

**DISTRICTWIDE IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE  
SUMMATIVE EVALUATION FOR  
RANDOLPH FIELD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT  
October 2, 2008**

## **History and Rationale**

Randolph Field ISD staff is committed to using action research as a means of influencing student achievement. The Campus Improvement Plan process is not a static but a dynamic process to achieve higher levels of achievement for all students. Focusing on specific target goals, teams and individuals work to craft action evidences and evidences of progress, reflect on and monitor their effectiveness, and respond to student successes and challenges with refined strategies and assessment tools.

Historically, the Campus Improvement Plan revolved around two events: first, the annual compiling of often-isolated intentions and actions without documentation relating them to student achievement; and second, the annual “checking off” of actions completed or the revising of timelines and target dates of actions not completed. In addition, these plans were often based on a broad range of unfocused objectives, and the connection to student achievement was unclear. The catalyst for changing this traditional perspective came in 1995 when Dr. Maddox, the superintendent at that time, requested from the Districtwide Improvement Committee a tool for evaluating the results of the Campus Improvement Plans. In the process of designing an evaluative tool, the Districtwide Improvement Committee realized that although we had met state requirements and shown a district commitment to improvement, we had not established a direct correlation between the Campus Improvement Plan and increased student achievement. Additionally, without such correlation, there was no real basis for evaluating the Campus Improvement Plan with regard to meeting the District Instructional Goals for increasing student achievement.

The 1995-1996 school year was the first year of implementation of the new Campus Improvement Plan process. The Districtwide Improvement Committee issued its first annual report that identified the successes met in the process as well as the challenges and next steps. Successes included enhanced dialogue among teachers about instruction, not just student behaviors, and increased focus on student achievement with a connection to specific instructional actions. Some of the challenges and next steps included increasing the ongoing documentation to connect instructional strategies and to relate student progress to desired results, improving the quality of feedback, and analyzing and incorporating the results provided by the staff evaluation of the first cycle in the Campus Improvement Plan process. Since the beginning of this process, each campus has shown increased student achievement that has been documented in each Campus Improvement Plan.

## **Implementation**

The first task for each campus is to examine data related to student achievement and select Campus Performance Objective(s) based on that data. Instructional teams and individual teachers of specialized courses then design strategies for accomplishing the Campus Performance Objective(s) and identify tools to assess progress toward the objective(s). Monthly, the campus

administrators meet with teams to provide instruction, guidance, and feedback. The middle school and high school campuses have found the sharing of ideas and feedback is more effective in multi-level, multi-discipline team meetings. This process has remained relatively unchanged at the elementary campus as strong collaborative teams have been evident for a number of years. Twice during the year, in January and April, teams give their Campus Improvement Committee a report of progress toward the Campus Performance Objective(s) and receive feedback each time. After the oral presentations of the teams in April, each Campus Improvement Committee presents a summative report in August to the Districtwide Improvement Committee regarding the campus' progress. The final step in this process is the Districtwide Improvement Committee's report to the Board of Trustees.

## **Campus Performance Objectives**

The Campus Performance Objective is developed based on data from a variety of sources such as Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills, Adequate Yearly Progress, Texas Primary Reading Inventory and advanced placement results. Each campus analyzes the available data and comes to consensus about a specific, measurable result expected for the student population served at each campus. This becomes the proposed Campus Performance Objective which is then reviewed by the Campus Improvement Committee. Once the objective has been approved by the campus committee, the Districtwide Improvement Committee reviews the Campus Performance Objectives from all three campuses. Finally each Campus Performance Objective is approved by the Board of Trustees.

The following Campus Performance Objectives were addressed in the 2007-2008 year:

### High School

- All students will demonstrate improvement in critical analysis through expository reading and writing with emphasis on the connecting writing process using a common rubric for assessment. Low performing and at-risk students will be reported separately to track their writing skills improvement.

### Middle School

- All students will demonstrate improvement in the interpretation and application of content specific vocabulary. Low performing and at-risk students will be reported separately to track their improvement in their interpretation and application of content vocabulary.

### Elementary School

- All students will improve their skills to interpret and apply content vocabulary with attention to low performing and at-risk students.

This report from the Districtwide Improvement Committee marks the completion of 2007-2008 Campus Improvement Plan cycle and highlights the results, successes, challenges, and next steps relative to these performance objectives.

## **Results of the Campus Performance Objectives**

The Board of Trustees approved the Campus Performance Objectives for each campus in September 2007. On each campus every teacher, whether they taught physical education, art, music, Spanish or a core subject, worked throughout the year to achieve the Campus Performance Objective(s) with their students. Each teacher gathered data to establish where their students were

in relation to the Campus Performance Objective at the beginning of the year and continued to gather data on their students' achievement of that Campus Performance Objective throughout the year. Examples of results for individual teachers are included below.

#### Randolph Elementary

- In accordance with the elementary Campus Performance Objective to improve students' skills to interpret and apply content vocabulary, the students in reading improvement created a chart of word relationships and had to justify why each word was placed on the continuum as it was and present ideas orally.

#### Randolph Middle School

- In accordance with the middle school Campus Performance Objective to improve the students' ability to interpret and apply content specific vocabulary, teachers in the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> grades collaborated on using instructional strategies such as word walls, experiential learning and interactive instruction.

#### Randolph High School

- In accordance with the high school Campus Performance Objective to improve students' critical analysis through expository reading and writing, ninth grade English students were shown their own work and one of the few writing assessments that received the highest rating (3) for the entire year. Viewing their own work allowed students to realize 1) they weren't the only ones to mess up, 2) they saw the correct answer, 3) they saw why their answer did not receive a two or a three, and 4) they saw examples of good or excellent answers to model.

### **Successes**

As a result of the collective effort on each campus, the campuses and the district have achieved successes in several areas.

- Randolph High School seniors scored 1619 on the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT) with the inclusion of a writing component. As a state Texas scored 1473, and the nation scored 1511. 64 out of a class of 79 (81%) took the SAT. Seniors who took the American College Testing (ACT) exam scored 21.9 while as a state Texas scored 20.7 and the nation scored 21.1.
- Randolph High School had 100% of the eleventh graders meet the standard on the social studies section of the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills test for four of the last five years. Eighty-five out of 100 (85%) students scored a 3 or 4 on the essay in eleventh grade.
- Randolph Elementary School had 100% of the fifth graders meet the standard in reading, 99% meet the standard in math and 94% meet the standard in science with 66% commended. Cross curricular examination of the varied definitions of specific vocabulary led to increased student achievement. For example: the word "scale" was examined in music, math, social studies, and science.
- Randolph Elementary School has had over 90% of the fourth graders meet the standard for writing each year that the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills has been given (96%, 96%, 94%, 96% and 99%), and this year 100% of the students met that standard.
- Randolph Middle School had 100% of the eighth grade students meet the standard for reading, and 66% of the eighth graders met the Commended Performance Standard in reading. Eighth grade students have met the standard in reading every year the Texas

Assessment of Knowledge and Skills has been given (94%, 99%, 92%, 100%, and 96%). The eighth grade students also had 100% meet the standard in math increased their commended scores from 16 % in 2007 to 39% in 2008.

- Randolph Middle School has had over 90% of the sixth grade students meet the standard in reading (91%, 90%, 96%, and 99%) for the last four years. Fifty percent or more have been commended for the past three years (52%, 50%, and 52%), and this year 69% were commended.
- Randolph Field ISD was a Recognized district under Texas Education Agency accountability standards. Randolph Elementary School and Randolph Middle School were Exemplary campuses, and Randolph High School was a Recognized campus.
- Randolph Field ISD teachers continue to collaborate together to foster the development of Professional Learning Communities.
- All three campuses showed an increase in parental involvement

## **Rubric**

A rubric is a tool used to evaluate the implementation of the Campus Improvement Plans. It is reviewed annually and revised appropriately by the Districtwide Improvement Committee as part of the Continuous Cycle of Progress. This rubric is not meant to be a grade, but rather a means of guiding campus progress. The rubric used to evaluate the Campus Improvement Plans was revised by the Districtwide Improvement Committee in 2002-2003 to reflect increased levels of student achievement, as well as higher levels of sophistication in each campus' approach to the improvement process.

The Districtwide Improvement Committee's Evaluation of the Campus Improvement Plans uses a four point rubric with four components. The complete evaluation for each campus is attached and an overall summary for the campuses is noted below.

### **Randolph Elementary**

- The elementary was highly successful on one of the four components of the rubric (identifying specific changes that occurred as a result of the Campus Performance Objective).
- The elementary was successful in identifying the steps to extend the process.
- There were indications of a need for improvement in documenting progress with data and responding to feedback.

### **Randolph Middle School**

- The middle school was highly successful on two of the four components of the rubric (responding to feedback, identifying specific changes that occurred as a result of the Campus Performance Objective).
- The middle school was successful in documenting progress with data and identifying the steps to extend the process.

### **Randolph High School**

- The high school was highly successful on two of the four components of the rubric (documenting progress with data and responding to feedback).
- The high school was successful in identifying specific changes that occurred as a result of the Campus Performance Objective and identifying the steps to extend the process.

## Challenges and Next Steps

In 2007-2008, all campuses addressed the challenges and next steps cited in the previous (2006-2007) District Summary Report in these ways:

- **Improve the reporting of cohort data**  
The middle school and high school did a good job of reporting cohort data with a few exceptions, and the data was clear, accurate, and consistent.
- **Improve the review process of Campus Summary Reports by Campus Improvement Committees prior to sending those reports to the Districtwide Improvement Committee**  
The middle school and high school did an excellent job in reviewing and revising the Campus Summary Reports before sending them to the Districtwide Improvement Committee.

Because of the rubric results, the challenges and next steps for the 2008-2009 Continuous Cycle of Progress include the following:

- All campuses will continue to improve the reporting of cohort data.
- The elementary committee needs to use the district's summary template to collect data and report it to the Districtwide Improvement Committee.
- The elementary committee needs to provide feedback in January and May to all teams.

## Changes in the Campus Improvement Plan Process

The Districtwide Improvement Committee continues to revise the Campus Improvement Plan process based on the feedback the committee receives from the staff and Campus Improvement Committees.

- Each campus will continue to report on a specific target goal for the campus as a whole for 2008-2009.
- All three campuses will continue to collect and report data by cohort groups.
- The "Next Step" component of the rubric will be examined this year.

## Conclusion

As we complete the thirteenth cycle of the campus improvement process, the Districtwide Improvement Committee acknowledges that further work is necessary to achieve our goal. Having analyzed the results for the 2007-2008 school year, Randolph Field ISD reaffirms its commitment to increased student achievement for all of our students. We are dedicated to improving our results for 2008-2009. We believe that:

*"I have yet to see a school where the learning curves...of the adults were steeped upward and those of the students were not. Teachers and students go hand in hand together as learners...or they don't go at all."* Roland Barth

Our Campus Improvement Plan is a process that allows us to make a significant difference in our students' lives.

We look forward to reporting further progress in 2008-2009.

## DWIC EVALUATION OF CIP

Campus Randolph Elementary

Date September 16, 2008

The following responses are based on information provided to the Districtwide Improvement Committee by the Campus Improvement Committee in the annual report.

*Circle the appropriate choice.*

- Yes** The CPO(s) were aligned with the DIG(s).  
**Yes** The CPO(s) are observable and measurable.  
**Yes** The Action Evidences and Evidences of Progress addressed the CPO(s).  
**Yes** The campus developed a goal for drug, alcohol and tobacco prevention/intervention, implemented the goal and achieved the results.  
**Yes** The campus developed a goal for violence prevention/intervention, implemented the goal and achieved the results.  
**Yes** The campus developed a goal for parent involvement, implemented the goal and achieved the results.  
**No** The campus established baseline data, identified the target goal and achieved the target goal for the CPO.

### A. QUESTION: What data has the campus collected (hard and/or soft) to document progress in increased student achievement?

Each campus participating in the Continuous Cycle of Progress, the core of the CIP will collect data (hard and/or soft) to document progress toward increased student achievement. Data will be both formative and summative in nature. This data should be varied to document student progress. Objective data sources include results from TAKS, teacher-made tests, etc. Subjective data sources include a teacher observation checklist, rubric, portfolio, journal, survey, etc. The use of objective data will validate the results of the teams' subjective data. A combination of quantitative and qualitative data would provide the most comprehensive documentation of student progress toward the CPO(s).

- 4 The campus provided extensive observable and measurable data that was completely relevant and appropriate and sufficiently documented increased student achievement related to the CPO(s).  
3 The campus provided extensive observable and measurable data that was somewhat relevant and appropriate and sufficiently documented progress toward increased student achievement related to the CPO(s).  
2 **X** The campus provided adequate observable and measurable data that was somewhat relevant and appropriate and/or insufficiently documented progress toward increased student achievement related to the CPO(s).  
1 The campus provided insufficient documentation to indicate increased student achievement related to the CPO(s).

### B. QUESTION: In what ways did the campus respond to feedback?

In the Continuous Cycle of Progress, feedback is provided at different times and originates from a variety of sources. Teams or individuals, administrators, CIC, and DWIC all engage in feedback in an ongoing and a summative manner. Feedback often recommends adjustments be made while sometimes no changes are needed. A campus continuously monitors and adjusts in order to increase student achievement. The campus teams or individuals can seek input from other staff members on new or more effective strategies/techniques or on ways to document student

progress more efficiently. Teams or individuals might respond by increasing the number of times that student progress is documented. Numerous positive changes can result from these and/or many other divergent actions taken by teams or individuals as a result of feedback.

- 4 The campus responded thoroughly, and clearly documented significant changes (or made no changes) based on feedback.
- 3 The campus responded adequately, and documented moderate changes/revisions based on feedback.
- 2 **X** The campus provided minimal evidence that changes/revisions were made based on feedback.
- 1 The campus did not respond to feedback when warranted.

**C. QUESTION: What specific changes on the campus occurred as a result of the CIP?**

Changes on a campus could impact teachers, students, and/or a campus as a whole. Changes impacting teachers directly could be changes in behaviors, instructional strategies, beliefs, and/or interests. Changes to students could include student attitudes, behavior, skills, and ability to acknowledge and address strengths or weaknesses, and/or levels of commitment or performance. Campus-wide changes could include the time spent on the target goal, revisions in the campus schedule, or even altering homework or tutorial policies, etc. A list of all of the potential changes that could occur to teachers, students, and campus in relation to the CPO(s) is unlimited.

- 4 **X** The campus experienced explicit changes resulting from the Campus Improvement Plan that made a clearly positive impact.
- 3 The campus experienced some changes resulting from the Campus Improvement Plan that made a clearly positive impact.
- 2 The campus experienced some changes resulting from Campus Improvement Plan that made an acceptable impact.
- 1 The campus provided no documentation of positive changes as a result of the Campus Improvement Plan.

**D. QUESTION: What steps will the campus take next year to refine the Action Evidences and Evidences of Progress?**

The campus must determine which steps to take the next year to refine the Action Evidences and the Evidences of Progress. The steps could reflect additional steps to enhance this year's CPO(s). Multifaceted and more complex steps could be designed to refine this year's CPO(s), or, the step could be correlated to the curriculum initiative. The step could establish connections between the CPO(s) from this year to the next year. Steps could even be eliminated when not successful.

- 4 The campus has completely outlined specific and constructive steps to refine their Campus Improvement Plan for the coming year.
- 3 **X** The campus has adequately outlined proposed changes to their Campus Improvement Plan for the coming year.
- 2 The campus has partially outlined steps to refine their Campus Improvement Plan for the coming year.
- 1 The campus provided no evidence that steps had been outlined to refine their Campus Improvement Plan for the coming year.

## DWIC EVALUATION OF CIP

Campus Randolph Middle School

Date September 16, 2008

The following responses are based on information provided to the Districtwide Improvement Committee by the Campus Improvement Committee in the annual report.

*Circle the appropriate choice.*

- Yes** The CPO(s) were aligned with the DIG(s).  
**Yes** The CPO(s) are observable and measurable.  
**Yes** The Action Evidences and Evidences of Progress addressed the CPO(s).  
**Yes** The campus developed a goal for drug, alcohol and tobacco prevention/intervention, implemented the goal and achieved the results.  
**Yes** The campus developed a goal for violence prevention/intervention, implemented the goal and achieved the results.  
**Yes** The campus developed a goal for parent involvement, implemented the goal and achieved the results.  
**No** The campus established baseline data, identified the target goal and achieved the target goal for the CPO.

### A. QUESTION: What data has the campus collected (hard and/or soft) to document progress in increased student achievement?

Each campus participating in the Continuous Cycle of Progress, the core of the CIP will collect data (hard and/or soft) to document progress toward increased student achievement. Data will be both formative and summative in nature. This data should be varied to document student progress. Objective data sources include results from TAKS, teacher-made tests, etc. Subjective data sources include a teacher observation checklist, rubric, portfolio, journal, survey, etc. The use of objective data will validate the results of the teams' subjective data. A combination of quantitative and qualitative data would provide the most comprehensive documentation of student progress toward the CPO(s).

- 4 The campus provided extensive observable and measurable data that was completely relevant and appropriate and sufficiently documented increased student achievement related to the CPO(s).
- 3 **X** The campus provided extensive observable and measurable data that was somewhat relevant and appropriate and sufficiently documented progress toward increased student achievement related to the CPO(s).
- 2 The campus provided adequate observable and measurable data that was somewhat relevant and appropriate and/or insufficiently documented progress toward increased student achievement related to the CPO(s).
- 1 The campus provided insufficient documentation to indicate increased student achievement related to the CPO(s).

### B. QUESTION: In what ways did the campus respond to feedback?

In the Continuous Cycle of Progress, feedback is provided at different times and originates from a variety of sources. Teams or individuals, administrators, CIC, and DWIC all engage in feedback in an ongoing and a summative manner. Feedback often recommends adjustments be made while sometimes no changes are needed. A campus continuously monitors and adjusts in order to increase student achievement. The campus teams or individuals can seek input from other staff members on new or more effective strategies/techniques or on ways to document student

progress more efficiently. Teams or individuals might respond by increasing the number of times that student progress is documented. Numerous positive changes can result from these and/or many other divergent actions taken by teams or individuals as a result of feedback.

- 4 **X** The campus responded thoroughly, and clearly documented significant changes (or made no changes) based on feedback.
- 3 The campus responded adequately, and documented moderate changes/revisions based on feedback.
- 2 The campus provided minimal evidence that changes/revisions were made based on feedback.
- 1 The campus did not respond to feedback when warranted.

**C. QUESTION: What specific changes on the campus occurred as a result of the CIP?**

Changes on a campus could impact teachers, students, and/or a campus as a whole. Changes impacting teachers directly could be changes in behaviors, instructional strategies, beliefs, and/or interests. Changes to students could include student attitudes, behavior, skills, and ability to acknowledge and address strengths or weaknesses, and/or levels of commitment or performance. Campus-wide changes could include the time spent on the target goal, revisions in the campus schedule, or even altering homework or tutorial policies, etc. A list of all of the potential changes that could occur to teachers, students, and campus in relation to the CPO(s) is unlimited.

- 4 **X** The campus experienced explicit changes resulting from the Campus Improvement Plan that made a clearly positive impact.
- 3 The campus experienced some changes resulting from the Campus Improvement Plan that made a clearly positive impact.
- 2 The campus experienced some changes resulting from Campus Improvement Plan that made an acceptable impact.
- 1 The campus provided no documentation of positive changes as a result of the Campus Improvement Plan.

**D. QUESTION: What steps will the campus take next year to refine the Action Evidences and Evidences of Progress?**

The campus must determine which steps to take the next year to refine the Action Evidences and the Evidences of Progress. The steps could reflect additional steps to enhance this year's CPO(s). Multifaceted and more complex steps could be designed to refine this year's CPO(s), or, the step could be correlated to the curriculum initiative. The step could establish connections between the CPO(s) from this year to the next year. Steps could even be eliminated when not successful.

- 4 The campus has completely outlined specific and constructive steps to refine their Campus Improvement Plan for the coming year.
- 3 **X** The campus has adequately outlined proposed changes to their Campus Improvement Plan for the coming year.
- 2 The campus has partially outlined steps to refine their Campus Improvement Plan for the coming year.
- 1 The campus provided no evidence that steps had been outlined to refine their Campus Improvement Plan for the coming year.

## DWIC EVALUATION OF CIP

Campus Randolph High School

Date September 16, 2008

The following responses are based on information provided to the Districtwide Improvement Committee by the Campus Improvement Committee in the annual report.

*Circle the appropriate choice.*

- Yes** The CPO(s) were aligned with the DIG(s).  
**Yes** The CPO(s) are observable and measurable.  
**Yes** The Action Evidences and Evidences of Progress addressed the CPO(s).  
**Yes** The campus developed a goal for drug, alcohol and tobacco prevention/intervention, implemented the goal and achieved the results.  
**No** The campus developed a goal for violence prevention/intervention, implemented the goal and achieved the results.  
**Yes** The campus developed a goal for parent involvement, implemented the goal and achieved the results.  
**No** The campus established baseline data, identified the target goal and achieved the target goal for the CPO.

### A. QUESTION: What data has the campus collected (hard and/or soft) to document progress in increased student achievement?

Each campus participating in the Continuous Cycle of Progress, the core of the CIP will collect data (hard and/or soft) to document progress toward increased student achievement. Data will be both formative and summative in nature. This data should be varied to document student progress. Objective data sources include results from TAKS, teacher-made tests, etc. Subjective data sources include a teacher observation checklist, rubric, portfolio, journal, survey, etc. The use of objective data will validate the results of the teams' subjective data. A combination of quantitative and qualitative data would provide the most comprehensive documentation of student progress toward the CPO(s).

- 4 **X** The campus provided extensive observable and measurable data that was completely relevant and appropriate and sufficiently documented increased student achievement related to the CPO(s).  
3 The campus provided extensive observable and measurable data that was somewhat relevant and appropriate and sufficiently documented progress toward increased student achievement related to the CPO(s).  
2 The campus provided adequate observable and measurable data that was somewhat relevant and appropriate and/or insufficiently documented progress toward increased student achievement related to the CPO(s).  
1 The campus provided insufficient documentation to indicate increased student achievement related to the CPO(s).

### B. QUESTION: In what ways did the campus respond to feedback?

In the Continuous Cycle of Progress, feedback is provided at different times and originates from a variety of sources. Teams or individuals, administrators, CIC, and DWIC all engage in feedback in an ongoing and a summative manner. Feedback often recommends adjustments be made while sometimes no changes are needed. A campus continuously monitors and adjusts in order to increase student achievement. The campus teams or individuals can seek input from other staff members on new or more effective strategies/techniques or on ways to document student

progress more efficiently. Teams or individuals might respond by increasing the number of times that student progress is documented. Numerous positive changes can result from these and/or many other divergent actions taken by teams or individuals as a result of feedback.

- 4  The campus responded thoroughly, and clearly documented significant changes (or made no changes) based on feedback.
- 3 The campus responded adequately, and documented moderate changes/revisions based on feedback.
- 2 The campus provided minimal evidence that changes/revisions were made based on feedback.
- 1 The campus did not respond to feedback when warranted.

**C. QUESTION: What specific changes on the campus occurred as a result of the CIP?**

Changes on a campus could impact teachers, students, and/or a campus as a whole. Changes impacting teachers directly could be changes in behaviors, instructional strategies, beliefs, and/or interests. Changes to students could include student attitudes, behavior, skills, and ability to acknowledge and address strengths or weaknesses, and/or levels of commitment or performance. Campus-wide changes could include the time spent on the target goal, revisions in the campus schedule, or even altering homework or tutorial policies, etc. A list of all of the potential changes that could occur to teachers, students, and campus in relation to the CPO(s) is unlimited.

- 4 The campus experienced explicit changes resulting from the Campus Improvement Plan that made a clearly positive impact.
- 3  The campus experienced some changes resulting from the Campus Improvement Plan that made a clearly positive impact.
- 2 The campus experienced some changes resulting from Campus Improvement Plan that made an acceptable impact.
- 1 The campus provided no documentation of positive changes as a result of the Campus Improvement Plan.

**D. QUESTION: What steps will the campus take next year to refine the Action Evidences and Evidences of Progress?**

The campus must determine which steps to take the next year to refine the Action Evidences and the Evidences of Progress. The steps could reflect additional steps to enhance this year's CPO(s). Multifaceted and more complex steps could be designed to refine this year's CPO(s), or, the step could be correlated to the curriculum initiative. The step could establish connections between the CPO(s) from this year to the next year. Steps could even be eliminated when not successful.

- 4 The campus has completely outlined specific and constructive steps to refine their Campus Improvement Plan for the coming year.
- 3  The campus has adequately outlined proposed changes to their Campus Improvement Plan for the coming year.
- 2 The campus has partially outlined steps to refine their Campus Improvement Plan for the coming year.
- 1 The campus provided no evidence that steps had been outlined to refine their Campus Improvement Plan for the coming year.