

kid-FRIENDLY Driver Implementation (DI) & Personalized Learning (PL) Maps Cover Page

Instruction: Please provide the information below. Then read "How to use this Document" for further guidance.

School Name:		Self- Assessment Team Members	
District Name:		Name 1:	Name 5:
Person Submitting Form:		Name 2:	Name 6:
Date Submitted:		Name 3:	Name 7:
		Name 4:	Name 8:

How to Use this Document

The kid-FRIENDLY Driver Implementation (DI) and Personalized Learning (PL) Maps were designed as a self-assessment for schools. The first section relates to schools' efforts to understand, participate in, and implement the key drivers (supporting activities, terminology, and performance measures) kid-FRIENDLY created to help schools move toward creating more personalized learning environments. The second section describes characteristics that would manifest themselves (in the learning process, school climate, teachers, and students) as schools are able to create more personalized learning environments.

Please rate your school on each indicator using the 1-5 rating scale provided. See the descriptors below to guide your thinking about each rating level. For each indicator, possible sources of evidence to support your ratings are provided for schools to consider. In the spaces provided, please describe the evidence you used to support your ratings.

Note that for the Personalized Learning (PL) Map in particular, schools are not expected to rate high on every indicator, as each school's chosen innovation will drive the extent to which each indicator is relevant. The 1-5 scale is not meant to identify schools that are implementing personalized learning better or worse; rather, its goal is to show schools where they are currently and where they can go with continued use of their innovation as it relates to personalized learning.

For more detailed information regarding how to use these documents, please refer to the "Manual for School Self-Assessment on the Driver Implementation (DI) and Personalized Learning (PL) Maps (Version 3.0)."

Rating Color Scheme	Map	Rating Definition
5 Sustaining	DI	A school that has embraced the grant supports associated with the driver to the extent that, even when the grant supports end, the school will continue a sustainable effort to pursue the dimensions of personalized learning connected to the driver.
	PL	A school where there is a firm, shared commitment to the principles and practices of personalized learning. The learning process, climate, and actions and attitudes of teachers and students consistently reflect this commitment. Structures and practices that support personalized learning are central to the school's vision and persist even through changes in leadership and teaching personnel.
4 Scaling Up	DI	A school where there is a widespread commitment to driver implementation. Key participants in the driver are beginning to influence others in the school to adopt the principles and practices associated with the driver's goals. Pockets of inconsistency linger, and there is risk changes in leadership or teaching personnel could jeopardize sustainability of efforts.
	PL	A school where there is a widespread commitment to the principles and practices of personalized learning. The learning process, climate, and actions and attitudes of teachers and students mostly reflect this commitment. Pockets of inconsistency linger, and there is risk changes in leadership or teaching personnel could jeopardize the sustainability of personalization efforts.
3 Implementing	DI	Where a school is when it has begun utilizing some key grant supports and is starting to understand the rationale for the driver, but there is limited understanding of how it links to personalized learning or how its impact might be measured.
	PL	A school where personalized learning has become a priority. Key teacher and administrative leaders are engaged in shifting the learning process and climate toward structures and practices that align with personalized learning. Teachers still maintain a largely directive role in the learning process and practices are not consistently implemented across the school.
2 Starting	DI	A school where stakeholders are just beginning to learn about the driver and some individual teachers or staff members are engaged with the grant supports associated with the driver on a limited basis, largely in isolation from one another.
	PL	A school where stakeholders are just beginning to learn about personalized learning and individual teachers engage in limited experimentation with personalized learning, largely in isolation from other teachers.
1 Continuing Status Quo	DI	Where a school might be if it never participated in the kid-FRIENDLY grant, or where all schools might have been at the beginning of Year 1 of the grant.
	PL	A school where stakeholders are largely unfamiliar with the concept of personalized learning.

kid · FRIENDLY Driver Implementation (DI) Map

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

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

EVIDENCE

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

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

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

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

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

kid ·FRIENDLy Personalized Learning (PL) Map

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Personalized Learning Map Development Resources

References Cited

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

Bibliography (Additional Sources Consulted)

- Aronson, J., Fried, C. B., & Good, C. (2002). Reducing the effects of stereotype threat on African Americans college students by shaping theories of intelligence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 38*, 113-125. doi: 10.1006/jesp.2001.1491
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Journal of Psychological Inquiry, 11* (4), 227-268.
- Dohrmann, K. R., Nishida, T. K., Gartner, A., Lipsky, D. K., & Grimm, K. J. (2007). High school outcomes for students in a public Montessori program. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 22* (2), 205-217.
- Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist, 41*, 1040-1048.
- Dweck, C. S. (2012). Mindsets and human nature: Promoting change in the Middle East, the schoolyard, the racial divide, and willpower. *American Psychologist, 67*, 614-622. doi: 10.1037/a0029783
- Dweck, C. S. (2015, September 22). Carol Dweck revisits the "growth mindset." *Education Week, 35*, pp. 20, 24.
- Eyrie, H. L. (2007). Keller's personalized system of instruction: Was it a fleeting fancy or is there a revival on the horizon? *The Behavior Analyst Today, 8*, 317-324.
- Green River Region Educational Cooperative. (2012). *kid-FRIENDly (Kids Focused, Responsible, Imaginative, Engaged, and Determined to Learn) Learning Project Proposal (RTT-D)*. Bowling Green, KY: Author.
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (2011). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Knowledge Works. (n.d.). *A glimpse into the future of learning* [infographic]. Retrieved from http://knowledgeworks.org/sites/default/files/A-Glimpse-into-the-Future-of-Learning-Infographic_0.pdf
- Kulik, J. A., Kulik, C. C., & Cohen, P. A. (1979). A meta-analysis of outcome studies of Keller's personalized system of instruction. *American Psychologist, 34*, 307-318.
- Lillard, A., & Else-Quest, N. (2006). Evaluating Montessori education. *Science, New Series, 313*, 1893-1894.
- Ljungman, A.G., & Silén, C. (2008). Examination involving students as peer examiners. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*, 289-300. doi: 10.1080/02602930701293306
- Loyens, S. M. M., Magda, J., & Rikers, R. M. J. P. (2008). Self-directed learning in problem-based learning and its relationships with self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychology Review, 20*, 411-427. doi: 10.1007/s10648-008-9082-7
- Meece, J. L., Anderman, E. M., & Anderman, L. H. (2006). Classroom goal structure, student motivation, and academic achievement. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56*, 487-503. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070258
- Mitra, S., & Rana, V. (2001). Children and the internet: Experiments with minimally invasive education in India. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 32*, 221-232.
- Ornstein, A., C. (1994). The textbook-driven curriculum. *Peabody Journal of Education, 69*, 70-85.
- Ratunde, K., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2005). The social context of middle school: Teachers, friends, and activities in Montessori and traditional school environments. *The Elementary School Journal, 106* (1), 59-79.
- Reeve, J., & Halusic, M. (2009). How k-12 teachers can put self-determination theory principles into practice. *Theory and Research in Education, 7*, 145-154. doi: 10.1177/1477878509104319

- Richardson, M., Abraham, C., & Bond, R. (2012). Psychological correlates of university students' academic performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *138*, 353-387. doi: 10.1037/a0026838
- Schmidt, H. G., Rotgans, J. I., & Yew, E. H. (2011). The process of problem-based learning: What works and why. *Medical Education*, *45*, 792-806. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.2011.04035.x
- School in the Cloud. (2014). *Introduction to self-organized learning* . Retrieved from <https://www.theschoolinthecloud.org/library/resources/introduction-to-self-organized-learning>
- Sheroff, D. J. (2013). *Optimal learning environment to promote student engagement* . New York, NY: Springer.
- Sheroff, D.J., Csikszentmihalyi, M., Schneider, B., & Sheroff, E. S. (2003). Student engagement in high school classrooms from the perspective of flow theory. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *18* , 158-176.

