

# Archived Information

## Interim Evaluation of the Appalachia Educational Laboratory

### **I. Brief Overview of Laboratory**

The Appalachian Educational Laboratory (AEL) has a lengthy history dating back to 1966. The panel conducting the Interim evaluation of the Lab first reviewed extensive written documentation and then visited the Lab over five days, April 12-16, 1999, to conduct extensive interviews. Combined with the written documentation, the five days of interviews illuminated major initiatives at the Lab. Sufficient documentation and insights were provided to address the key evaluation questions presented by OERI. A special note of recognition and thanks is due Decision Information Resources, Inc. which effectively made strategic decisions in arranging materials and the on-site visit.

### **II. Implementation and Management**

#### **A. To what extent is the REL doing what they were approved to do during the first three contract years?**

##### **1. Strengths**

Laboratory operations exceed expectations. A major strength of AEL is the leadership of the Executive Director whose tenure spans much of the Lab's lifetime. He has unusual support from a very involved Board of Directors. In a very convincing way the Director and the Board agree as one that the mission of REL is coterminous with the mission of AEL. In practice this means that REL's priorities are first established, then decisions regarding the allocation of resources from throughout AEL are made to address REL's mission.

One manifestation of effective leadership is that AEL's evolving and dynamic contracted

work has generally been executed in a timely manner. AEL's broad vision of service to the region often motivates revisions and extensions of programs which extends far beyond formally contracted terms.

Several elements of the organizational structure are critical to making certain that resources converge on a functional basis, resulting in support for REL initiatives across and external to AEL. All of REL's key programs report to a single individual, the Program Leader. Thus, coordination across programs can be facilitated on a daily basis. REL's Program Leaders join with Directors throughout AEL as a member of the decision-making Corporate Leadership Group (CLG) headed by the Executive Director. In this manner coordination of programs across AEL, with REL initiatives as a priority, are facilitated. Further, a recent structure being implemented places a Resident Director in each affected state, who meet monthly as a group.

The organizational structure also includes a Policy Staff which target services to key statewide policymakers to assist them in decisionmaking. Services and products involve both publications based on requests and needs, along with the convening of policymakers in various state or multi-state meetings. Since AEL is viewed as neutral and impartial on educational issues, this group serves an indispensable function.

The Scaling-Up Project disseminates both products and selected training. Some items, such as *Family Connections* and the *ABCs of Parent Involvement in Education*, have been disseminated broadly, both within and the region and nationally.

Relating to needs of the area is a singular strength of AEL; this was reflected convincingly in an interview with AEL's Board of Directors. Upon request, AEL provided independent information to help the State of Tennessee address a dispute between independent and public schools. AEL has assisted the Tennessee State Department of Education in the analysis of relevant data. In Tennessee

only hard copies of the curriculum frameworks were available until AEL provided access o the Internet. There is the prospect that AEL will devise strategies in Virginia to assist children of the incarcerated. All of these instances of assistance are in addition to the more well known major efforts: response to the request from the Commissioner of Education in Tennessee to provide direct assistance to Hancock County; and interactions with policymakers in Kentucky to undertake an extended study of the effects of KERA in selected districts.

The high degree of customer satisfaction is noted in evaluations and surveys pertaining to particular programs, and in the overall evaluations conducted by Western Michigan University, which notes, “There is a very high level of satisfaction with practically all characteristics of information/materials/products received by AEL” (L.B-11). There were no responses during the extensive interviews which contradicted this basic position.

There is considerable evidence of AEL’s effective partnering with other labs. Ideas for various Quest initiatives, including “Data-for-a-Day,” were learned from the NWREL.

The networks and partnerships which AEL has established within the region, both formal and informal, are so ubiquitous that they defy easy description or definition. The Lab views state and regional networking and partnering as the essence of its daily business.

## **2. Areas of needed improvement**

There are some emphases of OERI which do not appear as high priorities within AEL:

\*National Recognition, Research, and Presentations. At AEL there are few incentives from the central administration and some possible disincentives to publish in refereed journals and present at diverse national meetings. Nothing should compromise AEL’s unmistakable and invaluable commitment to serve its region well. Yet, in doing so there are exemplary models and practices being developed which should be shared more broadly.

\*Internal Coordination and Collaboration among programs. The CLG and Resident Directors provide an agency-wide structure to ensure coordination of initiatives within AEL. After considerable discussion, it became apparent that communication across programs occurs in informal conversations, seminars organized by the Rural Center, the organization of program officers and resident directors, and the newly formed “Learning Laboratory.” Nevertheless, in repeated interviews questions were posed regarding collaboration among programs in Hancock County and Fayetteville, TN, the Quest initiative, KERA, and others. With some exceptions, the interfaces among programs which occurred were serendipitous rather than by design.

### **3. Recommendations for improvement**

\*While maintaining its commendable traditional focus, AEL should maintain a more balanced portfolio by providing special incentives for staff to achieve greater recognition for major programs by making national presentations and publishing in refereed journals.

\*Specific steps should be taken to realize the potential of the newly formed “Learning Laboratory” and seminars organized by the Rural Center. Specifically, in order to encourage the dissemination of useful insights and best practices, teams working on particular projects should periodically report to the general group in a manner which engenders interactive discussion and follow up.

## **B. To what extent is the REL using a self-monitoring process to plan and adapt activities in response to feedback and customer needs?**

### **1. Strengths**

AEL’s formal organization for monitoring is reasonable and effective. The Program Leader, who reports to the Executive Director, also heads the R&D Evaluation Office. This facilitates the allocation of R&D resources across programs as needed. The R&D staff emphasizes their service role

to program managers who have the broader responsibility of ensuring overall evaluation. There is also a long-standing evaluative/monitoring role performed by the research center at Western Michigan University (WMU). WMU focuses on institutional surveys and reports, which are negotiated annually with AEL staff. A “Client Survey” and a meta-evaluation of AEL’s internal evaluations are conducted annually. The studies done under auspices of R&D are tailored to meet particular needs of respective programs. These are generally based on or involve participant observations and provide useful feedback to program managers. Some notable examples of effective self monitoring and adaptation of activities in response to feedback and customer needs are indicated under “strengths” above (see. pp.1-3): Hancock County where the Teaching/Learning/Mapping Strategy was produced through extensive communications between AEL, the TN SDE and officials of Hancock County; KERA, planned from the inception by and for policymakers in Kentucky; and Quest, uniquely and singularly driven by the “constructivist” commitment that affected communities, enabled by AEL, will help shape their own goals and solutions. Self-monitoring and feedback is a common theme throughout AEL's evaluations, studies and reports, conducted both internally and externally. Considerable attention is given to developing programs on an interactive needs assessment basis.

There is ample documentation specific to varied programs indicating ongoing interactions and feedback with users. There is further documentation from evaluations, materials distributed, website hits, and attendance at varied meetings to indicate usefulness and use by “customers.” The Board of Directors and users of varied programs, positioned to be highly sensitive to customer needs, uniformly praised the staff for its sensitive attention to users.

AEL meets and exceeds reasonable expectations in tailoring program activities to meet customer needs.

## **2. Areas of needed improvement**

\*Clearer articulation is needed in some instances between the findings in formal recommendations and use by program staff. When relevant, this articulation should be shared across programs.

\*AEL needs to adopt a broader definition of “customer,” to include, especially in key areas, a national as well as a regional audience.

\*Coordinated monitoring across programs would allow AEL to more effectively serve customers by broadening the range from which best practices could be adapted.

### **3. Recommendations for improvement**

\*Attention should be given to the articulation between findings in formal recommendations and use by program staff.

\*AEL needs to be more sensitive to its responsibilities to national customers.

\*Existing strengths and procedures should be oriented to ensure meaningful communication of ideas and models across projects.

## **III. Quality**

### **To what extent is the REL developing high quality products and services?**

#### **1. Strengths**

Across its many programs and initiatives, the strengths of AEL cannot be easily summarized. All of the documents and conversations, during diverse interviews, both with staff and a range of users, made clear AEL’s abiding dedication to advance teaching and learning within the context of Appalachia’s educational and cultural environment. This commitment manifests itself in attitudes and understandings as well as more formal programs and initiatives. Outcomes are equally

obvious and equally subtle.

Within the region, AEL is developing products of unusual high quality. Quest is a prime example. Prior to the on-site visitation and during the initial interviews with Quest personnel, no member of the review panel had a clear and positive view of Quest, notwithstanding the obvious confidence that pervaded written materials and presentations. The word “Quest,” combined with other descriptors such as “rainbow,” “rally,” “co-venture,” “co-create,” “SMART learner,” and “participative assessment” connoted, it appeared, fuzziness of language likely produced by fuzziness of thought. Fortunately and insightfully, the Quest staff scheduled a range of interviews with representatives from affected schools and communities in order that the panel could directly assess impact on users.

These interviews provided meaning and clarity. Each school, in every state was being held accountable for traditional academic achievement. Quest has enabled them first by enlarging the meaning of learning beyond traditional testing, and further by assisting in building learning communities around respective goals and objectives. A variety of schools used the Quest-inspired “SMART learner” concept as motivational themes at school assemblies, in classes, at extracurricular activities, and as conversational topics. The view that students should be meaningfully involved in educational decision-making has encouraged a number of schools to organize parent/teacher conferences that are led by students. Uniformly, schools reported a much greater interest and involvement among parents in school affairs. At one school participation was elevated from 50 per cent to approximately 90 percent. At a high school the empowering of students led to creation of a new student newspaper to which parents, teachers, and students contribute.

In some instances Quest serves as a conduit of good ideas which had origins in other reform efforts. The “Data-for-a-Day” initiative, which engages systemic school teams in assessing goals, was

transported from the NW REL's School Change collaborative program. For one school, writing portfolios was influenced by a project with which Quest is associated in Kentucky. Creating "microsocieties," adopted with Quest assistance by some schools, is a concept that has national currency.

Across the schools there was a strong consensus that Quest was enlarging the meaning of learning, concurrent with setting the stage for higher levels of student achievement.

AEL's KERA studies constitute another area of demonstrable strength. The panel was informed about KERA through expansive documentation, ample opportunities to converse with relevant staff, focused discussions with members of the peer review panel which advises the AEL researchers, and a brief, yet insightful conversation with statewide policy representatives, each of whom had played key roles in the development of KERA since its inception.

AEL's attention to KERA since 1990 spans the lifetime of this seminal statewide systemic effort. The evolution of AEL's studies also parallels the evolution of the reform effort: attention during the first five years to process associated with the emphasis on primary grades and the accountability system; and growing emphasis subsequently to attaining the content and infrastructure essential to achieve and sustain reform.

The KERA studies have constituted a natural signature focus for AEL's Rural Specialty and general rural setting. A supporting rationale was the inadequate attention being given nationally to research on rural education issues. A peer review panel, which reviews documents and meets annually, has effectively advised the AEL staff on research topics and directions.

At both the statewide and local levels the singular impact of AEL's KERA studies has been dramatic. Perceptions of AEL are differentiated from other research and study done on KERA in two related and important respects. First, AEL's approach is longitudinal, and as a consequence there

is a sequence to the research which parallels the implementation of KERA; and second, AEL is more knowledgeable and caring about the local area. Further, AEL's research is federally supported, which conveys an aura of independence that would be difficult for research sponsored by the Kentucky State Department of Education to achieve. Finally, the direct commitment of AEL is to provide information through the KERA studies that will address questions and issues relevant to policymakers at the state and district levels. These factors combined establish a widespread ambience of acceptance.

The Chair of the Kentucky State Board of Education noted that the Board had become more data driven in its decisionmaking. AEL has provided relevant quantitative and qualitative information which has enhanced the Board's consideration and resolution of issues. In some instances the impact on decisionmaking has been more direct. Apparently, AEL's report on positive attributes of Family Resource Centers helped influence their continuance by the state legislature. Several policy representatives praised the "staying power" and "objectivity" of AEL in addressing research questions. Policymakers also lauded AEL's role as a broker with OERI during early years of KERA, when adjustments in relations were required.

AEL has taken care to satisfy the widespread interest in their KERA findings. Information has been disseminated through hard copy and over websites throughout the region and beyond. Presentations at national meetings include AAAS and AERA, and an article has recently been submitted for publication to the Journal of Rural Education.

The Rural Center is envisioned as a broad and flexible ideal toward which AEL is evolving. The Rural Specialty and ERIC/CRESS are identified as delimited initiatives within the Rural Center. The Rural Center has effectively bridged the Annenberg and ARSI efforts in furthering initiatives related to community engagement. Insights from Quest's focus on school change has been used to further school improvement in Virginia. The Rural Center maintains an array of relations with national

organizations, including NREA, Foxfire, AASA, AAESA, and AERA. Two staff serve as editors on reputable journals, and a recent addition to the staff has exercised leadership in developing three grant proposals. Clearly the Rural Center has a national presence and identity.

The Hancock County Project joins other AEL efforts like KERA, CSRD, and Policy Studies in the distinctive and careful tailoring of products and services to meet state and regional needs. In this effort AEL, with full collaboration of the Tennessee State Commissioner, and stakeholders at district and school levels, is fully embedded in the effort to elevate the level of attainment of a low performing school.

The relationship of AEL to respective states regarding implementation of the CSRD program has been exemplary. Independent conversations with representatives of the SEA's from Kentucky and Tennessee confirmed observations of the AEL staff. AEL has tailored its technical assistance not only to the respective stages of SEA development regarding CSRD, but also of schools directly affected: those preparing for competition, those successful, as well as those who initially did not succeed in the competition.

## **2. Areas of Needed Improvement**

### **Quest**

- The program should include a fuller, more attractive description which includes the actual impact at school and community levels.
- There should be broader dissemination of Quest ideas outside of AEL's service area.
- Quest should supplement the insightful internal evaluations with a comprehensive external review.

## **KERA**

There are varying perspectives among the peer review panel regarding the degree to which the rural community setting and culture distinctively influences systemic school reform. Approaches to KERA research would profit from a common sense approach which recognizes commonalties and distinctions across geographic boundaries and efforts to build learning communities. Other initiatives at AEL could profit as

- KERA offers AEL a singularly opportune prospect for greater national recognition. The KERA staff **indicates** current plans to be more aggressive in this regard.
- Policy representatives interviewed uniformly recommended that continuing AEL studies adopt a “holistic” approach to systemic reform issues.
- Policy representatives uniformly value the continuation of AEL’s KERA studies and research beyond the current funding period

## **The Rural Center**

- Considerable discussion focused on the meaning of national recognition and leadership in relation to AEL’s history, foci, and responsibilities to OERI. A shift toward greater emphasis on national presentations, publications in refereed journals, and more visible leadership in selected areas appear warranted. In order to provide a more balanced portfolio involving practice and research, the pendulum needs to swing more toward national recognition, though not too aggressively.
- This reviewer departed the AEL review without a satisfactory understanding of the Rural Center and Specialty within the context of AEL’s range of responsibilities. The basic problem may be the nature of contractual obligations pertaining to programs, combined with the predisposition of programs to operate on a territorial basis. In any case, it appears unreasonable for the Center and other programs with rural foci to operate largely independently of each other.

## **The Hancock County Project**

Strategies for evaluation should reflect the reality that, ultimately, the success or failure of this project will be judged based on whether students over time perform at higher levels on state and

national tests.

### **The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRSD) Program**

Within the AEL region, the requirements for school eligibility in CSRSD necessitates a focus on rural schools. CSRSD should, therefore, be highly coordinated with other AEL programs which have rural foci.

### **3. Recommendations for Improvement**

#### **Quest**

- The Quest staff needs to prepare a clearer definition of the program that includes the actual impact at school and community levels.
- Quest should be less insular regarding the dissemination of its ideas. Poor rural communities across the nation can learn considerably from successful efforts to build learning communities. Other initiatives at AEL could profit as well.
- To the extent possible, greater emphasis should be placed on presentations at national meetings and research in refereed journals.
- Quest would profit from a comprehensive external review.

#### **KERA**

- It is essential that KERA researchers attain a higher degree of national visibility through presentations at national meetings and research in refereed journals.
- In the next stages of its planned research, AEL should emphasize a “wholistic” approach to systemic reform consistent with stated needs of policymakers. The “next steps” indicated by the KERA researchers point in this direction.
- Through federal and/or private funds AEL should find a way to strengthen and continue its KERA research since AEL’s sustained effort can provide unique perspectives for Kentucky and the nation.
- Approaches to KERA research would profit from a common sense approach which recognizes commonalties and distinctions across geographic boundaries.

### **The Rural Center**

- Without doing harm to its meritorious regional focus, the Rural Center should place increased emphasis on national leadership in selected aspects of its specialty: through increased national presentations, publications in refereed journals, and overall visibility in selected areas.
- AEL should carefully explore ways to achieve greater integration of initiatives centered within the Rural Center with other initiatives which have rural foci at AEL.

### **The Hancock County Project**

Longitudinal plans for evaluation should include strategies to compare the performance of students from the beginning of the project through selected stages of development.

### **The Comprehensive School Demonstration (CSRD) Program**

Maximal attention should be given to ensure meaningful interactions between CSRD, the Rural Center, and other AEL programs which have rural foci.

## **IV. Utility**

### **A. To what extent are the products and services provided by the Laboratory useful to and used by customers?**

#### **1. Strengths**

Within respective states, the region, and in many instances the nation, the Laboratory is performing at a level which meets or exceeds expectations in making products and services useful to and used by customers (see above, pp. 1-11, and 14-16). In providing products and services beyond the region, AEL is operating at a level which in some instances barely meets expectations (see above, pp. 2-4, 10, and 11-14)

## **2. Areas of needed improvement**

There are areas of improvement needed to make services and products more useful to customers (see above, pp. 3-4, 6, and 11-15)

## **3. Recommendations for improvement**

Recommendations to improve the use of services and products include a variety of matters (see above, pp. 3-4, 6, and 11-16).

### **B. To what extent is the REL focused on customer needs?**

#### **1. Strengths**

In its operations and signature initiatives and other programs, the AEL far exceeds expectations in providing products and services which focus on consumer needs (see above, pp. 1-11, and 15).

#### **2. Areas of needed improvement**

AEL could improve its focus on customer needs within and external to the region in a variety of ways (see above, pp. 3-4, and 11-16).

#### **3. Recommendations for improvement**

Recommendations for AEL to improve its services and products to customers span a variety of areas (see above, pp. 3-4, and 11-16).

## **V. Outcomes and Impact**

### **A. To what extent is the REL's work contributing to improved student success, particularly in intensive implementation sites?**

#### **1. Strengths**

All of AEL's major initiatives may be viewed as contributing to improved student success. None of them, however, can directly document a cause and effect relationship. The reasons vary. All of AEL's initiatives, such as QUEST, KERA, Hancock County, CSRD, and the Rural Specialty, are collaborative efforts with states, districts, schools, and communities. Even where increased student success may result, the issue of attribution is unclear and in many cases uncertain. In the case of KERA, additional attention to student achievement is planned in forthcoming impact studies. Some initiatives are too young to have significantly impacted student achievement. Nevertheless, in light of the research basis for the AEL initiatives, their efforts in this arena are rated as exceeding expectations (see above, pp. 1-11, and 15).

#### **2. Areas of needed improvement**

In evaluations and studies, greater emphasis on student outcomes would illuminate the degree of progress respective programs are attaining toward their ultimate goals of AEL's initiatives.

#### **3. Recommendations for improvement**

In a timely and appropriate manner, AEL should evaluate student outcomes for all of its major initiatives.

**B. To what extent does the Laboratory assist states and localities to implement comprehensive school improvement strategies?**

**1. Strengths**

Assisting states and localities to implement comprehensive school improvement strategies represents the heart and soul of AEL's mission and daily activities (see above, pp. 1-11, and 15). The Lab meets and exceeds expectations in this area.

**2. Areas of needed improvement**

AEL could assist states and localities to implement comprehensive school improvement strategies in ways specific to the various programs (see above, pp. 1-11, and 15).

**3. Recommendations for improvement**

Recommendations to improve AEL's assistance to states and localities parallel the areas identified for needed improvement (see above, pp. 1-11, and 15).

**C. To what extent has the REL made progress in establishing a regional and national reputation in its specialty area?**

**1. Strengths**

In a variety of ways specific to Lab operations and programs, AEL has exceeded expectations by establishing a significant regional reputation (see above, pp. 1-11, and 15).

**2. Areas of needed improvement**

AEL should give additional attention to enhancing its national reputation in various ways (see above, pp. 3-4, 6, and 11-13).

**3. Recommendations for improvement**

Ways recommended for AEL to enhance its national reputation parallel the areas identified for needed improvement (see above, pp. 3-4, 6, and 11-13).

## **VI. Overall Evaluation of Total Laboratory Programs, Products and Services**

Across its many programs and initiatives, the strengths of AEL cannot be easily summarized. All of the documents and conversations, during diverse interviews, both with staff and a range of users, made clear AEL's abiding dedication to advance teaching and learning within the context of Appalachia's educational and cultural environment. This commitment manifests itself in attitudes and understandings as well as more formal programs and initiatives. Outcomes are both equally obvious and equally subtle.

A major strength of AEL is its leadership team, headed by the Executive Director whose tenure spans much of the Lab's lifetime. He and his staff have unqualified support from a very committed and involved Board of Directors. In a consequential way the Executive Director and the Board agree as one that the mission of the REL is coterminous with the mission of AEL. In practice this means that that REL's priorities are first established, then decisions regarding the allocation of resources throughout AEL are made to address the REL's mission.

One manifestation of effective leadership is that AEL's evolving and dynamic contracted work has generally been executed in a timely manner. AEL's broad vision of service to the region often motivates extensions and expansions of initiatives that extend far beyond formal contracts.

Within the region AEL is developing and making available products and services of unusual high quality. Quest is a prime example. Though the impact at local levels was not clear to reviewers either from advanced documentation or from conversations with Quest staff, interviews with local representatives, including administrators, teachers, students, and parents, made clear that each school, in every state was being held accountable by local authorities for traditional academic achievement. Quest has enabled these schools and communities, first by enlarging the meaning of learning beyond traditional testing, and further by assisting in building learning communities around respective goals

and objectives. Across the schools, there was a strong consensus, ultimately shared by reviewers, that Quest was enlarging the meaning of learning, concurrent with setting the stage for higher levels of student achievement.

The KERA studies have constituted a natural signature focus for AEL's Rural Specialty and general rural setting. A supporting rationale for the focus of the KERA study was the inadequate attention being given nationally to research on rural education issues. A national peer review panel, which peruses relevant documents and meets annually, has effectively advised the AEL staff on research topics and directions. At both the statewide and local levels, the singular impact of AEL's KERA studies within Kentucky has been dramatic. Policymakers differentiate AEL research and study done on KERA from that of national researchers in two related and important respects: first, AEL's approach is longitudinal, and as a consequence there is a sequence to the research which parallels the implementation of KERA; and second, AEL is more knowledgeable and caring about the local area. Further, AEL's research is federally supported, which conveys an aura of independence that would be difficult for research sponsored by the Kentucky SDE to achieve. Finally, the direct commitment of AEL is to provide information through the KERA studies that will address questions and issues relevant to policymakers at the state and district levels. These factors combined establish a widespread ambience of acceptance.

The careful and distinctive tailoring of products and services to meet state and regional needs, amply manifested in the QUEST and KERA initiatives, were found as well in other initiatives examined, including the Rural Specialty, assistance to Hancock County, the CSRD, and Policy Studies.

Recommendations regarding areas identified for improvement should be considered in perspective of this reviewer's overall high evaluation of AEL.

- In some areas there is a need for sharper clarity and definition: Quest, in relation to its involvement and impact on local levels; the Rural Specialty, in relation to other initiatives with rural foci at AEL; and the Scaling-Up Project, involving a distinction between information dissemination from the actual institutionalization of reforms in classrooms and schools previously unaffected.
- AEL should recognize that no dichotomy has to exist between effectively serving the region while achieving a higher degree of national recognition. The seeds have already been planted with a recent addition to the staff of the Rural Center and the consideration by CSRD of developing rural models which may provide additional national demonstration options. CSRD, in particular, concomitantly challenges AEL's claim to rural distinctiveness and national leadership. If there is a vacuum in national leadership and rural models, why should AEL not stake its claims?
- AEL provides a variety of initiatives that embody systemic orientations to reform. There are formal structures, including corporate retreats, seminars sponsored by the Rural Center, an organization of program officers, and the recently established "Learning Laboratory," combined with informal habits and a general collaborative spirit which encourage communication across programs. Nevertheless, program officers in their presentations rarely attributed ideas and strategies employed to other internal programs. It is logically inconsistent for systemic programs, which focus on a predominately rural clientele, to coexist in proximity, yet operate largely independently of each other. The "Learning Laboratory," the organization of program officers, and the seminars organized by the Rural Center all provide the needed opportunities. These should be used more systematically to ensure that effective "lessons learned" are disseminated throughout AEL.

## **VII. Broad Summary of Strengths, Areas for Improvement, and Strategies for Improvement**

See Section VI above