

Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP)

Rationale

School improvement efforts are a collaborative process involving multiple stakeholders. Through the improvement planning process, leaders focus on priority needs, funding, and closing achievement gaps among identified subgroups of students. When implemented with fidelity, the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) cultivates an environment that promotes student growth and achievement.

While the focus of continuous improvement is student performance, the work must be guided by the aspects of teaching and learning that affect performance. An effective improvement process should address the contributing factors creating the learning environment (inputs) and the performance data (outcomes). Through the Needs Assessment for Schools, priorities were identified and processes, practices, and/or conditions were chosen for focus. This goal building template will assist your improvement team to address those priorities and outline your targets and the activities intended to produce the desired changes. Progress monitoring details will ensure that your plan is being reviewed regularly to determine the success of each strategy.

Please note that the objectives (short-term targets) set by your school under the Achievement Gap section of this planning template will be used by the district's superintendent to determine whether or not your school met its targets to reduce the gap in student achievement for any student group for two consecutive years as required by KRS 158.649. Likewise, operational definitions for each required planning component can be found on page 2 of the planning template.

For those schools operating a Title I Schoolwide Program, this plan meets the requirements of Section 1114 of the Every Student Succeeds Act as well as state requirements under 703 KAR 5:225. **No separate Schoolwide Program Plan is required.**

Requirements for Building an Improvement Plan

- The required school goals include the following:
 - For elementary/middle school, these include proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, and, growth.
 - For high school, these include proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, graduation rate, and transition readiness.

Explanations/Directions

Goal: Schools should determine long-term goals that are three to five year targets for each required school level indicator. Elementary/middle schools must address proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, and growth. High schools must address proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, graduation rate, and transition readiness. Long-term targets should be informed by The Needs Assessment for Schools.

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p>Schools should determine short-term objectives to be attained by the end of the current academic year. There can be multiple objectives for each goal.</p> | <p>Describe your approach to systematically address a process, practice, or condition that was identified as a priority during the Needs Assessment for Schools. There can be multiple strategies for each objective. The strategy can be based upon Kentucky's six (6) Key Core Work Processes or another established improvement approach (i.e. <i>Six Sigma, Shipley, Baldrige, etc.</i>).</p> | <p>Describe the actionable steps that will occur to deploy the chosen strategy. There can be multiple activities for each strategy.</p> | <p>List the criteria that will gauge the impact of your work. The measures may be quantitative or qualitative but are observable in some way. Consider measures of input as well as outcomes for both staff and students.</p> | <p>Describe the process used to assess the implementation of the plan, the rate of improvement, and the effectiveness of the plan. Your description should include the artifacts to be reviewed, specific timelines, and responsible individuals.</p> | <p>List the funding source(s) used to support (or needed to support) the improvement initiative. If your school is a recipient of Title I, Part A funds, your CSIP serves as your annual plan and should indicate how Title I funds are utilized to carry out the planned activities.</p> |

1: Proficiency

| Goal 1 (State your proficiency goal.): Increase the percentages students scoring proficient in reading from 47% in 2021 to 57% in 2024 and increase the math proficiency from 19.4% in 2021 to 45% in 2024. | | | | | |
|---|---|---|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
| Objective 1: Increase KPREP reading proficiency from 47% to 51% in 2022 | KCWP2: ensure high quality instructional program; evidence-based instructional strategies. | Ensure congruency between standards, learning targets, and assessment measures. | Backward Design Document | Check by revised instructional units; review during department PLCs with Instructional Coach | District for Instructional Coach |
| | | Incorporate “One More Think” strategies into instructional activities, formative and summative assessments. | Friday Department PLCs meetings | Check by lesson plans; common formative and summative assessments; review by Instructional Coach and principals | District funds for Instructional Coach |
| | KCWP4: Ensure uniform and reliable and valid ways of examining and interpreting data; teachers’ appropriate use of formative, summative, and benchmark data to determine priorities for individual student success. | Create and monitor a “watch list” for special education students performing below proficiency in reading. | Individual teacher lists | Updated quarterly; data days | |
| | | Use classroom assessment data to inform teacher’s instructional decisions and implement differentiation. | Department PLCs and lesson plans | Department PLCs and lesson plans | District funds for Instructional Coach |
| | | | | | |
| Objective 2: Increase KPREP math proficiency from 19.4 to 22 % in 2022. | KCWP2: ensure high quality instructional program; evidence-based instructional strategies | Ensure congruency between standards, learning targets, and assessment measures. | Backward Design Document | Check by revised instructional units; review during department PLCs with Instructional Coach | District for Instructional Coach |
| | | Incorporate “One More Think” strategies into instructional activities, formative and summative assessments. | Friday Department PLCs meetings | Check by lesson plans; common formative and summative assessments; review by Instructional Coach and principals | District funds for Instructional Coach |
| | KCWP4: Ensure uniform and reliable and valid ways of examining and interpreting data; teachers’ appropriate | Ensure item analysis methods are occurring during PLCs to evaluate instructional effectiveness and determine if instructional | Department PLC meetings | Check by common summative assessments; GRADE Cam item analysis; review by Instructional coach and principals. | District funds for Instructional Coach; SBDM funds for GRADE Cam. |

Goal 1 (State your proficiency goal.): Increase the percentages students scoring proficient in reading from 47% in 2021 to 57% in 2024 and increase the math proficiency from 19.4% in 2021 to 45% in 2024.

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|-----------|---|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|
| | use of formative, summative, and benchmark data to determine priorities for individual student success. | adjustments are needed, and if so, what those adjustments are. | | | |
| | | Create and monitor a “watch list” for special education students performing below proficiency in math. | Individual teacher lists | Updated quarterly; data days | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

2: Separate Academic Indicator

| Goal 2 (State your separate academic indicator goal.): Increase proficiency in science from 19.6 in 2021 to 28.4 in 2024. Increase proficiency in writing from 62.8 to 75% in 2024. | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---------|
| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
| Objective 1: Increase KPREP Science proficiency from 19.6 to 21% IN 2022. | KCWP3: Provide effective practice for students; appropriate assessment design is used to best evaluate students; teachers utilize formative and summative information to increase student achievement | Weekly department PLC s will review alignment between standards, learning targets, and assessment measures | Backward Design Curriculum documents | Department PLCs | |
| | | Weekly department PLCs will analyze formative and summative data and use information to drive instruction | Common formative and summative assessments | Department PLCs GRADE Cam and item analysis | |
| | KCWP1: ensure design and deployment of standards; curriculum is continually assessed, reviewed, and revised to assure students have knowledge skills, and dispositions for success. | Ensure vertical mapping to identify instructional gaps, including planning for the introduction, development, and gradual release phases, and arrival at standards mastery. | Aligned curriculum document, grades 6-12; aligned assessments | Vertical Team meeting documents grades 6-8 and 6-12 | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Objective 2: Increase KPREP writing proficiency from 62.8% to 65% in 2022. | KCWP2: ensure high quality instructional program; evidence-based instructional strategies | Review and revise the school-wide writing plan to ensure current policy is implemented at all grade levels | School-wide writing plan- Kentucky Writing Project | SBDM Curriculum committee and SBDM minutes | |
| | | Writing to learn and writing to demonstrate learning occur regularly in all content areas | Curriculum documents; unit and lesson plans | Weekly PLCs | |
| | | Development of common expectations and understanding of quality writing (exemplars) | Curriculum documents; unit and lesson plans | Professional Development document; Weekly PLCs | |
| | | | | | |

Goal 2 (State your separate academic indicator goal.): Increase proficiency in science from 19.6 in 2021 to 28.4 in 2024. Increase proficiency in writing from 62.8 to 75% in 2024.

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|-----------|----------|------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------|
| | | | | | |

3: Achievement Gap

KRS 158.649 requires the school-based decision making (SBDM) council, or the principal if no council exists, to set the school's yearly targets for eliminating any achievement gap. The targets should be established with input from parents, faculty, and staff and submitted to the superintendent for consideration and the local board of education for adoption. In addition to being a statutory requirement, intentionally focusing on the achievement gaps that exist among a school’s underserved student populations is also a vital component of the continuous improvement process. Schools should use a variety of measures and analysis when conducting its review of its achievement gaps, including a review of the school’s climate and culture. Schools are not required to establish long term achievement gap goals; however, schools must establish yearly targets (objectives).

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|--|---|---|---|--|---------|
| Objective 1: Increase the percentage of proficiency for students with disabilities in reading from 13.1 % to 17.5 in 2024. | KCWP: 5: Ensure data are used for continuous improvement and improve work processes to support student learning. Stakeholders will determine best practice strategies to meet identified needs. | Create and monitor a “watch list” for disability students scoring bellowing proficiency and/or no making adequate growth in reading | Department level spreadsheets tracking individual students’ classroom performance MAP benchmark scores | Department PLCs; Administrative PLCs; monthly special education department meetings | |
| | | Utilize technology to support student learning (text readers, voice to text, etc.) | Unit and Lesson plans | Meeting documents showing collaboration between general education and special education | |
| | KCWP: 5: Ensure data are used for continuous improvement and improve work processes to support student learning. Stakeholders will determine best practice strategies to meet identified needs. | Utilize daily formative data collection tools, benchmark data, and formative/summative teacher observations to ensure high levels of teacher effectiveness and student achievement. | MAP benchmark scores, classroom assessments; Framework for Teaching and Learning; instructional monitoring data | Department PLCs, Administrative PLCs, special education team leader meetings; monthly special ed department meetings; school-wide data days; lesson plans; instructional walk-throughs with feedback | |
| | | | | | |
| Objective 2: Increase the percentage of proficiency for students with disabilities in math from 19.4 % to 25.8% in 2024. | Create and monitor a “watch list” for disability students scoring bellowing proficiency and/or no making adequate growth in math | Department level spreadsheets tracking individual students’ classroom performance MAP benchmark scores | Department PLCs; Administrative PLCs; monthly special education department meetings | | |

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|-------------|---|---|--|---------------------|---------|
| | Ensure resource math classes focus on development of concepts using developmentally appropriate strategies and application of concepts rather than rote memorization | Unit and Lesson Plans | Weekly PLCs | | |
| | Utilize daily formative data collection tools, benchmark data, and formative/summative teacher observations to ensure high levels of teacher effectiveness and student achievement. | MAP benchmark scores, classroom assessments; Framework for Teaching and Learning; instructional monitoring data | Department PLCs, Administrative PLCs, special education team leader meetings; monthly special ed department meetings; school-wide data days; lesson plans; instructional walk-throughs with feedback | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Objective 3 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

4: Growth

| Goal 4 (State your growth goal.): No longer applicable due to state accountability. | | | | | |
|---|----------|------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------|
| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
| Objective 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Objective 2 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

5: Transition Readiness

| Goal 5 (State your transition readiness goal.): N/A for middle school | | | | | |
|---|----------|------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------|
| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
| Objective 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Objective 2 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

6: Graduation Rate

| Goal 6 (State your graduation rate goal.): N/A for middle school | | | | | |
|--|----------|------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------|
| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
| Objective 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Objective 2 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

7: Other (Optional)

| Goal 7 (State your separate goal.): N/A | | | | | |
|---|----------|------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------|
| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
| Objective 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Objective 2 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Special Considerations for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) including Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) Schools

TSI schools (including ATSI schools) must embed their subgroup(s) plan for improvement within their CSIPs. TSI stakeholders, including the principal and other school leaders, teachers, and parents, should carefully consider what must be done to ensure the subgroup(s) perform(s) at high levels in the state accountability system. In addition to identifying strategies and activities within the CSIP that address the specific needs of underperforming groups, provide narrative information regarding the additional requirements for TSI schools in the following chart:

| Components of Turnaround Leadership Development and Support: |
|--|
| <p>Consider: How will you ensure that school leadership has or develops the skills and disposition to achieve accelerated, meaningful, and sustainable increases in student achievement for underperforming subgroups?</p> <p>Response:</p> |
| Identification of Critical Resources Inequities: |
| <p>Consider: Describe the process used to review the allocation and use of resources (people, time, and money), any resource inequities that were identified that may contribute to underperformance, and how identified resource inequities will be addressed.</p> <p>Response:</p> |

Targeted Subgroups and Evidence-Based Interventions:

Consider: Identify the areas of need revealed by the analysis of academic and non-academic data that will be addressed through CSIP activities for your targeted subgroup(s). What evidence-based practice(s) will the school incorporate that specifically targets the subgroup(s) achievement that contributed to the TSI identification? How will we monitor the evidence-based practice to ensure it is implemented with fidelity? Complete the table below to document the evidence that supports the Activities outlined in this plan. Additional rows may be added to accommodate additional pieces of evidence.

Response:

| Evidence-based Activity | Evidence Citation | Uploaded in eProve |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| Train staff to implement inductive teaching strategies. | Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge: New York, NY. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Additional Actions That Address the Causes of Consistently Underperforming Subgroups Of Students

Consider: Describe the process used to review the learning culture related to your targeted subgroup(s) and any additional actions that were determined to address the causes of underperformance.

Response:

Special Considerations for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) Schools

Schools identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) must complete the CSIP process and meet all applicable deadlines while identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI). Following the completion of the school audit, CSI schools must revise their CSIP to account for the improvement priorities identified by the audit team. The newly revised CSIP, referred to as a Turnaround Plan, must include the following items: (1) evidence-based interventions to be utilized to increase student performance and address the critical needs identified in the school audit, (2) a comprehensive list of persons and entities involved in the turnaround efforts and the specific roles each shall play in the school’s turnaround process, and (3) a review of resource inequities, which shall include an analysis of school level budgeting to ensure resources are adequately channeled towards school improvement (703 KAR 5:280). Each of the three aforementioned requirements must be embedded throughout the CSIP document. Once the CSIP has been revised, the turnaround plan must be submitted to the LEA for approval before it is submitted to the Commissioner of Education for final approval.

Evidence-based Practices

The Every Student Succeeds Act (2015) created new expectations for evidence-based decision making at school and district levels. More specific information regarding evidence-based practices and requirements can be found on the Kentucky Department of Education’s [Evidence-based Practices website](#). While evidence documentation in the CSIP is only required for schools identified for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), KDE encourages all school leaders to review evidence related to new programs, practices, or interventions being implemented in the school. In addition to documenting the evidence below, TSI and CSI schools are expected to upload a description of their evidence review process, the findings of their evidence review, and a discussion of the local implications into eProve. Specific directions regarding the documentation requirements can be found in the [“Documenting Evidence under ESSA”](#) resource available on KDE’s [Evidence-based Practices website](#).

Complete the table below to document the evidence that supports the Activities outlined in this plan. Additional rows may be added to accommodate additional pieces of evidence.

| Evidence-based Activity | Evidence Citation | Uploaded in eProve |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| Train staff to implement inductive teaching strategies. | Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge: New York, NY. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> |