

## **HCS 2018-19 Phase One: Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Districts\_11152018\_11:49**

Phase One: Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Districts

**Henderson County**  
Marganna Stanley  
1805 Second St  
Henderson, Kentucky, 42420  
United States of America

Last Modified: 12/03/2018  
Status: Locked

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

Continuous Improvement Diagnostic ..... 3  
ATTACHMENT SUMMARY..... 5

## Phase One: Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Districts

### Continuous Improvement Diagnostic

**Rationale:** The purpose of this diagnostic is to encourage thoughtful reflection of a district's current processes, practices and conditions in order to leverage its strengths and identify critical needs.

#### Part I:

1. Using the results of perception surveys (e.g., TELLKY, eProve™ surveys\*) from various stakeholder groups, identify the processes, practice and conditions the district will address for improvement. Provide a rationale for why the area(s) should be addressed.

\*eProve™ surveys employ research-based questions that produce useful, relevant results, empowering institutions to turn knowledge into practice. These surveys are accessible to all schools and districts and monitor stakeholder perceptions in the areas of communication, continuous improvement, and improvement initiatives. Additionally, surveys empower you to capture stakeholder feedback, target professional development, identify areas of strengths and weaknesses, monitor progress of improvement, and focus improvement initiatives and student achievement.

When the last TELL survey was administered, our district was in the process of a \$7 million budget reduction over a two-year period. All of the statements under Time are below the state average. Under the category of facilities and resources, we were below the state average as a district in the cleanliness and maintenance of the school environment. We were above state averages in all areas for community support and involvement with the same low areas as the state in parents/guardians as influential decision makers in the schools and supporting teachers to contribute to student success. In the area of managing student conduct, concerns are noted in students following school rules of conduct and administration consistently enforcing rules for conduct. Teacher leadership was consistently above the state average in each indicator. Differentiation of professional learning and the evaluation with results communicated to teachers were areas lower than state average. Our superintendent has shared these data with district and school leadership to determine strengths and areas for growth in improvement; in addition, she has met with each school leader to determine specific areas on their professional growth plans to address school concerns. An intentional focus to differentiate professional learning for teachers has been implemented also.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

#### Part II:

2. How will the district engage a variety of stakeholders in the development of a process that is truly ongoing and continuous? Include information on how stakeholders will be selected and informed of their role, how meetings will be scheduled to accommodate them and how the process will be implemented and monitored for effectiveness.

Data results are reviewed and analyzed at district leadership level and school level as results become available. Schools share data with SBDM Councils and staffs and district shares data with school level administration and school board. School leaders and teachers analyze data within weekly PLC meetings. District leadership meets twice monthly and more frequently as needed; SBDM Councils meet monthly and school board meets at least monthly. Meetings are documented through minutes, Google docs; board meetings are streamed live as well. Internal data sources such as individual classroom data, Infinite Campus/SWIS data/AESOP (behavior, attendance, etc.), NWEA MAP data, ACT data, KPREP data, transition readiness data, graduation rate, district

common assessments, surveys from staff and students such as Gallup and Bright Bytes, walkthrough data, MUNIS data, and other data at the school and district level were also used. While this data can show us points in time, trends, and longitudinal information from various perspectives, there are many other aspects of our school system, such as the relationships among students and staff, that are less tangible but definitely have an impact.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

ATTACHMENT SUMMARY

Attachment Name	Description	Item(s)
-----------------	-------------	---------