| *Vision* | | *Mission* |
|---|---|---|
| *All JCPS students graduate prepared, empowered, and inspired to reach their full potential and contribute as thoughtful responsible citizens of our diverse, shared world* | **JCPS**<br><br>CDIP Overview 2021 -2022 | *To challenge and engage each learner to growth through effective teaching and meaningful experiences with caring, supportive environments* |

| Learning: Student Learning, Growth and Development | Culture and Climate: Increasing Capacity and Improving Culture | Organizational Coherence: Improving Infrastructure and Integrating Systems |
|---|---|---|

**Goals/Outcomes include (not limited to):**

⬆ Success skills-prepared and resilient learner, effective communicator, productive collaborator, globally and culturally competent citizen, emerging innovator

⬆ Proficiency, Separate Academic Indicator, Gap, Growth

⬆ Transition Readiness

⬆ Graduation

**Key Actions**
- Backpack of Success Skills
- Transition readiness continuum
- Authentic assessment system
- Personalized and engaging learning environment (e.g., Six Essential Systems)
- Community partnerships

**Goals/Outcomes include (not limited to):**

⬆ Positive, safe school culture and climate

⬆ Teacher retention, satisfaction

⬆ Integration of teaching, assessment, and deeper learning opportunities

⬆ Student engagement, sense of belonging, attendance

⬇ Suspensions

**Key Actions**
- Meaningful relationships
- Professional deeper learning
- Transformed instructional core
- Family engagement
- High performing teams
- Leadership Equity-Centered Pipeline

**Goals/Outcomes include (not limited to):**

⬆ School performance (AIS status)

⬆ Coherent core processes and practices

⬆ Equitable access in systems for different student groups

⬇ Disproportionality gaps across behavior and academic data

⬆ Parent/family satisfaction

**Key Actions**
- Coherent systems and processes (Future State teams)
- Racial equity policy
- School redesign and innovation
- Improved school supports
- Modernized facilities plan
- School choice plan
- Evolve 502

# EXCELLENCE WITH EQUITY

| Type | Goal | Objective | Methodology |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Proficiency** | 1. Proficiency: By the end of the 2024-2025 school year, Jefferson County Public Schools will reach their goals for percentage of students Proficient/Distinguished in  Reading and Math to the following:<br><br>Reading (baseline 2018-2019):<br>Elementary: 46% to 58%<br>Middle: 50% to 61%<br>High: 37% to 52%<br><br>Math (baseline 2018-2019):<br>Elementary: 40% to 53%<br>Middle: 35% to 50%<br>High: 31% to 46% | 1.1 Proficiency: By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, Jefferson County Public Schools will reach their goals for percentage of students Proficient/Distinguished in  Reading and Math to the following:<br><br>Reading (baseline 2018-2019):<br>Elementary: 46% to 51%<br>Middle: 50% to 54%<br>High: 37% to 43%<br><br>Math (baseline 2018-2019):<br>Elementary: 40% to 45%<br>Middle: 35% to 41%<br>High: 31% to 37% | KDE Interim Proficiency Goals |
| **Gap** | 2. Gap: By the end of the 2024-2025 school year, JCPS will reach their goals for percentage Proficient/Distinguished in combined Reading/Math for the all the groups of students we serve (40% African American, 48% Hispanic, 74% Asian, 34% ELL, 45% FRL, 65% White, and 31% ECE). | 2.1. Gap: By the end of the 2021-2022 , JCPS will reach their goals for percentage Proficient/Distinguished in combined Reading/Math for the all the groups of students we serve  (29% African American, 38% Hispanic, 69% Asian, 23% ELL, 35% FRL, 59% White, and 19% ECE) | KDE Interim Proficiency Goals |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Growth | 3. Growth: By the end of the 2024-2025 school year, our district will increase the percentage of students meeting their expected growth 65% in Reading and Math as measured by MAP (baseline in 2018-2019 was 56% met growth in Reading and Math) | 3.1 By the end of the 2020-2021  school year, 58% of students will meet their expected Winter to Spring growth in Reading and Math as measured by MAP. | Local Measure |
| Transition Readiness | 4. Transition Readiness: By the end of the 2024-2025 school year, JCPS will increase the percentage of students that are college and career ready to 64%. | 4.1 Transition Readiness: By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, JCPS will increase the percentage of students that are college and career ready to 58%. | Cut the distance to 100% CCR in half by 2030 based on 2018-2019 baseline data |
| Graduation | 5. Graduation: By the end of the 2024-2025 school year, JCPS will increase the 4-year graduation rate to 85.2% | 5.1 Graduation: By the end of 2021-2022 school year JCPS will increase the 4-year graduation rate to 83.5%. | KDE Interim Graduation Goals |
| Culture and Climate | 6. Culture and Climate: By the end of the 2024-2025 school year, JCPS will increase the average percent satisfaction with their school/department across all role groups to 90%. | 6.1 By end of the 2021-2022 school year, JCPS will increase the average percent satisfaction with their own school/department, across all role groups, to 85% | Local Measure |

| Separate Academic Indicator | 7. Separate Academic Indicator: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, Jefferson County Public Schools will reach their goals for percentage of students Proficient/Distinguished in  Social Studies, Science and Writing to the following: | 7.1 By end of the 2021-2022 school year, Jefferson County Public Schools will reach their goals for percentage of students Proficient/Distinguished in  Social Studies, Science and Writing to the following: | KDE Interim Proficiency Goals |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Science<br>Elementary: 25% to 42%<br>Middle: 23% to 40%<br>High: 24% to 41%<br><br>Social Studies<br>Elementary: 43% to 56%<br>Middle: 49% to 61%<br>High: N/A<br><br>Writing<br>Elementary: 36% to 51%<br>Middle: 21% to 39%<br>High: 36% to 51% | Science<br>Elementary: 25% to 31%<br>Middle: 23% to 29%<br>High: 24% to 31%<br><br>Social Studies<br>Elementary: 43% to 48%<br>Middle: 49% to 54%<br>High: N/A<br><br>Writing<br>Elementary: 36% to 42%<br>Middle: 21% to 28%<br>High: 36% to 42% | |

| KDE Goal | Strategy (Vision 2020) | # | Vision 2020 In Action Activity | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding (representing key 21-22 investments) | Start Date | End Date | Persons Responsible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Proficiency, Gap, Growth, Transition Readiness, Separate Academic Indicator | 1.1.1. Adopt a broader definition of deeper learning, 1.1.2 Personalize learning, 1.1.3 Provide equitable access, 3.3.2 Harness innovation, 3.3.3 Optimize technology usage (KCWP 2, 5, 6) | 1 | **Backpack of Skills:** Identify, implement and support Backpack of Skills: (1) What do students need to be able to do? (2) What experiences will get them there? (3) How will they demonstrate skills?** | Improved literacy and numeracy skills Increased college and career readiness rates Increased graduation rate Improved NAEP Increased access to devices and wifi | % of students with evidence of success skills in their digital portfolio % of students experiencing learning experiences aligned to deeper learning principles as measured by CSS % of students meeting literacy and numeracy benchmarks as measured by MAP % of students with acceleration plans | Backpack and: $300,000 General Fund; DL Symposium cost: $460,000 General Fund; Technology and Hotspots: $39,000,000 GEER/ESSER;* NWEA MAP Assessment: $1,782,000 General Fund; * Technology and Hotspots: $39,000,000 GEER/ESSER; Deeoer Learning Infrastructure and Support: $458,652 General Fund; Extended Learning before/after school $23,113,814 ESSER/GEER; Library Books/Textbooks/Study Guides: 5,816,933 ESSER/GEER; Pathfinder: $15,000,000 ESSER and $10,000,000 General Fund; Florida Virtual School: $8,500,000 ESSER | 08/01/2021 | 12/31/2022 | Coleman, Belcher |
| Transition Readiness | 1.1.2 Personalize learning,1.1.6 Strengthen early childhood, 1.1.7 Eliminate achievement, learning, and opportunity gaps (KCWP 1, 2, 5) | 2 | **Transition Readiness Continuum:** Define and monitor transition readiness of critical skills needed at key points in student development; provide various supports for students not transition ready, including extended learning time. | Decreased 9th grade dropout rates Increased transition ready Increased graduation rate Increased college and career readiness rates Increased college-going rate | % of 5th, 8th, and 12th grade students meeting defense/capstone requirements % of students on track to graduate % kindergarten ready (Brigance) % of students participating in extended learning % meeting growth on MAP in literacy and numeracy % of students at-risk as assessed by a universal screener | Backpack platform: $300,000 General Fund;* Early Childhood: $22,100,000 ESSER/GEER; Multi-Tiered Systems of Support: $3,676,221 CCEIS Fund; * Kindergarten Readiness Camp: $600,000, General Fund; Vocational-Tech: $5,181,583 General Fund; Summer Learning /Extended Learning: $26,055,919 ESSER/GEER | 08/01/2021 | 12/31/2022 | Moore, Coleman, Meyer, Hartstern, Leffert, Marks-Johns, Fulk, Ellison, Gratz |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Proficiency, Gap, Growth | 1.1.4 Reduce, revise, and refine assessments, 2.1.2 Cultivate growth mindset (KCWPs 2, 3 and 4) | 3 | **Authentic Assessment System:** Meaningfully assess student learning and provide feedback throughout the school year to adjust instruction and interventions to meet the needs of each student. | Increased student-led conferences presenting goals, work, and assessment outcomes. Increased quality of work in student digital portfolios Increased transition ready | % of educators trained in assessment literacy % student engagement on CSS % of schools implementing multiple demonstrations of learning | NWEA MAP Assessment: $1,782,000 General Fund* Brigance Screening: $41,000 General Fund; Gifted and Talented Expansion: $266,821* General Fund; | 08/01/2021 | 12/31/2022 | Coleman, Dillard |
| Transition Readiness, Graduation | 1.1.2 Personalize learning, 1.1.5 Improve student literacy (KCWP 1) | 4 | **Personalized and Engaging Learning Environments:** Provide students with quality and engaging educational programs, relevant career-focused experiences, and comprehensive support services by personalizing learning environments, transforming the alternative schools and expanding and monitoring the Academies of Louisville model. | Decreased dropout and retention Increased college and career readiness rates Increased graduation rate Decreased suspension and behavioral referrals | % student sense of belonging and engagement on CSS and QSCS # of suspensions and behavior referrals Absenteeism/ attendance rates % of students on-track for promotion % of students transition ready | Academies of Louisville: $7,966,599 General Fund * Art and Music in Elementary Schools: $2,500,000 General Fund; Middle School Explore Pathways: $1,000,000 General Fund; Technology and Hotspots: $39,000,000 GEER/ESSER;* | 08/01/2021 | 12/31/2022 | Coleman, Ellison, Deferrari |
| Transition Readiness, Graduation | 1.1.2 Personalize learning, 1.1.3 Provide equitable access (KWCP 5) | 5 | **Community Partnerships:** Leverage community partners to provide equitable personalized learning experiences and targeted support for students | Decreased dropout and retention Increased college and career readiness rates Increased graduation rate | # of Academies of Louisville business partnership reports % of students participating in work-based experiences % of students with dual credit | Academies of Louisville: $7,966,599 General Fund; * Evolve 502 student supports: $2,500,000 General Fund;* | 08/01/2021 | 12/31/2022 | Moore, Ellison |
| Gap, Growth | 2.1.2 Cultivate growth mindset, 2.1.3 Improve culture and climate, 1.1.2 Personalize learning, 1.1.7 Eliminate achievement, learning, and opportunity gaps (KCWP 5, 6) | 6 | **Meaningful Relationships:** Advocate practices that improve engagement, belonging, and empowerment for students, staff, and families. | Improved teacher and staff retention Decreased disproportionality in suspensions | % sense of belonging, engagement, and voice across stakeholder groups from the CSS and QSCS % positive ratings on teacher and school leadership items from the IMPACT survey | Mental Health Supports $6,800,000 General Fund;* Multi-Tiered Systems of Support $3,676,221 CCEIS Fund; * Restorative Practice $2,600,000 General Fund; Social Emotional & Mental Health Services: 19,995,808 ESSER/GEER | 08/01/2021 | 12/31/2022 | Coleman, Deferrari, Green-Webb, Averette |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Proficiency, Gap, Growth, Separate Academic Indicator | 2.1.1. Personalize deeper learning, 2.2.2 Build capacity of PLCs (KCWP 5, 6) | 7 | **Professional Deeper Learning (Teacher Backpack):** Develop a professional learning system that provides common understanding of deeper learning and deeper learners constructs with clear exemplars to improve shared understanding districtwide. | Increased number of teachers with microcredentials in personalizing instruction Increased quality exhibitions and defenses across schools Increased number of teachers with professional learning experiences in remote instruction tools | % of educators with professional learning experiences in deeper learning % of students with evidence of success skills in their digital portfolio | Professional development for staff: $5,301,633 Title II; Project-based Learning: $135,000 General Fund; Deeper Learning Flex PD Days: $31,000 General Fund; | 08/01/2021 | 12/31/2022 Coleman, Dillard |
| Proficiency, Gap, Growth, Separate Academic Indicator | 2.1.1. Personalize deeper learning, 2.2.2 Build capacity of PLCs (KCWP 5, 6) | 8 | **Transformed Instructional Core:** Implement an aligned instructional core (i.e., standards, curriculum, instruction, and assessment frameworks, and grading practices) and professional development system to create deeper learning experiences for all students. | Improved literacy and numeracy skills and growth Increased transition readiness Increased quality of work in student digital portfolios | % of educators trained in deeper learning strategies % educators implementing deeper learning experiences measured by surveys Passing rates in gateway courses (e.g., English I, Algebra I) measured through grades % of students with acceleration plans | School-Based Academic Instructional Coaches: $11,800,000, General Fund; Edmentum Courseware and Support: $725,000, General Fund; $300,000 ESSER ThinkCERCA: $1,000,000 CARES Fund* | 08/01/2021 | 12/31/2022 Coleman, Dillard |
| Gap, Growth | 3.2.1 Engage with families, 3.2.2 improve and standardize external systems (KCWP 5) | 9 | **Family Engagement**: Improve outreach so families can have more access points to engage in their students' educational experiences. | Increased student attendance Reduced chronic absenteeism Increased transition readiness NTI participation rates | % parental login to digital portfolio platform and parent portal % parent satisfaction from the CSS School CNXT data metrics | Family Engagement school capacity work and NCFL collaboration $241,000 Title IV;* Parent and Family Engagement school initiatives: $462,429 Title I; | 08/01/2021 | 12/31/2022 Coleman, Marshall, Deferrari |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Proficiency, Gap, Growth | 2.1.3 Improve culture and climate, 2.2.1 Define high-performing teams (KCWP 6), | 10 | **High Performing Teams**: Provide learning opportunities for educators to learn together, plan, and reflect upon and improve professional practice. | Increased teacher retention Increased minority educator staffing | % positive ratings on teacher survey and IMPACT survey % educator sense of belonging and satisfaction from the CSS | Equity Institute: $220,000 General Fund; Sub Solutions: $2,200,000 General Fund; National Board Certification Tuition Reimbursement: $818,205 General Fund; Classified Employee Teacher Pipeline program: $185,000 General Fund; Teacher Residency Program: $1,600,000 General Fund; Equity Centered Leadership Pipeline: up to $8,200,000 Wallace Foundation * | 08/01/2021 | 12/31/2022 Green-Webb, Marshall |
| Proficiency, Culture and Climate | 1.1.6 Strengthen early childhood, 1.1.7 Eliminate achievement, learning, and opportunity gaps, 3.2.3 Improve and standardize internal systems (KCWP 1, 2, 5) | 11 | **Coherent Systems and Processes**: Implement common performance management practices, processes, and routines focused on (1) reviewing current data related to strategic goals, (2) defining actions that will improve data to meet goals, (3) conducting systematic reviews of district corrective action plans, and (4) supporting schools in their development of systems to support a healthy learning environment (Future State teams) | Improved district ratings on state accountability Reduced number of CSI/TSI schools | Regular cycle of review of strategies/targets and gap to goal analysis at Cabinet meeting, school leadership team meeting, and Board meeting as demonstrated by agenda/minutes. % central office satisfaction ratings on the CSS Comprehensive Systems Reviews (CSR) of Six Essential Systems as measured by CSR reports *(if available)* | Multi-Tiered Systems of Support: $3,676,221 CCEIS Fund; * CSI and ATSI School support: $4,800,000 SIF Fund;* | 08/01/2021 | 12/31/2022 Dossett |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Proficiency, Gap, Growth, Culture and Climate | 1.1.7 Eliminate achievement, learning, and opportunity gaps, 3.1.3 Improve human resources infrastructure (KCWP 5, 6) | 12 | **Racial Equity Policy:** Implement JCPS Racial Equity Policy and monitor plans districtwide. | Reduced disproportionality in behavior referrals, suspensions, and ECE placements<br>Reduced achievement gaps through increased proficiency and growth in literacy and numeracy among students of color | Racial Equity Plan monitoring metrics | Racial Equity Plan Support: $8,200,000 General Fund;<br><br>Gifted and Talented Expansion: $226,821*<br>General Fund;<br><br>ESL Support: $25,037,429*<br>General Fund;<br><br>ECE: $124,945,892 General Fund;<br><br>Equity Programs including ESL and ECE: $13,500,000 ESSER/GEER<br><br>Equity Centered Leadership Pipeline: up to $8,200,000 Wallace Foundation *<br><br>Equity Programs for school-based racial equity professional development: $3,000,000 ESSER | 08/01/2021 | 12/31/2022 | Marshall, Coleman, Moore, Hardin, Belcher, Perkins, Dossett, Murphy, Green-Webb, Dennes, Brown, Chevalier |
| Gap, Growth | 1.1.3 Provide equitable access,, 1.1.7 Eliminate achievement, learning, and opportunity gaps, 3.3.2 Harness innovation (KCWP 1, 2, 5) | 13 | **School Redesign and Innovation:** Support turnaround efforts to implement evidence-based and innovative systems of support | Improved school ratings on state accountability<br>Reduced CSI/TSI schools | % funding for CSI/TSI schools | Funding for Accelerated Improvement Schools: $7,800,000 General Fund;<br><br>CSI and ATSI School support: $4,800,000 SIF Fund;*<br><br>Alternative School Redesign Behavior Support: $340,435 General Fund; | 08/01/2021 | 12/31/2022 | Moore, Meyer, Hartstern, Leffert, Marks-Johns, Fulk, Ellison |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gap, Growth | 3.1.4 Ensure responsible stewardship of resources, 3.2.2 Improve and standardize external systems, 3.2.3 Improve and standardize internal systems, 3.2.4 Listen and respond to stakeholders, 3.3.1 Create a technology roadmap (KCWP 4, 5) | 14 | **Improved School Supports:** Equitably align resource allocation with strategic priorities for physical, instructional, and human resource infrastructure in ways that meet student learning needs. | Improved teacher and staff retention (working conditions) Improved literacy and numeracy skills | % instructional and non-instructional school staffing % NBCT in the classroom % of schools in High Growth category in literacy and numeracy (MAP) % of schools in High Achievement category in literacy and numeracy (MAP) | ECE Implementation Coaches: $10,500,000 General Fund; Mental Health Supports: $6,800,000 General Fund;* Ventilation, Safety, PPE Protocols: $28,400,000 GEER/ESSER* CSI and ATSI School support: $4,800,000 SIF Funds;* Textbook Rescue for elementary and middle schools: $2,280,480 General Fund; ESL Support: $25,037,429* General Fund; Funding for high-poverty schools: $53,197,118, Title I; Teacher Retention Supports: $130,000 General Fund | 08/01/2021 12/31/2022 | Perkins, Green-Webb, Coleman, Hardin, Chevalier, Averette, Meyer |
| Culture and Climate | 1.1.7 Eliminate achievement, learning, and opportunity gaps, 3.1.1 Improve physical infrastructure, 3.1.2 Improve instructional infrastructure (KCWP 2, 5, 6) | 15 | **Modernized Facilities Plan:** Develop a facilities planning process to address the most critical three-year consumer and renovation needs. | Improved facility conditions index for quintile 4 schools Increased early childhood centers Increased new buildings | % spending on critical maintenance needs | New construction (multi-year) $271,000,000 in bondable projects; Facilities non-bondable projects: $11,000,000 General Fund; Athletic fields and facilities renovations: $250,000 General Fund Ventilation, Safety, PPE Protocols: $28,400,000 GEER/ESSER | 08/01/2021 12/31/2022 | Perkins |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Culture and Climate | 3.3.2 Harness innovation, 3.4.1 Improve communications, 3.4.2 Improve processes, 3.4.3 Provide customer-service training, 3.4.4. Empower families, 3.4.5 Reduce student mobility (KCWP 5) | 16 | **School Choice Plan**: Clarify, restructure, and expand choice programs to better meet student and family needs. | Improved JCPS market share<br>Improved quality of magnets | % satisfaction with schools<br><br>Enrollment in magnets for students of color | Marketing School Choice: $300,00 General Fund; | 08/01/2021 | 12/31/2022 Moore, Dossett |
| Transition Readiness, Graduation | 1.1.2 Personalize learning, 1.1.7 Eliminate achievement, learning, and opportunity gaps, 2.1.2 Cultivate growth mindset, 3.2.1 Engage with families, 3.4.4 Empower families, (KCWP 5, 6) | 17 | **Evolve 502:** Engage in a community-wide development of a system infrastructure to support each student in post-secondary success | Improved college and career readiness rates<br>Improved graduation rates<br>Increased transition readiness | % of students with Unite Us referrals<br><br>% of students with scholarships upon graduation | Evolve 502 student supports: $2,500,000 General Fund; | 08/01/2021 | 12/31/2022 Dossett, Lowe |

\* Repeat of item due to applicability to more than one Activity

## Special Considerations for Districts with Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) Schools

Districts with a school identified for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) must monitor and provide support to the school to ensure the successful implementation of the school improvement plan (703 KAR 5:280(11)). The local board of education must review and approve the revised school improvement plan for TSI schools (KRS 160.346(4)(a)) .

| Monitoring and Support |
|---|
| **Consider:** Describe the district's plan for monitoring and supporting the school improvement plan of any school identified for TSI. Include in your response information regarding the process for local board review and approval. |
| **Response:** |
| In 2018-2019, JCPS created an office of Accelerated Improvement Schools (AIS). The AIS office, in collaboration with our Elementary, Middle, and High School offices, was designed to provide supports to CSI/TSI schools as well as schools that are identified as potentially becoming a CSI school. Currently, the AIS department and High School office is focused on serving 2 TSI schools (Ballard and Seneca).  Each school receives differentiated support from the District staff and assistant superintendents and are given special emphasis, support, resources, and attention when the District makes decisions in order to foster success. Support for the TSI schools include increased funding and support for the schools in the area identified for targeted support, data supports from the district Research office, and assistance from the district Resource Development office in developing and submitting their SIF application. Monitoring of progress on school improvement efforts are led by the High School Office and AIS offices and includes routines that examine each schools' vital signs (key performance indicators), and implementation checks of school turnaround efforts through school leadership reflections, Formative Systems Reviews, and Comprehensive School Reviews. Based on JCPS analysis of data, if accountability had been calculated in 2019-2020, Seneca would have exited ATSI status based on their progress for students with disabilities. However, ATSI status label remained due to no state accountability changes being made this past year.  The JCPS Board of Education reviews and approves the revised school improvement plans annually. |

# CDIP Addendum: AIS District/School Improvement Activities

| Activity Name and Description<br>(Include EBP) | Funding | Monitoring/ Measurement |
|---|---|---|
| **Carnegie Improvement Systems Professional Learning** - Participants (All AIS principals and ERs) will be enrolled in courses from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to learn processes related to building a system of continuous improvement in their schools (Cognia Standard 1.3). Each AIS principal and ER staff member will be participate in an early spring 2021 course called "Introduction to Improvement Science Basics", a late spring course "Causal System Analysis", a fall course called "Improvement Science in Practice", and a spring 2022 course called "Facilitating Improvement Teams". AIS principals and ERs will also participate in a Causal System Analysis workshop to being set the stage for the fall "Improvement Science in Practice" course. Schools will be grouped into Network Improvement Communities to collaborate on using improvement science to address common problems of practice. These NICs will be assigned to coaches from Carneige who will guide each through a continuous improvement process focused on one or more of the school's improvement priorities. | **$725,830 – 2 year SIF Grant** | ➤ **AIS Office Monitoring Visits**<br>➤ **KDE Monitoring/Quarterly Reporting**<br>➤ **MAP Data**<br>➤ **Data from School and District PDSA's (Plan, Do, Study, Act)**<br>➤ **KPREP Data including reduction of # of CSI schools in JCPS**<br>➤ **Various Plus Deltas on training and training implementation** |
| **Urban School Visit** - The AIS district support staff will travel to another urban school district that has documented success with school turnaround practices. The purpose of this learning visit will be to collaborate and review systems of support and accountability developed by the successful urban district in order to inform change around current systems within the AIS office. This visit will coincide with the work related to the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders. GTL will support the AIS office in the planning of the visit based upon their expertise with other successful urban turnaround districts and their fit to the JPCS context. | **$10,704 – 2 year SIF Grant** | ➤ **Plus Deltas on visits**<br>➤ **Evidence of implementation of system development within the AIS Office.** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Center for Great Teachers and Leaders Professional Learning, Coaching, and Consultation** - The Center on Great Teachers and Leaders will provide the AIS office with expertise and coaching on the development of new systems for building and developing turnaround leader competencies within the CSI principals.<br><br>GTL will provide the AIS office with expertise and coaching on the development of new systems for building and developing a program to support and grow teachers in CSI schools. This system will include components of recruitment and retention of teaching staff.<br><br>GTL will also provide professional learning experiences directly to the AIS leadership team in order to develop best practices around district support and accountability to CSI schools. These services will include supporting the AIS office with the development, implementation, and monitoring of a strategic plan focused on supporting the capacity building of turnaround teachers and leaders (items 1 and 2 above.) | **$923,299 – 2 year SIF Grant** | ➢ **KDE Monitoring/Quarterly Reporting**<br>➢ **MAP Data**<br>➢ **KPREP Data including reduction of # of CSI schools in JCPS**<br>➢ **Various Plus Deltas on coaching and consultation**<br>➢ **Evidence of implementation of system development within the AIS Office.** |
| **Harvard School Turnaround Leader Development Program** - 26 CSI principals based upon turnaround capacity needs will attend the School Turnaround Leaders Institute at Harvard University during the summer session. The Institute is a 5 day experience on the campus. School turnaround efforts require highly effective leaders who are able to create the conditions for rapid and sustained change. Leaders must drive fundamental shifts in school culture and instructional practice that result in rapid gains and ongoing performance. The demands are great and the need for such leaders is even greater. This specialized leadership program from The Principals' Center brings together individuals and teams who are charged with turning around chronically underperforming schools. Participants learn how to establish high expectations for instructional quality, develop effective teams, translate data into action, and generate deep engagement among school and community stakeholders. They leave with a school improvement plan they can put into action right away. | **$78,182 – 2 year SIF Grant** | ➢ **Plus Deltas on training experience**<br>➢ **Evidence of implementation of learning as documented through AIS school monitoring visits**<br>➢ **CCVs (Collaborative Calibration Visits)**<br>➢ **KY IMPACT Data**<br>➢ **JCPS Comprehensive School Survey Data** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Feedback and Coaching Labs from Rutherford Learning Group** - Supporting schools in the development and implementation of an effective feedback and coaching system that improves instruction leading to increases in student performance is a main priority across all Jefferson County CSI schools.  Schools will be supported through 4 specific approaches targeted to improve feedback and coaching skills among school leaders and coaches, building capacity with school leaders and coaches to train others on feedback and coaching, improve the capability of school leaders and coaches to accurately assess the instruction performance of their school, and provide teachers in CSI schools with a deeper understanding of 23 teacher themes of quality instruction.  Mike Rutherford of the Rutherford Learning Group will be working with the school leaders, coaches, district support personnel, and educational recovery members to build these skills and capacities. | **$178,500 – 2 year SIF Grant** | ➢ **Plus Delta**<br>➢ **Evidence of implementation of learning as documented through AIS school monitoring visits**<br>➢ **AIS Bi-Week School Report**<br>➢ **KY IMPACT Data**<br>➢ **JCPS Comprehensive School Survey Data** |
| **Additional Academic Instruction Coach Professional Learning related to effective feedback and coaching practices** - The Jefferson County School District provides half day support sessions for all of the district academic instructional coaches on a monthly basis.  These sessions include a variety of topic and many times just logistics in nature. The AICs of CSI schools have specifically asked for more time to practice and learn from each other the aspects of effective feedback and coaching. To accommodate this need, the AIS office will include a second half of the day learning experience for the coaches to specifically focus on feedback and coaches processes.  These professional learning experiences would be planned in collaboration between the AIS office and ER staff based upon coaching materials related to the Rutherford Feedback and Coaching Tools, The Heart of Coaching, and The Art of Coaching.  These experiences will take place in one of the CSI schools where practice sessions could be scheduled. | **$15,750 – 2 year SIF Grant** | ➢ **Plus Delta**<br>➢ **JCPS Comprehensive School Survey Data**<br>➢ **School Report Card (teacher retention)**<br>➢ **AIS Bi-Week School Report** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Additional Professional Learning Community Time for AIS teachers -** Beginning in 2020-21, all AIS schools will provide additional PLC time for teacher teams to address student learning deficiencies and gaps in academic performance. This additional one additional hour per week per teacher throughout each school will be used for grade level teams to analyze common assessment data in order to adjust instruction to meet the specific learning needs of students. The additional hour at the elementary level will enable teachers to address both math and ELA data each week. The secondary schools will have an additional hour to address their assigned content areas. | **$1,305,756 – 2 year SIF Grant** | ➢ **AIS Office Monitoring Visits**<br>➢ **KDE Monitoring/Quarterly Reporting**<br>➢ **MAP Data**<br>➢ **KPREP Data including reduction of # of CSI schools in JCPS** |
| **Solution Tree Training for AIS Schools -** Several of the CSI schools have expressed a need and desire to receive extensive training related to the implementation and development of professional learning communities. This allocation would allow 7 school teams to attend the 3 day Solution Tree Institute for deeper learning experiences regarding the use of PLC's to drive improved student learning results. | **$110,824 – 2 year SIF Grant** | ➢ **Plus Delta**<br>➢ **Evidence of implementation of learning as documented through AIS school monitoring visits**<br>➢ **AIS Bi-Week School Report**<br>➢ **KY IMPACT Data**<br>➢ **JCPS Comprehensive School Survey Data** |
| **AIS Summer Learning Institutes for Teachers and Leaders –**<br><br>The first segment of this activity will be a two day professional learning experience for all AIS principals and administrative support teams (Assistant Principals, AICs, Resource Coaches) focused on effective teams and team processes, improvement science, and creating a culture of equity and inclusion.  Each AIS principal will participate in this experience for the summer of 2021 and summer 2022. | **$50,000 – 2 year SIF Grant (Principal Institute)**<br><br><br><br>**$ 389,248 – 2 year SIF Grant (Teacher** | ➢ **Plus Delta**<br>➢ **KDE Monitoring/Quarterly Reporting**<br>➢ **MAP Data**<br>➢ **KPREP Data including reduction of # of CSI schools in JCPS** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| The second segment of this activity will include a two day professional learning experience for all AIS teachers new to 3 years experience focused three major threads of development.  These include high-leverage teaching practices for all learners (emphasis on , teacher clarity of instruction, and learner equity in the classroom. | **Institute)** | |
| <mark>Chromebooks for AIS Schools</mark> **–** Chromebooks acquisition and use for improved student learning has been a focus in all AIS schools over the past year.  Each school is now one to one with technology.  There is still a need to have additional Chromebooks on hand to serve as replacements.  Each AIS school will be allotted one classroom set of Chromebooks to serve as replacements. | **$ 388,00 – 2 year SIF Grant (Teacher Institute)** | ➢ **AIS Office Monitoring Visits**<br>➢ **AIS Bi-Week School Report** |
| <mark>Extended Learning Time for Students</mark> **–** Each AIS school will be provided additional funds in order to extend student learning time throughout the year.  Schools will be able to support both after school learning programs and summer learning programs that provide more options and time for academic learning services to students. | **$ 500,000 – 2 year SIF Grant (Teacher Institute)** | ➢ **MAP Data**<br>➢ **KPREP Data including reduction of # of CSI schools in JCPS** |
| <mark>AIS Personnel</mark> – The AIS office will seek to employee a retired school administrator on a part time basis to ensure implementation of the district SIF grant supporting the AIS office, to assist with progress monitoring of the implementation and impact of improvement initiatives, and to report progress of SIF grant/improvement plan effectiveness to KDE. | **$ 68,000 – 2 year SIF Grant** | ➢ **Weekly AIS Leadership Meeting Agendas and Minutes (Grant/Plan Implementation Levels)**<br>➢ **District SIF Quarterly Expenditure Reports from KDE** |

## Evidence Based Practice #1: Continuous Improvement Systems

| | |
|---|---|
| Are there research data available to demonstrate the effectiveness (e.g. randomized trials, quasi-experimental designs) of the innovation? If yes, provide citations or links to reports or publications. | A case study published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching found that improvement work should be "planned and undertaken in a rigorous, thoughtful, and transparent fashion".  Administration and instructional coaches will attend training this summer focusing on school improvement and use of data. The administration and instructional coaches will also be trained in Shipley's school improvement systems. The protocols and tools for continuous improvement will be implemented to develop goals, action plans, and progress monitoring systems resulting in improved outcomes for students.<br><br><br><br>Park, Sandra, et al. "Continuous Improvement in Education." *Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*, 2013, pp. 1–48.<br><br><br>Continuous Improvement in Education.pdf |
| What is the strength of the evidence?  Under what conditions was the evidence developed? | ESSA Level III: A sampling of organizations, including school districts, individual schools, and community partners; the case examples focused on three school districts and one community partnership. |
| What outcomes are expected when the innovation is implemented as intended? How much of a change can be expected? | AIS Schools will implement and promote Carnegie's system for school Improvement.  District staff and school principals will learn how to analyze and use key data points to inform academic and non-academic decision-making, ensuring the systems are sustainable, while supporting continuous improvement. |
| If research data are not available, are there evaluation data to indicate effectiveness (e.g. pre/post data, testing results, action research)? If yes, provide citations or links to evaluation reports. | N/A |

| | |
|---|---|
| Is there practice-based evidence or community-defined evidence to indicate effectiveness? If yes, provide citations or links. | Yes - Practice based evidence that supports/indicates effectiveness.<br><br>Continuous Improvement in Education pdf |
| Is there a well-developed theory of change or logic model that demonstrates how the innovation is expected to contribute to short term and long-term outcomes? | Yes - There is a three-phase system that schools work through to implement the system Phase One of the framework consists of a causal system analysis; phase two – developing a working theory of improvement; and phase three - PDSA.<br><br>Continuous Improvement in Education.pdf |
| Do the studies (research and/or evaluation) provide data specific to the setting in which it will be implemented (e.g., has the innovation been researched or evaluated in a similar context?)<br>If yes, provide citations or links to evaluation reports. | Yes - The data specific to the setting was obtained from educational settings using continuous improvement processes and procedures. The research is descriptive in nature.<br><br>Continuous Improvement in Education.pdf |
| Do the studies (research and/or evaluation) provide data specific to effectiveness for culturally and linguistically specific populations? If yes, provide citations or links specific to effectiveness for families or communities from diverse cultural groups? | The study does not provide data specific to effectiveness for culturally and linguistically specific populations because it applies to all stakeholders. |

# Evidence Based Practice #2: Rutherford Coaching- Instructional Coaching: Curriculum and Instructional Practices

| | |
|---|---|
| Are there research data available to demonstrate the effectiveness (e.g. randomized trials, quasi-experimental designs) of the innovation? If yes, provide citations or links to reports or publications. | In a 2017 study conducted by Brown University and published by LearningForward, the pooled effect size of coaching on teacher practice is .57 standard deviation (p<.001) across the 25 studies within the measure of instructional practice. The effects are larger (.71 standard deviation, p<.001) in coaching programs focused on general practices than on content-specific coaching programs (.51 standard deviation, p<.001). In addition, all models of teacher coaching, across all content areas combined, have a positive effect (.11 standard deviation, p<.001) on student achievement when pooled across reading, math, and science as measured on standardized tests, a finding drawn from the effect sizes reported in 21 studies. Content-specific coaching in reading (22 of 26 studies) has a .12 standard deviation (p<.001) on student reading achievement. The number of studies focusing on general instructional coaching and measuring student achievement is limited — only three of nine studies — and further research is needed. The effect size across the general coaching studies on teaching practice is .70 (p<.01).

Kraft MA, Blazar D, Hogan D. The Effect of Teacher Coaching on Instruction and Achievement: A Meta-Analysis of the Causal Evidence. Review of Educational Research [Internet]. 2018; 88 (4):547-588.

[The Effect of Teacher Coaching on Instruction and Achievement: A Meta-Analysis of the Causal Evidence](#)

Meta-analysis conducted on various sized teacher-coaching programs and diverse contexts

[The Rutherford Learning Group](#) |
| What is the strength of the evidence? Under what conditions was the evidence developed? | ESSA Level III: Teacher coaching has emerged as a promising alternative to traditional models of professional development. The authors reviewed the empirical literature on teacher coaching and conduct meta-analyses to estimate the mean effect of coaching programs on teachers' instructional practice and students' academic achievement. Combining results across 60 studies that employ causal research designs, they found pooled |

| | |
|---|---|
| | effect sizes of 0.49 standard deviations (SD) on instruction and 0.18 SD on achievement. Much of this evidence comes from literacy coaching programs for prekindergarten and elementary school teachers. Although these findings affirm the potential of coaching as a development tool, further analyses illustrate the challenges of taking coaching programs to scale while maintaining effectiveness. Average effects from effectiveness trials of larger programs are only a fraction of the effects found in efficacy trials of smaller programs. The concluded by discussing ways to address scale-up implementation challenges and providing guidance for future causal studies. |
| What outcomes are expected when the innovation is implemented as intended? How much of a change can be expected? | **Important aspects of school function such as student learning, teacher development, and school culture improvement. To make a statistically significant (measureable and substantial) impact on teacher quality, enhancing the long-term utility of each student's education (not just increasing test scores).** |
| If research data are not available, are there evaluation data to indicate effectiveness (e.g. pre/post data, testing results, action research)? If yes, provide citations or links to evaluation reports. | N/A |
| Is there practice-based evidence or community-defined evidence to indicate effectiveness? If yes, provide citations or links. | During the 2020 - 2021 school year, the tools of coaching and feedback will be examined and practiced in school classrooms with school teachers to focus on high-performance teaching and effective leadership. The final piece of the year will include a two-day academy (six hours each) to examine the 23 teaching themes closer and provide more learning experiences around feedback and coaching.<br><br>The Rutherford Learning Group |
| Is there a well-developed theory of change or logic model that demonstrates how the innovation is expected to contribute to short term and long-term outcomes? | *Feedback & Coaching Lab™* **is a school-embedded professional learning experience that builds instructional leadership capacity for administrators, instructional coaches, curriculum specialists, and/or anyone who is responsible for the learning of teachers and the development of teaching.**<br><br>**Here's the logic for Feedback & Coaching Lab: Many variables affect student achievement. The variable with the largest and most durable effect size is instructional quality. Instructional quality is largely a product of the teacher's skills, techniques, and approaches to teaching. These skills, techniques, and approaches are highly developable through feedback and coaching. Over time, school leaders who, through skillful feedback and coaching, can develop teachers and teaching create school cultures that attract and retain even more skillful teachers. And the cycle continues… to the great benefit of student learning.** |
| Do the studies (research and/or evaluation) provide data specific to the setting in which it will be implemented (e.g., has the innovation been researched or evaluated in a similar context?) If yes, provide citations or links to evaluation reports. | **This is an ongoing study of the most recurring pedagogical approaches of particularly successful teachers. Based on more than 40,000 classroom observations, the 23 Artisan Themes represent a comprehensive lexicon of terms that describe the core skills of excellent instruction. The 23 themes are discussed fully in Mike Rutherford's The Artisan Teacher: A Field Guide to Skillful Teaching. The Artisan Teacher is designed to develop the craft of teaching by enabling teachers to identify and hone their most productive skills—and, to add new, complementary,** |

| | skills to their repertoire.  The Artisan Teacher is also designed to be an aid to administrators, instructional coaches, college professors, and anyone who is engaged in the learning and development of teachers and teaching.<br><br>**The Rutherford Learning Group** |
|---|---|
| Do the studies (research and/or evaluation) provide data specific to effectiveness for culturally and linguistically specific populations? If yes, provide citations or links specific to effectiveness for families or communities from diverse cultural groups? | N/A |

# Evidence Based Practice #3 Dufour Professional Learning Communities

| | |
|---|---|
| Are there research data available to demonstrate the effectiveness (e.g. randomized trials, quasi-experimental designs) of the innovation? If yes, provide citations or links to reports or publications. | *Evidence Citation:*<br><br>DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R, & Many, T. (2006). *Learning by Doing: A Handbook for*<br><br>  *Professional Learning Communities at Work*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.<br><br><br>Hattie, J. (2008). *Visible Learning*. Abington, Oxon: Routledge.<br><br><br>Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008) A review of research on the impact of professional<br><br>  learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. Teaching and Teacher<br>  Education (24), 80-91.<br><br><br>Park, J., Lee, I., & Cooc, N. (2019). The role of school-level mechanisms: How principal support, professional |

| | learning communities, collective responsibility, and group-level teacher expectations affect student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 55*(5), 742-780. |
|---|---|
| What is the strength of the evidence?  Under what conditions was the evidence developed? | Creating a professional learning community is suggested as a new alternative for propelling teacher's professional development (Lomos et al., 2011; Vescio et al., 2008; Wong, 2010). Many studies also report that teacher engagement in the professional learning community is important, specifically in relation to the improvement of student achievement (e.g., 746 Educational Administration Quarterly 55(5) Bruce & Flynn, 2012). In addition, as a part of the social environment in the school, collective responsibility contributes to helping teachers focus on school norms that are linked with student achievement (Lee & Loeb, 2000). These two school organization factors directly influence group-level teacher expectations that are closely connected to improving student achievement. Finally, group-level teacher expectation (see Agirdag, Van Avermaet, & Van Houttee, 2013; Brault, Janosz, & Archambault, 2014; Rubie-Davies, 2007) plays a key role in changing student attitudes and behaviors, including learning motivation (Woolley & Grogan-Kaylor, 2006), and academic achievement (Mistry, White, Benner, & Huynh, 2009; Muller, 1998; Muller, Katz, & Dance, 1999; Tyler & Boelter, 2008). In this vein, we focused on identifying group-level teacher expectations as a critically mediating role between a high school's three social environmental factors (i.e., principal support, professional learning communities, and collective responsibility) and student math achievement in this study. There is also evidence that the attached study addresses well-defined and developed PLC's have a positive effect on student learning (11 studies on teaching and learning through the PLC Process). A Review of Research on the Impact of Professional Learning Communities on Teaching Practices and Student Learning.pdf |

| | |
|---|---|
| What outcomes are expected when the innovation is implemented as intended? How much of a change can be expected? | Many researchers generally note that the concept of professional learning community includes the following aspects: teachers sharing a common view on a school's mission or goals, mutually reflecting on instructional activities, engaging in reflective dialogue, providing each other with feedback on teaching practices, and collectively focusing on student learning (Lomos et al., 2011; Vescio et al., 2008). As a new paradigm in the professional development of teachers, attention to the professional learning community has increased since the mid-1990s (Vescio et al., 2008; Wong, 2010). Education policy has particularly placed a high priority on energizing professional learning communities in U.S. schools (Blank, 2013; Lomos et al., 2011). In addition, as another type of positive school climate, collective responsibility is usually described as the extent to which teachers accept responsibility for student learning success at a school (LoGerfo & Goddard, 2008).

Research shows school climate affects student outcomes by directly influencing teachers' instructional behaviors and attitudes (Cook, Murphy, & Hunt, 2000; Freiberg, 1999). In the same line, Hord (1997) argues that transforming a school into a professional learning community has positive effects for teachers and students. Compared with teachers in traditionally organized schools, faculty members working in the schools that are characterized as professional learning communities work better together and modify their pedagogy (Hord, 1997; Lee, Smith, & Croninger, 1995). In more detail, teacher isolation is reduced, commitment to the mission and goals of the school is increased, professional learning community for students is shared, and new knowledge and beliefs about teaching and learning are created. For students, a large body of research reports that the professional learning community has a positive influence on student achievement (e.g., Akiba & Liang, 2016; Lomos et al., 2011; Supovitz & Christman, 2003; Vescio et al., 2008). For example, Bruce and Flynn (2012) reported that students taught by teachers participating in professional learning community programs showed increased confidence in math ability and improved math achievement. More recently, by analyzing statewide longitudinal survey data in Missouri, Akiba and Liang (2016) found that teacher participation in the professional learning community is more effective for student achievement growth than their engagement in university courses or individual learning activities. |
| If research data are not available, are there evaluation data to indicate effectiveness (e.g. pre/post data, testing results, action research)? If yes, provide citations or links to evaluation reports. | N/A |
| Is there practice-based evidence or community-defined evidence to indicate effectiveness? If yes, provide citations or links. | Park, J., Lee, I., & Cooc, N. (2019). The role of school-level mechanisms: How principal support, professional learning communities, collective responsibility, and group-level teacher expectations affect student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 55*(5), 742-780. |

[A Review of Research on the Impact of Professional Learning Communities on Teaching Practices and Student Learning.pdf](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Is there a well-developed theory of change or logic model that demonstrates how the innovation is expected to contribute to short term and long-term outcomes? | The innovation is expected to contribute to short-term outcomes by implementing the PLC process with fidelity to ensure a continuous improvement design is sustainable for focusing on student learning and building teacher efficacy.  The long-term outcome is for AIS schools to have sustainability and refinement of continuous PLC design. |
| Do the studies (research and/or evaluation) provide data specific to the setting in which it will be implemented (e.g., has the innovation been researched or evaluated in a similar context?)<br>If yes, provide citations or links to evaluation reports. | Identifying a school-level mechanism influencing student achievement provides a better understanding of how to sustain high school performance through school reform initiatives (e.g., principal leadership training or building a learning climate to improve teachers' educational expectations). Of the many predictors of student achievement, factors that relate to the school social environment can be directly influenced by school policy and practices (K. J. Reynolds et al., 2017; Thapa, Cohen, Guffey, & Higgins-D'Alessandro, 2013). From a practical standpoint, the current study provides important policy implications by showing how students' academic achievement can be improved through reforming a school's social environmental factors. To improve student achievement, this study empirically shows the need to facilitate the school learning climate as well as raise teacher expectations at the group level. Results of the current study suggest the importance of strengthening teachers' collaborative learning for building a professional learning community, accountability for students' successful learning, and high educational expectations that are closely linked with the change of instructional practices and teaching behaviors.<br><br>R. Goddard et al. (2015), results of this study have a methodological implication for creating appropriate estimations of latent schoollevel constructs. The current study used MSEM to appropriately estimate the effect of principal support, professional learning community, and collective responsibility, and group-level expectations, which are aggregated by individual math teacher ratings in the same school. In this study, estimating and interpreting the effect of these school-level variables on student math achievement was achieved by controlling for measurement errors at both the individual math teacher and school levels, as well as a sampling error in the aggregation of individual math teacher ratings to form school-level constructs (see, Marsh et al., 2012; Preacher et al., 2011). As a result, this research extends many existing studies that have only applied traditionally structural equational modeling of a single level for controlling for measurement error, or multilevel modeling (or hierarchical linear modeling) used to control for sampling error, and to decompose effects at the level of the individual teacher and school. |

Park, J., Lee, I., & Cooc, N. (2019). The role of school-level mechanisms: How principal support,professional

learning communities, collective responsibility, and group-level teacher expectations affect student

achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 55*(5), 742-780.

 doi:10.1177/0013161X18821355

| | |
|---|---|
| Do the studies (research and/or evaluation) provide data specific to effectiveness for culturally and linguistically specific populations? If yes, provide citations or links specific to effectiveness for families or communities from diverse cultural groups? | Yes: In MEFA, first within factor consisted of six items: (1) math teachers in this department share ideas on teaching, (2) math teachers in this department discuss what was learned at workshop/conference, (3) math teachers in this department share and discuss student work, (4) math teachers in this department discuss lessons that were not successful, (5) math teachers in this department discuss beliefs about teaching/ learning, and (6) math teachers in this department share research on effective teaching methods. Second within factor was loaded by four items: (1) math teachers in this department share and discuss research on effective instructional practices for English language learners, (2) math teachers in this department explore new teaching approaches for underperforming students, (3) math teachers in this department coordinate course content with other teachers in this school, and (4) math teachers in this department are effective at teaching students in math. However, two items not significantly loaded from the original measurement (math teachers in this department provide support to new math teachers; math teachers are supported/encouraged by math department's chair or curricular area coordinator) were deleted in this study.<br><br>Park, J., Lee, I., & Cooc, N. (2019). The role of school-level mechanisms: How principal support,professional learning communities, collective responsibility, and group-level teacher expectations affect student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 55*(5), 742-780. doi:10.1177/0013161X18821355 |