

Manual for School Self-Assessment on the Driver Implementation (DI) and Personalized Learning (PL) Maps

Version 3.0

*Developed by the WKU Rock Solid Evaluation Team in Support of the
kid-FRIENDLY RTT-D Grant*



January 31, 2017 Edition

©WKU Rock Solid Evaluation Team

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Step 1: Assemble the Self-Assessment Team	2
Step 2: Get Familiar with the kid·FRIENDLY Driver Implementation Map	3
Step 3: Get Familiar with the kid·FRIENDLY Personalized Learning Map	4
Step 4: Make Initial Ratings	6
Step 5: Consider Evidence.....	7
Step 6: Review Evidence and Make Final Ratings.....	9
Step 7: Reflect and Plan Ahead.....	9
Final Steps.....	9
Appendix A: kid·FRIENDLY Driver Implementation Map.....	11
Appendix B: kid·FRIENDLY Personalized Learning Map	16
Appendix C: Teacher Interview Questions.....	26
Appendix D: Student Interview Questions.....	28
Appendix E: kid·FRIENDLY Personalized Learning Classroom Observation Tool	30
Appendix F: Reflection and Planning Tool	38

Introduction

The goal of the GRREC/OVEC kid·FRIENDLY Race to the Top program is to promote rich personalized learning environments in all participating schools. This manual allows school leadership teams to assess their own school's journey toward personalized learning and reflect on how they are using kid·FRIENDLY grant components to support their improvement efforts.

With the guidance of your school's kid·FRIENDLY leadership mentor and the protocols described in this document, you will...

- Assemble a self-assessment team.
- Review the kid·FRIENDLY Driver Implementation Map.
- Review the kid·FRIENDLY Personalized Learning Map.
- Individually make an initial rating of your school on the indicators associated with both Maps.
- Consider possible sources of evidence that would support or challenge your initial ratings.
 - Consider artifacts that would support or challenge your initial ratings like your school's master schedule, curriculum documents, examples of classroom lesson plans or assessments, etc.
 - Consider assembling focus groups and interview a representative sample of teachers and students whose perspectives would support or challenge your initial ratings.
 - Consider conducting observations in a representative sample of classrooms using the kid·FRIENDLY Personalized Learning classroom observation tool to further confirm or challenge your initial ratings.
- Collaboratively review your initial ratings of all standards and indicators and make adjustments based on your review of evidence.
- Reflect on your school's progress toward personalized learning and plan next steps.

To know whether kid·FRIENDLY is being successful, we must gauge the extent to which schools are using key grant components to create meaningful personalized learning environments across multiple classrooms. ***This self-assessment process is critical to knowing how much progress we've made, and where we go in the next two years of the grant.***

Self-Assessment as a Mechanism for Learning

It is important for all stakeholders to understand that this self-assessment process is a mechanism for learning. Key school personnel will have the chance to reflect on the overarching goals of the kid·FRIENDLY grant and the progress their school has made toward those goals. Given that this grant has only been implemented for *two years*, ***no school is expected to demonstrate the sustaining level (the highest rating) of personalized learning***, and certainly not on all components of the Personalized Learning Map.

Likewise, schools have focused their efforts around specific innovations and may be utilizing certain kid-FRIENDLY grant supports more than others. ***Therefore, schools are also not expected to obtain high ratings on all dimensions of the Driver Implementation Map.***

The results of this self-assessment will help kid-FRIENDLY leadership understand the progress of all 111 grant-participating schools in the long-term process of growth toward personalized learning, and to help school leadership teams plan their next steps. ***Just as classroom teachers formatively assess their students so they can make adjustments in their instruction and give students descriptive feedback for continuous improvement,*** this self-assessment process helps schools deepen their self-awareness of their strengths and growth areas and supports the on-going work of making learning more personalized for all students.

The results of your school's self-assessment will not be shared with any other school. Grant-wide results may be aggregated and reported, but individual school identifying information will be removed. Schools will not be penalized or rewarded in any way for their progress as measured by the Map documents. ***This process solely serves the purpose of reflecting on your progress and planning for the future.***

Step 1: Assemble the Self-Assessment Team

Your school's self-assessment should be collaborative. Engaging multiple stakeholders in the review of documents, observations, interviews, and the rating of indicators increases the trustworthiness of results. Depending on the size of your school, consider including 3-6 people on your Self-Assessment Team. Team members might include the following:

- Your school's principal (required; serves as chair of the team)
- 1-3 other members of your school's leadership team (e.g., assistant principals, guidance counselors, curriculum coordinators, etc.)
- 1 or more teachers (more if your school is large); especially consider teachers who have played a key role in kid-FRIENDLY grant initiatives

Also consider including a student representative (especially for middle or high school, such as a *Leader in Me* Lighthouse or GRIT student team member), and members of classified and support staff (e.g., college and career readiness coaches). While participation from these groups is not required, the inclusion of more stakeholders improves the trustworthiness of your self-assessment results by providing a broader range of perspectives on the school's artifacts, interview responses, and other sources of evidence.

Step 2: Get Familiar with the kid-FRIENDLY Driver Implementation Map

Once your team is assembled, all members should become familiar with the kid-FRIENDLY **Driver Implementation Map (Appendix A)**. Grant supports have concentrated around **five key “drivers,”** which include the following:

- **Driver 1: Student Empowerment.** Student empowerment via Leader in Me for elementary and middle schools, and GRIT for high schools
- **Driver 2: College and Career Readiness.** Fostering a future-oriented mindset on the part of students through the work of College and Career Readiness Coaches, collaborations with business and industry, etc.
- **Driver 3: Communities of Practice.** Cognitive coaching, professional development for teachers, and the establishment of demonstration classrooms
- **Driver 4: Community-based Childcare*.** Supports for private preschool and daycare programs to increase student readiness for school
- **Driver 5: Community of Learners.** Coaching, training, and support for school principals

**Note: Although “Community-based Childcare” is a key driver in the kid-FRIENDLY project, because much of the work associated with this driver occurred outside schools, schools will not self-assess on this driver.*

Review the structure of the kid-FRIENDLY Driver Implementation Map. Each page of the Map corresponds with a single driver. Each driver is then described in terms of **three main categories**:

1. *Participation in Grant Supported Activities* – To what extent are schools aware of these supports, utilize them, and are moving beyond the supports to sustain long-term efforts toward personalized learning?
2. *Knowledge of the kid-FRIENDLY Theory of Action and Personalized Learning Framework and key terms associated with the driver* – To what extent are teachers and school leaders familiar with these terms and the rationale for how the driver links to the larger goal of personalized learning?
3. *Knowledge of Performance Measures* – To what extent do teachers and school leaders understand how they would measure (and how kid-FRIENDLY is measuring) whether their participation in driver supports is making an impact on students?

Related terms associated with each of these three dimensions are listed in the second column of the KF Driver Implementation Map.

Next, note the **five-point rating structure** for each of these dimensions.

- **1 (Continuing Status Quo)** represents where a school might be if it never participated in the kid-FRIENDLY grant, or where all schools might have been at the beginning of Year 1 of the grant.
- **2 (Starting)** describes a school where stakeholders are just beginning to learn about the driver and some individual teachers or staff members are engaged with the grant supports associated with the driver on a limited basis, largely in isolation from one another.
- The mid-point in the Map, **3 (Implementing)**, represents where schools are when they have begun utilizing some key grant supports and are starting to understand the rationale for the driver, but there is limited understanding of how it links to personalized learning or how its impact might be measured.
- **4 (Scaling up)** describes a school where there is a widespread commitment to driver implementation. Key participants in the driver (teacher leaders, for example) are beginning to influence others in the school to adopt the principles and practices associated with the driver's goals. Pockets of inconsistency linger, and there is risk changes in leadership or teaching personnel could jeopardize sustainability of efforts.
- Finally, **5 (Sustaining)** represents a school that has embraced the grant supports associated with the driver to the extent that, even when the grant supports end, the school will continue a sustainable effort to pursue the dimensions of personalized learning connected to the driver.

Note also the column **Possible Sources of Evidence**, which describes the people who might be interviewed or artifacts that might be reviewed by the Self-Assessment team to establish these ratings (see Step 5).

Finally, note the last column of the Map, where **Ratings** for each indicator can be recorded, along with the **Evidence** area for briefly describing the team's rationale for its ratings.

Step 3: Get Familiar with the kid-FRIENDLY Personalized Learning Map

While the Driver Implementation Map just described allows you to reflect on the extent to which your school is utilizing key kid-FRIENDLY drivers, the **Personalized Learning Map (Appendix B)** measures how far you have been able to leverage the grant drivers to move your whole school toward personalized learning.

The Personalized Learning Map is based on research literature and well-established theories about student motivation and optimal learning environments (see the Bibliography included in this document). The Map presents a comprehensive framework for describing a school that has created sustainable structures and practices that foster student empowerment in the learning process, fluidly adjusting the pace and location of learning to meet the student at his or her individual readiness level.

The Map is divided into four standards which represent key perspectives on personalized learning. Schools that are truly personalized will differ dramatically from traditional schools relative to **the**

learning process, the overall school *climate* (which requires a change in *leadership* perspective and behavior), and in the attitudes and activities of *teachers* and *students*:

- **Standard 1: The Learning Process.** The school community works collaboratively to develop instructional and assessments practices that are in harmony with personalized learning.
- **Standard 2: Climate.** School administrators and the wider school community demonstrate a commitment to providing an adequate setting in which personalized learning can thrive.
- **Standard 3: Teachers.** Teachers understand personalized learning concepts and are committed to implementing them in guiding students to achieve learning goals.
- **Standard 4: Students.** Students understand personalized learning concepts and strategies and use them as the foundation for progress toward clear, meaningful learning targets and growth goals.

Each standard is divided into **indicators** that further describe the various ways schools transform as they move toward personalized learning. Self-assessment teams should **be familiar with these standards and indicators**.

Note that the **five-point rating scale** for the Personalized Learning Map matches the scale used for the Driver Implementation Map, but represents what schools look like at various points along the journey from a traditional school to a school that is truly personalized:

- **1 (Continuing the Status Quo)** describes a school where stakeholders are largely unfamiliar with the concept of personalized learning.
- **2 (Starting)** describes a school where stakeholders are just beginning to learn about the personalized learning and individual teachers engage in limited experimentation with personalized learning, largely in isolation from other teachers.
- **3 (Implementing)** describes a school where personalized learning has become a priority. Key teacher and administrative leaders are engaged in shifting the learning process and climate toward structures and practices that align with personalized learning. Teachers still maintain a largely directive role in the learning process and practices are not consistently implemented across the school.
- **4 (Scaling Up)** describes a school where there is a widespread commitment to the principles and practices of personalized learning. The learning process, climate, and actions and attitudes of teachers and students mostly reflect this commitment. Pockets of inconsistency linger, and there is risk changes in leadership or teaching personnel could jeopardize the sustainability of personalization efforts.
- **5 (Sustaining)** describes a school where there is a firm, shared commitment to the principles and practices of personalized learning. The learning process, climate, and actions and attitudes of teachers and students consistently reflect this commitment. Structures and practices that support personalized learning are central to the school's vision and persist even through changes in leadership and teaching personnel.

As with the Driver Implementation Map, the Personalized Learning Map includes a **Possible Sources of Evidence** column. For each indicator, as described more fully in Step 5, suggestions are made for people who could be interviewed, artifacts that could be reviewed, or other sources of information that could be consulted in assisting Self-Assessment teams in confirming or challenging their initial, and reaching consensus on final, ratings.

Finally, note the **Ratings** column on the right-hand side of the Map, along with the **Evidence** column for briefly describing the team's rationale for the rating.

Once Self-Assessment Teams are familiar with both Map documents, they are ready to start making their initial ratings of all standards and indicators.

Step 4: Make Initial Ratings

Once your team is familiar with the Driver Implementation and Personalized Learning Maps and has holistically considered your school's involvement in kid-FRIENDLY grant initiatives and personalized learning implementation, you are ready to individually rate your school on each of the indicators. Each team member should individually rate each indicator on the Map documents. Note that your name will not be associated with your initial rating results.

Later on (see step 6), team members will meet to share their ratings and discuss their rationale to arrive at a consensus rating for each indicator. ***The goal is to generate discussion, reflection, and consensus around each rating.*** Please keep each individual team member's initial ratings, and the team's eventual consensus rating, for your records.

Use the **five-point scale** from "1" (Continuing the Status Quo) to "5" (Sustaining), **discussed under Step 3 above**, to rate each indicator. Start with the Driver Implementation Map and then move on to the Personalized Learning Map. You will be provided an **electronic version** of the Map documents which will simplify the ratings process. The Excel worksheet will automatically generate an **overall rounded average rating** for each driver or standard.

For each indicator, under **Possible Sources of Evidence**, make note of evidence you might consider to confirm or challenge your initial ratings. Also for each indicator, under **Evidence**, note the evidence you did consult, if any, in support of your rating.

*As discussed earlier, throughout this process keep in mind that **this self-assessment is formative**. No school is expected to rate highly in all dimensions of either Map. **Realistic ratings** on the grant drivers and on the personalized learning standards will help clarify the real progress your school has made, point toward quick wins for the near future, and give guidance for on-going improvement.*

After your initial ratings, collaboratively discuss what evidence sources might support or challenge your ratings. Review Steps 5-7 below and consider a strategy for gathering evidence that would support or challenge your initial ratings.

Step 5: Consider Evidence

Now that you have made an initial rating of all indicators, consider evidence sources that you might consult that would support or challenge your ratings. Evidence will be especially important if your **initial ratings are high** for particular areas on one or both Maps, if **individual ratings are inconsistent** from member to member, or to **substantiate areas rated high on the team's final consensus ratings (Step 6)**. Sources might include a review of artifacts, interviews with select groups of teachers or students, and observations of select classrooms.

A. Consider a Review of Artifacts

The Self-Assessment Team can consult the list of **Possible Sources of Evidence** offered on the Driver Implementation Map and Personalized Learning Map as a starting point for possible artifacts that could provide evidence to support or challenge the team's initial ratings of indicators.

The following list of suggested artifacts is by no means all-inclusive. Schools may have many other documents or sources of evidence worthy of consideration for the self-assessment process.

- Samples of classroom assessments
- Samples of teacher lesson and/or unit plans
- Course syllabi
- Samples of student work
- Samples of completed student assessment tasks
- Pacing guides
- School grading and assessment policies
- Teacher gradebooks reflecting feedback, assessment, and grading practices
- Progress and report cards
- School bell schedule
- School master schedule
- School's Innovation Snapshot or Personalized Learning Plan

Note that some artifacts are especially helpful for supporting particular ratings. For example, for the Personalized Learning Map, Standard 1 (The Learning Process), samples of teacher lesson and unit plans or samples of student work may be helpful. Other artifacts can lend insight into Standard 2 (Climate), such as bell schedules that might reflect the way the school is supporting the larger goal of personalized learning across classrooms. All of these artifacts might provide evidence for ratings of Standard 3 (Teachers) and 4 (Students).

B. Consider Conducting Interviews

While some of the evidence for your ratings can come from a review of artifacts (Step 5A), and some can come from observations (Step 5C), other indicators might be best confirmed by *talking* to teachers and students. Rather than try to interview every teacher, we recommend Self-Assessment teams establish **focus groups** of 4-6 teachers who represent a cross section of the school's faculty. Larger schools may want to carry out two or more focus groups. Similarly, focus groups of students who represent multiple grade levels and demographic groups would provide a means of capturing student perceptions of personalized learning without polling every student.

Arrange to meet with teacher focus groups during planning periods or after school. Ask open-ended questions that can provide insight into multiple indicators (see **Appendix C: Teacher Interview Questions** for a list of possible questions) and give all members of the group an opportunity to share and dialogue with one another about question topics. Use the “**Listen For’s**” for each suggested question to note evidence of the indicators.

Likewise, **Appendix D: Student Interview Questions** provides open-ended questions and “**Listen For’s**” for student interviews.

C. Consider Conducting Observations

An important step in the self-assessment process might involve visiting classrooms to observe teaching and learning. These observations can provide evidence whether what teachers and students say about personalized learning, and what artifacts suggest, is translating into practice. Especially consider observing classrooms where you know some aspects of personalized learning may be taking place. Additionally, by combining the three evidence sources of artifacts, interviews, and observations, you achieve a **triangulation of evidence** that helps ensure your ratings on the Driver Implementation and Personalized Learning Map documents are trustworthy.

The kid-FRIENDLY **Personalized Learning Classroom Observation Tool (Appendix E)**, which closely parallels the Personalized Learning Map, should be used to conduct classroom observations. The observation tool provides guidelines for observing personalized learning in classrooms, and, thus, can help provide evidence of personalized learning in your school.

Similar to completing both Maps, please rate the classrooms you observe on each indicator, using the 1-5 scale provided. For each learning indicator, possible sources of evidence to support your ratings are provided—the observation itself also serves as a source of evidence, but you may wish to include other artifacts that you observe in classrooms (e.g., student work or copies of class rules).

Again, note that observed classrooms are not expected to score high on every indicator, as each school's chosen innovation will drive the extent to which each indicator is relevant. The 1-5 scale is not meant to

identify schools or classrooms that are implementing personalized learning better or worse, rather, its goal is to show schools where they are currently based on classroom observations, and where they can go with continued use of their innovation as it relates to personalized learning.

Step 6: Review Evidence and Make Final Ratings

Once you and other team members have considered evidence from artifacts, interviews, and observations, make sure all members have had an opportunity to review these various sources of evidence. Then you are ready to collaboratively revisit your initial ratings for each of the indicators. Discuss each of your initial ratings in light of the evidence you have considered. Reflect on whether a visitor in your school would agree with your ratings based on the sources of evidence you have considered. Work to reach consensus, then finalize and record the “official” scores that you will submit electronically for grant data collection purposes. *For high ratings in particular*, indicate in the “Evidence” space provided the sources you actually considered in making your final rating and provide a brief description of how these sources of evidence support your high rating.

Step 7: Reflect and Plan Ahead

After all indicators have been rated (Step 6), your self-assessment team is ready to reflect on the data. Note highest and lowest drivers and/or standards overall, and highest and lowest indicators within each driver and/or standard. Use the **Reflection and Planning Tool (Appendix F)** to collaboratively identify strengths (the “Plus” column on the Reflection and Planning Tool) and growth areas (“Deltas”). Finally, use the “Next Steps” section of the tool to note specific actions you can take to address these growth areas and accelerate your progress toward personalized learning.

Final Steps

1. Submit the electronic version of the following items to your school’s leadership mentor and to the Rock Solid evaluation team (rocksolid@wku.edu)
 - a. The final version of your school’s **Driver Implementation Map** with all ratings completed
 - b. The final version of your school’s **Personalized Learning Map** with all ratings completed and all evidence sources noted.
 - c. An electronic copy of your school’s completed **Reflection and Planning Tool**.

Submit these items as two separate files (the two Maps are in one Excel file). Include your school’s name in the file name for each document. Make sure to save copies for your own records.

2. Archive and back up any evidence used to make your final determination of ratings. This would include artifacts consulted, interview notes, and copies of classroom observation tools. Also archive paper copies of your initial ratings of all indicators by individual team members, a paper copy of the final consensus ratings of the entire team, as well as any notes or meeting minutes that might be

helpful in understanding both the self-assessment process your team followed and how final ratings were reached.

3. Discuss the results of your school's self-assessment with district leaders and your leadership mentor. Consider sharing and discussing with the faculty of your school and consider next steps for school-wide improvement planning processes.

Leadership from kid-FRIENDLY and the Rock Solid evaluation team will review self-assessment results and reflect on implications for further school supports in Year 4. Schools that appear to be making strides toward personalized learning may be invited to host a "Learning Visit" during which kid-FRIENDLY leaders and the evaluation team can learn more about their progress and visit classrooms that exemplify meaningful shifts toward personalized learning.

A FINAL NOTE

Thank you for the time you have devoted to this self-assessment process. Your efforts will pay off in terms of better understanding your school's progress toward personalized learning and how grant leaders can better support your work.

Appendix A: kid ·FRIENDLY Driver Implementation (DI) Map

Instructions: For each indicator, provide a 1-5 rating in the right hand column. Note that the "Average Rating" cell will be automatically calculated based on your ratings (as will the "Summary" page). In the "Evidence" space, please provide a description of supporting *evidence* for the three main categories of each driver if any. In providing *evidence*, please note the difference between *evidence* and *opinion*. *Evidence* means an objective description of school or classroom practices with no interpretation. *Evidence* is **observable, objective, and free of value judgment** whereas *opinion* reflects one's beliefs or personal preferences that are often not supported by evidence. Examples of evidence are scripts of teacher or student comments, non-evaluative statements of observed teacher or student behavior (e.g., *Students were working on the task independently*), numeric information about time, student participation, resource use, etc. (e.g., *Fifteen minutes were spent in circle time*), or an observed aspect of the school or classroom environment (e.g., *Student work samples are displayed on school walls*).

#	Driver	Description							Average Rating
1	Student Empowerment	If students are given the opportunities and support to develop self and social awareness, ethical leadership, initiative, resilience, tenacity, and self management, then they will (1) seek and solve problems; (2) plan, prioritize, and monitor goals; (3) innovate using creative and critical thinking; (4) be empowered to act for self and others; and (5) have a future mindset.							
	Main Categories	Related Terms	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Rating (1-5)
1.1	Participation in Grant Supported Activities	TLIM/GRIT	School administrators, staff, TLIM lighthouse team, GRIT faculty/student team, PD documents	School staff members are effectively moving beyond grant supports related to this driver toward establishing school environments that support student empowerment and personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	School staff members are participating in most support activities related to this driver BUT describe them as ends in themselves or as isolated events.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	School staff members are unaware of (or opposed to) grant supports OR they have not participated in support activities.	
1.2	KF Theory of Action/ PL Framework Terms	Self Development	School administrators, staff, points of contacts	School staff members regularly use terms from the driver's theory of action and PL framework, are aware of their role within the driver, AND can articulate how driver participation moves schools toward to student empowerment and personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	School staff members can describe some or similar terms from the driver's theory of action or PL framework and are aware of their role within the driver BUT cannot explain how driver/participation moves schools toward student empowerment and personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	School staff members are unaware of key terms from the driver's theory of action or PL framework OR are unaware of their role within this driver.	
Social Awareness									
Ethical Leadership									
Initiative									
Resilience									
Self Management									
Problem-Solving									
Goal Setting, Planning									
Creativity/Critical Thinking									
Empowerment									
Future Mind Set									
1.3	Performance Measures	School Engagement	School administrators, staff, points of contacts	School staff members can clearly articulate how the performance measures related to this driver are important indicators of a school's movement toward student empowerment and personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	School staff members are aware of performance measures related to this driver BUT cannot explain how these measures relate to student empowerment and personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	School staff members are unaware of performance measures related to this driver.	
School Satisfaction									
Positive Student Behavior									
KDE Data (Discipline Referrals, Bullying)									
Dropout (Indicators)									

EVIDENCE

#	Driver	Description							Average Rating
2	College and Career Ready	If the College and Career Readiness Centers Services support a comprehensive system of college and career readiness--developed by invested stakeholders, then students will graduate life ready.							
	Main Categories	Related Terms	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Rating (1-5)
2.1	Participation in Grant Supported Activities	CCR Center/Counselors Providing students information, support, counseling Professional learning (teachers/staff) WIFI technology FRYSC partnership Transitions	CCR Centers/ Counselors, Principals, Teachers, Students	School staff members are effectively moving beyond grant supports related to this driver toward establishing school environments that support college and career readiness and personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	School staff members are participating in most support activities related to this driver BUT describe them as ends in themselves or as isolated events.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	School staff members are unaware of (or opposed to) grant supports OR they have not participated in support activities.	
2.2	KF Theory of Action/ PL Framework Terms	Real world, work related Life-ready Future planning Co-ops, apprenticeships, internships	CCR Centers/ Counselors, Principals, Teachers, Students	School staff members regularly use terms from the driver's theory of action and PL framework, are aware of their role within the driver, AND can articulate how driver participation moves schools toward college and career readiness and personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	School staff members can describe some or similar terms from the driver's theory of action or PL framework and are aware of their role within the driver BUT cannot explain how driver/participation moves schools toward college and career readiness and personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	School staff members are unaware of key terms from the driver's theory of action or PL framework OR are unaware of their role within this driver.	
2.3	Performance Measures	School Satisfaction School Engagement Career/student profiles Acceleration On track for graduation	CCR Centers/ Counselors, Principals, Teachers, Students	School staff members can clearly articulate how the performance measures related to this driver are important indicators of a school's movement toward college and career readiness and personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	School staff members are aware of performance measures related to this driver BUT cannot explain how these measures relate to college and career readiness and personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	School staff members are unaware of performance measures related to this driver.	
EVIDENCE									

#	Driver	Description							Average Rating
3	Communities of Practice	If Teacher Leaders engage in a process of collective learning through the kid•FRIENDLY Communities of Practice, then they will (1) increase their professional knowledge and skill and (2) develop classrooms that are models of personalized learning and innovative practice.							
	Main Categories	Related Terms	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Rating (1-5)
3.1	Participation in Grant Supported Activities	Cognitive coaches Collective learning Teacher leaders Three domains: real world application, digital natives, student empowerment Needs-based PD FRYSC partnership	Classroom observations, PD documentation, Cognitive coaches, Teacher Leaders	School faculty are effectively moving beyond grant supports related to this driver toward establishing school environments that support personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Teacher leaders are participating in most support activities related to this driver BUT describe them as ends in themselves or as isolated events.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Teacher leaders are unaware of (or opposed to) grant supports OR they have not participated in support activities.	
3.2	KF Theory of Action/ PL Framework Terms	Demonstration classrooms as models of personalized learning and innovation Personalized learning Innovative practice	Observations of demonstration classrooms	Demonstration classrooms modeling personalized learning have been fully implemented AND the school's chosen innovative practice is clearly evident throughout the school.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Demonstrations classrooms modeling personalized learning have been fully implemented, and the school's chosen innovation is somewhat evident in the school.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Demonstration classrooms are not implemented. The chosen innovation has not been implemented throughout the school.	
3.3	Performance Measures	CBI (See SOW achievement benchmarks: KPREP, EOC, ACT) Advanced Placement (AP) Decrease Achievement gap Graduation rates/college enrollment College bearing coursework, dual credit	Innovation Snapshots, Teacher Leaders, CCRCs	School staff members can clearly articulate how the performance measures related to this driver are important indicators of a school's movement toward personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	School staff members are aware of performance measures related to this driver BUT cannot explain how these measures relate to personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	School staff members are unaware of performance measures related to this driver.	
EVIDENCE									

#	Driver	Description							Average Rating
4	Community of Learners	If leaders are (1) knowledgeable about the work of the Communities of Practice and the three domains (Digital Natives, Student Empowerment, Real-world Application), (2) knowledgeable about other innovations, (3) knowledgeable about leading change, and (4) collaborative and learn from each other; then they will (1) have a network of support for learning and supporting innovations and (2) lead schools that personalize learning.							
	Main Categories	Related Terms	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Rating (1-5)
4.1	Participation in Grant Supported Activities	Leadership mentors Exploring innovative processes and practices Share knowledge to build capacity Facilitate data retreats	Superintendents, Principals, Points of Contact	School Leaders are effectively moving beyond grant supports related to this driver toward establishing school environments that support personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	School Leaders are participating in most support activities related to this driver BUT describe them as ends in themselves or as isolated events.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	School leaders are unaware of (or opposed to) grant supports described under related terms OR they have not participated in support activities.	
4.2	Knowledge of KF Theory of Action/ PL Framework Terms	Administration (principal, superintendent) Leadership knowledge about COP and three domains Knowledge of other innovations Leading change Collaboration, learning from each other Support network for innovation Leading toward personalized learning	Superintendents, Principals, Points of Contact	School leaders regularly use terms from the driver's theory of action and PL framework, are aware of their role within the driver, AND can articulate how driver participation moves schools toward personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	School leaders can describe some or similar terms from the driver's theory of action or PL framework and are aware of their role within the driver BUT cannot explain how driver/participation moves schools toward personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	School leaders are unaware of terms related to driver's theory of action or PL framework OR are unaware of their role within this driver.	
4.3	Knowledge of Performance Measures	Effective teachers and principals	Superintendents, Principals, Points of Contact	School leaders can clearly articulate how the performance measures related to this driver are important indicators of a school's movement toward personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	School leaders are aware of performance measures related to this driver BUT cannot explain how these measures relate to personalized learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	School leaders are unaware of performance measures related to this driver.	
EVIDENCE									

<i>kid-FRIENDLY Driver Implementation (DI) Map (Summary)</i>				
#	<i>Driver</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Average Rating</i>	<i>Rounded Rating (1-5)</i>
1	Student Empowerment	If students are given the opportunities and support to develop self and social awareness, ethical leadership, initiative, resilience, tenacity, and self management, then they will (1) seek and solve problems; (2) plan, prioritize, and monitor goals; (3) innovate using creative and critical thinking; (4) be empowered to act for self and others; and (5) have a future mindset.		
2	College and Career Ready	If the College and Career Readiness Centers Services support a comprehensive system of college and career readiness--developed by invested stakeholders, then students will graduate life ready.		
3	Communities of Practice	If Teacher Leaders engage in a process of collective learning through the kid•FRIENDLY Communities of Practice, then they will (1) increase their professional knowledge and skill and (2) develop classrooms that are models of personalized learning and innovative practice.		
4	Community of Learners	If leaders are (1) knowledgeable about the work of the Communities of Practice and the three domains (Digital Natives, Student Empowerment, Real-world Application), (2) knowledgeable about other innovations, (3) knowledgeable about leading change, and (4) collaborative and learn from each other; then they will (1) have a network of support for learning and supporting innovations and (2) lead schools that personalize learning.		
OVERALL				

Rating Color Scheme		Rating Definition
5	Sustaining	A school that has embraced the grant supports associated with the driver to the extent that, even when the grant supports end, the school will continue a sustainable effort to pursue the dimensions of personalized learning connected to the driver.
4	Scaling Up	A school where there is a widespread commitment to driver implementation. Key participants in the driver are beginning to influence others in the school to adopt the principles and practices associated with the driver's goals. Pockets of inconsistency linger, and there is risk changes in leadership or teaching personnel could jeopardize sustainability of efforts.
3	Implementing	Where a school is when it has begun utilizing some key grant supports and is starting to understand the rationale for the driver, but there is limited understanding of how it links to personalized learning or how its impact might be measured.
2	Starting	A school where stakeholders are just beginning to learn about the driver and some individual teachers or staff members are engaged with the grant supports associated with the driver on a limited basis, largely in isolation from one another.
1	Continuing Status Quo	Where a school might be if it never participated in the kid-FRIENDLY grant, or where all schools might have been at the beginning of Year 1 of the grant.

Appendix B: kid-FRIENDLY Personalized Learning (PL) Map

Instructions: For each indicator, provide a 1-5 rating in the right hand column. Note that the "Average Rating" cell will be automatically calculated based on your ratings (as will the "Summary" Page). In the "Evidence" space, please provide a description of supporting evidence for each indicator if any. In providing evidence, please note the difference between evidence and opinion. Evidence means an objective description of school or classroom practices with no interpretation. Evidence is **observable, objective, and free of value judgment** whereas opinion reflects one's beliefs or personal preferences that are often not supported by evidence. Examples of evidence are scripts of teacher or student comments, non-evaluative statements of observed teacher or student behavior (e.g., *Students were working on the task independently*), numeric information about time, student participation, resource use, etc. (e.g., *Fifteen minutes were spent in circle time*), or an observed aspect of the school or classroom environment (e.g., *Student work samples are displayed on school walls*).

Note: [Bracketed numbers] refer to materials listed in "References Cited" supporting the inclusion of specific PL Map Indicators (See *Personalized Learning Map Development Resources* page).

#	Standard	Description						Average Rating	
1	The Learning Process	The school community works collaboratively to develop instructional and assessment practices that are in harmony with personalized learning.							
	Indicators	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Rating (1-5)	Evidence
1.1	Pre-Assessment	Classroom assessment, lesson and unit plans, teacher and student interviews	Teachers regularly pre-assess students' prior knowledge or skill before teaching a lesson or unit and then regularly use pre-assessment data to make changes in their instructional plans, including differentiating for individual student's readiness to learn new content.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Teachers regularly pre-assess students' prior knowledge or skill before teaching a lesson or unit, but pre-assessment data rarely lead to changes in teachers' instructional plans.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Teachers rarely pre-assess students' prior knowledge or skill before teaching a new lesson or unit.		
1.2	Planning [1]	Lesson and unit plans, syllabi, teacher and student interviews, classroom observations	There is school-wide commitment to student learning and assessment using a framework of learning targets and competencies that are established based on students cognitive development/readiness.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Some teachers/leaders demonstrate commitment to student learning and assessment by using a framework of learning targets and competencies tied to defensible and age/grade appropriate standards.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Student learning and assessment is primarily textbook driven in that teachers closely follow the organization of the prescribed text with little deviation.		
1.3	Assessment Development	Classroom assessment samples, classroom observations, documentation of completed student assessment tasks, teacher and student interviews, SBDM policies	Most paper and pencil tests have been replaced by various authentic performance based assessments that are interdisciplinary and represent real-world demonstrations of learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Some paper and pencil tests have been replaced by performance based assessments.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Assessments are summative in nature, typically given only once, and are usually paper and pencil tests delivered in a standardized format (multiple choice, short-answer, essay; one assessment for all students).		
1.4	Challenge [2][3]	Lesson plans, student and teacher interviews, classroom observations	Activities are designed to adequately challenge students by targeting not just the concepts and tasks they are ready to learn and do but also those they will be able to tackle with additional assistance from peers and teachers.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Activities are restricted to just the concepts and tasks that students are ready to learn and can master independently. Teachers avoid anything challenging that would cause discomfort among students.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Activities are not differentiated and students are all assigned similar tasks based on the readiness/cognitive development of a steering group.		

	Indicators	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Rating (1-5)	Evidence
1.5	Pacing [4]	Lesson and unit plans, pacing guides, assessment samples, student and teacher interviews, classroom observations, School PLPs, Student work samples	Students advance through learning targets at their own pace, mostly unencumbered by the limitations of class period, school day, grading period or academic year or traditional grade-level assignment. Students have the opportunity to move beyond their assigned grade level in topics and subject content.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Within the limitations of a single school year, students may move through curricular concepts at their own pace. School day schedules allow the flexibility for students to work on interdisciplinary performance tasks across multiple class periods.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Learning segments are defined by the length of the class period, school day, grading period, and academic year. Age-determined grade levels dictate the content and pacing of curricular concepts.		
			Students are responsible stewards of their own time, learning how to manage tasks efficiently and effectively.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students demonstrate increasing levels of responsibility with time management and pacing towards achieving learning goals.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students learn to be compliant with adult directives on when and what to learn.		
			Students work collaboratively with teachers to develop their own timelines for completing learning targets. Students regularly communicate with teachers on their progress.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students mostly rely on teachers to set the pace of learning, but take advantage of classroom structures of remediation and enrichment to accelerate their progress towards learning targets.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students rely on teachers to set the pace of their learning, completing assignments based on schedules established by the teacher.		
1.6	Collaboration	Lesson and unit plans, teacher and student interviews, classroom observations	Students' voice and choice are integral to the instructional process and teachers and students are co-creators of knowledge, with teachers acting as facilitators of knowledge and skill development. Students actively seek engagement and demonstrate their responsibility for learning based on mutual understanding with the teacher, of their needs and aspirations. (Personalized Learning)	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students have some opportunities to act as partners in learning through activities designed to actively engage them. Classrooms show evidence of some facilitation of learning and not just traditional directed learning strategies. Teachers view learning as unique and actively incorporate student interests and aspirations into their instructional processes. (Student-Centered Learning)	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students have some opportunity for choice within instructional processes. The classroom is predominantly teacher-directed; plans show little evidence of understanding/consideration of student backgrounds. (Teacher-centered learning)		

	Indicators	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Rating (1-5)	Evidence
1.7	Autonomy [5]	Lesson and unit plans, student and teacher interviews, assessment samples, classroom observations	Students play an extensive role in developing their learning goals. With teachers serving as guides, students develop strategic plans for accomplishing these goals by designing appropriate learning tasks, and seeking help, resources, and other assistance as needed.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students are encouraged and sometimes required to take responsibility for articulating their own learning goals. Students also suggest ideas for learning tasks and/or may choose from a menu of choices for learning tasks.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students typically exercise little to no choice in their learning goals. Teachers develop all learning tasks with no input from students.		
			Students design their own performance-based assessments with support and advice from teachers, parents, peers, and community-based mentors and engage in thoughtful self-assessment of their progress.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students participate heavily in the development of individualized performance-based assessments and are encouraged to assess their own work; teachers still make most judgments about student progress toward learning targets.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students complete summative assessments developed by teacher, typically with no input into the assessment's construction or assessed learning targets.		
1.8	Mastery [6]	Assessment samples, student and teacher interviews, unit plans, pacing guides, classroom observations	Students have multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery of learning objectives. Based on teacher feedback as well as peer- and self-assessment, students will revise their work and perform tasks repeatedly until mastery is demonstrated.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students may occasionally have multiple attempts on evaluations. These attempts are generally geared towards improving a test score or grade. There may exist some opportunities for enrichment or remediation for crucial (state-mandated) performance targets.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Once a concept has been taught and assessed, learning moves forward regardless of student mastery of the concept. Similarly, few enrichment opportunities exist for students who have already demonstrated mastery of learning concepts or who do so more quickly than their peers.		
1.9	Grading [7]	Grade book samples, grading and reporting policies, assessment samples, teacher and student interviews, classroom observations	Traditional letter grades may not be given; work is entirely assessed through feedback and performance statements describing student progress toward mastery of the assessment's stated learning targets.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Traditional letter grades may be given, but grades are intentionally and clearly tied to student mastery of specific learning objectives. Most variables other than student mastery of learning objectives have been eliminated from the grading and reporting process.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Traditional letter grades are given but some teachers implement a standards-based grading process that limits the percentage of student grades on homework or other tasks that do not measure learning.		

#	Standard	Description					Average Rating		
2	Climate	School administrators and the wider school community demonstrate a commitment to providing an adequate setting in which personalized learning can thrive.							
	Indicators	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Rating (1-5)	Evidence
2.1	School Structures	Master schedule, bell schedules, teacher and student interviews, classroom observations	Policies and/or procedures for school bell and master schedules reflect efforts to create meaningful student opportunities to engage in learning across subject areas for extended periods of time without interruption.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Select groups of students engage in small-scale experiments in project-based learning across multiple class periods.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students move through an adult-established schedule that compartmentalizes learning by subject area and limits the time students can devote to any one task without interruption.		
2.2	Success [8]	Teacher and student interviews, classroom rubrics, grading policies, assessment samples, classroom observations	Success is described as making progress in learning by accomplishing tasks and acquiring new skills.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Success is described as making progress in learning but there remains an emphasis on actual score and grades.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Success is defined by getting high scores on assessments, getting good grades, and other activities as well as demonstrating good behavior.		
2.3	Networks Beyond School	Master schedule, bell schedules, student and teacher interviews, community stakeholder interviews, classroom observations	Students have the flexibility to engage in learning tasks at home, at school, and in the community both during and after the regular school day.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Some students have the opportunity to engage in learning tasks outside of school either during or after the normal school day.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students attend school daily during regular school hours except in extraordinary circumstances (field trip, illness, etc.).		
			Teachers and students rely on resources for learning (human, physical, and virtual) from a variety of sources outside the walls of the school in real-world environments.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Some teachers invite and encourage community involvement in student learning tasks and performance assessments by encouraging community-based mentors and utilizing community resources.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Schools operate as islands within the community and few partnerships are developed or sought		
2.4	Location	Master schedule, bell schedules, student and teacher interviews, community stakeholder interviews, classroom observations	A student's assigned school is a hub for learning that occurs in a variety of locations. Students engage in learning tasks at and outside the school, both during and outside the normal school day.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Most meaningful learning tasks and all performance tasks take place at school during the regular school day. Some teachers experiment with blended learning techniques that begin to encourage seamless student learning between home and school.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Learning occurs throughout the day during a series of fragmented subject-based time periods throughout the day.		

#	Standard	Description					Average Rating		
3	Teachers	Teachers understand personalized learning concepts and are committed to implementing them in guiding students to achieve learning goals.							
	Indicators	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Rating (1-5)	Evidence
3.1	Self- Efficacy [9]	Teacher and student interviews, lesson and unit plans, assessment samples, classroom observations	Teachers demonstrate high levels of confidence in their abilities to develop and maintain personalized learning environments.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Teachers demonstrate moderate levels of confidence in their abilities and are willing to develop personalized learning environments. However, they maintain levels of uncertainty regarding their ability as well as students' abilities to succeed in this new model.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Teachers demonstrate low levels of confidence in their ability to release any control over the learning process to students.		
3.2	Modeling [10]	Teacher and student interviews, lesson and unit plans, assessment samples, classroom observations	Teachers get students involved in the process of modeling interest and enthusiasm towards all the topics studied highlighting the potential value to be gained.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Modeling efforts are primarily teacher-centered modeling interest in some topics while making it evident that other topics are studied solely because they are compulsory parts of the curriculum.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Teachers model a lack of interest and enthusiasm for most topics. It is evident that learning is simply a matter of checking off boxes without meaningfully engaging with the material in a way that would promote long-term growth.		
			Teachers communicate with students an emphasis on mastery views of intelligence and a growth mindset.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	While teachers mostly communicate in a way that ascribes some importance to mastering knowledge and skills, they continue to also emphasize performance.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Teacher communication with students is primarily focused on performance and reflects ability based views of intelligence.		
3.3	Monitoring	Teacher and student interviews, lesson and unit plans, assessment samples, classroom observations	Teachers maintain close watch over students' progression towards learning goals, providing appropriate feedback. Students and teachers work in close collaboration to make adjustments to the learning plans as needed.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Teachers generally monitor students and adjust their instruction (re-teaching, flexible grouping for intervention, enrichment, etc.) based on student progress toward learning targets.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Teachers deliver instruction, assess, record grades, and then move on to the next objective. There is little/no monitoring of individual student progress during the learning process.		

	Indicators	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Rating (1-5)	Evidence
3.4	High Expectations [11]	Teacher and student interviews, lesson and unit plans, assessment samples, classroom observations	Teachers regularly communicate high expectations for all students regardless of students' prior performance.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Teachers occasionally communicate high expectations for students who are known as high achievers but are more accommodating of students who are typically regarded as low achievers. These expectations are commensurate to students' prior performance.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Teachers do not communicate high expectations for students highlighting instead their prior achievements as a basis for their current or future performance/progress.		
			Teachers do not accept mediocre work encouraging students to take as many opportunities as necessary to revise and resubmit.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Teachers do not accept mediocre work from high achieving students, but allow low achievers to turn in low quality work.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Teachers accept low quality work from all students as a means of protecting students' self-esteem.		
3.5	Student-Teacher Relationship [12]	Teacher and student interviews, lesson and unit plans, assessment samples, classroom observations	All teachers identify and work to develop strong, positive and caring relationships with all students as critical components of the instructional process irrespective of whether or not they teach these students.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Most student-teacher relationships are characterized by trust, caring, and demonstrated commitment to support all students within the class to be successful at school.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Student-teacher relationships are not considered a primary focus of improved student achievement and are rarely evident within the school community.		
			Teachers actively seek to understand the student, his or her life experiences, cultural background, talents, and strengths, in order to better meet learning and developmental needs.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Schools have developed and implemented plans to strengthen the connection and relationships with vulnerable students are in process.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Many students, particularly vulnerable students, do not feel that teachers in the school care about them outside of the classroom. There are no plans in place to develop connections with students.		

#	Standard	Description					Average Rating		
4	Students	Students understand personalized learning concepts or activities and use them as the foundation for progression towards clear and meaningful learning targets and growth goals.							
	Indicators	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Rating (1-5)	Evidence
4.1	Goal Setting [13]	Patterns of Adaptive Learning Survey, Student Interviews, School honor roll (reverse), Documentation of Student/School PLPs	Students focus on understanding a concept or skill so that they can apply the knowledge gained or skill acquired in other classes or settings in/outside of school.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students focus on understanding a concept or skill in a way that their grasp extends beyond the period of study of the topic and/or the school year.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students focus on learning a concept in order to pass the assessment of that concept. Once the evaluation process is complete the knowledge gained is quickly forgotten.		
			Students focus solely on comparing their current level of achievement to prior accomplishments. Students maintain self-improvement as their goal.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students may compare current achievement to prior accomplishments but outperforming others (or performing on par with others) remains the primary focus.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students focus on how their performance compares to other students in the class as a measure of their understanding of the material. Comparing scores on a test is a regular occurrence.		
4.2	Goal Monitoring [14]	Patterns of Adaptive Learning Survey, Student Interviews, Documentation of Student/School PLPs	Students view mistakes as an essential part of learning and regard them as an opportunity for learning.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students feel encouraged to continue trying after making mistakes and that the effort expended is just as important as the end result.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students become quickly frustrated and unwilling to continue trying if they do not immediately meet learning target.		
4.3	Self-Regulation [15]	Patterns of Adaptive Learning Survey, Student Interviews, Documentation of Student PLP	Students take the initiative to create goals that target improvement in the areas of weakness identified. They consult with teachers, parents, and/or community members for tips and pointers for accomplishing these goals.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students adopt suggestions offered by teachers, parents and/or community mentors to improve identified where growth is needed.	(Evidence suggests your school falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students do not engage in activities of their own volition to address the identified areas where growth is needed.		

<i>kid-FRIENDLY Personalized Learning (PL) Map (Summary)</i>				
#	Standard	Description	Average Rating	Rounded Rating (1-5)
1	The Learning Process	The school community works collaboratively to develop instructional and assessment practices that are in harmony with personalized learning.		
2	Climate	School administrators and the wider school community demonstrate a commitment to providing an adequate setting in which personalized learning can thrive.		
3	Teachers	Teachers understand personalized learning concepts and are committed to implementing them in guiding students to achieve learning goals.		
4	Students	Students understand personalized learning concepts or activities and use them as the foundation for progression towards clear and meaningful learning targets and growth goals.		
OVERALL				

Rating Color Scheme		Rating Definition
5	Sustaining	A school where there is a firm, shared commitment to the principles and practices of personalized learning. The learning process, climate, and actions and attitudes of teachers and students consistently reflect this commitment. Structures and practices that support personalized learning are central to the school's vision and persist even through changes in leadership and teaching personnel.
4	Scaling Up	A school where there is a widespread commitment to the principles and practices of personalized learning. The learning process, climate, and actions and attitudes of teachers and students mostly reflect this commitment. Pockets of inconsistency linger, and there is risk changes in leadership or teaching personnel could jeopardize the sustainability of personalization efforts.
3	Implementing	A school where personalized learning has become a priority. Key teacher and administrative leaders are engaged in shifting the learning process and climate toward structures and practices that align with personalized learning. Teachers still maintain a largely directive role in the learning process and practices are not consistently implemented across the school.
2	Starting	A school where stakeholders are just beginning to learn about personalized learning and individual teachers engage in limited experimentation with personalized learning, largely in isolation from other teachers.
1	Continuing Status Quo	A school where stakeholders are largely unfamiliar with the concept of personalized learning.

Personalized Learning Map Development Resources

References Cited

- Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80 (3), 260-267. [13]
- Anderman, E. M., & Midgley, C. (1997). Changes in achievement goal orientations, perceived academic competence, and grades across the transition to middle-level schools. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 22, 269-298. [14]
- Brickhouse, N. & Bodner, G. M. (1992). The beginning science teacher: Classroom narratives of convictions and constraints. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 29, 471-485. doi: 10.1002/tea.3660290504. [1]
- Burns, R. B. (1987). Steering groups, leveling effects, and instructional pace. *American Journal of Education*, 96, 24-55. [2]
- Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., & Williams, G. C. (1996). Need satisfaction and the self-regulation of learning. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 8, 165-183. doi: 10.1016/S1041-6080(96)90013-8. [5]
- Dweck, C. S. (2007). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. New York, NY: Random House. [10]
- Eggen, P., & Kauchak, D. (2013). *Educational psychology: Windows on classrooms* (9th ed.). London: Pearson. [8][11][12]
- Gray, P., & Chanoff, D. (1986). Democratic schooling: What happens to young people who have charge of their own education? *American Journal of Education*, 94, 182-213. [4]
- Keller, F. S. (1968). Good-bye, teacher.... *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 1, 79-89. [6][7]
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1997). Interaction between learning and development. In M. Gauvain & M. Cole (Eds.), *Readings on the Development of Children* (pp. 29-36). New York, NY: W. H. Freeman and Company. (Reprinted from *Mind and Society*, pp. 79-91, 1978, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.) [3]
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(2), 64-70. [9][15]

Bibliography (Additional Sources Consulted)

- Aronson, J., Fried, C. B., & Good, C. (2002). Reducing the effects of stereotype threat on African Americans college students by shaping theories of intelligence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 113-125. doi: 10.1006/jesp.2001.1491
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Journal of Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
- Dohrmann, K. R., Nishida, T. K., Gartner, A., Lipsky, D. K., & Grimm, K. J. (2007). High school outcomes for students in a public Montessori program. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 22(2), 205-217.
- Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist*, 41, 1040-1048.
- Dweck, C. S. (2012). Mindsets and human nature: Promoting change in the Middle East, the schoolyard, the racial divide, and willpower. *American Psychologist*, 67, 614-622. doi: 10.1037/a0029783
- Dweck, C. S. (2015, September 22). Carol Dweck revisits the "growth mindset." *Education Week*, 35, pp. 20, 24.
- Eyrie, H. L. (2007). Keller's personalized system of instruction: Was it a fleeting fancy or is there a revival on the horizon? *The Behavior Analyst Today*, 8, 317-324.

- Green River Region Educational Cooperative. (2012). *kid-FRIENDLy (Kids Focused, Responsible, Imaginative, Engaged, and Determined to Learn) Learning Project Proposal (RTT-D)*. Bowling Green, KY: Author.
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (2011). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Knowledge Works. (n.d.). A glimpse into the future of learning [infographic]. Retrieved from http://knowledgeworks.org/sites/default/files/A-Glimpse-into-the-Future-of-Learning-Infographic_0.pdf
- Kulik, J. A., Kulik, C. C., & Cohen, P. A. (1979). A meta-analysis of outcome studies of Keller's personalized system of instruction. *American Psychologist*, 34, 307-318.
- Lillard, A., & Else-Quest, N. (2006). Evaluating Montessori education. *Science, New Series*, 313, 1893-1894.
- Ljungman, A.G., & Silén, C. (2008). Examination involving students as peer examiners. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33, 289-300. doi: 10.1080/02602930701293306
- Loyens, S. M. M., Magda, J., & Rikers, R. M. J. P. (2008). Self-directed learning in problem-based learning and its relationships with self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychology Review*, 20, 411-427. doi: 10.1007/s10648-008-9082-7
- Meece, J. L., Anderman, E. M., & Anderman, L. H. (2006). Classroom goal structure, student motivation, and academic achievement. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 487-503. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070258
- Mitra, S., & Rana, V. (2001). Children and the internet: Experiments with minimally invasive education in India. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 32, 221-232.
- Ornstein, A., C. (1994). The textbook-driven curriculum. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 69, 70-85.
- Ratunde, K., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2005). The social context of middle school: Teachers, friends, and activities in Montessori and traditional school environments. *The Elementary School Journal*, 106(1), 59-79.
- Reeve, J., & Halusic, M. (2009). How k-12 teachers can put self-determination theory principles into practice. *Theory and Research in Education*, 7, 145-154. doi: 10.1177/1477878509104319
- Richardson, M., Abraham, C., & Bond, R. (2012). Psychological correlates of university students' academic performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138, 353-387. doi: 10.1037/a0026838
- Schmidt, H. G., Rotgans, J. I., & Yew, E. H. (2011). The process of problem-based learning: What works and why. *Medical Education*, 45, 792-806. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.2011.04035.x
- School in the Cloud. (2014). Introduction to self-organized learning. Retrieved from <https://www.theschoolinthecloud.org/library/resources/introduction-to-self-organized-learning>
- Sherhoff, D. J. (2013). *Optimal learning environment to promote student engagement*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Sherhoff, D.J., Csikszentmihalyi, M., Schneider, B., & Sherhoff, E. S. (2003). Student engagement in high school classrooms from the perspective of flow theory. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 18, 158-176.

Appendix C: Teacher Interview Questions

Below are possible questions to use for teacher interviews (Described under Step 5). Standards and Indicators from the Driver Implementation (DI) and Personalize Learning (PL) Map documents that might be addressed for each question are noted (for example, PL 1.1 = Personalized Learning Map Standard 1 (The Learning Process), Indicator 1 (Pre-Assessment)).

Driver Implementation Map Questions

1. As you understand it, *what is* kid-FRIENDLY?
2. What kid-FRIENDLY grant supports have you participated in or utilized?
3. How are kid-FRIENDLY grant supports changing your teaching practices?

Listen For:

- An awareness of kid-FRIENDLY, its goals, and its grant components
- Driver language (e.g., Student Empowerment, Communities of Practice, etc.)
- Driver theory of action terms (e.g., student empowerment, demonstration classrooms, choices and goal setting, etc.)
- Performance measures associated with the grant (e.g., college and career readiness rates, student satisfaction survey, etc.)
- Movement of the teachers beyond the grant supports to sustainable structures for promoting personalized learning as a long-term priority for the school.

Personalized Learning Map Questions

4. Describe how you decide **what** to teach, **when** to teach each skill or concept, and how you **assess** it and give **feedback**. (PL 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.8, 1.9, 3.3)

Listen for:

- Use of pre-assessments (PL 1.1)
- Use of learning targets to drive instruction (PL 1.2)
- Authentic and performance-based assessments (PL 1.3)
- Demonstration of mastery (PL 1.8)
- Grading practices (PL 1.9)
- Monitoring of student progress (PL 3.3)

5. Describe how you **differentiate** for different student readiness levels (PL 1.1, 1.4, 1.5, 2.4).
6. Describe the ways you give students **voice or choice** in your classroom (PL 1.6, 1.7)

Listen for:

- Use of pre-assessments (PL 1.1)
- Level of challenge (PL 1.4)
- Student self-pacing (PL 1.5)
- Collaboration between teacher and student (PL 1.6)
- Student autonomy (PL 1.7)
- Location of learning (PL 2.4)

7. How do *students* **define success** in your classroom? How do they handle failure? (PL 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

Listen For:

- Teacher's high expectations (PL 3.4)
- Student goal-setting (PL 4.1)
- Student goal monitoring (PL 4.2)
- Student self-regulation (PL 4.3)

8. How **confident** are you in delivering **personalized learning** for your students? What would increase your level of confidence? (PL 3.1)

Listen For:

- Teacher's level of self-efficacy (PL 3.1)

Appendix D: Student Interview Questions

Below are possible questions to use for student interviews (Described under Step 5). Standards and Indicators from the Personalize Learning (PL) Map that might be addressed for each question are noted (for example, PL 1.1 = Personalized Learning Map Standard 1 (The Learning Process), Indicator 1 (Pre-Assessment)).

Personalized Learning Map Questions

9. When you walk into class each day, how do you know what you're going to be learning?

Listen for:

- Pre-assessment (PL 1.1)
- Learning targets vs. teacher/textbook driven (PL 1.2)
- Pacing (PL 1.5)

10. How do you know if you are being successful in your classes?

Listen for:

- Challenge level (PL 1.4)
- Mastery (PL 1.8)
- Standards-based Grading (PL 1.9)
- Success as mastery (PL 2.2)
- Teachers communicate mastery/growth mindset (PL 3.2)
- Teachers monitor progress toward mastery (PL 3.3)
- Teachers' high expectations (PL 3.4)
- Student goal setting (PL 4.1)
- Student goal monitoring (PL 4.2)
- Student self-regulation (PL 4.3)

11. How does your teacher make sure you are getting exactly what you need for learning, even if that's different from the rest of the class?

Listen for:

- Pacing (PL 1.5)
- Collaboration between teacher and student (PL 1.6)
- Teachers monitor progress toward mastery (PL 3.3)
- Teacher's high expectations (PL 3.4)
- Student-teacher relationship (PL 3.5)

12. When do you get to choose your own class work?

Listen for:

- Collaboration between teacher and student (PL 1.6)
- Autonomy (PL 1.7)
- Pacing (PL 1.5)
- Flexibility of location (PL 2.4)
- Teacher self-efficacy (PL 3.1)
- Student goal setting (PL 4.1)
- Student self-regulation (PL 4.3)

13. How does your teacher let you know if you are making progress in class?

Listen for:

- Mastery (PL 1.8)
- Standards-based grading (PL 1.9)
- Teachers communicate mastery/growth mindset (PL 3.2)
- Teachers monitor progress toward mastery (PL 2.2)
- Teachers' high expectations (PL 3.4)
- Student-teacher relationship (PL 3.5)

14. What happens when you are struggling with a lesson? How does your teacher help you get past the struggle?

Listen for:

- Mastery (PL 1.8)
- Teachers communicate a mastery/growth mindset (PL 3.2)
- Teachers monitor progress toward mastery (PL 3.3)
- Teachers high expectations (PL 3.4)
- Student goal setting (PL 4.1)
- Student goal monitoring (PL 4.2)
- Student self-regulation (PL 4.3)

15. What are tests or assessments like in your class?

Listen for:

- Performance assessments vs paper/pencil (PL 1.3)
- Standards-based grading (PL 1.9)
- Teachers' high expectations (PL 3.4)

16. What are your personal goals for learning?

Listen for:

- Student goal setting (PL 4.1)
- Student self-regulation (PL 4.3)

Appendix E: kid-FRIENDLY Personalized Learning Classroom Observation Tool

Instructions: This tool was designed to be used in conjunction with other data sources to make a holistic rating on the KF Personalized Learning Map document. For each indicator, provide a 1-5 rating in the right hand column. Note that the "Rounded Average" cell will be automatically calculated based on your ratings (as will the "Summary" Page). In the "Evidence" space, please provide a description of supporting evidence for **each indicator if any**. In providing evidence, please note the difference between evidence and opinion. Evidence means an objective description of classroom practices with no interpretation. Evidence is **observable, objective, and free of value judgment** whereas opinion reflects one's beliefs or personal preferences that are often not supported by evidence. Examples of evidence are scripts of teacher or student comments, non-evaluative statements of observed teacher or student behavior (e.g., Students were working on the task independently), numeric information about time, student participation, resource use, etc. (e.g., Fifteen minutes were spent in circle time), or an observed aspect of the classroom environment.

#	Standard	Description						Rounded Average (1-5)	
1	The Learning Process	The school community works collaboratively to develop instructional and assessment practices that are in harmony with personalized learning.							
	Indicators	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Score (1-5)	Evidence
1.1	Pre-Assessment	<u>Classroom assessment, lesson and unit plans, teacher and student interviews, classroom observations</u> (may not be directly observable in all classrooms)	Teachers regularly pre-assess students' prior knowledge or skill before teaching a lesson or unit and then regularly use pre-assessment data to make changes in their instructional plans, including differentiating for individual student's readiness to learn new content.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Teachers regularly pre-assess students' prior knowledge or skill before teaching a lesson or unit, but pre-assessment data rarely lead to changes in teachers' instructional plans.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Teachers rarely pre-assess students' prior knowledge or skill before teaching a new lesson or unit.		
1.2	Planning	<u>Lesson and unit plans, syllabi, teacher and student interviews, classroom observations</u>	All teachers exhibit a school-wide commitment to student learning and assessment using a framework of learning targets and competencies that are established based on students cognitive development/readiness.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Some teachers/leaders demonstrate commitment to student learning and assessment by using a framework of learning targets and competencies tied to defensible and age/grade appropriate standards.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Student learning and assessment is primarily textbook driven in that teachers closely follow the organization of the prescribed text with little deviation.		
1.3	Assessment Development	<u>Classroom assessment samples, classroom observations, documentation of completed student assessment tasks, teacher and student interviews, SBDM policies</u>	Most paper and pencil tests have been replaced by various authentic performance based assessments that are interdisciplinary and represent real-world demonstrations of learning.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Some paper and pencil tests have been replaced by performance based assessments.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Assessments are summative in nature, typically given only once, and are usually paper and pencil tests delivered in a standardized format (multiple choice, short-answer, essay; one assessment for all students).		
1.4	Challenge	<u>Lesson plans, student and teacher interviews, classroom observations</u>	Activities are designed to adequately challenge students by targeting not just the concepts and tasks they are ready to learn and do but also those they will be able to tackle with additional assistance from peers and teachers.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Activities are restricted to just the concepts and tasks that students are ready to learn and can master independently. Teachers avoid anything challenging that would cause discomfort among students.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Activities are not differentiated and students are all assigned similar tasks based on the readiness/cognitive development of a steering group.		

	Indicators	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Score (1-5)	Evidence
1.5	Pacing	Lesson and unit plans, pacing guides, assessment samples, student and teacher interviews, classroom observations, School PLPs, Student work samples	Students advance through learning targets at their own pace, mostly unencumbered by the limitations of class period, school day, <u>grading period or academic year</u> or traditional grade-level assignment. Students have the opportunity to move beyond their assigned grade level in topics and subject content.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	<u>Within the limitations of a single school year</u> , students may move through curricular concepts at their own pace. School day schedules allow the flexibility for students to work on interdisciplinary performance tasks across multiple class periods.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Learning segments are defined by the length of the class period, school day, <u>grading period, and academic year</u> . Age determined grade levels dictate the content and pacing of curricular concepts.		
			Students are responsible stewards of their own time, learning how to manage tasks efficiently and effectively.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students demonstrate increasing levels of responsibility with time management and pacing towards achieving learning goals.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students learn to be compliant with adult directives on when and what to learn.		
			Students work collaboratively with teachers to develop their own timelines for completing learning targets. Students regularly communicate with teachers on their progress.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students mostly rely on teachers to set the pace of learning, but take advantage of classroom structures of remediation and enrichment to accelerate their progress towards learning targets.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students rely on teachers to set the pace of their learning, completing assignments based on schedules established by the teacher.		
1.6	Collaboration	<u>Lesson and unit plans, teacher and student interviews</u> , classroom observations	Students' voice and choice are integral to the instructional process and teachers and students are co-creators of knowledge, with teachers acting as facilitators of knowledge and skill development. Students actively seek engagement and demonstrate their responsibility for learning based on mutual understanding with the teacher, of their needs and aspirations. (Personalized Learning)	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students have some opportunities to act as partners in learning through activities designed to actively engage them. Classrooms show evidence of some facilitation of learning and not just traditional directed learning strategies. Teachers view learning as unique and actively incorporate student interests and aspirations into their instructional processes. (Student-Centered Learning)	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students have some opportunity for choice within instructional processes. The classroom is predominantly teacher-directed; plans show little evidence of understanding/consideration of student backgrounds. (Teacher-centered learning)		

	Indicators	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Score (1-5)	Evidence
1.7	Autonomy	<u>Lesson and unit plans, student and teacher interviews, assessment samples, classroom observations</u>	Students play an extensive role in developing their learning goals. Expectations for goal-setting are age appropriate and include scaffolding and age-appropriate choices. With teachers serving as guides, students develop strategic plans for accomplishing these goals by designing appropriate learning tasks, and seeking help, resources, and other assistance as needed.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students are encouraged and sometimes required to take responsibility for articulating their own learning goals. Expectations for goal-setting are age appropriate and include scaffolding and age-appropriate choices. Students also suggest ideas for learning tasks and/or may choose from a menu of choices for learning tasks.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students typically exercise little to no choice in their learning goals. Teachers develop all learning tasks with no input from students.		
			Students design their own performance-based assessments with support and advice from teachers, parents, peers, and community-based mentors and engage in thoughtful self-assessment of their progress.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students participate heavily in the development of individualized performance-based assessments and are encouraged to assess their own work; teachers still make most judgments about student progress toward learning targets.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students complete summative assessments developed by teacher, typically with no input into the assessment's construction or assessed learning targets.		
1.8	Mastery [6]	<u>Assessment samples, student and teacher interviews, unit plans, pacing guides, classroom observations</u>	Students have multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery of learning objectives. Based on teacher feedback as well as peer- and self-assessment, students will revise their work and perform tasks repeatedly until mastery is demonstrated.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students may occasionally have multiple attempts on evaluations. These attempts are generally geared towards improving a test score or grade. There may exist some opportunities for enrichment or remediation for crucial (state-mandated) performance targets.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Once a concept has been taught and assessed, learning moves forward regardless of student mastery of the concept. Similarly, few enrichment opportunities exist for students who have already demonstrated mastery of learning concepts or who do so more quickly than their peers.		
1.9	Grading	Grade book samples, grading and reporting policies, assessment samples, teacher and student interviews, classroom observations	Traditional letter grades may not be given; work is entirely assessed through feedback and performance statements describing student progress toward mastery of the assessment's stated learning targets.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Traditional letter grades may be given, but grades are intentionally and clearly tied to student mastery of specific learning objectives. Most variables other than student mastery of learning objectives have been eliminated from the grading and reporting process.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Traditional letter grades are given but some teachers implement a standards-based grading process that limits the percentage of student grades on homework or other tasks that do not measure learning.		

#	Standard	Description						Rounded Average (1-5)	
2	Climate	School administrators and the wider school community demonstrate a commitment to providing an adequate setting in which personalized learning can thrive.							
	Indicators	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Score (1-5)	Evidence
2.1	School Structures	<u>Master schedule, bell schedules, teacher and student interviews,</u> classroom observations	Policies and/or procedures for school bell and master schedules reflect efforts to create meaningful student opportunities to engage in learning across subject areas for extended periods of time without interruption.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Select groups of students engage in small-scale experiments in project-based learning across multiple class periods.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students move through an adult-established schedule that compartmentalizes learning by subject area and limits the time students can devote to any one task without interruption.		
2.2	Success	<u>Teacher and student interviews, classroom rubrics, grading policies, assessment samples,</u> classroom observations	Success is described as making progress in learning by accomplishing tasks and acquiring new skills.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Success is described as making progress in learning but there remains an emphasis on actual score and grades.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Success is defined by getting high scores on assessments, getting good grades, and other activities as well as demonstrating good behavior.		
2.3	Intentionally Blank								These elements of personalized learning are not observable in classrooms.
									These elements of personalized learning are not observable in classrooms.
2.4	Intentionally Blank								These elements of personalized learning are not observable in classrooms.

#	Standard	Description						Rounded Average (1-5)	
3	Teachers	Teachers understand personalized learning concepts and are committed to implementing them in guiding students to achieve learning goals.							
	Indicators	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Score (1-5)	Evidence
3.1	Self- Efficacy	<u>Teacher and student interviews, lesson and unit plans, assessment samples, classroom observations</u>	Teachers demonstrate high levels of confidence in their abilities to develop and maintain personalized learning environments.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Teachers demonstrate moderate levels of confidence in their abilities and are willing to develop personalized learning environments. However, they maintain levels of uncertainty regarding their ability as well as students' abilities to succeed in this new model.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Teachers demonstrate low levels of confidence in their ability to release any control over the learning process to students.		
3.2	Modeling	<u>Teacher and student interviews, lesson and unit plans, assessment samples, classroom observations</u>	Teachers get students involved in the process of modeling interest and enthusiasm towards all the topics studied highlighting the potential value to be gained.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Modeling efforts are primarily teacher-centered modeling interest in some topics while making it evident that other topics are studied solely because they are compulsory parts of the curriculum.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Teachers model a lack of interest and enthusiasm for most topics. It is evident that learning is simply a matter of checking off boxes without meaningfully engaging with the material in a way that would promote long-term growth.		
			Teachers communicate with students an emphasis on mastery views of intelligence and a growth mindset.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	While teachers mostly communicate in a way that ascribes some importance to mastering knowledge and skills, they continue to also emphasize performance.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Teacher communication with students is primarily focused on performance and reflects ability based views of intelligence.		
3.3	Monitoring	<u>Teacher and student interviews, lesson and unit plans, assessment samples, classroom observations</u>	Teachers maintain close watch over students' progression towards learning goals, providing appropriate feedback. Students and teachers work in close collaboration to make adjustments to the learning plans as needed.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Teachers generally monitor students and adjust their instruction (re-teaching, flexible grouping for intervention, enrichment, etc.) based on student progress toward learning targets.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Teachers deliver instruction, assess, record grades, and then move on to the next objective. There is little/no monitoring of individual student progress during the learning process.		

	Indicators	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Score (1-5)	Evidence
3.4	High Expectations	<u>Teacher and student interviews, lesson and unit plans, assessment samples, classroom observations</u>	Teachers regularly communicate high expectations for all students regardless of students' prior performance.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Teachers occasionally communicate high expectations for students who are known as high achievers but are more accommodating of students who are typically regarded as low achievers. These expectations are commensurate to students' prior performance.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Teachers do not communicate high expectations for students highlighting instead their prior achievements as a basis for their current or future performance/progress.		
			Teachers do not accept mediocre work, encouraging students to take as many opportunities as necessary to revise and resubmit.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Teachers do not accept mediocre work from high achieving students, but allow low achievers to turn in low quality work.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Teachers accept low quality work from all students as a means of protecting students' self-esteem.		
3.5	Student-Teacher Relationship	<u>Teacher and student interviews, lesson and unit plans, assessment samples, classroom observations</u>	All teachers identify and work to develop strong, positive and caring relationships with all students as critical components of the instructional process <u>irrespective of whether or not they teach these students.</u>	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Most student-teacher relationships are characterized by trust, caring, and demonstrated commitment to support all students within the class to be successful at school.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Student-teacher relationships are not considered a primary focus of improved student achievement and are rarely evident within the school community.		
			Teachers actively seek to understand the student, his or her life experiences, cultural background, talents, and strengths, in order to better meet learning and developmental needs.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Schools have developed and implemented plans to strengthen the connection and relationships with vulnerable students.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Many students, particularly vulnerable students, do not feel that teachers in the school care about them outside of the classroom. There are no plans in place to develop connections with students.		

#	Standard	Description						Rounded Average (1-5)	
4	Students	Students understand personalized learning concepts or activities and use them as the foundation for progression towards clear and meaningful learning targets and growth goals.							
	Indicators	Possible Sources of Evidence	5 Sustaining	4 Scaling Up	3 Implementing	2 Starting	1 Continuing Status Quo	Score (1-5)	Comments
4.1	Goal Setting	Patterns of Adaptive Learning Survey, Student Interviews, School honor roll (reverse), Documentation of Student/School PLPs	Students focus on understanding a concept or skill so that they can apply the knowledge gained or skill acquired in other classes or settings in/outside of school.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students focus on understanding a concept or skill in a way that their grasp extends beyond the period of study of the topic and/or the school year.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students focus on learning a concept in order to pass the assessment of that concept. Once the evaluation process is complete the knowledge gained is quickly forgotten.		
			Students focus solely on comparing their current level of achievement to prior accomplishments. Students maintain self-improvement as their goal.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students may compare current achievement to prior accomplishments but outperforming others (or performing on par with others) remains the primary focus.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students focus on how their performance compares to other students in the class as a measure of their understanding of the material. Comparing scores on a test is a regular occurrence.		
4.2	Goal Monitoring	Patterns of Adaptive Learning Survey, Student Interviews, Documentation of Student/School PLPs	Students view mistakes as an essential part of learning and regard them as an opportunity for learning.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students feel encouraged to continue trying after making mistakes and that the effort expended is just as important as the end result.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students become quickly frustrated and unwilling to continue trying if they do not immediately meet learning target.		
4.3	Self-Regulation	Patterns of Adaptive Learning Survey, Student Interviews, Documentation of Student PLP	Students take the initiative to create goals that target improvement in the areas of weakness identified. They consult with teachers, parents, and/or community members for tips and pointers for accomplishing these goals.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 3 and 5.)	Students adopt suggestions offered by teachers, parents and/or community mentors to improve identified where growth is needed.	(Evidence suggests the classroom falls somewhere between 1 and 3.)	Students do not engage in activities of their own volition to address the identified areas where growth is needed.		

kid-FRIENDLY Personalized Learning Classroom Observation Tool (Summary)			
#	Standard	Description	Rounded Average (1-5)
1	The Learning Process	The school community works collaboratively to develop instructional and assessment practices that are in harmony with personalized learning.	
2	Climate	School administrators and the wider school community demonstrate a commitment to providing an adequate setting in which personalized learning can thrive.	
3	Teachers	Teachers understand personalized learning concepts and are committed to implementing them in guiding students to achieve learning goals.	
4	Students	Students understand personalized learning concepts or activities and use them as the foundation for progression towards clear and meaningful learning targets and growth goals.	
			OVERALL

Rating Color Scheme		Rating Definition
5	Sustaining	A school where there is a firm, shared commitment to the principles and practices of personalized learning. The learning process, climate, and actions and attitudes of teachers and students consistently reflect this commitment. Structures and practices that support personalized learning are central to the school's vision and persist even through changes in leadership and teaching personnel.
4	Scaling Up	A school where there is a widespread commitment to the principles and practices of personalized learning. The learning process, climate, and actions and attitudes of teachers and students mostly reflect this commitment. Pockets of inconsistency linger, and there is risk changes in leadership or teaching personnel could jeopardize the sustainability of personalization efforts.
3	Implementing	A school where personalized learning has become a priority. Key teacher and administrative leaders are engaged in shifting the learning process and climate toward structures and practices that align with personalized learning. Teachers still maintain a largely directive role in the learning process and practices are not consistently implemented across the school.
2	Starting	A school where stakeholders are just beginning to learn about the personalized learning and individual teachers engage in limited experimentation with personalized learning, largely in isolation from other teachers.
1	Continuing Status Quo	A school where stakeholders are largely unfamiliar with the concept of personalized learning.

Appendix F: Reflection and Planning Tool

Below is a tool for collaboratively reflecting on the results of your self-assessment (Described under Step 7). School Self-Assessment Teams should complete this instrument together.

What area(s) received the highest overall ratings?			
Area:		Rating:	
Area:		Rating:	
What area(s) received the lowest overall ratings?			
Area:		Rating:	
Area:		Rating:	
What changes in your ratings have you observed since last year's self-assessment?			
PLUS		DELTA	
What strengths were revealed from the Self-Assessment relative to your school's implementation of personalized Learning?		What growth areas were revealed from the Self-Assessment relative to your school's implementation of personalized learning?	
NEXT STEPS			
What, if anything, does your school's ratings on the Driver Implementation Map suggest about your ratings on the Personalized Learning Map?			

Based on these data, what are the natural next steps for your school's implementation of personalized learning?