



Wyoming School Improvement Plan High-Impact Domains and Indicators Continuum

June 2022

This document identifies a set of indicators within Wyoming’s six High-Impact Domains, which are part of the Wyoming School Improvement Plan template. The indicators within these domains are described in a continuum of implementation, and data from the school improvement plan site visits (including interviews, focus groups, document reviews, surveys, classroom observations, and reviews of other data) will inform the status of implementation for each school improvement domain.

Exhibit 1 lists the six High-Impact Domains identified in the Wyoming School Improvement Plan template. These school improvement practices are based on research on other schools that have experienced rapid improvements in student outcomes.¹

Exhibit 1. Key High-Impact Domains

Key Turnaround Practice
A. Leadership
B. Culture and Climate
C. Data-Informed Planning
D. Professional Development
E. Instruction
F. Learning Support

These domains and related indicators are used to monitor the progress of schools implementing improvement plans. Each indicator is described on a 4-point continuum of implementation (no evidence, developing, providing, or sustaining).² The sustaining point on each indicator continuum aligns with the findings from research on underperforming schools that have experienced rapid improvement in student outcomes as well as the criteria described in the Wyoming School Improvement Plan template.

¹ See Lane, B., Unger, C., & Souvanna, P. (2014). *Turnaround practices in action: A three-year analysis of school and district practices, systems, policies and use of resources contributing to successful turnaround efforts in Massachusetts Level 4 schools.* Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. <https://www.doe.mass.edu/turnaround/practices-report-2014.pdf>

² The indicators draw from the *Implementation Continuum for School Turnaround and Transformation* from the American Institutes for Research, which serves as a self-guided implementation monitoring tool for schools. See Barbour, C., Karageorge, T., Bates, R., Meyer, C., Burdette, J., Newell, K., Dolby, D., Shively, J., Hill, U., Slater, M. (2014). *Implementation continuum for school turnaround and transformation.* American Institutes for Research.

Each indicator is in support of the overall domain rating. Evidence from schools will inform decisions about the implementation level of a school within each indicator. Then these indicators will be examined within each

Definitions for Indicator Implementation Continuum

The indicator implementation levels provide an overview of the process of developing, providing, and ultimately sustaining specific practices within each High-Impact Domain. Each indicator has a unique 4-point implementation continuum, specific to the indicator, that generally corresponds to the generic implementation continuum described in Exhibit 2.

Exhibit 2. Indicator Implementation Continuum

Limited	Developing	Providing	Sustaining
Necessary organizational practices, structures, and/or processes are nonexistent, evidence is limited, or practices are so infrequent that their impact is negligible. (For example, common planning time is not scheduled, or instructional leaders are unaware of research and promising practices.)	Organizational practices, structures, and/or processes exist on paper or are being tried but are not yet fully developed or implemented consistently. (For example, the practice may be implemented by only some teachers or with a target group of students or may intermittently be used but is not part of a consistent approach. Processes are inconsistent or operate in silos. For example, data might be collected, but only a few people are looking at or effectively using the information.)	Systems are functional, and their structures and processes have been implemented consistently throughout the school; however, either communication between systems may be lacking or systems do not contribute to systemic decision making. (For example, an assessment system is in place and data are tracked, but the results are not used in collaboration with other systems, such as teacher effectiveness or instructional guidance.)	The organizational practices, structures, and processes are functioning effectively, and timely feedback systems are embedded to identify potential problems and challenges. Feedback systems include progress checks to inform timely course corrections. The practice is embedded into the school culture.

domain as a whole, and a holistic implementation designation for each domain will be provided. The domain ratings are holistic ratings of the extent to which the indicators within that domain are coherently implemented. Domain ratings are not a sum or average of the indicator ratings within that domain (Exhibit 3).

Exhibit 3. Domain Implementation Continuum

Limited	Developing	Providing	Sustaining
Indicators for this turnaround practice area show limited or no evidence of implementation of the organizational practices, structures, and/or processes.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that all or most of the organizational practices, structures, and/or processes related to this area exist on paper or are being tried but are not yet fully developed or implemented.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that related systems are functional, and their structures and processes are implemented consistently throughout the school; however, either communication or systemic decision making is limited.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that the organizational practices, structures, and processes are functioning effectively, and timely feedback systems are embedded to identify potential problems and challenges.

Domain A: Leadership

A1. A clear and compelling purpose statement (e.g., mission, vision, values, and goals) developed with stakeholder input and consistent with the district purpose, provides focus for school decisions.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
The school does not have a purpose statement to guide school-level decisions.	The school has a purpose statement that is revised/ updated once a year, has been posted/shared with stakeholders, and is seldomly used to guide school-level decisions.	The school has an updated and relevant purpose statement which is reviewed once a semester, has been posted/shared with stakeholders who know what it is, and it is sometimes used to guide school-level decision making.	The school has an updated and relevant purpose statement which is reviewed quarterly, has been posted/ shared with stakeholders who know what it is, and the purpose statement is regularly used to guide school-level decision making.

A2. School leaders have a coherent theory of action for resource allocation and process improvement that links adult actions to student results.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
School leaders do not have a theory of action for resource allocation and process improvement that links adult actions to student results.	School leaders have a theory of action for resource allocation and process improvement, but it does not link adult actions to student results and/or is referenced once a year.	School leaders have a theory of action for resource allocation and process improvement, that somewhat links adult actions to student results and/or is referenced once a semester.	School leaders have a theory of action for resource allocation and process improvement that links adult actions to student results and is referenced quarterly.

A3. The principal distributes instructional leadership roles among teachers.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
School leaders do not distribute instructional leadership roles among teachers.	School leaders have established systems to distribute instructional leadership roles among teachers, however teachers do not have decision making responsibilities.	School leaders distribute instructional leadership roles and teachers are involved in decision making when appropriate, but there is a lack of documentation to reflect the process.	School leaders distribute instructional leadership roles among teachers, and teachers are involved in decision-making when appropriate. Documentation reflects the process.

A4. The principal is actively engaged in learning with teachers.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
The school leader does not engage in learning with school staff.	The school leader assigns learning with school staff AND engages in learning yearly with documentation to reflect the process OR the school leader does not participate in the learning.	The school leader engages in learning with school staff on a semester basis and has documentation to reflect the process.	The school leader is engaged in learning with school staff quarterly and has documentation to reflect the process.

Domain B: Culture and Climate

B1. Positive relationships and trust are maintained within and between school stakeholder groups (e.g., leaders, teachers, students, staff, families, community).

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
There are no positive relationships nor trust between any school stakeholders (e.g., school leaders, teachers, staff, students, families, and the community at large).	School leaders have established and maintain a culture of positive relationships and trust between some school stakeholders (e.g., school leaders, teachers, staff, students, families, and the community at large).	School leaders have established and maintain a culture of positive relationships and trust between all school stakeholders (e.g., school leaders, teachers, staff, students, families, and the community at large).	All stakeholders (e.g., school leaders, teachers, staff, students, families, and the community at large) take ownership in maintaining the school's culture of positive relationships and trust between all school stakeholders.

B2. School leaders maintain ongoing communication with teachers and other school stakeholders and solicit input on major decisions from relevant stakeholders.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
School leaders do not maintain ongoing communication with stakeholders (e.g., school leaders, teachers, staff, students, families, and the community at large) nor solicit input on major decisions from relevant stakeholders.	School leaders maintain ongoing communication with stakeholders (e.g., school leaders, teachers, staff, students, families, and the community at large) but do not solicit input on major decisions from relevant stakeholders.	School leaders maintain ongoing communication with stakeholders (e.g., school leaders, teachers, staff, students, families, and the community at large) and solicit input on major decisions from relevant stakeholders.	A culture of openness and two-way communication exists between all stakeholders (e.g., school leaders, teachers, staff, students, families, and the community at large) with various stakeholders initiating and being a part of the decision-making process.

B3. The school maintains a safe, orderly environment with measures in place to prevent violence and bullying and uses a team approach with established protocols for threat assessment and response.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
School leaders have not created nor do they maintain an environment and structures (expectations, systems, routines, protocols, etc.) that protect the physical, emotional, and intellectual safety for stakeholders (e.g., school leaders, teachers, staff, students, and families).	School leaders have created and maintain an environment and structures (expectations, systems, routines, protocols, etc.) that protect the physical, emotional, and intellectual safety for some stakeholders (e.g., school leaders, teachers, staff, students, and families).	School leaders have created and maintain an environment and structures (expectations, systems, routines, protocols, etc.) that protect the physical, emotional, and intellectual safety for all stakeholders (e.g., school leaders, teachers, staff, students, and families).	Multiple stakeholders (e.g., school leaders, teachers, staff, students, and families) have created or refined and maintain an environment and structures (expectations, systems, routines, protocols, etc.) that protect the physical, emotional, and intellectual safety for all stakeholders.

B4. Staff proactively build positive, authentic relationships with students.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
Staff do not build relationships with students.	Staff check in with students each day to see how students are doing and make 1 positive interaction with some students each day.	Staff check in with students each day to see how students are doing and make 1 positive interaction with each student each day.	Staff check in with students each day to see how students are doing and make more than 1 positive interaction with each student each day.

B5. Structures (e.g., structured advisories, mentor programs, smaller learning communities) are in place to support relationships among students and adults.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
There are no structures for support in place.	There is built in time for a student to meet with an adult each day outside of instructional time.	There is built in time for a student to meet with an adult each day outside of instructional time that involves mentoring opportunities OR future planning OR counseling to meet student needs.	There is sequential (meaning it builds on previous sessions) built in time for a student to meet with an adult each day outside of instructional time that is dedicated to mentoring OR future planning OR counseling to meet student needs AND is based on student data.

B6. Expectations for conduct are clearly understood by all staff and students and school staff have built a system to understand student behavior.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
Expectations for conduct are not understood by stakeholders and no system is in place to understand student behavior issues, the school does not have updated student or staff handbooks.	Conduct expectations are found in the student and staff handbooks and are easily accessible, a system is in place but used less than 50% of the time for student behavior issues.	Conduct expectations are found in the student and staff handbooks and are easily accessible, a system is in place but used 51- 75% of the time for student behavior issues.	Conduct expectations are found in the student and staff handbooks and are easily accessible, a system is in place but used 76-100% of the time for student behavior issues.

Domain C: Data-Informed Planning

C1. Systems are in place to collect and report student assessment results and other learning data.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
There are no systems in place to collect nor are there systems to report assessment results or learning data.	There are systems in place to collect some data, however the data are not shared with stakeholders.	There are systems in place to collect assessment results and learning data, however the data are not shared with stakeholders in a timely manner.	There are systems in place to collect assessment results and learning data, and the data are consistently shared with the relevant stakeholders in a timely manner.

C2. Systems are in place to collect non-academic data such as: absences, tardiness, discipline, mental, emotional, and physical well-being of students, families, and staff, etc.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
There are no systems in place to collect nor are there systems to report non-academic data.	There are systems in place to collect some data which is reviewed more than once per year and inform the refinement of school conduct expectations, climate, and/or culture.	There are systems in place to collect non-academic school data that are reviewed more than once per semester and inform the refinement of school conduct expectations, climate, or culture.	There are systems in place to collect non-academic school data that are reviewed more than once per quarter and inform the refinement of school conduct expectations, climate, or culture.

C3. Data are routinely analyzed in multiple ways (by school, grade, class, student sub-group, etc.) and discussed amongst staff.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
Data are never analyzed or discussed.	Data are sometimes analyzed and discussed.	Data are routinely analyzed in multiple ways and are sometimes discussed amongst staff to influence instruction.	Data are routinely analyzed in multiple ways, and discussed amongst staff to influence instruction.

C4. The results of the data analysis are used to identify individual students in immediate need of academic and/or behavioral intervention, and to inform school improvement planning.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
The results of data analysis are not used to identify student needs or as part of the school improvement planning process.	The results of data analysis are used in one of the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ analyzing data for strengths and challenges, ▪ identifying actions to address student learning needs ▪ action steps are reviewed and communicated to all staff 	The results of data analysis are used in two of the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ analyzing data for strengths and challenges, ▪ identifying actions to address student learning needs ▪ action steps are reviewed and communicated to all staff 	The results of data analysis are used in all three of the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ analyzing data for strengths and challenges, ▪ identifying actions to address student learning needs ▪ action steps are reviewed and communicated to all staff

Domain D: Professional Development

D1. The Professional Learning Community (PLC) model or a similarly collaborative approach is used to increase collective teacher efficacy and improve student achievement.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
There is no collaborative model in place.	The preliminary, logistical work related to collaborative teams (e.g., scheduling, group norms, etc.) has been done, but teams do not meet regularly or with fidelity.	Teams meet regularly and with fidelity; meeting best practices related to teacher efficacy are utilized OR meeting outcomes and commitments are tied to student achievement.	Teams meet regularly and with fidelity, meeting best practices related to teacher efficacy are utilized, and meeting outcomes and commitments are always tied to student achievement.

D2. Teacher expertise in the use of selected high-leverage instructional practices is developed through training, peer observation, intentional practice, and leadership feedback.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
Leaders and teachers have not identified, committed, or focused on high-leverage instructional practices.	Leaders and teachers focus on high-leverage instructional practices, however ongoing professional development and support is not provided to instructional staff.	Leaders and teachers focus on high-leverage instructional practices and professional development, and support is provided, however it is not provided consistently and via multiple modalities throughout the year.	Leaders and teachers focus on high-leverage instructional practices and professional development and support is provided consistently via multiple modalities throughout the year.

D3. Ongoing and sustained content-specific professional development, focused on the school purpose and selected based on the needs and feedback of staff as well as student outcomes, is provided for staff.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
Ongoing and sustained content-specific professional development is not provided for staff.	Professional development is provided; however, it is either not ongoing, content-specific, or based on the needs of/ feedback from teachers, nor student outcomes.	Ongoing, content-specific professional development is provided, however it is not based on the needs of/feedback from teachers and student outcomes.	Ongoing, content-specific professional development is provided, AND it is based on the needs of/feedback from teachers as well as student outcomes.

D4. Ongoing professional development structures and practices (e.g., professional learning communities, collaborative meeting time, coaching supports, peer-to-peer observation or collaboration) are established for Instructional Improvement.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
Ongoing professional development structures and practices are not present.	Reoccurring professional development structures and practices are in place but may be poorly defined, inconsistent, inefficient, or ineffective.	Reoccurring professional development structures and practices are in place to support continuous learning and are clearly defined, but are not always used consistently throughout the school, OR they happen with some frequency but without planning or coordination.	Reoccurring professional development structures and practices are formally planned and consistently used to support data-driven instruction.

Domain E. Instruction

E1. Leaders and staff work together to design and implement a high-quality, standards-aligned instructional program that results in high levels of achievement for all students.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
The school does not have a high-quality, standards-aligned instructional program.	The school leader has designed a high-quality, standards-aligned instructional program, however it is not implemented with fidelity, the program is reviewed once a year.	The school leader and staff have designed a high-quality, standards-aligned instructional program that is mostly implemented with fidelity, the program is reviewed once a semester.	The school leader and staff have designed a high-quality, standards-aligned instructional program, and it is implemented with fidelity, the program is reviewed at least once a quarter.

E2. Teachers promote deeper learning and elicit high levels of student engagement through projects, products, and presentations with performance assessments.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
Teachers do not promote deeper learning nor elicit student engagement through projects, products, or presentations/ performances.	Less than 50% of teachers promote deeper learning and elicit student engagement through projects, products, or presentation/ performances.	Most teachers (51-85%) promote deeper learning and elicit student engagement through projects, products, or presentations/ performances.	All teachers (86-100%) promote deeper learning and elicit student engagement through projects, products, or presentations/ performances.

E3. Classroom practices are used to promote self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making. (e.g., Social Emotional Learning).

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
No teachers incorporate practices that develop student learning strategies or their self-awareness, self-control, or intrapersonal skills.	Less than 50% of teachers incorporate practices that develop student learning strategies or their self-awareness, self-control, or intrapersonal skills.	Most teachers (51-85%) incorporate practices that develop student learning strategies or their self-awareness, self-control, or intrapersonal skills.	All teachers (86-100%) incorporate practices that develop student learning strategies or their self-awareness, self-control, or intrapersonal skills.

Domain F. Learning Support

F1. The school has scheduled time during the school day, and uses a systematic approach (e.g., MTSS) to prevention and intervention, to promptly address academic and behavioral issues for all students.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
The school does not have time during the school day to address academic and behavior issues for all students.	The school has some time (though not consistently) to address academic or behavior issues for all students, however, there is not a systemic approach to meet student needs.	The school has consistent time during the school day to address academic or behavior issues for all students, however there is not a systemic approach to meet student needs.	The school has time during the school day to address academic and behavior issues for all students, and there is a systemic approach to meet student needs.

F2. A framework for learning supports, including after-school and summer programs (expanded learning opportunities), are coordinated between the school, family, and community and governmental organizations.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
A framework for learning supports does not exist and learning supports are not coordinated between the school, family, community, and governmental organizations.	A framework for learning supports exists, however the learning supports do not align to the framework.	A framework for learning supports exists and the learning supports align to the framework.	A framework for learning supports exists, the learning supports align to the framework, and various partners work together in a systematic, cohesive manner to maximize collective impact for students.

F3. The systematic approach for prevention and intervention includes student placements that are reviewed by a relevant team who use consistent rules and procedures to deliver effective interventions and support for student growth.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
A systematic approach for prevention and intervention does not exist.	A systematic approach for prevention and intervention is used and documented by the relevant stakeholders, but the rules and procedures vary depending on who is administering the intervention.	A systematic approach for prevention and intervention is used once a semester and documented by the relevant stakeholders, and communicated to at least 50% of all relevant staff.	A systematic approach for prevention and intervention is used at least every quarter using data and documented by the relevant stakeholders, and a schoolwide system exists for communicating intervention action plans to all relevant staff.

F4. Students who have met the criteria for proficiency are provided enrichment or extended learning that is highly engaging.

Score 1 Limited	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Providing	Score 4 Sustaining
No options for enrichment or extended learning exist.	Proficient students are provided enrichment or extended learning outside of school hours.	Proficient students are provided enrichment or extended learning during the regular school day.	Proficient students are provided enrichment and extended learning during the regular school day and it is tailored and engaging.