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COORDINATED AND AlIGNED CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT**

| ✓ Ensures curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices and policies are aligned and implemented. |
| ✓ Coordinates and maintains curriculum and assessment practices and decisions that align with district framework in order to meet the needs of diverse student populations. |
| ✓ Reviews curriculum/assessment practices and board policy with leadership teams. |
| ✓ Consistently provides updates to building leaders and staff |
| ✓ Schedules or coordinates vertical teams, curriculum committees. |
| ✓ Facilitates or supports planning of district teams and committees. |
| ✓ Updates, agendas, and minutes. |
| ✓ Examples of curriculum framework, assessment matrix. |
| Schedules, agendas, timeline. |
| ✓ Products created by vertical teams and curriculum committees. |

**COORDINATED AND JOB-EMBEDDED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

| ✓ Identifies professional development that has the greatest potential for high-leverage change in instructional practice. |
| ✓ Fosters high-quality, ongoing, job-embedded professional development focused on improving classroom instruction. Supports implementation of professional development program that supports the instructional framework. |
| ✓ Systematic data collection documenting changing practice following professional development. |
| Meets with building leadership team to monitor implementation of professional development plan. |
| ✓ Advocates for resources including time for professional development. |
| Allocates resources based on building needs and implementation of instructional framework. |
| ✓ Supports administrator professional development around quality instruction. |
| ✓ Supports administration learning communities. |
| ✓ Data artifacts, feedback from coaches, consultants, etc. |
| ✓ Agendas, minutes. |
| ✓ Professional development plan. |
| ✓ Professional development evaluations and collected data on impact. |
| ✓ Budget and time allocated for targeted professional development. |
| ✓ Interviews with principals. |
| Professional development plan. |
| ✓ Professional development evaluations and collected data on impact. |
| ✓ Budget and time allocated for targeted professional development. |
| ✓ Artifacts from professional development. |
| ✓ Video tapes, classroom observation notes. |

Source: Washington Association of School Administrators

CURRICULUM COORDINATORS

Curriculum coordinators, or instructional specialists/coaches, are common district office staff members whose job is typically to oversee school curricula and teaching standards. Job responsibilities of a curriculum coordinator include: 12

- Develop and coordinate the implementation of curriculum;
- Plan, organize, and conduct teacher training conferences or workshops;
- Observe and evaluate teacher’s instruction and analyze student test data;
- Assess and discuss the implementation of education standards with school staff;
- Review and recommend teaching techniques and the use of different or new technologies;
- Develop procedures for teachers to implement the curriculum;
- Train teachers and other instructional staff in new content or programs; and
- Mentor or coach teachers to improve their skills.

Many states and districts use rubric tools to evaluate the performance of curriculum coordinators, which generally measure qualitative criteria for best practices and desirable professional qualities as assessed by the staff member’s immediate supervisor or another administrator. Although district rubrics vary, most evaluation criteria includes content knowledge, implementation of research-based strategies for instruction, incorporation of specific school and district needs and goals, ability to create a positive environment to support instructional improvement, success in collaborative work with teaching staff, and professional job performance. 13 Some evaluation criteria, like that in Spokane Public Schools, include measures of performance that focus more heavily on curriculum coordinator interactions with students, including “interest in teaching pupils,” “classroom management,” and “handling of student discipline and attendance problems.” 14 Performance criteria in Warren County Public Schools include additional standards related to the implementation of appropriate technology to enhance instruction. 15

The Arkansas Department of Education evaluation criteria for instructional specialists, which assesses quality job performance across four dimensions, including planning and preparation, environment, delivery of service, and professional responsibilities, is displayed in Figure 1.4 below. The evaluation tool includes several standards for performance under each domain, in addition to criteria for “unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, or distinguished” performance under each standard. The rubric also includes sample indicators of proficiency for each standard. For example, sample indicators for the performance standard “develops processes and procedures for teacher to participate in support activities” include:  

- Processes and procedures are clearly defined;  
- Teachers can describe how to access instructional support services;  
- Teachers access desired services using the established procedures; and  
- Specialist promotes understanding and use of the processes and procedures.

The instructional specialist’s supervisor can assess these measures of job performance through observations, interviews, conferences, and/or teacher surveys. An example of the formative and summative evaluation forms used by Warren County Schools to assess curriculum coordinators through conference and observation can be found in Appendix I.

Figure 1.4 Performance Standards for Instructional Specialists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNING AND PREPARATION</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>DELIVERY OF SERVICE</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates understanding of the underlying research, theories, knowledge, and skills of the discipline</td>
<td>• Creates a respectful, emotionally safe culture that promotes collaboration</td>
<td>• Collaborates with teachers to design rigorous, standards-based classroom instruction</td>
<td>• Reviews and reflects on practice to inform improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies the instructional improvement needs of the teachers served</td>
<td>• Promotes a culture of continuous instructional improvement</td>
<td>• Addresses the instructional improvement needs of the teachers served</td>
<td>• Follows established procedures for developing and submitting accurate and timely record, budgets, and reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies clear, specific, and appropriate goals for the instructional support program</td>
<td>• Develops processes and procedures for teachers to participate in support activities</td>
<td>• Engages teachers in learning new instructional strategies and practices</td>
<td>• Coordinates improvement efforts with other specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies resources for the instructional support program that are available within/outside the district</td>
<td>• Establishes clearly defined norms for professional conduct</td>
<td>• Provides relevant and timely feedback to teachers</td>
<td>• Engages with the larger school community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plans a coherent program of instructional support fully integrated with the school program</td>
<td>• Organizes physical space for professional learning</td>
<td>• Provides responsive professional support</td>
<td>• Enhances professional capacity through ongoing professional learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develops a plan and process for the ongoing assessment and improvement of instructional support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrates professionalism by adhering to the highest standards of integrity and confidentiality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Arkansas Department of Education

---

17 Ibid.
**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

Evaluating special education programs presents a particular challenge to school districts, due to the unique needs of student populations, the difficulty in using value-added measures for student achievement in certain student populations, the variety of specialized support positions, and the complex legal environment surrounding the programs.\(^{18}\) Many evaluations of district special education programs use surveys of parents and staff to gather stakeholder perceptions and to determine if student needs are being met (see Appendix II for example survey tools used by North St. Paul-Maplewood-Oakdale Independent School District to assess perceptions of parents, staff, and administrators in special education programs).\(^{19}\) Other frequently used measures for the effectiveness of special education programs at the district level include student dropout rate, percentage of time spent in general education, timeliness of the identification and referral process, equitable representation of minorities and English language learners in special education programs, and, when possible, student achievement data.\(^{20}\)

The New York State Education Department provides a number of standards and quality indicators for high-quality instruction in special education programs, identified through evidence-based research on best practices. For each standard, the evaluation criteria include a “driving question” that evaluators should seek to address. Figure 1.5 on the following page displays the special education program standards, driving questions, and quality indicators. The evaluation tool also includes a number of suggestions for supporting evidence for each quality indicator, available for review on the NYSED website.\(^{21}\)

---


---

### Figure 1.5 Quality Indicators for Special Education Instructional Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>DRIVING QUESTION</th>
<th>QUALITY INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Structured, predictable school and classroom environment | Do school/classroom structures support student success or present a barrier to it? | • The instructional environment is designed to support individual student needs.  
• Student participates in the general education environment including curriculum and instruction, assessment, and social activities based on individual student needs.  
• High expectations for all students are clearly articulated and defined.  
• Classroom climate is conducive to learning. |
| Planning for effective instruction             | Do the strengths and needs of each student drive instructional decision-making? | • Instruction is individually planned to address student needs.  
• Planned instruction is goal directed.  
• The plan includes direct instruction to explicitly teach academic content and skills.  
• The plan includes explicit instruction in the use of strategies for learning.  
• Self-regulation/executive functions are an integral part of instruction: compensatory strategies and effective habits of mind are taught.  
• Instructional and assessment accommodations for learner needs are planned and individualized. |
| Effective implementation of specially-designed instruction | Does the specially designed instruction improve student learning? | • Roles and responsibilities of service providers are clearly defined and implemented.  
• Delivery of instruction maximizes student learning.  
• Instructional groups are appropriate to support learner outcomes.  
• Supplemental supports and services are effectively used. |
| Ongoing assessment of student progress         | Are instructional decisions data-based and aligned with standards and curriculum? | • Curriculum-based assessments (both formative and summative) are used to monitor student progress.  
• Assessments are aligned with the clearly constructed/formulated objectives of the lesson/unit.  
• Teacher uses formative assessments while teaching to inform instruction.  
• Data is recorded and analyzed to inform the instructional planning for students with disabilities.  |
|                                               | Do instructional decisions support participation and progress of students with disabilities in general education curriculum? |                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

Source: New York State Education Department\(^{22}\)

School districts typically use specialized evaluation tools to assess the performance of individual instructional and support staff members in special education departments. The Educational Specialist Effectiveness Performance Evaluation System (ESEPES), which is used and adapted by a number of districts to evaluate education specialists, provides evaluation criteria for school and district staff members that provide support to students, teachers, and parents. Education specialists that work in special education programs include:\(^{23}\)

---

\(^{22}\) Ibid.  
Occupational therapists;
- Physical therapists;
- Speech and language pathologists; and
- Other unidentified support staff.

Under ESEPES, education specialists are evaluated based upon seven performance standards (see Figure 1.6) including: professional knowledge, program planning and management, program delivery, assessment, communication and collaboration, professionalism, and learner/program progress. Each standard includes corresponding sample performance indicators that offer clarification of expectations for each standard and potential sources of quality job performance evidence. ESEPES encourages evaluators to gather evidence from five sources: observations, documentation logs, client surveys, and student learning/program objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Professional Knowledge**  
The educational specialist uses professional knowledge to address the needs of the target learning community while demonstrating respect for individual differences, cultures, and learning needs. | 1.1 Demonstrates knowledge and skills relevant to the profession.  
1.2 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the learner.  
1.3 Promotes and models respect for individual and cultural differences.  
1.4 Uses district, school, family, and community resources to help meet learner and/or program needs.  
1.5 Identifies various learning styles and individual needs to assist in the implementation of intervention plans.  
1.6 Understands one’s responsibility to the system and collaborates in order to meet learner needs. |
| **Program Planning and Management**  
The educational specialist effectively plans, coordinates, and manages programs and services consistent with established guidelines, policies, and procedures. | 2.1 Understands and follows applicable local, state and federal regulations, policies, guidelines, and procedures.  
2.2 Provides a safe and appropriate environment for service delivery.  
2.3 Organizes and maintains appropriate program and learner records.  
2.4 Demonstrates effective scheduling and time management skills.  
2.5 Identifies and manages available resources (human and financial) to address learner and program needs.  
2.6 Adheres to proper procedures for using, maintaining, updating, and securing program materials.  
2.7 Maintains fidelity in delivering programs and services. |

---

24 Ibid, p. 4.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Delivery</strong></td>
<td>The educational specialist uses professional knowledge to implement a variety of services for the targeted learning community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Selects, develops, organizes, implements, and supports curriculum for specific learner and/or program needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Uses technology, materials, and other resources as appropriate to deliver services and programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Presents information and provides services using a variety of strategies or approaches to meet the needs of the learning community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Collaborates with instructional staff to design, implement, or support services for specific learner or program needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 On a continual basis, consults with administration, parents, community agencies, school, and support personnel to resolve issues and/or communicate progress related to the provision of programs/services to individual learners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Provides services that will support mastery of state and national standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Provides policies, programs, and procedures related to the delivery of services to learners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td>The educational specialist gathers, analyzes, and uses data to determine learner/program needs, measure learner/program progress, guide instruction and intervention, and provide timely feedback to learners, families, staff, and the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Demonstrates proficiency in administering, scoring, evaluating, and interpreting data from instruments or records.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Provides accurate feedback to learners, families, and staff on assessment results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Uses assessment information in making recommendations or decisions that are in the best interest of the learner/school/district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Uses assessment data to modify strategies, interventions, services, and programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Uses data to assess learner and/or program needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Uses data to assess learner and/or program outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Documents learner and/or program outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication and Collaboration</strong></td>
<td>The educational specialist communicates and collaborates effectively with learners, families, staff, and the community to promote student learning and well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Supports, promotes, and communicates the mission, vision, and goals of the school and the district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Uses effective written, verbal, and nonverbal communication skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Initiates, maintains, and appropriately documents communication to support the needs and progress of the learning community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Supports learner success and well-being by working collaboratively with stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Collaborates with stakeholders to design, implement, and/or support services for specific learner or program needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Responds promptly to learner, family, staff, and community concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 Actively assumes an advocacy role for learners and families.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 Uses resources, including technology, to effectively communicate with stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professionalism</strong></td>
<td>The educational specialist demonstrates behavior consistent with legal, ethical, and professional standards, contributes to the profession, and engages in professional growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Follows federal and state guidelines and school board policies and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Maintains positive professional behavior (e.g., appearance, demeanor, punctuality, and attendance).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Performs assigned duties in a timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Respects and maintains confidentiality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Evaluates and identifies strengths and areas for growth related to professional skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 Sets measurable goals for improvement of skills and professional performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7 Participates in professional growth activities and incorporates learning into professional practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8 Mentors, trains, and/or supports colleagues in professional growth opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9 Contributes to the organization and community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.10 Adheres to professional, legal, and ethical standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learner/Program Progress</strong></td>
<td>The work of the educational specialist results in acceptable and measurable learner or program progress based on established standards, district goals, and/or school goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Sets measurable, reasonable, and appropriate goals for learner/program progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Assesses prerequisite developmental knowledge and skills to determine initial level of service delivery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Monitors learner/program progress through the use of appropriate assessments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Identifies and establishes additional means of support to increase learner/program progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Provides evidence that learner/programs are meeting measurable, reasonable, and appropriate outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Stronge and Caine Tenneson

---

The District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) IMPACT Evaluation system recognizes 19 distinct groups of personnel that work at public schools, including Special Education Coordinators (SECs). Special Education Coordinators and IEP Case Managers at DCPS act as a point of contact for all special education issues in a particular school, including identifying children that might need special education services and organizing the necessary meetings related to special education.²⁷ Under the IMPACT evaluation system, SEC performance is measured through five components (see Figure 1.7).

The “Program Coordinator and Dean Standards” make up 40 percent of SEC evaluation scores, and are assessed by the administrator that oversees the SEC. The standards include core job functions, programmatic goals, positive rapport with students and families, collaboration, adaptability, use of data, and management and leadership.²⁸ In addition, “School Individual Education Plan Timeliness” measures the proportion of student IEP renewed on time each year at each school in which an SEC works; “School Eligibility Timeliness” measures the “extent to which the special education eligibility process required for students at [each] school are completed within the timeframe.”²⁹ SECs are scored from one to four for both timeliness measures based upon performance, with any rate of completion of less than 90 percent in either area earning the lowest possible score.³⁰ “Commitment to the School Community” is measured by the SEC administrator, and includes job aspects such as support for school initiatives, support of special education and ELL programs, and partnership with families.³¹ “Core Professionalism” is measured for each employment area; however, it does not influence the IMPACT score. Aspects of Core Professionalism include attendance, on-time arrival, adherence to policies and procedures, and respect.³²

Figure 1.7 Special Education Coordinator Evaluation System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT COMPONENT</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator and Dean Standards</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Individual Education Plan Timeliness</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Eligibility Timeliness</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the School Community</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Professionalism</td>
<td>Unscored</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DCPS IMPACT³³

²⁷ “Common Terms in Special Education.” District of Columbia Public Schools.  
http://dcps.dc.gov/DCPS/In-the-Classroom/Special-Education/Common+Terms+in+Special+Education#14
²⁹ Ibid, p. 18.
³¹ Ibid, p. 22.
³² Ibid, p. 28.
**ELL District Staff**

Many schools districts have additional central office staff members to oversee the English language learner (ELL) or bilingual education program. In order to evaluate the quality of the ELL district office, districts typically examine data including: state assessment data and other student achievement data, instructional practices and differentiation of instruction, and surveys, focus groups, and qualitative interviews with stakeholders.\(^3^4\)

In addition to collecting student achievement data and other information on student progress and retention, Batavia Public Schools in Batavia, Illinois collects survey information from parents, staff, and administrators to gather perceptions of ELL program quality from various stakeholders. Through the survey, BPS discovers information about knowledge of ELL program and policies, academic rigor, access to services, areas that need improvement, and perceptions of communication practices and involvement with parents from all involved parties.\(^3^5\) Excerpts of the survey tool used by BPS can be found in Appendix III.

Dekalb County Schools in Fort Payne, Alabama require that the district office carry out a program evaluation of the ELL program each year, in order to ensure that programming is supporting students to achieve independent functioning in the mainstream classroom. While informal evaluations of the program are conducted throughout the school year, formal evaluations are carried out at the end of each school year and require the collection of data from each school (see Figure 1.8 on the following page). Based on the data collected, each school is ultimately held accountable for:\(^3^6\)

- Annual increases in the number or percentage of students making progress in learning English;
- Annual increases in the number or percentage of students attaining English proficiency by the end of the school year;
- Adequate yearly progress, as defined by the state, for LEP students; and
- The percentage of LEP students who participate in the state’s student assessment system (must have 95 percent participation of the LEP subgroup on state assessments).

The “School Compliance Checklist” provided by Dekalb County Schools for the assessment of ELL programs is provided in Appendix IV.

---


## Figure 1.8 ELL Program Assessment Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Category</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| General Information                 | - Number of limited-English proficient students at each school  
- Number of students by gender and ethnicity who participate in the ELL program  
- ELL student enrollment by language and grade level |
| Identification and Assessment       | - The individual, by position, who is responsible for ensuring that the Home Language Survey has been completed for each student registering for enrollment for the first time. A description of how this information is maintained, by whom, and where  
- The number of Home Language Surveys currently on file  
- The number of students identified as having a primary or home language other than English who are not receiving services  
- The number of students of parents/legal guardians who waived English language instruction educational program student services during the year  
- The number of newly identified students assessed for English proficiency during the year  
- The number of new students enrolled in the district’s English language instructional program during the year |
| Program Exit Information            | - Criteria used by the district to determine when a student is ready to exit the English language instruction educational program  
- Transitional services provided by the LEA to students who have exited the ELL program  
- The number of students who exited the ELL program  
- The number of students who returned to the English language instruction program, by school and for the district  
- The number of students who received passing grades without transitional services or classroom modifications, by school and for the district  
- The number of years a district monitors the progress of former ELL students who have exited the ELL program  
- Number of ELLs who are in their first year of school in the United States  
- Number of ELLs who are in their second or higher of school in the United States  
- Number of students who are in the first year of monitoring as Former Limited English proficient students  
- Number of students considered Former Limited English Proficient (successfully completed 2 years of monitoring) |
| Participation in Other Programs     | - The number of ELL and general education students referred for special education evaluation by the school and for the district  
- The number of ELL and general education students who qualified for placement in special education programs and/or services by the school and for the district  
- The total number of ELL and general education students currently enrolled in the district’s special education program  
- The number of ELL and general education students referred for admission to the district’s gifted and talented program  
- The total number of ELL and general education students currently enrolled in the district’s career-technical education program  
- The number of ELL and general education students participating in extracurricular activities and clubs  
- The number of ELL students and general education students who received an honor or award during the school year  
- The number of ELL and general education students being served by Title I |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Category</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **State Assessment Reporting**           | • The percentage of Title III served LEP students scoring proficient or above on the mathematics portion of the Alabama Reading and Math Test (ARMT)  
• The percentage of Title III served LEP students scoring proficient or above on the reading/language arts portion of the ARMT  
• The percentage of Title III served former LEP (monitor years one and two) students scoring proficient or above in the mathematics portion of the ARMT  
• The percentage of Title III served former LEP (monitor years one and two) students scoring proficient or above on the reading/language arts portion of the ARMT |
| **English Language Proficiency**         | • The number of ELLs making progress in learning English according to the ACCESS for ELLs scores  
• The number of ELLs attaining English Language proficiency by the end of the school year  
• The number of ELLs exiting the ELL program (including those in monitoring) |
| **Staffing**                             | • The number of ESL certified teachers in the school and district  
• The number of teachers highly qualified to teach ESL but not ESL certified  
• The number of certified teachers teaching ESL (certified in a field other than ESL)  
• The number of paraprofessionals working in the ELL program  
• The number of highly qualified ELL professionals |
| **Training**                             | • A list and brief description of English language instruction educational program training provided for all personnel at each school and in the district, including the date, the intended audience, and the number of participants |
| **Communication**                        | • The number and name of different languages for which the district has written school-related documents  
• A list of interpreters who are readily available to assist in parent/guardian communication and a description of how the list is maintained, by whom, and where  
• A description of efforts and activities to involve parents/guardians in the educational process |
| **General Comparison Information**       | • The district’s number of ELL and general education dropouts  
• The total number of truancy petitions for ELL and general education students the district has issued during the year  
• The number of ELL and general education seniors that graduated.  
• The number of ELLs and general education students receiving supplemental services  
• The number of ELL and general education students prohibited or excluded from extracurricular activities based on grades.  
• The number of high school ELLs using elective credit for ELL services.  
• The number of ELL and general education students enrolled by grade level.  
• The number of ELL and general education students retained by grade level. |
| **Meeting Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives** | • Percent of ELLs making Adequate Progress in Language Acquisition (AMAO-A)  
• Percent of ELLs attaining English language proficiency (AMAO-B)  
• Meeting AYP requirements for the ELL subgroup at the LEA level (AMAO-C) |

Source: Dekalb County Schools\(^{37}\)

\(^{37}\) Ibid, pp. 43-46.
Much like special education support staff, ELL support staff can be difficult to evaluate based upon value-added measures.\textsuperscript{38} Specialists that work with ELL students are sometimes evaluated using the same criteria as those involved in special education (see Figure 1.6 in the previous subsection).\textsuperscript{39}

The DCPS IMPACT evaluation system provides an evaluation tool for assessing the performance of itinerant ELL Teachers (see Figure 1.9), who work as ELL specialists with students across a number of different schools in order to improve instruction for ELL students. Itinerant teachers under the IMPACT system are evaluated by their direct supervisor through observations and interviews based upon their mastery and use of the “teaching and learning framework,” which details best practices for instruction of ELL students. The remaining 15 percent of the itinerant ELL teacher IMPACT score is calculated by assessment that is designed by the teacher or department, but aligned to DCPS curricular standards. Core professionalism, which is considered during the evaluation process but not scored, includes factors such as attendance, on-time arrival, and respect in the work environment.\textsuperscript{41}

\textbf{Figure 1.9 Itinerant ELL Teacher Evaluation Criteria}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT COMPONENT</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning Framework</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Assessed Student Achievement Data</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Professionalism</td>
<td>Unscored</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DCPS IMPACT\textsuperscript{40}

\textsuperscript{38} Holdheide, Goe, Croft, and Reschly, Op. cit, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{39} “Examples of State and District Rubrics Used to Evaluate Specialized Instructional Support Personnel.” Center on Great Teachers and Leaders. http://www.gtlcenter.org/content/examples-state-and-district-rubrics-used-evaluate-specialized-instructional-support
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid, p. 6.
SECTION II: DISTRICT PROFILE

The following section details the quantitative and qualitative performance indicators used by Lubbock Independent School District in its 2013-2014 District Improvement Plan for several district staff roles, including curriculum coordinators, special education district staff, and English language learner district staff.

LUBBOCK INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Lubbock Independent School District (LISD) in Lubbock, Texas enrolled 28,790 students and employed 1,930 teachers as of 2012. In its 2013-2014 District Improvement Plan, LISD identifies the specific responsibilities of many district office staff members, including those in the curriculum and instruction office, the special education department, and district office staff members that work with English language learners (ELLs). The responsibilities outlined for each role in the District Improvement Plan include quantitative and qualitative measures for formative and summative evaluation.

CURRICULUM COORDINATORS

LISD employs one instructional/curriculum coordinator and two instructional coaches for each of four core subjects: English language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science. The District Improvement plan describes the responsibilities of curriculum coordinators (seen in Figure 2.1 on the following page), including performance objectives within overarching district goals and specific activities that the curriculum coordinators should play a role in carrying out. Each “activity” includes formative and summative evaluation criteria as indicators of quality job performance. While some indicators include student achievement data, many indicators address curriculum coordinator goals beyond increasing student achievement, including teacher attendance and certificates of completion at professional development trainings, number of new teachers assigned to an experienced teacher-mentor and number of students pursuing coherent career and technical education coursework.

### Figure 2.1 Curriculum Coordinator Responsibilities and Evaluation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Goal 1:</strong> Be the district of choice for the community by providing the highest quality programming and unprecedented support for students, teachers and parents in a safe and nurturing environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Objective:</strong> To provide the highest quality academic programming in the Lubbock area, as measured by state and national assessment scores and program participation numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement district-wide mentoring program for new teachers.</td>
<td>• Attendance of new teachers at mentoring events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a Summer Leadership Institute to address district-wide identified needs and to build campus leadership.</td>
<td>• Attendance at retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation of data by district and campus committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide district-wide new teacher training before school begins to emphasize the importance of teamwork and to disseminate district goals.</td>
<td>• Attendance at training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation of data by district and campus committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide district-wide team building through Convocation prior to the beginning of the school year.</td>
<td>• Teacher input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation by district and campus committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Goal 2:</strong> Demonstrate high expectations for all students by providing challenging, effective, and engaging educational environments and by continually monitoring students’ academic growth toward college readiness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Objective:</strong> Achieve student academic growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubbock ISD will conduct a comprehensive needs assessment to make data-driven decisions toward the goal of maximizing student achievement for all students. This comprehensive needs assessment will include data from state assessments.</td>
<td>• District Educational Improvement Committee will review compilation of needs assessment data by December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• District Educational Improvement Committee will review needs assessment data and utilize data in updating and revising district plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Spring benchmark and data analysis to serve as basis for focused interventions targeting areas of greatest instructional needs.</td>
<td>• Result analysis of benchmark testing data from Eduphoria analyzed in Professional Learning Communities by teachers, CALs, and administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Data analysis of 2014 STAAR results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District STAAR and alternate test results will be analyzed by entire staff and used to revise instructional program for 2013-2014 school year.</td>
<td>• Scope and sequence revision completed prior to first day of duty, August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Revised scope and sequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development will be targeted to improve student achievement. Individual teachers will attend staff development that targets self-designated and district-designated needs.</td>
<td>• Professional Development Appraisal System (PDAS) reviews and teacher personal reflection plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning for continuing professional development based on 2014 STAAR results occurring during summer 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The district will continue to hire, retain, and develop a highly qualified staff.</td>
<td>• PDAS, NCLB Highly Qualified Teacher analysis process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff turnover rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PDAS and STAAR scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Highly Qualified (HQ) Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceleration opportunities will be scheduled for all students who have failed any portion of the STAAR test.</td>
<td>• STAAR results from Spring 2014; District six-week assessment; STAAR benchmark in Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Benchmark testing data; 2014 STAAR scores; STAAR data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment for Advanced Placement courses will be analyzed and curriculum revisions in AP courses will be made in order to improve AP program and AP exam scores.</td>
<td>• Assessment data received in July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessment data reviewed by AP teachers, High School principal, and Asst. Supt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide immediate, intense, targeted Tier II and Tier III acceleration opportunities for students failing to master academic objectives.</td>
<td>• Six week grades; six-week assessments; intervention system progress monitoring data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• STAAR data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Special Education District Staff

The LISD Special Education Department employs one Executive Director and five special education coordinators. Four of the coordinators are assigned to specific school sites, where the coordinator oversees several schools within a “quad team” that includes one coordinator, one licensed specialist in school psychology (LSSP), and one behavior specialist. A fifth coordinator oversees special education and instructional services across the district with assistance from a professional development/instructional services specialist. The department also includes many other staff members in various departments, including the Regional Department for the Deaf, Behavior and Psychological Services, Homebound Students, Diagnostic Services, Speech Services, Assistive Technology Services, Special Education Records Services, and Vocational Training Center.46

The LISD District Improvement Plan does not include specific responsibility and evaluation information for district special education staff members; however, the Executive Director of Special Education is tasked with a number of activities, including health and safety-related measures; increasing overall student academic growth; the improvement of Career and

---

45 Ibid.
Technical Education (CTE) programs; ensuring equal representation and access to the
general education curriculum for English Language Learners (ELLs); and improving the
academic growth of special education students. Formative and summative evaluation
measures for specific activities for which the Executive Director of Special Education has full
or shared responsibility are listed in Figure 2.2 below. Specific factors other than student
achievement data examined include: the number of students with special needs identified
and served, the ratio of highly-qualified teachers and paraprofessionals in special education
programs, teacher attendance at professional development programs, measurements of
equity within programs through measuring the ratio of minority students identified for
special education, among others.  

Figure 2.2 Special Education Executive Director Responsibilities and Evaluation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Goal 1: Be the district of choice for the community by providing the highest quality programming and unprecedented support for students, teachers and parents in a safe and nurturing environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Objective: To provide a comprehensive focus on health, safety and well-being, as measured by health and fitness data as well as state and national academic assessment data</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Adopt effective and comprehensive discipline strategies, classroom management, crisis management, and conflict resolution plans. | - Attendance in Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs (AEPs);
- Number and type of discipline referrals
- Suspension and expulsion rates;
- Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS) report;
- Evaluation by Principals and Supt.;
- LISD police reports |
| Provide an effective and comprehensive Alternative Education Program (AEP). | - Attendance in AEPs;
- Academic progress of students in AEP
- Evaluation by Principals, Assoc. Supts., and Supt. |
| Provide prevention programs in the areas of drugs, violence, and suicide. | - Plans and dates of activities
- Evaluation report of serious violations and evaluation of program effectiveness by campus committees, Principals, Assoc. Supts., and Supt. |
| Provide accelerated educational program services for all students identified at-risk: including Title I, migrant, ESL, pregnant, or parents. | - Number of students served,
- Number of LEP exemptions
- STAAR data and results of other appropriate assessments |
| Provide accelerated education program services for all students identified as migrant, dyslexic, 504, homeless, or homebound. | - Number of students served
- STAAR data and results of other appropriate assessments |
| Increase district attendance rate through activities/support such as CIS, data monitoring, attendance officers, incentives, and social workers. | - Monitor attendance
- AEIS report 2013, 2014 |
| Increase district graduation rate through activities/support such as Expectation Graduation, credit recovery program, CIS, data monitoring, attendance officers, incentives, and social workers. | - Monitor attendance and academic progress
- Number graduating May 2014;
- PBMAS;
- AEIS report |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Goal 2: Demonstrate high expectations for all students by providing challenging, effective, and engaging educational environments and by continually monitoring students’ academic growth toward college readiness.</td>
<td><strong>Performance Objective: Achieve student academic growth</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Provide immediate, intense, targeted Tier II and Tier III acceleration opportunities for students failing to master academic objectives. | • Six week grades; six-week assessments;  
• Intervention system progress monitoring data  
• Six-week assessments; STAAR data |
| **Performance Objective: To improve Career and Technology Education (CTE) academic growth through challenging, effective, and engaging educational environments** | Provide transition activities for middle school to high school to work or to post-secondary education.  
• Lesson plans  
• List of senior students participating |
| Address PBMAS indicators with an Indicator Performance Level of “1” or greater. | • Student schedules;  
• Student Support Team Minutes;  
• ARD Committee Minutes  
• Placement of students in instructional settings;  
• SST interventions implemented;  
• Number of SPED referrals;  
• Number and ethnicity of SPED students identified |
| **Performance Objective: To improve ELL student academic growth through challenging, effective, and engaging educational environments** | Ensure that LEP students are not over-represented in special education or underrepresented in GT education.  
• List of identified/recommended students in either program  
• PBMAS data analysis |
| **Performance Objective: To improve SPED student academic growth through challenging, effective, and engaging educational environments** | Implement a full continuum of special education services to serve the academic needs of all special education students in the least restrictive environment.  
• ARDs/IEPs  
• PBMAS data |
| Ensure all teachers and paraprofessionals have the proper certification and/or endorsements and/or certificates of training required to teach in the special education program. | • Review of personnel files  
• Teacher/teacher assistants certificates on file |
| Provide research-based staff development, with input from staff. | • Staff development calendar  
• Attendance certificates |
| Ensure that all students with disabilities have access to the general curriculum in the least restrictive environment possible. | • ARD/IEP  
• Student schedules |
| Provide training to teachers regarding modifying the curriculum for students with disabilities. | • Agenda  
• Sign-in sheets |
| Provide parental involvement and opportunities for parents of students with disabilities to participate in school-sponsored activities. | • Parent Involvement activity calendar  
• Sign-in sheets |
| Reduce the percentage of special education student exemptions from STAAR into STAAR-M assessments. | • PBMAS  
• STAAR results  
• Reduced percentage of students taking STAAR-M or STAAR-ALT versions of state tests |
| Conduct a comprehensive RTI program that includes diagnostic assessments of students with disabilities to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses; prescribed interventions; and regular progress monitoring assessments to determine Response to Interventions. | • Disaggregated data STAAR results  
• IEP/Needs identified;  
• STAAR results AYP |
| Provide training to ARD committee. | • Training scheduled  
• Sign-in sheets |

Source: LISD District Improvement Plan

---

Ibid.
**ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNER DISTRICT STAFF**

While LISD does not explicitly state the roles and responsibilities of ELL staff at the district level, the District Improvement plan does include the improvement of ELL student academic growth as a specific performance objective. Figure 2.3 below displays the expected activities to advance the achievement of ELL students, the individuals responsible for carrying out the activity, and formative and summative evaluations that can be used as evidence of progress. The ELL program at LISD is located in the Student Support Services Department, and so activities are largely the responsibility of the Assistant Superintendent and Executive Director of Student Support Services (SSS).49

---

**Figure 2.3 District ELL Responsibilities and Evaluation Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Staff Members</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify and provide all LEP Students an ESL program that develops proficiency in the comprehension, speaking, reading, and composition of the English language.</td>
<td>Asst. Supt. Student Support Services (SSS) Exec. Dir. SSS Principals ESL Certified Teachers</td>
<td>• Home Language Survey  • List of ESL students  • Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) scores  • STAAR scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a comprehensive needs assessment of all ESL students to determine strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td>Asst. Supt. SSS Exec. Dir. SSS Principals ESL Certified Teachers</td>
<td>• Disaggregated scores of students  • Written annual evaluation of BE/ESL program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the percentage of LEP exemptions on STAAR.</td>
<td>Asst. Supt. SSS Exec. Dir. SSS Principals ESL Certified Teachers</td>
<td>• List of students exempted  • PBMAS data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the number of parent denials for ESL program.</td>
<td>Asst. Supt. SSS Exec. Dir. SSS Principals</td>
<td>• Conferences with parents  • List of students with denials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide staff development of professional staff and paraprofessionals that is researched-based with input from staff.</td>
<td>Asst. Supt. SSS Exec. Dir. SSS Principals ESL Certified Teachers</td>
<td>• Registration for workshops  • Attendance Certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that LEP students are not over-represented in special education or underrepresented in GT education.</td>
<td>Asst. Supt. SSS Exec. Dir. SSS Exec. Dir. Special Education (SPED) Coor. Advanced Academics (AA) Principals ESL Certified Teachers</td>
<td>• List of identified/recommended students in either program  • PBMAS data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that information to parents is provided in the home language.</td>
<td>Asst. Supt. SSS Exec. Dir. SSS Principals Language Proficiency Assessment Committee (LPAC)</td>
<td>• List of qualified translators  • Copies of notices sent to parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE STAFF MEMBERS</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Provide opportunities for parents of ESL students to participate in school-sponsored activities. | Asst. Supt. SSS  
Exec. Dir. SSS  
Principals  
ESL Certified Teachers  
LPAC members | • School calendar of parent involvement activities  
• Parent Sign-In sheets |
| Continue to recruit and retain highly qualified ESL staff including minorities. | Principals  
Asst. Supt. SSS  
Asst. Supt. Human Resources (HR)  
Exec. Dir. SSS  
Principals | • Positions posted  
• Fully certified staff hired |
| Increase the number of elementary core content teachers who are ESL certified. | Asst. Supt. SSS  
Exec. Dir. SSS  
Principals | • ESL certification exams  
• ESL Certifications |
| Provide six-week assessments translated into Spanish for elementary bilingual programs. | Asst. Supt. SSS  
Asst. Supt. Curriculum and Instruction (C&I)  
Exec. Dir. SSS  
Principals  
Counselors | • Translated assessments made available to campuses  
• Spanish six-week assessment data |
| Provide supplemental tutoring for students in ESL/bilingual programs. | Asst. Supt. SSS  
Asst. Supt. C&I  
Exec. Dir. SSS  
Principals  
Counselors  
Teachers | • Tutoring rosters  
• STAAR assessment data |
| Address PBMAS indicators with an Indicator Performance Level of “1” or greater, including: ESL STAAR 3-8 passing rate Math, Reading, Writing; ESL Annual Dropout Rate; LEP Graduation. | Superintendent  
Assoc. Supts.  
Asst. Supts.  
Exec. Dir. SSS  
Principals  
ESL/Bilingual Teachers  
Regular Ed Teachers | • Student schedules;  
• District assessment data;  
• SST records  
• PBMAS;  
• STAAR results;  
• Dropout rate;  
• Graduation rate |

Source: LISD District Improvement Plan

50 Ibid.
SECTION III: BEST PRACTICES FOR CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION OFFICE ORGANIZATION

The following section examines the literature surrounding best practices for curriculum and instruction district office organization, including the role of the curriculum and instruction office and organization strategies for instructional support. The section concludes with an overview of instructional staff organization at two districts: Bridgeport Public Schools in Bridgeport, Connecticut and Jefferson County Public Schools in Louisville, Kentucky.

THE ROLE OF THE CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION OFFICE

Several studies of school and district reform have found that instructional leadership at the central district office is integral to the improvement of schools.\textsuperscript{51} Although instructional leadership from the principal at the school level is a major factor for school improvement, district policies, processes, and cultures can shape instructional practices at the school-level, particularly when central office staff work to address targeted needs within schools, build capacity at the school level, and support building principals as instructional leaders.\textsuperscript{52}

A 2005 survey of superintendents across the United States revealed that most superintendents believe that the central office has a strong role to play in instructional leadership. Leadership actions were particularly prominent in larger school districts, where superintendents were more likely to report the importance of using a common curriculum or common instructional materials throughout the district. Out of the 813 superintendents who completed the survey, 93 percent reported that district office staff trained teachers to analyze achievement data, while 92 percent reported ensuring a common curriculum throughout the district (see Figure 3.1). Additionally, many superintendents reported that the district office staff held orientations for new hires (81 percent) and chose common math (80 percent) and reading programs (79 percent). Superintendents also reported that they required teachers to adjust instruction based upon benchmark assessment data (60 percent), but a smaller number of districts provided pacing guides (40 percent) and created...
teacher-leader positions to promote instructional support through coaching and mentoring (31 percent).53

Figure 3.1 Superintendents Reported Efforts for Instructional Leadership

![Chart showing percentages of superintendents reporting efforts for instructional leadership]

Source: Education Week54

Although the superintendent ultimately oversees the district’s instructional leadership efforts, the Curriculum and Instruction Office or a division within the central district office generally carries out the actions described in Figure 3.1 above. Personnel in the curriculum and instruction office are invaluable resources for schools because they possess knowledge, information, and resources necessary to school reform efforts.55

According to one article by the former Assistant Superintendent of Instruction at Arlington County Public Schools (ACPS), central office staff members are responsible for a number of instructional support functions, including developing curricula that are consistent across all schools, focused on state and district priorities, and supported by best practices for

54 Ibid.
In addition to curriculum development, central office staff support school staff by providing instructional services and expertise (see Figure 3.2 above). By completing these behind the scenes tasks, district office staff enables school staff to focus on teaching free from distractions.\(^{57}\)

Ensuring consistency across the district is a crucial function of the district curriculum and instruction support office. According to Grove:

> “... through the central textbook adoption process, the development of curricula, the publication of programs of studies, the development of services to special populations, classroom observations and feedback, staff development activities, and community forums, we establish ways to achieve the district’s goals and consistency of the instruction program.”\(^{59}\)

### Organization for Effective Instructional Support

Although there is a significant amount of literature regarding instructional leadership at the district office, there less literature regarding the optimal organizational structure of the district office and instructional staff. Instead, according to a Wallace Foundation report on the practices of high-improvement school districts, the “orientation” of the central office is more critical than its organization:

> ... the most significant changes, however, involved changing the mindsets and job descriptions of central-office staff to focus more on curriculum, instruction, and school support. Less important were changes in job titles, hierarchy, and district organization... Interviews revealed no quick-fix solutions for organizing district offices to better support principals’ work. How central office staff members

---


\(^{57}\) Ibid, p. 3.

\(^{58}\) Ibid, p. 3.

\(^{59}\) Ibid, p. 3.
organize their time and work to support principals’ work is more important than how the district office is organized. 60

In order to focus central office functions on improving student success, districts should organize the instructional and non-instructional staff in a manner that reduces inefficiencies and allows operations to shift from bureaucratic control to customer-oriented support. 61

The central office should facilitate strong communication and collaboration between departments that deal with academics in order to reduce bureaucratic inefficiencies and coordinate coherent responses to school needs. 62 Districts that allow different departments to operate and make decisions independent of other departments in a traditional “silo” fashion not only cause inefficiency due to overlapping responsibilities and unclear avenues through which schools should seek support, but also may stifle creative solutions to school-level problems. 63 According to the Wallace Foundation, districts that were able to create substantial improvements in academics at the school level often reported “tearing down walls separating different district functions and involving everyone—including business administrators—in the fundamental business of educating students.” 64

One example of district reduction of bureaucratic inefficiency is the reorganization of the district office at Sacramento City Unified School District in Sacramento, California. In 2009, Superintendent Jonathan Raymond discovered that a number of academic departments at the central office, including curriculum, professional development, and human resources, operated independently despite the considerable overlap in their functions and services. In order to reduce inefficiency and promote collaboration, the central office re-organized into three divisions: academics, accountability, and community and family engagement.

Under the academics division, Superintendent Raymond established a more coherent model for instructional support by re-organizing schools from discrete levels (elementary, middle, and high school) to geographically defined areas based upon school feeder patterns. By planning curricula and instructional strategies within neighborhoods rather planning based upon grade-level, the new structure promoted easier transitions between schools and coherent strategies to build on previous learning across all grades. 65

Re-organizing district structures to promote a customer service-oriented approach to school support allows central office staff to respond quickly and efficiently to individual

62 Ibid.
school needs.\textsuperscript{66} In a report from the Wallace Foundation, researchers found that a service-orientated central office is associated with improvement in teaching and learning. Specifically, the report finds two shifts in the practices of district administrators toward customer service-oriented practices that are associated with positive changes in the district’s ability to support teaching and learning: personalizing services to the unique needs of each school in the district and integrating district services to target specific problems. According to the report:

... under transformation, individual central office staff members specialized in particular schools, not services, and were assigned to address whatever needs arose in those schools across their department; likewise, staff were assigned to cross-unit project teams that addressed particular problems or challenges related to school support that did not fit neatly within any one central office unit.\textsuperscript{67}

In order to implement an adequate service-orientation at the district office level, some districts adopt a case management approach to support individual schools. The case management approach involves assigning specific schools to different district staff members, who become experts on the needs and goals of their assigned “caseload.” When administrators and district staff are organized to focus on individual schools, they are better able to provide targeted services to help schools overcome school-specific obstacles and implement strategies for better teaching and learning.\textsuperscript{68} Along with the case management approach to district management, the Wallace Foundation report found that successful districts were also able to adopt a project management approach to school support. Under the project management approach, districts shift focus from simple “service delivery” in discrete departments to collaborative problem-solving across central office divisions. This approach requires central office administrators to “take responsibility for work projects and [marshal] resources from throughout and sometimes beyond the central office to address them.”\textsuperscript{69}

For example, one district taking a case management/project management approach to improve curriculum and instructional support to schools engaged in a comprehensive planning process to identify instructional services that could be targeted to the needs of particular school principals and improvement plans. As a result, the curriculum and instruction office was able to offer differentiated support to schools. For instance, a “low-end service package” implemented in one elementary school, involved the curriculum and instruction office providing coaching and train-the-trainer instruction to experienced teacher leaders in order to improve mathematics instruction throughout the school, while a “more intensive service package” provided to other schools with fewer experienced

\textsuperscript{67} Ibid, p. 71.
\textsuperscript{68} Ibid, p. 71.
\textsuperscript{69} Ibid, p. 76-77.
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teachers included extra coaching days and initiatives to assist building principals in recognizing and training teacher leaders within the building.70

A different approach to providing service-oriented instructional support is the consulting model. While the consulting model also emphasizes targeted services to specific schools, this approach also involves the decentralization of decision-making to the school level, and the transition from top-down control of curriculum and instruction to a bottom-up approach through which district staff step in to meet the needs of individual schools upon request.72 Under the consulting model, “subject specialist” (i.e. curriculum coordinators) are not decision-makers, but rather collaborative experts that support decisions made at the school level. Further elaborating the role of “subject specialists,” an article from the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory comments:

The subject specialist, e.g., in mathematics or reading, assumes the role of facilitator or helper. "A change in title from supervisor or director to consultant can convey the direction of intended change... The best way for specialists to play their new role is to work with individual schools on an on-call basis." Specialists should be helped to realize that they are more effective when their services are sought rather than imposed.72

Napa Valley Unified School District, which created a “consulting model” for curriculum instruction to support best practices and student achievement, re-organized its district structure after the arrival of a new superintendent. After carrying out a needs assessment and consulting with school principals and district staff, the district office re-oriented toward a system in which district-level administrators and instructional experts, formerly curriculum directors, became “Learning Support Partners” (LSPs). While LSPs are also expected to continue their former administrative and operational roles at the district level — including special education administration, curriculum and instruction oversight, English language learner services, and other functions — each administrator is tasked with a specific group of school and charged with “mentoring, coaching, and advocacy” to encourage powerful teaching and learning. In order to ensure good working relationships with principals and building staff, LSPs act strictly as support figures, leaving evaluations of principals to the superintendent. LSPs are encouraged to spend a great deal of time at their school sites, typically visiting each site two to four times per month, in addition to bi-monthly LSP meetings designed to provide LSPs with professional development as well as time to discuss school and district needs and plan targeted initiatives to support school instruction.73

While both the consulting model and the case/project management model are service-oriented, the approaches involve very different degrees of centralization. Education researcher Meredith Honig argues that although districts should shift to a service-oriented model to support individual building principals in instructional leadership, the degree of decentralization possible should be dependent upon school capacity. Central office leadership is important for scaling up effective strategies to improve student achievement and the streamlining of district office staff and decentralization of decision-making may remove needed support from schools. Instead, Honig suggests that districts should engage in intensive, collaborative relationships with building principals to emphasize standards-based curriculum and assessment and provide a selection of performance-oriented support and professional development to teachers.\(^74\)

**Bridgeport Public Schools**

Bridgeport Public Schools (BPS) in Bridgeport, Connecticut enrolled 20,126 students and employed 1,338 teachers as of fall 2012.\(^75\) In 2006, BPS was named a finalist for the prestigious Broad Prize for Urban Education, largely because minority students outperformed peers statewide in reading and math achievement scores following district efforts to improve district-wide curriculum and instruction practices.\(^76\)

Although individual schools’ curricular and instructional decisions in BPS are often decentralized to the school-level, district curriculum and instruction staff have a major role in BPS student success. Each school in the district has designated instructional leaders, including the building principal and a school leadership team, that implement best practices and curricular initiatives at the school-level; however, the district staff play a critical role in providing training, resources, and support for school-led instructional improvement. While the district does not mandate any specific intervention programs for struggling students, district content directors and curriculum specialists “preview” and provide support for school-devised intervention plans. In addition to providing intervention assistance, the district deploys curriculum specialists in each subject area to schools based on need. In addition to curriculum specialists, each elementary and middle school has one mathematics instructional coach and at least one literacy coach. These school-based coaches are employed by the district and are placed in schools based on student enrollment and individual school needs.\(^77\)

BPS has implemented a number of strategies to support the continuous improvement of teaching and learning throughout the district, led by district curriculum and instruction staff. Both curriculum specialists and instructional coaches spend at least 60 percent of their time


in classrooms. Coaches and specialists take a hands-on role to supporting teachers by offering real-time assistance, modeling teaching strategies, co-teaching lessons, and facilitating teacher access to resources. In addition to instructional assistance, coaches and specialists also teach teachers how to analyze student performance data. Furthermore, the district provides targeted professional development through the curriculum and instruction office through “train-the-trainer” training of each school’s instructional leadership team. Figure 3.3 (on the following page) describes the general organization of instructional support at BPS; although school leadership teams have the ultimate decision regarding curriculum and instruction at the school-level, the district instructional staff provides responsive, collaborative support through coordination with the leadership team and through hands-on training with individual teachers.

---

80 Ibid, p. 4.
Figure 3.3 Bridgeport Public Schools Layers of Instructional Support

**District Level**

- District Directors

**School Level and District**

- Curriculum Specialists
  - School-based Instructional Coaches (Math and Literacy)

**School Level**

- School Leadership Teams
- High School Teachers (All subject areas)
- K-8 Teachers (For specific subject areas)
- K-8 Teachers (Math and English Language Arts)

Source: Broad Prize for Urban Education[81]

---

[81] [1] Ibid, p. 5.
JEFFERSON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Jefferson County Public Schools in Louisville, Kentucky, serves nearly 100,000 students and employs approximately 5,903 teachers. In December 2011, the district underwent a study by Phi Delta Kappa International to assess the efficiency of its organizational structure, central office staffing, functions, and operations. Upon examining the district office through staff surveys, comparison to peer districts, and student academic achievement, the Quality Review Team made a number of recommendations to reorganize the district structure for optimal quality and efficiency. The proposed structure for the District Executive Cabinet, Curriculum, Instruction, and Evaluation Division and the Academic Support Services Division can be seen in Figures 3.4 and 3.5 on the following pages.

Notably, the Curriculum Management Audit carried out in the JCPS central office found that a division of curriculum management staff members based on separate grade-level divisions was ineffective and inefficient, leading to disconnected and inconsistent support for teachers. Instead, the team recommended that the district re-organize the curriculum directors by core subject over the entire Pre-K-12 curriculum rather than for different curricular areas at different grade levels. In order to increase the district’s organizational efficiency and improve the district's ability to carry out its mission to improve the quality of curriculum, teaching, and learning, the quality review board suggested the following organizational actions:

- Relocate the ESL and ELL programs to the Curriculum, Instruction, and Evaluation Division, under the supervision of the Assistant Superintendent.
- Relocate the Student Development Services Department to the Curriculum, Instruction, and Evaluation Division, under the supervision of the Assistant Superintendent.
- Relocation of the Exceptional Child Education program to the Academic Support Division, under the supervision of the Superintendent of Academic Support Services.
- Creation of new “Curriculum Director” positions by academic subject and concentration, each spanning all grades Pre-K-12, under the supervision of the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, Instruction, and Evaluation.

---

Figure 3.4 Jefferson County Public Schools Executive Cabinet Optimal Organizational Structure

*Note: Only those administrators that report to the Chief Academic Officer and are involved in curriculum and learning are shown in the organizational chart above. The district staff that report to the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, Instruction, and Evaluation are elaborated on the following page.

Source: Jefferson County Public Schools

85 Ibid, p. 65.
Figure 3.5 Jefferson County Public Schools Executive Cabinet Optimal Organizational Structure

*Curriculum Directors include Math, Language Arts/Literacy, Science, Arts, Cultural Studies, World Languages, and one Social Studies Director
Source: Jefferson County Public Schools

---

*Ibid, p. 72.*
## APPENDIX I

### Figure A.1 Formative Evaluation Forms for Curriculum Coordinators

**WARREN COUNTY SCHOOLS**  
**MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM COORDINATOR EVALUATION FORM (FORMATIVE)**  
(Curriculum Coordinator Must Be Evaluated Annually)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluated by</th>
<th>Employee #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>Date of Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Date of Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle and High School Curriculum Coordinator Standards</th>
<th>Not Progressing</th>
<th>Progressing Toward Standard</th>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>Exceeds Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrates Professional Leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrates Knowledge of Content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Designs/Plans Instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Creates/Maintains Learning Climate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Implements/Manages Instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assesses and Communicates Learning Results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reflects/Evaluates Teaching/Learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Collaborates with Colleagues/Parents/Others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WARREN COUNTY SCHOOLS
MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM COORDINATOR EVALUATION FORM (FORMATIVE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle and High School Curriculum Coordinator Standards</th>
<th>Not Progressing</th>
<th>Progressing Toward Standard</th>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>Exceeds Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Demonstrates Implementation of Technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluator's Comments:**

**Evaluator's Comments:**

To be signed after all information has been completed and discussed:

Evaluator Signature  Date  Evaluator Signature  Date

Source: Warren County Public Schools

---

Figure A.2 Summative Evaluation Forms for Curriculum Coordinators

WARREN COUNTY SCHOOLS
MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM COORDINATOR EVALUATION FORM (SUMMATIVE)
(Middle and High School Curriculum Coordinator Must Be Evaluated Annually)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluatee</th>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Employee #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date(s) of Observation(s) 1st 2nd 3rd 4th
Date(s) of Conference(s) 1st 2nd 3rd 4th

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle and High School Curriculum Coordinator Standards</th>
<th>Not Progressing</th>
<th>Progressing Toward Standard</th>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>Exceeds Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrates Professional Leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrates Knowledge of Content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Designs/Plans Instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Creates/Maintains Learning Climate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Implements/Manages Instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assesses and Communicates Learning Results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reflects/Evaluates Teaching/Learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Collaborates with Colleagues/Parents/Others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Demonstrates Implementation of Technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVERALL RATING

Individual professional growth plan reflects a desire/need to acquire further knowledge/skills in the standard number(s) checked below:

- [ ] 1  - [ ] 2  - [ ] 3  - [ ] 4  - [ ] 5  - [ ] 6  - [ ] 7  - [ ] 8  - [ ] 9  - [ ] 10
WARREN COUNTY SCHOOLS
MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM COORDINATOR EVALUATION FORM (SUMMATIVE)
Page 2

Evaluatee’s Comments:

Evaluator’s Comments:

To be signed after all information above has been completed and discussed:

Evaluatee: (□) Agree with this summative evaluation (□) Disagree with this summative evaluation
(Evaluation may be attached)

Evaluator Signature __________________________ Date __________

Evaluator: __________________________ Date __________

Employment Recommendation to Central Office:

(□) Meets Middle and High School Curriculum Coordinator standards for reemployment
(□) Does not meet Middle and High School Curriculum Coordinator standards for reemployment

Opportunities for appeal processes at both the local and state levels are a part of Warren County Schools’ district evaluation plan.

Certified employees must make their appeals to this summative evaluation within the time frames mandated in 704KAR 3:345 Sections 7, 8, 9 and the local district plan.

*Any rating in the “Not Progressing” column requires the development of an Individual Corrective Action Plan.

Source: Warren County Public Schools

88 Ibid, pp. 63-64.
APPENDIX II

Figure B.1 Special Education Program Perception Survey Tool for Parents

A five point scale was used to define the ratings of each question:

- 0 – Not Applicable, Not Observed
- 1 – Strongly Disagree
- 2 – Disagree
- 3 – Neutral
- 4 – Agree
- 5 – Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARENT SURVEY QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: Communication between the staff working with my child and myself is positive and effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2: My child is learning to be as independent as possible, given the nature of their disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3: My child has equal access to the services, programs, and opportunities that are available to all children, including those without disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4: The building(s) where my child receives services is physically accessible to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5: I am part of the planning team when my child moves from one program or classroom to another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6: Transitioning from one program/classroom to another has gone smoothly for my child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7: I am part of the team that makes decisions about my child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8: My opinions about my child’s needs are requested and considered in decision making when the IEP or IIIP is developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9: The IEP/IIIP team is sensitive to my family’s values and goals for our child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10: I understand my child’s IEP/IIIP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 11: The staff who serve my child cooperate in planning and delivering services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 12: Paraprofessionals working with my child understand my child’s needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 13: I receive regular updates from special education staff that give me a clear understanding of my child’s progress in meeting their goals and objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 14: As my child accomplishes their IEP/IIIP goals, the team is responsive in updating the educational plan in a timely manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 15: I know what options are available to me if there is disagreement about the plan or I feel the district is not carrying out my child’s IFSP/IEP/IIIP as written.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 16: I am satisfied with the amount of time my child spends in activities with children who do not have disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 17: Special education staff have sufficient resources available for carrying out the programming options for my child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 18: If my child first entered special education in grades K - 12, I was involved with the school staff in trying different strategies to improve my child’s success in the general education classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 19: I feel better able to meet my child’s needs because of the supports and services they receive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 20: Overall, I am satisfied with the services my child receives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: North St. Paul-Maplewood-Oakdale Independent School District

**Figure B.2 Special Education Program Perception Survey Tool for Staff and Administrators**

A five point scale was used to define the ratings of each question:

- 0 – Not Applicable, Not Observed
- 1 – Strongly Disagree
- 2 – Disagree
- 3 – Neutral
- 4 – Agree
- 5 – Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATOR AND STAFF SURVEY QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: Staff are provided necessary resources to implement a successful special education program. Resources include a sufficient number of staff employed to maintain an effective teacher-student ratio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2: Staff are provided the necessary resources to implement a successful special education program. Resources include adequate instructional supports/materials and special education classrooms are centrally located for maximum integration of students with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3: Staff are provided opportunities to attend relevant training opportunities that strengthen their ability to provide effective services to students and enhance their ability to select strategies to improve student academic achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4: Staff are provided with a variety of appropriate instructional materials, supplies, and equipment to meet the needs of a variety of student learning styles within the special education classroom and general education classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5: Staff have a clear understanding of the state and federal guidelines established for implementing procedures to identify students with disabilities. Guidelines include completing pre referral documentations with adequate consultative services from the special education teacher to the general education teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6: Staff have a clear understanding of the state and federal guidelines established for placement of students with disabilities. Identification, placement, and grouping practices are determined by the needs of the student with a disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7: Staff maximize student’s participation in the general education curriculum using a full array of services delivery options with the goal of inclusion in the general education setting and curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8: Special education and general education staff share responsibility for the educational achievement of students with disabilities. Staff collaborate to enhance student learning and every effort is made to serve students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9: Staff provide students with disabilities full access to nonacademic and extracurricular services and activities including special transportation when required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10: Staff evaluate the progress of students and communicate with parents on a regular basis using established progress reporting procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 11: Staff evaluate program processes such as identification procedures, referral/intake, placement, and termination of services, instructional methods, and curriculum routinely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 12: Staff routinely check for student progress and make appropriate adjustments in their teaching. Programs include transition activities, self-advocacy skills, independent living skills, and collaboration with appropriate outside agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 13: Staff use a variety of teaching strategies and approaches that have been proven effective in educating all children. Research based practices, such as direct instruction and mastery-learning techniques, are implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 14: Staff understand the role of assistive technology and services in supporting instruction of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
children with disabilities. Essential assistive technology is available and used.

Question 15: Staff create a sense of belonging to the total school environment for students with disabilities. Students with disabilities attend the building they would attend if they were not disabled.

Question 16: Staff feel supported by administration for their efforts to implement inclusion practices for students with disabilities. Regular education staff make accommodations and adaptations in their classroom as a result of inclusion efforts.

Question 17: Special education staff have sufficient resources available for carrying out the programming options for my child.

Source: North St. Paul-Maplewood-Oakdale Independent School District90

90 Taken verbatim from: Ibid, pp. 51-58.
Figure C.1 ELL Program Perception Survey Tool for Parents

Please complete the survey by circling one answer for each question. Do not circle more than one answer.

B. What is your child’s native language?
   1. Spanish
   2. Other

C. How many years has your child been in the ELL program?
   1. 1-2
   2. 3-4
   3. 5-6
   4. More than 6

D. What other special services does your child receive?
   1. Speech
   2. Reading Resource
   3. Special Education
   4. None or Do not know

For what purposes have you come to visit the school?

E. Parent-teacher conference 1. Yes 2. No
F. Communication with school secretaries 1. Yes 2. No
G. Class programs 1. Yes 2. No
H. Curriculum Night 1. Yes 2. No
I. Volunteer in school or in the classroom 1. Yes 2. No
J. Other ____________________________

When you have not come to the school, what are the most likely reasons?

K. Unable to speak English 1. Yes 2. No
L. Work schedule 1. Yes 2. No
M. Family responsibilities 1. Yes 2. No
N. No transportation 1. Yes 2. No
O. Did not feel welcome 1. Yes 2. No
P. A bad experience at my child’s school 1. Yes 2. No
Q. Did not trust the teacher 1. Yes 2. No
R. Did not feel the need 1. Yes 2. No
S. Other ____________________________

T. How often are you able to help your child with homework?
   1. Always
   2. Sometimes
   3. Rarely
   4. Never

U. How comfortable do you feel in helping your child read in his/her native language?
   1. Very comfortable
   2. Comfortable
   3. Uncomfortable
   4. Very uncomfortable

V. How comfortable do you feel in helping your child read in English?
   1. Very comfortable
   2. Comfortable
   3. Uncomfortable
   4. Very uncomfortable

W. Do you speak to your child at home in your child’s native language?
   1. Yes, all the time
   2. Sometimes
   3. No, never
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| X. Do you think allowing your child to maintain the native language is  | 1. Yes  
| important?                                                             | 2. No                                                                              |
| Y. How well do you understand the entrance requirements for our ELL    | 1. Very knowledgeable  
| program?                                                               | 2. Fairly knowledgeable  
|                                                                      | 3. Minimally knowledgeable  
|                                                                      | 4. Not at all knowledgeable                                                    |
| Z. How well do you understand the exit requirements for our ELL        | 1. Very knowledgeable  
| program?                                                               | 2. Fairly knowledgeable  
|                                                                      | 3. Minimally knowledgeable  
|                                                                      | 4. Not at all knowledgeable                                                    |
| AA. How well do you understand the instructional philosophy of our     | 1. Very knowledgeable  
| ELL program?                                                           | 2. Fairly knowledgeable  
|                                                                      | 3. Minimally knowledgeable  
|                                                                      | 4. Not at all knowledgeable                                                    |
| BB. How well do you understand the progress of your student in the     | 1. Very knowledgeable  
| ELL program?                                                           | 2. Fairly knowledgeable  
|                                                                      | 3. Minimally knowledgeable  
|                                                                      | 4. Not at all knowledgeable                                                    |
| CC. How effective is the ELL program in teaching English language     | 1. Very Effective  
| acquisition?                                                           | 2. Fairly Effective  
|                                                                      | 3. Minimally Effective  
|                                                                      | 4. Not at all Effective                                                       |
| DD. How challenging is the ELL program for your child?                 | 1. Too Much Challenge  
|                                                                      | 2. Just Enough Challenge  
|                                                                      | 3. Too Little Challenge                                                       |
| EE. How challenging is the regular classroom instruction for your      | 1. Too Much Challenge  
| child?                                                                | 2. Just Enough Challenge  
|                                                                      | 3. Too Little Challenge                                                       |
| FF. Do you think there is a need for an ELL preschool program?         | 1. Yes  
|                                                                      | 2. No                                                                              |
| GG. If interpreter services were provided for meetings at the school,  | 1. Many times  
| how often would you use them?                                         | 2. Sometimes  
|                                                                      | 3. Never                                                                         |
| What other improvements do you believe could be made to our ELL        |                                                                                   |
| program?                                                               |                                                                                   |
| What other comments would you like to offer?                          |                                                                                   |

Source: Battavia Public Schools\(^91\)

**Figure C.2 ELL Program Perception Survey Tool for Teachers**

Please complete the survey by circling one answer for each question. Do not circle more than one answer. If you do not believe you have enough information or experience to answer a question, choose “not applicable.”

### Demographics

**A. What level do you teach?**

1. Grades K-2
2. Grades 3-5
3. Grade K-5 specials or support
4. Grades 6-8
5. Grades 9-12

**B. At what school do you teach?**

1. Alice Gustafson
2. Batavia High
3. Grace McWayne
4. H.C. Storm
5. Hoover-Wood
6. J.B. Nelson
7. Louise White
8. Rotolo Middle

**C. Identify in which years you have taught ELL students in our district.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to 2002-2003</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not taught any</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ELL Instructional Program

**D. Do you have a bilingual and/or ESL approval/endorsement?**

1. Yes
2. No

**E. To what degree do you believe you understand the entrance requirements for our ELL program?**

1. Very knowledgeable
2. Fairly knowledgeable
3. Minimally knowledgeable
4. Not at all knowledgeable

**F. To what degree do you believe you understand the exit requirements for our ELL program?**

1. Very knowledgeable
2. Fairly knowledgeable
3. Minimally knowledgeable
4. Not at all knowledgeable

**G. To what degree do you believe you understand the instructional philosophy of our ELL program?**

1. Very knowledgeable
2. Fairly knowledgeable
3. Minimally knowledgeable
4. Not at all knowledgeable

**H. To what degree do you believe you understand the instructional goals of our ELL program?**

1. Very knowledgeable
2. Fairly knowledgeable
3. Minimally knowledgeable
4. Not at all knowledgeable
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>To what degree do you believe you understand the instructional practices used by the teachers in our ELL program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Very knowledgeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Fairly knowledgeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Minimally knowledgeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Not at all knowledgeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>To what degree do you believe you understand the progress of your students in the ELL program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Very knowledgeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Fairly knowledgeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Minimally knowledgeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Not at all knowledgeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>To what degree do you believe the ELL program aligns with the curriculum you are teaching in the classroom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Very Aligned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Fairly Aligned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Minimally Aligned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Not at all aligned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>To what degree do you believe the ELL program is effective in teaching English language acquisition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Very Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Fairly Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Minimally Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Not at all Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>To what degree do you believe the ELL program is at the appropriate level of rigor for our students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Too Rigorous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Just Enough Rigor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Little Rigor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>To what degree do you believe the amount of homework, given to students by the ELL teacher, is appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Too Much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Just Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Too Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.</td>
<td>What level of rigor do you believe you provide ELL students in your classroom instruction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Too Rigorous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Just Enough Rigor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Little Rigor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.</td>
<td>To what degree do you believe that the amount of daily instructional time, given to students by the ELL teacher, is appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Too Much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Just Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Too Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>To what degree do you believe the ELL newcomer kit is effective in providing instructional support for students new to the country?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Very Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Fairly Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Minimally Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Not at all Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.</td>
<td>To what degree do you believe that the amount of space within your building given to teachers and students in our ELL program is appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Too Much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Just Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Too Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication

S. To what degree do you believe the ELL teachers are effective in communicating student progress to you, the classroom teacher?

1. Very Effective
2. Fairly Effective
3. Minimally Effective
4. Not at all Effective
5. Not applicable

T. To what degree do you believe that the amount of consultation time given to ELL and classroom teachers is appropriate?

1. Too Much
2. Just Right
3. Too Little
4. Not applicable

U. How much time each week would be appropriate to consult with the ELL teacher?

1. 15 minutes
2. 30 minutes
3. 45 minutes
4. 60 minutes
5. More than 60 minutes
6. Not applicable

V. To what degree do you believe the communication is effective between you and your ELL students’ parents?

1. Very Effective
2. Fairly Effective
3. Minimally Effective
4. Not at all Effective
5. Not applicable

W. To what degree do you believe the communication is effective between the ELL teacher and your ELL students’ parents?

1. Very Effective
2. Fairly Effective
3. Minimally Effective
4. Not at all Effective
5. Not applicable

X. To what degree do you believe the ELL report card is effective in communicating student progress (elementary teachers only)?

1. Very Effective
2. Fairly Effective
3. Minimally Effective
4. Not at all Effective
5. Not applicable

Training/Support

Y. To what degree do you believe the ELL teacher is effective in providing you with classroom instructional strategies to meet the needs of your ELL students?

1. Very Effective
2. Fairly Effective
3. Minimally Effective
4. Not at all Effective
5. Not applicable

Z. To what degree do you believe the district has been effective in providing you with training to meet the needs of your ELL students?

1. Very Effective
2. Fairly Effective
3. Minimally Effective
4. Not at all Effective
5. Not applicable
AA. Which of the following topics would you be interested in learning more about?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The culture of our ELL students</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How ELL students acquire English</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional strategies for ELL students</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of ELL students</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What other improvements do you believe could be made to our ELL program?

BB. What is the best method for you to learn these topics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 day Workshops</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Series of Learn and Apply Workshops</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Groups</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Classes Leading to Endorsement</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What other comments would you like to offer?

CC. Institute days are always the most preferred time for this professional development to occur. However, various district priorities compete for the use of this time. What other compensated times would be acceptable for you to participate in this professional development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After School</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before School</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DD. To what degree do you perceive a need for an ELL preschool program?

1. Very needed
2. Fairly needed
3. Minimally needed
4. Not at all needed
5. Not applicable

Source: Batavia Public Schools

Figure C.3 ELL Program Perception Survey Tool for Administrators

Please complete the survey by circling one answer for each question. Do not circle more than one answer. If you do not believe you have enough information or experience to answer a question, choose “not applicable.” Note: Particular letters in the question sequence have been purposely omitted for data input purposes.

Demographics

A. What level do you supervise?
   1. Grades K-5
   2. Grades 6-8
   3. Grades 9-12

ELL Instructional Program

E. To what degree do you believe you understand the entrance requirements for our ELL program?
   1. Very knowledgeable
   2. Fairly knowledgeable
   3. Minimally knowledgeable
   4. Not at all knowledgeable

F. To what degree do you believe you understand the exit requirements for our ELL program?
   1. Very knowledgeable
   2. Fairly knowledgeable
   3. Minimally knowledgeable
   4. Not at all knowledgeable

G. To what degree do you believe you understand the instructional philosophy of our ELL program?
   1. Very knowledgeable
   2. Fairly knowledgeable
   3. Minimally knowledgeable
   4. Not at all knowledgeable

H. To what degree do you believe you understand the instructional goals of our ELL program?
   1. Very knowledgeable
   2. Fairly knowledgeable
   3. Minimally knowledgeable
   4. Not at all knowledgeable

I. To what degree do you believe you understand the instructional practices used by the teachers in our ELL program?
   1. Very knowledgeable
   2. Fairly knowledgeable
   3. Minimally knowledgeable
   4. Not at all knowledgeable

J. To what degree do you believe you understand the progress of your students in the ELL program?
   1. Very knowledgeable
   2. Fairly knowledgeable
   3. Minimally knowledgeable
   4. Not at all knowledgeable

K. To what degree do you believe the ELL program aligns with the curriculum being taught in the classroom?
   1. Very Aligned
   2. Fairly Aligned
   3. Minimally Aligned
   4. Not at all aligned
   5. Not applicable

L. To what degree do you believe the ELL program is effective in teaching English language acquisition?
   1. Very Effective
   2. Fairly Effective
   3. Minimally Effective
   4. Not at all Effective
   5. Not applicable
M. To what degree do you believe the ELL program is at the appropriate level of rigor for our students?

1. Too Rigorous
2. Just Enough Rigor
3. Little Rigor
4. Not applicable

O. What level of rigor do you believe classroom teachers provide ELL students in your building?

1. Too Rigorous
2. Just Enough Rigor
3. Little Rigor
4. Not applicable

P. To what degree do you believe that the amount of daily instructional time, given to students by the ELL teacher, is appropriate?

1. Too Much
2. Just Right
3. Too Little
4. Not applicable

Communication

S. To what degree do you believe the ELL teachers are effective in communicating student progress to you, the principal?

1. Very Effective
2. Fairly Effective
3. Minimally Effective
4. Not at all Effective
5. Not applicable

T. To what degree do you believe that the amount of consultation time given to ELL and classroom teachers is appropriate?

1. Too Much
2. Just Right
3. Too Little
4. Not applicable

U. How much time each week would be appropriate to consult with the ELL teacher?

1. 15 minutes
2. 30 minutes
3. 45 minutes
4. 60 minutes
5. More than 60 minutes
6. Not applicable

V. To what degree do you believe the communication is effective between you and your ELL students’ parents?

1. Very Effective
2. Fairly Effective
3. Minimally Effective
4. Not at all Effective
5. Not applicable

W. To what degree do you believe the communication is effective between the ELL teacher and your ELL students’ parents?

1. Very Effective
2. Fairly Effective
3. Minimally Effective
4. Not at all Effective
5. Not applicable

X. To what degree do you believe the ELL report card is effective in communicating student progress (elementary principals only)?

1. Very Effective
2. Fairly Effective
3. Minimally Effective
4. Not at all Effective
5. Not applicable
### Training/Support

*Y.* To what degree do you believe the ELL teacher is effective in providing teachers with classroom instructional strategies to meet the needs of your ELL students?

1. Very Effective
2. Fairly Effective
3. Minimally Effective
4. Not at all Effective
5. Not applicable

*Z.* To what degree do you believe the district has been effective in providing staff with training to meet the needs of your ELL students?

1. Very Effective
2. Fairly Effective
3. Minimally Effective
4. Not at all Effective
5. Not applicable

### Improvements to the Program

**DD.** To what degree do you perceive a need for an ELL preschool program?

1. Very needed
2. Fairly needed
3. Minimally needed
4. Not at all needed
5. Not applicable

What other improvements do you believe could be made to our ELL program?

What other comments would you like to offer?

Source: Batavia Public Schools[^93]

[^93]: Ibid, pp. 75-80.
## APPENDIX IV

### Figure D.1 ELL Program School Compliance Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS TO BE OBSERVED</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>INITIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identification:</strong> Each student has a Home Language Survey completed and on file in the student’s cumulative record and ELL file.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment:</strong> Each ELL student has been assessed to determine those who need English language instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Placement:</strong> The school ensures age appropriate grade level placement and prohibits retention or failure based solely on lack of English skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school’s regular program teachers differentiate instruction and testing to accommodate the language ability level of each ELL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The campus evaluates each ELL individually to determine quantity of ELL and academic support necessary for the student to succeed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services:</strong> The school maintains regularly scheduled language instruction for ELLs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition:</strong> The campus evaluates each former ELL individually to determine if academic support is necessary for the student to succeed in the mainstream classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication:</strong> The school attempts to communicate with parents of ELLs about important school information in a language they can understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Checklist completed by: ____________________________

Principal Signature: ____________________________ Date: ________________

Comments:

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

Source: DeKalb County Schools

---
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