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**kid·FRIENDLy Year Four Progress:**

**An External Evaluation Report by the WKU Rock Solid Evaluation Team**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In 2012, the United States Department of Education (USED) awarded a 4-year grant of $41 million to a combined set of 22 school districts representing 118 schools belonging to the Green River Regional Educational Cooperative (GRREC) and Ohio Valley Educational Cooperative (OVEC). Because of closing or combining of some of the original 118 schools, now 111 remain in the project. The cooperatives established a new educational arm, called kid·FRIENDLy (Kids-Focused, Responsible, Imaginative, Engaged, and Determined to Learn) to implement the grant, currently consisting of 68 staff to carry out the project goals (see Appendix A). A team of researchers from Western Kentucky University, hired under the name “Rock Solid,” was commissioned to serve as external evaluators.

Grant implementation began in January 2013. After a brief review of grant goals and projects, the following report describes grant progress, based on an USED-provided outline of headings and key questions and topics to consider, over the fourth project year (Year Four), ending June 30, 2017.

**kid·FRIENDLy Goals**

In alignment with the goals USED established for Race to the Top, kid·FRIENDLy is oriented toward improving student achievement, and, consequently, college-and-career readiness, primarily through an emphasis on personalized learning with a competency-based instruction approach. kid·FRIENDLy seeks to deliver high-quality professional development and supports for teachers and leaders around these concepts so that educator effectiveness – understood to be the key to improved student learning – can be enhanced.

Accordingly, the Green River Regional and Ohio Valley Educational Cooperatives articulated the following goals in their Race to the Top application:

Goal 1: Increase the number of students in participating schools who have access to *highly effective*[[1]](#footnote-1) teachers and principals.

Goal 2: Increase the number of students in participating schools who have access to *effective* teachers and principals.

Goal 3: Improve the academic and non-cognitive outcomes for students in participating schools.

Goal 4: Ensure all students in participating schools are on track to be college- and career-ready by graduation.

Goal 5: Ensure all students in participating schools are capable and prepared for post-secondary careers, college, and/or technical school.

A supplemental grant called Preschool Pals was also awarded to enhance kindergarten readiness through a network of supports for private preschools and child care providers.

**kid·FRIENDLy Projects**

To meet the goals outlined above, kid·FRIENDLy proposed four projects as vehicles for carrying out their efforts. A fifth project related to managing the grant and the previously mentioned supplemental preschool project were also developed. Below is a brief description of each:

*Project 1: Students as Leaders*. Associated with Goal 3 (improving academic and non-cognitive outcomes), this project emphasizes empowering students to take charge of their own learning by teaching social and emotional skills associated with high levels of personal achievement. The Leader in Me*™* (TLIM) program, developed by Franklin Covey, is the centerpiece of this project, and seeks to engender student dispositions associated with Stephen Covey’s *7 Habits of Highly Effective People*. Districts and schools are capitalizing on the strategies associated with TLIM to promote student agency through curriculum, instruction, and assessment delivery models. Ultimately, the strategies help students act for themselves and take ownership for their learning by defining their learning goals, by relating their learning to authentic, real-life experiences, and by engaging them in student-centered metacognitive practices.

*Project 2: Leaders Developing Leadership*. Associated with Goals 1 and 2 (increasing the number of students with access to effective and highly-effective teachers and principals), this project emphasizes networking and mentoring for school leaders to lead innovative change, improve performance, and make key decisions based on data driven needs. Data analysis routines were established and facilitated by GRREC staff. Cognitive Coaches and Leadership Mentors facilitated on-going use of data analysis to inform innovative practices in districts and schools.

*Project 3: Competency-Based Instruction*. Associated with Goals 3, 4, and 5 (improving student academic and non-cognitive outcomes and improving students’ college and career readiness), this project shifts the focus of learning away from traditional teaching and assessment toward mastery of specific content knowledge and skills. Through needs-based professional development, teachers are developing strategies for competency-based instruction and standards-based reporting of student progress toward proficiency.

*Project 4: Personalized Learning*. Also associated with Goals 3, 4, and 5, this project supports school-wide efforts to make learning more flexible and individualized for all students. Personalized learning emphasizes a shift away from teacher-centered instruction and traditional modes of organizing the school day toward a learning environment unencumbered by the normal limits of the school day and bell schedule. Each school developed a school-wide Personalized Learning Plan, supported by professional development, enhanced technology resources, and technical support. This project also involves the establishment of College and Career Centers in every participating high school toward the goal of establishing a clear and coherent system to prepare all students for college and career.

*Project 5: Management and Evaluation*. This additional project, created in accordance with USED Scope of Work guidelines, governs the management and evaluation components of the grant itself. After the project director and program managers were hired, this leadership team collaborated with GRREC and OVEC staff to develop the Scope of Work to guide the work of this grant. The director then worked to hire the additional support staff and the external evaluation team, as well as to establish other support structures to carry out the grant. When the original project director chose to retire, another seasoned staff member from GRREC stepped into the role. This second project director also retired in July 2015. Year Four efforts continued under the guidance of a third director.

*Supplemental Project: Preschool Pals.* Additionally, several of the projects above include elements of a Preschool Pals supplemental grant to improve kindergarten readiness rates through enhanced supports for area daycares and preschools.

Subsequent sections of this report describe major activities associated with each project carried out in Year Four.

**OVERVIEW OF RTT-D STRATEGIES**

As described in the Year Two APR, Year Two focused on translating projects into key drivers to serve as key strategies for helping schools and districts achieve the ultimate goal of developing more personalized learning environments:

* Project 1: Students as Leaders – Driver: TLIM (K-8) and GRIT (9-12) led by the Student Empowerment Director
* Project 2: Leaders Developing Leadership – Driver: Community of Learners led by Leadership Mentors
* Project 3: Competency-Based Instruction – Driver: Communities of Practice led by Cognitive Coaches (note this project also connects directly with Projects 2, 4, and Supplemental)
* Project 4: Personalized Learning – Driver: College and Career Readiness Services led by College and Career Readiness Counselors
* Supplemental Project: Preschool Pals – Driver: Community-Based Childcare Services led by Preschool Pals

Year Three involved bringing the key driver work and subsequent DI/PL Maps work together toward creating a common language and understanding among kid·FRIENDLy personnel and participating schools.

Year Four emphasized kid·FRIENDLy coaches working with school-based teams to embed a common language and build capacity in that work toward sustainability in anticipation that kid·FRIENDLy supports were going to be gradually removed from schools as the grant ended. Every school has a team capable of leading at least some component of the kid·FRIENDLy work, whether it be student agency, learning labs, or demonstration sites. Regardless of chosen components, the majority of these teams can articulate how these aspects fall under the larger “personalized learning” umbrella that guided the kid·FRIENDLy grant. They have experienced the necessary shift in language and mindset mainly through the influence of the PL Map because it finally defined personalized learning. Schools can now articulate it and envision it. In addition to the reflection tool (part of the map scoring process), schools have developed plans with the kid·FRIENDLy team through a data review process to continue to support or even scale up this work. The goal this year was to extend the work beyond the initially identified Teacher Leaders, and several schools now have other additional teachers developing learning labs or demonstration sites.

As Year Four and the grant comes to a close, kid·FRIENDLy has plans in place to review each school’s second (and last within the grant) self-assessment based on the DI/PL Maps in order to conduct a modified or abbreviated last data analysis process. The process will involve comparing map results with last year’s school plans and then kid·FRIENDLy providing final feedback and guidance on next steps for schools as they more to self-sustaining their personalized learning efforts.

Our current reporting year, Year Four saw continued adjustments to the original grant strategies based on what the kid·FRIENDLy leadership team learned from during the first three years of implementation. One adjustment was an attempt to connect kid·FRIENDLy principals with GRREC’s principal network, specifically its Learning to Lead (L2L) grant, in order for both groups to learn from one another. kid·FRIENDLy endeavored to make similar connections with other networks at GRREC, but not as much progress was made with these. It is the vision of the kid·FRIENDLy director that in order to sustain and scale up this work there should be some cohesiveness among GRREC networks, not only for this grant, but all those GRREC manages and supports. The kid·FRIENDLy director is putting together for the GRREC director a “sustainability toolbox” to promote at GRREC to ensure the kid·FRIENDLy work continues--one of the major tools being the importance of these integrated networks rather than have several networks (across several grants) that do not communicate with one another effectively. Another adjustment involved taking the Preschool Pal work in community-based childcare centers into the public school preschools. Time was spent modeling lessons with public preschool and kindergarten teachers in order to expand this work. kid·FRIENDLy invited all the districts to discuss the preschool partnership grants offered through the state; some districts have chosen to purchase services from GRREC, much of which is similar to those services Preschool Pals provided to the community-based child care centers. This provides another opportunity for the work of the Preschool Pals to be scaled up and extended. College and Career Readiness Counselors have also made adjustments and seen great gains as they have focused on leaving tools behind that will allow others to replicate much of what they have been doing in each school. Because of their perceived value, most superintendents are finding funds to continue these positions. The kid·FRIENDLy project director would have liked more of these counselors to have connected better with middle, intermediate, and elementary schools; a few were able to make these connections, but this varied from district to district.

Additional key strategies the kid·FRIENDLy leadership team employed during Year Four included:

* Connecting school guidance counselors at elementary, middle, and high school levels with the College and Career Readiness Coach (CCRC) network at GRREC toward strategies to blend and combine their work. Typically, school guidance counselors are so overwhelmed with testing and assessment requirements that they do not find time to provide student adequate college and career guidance. The CCRCs provide this guidance but now are interacting with and informing school guidance counselors regarding their work.

The kid·FRIENDLy project reached the following milestones in Year Four that serve as indicators of continued progress toward long-term grant goals:

* Similar to last year, two Personalized Learning Symposia were held. But unlike previous years, students actually presented on their work related to kid·FRIENDLy, particularly The Leader in Me. Additionally, teachers brought their student-teachers to learn about the kid·FRIENDLy work.
* Non-kid·FRIENDLy schools were also invited to come to expand the grant work beyond participating schools (a small number attended). The DI/PL Map was presented to these schools so they could conduct their own personalized learning assessment.
* Schools finally got past “doing TLIM,” which in the past they would sometimes say kept them too busy to allow students to drive their own learning. We provided an “Aligning Academics” training to help schools see bridge the TLIM Seven Habits to student agency and academic (and non-cognitive) goal setting.
* A systemic change in mindset has taken place where schools no longer are asking, “Do we have to do this?” Instead, they are asking, “What do we need to do next to continue reaching and going beyond our personalized learning goals?”
* An agreement has been reached for FranklinCovey to continue to support kid·FRIENDLy schools beyond the end of the grant. One support “package” of services is at no cost; more elaborate service arrangements (including coaching) are available at varying levels of cost. Furthermore, every school district has at least two people trained in the TLIM Seven Habits so new teachers can become informed and supported or refresher courses can be offered; thus, this foundational work can be sustained within district resources.

The kid·FRIENDLy leadership team have devised several unique approaches to ensure that the spirit of the grant is being carried out:

* The High School GRIT Program continued to develop.
* Communities of Practice (Related to Project 3: Competency-Based Instruction) – The kid·FRIENDLy leadership team believes that the Communities of Practice approach is not only unique to the kid·FRIENDLy partner schools but may be a new approach for other school systems to consider.
* Teacher Leader Mini-Grants continued.
* More networking across the districts – Last year was more in district networking; this year, more districts were visiting other districts to see models of instruction. Several have said they will continue to network with other districts. Districts have asked the kid·FRIENDLy staff to leave behind a list of the “top ten schools/classrooms” to visit if others want to see various aspects of the personalized learning model in action. However, there is no networking yet between RTTD and non-RTTD schools.
* Every school has a demonstration classroom. For some sites this might be TLIM/student agency, but other schools have demonstration classrooms for other aspects of the personalized learning model.

Year Four also saw the continued implementation of a new instrument/assessment:

* The DI/PL Maps (see [wku.edu/rocksolid/dctools.php](http://wku.edu/rocksolid/dctools.php)) – As described in last year’s report, kid·FRIENDLy staff and schools explored Map results for patterns to plan supports and interventions for the rest of the grant. Thus, through the Maps, relationships among project implementation, movement toward personalization, and project outcome measures were more fully understood and are guided discussion and work throughout Year Four. As a culminating self-assessment of personalized learning growth over the grant, schools again completed the Maps during the spring 2017 semester.
* The “Pathways” CCRC document was refined – Developed for educators to use in schools/districts, the document outlines strategies and activities to help students to design their own pathways with support from teachers and other educators.
* “Preschool” PL Map – kid·FRIENDLy staff working with the Community-based Childcare initiative modified the PL Map to address how preschools could self-assess their work through the personalized learning lens. Many preschools used this tool over Year Four.
* Kentucky School Board Association self-assessment tool – It has been shared at GRREC board meetings, shared with superintendents, and presented at state and national conferences. However, only one kid·FRIENDLy district (Shelby) has chosen to use it.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND HIGHLIGHTS**

As described in earlier reports, kid·FRIENDLy staff translated projects into key drivers to serve as paths or tools for helping schools and districts achieve the ultimate goal of becoming more personalized learning environments. Over time, key school groups associated with these drivers, such as Community of Learners and Communities of Practice, began meeting together to combine their knowledge and efforts. As these groups met, the DI/PL Maps guided Year Four’s work toward sustainability.

*How is kid·FRIENDLy implementing student centered learning environments?*

* This year, Google Classroom has cropped up in every RTTD district with at least one or two classroom teachers, per district, utilizing it. When first mentioned by teachers at earlier kid·FRIENDLy symposia, this tool was merely a “glorified worksheet,” but there has been a shift toward using this technology as an effective instructional tool.
* Individual Learning Plans – As a state, Kentucky requires ILPs for grades 6-12 and has contracted with Career Cruising (See [education.ky.gov/educational/ccadv/ilp](http://education.ky.gov/educational/ccadv/ilp)) to provide a template for student individual learning plans. However, kid·FRIENDLy under the leadership of the Student Empowerment director has continued the work of developing a “For Me/By Me” profiles that build on the TLIM Student Data notebook. Templates have been created to include student-developed short-term and long-term goals. As this expands into higher grades, this process is becoming part of the GRIT profile. Part of this work has included defining various related terms, such as ILP, IEP, “For Me/By Me,” and how each contributes to a school’s broader goal of personalized learning.
* Adapted/Redesigned Classrooms Supporting Personalized Learning – Teacher Leader mini-grants continued into Year Four as Teacher Leaders in each school continued to develop their lab classrooms so that other educators could observe aspects of personalized learning in action.
* Technology Resources Supporting Personalized Learning – Through kid·FRIENDLy, schools have continued to be able to purchase WIFI, software, and electronic devices. Schools and districts have worked to utilize the resources to supplement personalized learning efforts
* Partnerships with External Organizations – The kid·FRIENDLy project has continued partnerships with the following organizations in Year Four in order to provide professional development and other support to schools:
* Franklin Covey (TLIM) – Student empowerment
* Erikson Institute – Preschool materials
* Buck Institute for Education – Project-based learning
* Carnegie Learning – Math Content Professional Learning
* WIN-Career Exploration
* Public Education and Business Coalition (PEBC) – Thinking strategies for Literacy
* Center for Cognitive Coaching

*How do RTT-D initiatives improve student outcomes?*

* Methods of Identifying Students Who May Need Additional Support – Year Four kid·FRIENDLy had no funds to use. Most schools used their own funds and to purchase software for students who were struggling in math or reading. Most schools chose to purchase reading software.

*How has RTT-D improved organizational and human capital structures?*

* New or Redefined Roles Supporting RTT-D Programs and Objectives – One of the biggest lessons learned through this project has been the need to focus more on the process of personalization versus various “packaged” products that purport to support personalization. This year has focused on integrating roles and developing a team at each school to continue the work.
* As the grant has ended, kid·FRIENDLy leadership was intentional in identifying a “coach” at each school toward the goal of sustaining this work. As kid·FRIENDLy coaches visited schools, they included these individuals in their meetings and encouraged them to shadow them in their coaching role.
* kid·FRIENDLy leadership commented that they still see more student-centered versus student-led instruction, but believe there is momentum toward more student-led if schools sustain their personalized learning work.

**PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATIONS**

Regarding the governance structure of the grant, Appendix A presents the kid·FRIENDLy personnel in place through June 30, 2017 and a brief description of the responsibilities related to the overall project. Appendix B provides the current kid·FRIENDLy organizational structure. As described in earlier APRs, the roles of many of the kid·FRIENDLy staff were further clarified by aligning them with a Driver tied to one of the original grant projects.

In an effort to focus on team building in Year Four, kid·FRIENDLy brought in Bill Owen (who also served as a cognitive coach) to present on coaching for innovation and coaching for teams.

Regarding involving educators, parents, and families in grant activities, please see the kid·FRIENDLy Professional Development Year Four Documentation file (see [wku.edu/rocksolid/reports.php](http://www.wku.edu/rocksolid/reports.php), APR Year Four Support Documents) for more details. Specifically, Preschool Pals, Family Resource and Youth Service Centers Directors (FRYSCs), and CCRCs have hosted events such as parent nights and provided tools and resources for parents to help their children. FRYSCs and CCRCs have collaborated on many of these events and tools. It should also be noted that all FRYSCs received Covey TLIM training.

Regarding support from non-profit organizations, although the kid·FRIENDLy project contains 22 school districts, it continues to be clear that without the support and leadership of the two non-profit cooperatives, GRREC and OVEC, this grant would not have not been written and its implementation would have been impossible. Both cooperatives provide superintendent networks (as well as at least one university’s representation and support).

**LESSONS LEARNED**

*Overcoming Implementation Challenges*

* Bringing Everything Together – Because of the number of districts and schools and the sheer complexity of the kid·FRIENDLy project, it has been difficult for all stakeholders (including kid·FRIENDLy staff) to see how all initiatives and support systems connect. An important lesson learned is that stakeholders should have been involved from the very beginning of the grant implementation process; there continued to be too many silos throughout the project. Even at the end of the previous year (Year Three), it remained difficult to discourage staff and schools from working in isolation, with “tunnel vision” regarding their specific piece of the puzzle. However, the kid·FRIENDLy leadership team and staff have agreed that the DI/PL Maps have become the needed apparatus during Year Four to help everyone see the same picture and speak the same language.
* Re-assembling kid·FRIENDLy Staff into District Teams – Similar to the above point, staff members often only have seen and understood their part in the project. As Year Three ended and the kid·FRIENDLy project director planned for Year Four, it was decided that from this point forward kid·FRIENDLy and district staff would be grouped into collaborative teams. Furthermore, Year Four of the grant emphasized the districts’ roles in supporting and sustaining the work versus kid·FRIENDLy doing something “to them or for them.”
* Coaching for Sustainability – kid·FRIENDLy was not intentional from the beginning of the project in identifying at least one school person both to coach as well as to train how to coach others towards the goal of sustainability. Teacher leaders received coaching, but were not in turn taught how to coach others. This became a focus in Year Four.
* Focusing the Work and Conversations of Leadership Mentors – Early in the project, leadership mentors met with principals to “check their pulse” and be a sounding board, but mentors did not focus on asking principals how the grant was going or how the school’s Teacher Leader was faring. During Year Three, as kid·FRIENDLy settled on driver language and then the evaluation team translated that into the DI/PL Maps, leadership mentors not only introduced the DI/PL Maps and assessment process (via the *Manual)* to principals in preparation for the self-assessment period, but they have continued in Year Four to use the DI/PL Maps to focus all subsequent meetings with principals.
* Empowering Teacher Leaders – After a very slow start, Teacher Leader mindsets have greatly changed in a very short time beginning in Year Three and continuing in Year Four. kid·FRIENDLy believes that the introduction of Teacher Leader Forums have helped Teacher Leaders learn from one another. Additionally, Teacher Leaders have begun to attempt truly innovative practices in their classrooms.
* Overemphasis on Programs – Another lesson is we focused too much on various programs and lost sight of the larger picture at times. For example, student empowerment should have been done differently, with other paths besides TLIM. Many schools were successful using TLIM, but schools should have had other choices to consider based on their needs, their context.
* The Challenge of Sustainability – No structures were developed over the life of the grant at GRREC to sustain and support any of the work schools have accomplished. There are key individuals and leaders remaining in most schools to continue the work, but integrated networks and support systems across GRREC districts need to exist. GRREC needs to become more proactive in the support systems it provides.

*Setbacks and Delays*

* Principals and teachers do say that they have experienced a mindset and culture shift because of the kid·FRIENDLy work. kid·FRIENDLy staff have also helped frame the conversation around, “Though the funding is ending, this transformative work is not. Keep moving forward in this work.”
* kid·FRIENDLy staff worked with districts and schools this year to connect their Di/PL Maps results to inform their Consolidated School Improvement Plan (CSIP) and Consolidated District School Improvement Plan (CDIP) for the future. In this way, the kid·FRIENDLy initiatives are finding their way into the normal work and thinking of schools.

*Other Lessons Learned*

* Instilling Ownership Earlier – kid·FRIENDLy acknowledges missed opportunities in involving stakeholders early in the grant toward “owning” the project goals and process instead of just offering resources and services. If this mindset could have been instilled earlier, then funds and resources could have been more “personalized” to meet the needs of each district and school rather than the “one size fits all” approach followed for most of the grant. However, Year Four was characterized by the more personalized approach—supporting schools and districts as they identified what they need to continue toward sustainability.

**PROJECT 1: STUDENTS AS LEADERS**

Project 1 (Student as Leaders) seeks to build a culture of student leadership and responsibility through implementing The Leader in Me (TLIM), a whole-school transformation process developed by Franklin Covey (FC) for elementary and middle schools, and GRIT, a new process designed especially for kid·FRIENDLy high schools. Both TLIM and GRIT programs first engage school staff in professional learning around *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People* (Covey, 1989) and ask them to see each of their students as leaders and as having special talents. Then, FC expert trainers and coaches provide extensive onsite support in each building. The kid·FRIENDLy leadership team articulated the “theory of action” behind this project as: 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; 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. Over Year Four, Project 1 has focused on providing continued coaching support to Cohort 2 elementary and middle schools finishing up their third year implementation of TLIM program, helping select schools to achieve TLIM lighthouse status and sustain TLIMand GRITafter the grant ends*.*

Supporting Cohort 2 Schools

Over Year Four, cohort 2 elementary and middle schools were to complete their third year implementation of TLIMprogram. Coaches from Franklin Covey provided one-day onsite coaching and two-day community coaching (fall and spring) to 23 elementary schools and 10 middle schools. Among all cohort 2 schools, 12 elementary schools, and seven middle schools opted out and did not move forward with TLIM*.* Among the 23 elementary schools completing the third year program implementation, 12 schools were rated as green (high implementers) and five elementary schools were rated as yellow (medium implementers) and four were rated as red (low implementers). Two elementary schools did not receive the rating from the coaches. Among the 10 middle schools completing the third year program implementation, four schools were rated as green (high implementers), two elementary schools were rated as yellow (medium implementers), and four were rated as red (low implementers).

Achieving Lighthouse Status

Over Year Four, the priority of project 1, Student Empowerment, was to give extra support to any school that wanted to achieve Lighthouse status before the end of the grant. A TLIM School can strive to become a Lighthouse school if they meet the Lighthouse Criteria set by Franklin Covey. Lighthouse Schools serve as exemplars to their community and other schools. A review team uses the Lighthouse Rubric to measure school outcomes in three areas: teaching leadership principles, creating a leadership culture, and aligning academic systems. To help schools achieve the goal, a Franklin Covey Lighthouse specialist was brought to provide training in September 2016 for the interested schools. Representatives from 15 kid·FRIENDLy schools attended the training that was focused on the Lighthouse Rubric. Franklin Covey official Lighthouse reviews were held at the ten schools that were ready for the review from the end of March to the end of April in 2017. After the systematic review, nine elementary schools achieved the Lighthouse status in Year Four. Among the 18 lighthouse schools in Kentucky out of 289 Lighthouse Schools world-wide, 14 are kid·FRIENDLy schools achieving the Lighthouse status during the grant period.

Sustaining TLIM

Another goal in Year Four was to support sustaining efforts for schools that wished to continue and grow Student Empowerment after the end of the grant. Throughout the kid·FRIENDLy grant, 85 Elementary and Middle schools were trained in the Seven Habits and Leader in Me. Only 18 of the schools (12 Elementary and six Middle) have decided to exit the program at the end of Year Four. The remaining 67 Elementary and Middle schools will continue using the TLIM program to facilitate Student Empowerment. Aligning Academics training was held in April 2017 for all interested elementary and middle schools. Aligning Academics focuses on goal setting for schools, teachers, classrooms, and students. The goal of the training was to refine goal setting for the schools and give them the support needed to sustain the momentum of student empowerment growth.

Out of the 22 high schools, 11 schools expressed interesting in continuing the GRIT program. These schools were given tools and training to help them grow and sustain the GRIT concept. All Access Pass from Franklin Covey was purchased for the eleven high schools. The All Access Pass provided these schools with training videos and resource materials for students, staff, and parents.

The following planned events and/or professional development opportunities were provided to support this project in Year Four:

* On September 26, 2016, a Franklin Covey Lighthouse specialist provided a training focusing on Lighthouse Review for the schools that are interested in pursuing Lighthouse Status. Representatives from 15 schools attended the training.
* On April 26, 2017, an Aligning Academics training was held for all interested middle and elementary schools that wished to sustain Student Empowerment after the end of grant. Representatives from seven schools attended the training.
* A Regional GRIT Synergy session was scheduled for high Schools in spring 2016. It was canceled due to the low attendance.

See the kid·FRIENDLy Professional Development Year Four Documentation file ([wku.edu/rocksolid/reports.php](http://www.wku.edu/rocksolid/reports.php), APR Year Four Support Documents) for more details.

**kid·FRIENDLy Activities Relative to Year Four Scope of Work:** None; all designated scope of work items completed by end of Year Three.

**Scope of Work Project 1 Summary Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SOW 1 N** | **Green** | **Yellow** | **Red** | **Blue** |
| 0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Highlights and Successes**

* Over Year Four, nine elementary schools have achieved the Lighthouse status. Out of 18 Lighthouse Schools in Kentucky, 14 were kid·FRIENDLy schools during the time of the grant. A principal from a Lighthouse elementary school reflected: “The four years spent on developing and inspiring children to become leaders has proven to be remarkable work. Providing opportunities for students to be empowered in their own learning while also training teachers ways to make classrooms student friendly, engaging, and owned by students will have a lasting impact on all stakeholders. I was blessed to see the growth from the beginning and know the changes to our school have been significant and life-changing.”
* Out of 85 elementary and middle schools trained in the Seven Habits and Leader in Me during the grant period, 67 (79%) elementary and middle schools will continue using the Leader in Me program to facilitate Student Empowerment.
* Based on Franklin Covey’s coaching report in Year 2016-2017, out of 33 elementary and middle schools that continued the third-year implementing TLIM program, 16 schools (50%) are implementing the program with high fidelity.
* Out of 85 kid·FRIENDLy schools which have completed self-assessment using the DI/PL Maps (5-point Likert scale) developed by the Rock Solid team, 32 (38%) schools scored between 4-5, 40 (47%) schools scored between 3-4 and 13 (15%) schools scored below 3 on the implementation of Student Empowerment driver.

**Summary of Progress**

Regarding individualized learning, the kid·FRIENDLy leadership team has pushed schools to move beyond the TLIM or GRIT program implementation toward establishing the school environment that supports personalized learning. Student Empowerment is evident in classrooms with self-pacing instruction. The students know what to do, the goal that they need to reach, and how to do it. Through individualized technology instruction, teacher individual or small group instruction, student work and collaborative group work, students become the agent of their own learning.

Regarding student outcomes, **TLIM coaching data** indicate that most cohort 2 schools are implementing the program with satisfactory fidelity, but nearly one-third schools opted out the program in Year Four. Student involvement in the GRIT program in most high schools is not evident. The **DI/PL Maps** created by the Rock Solid evaluation team have served as important guidelines for kid·FRIENDLy schools to gauge the implementation quality of student empowerment driver and progress of each school moving toward personalized learning. The school self-assessment on the DI/PL Maps results suggest that the majority of responded schools (85%) are making satisfactory progress in implementing the grant supported activities related to TLIM/GRIT. Both teachers and students completed **student engagement and satisfaction surveys** developed by the Rock Solid team, which are under analysis. The **student engagement and satisfaction data** collected by the Rock Solid team are under analysis.

Regarding human capital, kid·FRIENDLy leadership team has worked with school principals to develop a sustainability plan for the schools that wish to continue with the TLIM or GRIT processes after the end of the grant. These schools have identified a designated person who serves as the Head of TLIM to sustain the program after the grant ends.

**PROJECT 2: LEADERS DEVELOPING LEADERSHIP**

Project 2 (Leaders Developing Leadership) seeks to increase the percentage of students in grant-supported schools with access to effective and highly effective teachers and principals through the use of regional and district networking and mentoring for school leaders to lead innovative change, improve performance, and make key decisions based on data driven needs. Data analysis routines were established and facilitated by GRREC staff. Cognitive Coaches and Leadership Mentors facilitated on-going use of data analysis to inform innovative practices in districts and schools. Leadership mentors have been trained and are actively working with superintendents and other district personnel. The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) is the lead agency in developing a statewide superintendent effectiveness plan, and kid·FRIENDLy is partially dependent on KDE for progress on this particular component of the grant. Kid·FRIENDLy staff continues to collaborate with the Kentucky School Board Association to design tools to assist with feedback for effectiveness of boards of education.

To facilitate work on this grant project, the kid·FRIENDLy leadership team developed and clarified the project 2 driver, Community of Learners, as the mechanism to ensure district- and school-level leaders were informed about and supporting the various kid·FRIENDLy initiatives. The kid·FRIENDLy leadership team articulated the “theory of action” behind this driver as: If leaders are (1) knowledgeable about the work of the Communities of Practice (see Project 3) 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.

The following planned events and/or professional development opportunities were provided to support this project and its related driver:

* OVEC had monthly meetings with their districts.
* GRREC had their Personalized Learning Symposium February 28 for elementary schools and March 2 for middle and high schools. Teacher Leaders (TL), principals, and central office staff attended and some jointly presented (e.g., the Monroe County superintendent presented on Standards Based Grading). DI/PL Maps language guided presentations—potential presenters had to show how their presentation aligned to the Maps. The symposia conversations were rich and moved beyond “Why we would personalize/is it doable?” to “This is how I am doing it; how I’ve adapted and revised it, and why.” OVEC held a similar symposium in June for their Summer Leadership meeting.
* Bill Owen facilitated two sessions for kid·FRIENDLy and GRREC districts on how to use coaching books (Coaching for Innovation, Cognitive Coaching). New principals to the grant attended.
* Throughout Year Four, kid·FRIENDLy staff sustainability meetings were held after every monthly GRREC staff meeting. These meetings looked at the kid·FRIENDLy work across each district, whereas in previous years most kid·FRIENDLy meetings focused on the role of each person.
* In Year Four, kid·FRIENDLy began blending Leadership Mentor and Cognitive Coach roles into one a Coach/Mentor. This one person met with all district staff at least once a month and individually with school at least monthly. The coach/mentor met regularly with Teacher Leaders as well as with administrators.

See the kid·FRIENDLy Professional Development Year Four Documentation file ([wku.edu/rocksolid/reports.php](http://www.wku.edu/rocksolid/reports.php), APR Year Four Support Documents) for more details.

**kid·FRIENDLy Activities Relative to Year Four Scope of Work:** 2.1, 2.1.5, 2.1.7, 2.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.3, 2.2.6, 2.3, and 2.3.3-2.3.6.

**Scope of Work Project 2 Summary Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SOW 2 N** | **Green** | **Yellow** | **Red** | **Blue** |
| 12 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Highlights and Successes**

* kid·FRIENDLy views the new combined coach/mentor role as important for sustainability.
* The presentations and conversations that occurred as part of the Personalized Learning Symposia. Also, more Teacher Leaders more involved and served as “Ed Camp leaders.”
* Teacher Leaders worked closely with the administrators on various aspects of kid·FRIENDLy. In earlier years, Teacher Leaders received some financial support for their work; even though these funds were no longer available in Year Four, they continued the work, which indicates the now believed in the personalized learning process and wanted to continue. One example of this is Taylor County, which held its own Personalized Learning summit this summer and invited other districts to attend. There are other examples, such as Metcalfe County moving its curriculum on-line, of schools continuing the personalized learning work beyond the grant.
* Each school has set up Learning Labs/Demonstration Classrooms. Even as the funding decreased, the principal stepped in to buy needed items—an important outcome of coach/mentor roles being combined. School leadership now understands how the Labs/Demonstration Classrooms will support personalized learning sustainability efforts. All schools that have Teacher Leaders have established demonstration classrooms, and these teachers share what they are doing with others in the school and district.
* The DI/PL Maps created a unified, organizing language for grant participants. Map language became the “coin of the realm” to guide everything from Symposium presentations to coach/mentor discussions with Teacher Leaders and school/district administration.

**Summary of Progress**

As will be reported in more detail later, as Year Four concluded, schools had the opportunity to revisit the DI/PL Maps to self-assess again and to reflect on their progress since the Year Three self-assessment process. Most (but not all) schools took advantage of this opportunity.

Regarding human capital, kid·FRIENDLy views the new combined coach/mentor role as important for sustainability. Also, many districts have chosen to find permanent funds to continue the College and Career Readiness Coach (CCRC) position. Additionally, Year Four has been characterized by continued frequent and coach/mentor meetings with principals, Teacher Leaders, district points of contact, and CCRCs. Bill Owen’s innovative coaching work provided a solid framework to guide the coach/mentors.

**PROJECT 3: COMPETENCY-BASED INSTRUCTION**

Project 3 (Competency-Based Instruction) seeks to help teachers, students, and parents focus on learning systems (i.e., structures and processes used to provide curriculum, assessment, instructional pacing, student mastery of content, and reporting of student learning) by providing training on instructional strategies and on acquiring, managing, and using data for student progress.

The key driver for Project 3 is the development of Communities of Practice. Communities of Practice engage Teacher Leaders who share a common concern, set of problems, or interest in a topic. Participants focus on sharing best practices and deepening their expertise by interacting on an ongoing basis. Communities of Practice rely on face-to-face meetings, on-site coaching, and technology-based collaborative environments to communicate, connect, and conduct activities. Each Community of Practice focuses on a specific domain of learning: Student Empowerment, Real-World Application, or Digital Natives. Learning Lab Classrooms (peer-to-peer) and Demonstration Lab Classrooms (exemplars of practice) at the elementary, middle, and high school levels were developed to focus on personalized learning to support student growth goals. Learning labs had nearly 50 participants and teachers outside the kid·FRIENDLy grant also observed Learning Labs.

Teacher Leaders are receiving support through Learning Forums and from Cognitive Coaches, including intensive, job-embedded professional development and technical assistance to support bringing new, innovative strategies to scale in other classrooms within their school. Through the encouragement of classroom innovation and establishment of lab lessons and demonstration classrooms, this project contributes to the larger kid·FRIENDLy goal of personalizing learning for all students. The kid·FRIENDLy leadership team articulated the “theory of action” behind this driver as: 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.

Year Four was focused on sustainability. Demonstration Classrooms were established, and professional development targeted whole-school participation; non-teacher leaders also attended the Project 3 symposia. Communities of Practice and Communities of Learners merged; coaches are now coach/mentors. The focus on sustainability also includes working with principals and district staff. Lead coaches for each district, who serve as contacts for other coaches, were identified. Personalized Learning Maps were used to identify needs for each district and school.

Learning lab observations with Cognitive Coaches were completed in 54 classrooms during Year Four with each teacher receiving feedback on focus aspects of their lessons that they identified. Additional learning labs were open for other Teacher Leaders in the school to observe and provide feedback to the host teacher.

The following planned events and/or professional development opportunities were provided to support this project and its related driver:

* Two CCRC Professional Learning Workshops
* Two Coaching Sustainability Workshops
* A Lighthouse Review Workshop
* A Personalized Learning Symposium for Elementary School
* A Personalized Learning Symposium for Middle and High School

See the kid·FRIENDLy Professional Development Year Four Documentation file ([wku.edu/rocksolid/reports.php](http://www.wku.edu/rocksolid/reports.php), APR Year Four Support Documents) for more details.

**kid·FRIENDLy Activities Relative to Year Four Scope of Work:** 3.1, 3.1.1-3.1.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.3.3, 3.3.5, 3.3.7-3.3.9, 3.4, 3.4.3, and 3.4.4.

**Scope of Work Project 3 Summary Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SOW 3 N** | **Green** | **Yellow** | **Red** | **Blue** |
| 14 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Highlights and Successes**

* *Reimbursement for Personalized Learning Plan Costs*

Project 3 supported Teacher Leaders’ innovations by providing up to $1250 in reimbursement of costs that fit with the school’s Personalized Learning Plans. $84,820 was awarded for professional development workshops, visits to demonstration sites, and professional development support in the districts.

* *Training Modules*

Professional development in the form of training modules was provided, focusing on topics such as project-based learning, thinking routines, and coach-specific education. Coaches were trained in their local schools, and modules took place both during early release Fridays and separate all-day trainings. Some trainings also included non- kid·FRIENDLy schools. Trainings were arranged to build capacity and ensure that demonstration classrooms would be in place after the conclusion of the grant.

* *Symposia*

All symposia sessions were filmed and uploaded to YouTube to ensure they are available in the future. So many teacher leaders volunteered to participate in symposia that they made up the majority of the presenters, with 25-30 Teacher Leaders presenting each day (i.e., kid·FRIENDLy staff presentations were minimal). Superintendents and principals even presented at symposia, sharing experiences with new practices resulting from the grant, such as competency based grading. As with the second symposium last year, participants chose which activities they were interested in attending. Symposium presenters used their presentations as an opportunity to model what they expect teachers to do in their classrooms. An education camp model was used: Two teacher leaders led trainings on topics chosen by participants, and during the training, if participants decided the particular training was not what they wanted or needed, they could go to another table. This approach allowed participants to take some ownership of the learning process. Participant reviews of symposia were overwhelmingly positive. On a survey administered after the symposium, participants indicated they had learned something significant and useful. The mean response to the participant learning item learning item was 3.8 measured on a 4.0 scale.

* *Feedback from Cognitive Coaches/Mentors*

Several coaches conducted over 150 classroom visits. A focus on sustainability was emphasized in this year’s classroom visits, and visit documentation assessed whether sustainability was mentioned.

Coaches/mentors reported that personalized learning has caught on, and note that when school/district leadership is involved, it is more prevalent in schools. Coaches also reported that schools who became involved with the grant late have caught up and taken advantage of all resources. Coaches indicate that mindsets have been changed as a result of the grant.

“Because I was so energized to see a transformation in my students’ attitudes towards learning, I now want to take that work and my learning further . . . I want to create pathways for cross state collaboration among teachers” (Teacher Leader of a kid·FRIENDLy Elementary School).

**Summary of Progress**

* *Individualized Learning: Communities of Practice & Communities of Learners*

Two Personalized Learning Symposia were held (February and March). See “Highlights and Successes” section above for further details.

Cognitive Coaches met with Teacher Leaders in monthly face-to-face sessions, forums, and/or virtually, with some coaches logging over 150 classroom visits in total. During the meetings, Cognitive Coaches reviewed Teacher Leaders’ progress towards personalized learning. Examples of Cognitive Coaches’ documentation of their observation of and discussions with Teacher Leaders are below.

“Kara’s professional growth goal centers on student conversations. She loves the Thinking Strategies information that was shared and has implemented. Kara discussed the power she has seen in implementing student schedules, learning targets, and personalized learning. Her excitement is visible. She plans on continuing and expanding her personalized learning techniques. Kara requested she be sent anything that may help her expand her techniques, such as the Thinking Strategies.”

Coaches/Mentors also tracked teacher leaders’ progress during the entire school year to capture their progression throughout the project. The following excerpts present the activities for three different teachers during year 4.

“Brandi’s Action Plan centers on PBL. She attended PBL training and will be developing units for her 2nd graders. [I] worked with Brandi on submitting form for presentation at the forum on PBL in the primary classroom. She is currently using PBL to teach time. Students are creating their perfect birthday party. Brandi continues to use PBL and Voice/Choice. [Brandi is] getting ready to begin a PBL unit on seeds/plants. [She is] using Google to allow her 2nd graders to do a custom search. Brandi will be hosting a demo classroom on April 12th showcasing her work with PBL in literacy.”

 “Alex teaches 8th grade US History in each of his five blocks for the day. Each Unit is accompanied by a project at the end of the unit based on one standard (form a classroom government, teach a class on the Civil War, Culture Box, Mass Production vs. Handmade etc.). Alex said that FLIPPing his classroom didn’t work for him so he switched to PBL—enhanced after the recent TeachMeet presentation on PBL. In January, Alex’s big project will be having students to take on a Supreme Court case and a constitutional question. Kids will be paired up and have Voice through participating as jurors and lawyers. Additionally, in the winter, Alex will be hosting a Civics Fair where students try to solve the civics problems for Greensburg, as shared by the Mayor of Greensburg. In terms of areas for growth, Alex wants to make his standards more skills-related, incorporating skills related standards into projects that are a part of the school’s accountability. Additionally, Alex wants me to connect him with more history resources. I would like to push Alex even further in his exploration of PBL. Alex shared with me that he no longer gives baseline expectations for his projects. “Mediocre expectations result in mediocre projects. With great expectations, you get better projects!” Alex is moving all his instruction to higher level thinking: specifically, through annotations rather than definitions. I encouraged Alex to share the evolution of PBL in his classroom (potentially facilitating a roundtable discussion).”

* *Tracking Progress*

A key goal of this project is the implementation of innovations that personalize learning for every student.

Coaches/mentors used the CBAM and Levels of Use to gauge progress in their own minds, but found that using them to assess progress formally was less effective than in previous years, due to the implementation of multiple interventions simultaneously. In previous years, Levels of Use helped kid·FRIENDLy see initial differences between sporadic use, consistent use, and scaling up. However, because personalized learning also involved trying a new approach if the initial approach did not work, continuing to assess progress with Levels of Use could have resulted in inaccurate data (i.e., making it appear that a Teacher Leader had gone down in use, when in reality, they had moved on to a new, more effective approach). Because personalization is not about implementing a specific intervention, using these tools informally was more useful when focusing on sustainability. As Program Manager Karen Barron explained, “you use your knowledge of where they are, since we’re not focusing on solely moving Teacher Leaders to a different place, we’re focusing on sustainability.” However, College and Career Readiness Coaches continued to use CBAM and Levels of Use to assess progress, and reported good interrater reliability.

* *Competency-Based Instruction: Needs-Based Professional Development*

All Needs-Based Competency Based Instruction Professional Development activities were related to teaching practices. Trainings regularly offered in school districts and at the GRREC offices included Project Based Learning, kid·FRIENDLy coaching (a blended instructional cognitive coaching model), and Thinking Routines. Other professional development trainings were also provided as needed. One cognitive coach/mentor presented at the International Society for Technology and Education.

* *Student Outcomes*

Although Project 3 primarily focuses on training for teachers, evidence from the Cognitive Coaches’ interaction with teachers and school leadership illustrates the effect this project has on students:

“Now that we’re here, I can’t imagine going back. It’s a mindset that’s changed for all of us, as coaches, teacher leaders, and principals. Once you’ve crossed that line, you don’t go back. The student engagement, even when they don’t want to be, they really want to be” (Principal of a kid·FRIENDLy school).

* *Human Capital*

322 teachers from 102 schools in 22 districts participated in Project 3 activities during Year Four.

* *Innovation Configuration Map Development (SOW 3.3.2)*

Grant evaluators collaborated with kid·FRIENDLy staff and schools to finalize Driver Implementation and Personalized Learning Maps, based on the Innovation Configuration Map framework. Schools used the DI/PL Maps to self-assess their progress toward personalized learning implementation during Year Four.

* *Seek feedback and update Preschool Pals Program as needed*

Preschool PALS was instrumental in implementing MakerSpace. MakerSpace started in preschools, but was included in both symposia. kid·FRIENDLy staff reported that MakerSpace has been a successful endeavor that GRREC will continue to implement. Additionally, kid·FRIENDLy has been able to and bring Teacher Leaders into MakerSpace. Preschool Pals is continuing to grow due to an additional OVEC grant, as well as due to GRREC helping Preschool PALS scale up.

* *Focus on sustaining Personalized Learning*

“From ‘tell me what to do’ to ‘let me show you what I’m doing’—that’s probably our biggest needle move” (Karen Barron, Project 3 Program Manager).

Teacher participants have expressed appreciation of the concrete feedback they receive from Cognitive Coaches regarding their progress with the personalization process. The professional conversations with Cognitive Coaches and other Teacher Leaders, as well as the opportunity to present at Learning Forums have received overwhelmingly positive feedback from participants. This year’s focus was on working more holistically, towards sustainability. Instead of just working with teacher leaders, kid·FRIENDLy staff are also working with principals and district staff. School leaders have attributed substantial changes in school operations to the kid·FRIENDLy project:

“It’s made us think outside our own area, led to our progressive schedule” (kid·FRIENDLy school principal).

The focus on sustainability is on the forefront of kid·FRIENDLy’s interactions with participating schools (i.e., “When we leave, what will you do?”). kid·FRIENDLy staff noted that:

“Teams of teachers in each school are doing something successful enough that other teachers want to be a part of it. Principals are eager to show their schools’ successes to others. Students are engaged, and given opportunities to work on things they really need, whether remedial or accelerated. Teachers are providing more opportunities for students to do things—very little lecture, inquiry based teaching is really starting to take place, which is a mind-shift. Most principals are trying to keep their college and career readiness counselors because they realize the importance” (Karen Barron, Project 3 Manager).

Teacher Leaders have provided positive feedback about their experience with the grant:

“I am excited for the future possibilities for this unit. I am also planning on designing several other small, self-paced units for my other classes. Being a part of the kid·FRIENDLy grant has allowed me to reflect on my own teaching practices. I now find myself reflecting on each of my instructional units and thinking about the activities that are included and how I can personalize them to fit the individual needs of my students. I have learned that providing personalized learning takes work. It’s not something that can be done easily, but when it is done right it is tremendously beneficial for my students” (Claire Lanham, Teacher Leader).

**PROJECT 4: PERSONALIZED LEARNING**

Project 4 (Personalized Learning) seeks to give students the opportunity to demonstrate voice, choice, pace, and mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple and comparable ways, as well as providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students. Ultimately, teachers will take on the role of coach and mentor and, thereby, guide learners to design their own learning pathway experience. Students should become goal-driven, self-reflective learners, and a student-generated Personalized Learning Profile provides teachers and parents with a plan of action (based on individual needs, abilities, sensibilities, and competencies) that successfully supports the pace at which the learner is progressing by helping teachers understand their students.

The key driver for Project 4 is an emphasis on College and Career Readiness. College and career readiness counselors located in all grant-participating high schools work with stakeholders and coordinate school- and district-wide efforts to ensure all students are “Life Ready”—ready for college and careers and equipped with the skills to be successful and adaptable in a wide range of adult environments. Through an emphasis on individualized, long-range planning for every student’s unique needs and interests, this project contributes to the grant-wide goal of promoting personalized learning environments in all schools. The kid·FRIENDLy leadership team articulated the “theory of action” behind this driver as: 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.

Project 4 also includes grant-wide activities to promote personalized learning innovations in all schools. During Year Four schools continued to implement the personalized learning plans they identified in their Innovation Snapshots from Year Two, informed by data from a self-evaluation carried about by school-level leadership team carried using the DI/PL Maps developed by the Rock Solid Evaluation team in Year Three. Additionally, at the end of Year Four all schools carried about a second self-evaluation using a slightly-modified version of the same DI/PL Map in order to track their progress and inform their personalized learning implementation in the years following the conclusion of the grant. Results of the Year Four DI/PL Map implementation are described below.

College and career readiness efforts during Year Four focused on continued implementation of each CCR Center’s Innovation Plan, regional networking and professional development among CCR coaches, strategic job experiences like job shadowing programs, co-ops, internships and job fairs that allow students to work directly with professionals in their career fields of interest, and implementation of career planning processes for every student.

The following planned events and/or professional development opportunities were provided to support this project and its related driver:

* Fall and Spring CCRC professional learning sessions
* On-going WIN coaching supports
* Leadership coaches worked with school-based leadership teams to support their Personalized Learning Self-Assessment
* Work sessions for revisions of a Pathways Innovation Configuration Map that may guide future CCR work after the conclusion of the grant.

See the kid·FRIENDLy Professional Development Year Four Documentation file ([wku.edu/rocksolid/reports.php](http://www.wku.edu/rocksolid/reports.php), APR Year Four Support Documents) for more details.

**kid·FRIENDLy Activities Relative to Year Four Scope of Work:** 4.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.5-4.1.8, 4.2, 4.2.2, 4.3, 4.3.1, and 4.3.3-4.3.9.

**Scope of Work Project 4 Summary Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SOW 4 N** | **Green** | **Yellow** | **Red** | **Blue** |
| 17 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Highlights and Successes**

A key goal of this project is the implementation of long-range, individualized planning for every student that prepares them for college and careers. Implementation highlights for Four Three include the following:

* College and Career Readiness Coaches (CCRCs) continued to leverage their professional learning community to share ideas and increase their effectiveness. All CCRCs met for fall and spring professional learning sessions. These events provided opportunities for the CCRCs to be brought up to date on how their work fits within the larger kid·FRIENDLy framework, and state-level initiatives to promote college and career readiness. For example, Michael Ford, superintendent of the Russell County Schools, spoke to coaches on the strategic importance of college and career readiness for school improvement. Drs. Jill Duba-Sauerheber and Cheryl Wolf from Western Kentucky University also shared information about WKU’s new College and Career Readiness certificate and sought the coaches’ input on the design of the program. Coaches also used these sessions to gather and share various tools they had developed for carrying out their work. Finally, these sessions became the starting point of efforts to successfully organize the Kentucky Association of College and Career Readiness Coaches, whose primary purpose is to advocate for CCR coaches as integral members of every school district team.
* A key theme of CCRC professional discussions during Year Four was the sustainability of school-level CCRC efforts at the conclusion of the grant. CCRCs and school-level points of contact have been encouraged to work with school staff to discuss how college and career readiness initiatives can remain a priority. A kid·FRIENDLy administered Sustainability Survey revealed the 14 of 22 CCRCs (63%) indicated they believed it was at least “somewhat likely” or “likely” that their school would continue to employ a CCRC at the conclusion of the grant.
* Schools continued to receive coaching supports for implementation of career planning tools to help students with long-range goal-setting. Of the 57 schools utilizing the WIN Career Readiness Software, 27 (or 47.5%) were implementing with fidelity, per WIN implementation guidelines.
* CCRCs coordinated 86 student trips to visit post-secondary institutions and 32 trips to visit businesses or industries.
* kid·FRIENDLy staff utilized Hall and Hord’s (2011) Levels of Use concept and Kotter’s Change Model to develop an interview tool as they met with CCRCs throughout Year Four. Based on data collected from the interview tool, kid·FRIENDLy staff then worked with CCRCs to continue refining CCR Innovation Plans as well as professional growth plans. The CCRC Leading Indicators documents sets a goal that by Spring 2017 at least 75% of CCRCs will have achieved at least a Mechanical level of use for the implementation of their innovation plan. As of Winter 2017, 100% of CCRCs were achieving at least a Mechanical level.
* For the second consecutive year, during Year Four each school completed a self-assessment using a research-based Personalized Learning Continuum designed by the external evaluation team to assist with formatively assessing their progress toward implementation of their Innovation Snapshots. Eight-five schools completed the self-assessment in Year Four with results described in Appendix D.

**Summary of Progress**

Per Project 4 leading indicators, at the conclusion of Year Four, 100% of schools were implementing individualized learning plans and 100% of College and Career Readiness Centers had developed innovation plans to guide their on-going improvement efforts. A second leading indicator for Project 4 stipulated the goal that by Spring 2017, at least 50% of schools would be implementing strategic job experiences for students (e.g., job shadowing, apprenticeships, etc.). At the conclusion of the grant, 100% of schools were implementing such experiences.

Throughout Year Four schools continued to implement their Innovation Snapshots. The DI/PL Maps became the centerpiece of a school-level self-assessment process allowing schools to evaluate themselves on a range of domains and indicators relative to personalize learning. A second round of DI/PL Map self-assessments were conducted in early 2017. Full analysis of those results will be provided elsewhere, but evaluators found significantly higher levels of both Driver Implementation and personalized learning at the conclusion of the grant. Final DI/PL ratings provide leverage for schools to continue their personalized learning efforts in the post-grant period and a strong baseline to measure improvement.

**PROJECT 5: MANAGEMENT AND EVALUATION**

Project 5 (Management and Evaluation) provides guidance to the overall process of managing personnel, facilities, and expenditures related to a complex, multifaceted educational initiative. Year Three Scope of Work goals related to this project were categorized into the following key components:

* Coordinate logistics for a task force of RTT-D staff, district/school leaders, and national experts to develop an Innovation Configuration Map (ICM) for all projects.

During Year Two, to refine the focus of the many kid·FRIENDLy activities, the leadership team worked with USED staff to re-conceptualize the logic model guiding the grant into fewer all-encompassing projects guided by “drivers.” These have been more fully described in earlier sections of this report. Furthermore, the USED Scope of Work was also narrowed into more manageable and measurable strategies and activities. Once the drivers were identified, the leadership team spent much time developing “Theories of Action” and a “Personalized Learning Framework” that described how each of the drivers would contribute to schools creating more personalized learning environments. Each school was encouraged to develop a snapshot that described where the school currently was in personalized learning and its chosen innovation for the final years of the grant that would move the school toward promoting a more personalized learning environment.

Year Three was characterized by kid·FRIENDLy staff and participating schools attempting to bring all earlier efforts under the larger umbrella of personalized learning. After much debate regarding who would lead the Innovation Configuration Map development efforts, the kid·FRIENDLy director charged the Rock Solid evaluation team with creating an assessment tool to measure each participating school’s understanding and involvement in key project initiatives, termed “drivers,” and the school’s movement toward personalizing its educational environment. The development and use of this tool was deemed essential in connecting each school’s level of grant participation and growth toward personalization to the multiple outcome measures (both achievement and non-cognitive) being reported to the United States Department of Education. After conducting a thorough review of research on personalized learning and associated aspects (see Appendix C), the evaluators developed a self-assessment tool (and accompanying *Manual*) that focused on four major areas (the learning process, climate, teachers, and students) that should be affected as schools become more personalized. The tool’s structure follows the Innovation Configuration Map model developed by Hall and Hord (2011). Schools completed the Driver Implementation and Personalized Learning Continuums (now DI/PL Maps) around the midpoint of Year Three. Table 5.1 provides the summary scale that guided schools as they considered their progress on driver implementation and personalized learning.

Year Four was characterized by kid·FRIENDLy staff and participating schools using the DI/PL Maps language to guide school’s efforts as the grant concluded and also planning for sustainability. A common theme across schools, cooperatives (GRREC and OVEC), and kid·FRIENDLy staff was the central role of the DI/PL Maps in creating a common vocabulary and vision.

Table 5.1

*Driver Implementation and Personalized Learning Maps Summary Scale*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating Color Scheme** | **Map** | **Rating Definition** |
| 5 | Sustaining | DI | 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. |
| PL | 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 | DI | 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. |
| PL | 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 | DI | 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. |
| PL | 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 | DI | 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. |
| PL | 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 | DI | 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. |
| PL | A school where stakeholders are largely unfamiliar with the concept of personalized learning. |

Self-assessment results revealed a fairly normal distribution of average school self-assessment scores on both the DI and PL Maps, with a mean of 3.5 (*SD* = .672) and range of 1.2 to 5.0 on the DI Map and with a mean of 3.4 (*SD* = .577) a range of 2.3 to 4.7 on the PL Map (see Appendices D and E). This suggests an overall trend toward higher DI and PL scores from Year Three to Year Four. Rounding average scores allowed for placing all schools into one of the five implementation levels/color schemes described above. Percentages of schools in each level of driver implementation (by driver and overall) are reported in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2

*Percentage of Schools in Each Level of Driver Implementation and Overall*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Driver | Implementation Level |
| 1Continuing Status Quo | 2Starting | 3Implementing | 4Scaling Up | 5Sustaining |
| Student Empowerment | 1% | 8% | 35% | 44% | 12% |
| College & Career Ready | 1% | 12% | 31% | 46% | 11% |
| Communities of Practice | 1% | 13% | 44% | 36% | 6% |
| Community of Learners | 1% | 8% | 31% | 46% | 14% |
| OVERALL | 1% | 4% | 42% | 44% | 9% |

*Note:* Row percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. The Overall level reflects the rounded average score across all drivers.

Percentages of schools in each level of personalized learning (by component and overall) are reported in Table 5.3.

Table 5.3

*Percentage of Schools in Each Level of Personalized Learning and Overall*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PL Components | Implementation Level |
| 1Continuing Status Quo | 2Starting | 3Implementing | 4Scaling Up | 5Sustaining |
| The Learning Process | 0% | 9% | 55% | 34% | 1% |
| Climate | 0% | 15% | 47% | 32% | 6% |
| Teachers | 0% | 0% | 32% | 58% | 11% |
| Students | 1% | 8% | 48% | 35% | 7% |
| OVERALL | 0% | 6% | 55% | 35% | 4% |

*Note:* Row percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. The Overall level reflects the rounded average score across all components.

Additionally, preliminary analyses demonstrate signification correlations (school *n* = 85, *p* < .001) between driver and personalized learning scores suggesting important relationships between schools’ implementation of each driver and their movement toward personalization:

* + Driver 1 (Student Empowerment) Implementation and Personalized Learning self-assessment average scores were positively and significantly correlated (*r* = .72.
	+ Driver 2 (College & Career Ready) Implementation and Personalized Learning self-assessment average scores were positively and significantly correlated (*r* = .52).
	+ Driver 3 (Communities of Practice) Implementation and Personalized Learning self-assessment average scores were positively and significantly correlated (*r* = .71).
	+ Driver 4 (Community of Learners) Implementation and Personalized Learning self-assessment average scores were positively and significantly correlated (*r* = .64).
	+ Overall Driver Implementation and Personalized Learning self-assessment average scores were positively and significantly correlated (*r* = .75).

Arguably, the Maps represent a major shift both in the mindset of kid·FRIENDLy staff and participating schools and in a clearer future “sustainability” orientation. Schools and kid·FRIENDLy staff consistently attest that the Maps are providing shared language and guiding schools and staff in envisioning what personalized learning would actually look like in schools. Additionally, descriptive language under the “sustainability” implementation level for map indicators have helped participating schools prepare for life after the end of the kid·FRIENDLy project.

* Chief Council on Fidelity (CCF) who observe and advise project implementation

After much discussion, the kid·FRIENDLy leadership team decided this group was no longer needed.

* A national evaluator oversees data collection/analysis of the project

The evaluation team for this grant, entitled Rock Solid, continued to work with the kid·FRIENDLy leadership team and USED throughout all phases of the project. The evaluation team developed tools for documenting activities related to the Scope of Work, including the DI/PL Maps described earlier. Finally, the team worked with the Kentucky Department of Education and other state agencies to gather, analyze, and report the summative outcome data required by USED.

**kid·FRIENDLy Activities Relative to Four Scope of Work:** 5.1, 5.1.3, 5.1.5, 5.3, 5.3.1, 5.4., and 5.4.1-5.4.4.

**Scope of Work Project 5 Summary Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SOW 5 N** | **Green** | **Yellow** | **Red** | **Blue** |
| 10 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**SUPPLEMENTAL PROJECT: PRESCHOOL PALS**

The kid·FRIENDLy Supplemental Project (Preschool Pals) provides training and ongoing support for childcare centers, preschools, and in-home daycare through a cohort of itinerant Preschool Pals. Each Preschool Pal has a small toolbox of resources to share every other week so with centers, including classroom instructional strategies, read-alouds, and research-based curriculum. Although all Scope of Work activities were completed in Year One of the grant, this supporting work continued into Year Two, and, now, in Year Three.

The key driver for this project evolved into Community-Based Childcare. The kid·FRIENDLy leadership team articulated the “theory of action” behind this driver as: If (1) community-based childcare environments are conducive to literacy and inquiry based learning (2) students have opportunities to master academic content, develop social emotional skills, acquire dispositions, make choices and set their own goals and dreams, and (3) teachers and directors have opportunities to collaborate through professional learning experiences and activators of student learning; then students will meet and/or exceed kindergarten readiness goals and be school and life ready.

Year Four’s emphasis was on supporting childcare centers based on areas for growth identified when centers completed the Community Based Child Care (PL-CBC) PL Map toward the end of Year Three. Thus, in Year Four, kid·FRIENDLy staff shared several tools to help childcare centers in identified areas:

* Pre-assessment tools were provided as the Personalized Learning Map made clear this was a systemic need (similar to results in P-12 school settings). Prior to the grant, the childcare centers did not have formal ways to assess children so tools and free record-keeping systems were located and provided to center staff.
* Small-group structures were introduced that center staff could use effectively with children that helped move them from solely relying on “whole group instruction.”
* Through WKU’s Center for Gifted Studies “Grow Up Great” grant, OWLS (observe, wonder, learn, share) workshops and lessons were provided (also see [www.littlelearnersbigideas.org/](http://www.littlelearnersbigideas.org/)). This link has also been shared with school FRYSCs, who then have passed ideas on to parents/families about how they can partner with schools in educating their children (e.g., “I Wonder” and reflection exercises).
* Lessons (in workshop format) were provided and modeled that emphasized inquiry and student voice and choice twice a month. These relied on OWLS, thinking routines (visible thinking), and math/science-based inquiry tools.
* Some remaining funds were used to shore up center resources (i.e., lesson materials would be provided to centers) based on each center’s STARS (see below) and/or Map rating. This year funding was distributed based on need (equitable versus equal).

The state’s newly adopted Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS*-*R) STARS system clearly aligns with small-group and personalized instruction; thus, the Map brought areas to light where centers would need to improve in order to meet the ECERS’ standards, and, thus, receive better state “Star” ratings.

**kid·FRIENDLy Activities Relative to Year Four Scope of Work:** All original USED SOW items related to this project were completed in Year One. The kid·FRIENDLy leadership team created and completed four internal SOW items to monitor Year Two progress. No additional items were created for Year Four.

**Highlights, Successes, and Summary of Progress**

* Three districts (Hart, Green, and Caverna) received $150,000 in grant support to continue to fund their Preschool Pal.
* Three districts (Daviess, Owensboro, and Union) have set aside recurring funds in order to continue their Preschool Pals’ work.
* Several districts are in the process of submitting additional grants to continue this work. Even schools not associated with kid·FRIENDLy were able to use tools and lessons learned to guide their proposal writing toward replicating much of this work. Preschool Pals are being included in these grants as resources or training facilitators as new districts explore this work.
* Over the life of the kid·FRIENDLygrant, 85 childcare centers were involved.
* The kid·FRIENDLy Community-Based Childcare initiative has helped GRREC develop a “preschool presence” to support these centers and district/school-based preschools in the future.
* Preschool Pals are increasingly connected with school district preschool heads. For example, public preschool staff were invited to all workshops and trainings.
* Preschool Pals have continued their participation in local area early childhood councils.
* The state STARS system has brought new focus to kindergarten readiness. Community-based childcare centers must now achieve STARS status to be licensed. GRREC will continue working with these centers (including finding public funds when possible) so that they can provide the educational support required by STARS.
* Preschool Pals used the PL MAP results this year to conduct exit interviews with some centers to see if they reached their goals, their successes, and what they have learned.
* Preschool Pals have developed a coaching playbook (both paper and electronic versions) organized around the PL Map areas: “The Learning Process” has its own “research” and “tools” sections; the other portions of the Map are all another set of “research” and “tools” sections. The playbook helped Pals develop common vocabulary/common tools for their work. So, for example, when Caverna’s new Preschool Pal (Early Childcare Liaison) started in fall 2016 and began working with local childcare centers the Map and the playbook gave her the lenses to review the centers and then the tools needed to support their work.

**Additional Final APR Questions from RTT-D Webinar**

*What would you recommend as advice to other educators that are interested in designing and implementing a similar initiative? Reflect on any major lessons learned as well as challenges to design, implementation, and evaluation of your personalized learning initiative.*

kid·FRIENDLy marked the closing of the grant with a celebration seminar in which all participants were engaged in reflection on the overall progression of the grant. The function attendees included cognitive coaches/mentors, teacher leaders, Preschool PALs, college and career readiness counselors, and program managers from GRREC and OVEC.

Some of the major lessons learned were:

* Changes in education take a long time to occur.
* The results from the large datasets does not always align with small-scale observations.
* When the different components of the grant became clear on their individual purpose as well as how they fit into the larger vision, the project components were more interconnected with different components working more collaboratively instead of independent units (silos); however, the early period during which the units operated as silos was inevitable, if not necessary, while everyone figured out their respective roles.
* Mentors need mentors.
* It is important to provide anecdotal evidence as well as the numerical evidence. Numbers don’t quite capture it all.

*What are your next steps in order to build or sustain the progress attained during the grant period and or disseminate the results and lessons learned? What evidence has kid·FRIENDLy provided of steps taken to build or sustain the progress attained during the grant period?*

From the coach/mentor logs it is evident that the focus for this final year of the grant was sustainability. Several meetings were held with teacher leaders as well as school leaders during which the main discussion points were centered on sustaining not only the changes made and innovations implemented but also maintaining the momentum of the grant. kid·FRIENDLy staff provided training sessions/workshops on sustainability. Some of the changes reported in coach/mentor’s logs include:

* Plans for acquiring other grants or other funding to maintain the changes initiated
* The grant’s teacher leaders will maintain their roles as change agents within schools while also attempting to collaborate with other teacher leaders at other schools in order to remain current with best practices in personalized learning
* Collaborative efforts with other schools within the grant for professional development.

In addition to planning and organizing learning symposia for schools within the grant, cognitive coaches aided schools in hosting their own learning symposium led by teachers. The following is an excerpt from a coach’s log of a school visit:

“Today, during the Early Release Friday of Green County Middle School, we conducted a TeachMeet for the faculty of GCMS. It was a resounding success! With twelve sessions offered over three-25 minute blocks, we were able to provide the staff of GCMS with some quick best practice and innovation strategies to incorporate as soon as next week in their classrooms. While not as many teachers participated by sharing as I would have liked, since myself and my colleagues presented several sessions, I still feel like it was a great start to moving toward a collaborative culture of instructional sharing!”

*What are* kid·FRIENDLy*’s next steps in disseminating the results and lessons learned?*

A kid·FRIENDLy director and mentor/coach are currently working on a manuscript to submit for publication. The manuscript provides details on the grant, how it was executed, and the role of each group involved with the grant. It also provides suggestions for future grants and innovation leaders for effectively implementing change particularly in a K-12 setting.

**Rock Solid Year Four Concluding Evaluation Notes**

In Year One, evaluation efforts centered on compliance management. As described in the Year One Annual Performance Report submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, as well as in the similar *kid·FRIENDLy Year One Progress Report*, the evaluation team reflected on the usefulness of a more comprehensive approach to evaluation. Specifically, Rock Solid recognized the importance of a focus on descriptive assessment of effort regarding planning, training, and implementation of the various program elements and activities; fidelity of implementation of the four primary grant projects (Students as Leaders, Leaders Developing Leadership, Personalized Learning, Competency-Based Instruction); and outcomes-based assessment (both formative and summative) of the effect of implementing the components of each primary project (i.e., to what extent did the grant have an effect on student achievement, other cognitive goals, and various non-cognitive measures of student attitudes and behaviors).

In Year Two, as described in the Year Two Annual Performance Report submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, as well as in the similar *kid·FRIENDLy Year Two Progress Report*, several changes to the focus and process of the kid·FRIENDLy projects occurred (e.g., development of GRIT in Project 1, shift from CBI to Communities of Practice in Project 3). Additionally, struggles to clarify and simplify the grant Logic Model and the SOW caused some delay in kid·FRIENDLy implementation processes. Although the evaluation team continued to monitor compliance, there was a shift toward evaluating implementation. This occurred through formative and summative assessment of project progress, using surveys of students and teachers, review of professional development event participant evaluations, analysis of student achievement data, and review of kid·FRIENDLy staff’s documentation of work with individual teachers and school administrators. Additionally, some kid·FRIENDLy staff took the initiative to collect their own formative assessment data, using the CBAM Levels of Use and Stages of Concern tools to measure stakeholders’ involvement and investment in kid·FRIENDLy projects. Also, once the SOW was simplified, kid·FRIENDLy began reporting implementation progress with accompanying documentation for SOW tasks through the USED GRADS 360 system.

In Year Three, evaluation efforts focused on finalizing and implementing the school self-assessment process using the review of artifacts and classroom observations to determine the effect of kid·FRIENDLy drivers on personalized learning at the individual school level. We (and the kid·FRIENDLy leadership team seems to agree) believe these efforts have reaped important and lasting dividends. The resulting DI/PL Maps, as well as the self-assessment results and school visits, described earlier are assisting kid·FRIENDLy team members and participating schools in reaching shared understanding of relationships among project implementation, movement toward personalization, and project outcome measures. This shared understanding is making kid·FRIENDLy personnel and participating school discussions more fruitful as they plan toward sustainability beyond the grant.

As the grant has come to an end in Year Four, the Rock Solid evaluation team commends the kid·FRIENDLy staff and participating school districts for staying the course. As this and previous years’ reports describe, carrying out such a complex project faithfully across two cooperatives (GRREC and OVEC) with so many participating districts and associated schools was not without its challenges. However, our review of the Scope of Work/Project Plan kid·FRIENDLy developed in concert with USED reveals that kid·FRIENDLy carried out all strategies and activities. As the Year Three and Four DI/PL Maps scores indicate, most participating schools made measurable advancements in creating and sustaining more personalized learning environments for their students.
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**APPENDICES**

**Appendix A: kid·FRIENDLy Staff – Year Four**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Staff** | **Salary Range** | **Description of role and responsibilities** |
|  7    | Leadership Mentors   | $45,756 - $74,462 | This position is responsible for ongoing support for school principals and their local leadership teams as they implement the key components of the Leaders Developing Leadership strategies. Mentors are former school building leaders (principal) who mentor and support project principals as they begin to shift the cultures within their respective schools. In addition, the mentors provide face-to-face and remote support to principals as they implement components related to the project; they provide support on demand as well as in regularly scheduled sessions (individual; regional). Each mentor is assigned to multiple districts based on region and size of schools. Mentors help with data collection related to implementation and conduct site visits throughout their region. They work at the direction of the Leadership Director, senior project staff, and the Cooperative Executive Director. |
| 1 | Outreach Director |  $51,450 | This position is responsible for (1) working with and providing support to various members of the project team by helping to identify and eliminate barriers (e.g., poverty, gender, etc.) to college and career readiness and (2) collaborating with the participating districts as they work with families and preschool/daycare centers to align student supports that will eliminate barriers to kindergarten readiness. The outreach director is a project liaison with each community and supports Preschool Pals, Elementary Liaisons, and directors and personnel in Family Resource and Youth Service Centers (FRYSC). For example, the outreach director works with FRYSCs to include an alignment to state- and project-based CCR indicators, including the creation of a student purpose for learning, and work involving the Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS) data system with students and parents. Additionally, the outreach director is responsible for assisting in the development of School Personalized Learning Plans in participating schools and helping stakeholder groups implement research-based supports that help the regions’ youngest students become kindergarten ready. The outreach director reports to the Project Director and the Executive Director. |
| 8 | Preschool Pals | $31,454– 45,328 | This position is responsible for training and support activities in preschools throughout the districts participating project. This includes finding and communicating with preschool centers, developing relationships with center directors and other staff members, and providing ongoing training in formal and informal settings. Preschool pals live in or around their assigned school districts and actively work in those communities each day. Preschool pals develop productive relationships and build capacity in others. The position includes evening and Saturday work to promote attendance of families and preschool personnel. Preschool pals are responsible for helping each young child living in their assigned districts to become kindergarten ready. |
| 14 | Cognitive Coaches |  $36,343 - $66,631 | This position is responsible for coaching, modeling, and supporting teachers as they implement research-based strategies within their assigned schools across the regions. Cognitive coaches work with multiple schools, helping teachers integrate technology and research-based instruction and assessment strategies into their daily instruction. Through the coaching process, cognitive coaches help teachers develop demonstration classrooms and work with other teachers to observe the methods and practices being used in those classrooms. Cognitive coaches work on-site at assigned school campuses and collaborate with teams of teachers each week. Cognitive coaches support district-level teams as they begin to train as Cognitive coaches and will “meta-coach” these teams in the final year of the project to ensure sustainability and continued development of new Demonstration Classrooms. Cognitive coaches report directly to senior project staff. |
| 24 | College & Career Readiness Counselors | $56,662 | This position will be responsible for providing career counseling to students. CCRCs provide support to teachers and students and assist students in their career planning. CCRCs work primarily within an assigned school district, supporting a single high school and its feeder middle and elementary schools and will be required to attend project meetings and professional development throughout the project period. CCRCs are responsible for implementing the strategies of the project including the creation and operation of a Career Center; the implementation of Career Profile systems and supports for students; the expanded use of the Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS) data system with teachers, students and parents; and the coordination of support through the Family Resource and Youth Services Centers (FRYSC). CCRCs conduct initial assessments of students’ career goals in relation to their current educational standing and assist them in developing individualized goals, plans, and next steps to achieve career readiness. This position also assists in collecting, organizing, and submitting data to assist the project director and external evaluator. |
| 1 | IT Director | $37,819 | This position is responsible for leading the work of integrating technology-based personalized instructional strategies into the learning environments. This is done through regional trainings provided almost monthly throughout the project; in addition, the director ensures the coaches/consultants are fully trained and capable of modeling the authentic use of instructional strategies with students. The director works with coaches, consultants and others to develop model lessons to demonstrate the appropriate use of technology, and is a resource for available strategies, products, online resources, and more. The IT director also works with the Personalized Learning Teams to help them determine the best uses of their existing and BYOD technologies. The director facilitates the technology needs of the project as needed and also supports district technology directors as they implement new Wi-Fi networks on buses and in the community. The director conducts monthly networking opportunities for Technology Resource Teachers as well as CIO/DTC. The director provides instructional technology support/professional development experiences based on GRREC school districts’ needs.  |
| 1 | Project Director | $107,000 | The position of Associate Executive Director for RTT-D Administration with the Green River Regional Educational Cooperative (GRREC) and Ohio Valley Educational Cooperative (OVEC) is designed to provide overall project director (PD) leadership for the implementation of the Race to the Top-District grant program. The PD is responsible for coordinating all activities and the day-to-day operations of kid-FRIENDLy as outlined in the proposal for funding. The PD provides management for project resources, budget, facilities, travel, school faculty, district-level support, and community partners. The PD works directly with both USED and the national evaluator in providing ongoing and summative reporting. On behalf of the project, the PD seeks out and cultivates meaningful partnerships and collaborative arrangements with a variety of agencies, institutions, and individuals, whose goals and objectives align with the project’s goals and objectives and who can provide resources and other supports. The PD provides direct supervision for the project managers and other director level positions and reports to the GRREC and OVEC Executive Directors. |
| 3 | Program Managers | $92,719 | Project managers are responsible for implementing day-to-day activities as outlined in the proposal for funding. Project managers report to the Project Director, helping him/her manage and work with project resources, budgets, facilities, travel, school faculty, district-level support, and community partners. Project managers work with Personalized Learning Teams to create annual PL Plans to implement strategies appropriate to each district. Project managers work to communicate the needs of their districts to appropriate project personnel and are responsible for coordinating data collection and analysis in their region. |
| 1 | Finance Director | $51,510 | Prepare payroll on a bi-weekly basis, including all withholdings. Manage all cooperative budgets from initial set-up to year-end reports. Receipt all income to the accounting system and post to appropriate accounts. Manage all accounts payable functions Manage employee benefits including insurance, retirement, flexible accounts, deferred compensation, and workers compensation. Prepare monthly financial statements for the Board of Directors. Reconcile bank statements monthly. Prepare audit reports and meet with auditors as needed including for the year-end audit report. Maintain files of all Cooperative accounts for length of time required by the state. Attend trainings, workshops, and conferences (as applicable to position and approved by Supervisor) to maintain awareness of current information and best practices in the field of finance. Assure compliance with policies, procedures, or other agreements as applicable to assignment. Work harmoniously and professionally with other Cooperative personnel. Assist directly and indirectly with the public relations program of the Cooperative. Perform duties and responsibilities in a manner consistent with high professional ethics and courtesy. Perform related duties as assigned. |
| 1 | Marketing & Communication Director | $58,772 | Develop and implement a comprehensive communications strategy to build awareness of the project; establish a high profile of the work at the national, statewide, and local levels; and assist involved districts by informing their stakeholder groups and highlighting successes. Support schools, district administrators, boards of education, and project staff and teams as they implement the project through services such as crafting communications messages and developing marketing strategies tailored for their local communities. Coordinate a Communications Network that includes a representative of each participating district and stakeholder organizations to address communications challenges, needs, and solutions and ongoing development of messaging for project initiatives. Plan events to support implementation and sustainability of the project. Build effective relationships with national, state, and local organizations and individuals that can help further the mission of the project and potentially extend its impact to other school districts within Kentucky. Lead media relations efforts for the project including relationship building with national, state, and local media outlets; development of news releases, opinion editorials, letters-to-the-editor; public service announcements, etc.; pitching story ideas; and serving as the primary spokesperson for the project. Coordinate the work of the project's Fidelity Council. Provide ongoing progress reports to federal and state elected officials and policy makers. |
| 1 | Rock Solid | External Evaluator |   |
| 1 | Data Specialist | $10,000 | This position is responsible for expanding ongoing data collection, including aligning project outcomes to data. The data specialist works with the external evaluator to coordinate data collection and provide systems for ongoing analysis to the Implementation Team and the Chief Council on Fidelity. In addition, the Data Specialist primarily supports the work of project staff and reports to the Project Director and the Cooperative Executive Director. |
| 1 | Administrative Assistant | $33,624 | This position is responsible for assisting the Race to the Top Director of Finance with daily tasks at the Director's discretion and helps the director maintain an accurate and efficient accounting system. This position is responsible for general ledger accounting for the organization including: Accounts Payable, Account Receivable, and Fixed Assets, under the discretion of the Director of Finance RTT-D. The position assists the director with payroll and Human Resources needs as they arise and works with the director to process and pay bills. The administrative assistant performs other non-financial office/clerical duties. |
| 1 | Administrative Assistant | $39,475 | This position with the Green River Regional Educational Cooperative (GRREC) provides consortium support for the implementation of the Race to the Top-District grant program. This position is responsible for daily support to the senior project staff as they implement the RTT-D project components. The administrative assistant builds relationships with school and district leaders to facilitate communication and project goals and organizes and coordinates office activities, which includes planning, coordination, and implementation of professional development activities and meetings. The position creates and maintains organized and effective system that supports staff in all activities, including writing and editing correspondence, creating and maintaining calendars and schedules, filing, ordering and organizing materials, entering data, word processing, creating spreadsheets, and supporting project staff. The position compiles and submits required reports and data to the appropriate agency or staff and works at the direction of senior project staff. |
| 1 | Program Assistant | $21,463 |  This part-time position is responsible for daily support to the senior project staff as they implement the RTT-D project initiatives and events. The program assistant builds relationships with school and district leaders to facilitate communication and project goals. The position organizes and coordinates office activities, which includes planning, coordination, and implementation of professional development activities and meetings. The position creates and maintains organized and effective system that supports staff in all activities, including writing and editing correspondence, creating and maintaining calendars and schedules, filing, ordering and organizing materials, entering data, word processing, creating spreadsheets, and supporting project staff. The position compiles and submits required reports and data to the appropriate agency or staff and works at the direction of senior project staff. |
| 1 | School/Community Liaison | $38,423 | This position works as a bridge between preschool pals and elementary and preschool programs. |
| 1 | Student Leadership Director |  $70,827 | The Student Leadership Director (SLD) with the Green River Regional Educational Cooperative provides consortium support for the implementation of the Race to the Top-District grant program. This position is responsible for daily support of schools and districts as they implement the Students as Leaders component of the project and as schools build a student culture around the 7 Habits of Highly Successful People. The SLD works with national consultants to ensure teams of local teachers/leaders in each school become certified in the process, enabling them to further sustain the model. Other duties include the ordering of materials, event/training scheduling in each of the 100+ school, and site visits for data collection and support. The SLD works at the direction of senior project staff as well as the communication/marketing director to create aligned messaging across the project and support a positive message for each community. |
| 1  | College and Career Readiness Mentor  |  $45,846 | The College and Career Readiness mentor (CCRM) is responsible for providing mentoring and leadership to the College and Career Readiness Counselors (CCRC) working in the districts as part of the Race to the Top-District grant. The CCRM supports CCRCs, administrators, and teachers participating with the kid∙FRIENDLy grant to maximize the impact of college and career readiness strategies with all students. The CCRM primarily assists the CCRCs within the project high schools, as well as their feeder schools. The CCRM is responsible for assisting the program manager in monitoring the implementation of the project including the creation and operation of a Career Center; the implementation of Career Profile systems and supports for students; the expanded use of the Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS) data system with teachers, students and parents; and the coordination of support through the Family Resource and Youth Services Centers (FRYSC). This position also assists in collecting, organizing, and submitting data to assist the project director and external evaluator.  |

**Appendix B: kid·FRIENDLy Organization Chart**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Appendix C: Personalized Learning Map Development – A Brief Overview**

**Theoretical Framework for the Personalized Learning Map**

The Personalized Learning Continuum, now Personalized Learning Map (PL Map), was developed based on learning and motivational theories and empirical findings relevant to the field of educational psychology. The PL Map describes a continuum of personalized learning implementation relative to its impact on the learning process, the school climate, and the behaviors of teachers and students. We define personalized learning as follows:

* Personalized learning is an approach to education that emphasizes the student as the most important actor in the learning process.
* In personalized learning, the school climate is structured to empower students and create opportunities for learning that are responsive to individual students’ readiness levels, interests, and progress toward mastery of learning goals.
* Personalized learning helps schools more fully realize the goal of helping students emerge from their educational experience with a deep base of content knowledge and the cognitive, leadership, and emotional skills to effectively apply that knowledge in a broad range of real-world contexts.

The PL Map is designed to assist schools with personalized learning implementation through self-assessment and self-reflection. Its theoretical and empirical background are discussed below.

**Learning Theories**

One of the theories used in developing the PL Map was Vygotsky’s (1997/1978) Zone of Proximal Development. The zone of proximal development is that region between the students’ actual development—what they have mastered—and their potential development—what they are now ready to master. The essential idea of the zone of proximal development is that students are assigned to complete tasks that are sufficiently challenging. Tasks are not too easy so that students are able to complete them effortlessly, but, at the same time, they are not so difficult that students become frustrated and stop trying. Activities in the zone of proximal development present just the right level of difficulty so that using the present skills that they have, along with teacher scaffolding, students are able to complete them. In so doing, students are challenged beyond their present level of mastery, thereby tapping into their zone of proximal development.

Essential to the idea that students are capable of managing challenging work is the idea of a growth versus fixed mindset. A fixed mindset hinges on the belief that intelligence is innate and finite, whereas a growth mindset is characterized by the belief that intelligence can be further developed through effort placed on learning and practice (Dweck, 2007, 2012). It is important for students to maintain a growth mindset, as it impacts their academic success (Aronson, Fried, & Good, 2002). Parents and teachers must also model this growth mindset not only to promote learning, but also to facilitate the development of such mindsets in children (Dweck, 2015).

The theory of self-regulated learning is also applicable to personalized learning. According to Zimmerman (2002), students engaging in self-regulated learning apply the processes of forethought for goal-planning, goal-setting, goal-monitoring, and self-reflection. By engaging in these processes, students are able to appropriately define the goals they have set for themselves, develop a plan for achieving these goals, execute the plan, and finally, evaluate their progress towards accomplishing the goals. An important part of the goal-setting phase is maintaining high self-efficacy (i.e., confidence that they have the capacity to accomplish these goals). Learners who engage in self-regulation experience greater autonomy in their learning (Zimmerman, 2002).

**Motivation Theories**

Goal orientation theory describes the underlying motivations students have for completing tasks or working toward a goal. Being performance-oriented means that students are motivated by a desire to perform better than or comparable to their peers (Ames & Archer, 1988). On the other hand, mastery-oriented learners are more concerned with mastering a particular skill or concept independent of how others perform (Ames & Archer, 1988). With a focus on mastery goals, students’ academic and engagement outcomes tend to be enhanced (Richardson, Abraham, & Bond, 2012). Anderman and Midgley (1997) proposed several indicators that can be used to identify the adoption of mastery- versus performance-oriented goals. These indicators highlight the importance of focusing on the growth and progression towards goal achievement as well as valuing the overall learning process in attaining mastery including successes as well as mistakes.

Closely related to goal orientation is the idea of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation stems from activities students engage in to pursue their own interests, whereas extrinsic motivators take the form of external rewards or punishments (Deci & Ryan, 2000). A focus on intrinsic motivation can instill a sense of autonomy in children, which can lead to greater student achievement (Deci, Ryan, & Williams, 1996). Reeve and Halusic (2009) maintain that supporting student autonomy promotes learning and increases student engagement. Student autonomy and intrinsic motivation are essential components of personalized learning.

Eggen and Kauchak (2013) developed a framework by which teachers could instill motivation in students for learning. This framework incorporated classroom climate factors, such as how success is defined, as an important way in which teachers can motivate students. Eggen and Kauchak suggest that success should be defined in terms of *progression* towards the goal, rather than just the accomplishment of the goal itself. This definition speaks to a mastery orientation for goal attainment. This perspective also encourages students to value the journey toward goal attainment and the experiences this provides. Another element of the Eggen and Kauchak framework is teacher expectations. Teachers can motivate students by maintaining and communicating high expectations for student learning.

**Empirical Studies**

Several empirical studies were relevant to PL Map development. Brickhouse and Bodner (1992) conducted a qualitative study employing a case study paradigm to chronicle the struggles of a first-year science teacher. The teacher felt constrained to adhere to the textbook to fulfill the curriculum. Brickhouse and Bodner highlighted that more experienced teachers are better able to extend learning beyond the textbook. Similarly, Ornstein (1994) encourages meaningful departures from the textbook to better meet the needs and readiness levels of students.

Burns (1987) examined the impact of self-paced instruction in a mathematics class. Students in the self-paced group progressed to a greater extent, even after accounting for ability, than students in the control group, where the pace was set by the teacher as determined by the steering group. The steering group, as described by Burns, consisted of the middle third of students, so that students in the upper third were not adequately challenged and students in the lower third were overwhelmed. Burns explained that allowing student learning to progress in a self-paced manner eliminated the negative effect of a steering group.

Gray and Chanoff (1986) described the highest level of self-pacing at a school in Boston, wherein students have complete autonomy over their learning. Students were able to decide their learning goals and how they would be assessed on these goals. The school did not have a curriculum or formal learning assessments. In comparing graduates of this school to high school graduates from the traditional school system, Gray and Chanoff observed that in the absence of a set curriculum and teacher-set learning objectives, students from the personalized learning environment graduated with deficits. However, these students were better equipped to compensate for these gaps in their learning when compared to students who graduated from the traditional school system who also had gaps in their learning. Students indicated that they were able to transfer the autonomy they develop to other phases and areas of their lives.

Keller’s personalized system of learning (1968) focuses on students attaining mastery. In Keller’s personalized system, students have multiple opportunities during the semester to demonstrate they have mastered the concepts presented in the course. Kulik, Kulik, and Cohen’s (1979) meta-analysis of research on Keller’s personalized system of learning in post-secondary institutions found that this system offered greater student outcomes in achievement and course satisfaction.

**Development of the Personalized Learning Map: Application of Theories**

The PL Map was initially developed to serve as an innovation configuration map. Hall and Hord (2011) encouraged the development of innovation configuration maps to be used as tools to guide the implementation of educational innovations by assisting stakeholders in conceptualizing the impending change. Following a review of the literature, the initial iteration of the PL Map was developed by incorporating the respective expectations of the innovation planning team, school community, students, teachers, and school leaders. The second iteration was developed by first eliminating the cases of overlap and redundancy by collapsing closely related categories into a single category. One of the goals of this second iteration was to ensure the PL Map was more closely tied to the theoretical framework. As such, only those indicators that were directly aligned with the literature were retained, and indicators that were missing from the previous iteration were added.

The final iteration that resulted from this process contains indicators based on the theories described in the previous section. The current PL Map is divided into four standards and supporting indicators (with relevant literature cited), outlined below:

* Standard 1 – The Learning Process: The school community works collaboratively to develop instructional and assessment practices that are in harmony with personalized learning. This standard describes the activities that should be involved in planning and executing personalized instruction, while progression of learning describes the activities involved in day-to-day implementation of a personalized learning approach.
	1. Pre-Assessment
	2. Planning (Brickhouse & Bodner, 1992)
	3. Assessment Development
	4. Challenge (Burns, 1987; Vygotsky, 1997/1978)
	5. Pacing (Gray & Chanoff, 1986)
	6. Collaboration
	7. Autonomy (Deci, Ryan, & Williams, 1996)
	8. Mastery (Keller, 1968)
	9. Grading (Keller, 1968)
* Standard 2 – Climate: School administrators and the wider school community demonstrate a commitment to providing an adequate setting in which personalized learning can thrive. This standard captures elements of both the internal school climate, as well as that of the wider community. It primarily describes the changes to be made to the physical structures as well as the operational infrastructure to accommodate personalized learning approaches.

2.1 School Structures

2.2 Success (Eggen & Kauchak, 2013)

2.3 Networks Beyond School

2.4 Location

* Standard 3 – Teachers: Teachers understand personalized learning concepts and are committed to implementing them in guiding students to achieve learning goals. This standard outlines the activities in which teachers should be engaged as innovators of personalized learning. These activities involve overseeing students, as well as continually reflecting on their own practice. This section captures the need for teachers to maintain high expectations of students, as well as foster the development of strong student-teacher relationships.

3.1 Self-Efficacy (Zimmerman, 2002)

3.2 Modeling (Dweck, 2007)

3.3 Monitoring

3.4 High Expectations (Eggen & Kauchak, 2013)

3.5 Student-Teacher Relationship (Eggen & Kauchak, 2013)

* Standard 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. This standard describes how students become intrinsically motivated, mastery-oriented goal setters who actively engage in self-regulation.

4.1 Goal Setting (Ames & Archer, 1988)

4.2 Goal Monitoring (Anderman & Midgley, 1997)

4.3 Self-Regulation (Zimmerman, 2002)

**Conclusion**

Despite growing interest in personalized learning, few efforts have been made to create an operational definition of personalized learning or describe it at varying levels of implementation. The PL Map is based on well-established learning theories supported by empirical research and serves as a tool by which schools can measure their progress in creating personalized learning environments.
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1. Note: This and other terms associated with each goal were operationalized by the Rock Solid evaluation team, in coordination with the kid·FRIENDLy leadership team, to create measures that met USED approval. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)