

**DISTRICTWIDE IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE
SUMMATIVE EVALUATION FOR
RANDOLPH FIELD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
September 27, 2007**

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 student 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 previous superintendent, 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. This process has remained relatively unchanged at the elementary campus, while 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. 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 2006-2007 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 concepts and uses of measurement. Low performing and at-risk students will be reported separately to track their improvement in their measurement skills.

Elementary School

- All students will master Earth Science Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills with attention to low performing and at-risk students.

This report from the Districtwide Improvement Committee marks the completion of 2006-2007 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 2006. 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' Earth Science skills, the students were given quite time devoted to reviewing vocabulary and allowing the children to find and develop their own dictionaries of science terms. Much of the nonfiction text instruction involved earth science concepts. Most of the content area reading instruction was implemented with a science focus.

Randolph Middle School

- In accordance with the middle school Campus Performance Objective to improve the students' measurement skills, the students in sixth and seventh grades achieved success as a result of team efforts to incorporate the use of measurement problems in all core curriculum. For example, choir incorporated measurement skills as measured by the 8th grade music TEKS.

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 had at least one short answer on every test they took this year. They saw the words "support your answer with evidence from the text" over and over. In tenth grade, an increase in student writing performance is attributed to intensive writing tutorials at the start of the school year.

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 1591 on the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT) with the inclusion of a writing component for the second time. As a state Texas scored 1481, and the nation scored 1511. Fifty-six out of a class of 62 (90%) took the SAT. Seniors who took the American College Testing (ACT) exam scored 23.8 while as a state Texas scored 20.5 and the nation scored 21.2.
- ◆ Randolph High School had 100% of the tenth and eleventh graders meet the standard on the social studies section of the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills test. Fifty-four out of 68 (78%) 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 96% meet the standard in science with 60% commended. A rotation based on a specific science strand utilized the expertise of each teacher which impacted student learning and student success on TAKS.
- ◆ 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%). This year not only did 99% of the students meet the standard but 54% of them were commended in writing.
- ◆ Randolph Middle School had 96% of the eighth grade students meet the standard for reading, and 58% 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%).

- ◆ Randolph Middle School has had over 90% of the sixth grade students meet the standard in reading (91%, 96% and 96%) for the last three years and 50% or more have been commended (52%, 50% and 52%).
- ◆ Randolph Field ISD has achieved Adequate Yearly Progress as determined by the standards set by the federal government in No Child Left Behind each year.
- ◆ Randolph Field ISD teachers continue to collaborate together to foster the development of Professional Learning Communities.

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 four of the four components of the rubric (documenting progress with data, responding to feedback, identifying specific changes that occurred as a result of the Campus Performance Objective, and identifying the steps in refining the process).

Randolph Middle School

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

Randolph High School

- The high school was highly successful on one of the four components of the rubric (documenting progress with data).
- In the component responding to feedback, the campus responded adequately and documented moderate changes/revisions based on feedback. The campus experienced some changes that occurred as a result of the Campus Improvement Plan that made a clearly positive impact. The campus took steps that adequately outlined proposed changes to their Campus Improvement Plan. The high school will revise the process to consistently align the procedures towards equalizing the assessment, administration and evaluation of the CPO to make the results more statistically accurate and usable.

Challenges and Next Steps

In 2006-2007, all campuses addressed the challenges and next steps cited in the previous (2005-2006) District Summary Report in these ways:

- **Continuing to refine the reporting data**
The elementary school, the middle school and the high school implemented the use of cohort data collection and reported the data for students who had been in the district all year.
- **Continuing to clarify the changes and revisions that occurred on the feedback from the Campus Improvement Committees and the Districtwide Improvement Committee**
The elementary school, middle school and high school identified the feedback gathered from each team and their responses to that feedback.
- **Continuing to improve the use of technology to facilitate learning**
Teachers are in direct communication with parents and students through their web pages and email.
- **Thoroughly revising and editing the Campus Summary Reports by the Campus Improvement Committees prior to sending those reports to the Districtwide Improvement Committee**
The Campus Improvement Committees took an active role in revising and editing data in the Campus Summary Reports.

Because of the rubric results, the challenges and next steps for the 2007-2008 Continuous Cycle of Progress include the following:

- Improve the reporting of cohort data
- Improve review process of Campus Summary Reports by Campus Improvement Committees prior to sending those reports to the Districtwide Improvement Committee

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 2007-2008.
- All three campuses will continue to collect and report data by cohort groups.

Conclusion

As we complete the twelfth 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 2006-2007 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 2007-2008. We believe that:

“School improvement is most surely and thoroughly achieved when teachers engage in frequent, continuous and increasingly concrete and precise talk about teaching practice...adequate to the complexities of teaching, capable of distinguishing one practice and its virtue from another.”

Judith Warren Little

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 2007-2008.

DWIC EVALUATION OF CIP

Campus Randolph Elementary

Date September 11, 2007

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) 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.

DWIC EVALUATION OF CIP

Campus Randolph Middle School

Date September 11, 2007

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) 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.

DWIC EVALUATION OF CIP

Campus Randolph High School

Date September 11, 2007

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). |
| No | 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 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.