

Self-Study Tool for Alaska Schools

Evaluating Instructional Effectiveness
Through Six Domains



David Predeger

*Prepared in collaboration with Alaska's Department of Education & Early Development
by Education Northwest and the Alaska Comprehensive Center*

Revised Edition, March 2010

Alaska Self-Study Tool

Table of Contents

Overview	1
Step-by-Step Process	3
Introduction to the Domain—Curriculum.....	6
Domain rubric	8
Domain summary	11
Introduction to the Domain—Assessment.....	12
Domain rubric	14
Domain summary	17
Introduction to the Domain—Instruction	18
Domain rubric	20
Domain summary	24
Introduction to the Domain-Supportive learning environment ...	25
Domain rubric	27
Domain summary	32
Introduction to the Domain—Professional development	33
Domain rubric	34
Domain summary	38
Introduction to the Domain—Leadership	39
Domain rubric	40
Domain summary	46
Glossary of General Education Terms and Acronyms.....	48

Prepared in collaboration with Alaska's Department of Education & Early Development
by Alaska Comprehensive Center

OVERVIEW

The Self-Study Tool (SST) was developed to help schools conduct an internal review as part of their school improvement effort. The SST materials are based on the Instructional Audit Tool that has been used throughout Alaska to conduct on-site school audits by external teams of educators. The SST process provides teams from a school community an opportunity to engage in discussion and evidence-based inquiry. It is not intended to be the basis for evaluation or for making comparisons across schools. The end product is not a score, but the identification of current strengths and limitations, which can assist school staff members in their school improvement efforts.

The tool is organized around six domains that represent important areas of successful school functioning:

1. Curriculum
2. Assessment
3. Instruction
4. Supportive learning environment
5. Professional development
6. Leadership

Each domain consists of a series of key elements that are grounded in school improvement literature. It is not necessary for a school team to conduct the self-study across all six domains at once. For instance, a team might choose to begin by examining only two domains, such as instruction and supportive learning environment.

To complete this self-study, the entire school faculty, or a smaller leadership team, works in small groups to locate evidence, make ratings, and summarize findings. Parents, community members, and students may also be involved. When a team engages in the self-study process, it is important for each team member to begin with an open mind, setting aside assumptions and relying on evidence to make ratings on each of the elements. Some of the options for use of the SST include:

1. Teams may start by examining a single domain area, using the initial discussion questions and then dividing up the elements they wish to tackle. In a subsequent meeting they can share their evidence, and then the whole group can come to a consensus on the rating of each element. Ultimately, the entire group needs to agree.
2. Teams may focus on several, but not all, domains. Different teams might each work on the same domain and then compare their ratings, or the teams might “jigsaw” the effort so that each group looks at a different domain.
3. One team or several smaller teams may use the SST to review their status in all domains. Because this option requires collecting evidence to make ratings, it is the most thorough, yet time consuming of all the options.

The findings from any of these options can be useful for determining school direction and goal setting for school improvement planning. The three essential aspects of the process, which should remain consistent, are that 1) all ratings are based on evidence, 2) teams reach a consensus on the ratings, and 3) the process is transparent—findings are presented back to the entire school faculty and to the school community.

STEP-BY-STEP PROCESS

Using a team approach

The tasks in the SST are designed to help a group develop a “team” perspective. Teams work best when members agree at the outset on the rules for working together. However, what the team members agree to is not as important as the process they go through together to reach the agreements. Group agreements might include:

- One voice at a time
- No side conversations
- All opinions are respected
- Start and stop on time
- Use consensus rather than majority rule

Conducting the self-study

The following six tasks are involved in conducting the self-study:

1. Review the rubric
2. Discuss the guiding questions for each domain
3. Locate the evidence necessary to make ratings for each domain
4. Make the ratings directly on the rubric
5. Determine strengths and areas for improvement
6. Present findings to all faculty members and/or the greater school community

1. Review the rubric

There is a separate rubric for each of the six domains, and each rubric breaks down its domain into several key elements. Four ratings are possible for each of the key elements. The rubric gives an example of the level of implementation and/or development necessary for each rating. For the self-study to be most effective, it is important for the team to review the entire packet of materials and to understand the process prior to engaging in the work.

2. Discuss the guiding questions for each domain

Each domain begins with a set of guiding questions. It is important to respond to these questions prior to attempting to rate the school across the domain. Time spent reflecting upon, discussing, and answering these questions will lead participants to a deeper understanding of the domain and the related key elements they are about to examine. This also gives the team an opportunity to discuss potential sources of evidence. If working with a larger faculty group, have small groups discuss the questions and share out with the entire group.

3. Locate the evidence necessary to make ratings for each domain

To determine the level of functioning for each element, it is necessary to find written evidence that substantiates the rating. For example, a team might look at the alignment maps to determine if the curriculum is aligned. There is space under each rating choice to record the evidence the team used to help make its decision. For each indicator, brainstorm the sources of evidence that would allow you to make a rating.

4. Make the ratings directly on the rubric

Ratings of the school's performance level should be made once the team reaches consensus, based on the evidence. Note that each rating must be backed up with evidence from multiple sources. Opinions do not constitute evidence; therefore, even if someone at the school thinks that lesson plans demonstrate alignment to the GLEs, if none of the lesson plans actually show any reference to GLEs, the rating should be a "1" ("limited or no evidence"). Additionally, while some team members may be tempted to inflate their school's ratings, the final team ratings must be based on evidence and on group consensus.

For each of the elements, teams list the evidence that was used to determine the rating directly on the rubric. The following are the conditions for making ratings at each of the performance levels:

4 = Exemplary level of development and implementation of this element

This rating is given if there are multiple sources of evidence that this element is a key component of everyday school functioning.

3 = Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation of this element

Schools may receive this rating if there are multiple sources of evidence for the presence of this element. It is possible that the evidence depends on a source document that is reviewed for the rating, such as current curriculum maps for all subjects.

2 = Limited development or partial implementation of this element

This rating is appropriate if there has been some effort related to the indicator but it has not been fully implemented and/or there is only one source of evidence. For example, alignment activities may be very active and ongoing in the content area of reading, but not in mathematics.

1 = Little or no development and implementation of this element

This rating is appropriate where there is very limited or no evidence for the presence of this element.

5. Determine strengths and areas for improvement

Once the ratings are made, transfer them to the chart on the domain *Ratings Summary* that follows each rubric and make copies for each participant involved in the self-assessment process. As a team, answer the final summarizing questions:

- What are the school's top 2–3 strengths within this domain?
- What are the school's top 2–3 limitations/areas needing improvement within this domain?
- How will we further develop this domain?

6. Present findings to all faculty members and/or the greater school community

Sharing the results is an important step in building awareness of and support for the self-study findings and the school improvement steps taken as a result. The SST can be used to help all members of the school community understand the current strengths and the areas needing improvement. It can also provide an opportunity for discussion and transparency.

Self-Study Tool—CURRICULUM

Domain 1.0: There is evidence that the curriculum is aligned, implemented, and used in conjunction with both local and state standards and grade-level expectations (GLEs)

Curriculum

A school or district curriculum is an educational plan that defines all content to be taught, the instructional methods to be used, and the assessment processes to be employed for documenting student achievement. It is aligned with state standards and allows for the collection of data to inform instruction. Ideally, all aspects of the curriculum are coordinated across grade levels so that the goals and objectives can be met. In addition to the academic subjects covered, a curriculum includes other learning opportunities for students.

Examples of supporting evidence

The following resources may be used as evidence for making ratings. This is not a complete list—each school may have other sources of evidence that will be useful in making ratings in this domain.

- Local curriculum documents/units of study
- Lesson plans showing alignment to GLEs
- Curriculum maps
- Professional development records
- Curriculum guides
- Scope and sequence documents
- Professional resource materials
- Collaborative meeting notes and agendas tied to curriculum alignment activities
- Aligned assessments

Before making ratings for the indicators within each domain, it is important for the team to pool their knowledge and come to a common understanding about the domain as a whole. This will help ensure that all team members are talking about the same thing. This may also be a good time to review important terms used throughout the rubric (see the *Glossary* for key definitions).

Discussion questions prior to making ratings:

1. What was the process for aligning the curriculum with standards and GLEs in your school/district?
2. How are new curricula and materials aligned to standards and GLEs on an ongoing basis?
3. How do we make sure new staff members understand what the Alaska standards and GLEs are and how the curriculum is aligned?

CURRICULUM

Domain 1.0 - There is evidence that the curriculum is aligned, implemented, and used in conjunction with the local and Alaska state standards and GLE’s.	Indicator Ratings of Performance							
	<i>Exemplary level of development and implementation</i>	<i>Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation</i>	<i>Limited development or partial implementation</i>	<i>Little or no development and implementation</i>				
Key Elements	4	3	2	1				
1.1 Alaska state standards and GLEs are aligned with school/district curriculum.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: The school has intentionally established a curriculum that without exception is fully aligned with Alaska state standards documents and grade-level expectations.	The school’s curriculum is directly based on and is mostly aligned with Alaska standards documents and grade-level expectations.	The school’s curriculum is aligned with some of Alaska’s standards and grade-level expectations.	The school’s curriculum is based on resources (e.g., textbooks) rather than on Alaska state standards.				
ELEMENT RATING (1.1)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE UNDER APPROPRIATE COLUMN							
<table border="1"><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					
Key Elements	4	3	2	1				
1.2 A system is used to monitor implementation of Alaska state standards and GLEs.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School leaders facilitate frequent discussions among the staff to ensure the implementation of curriculum alignment with Alaska state standards and GLEs.	Established procedures are consistently used to determine the degree to which individual teachers are implementing the school’s curriculum and GLEs.	There are some procedures for determining the degree to which teachers are implementing the school’s curriculum and GLEs, and/or they are used inconsistently.	There are no procedures for determining the degree to which teachers are implementing the school’s curriculum and GLEs.				

Alaska Self-Study Tool—Curriculum Rubric

ELEMENT RATING (1.2)					LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE UNDER APPROPRIATE COLUMN								
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>					4	3	2	1					
4	3	2	1										
1.3 There is a schedule for the review and/or development of the curriculum based on the Alaska Content Standards for each curriculum area and the schedule is consistently followed.					Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: All curricular areas subject to SBA testing are reviewed on a regular basis to ensure alignment to the GLEs.	Most curricular areas subject to SBA testing are reviewed on a regular basis to ensure alignment to the GLEs.	Some curricular areas subject to SBA testing are reviewed on a regular basis to ensure alignment to the GLEs.	There are neither policies nor procedures in place for the regular review of any curricular areas.					
ELEMENT RATING (1.3)					LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE UNDER APPROPRIATE COLUMN								
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>					4	3	2	1					
4	3	2	1										
Key Elements					4	3	2	1					
1.4 Statewide assessment data are used each year to identify gaps of curriculum.					Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: SBA data are actively analyzed by grade level in a collaborative manner to identify gaps and to make the changes to instruction necessary to address these gaps.	SBA data are consistently used each year to identify gaps/areas of curriculum that are not being taught.	SBA data are reviewed each year but there is not a process to identify gaps in curricular areas.	SBA data are not reviewed and/or there is not a process to identify gaps in curricular areas.					
ELEMENT RATING (1.4)					LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE UNDER APPROPRIATE COLUMN								
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>					4	3	2	1					
4	3	2	1										

Alaska Self-Study Tool—Curriculum Rubric

1.5 A review process is used to determine if the curriculum is responsive to the learning needs of all students.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: The school staff reviews all aspects of the school’s curriculum to determine responsiveness to the needs of the school’s student population subgroups and has made changes accordingly.	A review process has occurred to ensure that the curriculum in most subject areas is responsive to the learning needs of student population subgroups, and changes have been made to address those needs.	Some aspects of the curriculum have been reviewed to ensure responsiveness to the learning needs of student population subgroups.	The curriculum has not been reviewed to ensure responsiveness to the learning needs of students.				
ELEMENT RATING (1.5)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE UNDER APPROPRIATE COLUMN							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Curriculum Ratings Summary

1.0 Curriculum Domain – There is evidence that the curriculum is aligned, implemented, and used in conjunction with the local and Alaska state standards and GLE’s				
1.1 Alaska standards and GLEs are aligned with school/district curriculum	4	3	2	1
1.2 A system is used to monitor implementation of Alaska state standards and GLEs	4	3	2	1
1.3 There is a schedule for the review and/or development of curriculum based on the Alaska Content Standards for each curriculum area and the schedule is consistently followed	4	3	2	1
1.4 Statewide assessment data are used to identify gaps in the curriculum	4	3	2	1
1.5 A review process is used to determine if the curriculum is responsive to the learning needs of all students	4	3	2	1

ANALYSIS OF CURRICULUM DOMAIN

Top 2–3 strengths within this domain:

Top 2–3 limitations/areas needing improvement:

How we will further develop this domain:

Self-Study Tool—ASSESSMENT

Domain 2.0: There is evidence that assessment of student learning is frequent, rigorous, and aligned with Alaska’s grade-level expectations (GLEs) and performance standards

Assessment

Assessment is the process of collecting, recording, scoring, monitoring, and interpreting information about a student’s progress, the effectiveness of teaching, and the school’s overall effectiveness. Some assessments are used at the end of a unit, semester, or school year for a record of accountability. These are called “summative assessments.”

Assessments given on a regular basis to monitor progress and inform instructional decisions as called “formative assessments.” Teachers and other school staff members must be supported by school and district administrative leadership in their efforts to collect and use summative and formative assessment data.

Examples of supporting evidence

The following resources may be used as evidence for making ratings. This is not a complete list—each school may have other sources of evidence that will be useful in making ratings in this domain.

- Assessment plan
- Units of study
- Lesson plans that highlight assessments
- Samples of classroom assessments
- Samples of student work
- Student and staff member interviews
- GLE walkthrough data
- Samples of final examinations at middle and high school levels
- Disaggregated state assessment data
- Samples of assessments used for screening, diagnosis, and progress monitoring

Before making ratings for the key elements within each domain, it is important for the team to pool their knowledge and come to a common understanding about the domain as a whole. This will help ensure that all team members are talking about the same thing. This may also be a good time to review important terms used throughout the rubric (see the *Glossary* for key definitions).

Discussion questions prior to making ratings:

1. What assessments are given at each of the grade levels/subject areas?
2. How does the school go about reviewing and using summative assessment results?
3. In what ways do the formative assessments we use inform our instructional practices in the classroom and at the individual student level?

ASSESSMENT

Domain 2.0 - There is evidence that assessment of student learning is frequent, rigorous, and aligned with Alaska’s grade-level expectations (GLEs) and performance standards.	Indicator Ratings of Performance							
	Exemplary level of development and implementation	Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	Limited development or partial implementation	Little or no development and implementation				
Key Elements	4	3	2	1				
2.1 Assessments are aligned with Alaska’s Performance Standards, GLEs, and district curriculum.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: All curricular- area assessments are aligned with Alaska state standards and GLEs.	Most curricular-area assessments are aligned with Alaska state standards and GLEs.	Some curricular-area assessments are aligned with Alaska state standards and GLEs.	Curricular-area assessments are not intentionally aligned with the Alaska state standards and GLEs.				
ELEMENT RATING (2.1)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE UNDER APPROPRIATE COLUMN							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					
Key Elements	4	3	2	1				
2.2 The school staff uses established systems for collecting, managing, analyzing, and reporting data.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: All school staff members use established systems for collecting, managing, analyzing, and reporting data.	Most school staff members use established systems for collecting, managing, analyzing, and reporting data.	Some school staff members use established systems for collecting, managing, analyzing, and reporting data.	There are neither formal assessment systems nor procedures in place for utilizing data.				
ELEMENT RATING (2.2)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE UNDER APPROPRIATE COLUMN							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Alaska Self-Study Tool—Assessment Rubric

2.3 Data from classroom assessments are used by school staff members as a source of information about student learning and to guide instructional decisions.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: All staff members actively use classroom assessment data to make instructional decisions for individual students.	Data from classroom assessments are used by most school staff members as a source of information about student learning, and instructional decisions are made based on these data.	Data from classroom assessments are used by some staff members as a source of information about student learning, and instructional decisions are made based on these data.	Data from classroom assessments are not used by school staff members to guide instructional decisions.				
ELEMENT RATING (2.3)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE UNDER APPROPRIATE COLUMN							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					
2.4 Assessments are administered multiple times a year, in order to determine student progress.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: Progress-monitoring assessments are administered multiple times a year in all current SBA-tested areas.	Progress-monitoring assessments are administered multiple times a year to determine student progress in multiple curricular areas.	There are some progress-monitoring assessments available, but they are inconsistently used.	Progress monitoring assessments are not used.				
ELEMENT RATING (2.4)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE UNDER APPROPRIATE COLUMN							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Alaska Self-Study Tool—Assessment Rubric

2.5	Formative assessments are used on a regular basis to inform instruction and to address the instructional needs of students.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: All teachers use formative assessments on a regular basis to inform instruction and to address student instructional needs.	Most teachers use formative assessments to inform instruction and to address the instructional needs of students.	Some teachers use formative assessment data to inform their instruction and to meet the instructional needs of students.	There is no organized or consistent use of formative assessments.				
ELEMENT RATING (2.5)		LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE UNDER APPROPRIATE COLUMN							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>		4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1						
2.6	The school’s leadership and instructional staff review SBA data to evaluate school programs and student performance.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School and district administrative leaders routinely collaborate with the instructional staff to analyze SBA data aimed at identifying areas needing improvement.	School administrative leaders and most instructional staff members review SBA results to evaluate school programs and student performance.	School administrative leaders and some instructional staff members review SBA results to evaluate school programs and student performance.	No review of SBA results to evaluate school programs and student performance occurs.				
ELEMENT RATING (2.6)		LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE UNDER APPROPRIATE COLUMN							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>		4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1						

Assessment Ratings Summary

2.0 Assessment Domain – There is evidence that assessment of student learning is frequent, rigorous, and aligned with Alaska’s grade-level expectations (GLEs) and performance standards				
2.1 Assessments are aligned with Alaska’s Performance Standards, GLEs, and district curriculum	4	3	2	1
2.2 The school staff uses established systems for collecting, managing, analyzing, and reporting data	4	3	2	1
2.3 Data from classroom assessments are used by school staff members as a source of information about student learning and to guide instructional decisions	4	3	2	1
2.4 Assessments are administered multiple times a year, in order to determine student progress	4	3	2	1
2.5 Formative assessment are used on a regular basis to inform instruction and to address the instructional needs of students	4	3	2	1
2.6 The school’s leadership and instructional staff review SBA data to evaluate school programs and student performance	4	3	2	1

ANALYSIS OF ASSESSMENT DOMAIN

Top 2–3 strengths within this domain:

Top 2–3 limitations/areas needing improvement:

How we will further develop this domain:

Self-Study Tool—INSTRUCTION

Domain 3.0: There is evidence that effective and varied instructional strategies are used in all classrooms to meet the needs of each student

Instruction

Effective instruction incorporates strategies and methods to meet the learning needs of students who function at varied levels within a classroom. Instruction that encourages each student to learn at or above grade level builds student depth of knowledge. High expectations ensure that learning is rigorous. Highly effective teachers are actively involved in making decisions about accommodating individual needs, interests, and learning styles.

Examples of supporting evidence

The following resources may be used as evidence for making ratings. This is not a complete list—each school may have other sources of evidence that will be useful in making ratings in this domain.

- School improvement plan including activities for instructional improvement in reading, writing, and mathematics
- Lesson plans/units of study
- Samples of student work
- Professional development plans for individual teachers
- Professional learning community logs
- Agendas from professional development on instructional strategies
- GLE walkthrough data
- Student journals/learning logs
- Newsletters/other communications with students and families regarding expectations and available support for learning
- Individual learning plans

Before making ratings for the indicators within this domain, it is important for the team to pool their knowledge and come to a common understanding about the domain as a whole. This will help ensure that all team members are clear about the domain and its elements. This may also be a good time to review important terms used throughout the rubric (see the *Glossary* for key definitions).

Discussion questions prior to making ratings:

1. What are the expectations of the school and district for how we provide instruction? (e.g., lesson plans, providing for diverse student needs, etc.)
2. How do teachers identify struggling students for additional and/or more appropriate instruction?
3. How do teachers select instructional strategies and learning activities that meet the individual learning needs of all students?
4. How do teachers collaborate with one another around teaching and student learning?

INSTRUCTION

Domain 3.0 – There is evidence that effective and varied instructional strategies are used in all classrooms to meet the needs of each student.	Indicator Ratings of Performance							
	Exemplary level of development and implementation	Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	Limited development or partial implementation	Little or no development and implementation				
Key Elements	4	3	2	1				
3.1 There is a system in place to ensure that classroom instructional activities are aligned to Alaska’s Content and Performance Standards and GLEs.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders actively use a system to ensure that instructional activities in all classrooms are aligned with Alaska standards and GLEs.	There is a system in place to ensure that instructional activities in most classrooms are aligned with Alaska standards and GLEs.	There is a system in place to ensure that instructional activities in some classrooms are aligned with Alaska standards and GLEs.	There is no system in place to ensure that instructional activities in classrooms are aligned with Alaska standards and GLEs.				
ELEMENT RATING (3.1)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					
Key Elements	4	3	2	1				
3.2 There are coordinated schoolwide-efforts to help low-performing students become proficient.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: All teachers actively and systematically collaborate to utilize different types of instructional strategies to meet the needs of each student in the building.	Most teachers work together to utilize different types of instructional strategies in systematic ways to assist students who are not achieving at proficient levels.	Some teachers work together to utilize different types of instructional strategies in systematic ways to assist students who are not achieving at proficient levels.	Teachers do not work together to utilize different types of instructional strategies to assist students who are not achieving at proficient levels.				
ELEMENT RATING (3.2)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Key Elements	4	3	2	1				
3.3 There is a system in place to provide timely/early instructional intervention to help low-performing students.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: There is a coordinated system in place to identify all students who need additional intensive instructional support early in the school year, and this system is used consistently.	There is a coordinated system to provide timely additional instructional intervention to help most low-performing students.	There are efforts to provide additional instructional intervention to help some low-performing students, but there is no coordinated system in place.	There is not a coordinated system to provide additional instructional intervention to help low-performing students.				
ELEMENT RATING (3.3)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					
Key Elements	4	3	2	1				
3.4 The use of research-based instructional practices guides instructional planning and teaching.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: All teachers throughout the school actively use scientifically based instructional practices to teach at appropriate levels of student readiness, interest, and learning needs.	Most teachers use scientifically based instructional practices to teach at appropriate levels of student readiness, interest, and learning needs.	Some teachers use scientifically based instructional practices to teach at appropriate levels of student readiness, interest, and learning needs.	There is little or no evidence to support that teachers are using scientifically based instructional practices to teach at appropriate levels of student readiness, interest, and learning needs.				
ELEMENT RATING (3.4)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

<p>3.5 Classroom instruction addresses diverse student learning needs.</p>	<p>Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders and teachers actively seek new ways to systematically differentiate instruction to meet student learning needs.</p>	<p>Most classroom instruction throughout the school is differentiated to meet diverse student learning needs.</p>	<p>Some classroom instruction throughout the school is differentiated to meet diverse student learning needs.</p>	<p>Classroom instruction does not appear to address diverse student learning needs.</p>				
<p>ELEMENT RATING (3.5)</p>	<p>LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE</p>							
<table border="1" data-bbox="134 553 453 586"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					
<p>3.6 High academic expectations for student learning are conveyed to students, so that they know what is needed for them to achieve at proficient levels.</p>	<p>Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders and teachers collaboratively convey high academic expectations and support for student learning at the highest possible levels.</p>	<p>Most teachers convey high academic expectations and provide support for student learning to proficient levels.</p>	<p>Some teachers convey high academic expectations and provide support for student learning to proficient levels.</p>	<p>There is little evidence that teachers convey high academic expectations for student learning.</p>				
<p>ELEMENT RATING (3.6)</p>	<p>LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE</p>							
<table border="1" data-bbox="134 1170 453 1203"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Alaska Self-Study—Instruction Rubric

3.7 Teachers use formative assessments, on a regular basis, to measure the effectiveness of instruction and to monitor student progress.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: Teachers and school administrative leaders routinely and actively use formative assessment data to determine the effectiveness of instruction and to monitor student progress in all SBA-tested areas.	Most teachers use formative assessment data to determine the effectiveness of their instruction and to monitor student progress.	Some teachers use formative assessment data to determine the effectiveness of their instruction and to monitor student progress.	There is little or no evidence that teachers use formative assessment data to determine the effectiveness of their instruction and to monitor student progress.				
ELEMENT RATING (3.7)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					
Key Elements	4	3	2	1				
3.8 Teachers’ daily lesson plans demonstrate an alignment of instruction with Alaska content standards and GLEs.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders train and support all teachers in collaborative efforts to write and use effective lesson plans that are aligned with Alaska content standards and GLEs.	Most staff members write and use lesson plans in which the instruction is aligned with Alaska content standards and GLEs.	Some staff members write and use lesson plans in which the instruction is aligned with Alaska content standards and GLEs.	Teachers’ daily lesson plans are not aligned with Alaska content standards or GLEs.				
ELEMENT RATING (3.8)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Instruction Ratings Summary

3.0 Instruction Domain – There is evidence that effective and varied instructional strategies are used in all classrooms to meet the needs of each student				
3.1 There is a system in place to ensure that classroom instructional activities are aligned to Alaska’s Content and Performance Standards and GLEs	4	3	2	1
3.2 There are coordinated schoolwide-efforts to help low performing students become proficient	4	3	2	1
3.3 There is a system in place to provide timely/early instructional intervention to help low-performing students	4	3	2	1
3.4 The use of research-based instructional practices dominates instructional planning and teaching	4	3	2	1
3.5 Classroom instruction addresses diverse student learning needs	4	3	2	1
3.6 High academic expectations for student learning are conveyed to students, so that they know what is needed for them to achieve at proficient levels	4	3	2	1
3.7 Teachers use formative assessments, on a regular basis, to measure the effectiveness of instruction and to monitor progress	4	3	2	1
3.8 Teachers’ daily lesson plans demonstrate an alignment of instruction with Alaska Content Standards and GLEs	4	3	2	1

ANALYSIS OF INSTRUCTION DOMAIN

Top 2–3 strengths within this domain:

Top 2–3 limitations/areas needing improvement:

How we will further develop this domain:

***Self-Study Tool—
SUPPORTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT***

Domain 4.0: There is evidence that the school culture and climate provide a safe, orderly environment conducive to learning

Supportive learning environment

Safety and order, an emphasis on academic achievement, and attention to assessment and monitoring, all are factors in creating a supportive learning environment. Schools that foster a positive school climate create a culture of cohesiveness and a high level of morale among both students and the staff.

Examples of supporting evidence

The following resources may be used as evidence for making ratings. This is not a complete list—each school may have other sources of evidence that will be useful in making ratings in this domain.

- Student discipline logs, infraction and referral reports
- School discipline plan/policy
- Attendance records
- Teacher turnover and attendance records
- School/district safety plan
- Student/parent/staff handbooks
- School improvement plan
- Walkthrough data
- Facility examination
- Review of selected IEPs
- Title I plan, school improvement plan
- School-parent compact
- Parent notification letters
- Parent/teacher conference materials/communications
- Intervention or assistance-team records
- Staff/student/community survey results

Before making ratings for the indicators within each domain, it is important for the team to pool their knowledge and come to a common understanding about the domain as a whole. This will help ensure that all team members are talking about the same thing. This may also be a good time to review important terms used throughout the rubric (see the *Glossary* for key definitions).

Discussion questions prior to making ratings:

1. Does our school consistently provide a safe, orderly, and supportive learning environment for our students?
2. What are the building-wide behavior standards for students? Is there a building-wide discipline plan? Is the plan used consistently across the building?
3. How does the school schedule maximize learning time?
4. How are parents and community members involved in the school's supportive environment?

SUPPORTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Domain 4.0 – There is evidence that school culture and climate provide a safe, orderly environment conducive to learning.	Indicator Ratings of Performance							
	Exemplary level of development and implementation	Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	Limited development or partial implementation	No development and implementation				
Key Elements	4	3	2	1				
4.1 Effective classroom management strategies that maximize instructional time are evident throughout the school.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: A schoolwide positive behavior intervention and support system that includes effective classroom management strategies is actively used throughout the school.	Most teachers consistently implement effective classroom management strategies that maximize instructional time.	Some teachers consistently use classroom management strategies that maximize instructional time.	There is no consistent use of classroom management strategies. Time for instruction is compromised repeatedly throughout the day.				
ELEMENT RATING (3.1)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					
Key Elements	4	3	2	1				
4.2 Schoolwide operational procedures are in place to minimize disruptions to instructional time.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders collaborate with community, family, and student representatives to establish and support policies and operational procedures to minimize disruptions to instruction.	Most school staff members, including administrative leaders, consistently implement and support operational procedures to minimize disruptions to instruction.	Some school staff members, including administrative leaders, do implement and support operational procedures to minimize disruptions, but the procedures are not consistently used nor supported.	The school has not established operational procedures to minimize disruptions to instruction.				
ELEMENT RATING (4.2)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Alaska Self-Study Tool—Supportive learning environment Rubric

4.3 Schoolwide behavior standards are communicated by staff and understood by students.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders and all staff members actively collaborate to consistently define, communicate, and apply student and staff behavior standards throughout the building.	Most teachers clearly communicate behavior standards to students and consistently apply them throughout the school.	Some teachers clearly communicate behavior standards to students and consistently apply them throughout the school.	Behavior standards have not been well defined, clearly communicated to students, or equitably applied.				
ELEMENT RATING (4.3)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					
4.4 The school has an established attendance policy that is implemented.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: The entire school community (parents, community members, staff, and students) is aware of and involved with the implementation of an attendance policy that is used consistently.	Most students and staff are aware of the school attendance policy and it is implemented consistently.	Only some students and staff members are aware of the school attendance policy and/or it is not implemented consistently.	Students and staff members are not aware of the school attendance policy and it is not implemented consistently.				
ELEMENT RATING (4.4)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Alaska Self-Study Tool—Supportive learning environment Rubric

<p>4.5 Extended learning opportunities are made available and utilized by students in need of additional support.</p>	<p>Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: All students who need additional learning support are actively recruited for and participate in extended learning opportunities in SBA-tested areas.</p>	<p>Extended learning opportunities are made available to most students in need of additional support in SBA-tested areas.</p>	<p>Extended learning opportunities are made available to some students in need of additional support in SBA-tested areas.</p>	<p>Extended learning opportunities are not made available to students in SBA-tested areas.</p>				
<p>ELEMENT RATING (4.5)</p>	<p>LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE</p>							
<table border="1" data-bbox="134 521 453 553"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					
<p>4.6 School and classroom environments reflect cultural awareness and an understanding of local cultural values.</p>	<p>Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders actively collaborate with the teaching staff to build cultural awareness and a deepening understanding of local cultural values.</p>	<p>Most teachers and other school staff acknowledge and build on the local cultural values to create supportive classroom learning environments that are reflective of the students who attend the school.</p>	<p>Some teachers and other school staff members acknowledge and build on the local cultural values to create supportive classroom learning environments that are reflective of the students who attend the school.</p>	<p>School and classroom environments do not reflect a cultural awareness and/or an understanding of local cultural values that are reflective of the students who attend the school.</p>				
<p>ELEMENT RATING (4.6)</p>	<p>LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE</p>							
<table border="1" data-bbox="134 1183 453 1216"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Alaska Self-Study Tool—Supportive learning environment Rubric

Key Elements	4	3	2	1				
4.7 School staff members communicate with parents about learning expectations, student progress, and ways to reinforce learning at home.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: The school provides multiple avenues beyond routine progress reports to facilitate regular communication between the school and all families about learning expectations, academic growth, and ways to reinforce learning at home.	Most staff members regularly share with parents/families the expectations for student learning, along with specific explanations of student performance and ways to reinforce learning at home.	Some staff members regularly share with parents/families the expectations for student learning, along with specific explanations of student performance and ways to reinforce learning at home.	There is little evidence that staff members regularly share with parents/families the expectations for student learning, or provide specific explanations of student performance and ways to reinforce learning at home.				
ELEMENT RATING (4.7)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Key Elements	4	3	2	1				
4.8 School staff members communicate with parents and community members to inform them about school priorities and to engage their support.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School staff members systematically analyze outreach efforts and patterns of involvement to ensure that parents and community members are active participants in structuring a supportive learning environment.	Many formal and informal structures are in place to ensure that parents and community members are informed and have the opportunity to contribute to a supportive learning environment.	Some formal and informal structures are in place to ensure that parents and community members are informed and have the opportunity to contribute to a supportive learning environment.	No structures are in place for parents and community members to contribute to a supportive learning environment.				
ELEMENT RATING (4.8)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Alaska Self-Study Tool—Supportive learning environment Rubric

4.9 Physical facilities are safe and orderly.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: The school facility is attractive, well maintained, clean, safe, well lit, orderly, and uncluttered.	Most of the school facility is free of major maintenance issues, is generally in good repair, and is generally clean, safe, orderly, and uncluttered.	Parts of the facility have one or more of the following: minor disrepair, areas of clutter, minor safety concerns, lack of cleanliness	Facility is not safe or orderly due to one or more of the following: major maintenance issues, unclean, seriously cluttered, safety hazards.				
ELEMENT RATING (4.8)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Supportive Learning Environment Ratings Summary

4.0 Instruction Domain – There is evidence that the school culture and climate provide a safe, orderly environment conducive to learning				
4.1 Effective classroom management strategies that maximize instructional time are evident throughout the school	4	3	2	1
4.2 School operational procedures are in place to minimize disruptions to instructional time	4	3	2	1
4.3 Schoolwide behavior standards are communicated by staff and understood by students	4	3	2	1
4.4 The school has an established attendance policy that is implemented	4	3	2	1
4.5 Extended learning opportunities are made available and utilized by students in need of additional support	4	3	2	1
4.6 School and classroom environments reflect a cultural awareness and an understanding of local cultural values	4	3	2	1
4.7 School staff members communicate with parents about learning expectations, student progress, and ways to reinforce learning at home	4	3	2	1
4.8 School staff members communicate with parents and community members to inform them about school priorities and to engage their support	4	3	2	1
4.9 Physical facilities are safe and orderly	4	3	2	1

ANALYSIS OF SUPPORTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT DOMAIN

Top 2–3 strengths within this domain:

Top 2–3 limitations/areas needing improvement:

How we will further develop this domain:

Self-Study Tool—PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Domain 5.0: There is evidence that professional development is based on data and reflects the needs of students, schools, and the district

Professional development

Well-planned, ongoing professional development involves teachers in their own learning and ultimately leads to improved student achievement. It is based on scientifically based practice and is practical, job embedded and results oriented. Professional learning communities are used to support effective staff development and allow for coaching, mentoring, collaboration, and a collective responsibility for student learning.

Examples of supporting evidence

The following resources may be used as evidence for making ratings. This is not a complete list—each school may have other sources of evidence that will be useful in making ratings in this domain.

- School professional development plan
- Professional development components of School improvement plans
- Implementation and impact checks
- List of professional development offerings and records of staff participation
- Individual growth plans
- District teacher evaluation documents
- Other district-specific materials
- Agendas and minutes documenting professional development planning activities

Before making ratings for the indicators within this domain, it is important for the team to pool their knowledge and come to a common understanding about the domain as a whole. This will help ensure that all team members are talking about the same thing. This may also be a good time to review important vocabulary and terms used throughout the rubric (see the Glossary for key definitions).

Discussion questions prior to making ratings:

1. What professional development has taken place during the last year and how has it influenced our instructional practices?
2. How are professional development topic priorities determined at our school?
3. In what ways are new teachers supported in our school and district?

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Domain 5.0 – There is evidence that professional development is based on data and reflects the needs of students, schools, and the district.					Indicator Ratings of Performance										
					Exemplary level of development and implementation		Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation		Limited development or partial implementation		Little or no development and implementation				
Key Elements					4		3		2		1				
5.1 Student achievement data are a primary factor in determining professional development priorities.					Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders and staff members analyze historical data on student achievement to identify persistent needs that should be addressed in present and future professional development.		Multiple sources of student achievement data are a primary factor in determining an intentional strategy for professional development priorities.		Professional development seems inconsistent or is not intentionally linked to student achievement data.		Professional development is neither linked to student achievement data nor reflective of student needs.				
ELEMENT RATING (5.1)					LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE										
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>					4	3	2	1							
4	3	2	1												
5.2 Written policies and procedures are used in the evaluation of all personnel.					Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders ensure that all school staff members understand the personnel evaluation plan in a timely manner.		There are written policies and procedures that are consistently and equitably used in the evaluation of all personnel.		There are written policies and procedures regarding evaluation, but they are inconsistently or inequitably followed.		There are no written policies or procedures regarding evaluation.				
ELEMENT RATING (5.2)					LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE										
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>					4	3	2	1							
4	3	2	1												

Alaska Self-Study Tool—Professional development Rubric

<p>5.3 The teacher evaluation process is aligned to the Alaska Professional Teacher Standards.</p>	<p>Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders facilitate discussion between staff members about the Alaska professional teacher standards and what these look like in practice.</p>	<p>The teacher evaluation process is fully aligned to the Alaska professional teacher standards.</p>	<p>Some of the teacher evaluation process is aligned to the Alaska professional teacher standards.</p>	<p>The teacher evaluation process is not aligned to the Alaska professional teacher standards.</p>				
<p>ELEMENT RATING (5.3)</p>	<p>LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE</p>							
<table border="1" data-bbox="134 488 453 521"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					
<p>5.4 Professional development is embedded into the daily routines and practices of the school staff.</p>	<p>Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: Teachers work together as a professional learning community to support learning for all students. They contribute to the learning of others.</p>	<p>Professional development is ongoing and embedded into teacher routines and practices.</p>	<p>Professional development occurs infrequently and is not embedded into teacher routines and practices.</p>	<p>Professional development consists of one-time, disconnected events and is not embedded into teacher routines and practices.</p>				
<p>ELEMENT RATING (5.4)</p>	<p>LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE</p>							
<table border="1" data-bbox="134 1104 453 1136"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Alaska Self-Study Tool—Professional development Rubric

5.5 All teachers receive ongoing and systematic feedback and support for instructional improvement.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders actively share with the staff a global picture of the school instructional needs and overall staff growth objectives and provide ongoing and systematic feedback and support linked to schoolwide improvement goals.	School administrative leaders follow the certified personnel evaluation plan to document staff members’ performance through formal observations and provide informal observations and feedback to all staff members at regular intervals.	School administrative leaders follow the certified personnel evaluation plan by completing formal observations and providing feedback, but do not provide informal observations and feedback to staff members.	School administrative leaders follow the certified personnel evaluation plan, but do not provide feedback or support for instructional improvement.				
ELEMENT RATING (5.5)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE UNDER APPROPRIATE COLUMN							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					
5.6 There is a mentoring program in place that supports new teachers in the development of instructional and classroom management skills.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School leaders collaborate with mentors to maintain continuity and to differentiate professional development for new staff members.	Most new teachers have access to mentoring and support related to classroom management and instructional skills.	Some new teachers have access to mentoring and support related to classroom management and instructional skills.	There are no organized efforts to provide support to new teachers.				
ELEMENT RATING (5.6)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE UNDER APPROPRIATE COLUMN							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Alaska Self-Study Tool—Professional development Rubric

5.7 Sufficient time and resources are allocated to support professional development and growth geared toward the goals outlined in the school improvement plan.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: The school administrative leaders regularly seek outside resources to expand professional development opportunities in line with the school improvement plan or with identified professional development needs.	Sufficient time and resources are allocated toward supporting the goals and the professional development needs outlined in the school improvement plan.	Insufficient time and resources are allocated toward supporting the goals and the professional development needs outlined in the school improvement plan.	School administrative leaders allocate professional development resources on activities that are not outlined in the school improvement plan and/or resources intended for professional development are not used.				
ELEMENT RATING (5.7)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE UNDER APPROPRIATE COLUMN							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Professional Development Ratings Summary

5.0 Professional development Domain – There is evidence that professional development is based on data and reflects the needs of students, schools, and the district				
5.1 Student achievement data are a primary factor in determining professional development priorities	4	3	2	1
5.2 Written policies and procedures are used in the evaluation of all personnel	4	3	2	1
5.3 The teacher evaluation process is aligned to the Alaska Professional Teacher Standards	4	3	2	1
5.4 Professional development is embedded into the daily routines and practices of the school staff	4	3	2	1
5.5 All teachers receive ongoing and systematic feedback and support for instructional improvement	4	3	2	1
5.6 There is a mentoring program in place that supports new teachers in the development of instructional and classroom management skills	4	3	2	1
5.7 Sufficient time and resources are allocated to support professional development and growth geared toward the goals outlined in the school improvement plan	4	3	2	1

ANALYSIS OF SUPPORTIVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DOMAIN

Top 2–3 strengths within this domain:

Top 2–3 limitations/areas needing improvement:

How we will further develop this domain:

Self-Study Tool—LEADERSHIP

Domain 6.0: There is evidence that leadership focuses on improving student achievement

Leadership

Leadership at the school level is a process of guiding improvements in student learning. Successful leaders develop a vision for their schools based on their personal and professional values. They can articulate this vision at every opportunity and influence their staff and community to share the vision. The management of learning—its structures and activities—is focused toward the achievement of this shared vision.

Examples of supporting evidence

The following resources may be used as evidence for making ratings. This is not a complete list—each school may have other sources of evidence that will be useful in making ratings in this domain.

- Displays of the vision, mission, and belief statements
- School improvement plan
- Meeting announcements, agendas, and minutes of staff meetings, team meetings
- Professional development component of school improvement plan
- Teacher/student/parent handbooks
- GLE walkthrough data
- School Web site
- Other district-specific materials
- Policies and procedures for the supervision of principals

Before making ratings for the indicators within each domain, it is important for the team to pool their knowledge and come to a common understanding about the domain as a whole. This will help ensure that all team members are talking about the same thing. This may also be a good time to review important vocabulary and terms used throughout the rubric (see the Glossary for key definitions).

Discussion questions prior to making ratings:

1. How has the school developed its improvement goals in the past?
2. How is progress on the school improvement plan monitored in this building?
3. How does the district and building-level leadership assist teachers in overseeing the progress of students, including student subgroups?

LEADERSHIP

Domain 6.0 - There is evidence that school administrative leaders focus on improving student achievement.	Indicator Ratings of Performance							
	Exemplary level of development and implementation	Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	Limited development or partial implementation	Little or no development and implementation				
Key Elements	4	3	2	1				
6.1 School administrative leaders facilitate the development and implementation of the school and district goals.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: The school’s goals are known by the entire staff, they are actively implemented, and progress is monitored toward achieving these goals.	School administrative leaders actively facilitate the development and implementation of school goals in collaboration with the school staff.	There are school goals but they are not actively developed or implemented by the school staff.	School goals do not exist.				
ELEMENT RATING (6.1)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					
6.2 School administrative leaders regularly analyze assessment and other data, and use the results in planning for the improved achievement of all students.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders continually monitor student academic performance data and regularly convene staff and community members to keep them informed and to develop consensus about ways to address the identified concern areas.	School administrative leaders, in collaboration with staff members, analyze assessment and other data on a regularly scheduled basis and use the results in planning for the improved achievement of all students.	School administrative leaders, in collaboration with staff members, analyze assessment and other data on an annual basis to make some modifications to school improvement plans based on this analysis.	Assessment and other data are not analyzed to make modifications to school improvement plans.				
ELEMENT RATING (6.2)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Alaska Self-Study Tool—Leadership Rubric

6.3 School administrative leaders actively assist staff members in understanding formative and summative student achievement data and in how to use this information to make changes to instruction.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders require all instructional staff members to collaborate on making appropriate and timely adjustments to their instruction or curricular materials, based on summative and formative assessment data.	School administrative leaders assist the entire instructional staff on the use of summative and formative assessment data to indentify curriculum and instructional changes necessary to meet the learning needs of individual students.	School administrative leaders assist some instructional staff members on the use of summative and formative assessment data to indentify curriculum and instructional changes necessary to meet the learning needs of individual students.	Formative and summative assessment data are not used in making decisions about curriculum and assessment.				
ELEMENT RATING (6.3)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Alaska Self-Study Tool—Leadership Rubric

6.4 School improvement goals are specific, measureable, attainable, realistic, and time bound (SMART) and are based on student achievement data.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders require the entire instructional staff to regularly make appropriate, timely adjustments in their instruction or curricular materials, based on disaggregated student performance data.	School improvement goals are “SMART” and are based on student achievement data.	School goals are “SMART” but are not based on student achievement data.	School goals are not “SMART” and are not based on student achievement data.				
ELEMENT RATING (6.4)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					
6.5 School administrative leaders systematically monitor the implementation of the school improvement plan.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders use a variety of data sources (lesson plans, classroom observations, grade level meetings, etc.) to ensure the implementation of the school improvement plan.	School administrative leaders facilitate regularly scheduled meetings about progress on the school improvement plan—utilizing the benchmarks addressed in the plan.	School administrative leaders infrequently monitor the implementation and progress of the school improvement plan.	There is no monitoring of the school improvement plan during the school year.				
ELEMENT RATING (6.5)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Alaska Self-Study Tool—Leadership Rubric

6.6 School administrative leaders ensure that staff members have access to and are trained to implement Alaska’s Content and Performance Standards and Grade-Level Expectations.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders invest time and effort throughout the school year to assist staff members in ways to understand and implement Alaska’s state standards and the grade-level expectations.	School administrative leaders ensure that all staff members have access to and are trained to implement Alaska State Standard and Grade Level Expectations.	School administrative leaders have provided some staff members with information on accessing the Alaska state standards and GLEs, but no formal steps have been taken to develop teachers’ skills.	School administrative leaders have provided no information or opportunities to develop teachers’ skills and awareness of Alaska state standards and GLEs.				
ELEMENT RATING (6.6)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					
6.7 School administrative leaders conduct formal and informal observations and provide timely feedback to staff members on their instructional practices.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders make weekly informal observations with feedback that teachers use to make improvements in their instructional practices.	School administrative leaders conducts both informal and required formal classroom observations and provide timely feedback to staff members on their instructional practices.	School administrative leaders conduct both informal and required formal classroom observations but do not provide timely feedback to staff members on their instructional practices.	School administrative leaders only make the formal observations required to complete teacher evaluations.				
ELEMENT RATING (6.7)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Alaska Self-Study Tool—Leadership Rubric

6.8 School administrative leaders build a positive relationship with parents and community members regarding school improvement efforts.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leaders actively partner with the district staff, school staff, parents, and community to engage their support and active involvement towards continuous school improvement.	School administrative leaders make ongoing contact on a regular basis with parents and community members regarding school improvement efforts to enlist their support for continuous improvement.	School administrative leaders do not communicate on a regular basis with parents and community members with regard to school improvement activities.	School administrative leaders conduct school functions without including parents and community members.				
ELEMENT RATING (6.8)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					
6.9 There is a process for the school administrative leader to receive support and guidance as part of administrator evaluation procedures.	Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus: School administrative leader growth plans include a focus on nurturing leadership skills for district, community, and professional roles inside and outside of the school.	There is a process for school administrative leaders to receive follow-up support and guidance as part of the administrator evaluation procedures, and this process is implemented in an ongoing manner throughout the year.	The school administrative leaders receive annual follow-up support and guidance as part of the principal evaluation process.	The school administrative leaders do not receive follow-up support and guidance as part of the principal evaluation process.				
ELEMENT RATING (6.9)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Alaska Self-Study Tool—Leadership Rubric

6.10 The school administrative leader oversees the progress of students who are not meeting adequate yearly progress.	<p>Meets criteria for rating of “3” on this indicator plus:</p> <p>School administrative leaders compare the academic achievement of student subgroups of the school with the academic achievement of comparable population subgroups in similar and high-performing schools to inform curricular and instructional decisions that address the needs of the school’s diverse population.</p>	The school administrative leaders conduct monthly student progress reviews for all students who are not meeting AYP.	The school administrative leaders on a conduct quarterly student progress reviews for all students who are not meeting AYP.	The school administrative leaders do not oversee the progress of students who are not meeting AYP.				
ELEMENT RATING (6.10)	LIST DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE							
<table><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	4	3	2	1				
4	3	2	1					

Leadership Ratings Summary

6.0 Leadership Domain – There is evidence that school administrative leaders focus on improving student achievement	Exemplary	Fully functioning	Limited development	Little or No
6.1 School administrative leaders facilitate the development and implementation of the school and district goals	4	3	2	1
6.2 School administrative leaders regularly analyze assessment and other data, and use the results in planning for the improved achievement of all students	4	3	2	1
6.3 School administrative leaders actively assists staff members in understanding formative and summative student achievement data and how to use this information to make changes to instruction	4	3	2	1
6.4 School improvement goals are specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time bound (SMART) and are based on student achievement data	4	3	2	1
6.5 School administrative leaders systematically monitor the implementation of the school improvement plan	4	3	2	1
6.6 School administrative leaders ensure that staff members have access to and are trained to implement Alaska’s Content and Performance Standards and Grade-Level Expectations	4	3	2	1
6.7 School administrative leaders conduct formal and informal observations and provide timely feedback to staff members on their instructional practices	4	3	2	1
6.8 School administrative leaders build a positive relationship with parents and community members regarding school improvement efforts	4	3	2	1
6.9 There is a process for the school administrative leader to receive support and guidance as part of the administrator evaluation procedures	4	3	2	1
6.10 The school administrative leader oversees the progress of students who are not meeting adequate yearly progress	4	3	2	1

ANALYSIS OF SUPPORTIVE LEADERSHIP DOMAIN

Top 2–3 strengths within this domain:

Top 2–3 limitations/areas needing improvement:

How we will further develop this domain:

Glossary of General Education Terms and Acronyms

“872” School – This is a school that meets specific criteria, per 4 AAC 06.872, indicating a need for EED and district consultation.

ACC – Alaska Comprehensive Center. The Alaska Comprehensive Center at SERRC, in partnership with Education Northwest, is part of the network of 16 Regional Comprehensive Centers and five Content Centers that support EED with high-quality, research-based resources.

Alaska content standards — Broad statements of what students should know and be able to do as a result of their public school experience.

Alaska professional teacher standards — Standards clearly defining the skills and abilities Alaska teachers and administrators must possess to prepare effectively today’s students for successful lives and productive careers.

AMO – Annual measurable objective. AMO is the percentage of students who must score at a proficient level or higher on state assessments. By the 2013–2014 school year the AMO for language arts and math is 100 percent.

AYP – Adequate yearly progress. AYP occurs when a school or district meets the state’s goals for reading/language arts and mathematics.

CBM – Curriculum-based measurement. An assessment for learning that is used for progress monitoring and is aligned to the GLEs.

Classroom assessments – Formal and informal assessments of students by a teacher, typically in a classroom setting.

Curriculum – What students should know, be able to do, and be committed to (content and performance standards)—how it is taught (instruction), how it is measured (assessment), and how the educational system is organized (context).

Curriculum alignment – Process by which a district’s curriculum is examined and modified in order to address adequately the Alaska performance standards/grade-level expectations at all grade/developmental levels and content areas.

Desk audit – EED’s review of data to determine the ways in which a district and its schools are making progress in mathematics and language arts towards achieving AYP.

Domain – Large spheres of educational activities ordering the related practices within it such as the six “domains” within Alaska’s instructional audit.

EED/(DEED) – Alaska’s Department of Education and Early Development. This is the state education agency (SEA).

Embedded professional development – Professional development designed within a district’s or a school’s daily culture, providing for continual, intentional, broad, and deep instructional improvement.

Formative assessment – Formative assessments are conducted at the classroom level and are intended to be used by teachers to monitor and adjust instruction based on student need. These are assessments for learning.

GLEs – Grade-level expectations. GLEs are based on the state’s standards and provide teachers with a roadmap at each grade level for what must be taught and what may be assessed.

HSGQE – High School Graduation Qualifying Exam. This exam consists of three parts (reading, writing, and math) and all three parts need to be passed to earn a high school diploma. Students can begin testing in their sophomore year and have two opportunities to take it in both their junior and senior years of high school.

Instructional audit – An on-site review conducted by a state team of educators and focused on the policies and practices around six domains. The instructional audit takes place in selected schools within a district. Results are summarized into a district report.

Key element – One item of a list that identifies major component parts of a domain (also, itemized lists in the GLEs describing standards).

LEA – Local education agency. The local agency responsible for the implementation of program services to students. In Alaska, this is usually the school district.

NCLB – The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. This is the latest version of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act, signed into law January 8, 2002.

PBS or PBIS – Positive behavior intervention supports. A three-tiered system for addressing a school’s climate and an individual student’s behavioral needs.

Proficient – Acceptable status of student mastery in a content area expressed as a score at or above a certain boundary on the commensurate standards-based assessment (SBA).

Progress monitoring – This is a set of techniques for assessing student performance on a regular and frequent basis.

RTI – Response to Intervention/Instruction. In Alaska, RTI provides a framework to support all students using a three-tiered model that addresses both academic achievement and behavioral support for all students.

Scientifically based research – The term “scientifically based research” means research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs.

SEA – State education agency. This is the government agency responsible for statewide education program supervision and administration. In Alaska, the SEA is the Department of Education and Early Development (EED), which is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education as the governing agency.

SBAs – Standards-based assessments. These are Alaska’s annual assessments for students in grades 3–10 in reading, writing, and math. Students in grades 4, 8, and 10 are also assessed in science. The results of these assessments are used in determining a school and district’s adequate yearly progress (AYP).

SSOS – Statewide system of support. NCLB requires SEAs to provide a system of intensive and sustained support to districts and schools that are in corrective action and restructuring status. The legislation expects states to prioritize their support and to utilize support teams and distinguished educators and principals to do this.

Summative assessment – Assessments that are given at the end of a learning period, such as Alaska’s SBAs or end-of-course assessments. These are assessments of learning.

Technical assistance providers – In Alaska, this includes technical assistance coaches, content support specialists, Alaska administrator mentors, and Alaska teacher mentors.

Title I – The largest program of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). Title I provides federal funding to high-poverty schools.