

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.

Operational Definitions

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

Objective: Short-term target to be attained by the end of the current academic year. There can be multiple objectives for each goal.

Strategy: An approach to systematically address the process, practice, or condition that the school will focus its efforts upon in order to reach its goals or objectives. There can be multiple strategies for each objective. The strategy can be based upon Kentucky's six (6) Key Core Work Processes listed below or another established improvement approach (i.e. *Six Sigma, Shipley, Baldrige, etc.*).

Activity: Actionable steps used to deploy the chosen strategy. There can be multiple activities for each strategy.

Key Core Work Processes: A series of processes identified by the Kentucky Department of Education that involve the majority of an organization's workforce and relate to its core competencies. These are the factors that determine an organization's success and help it prioritize areas for growth.

- [KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards](#)
- [KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction](#)
- [KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy](#)
- [KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data](#)
- [KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support](#)
- [KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment](#)

Measure of Success: Criteria that shows the impact of the work. The **measures** may be quantitative or qualitative, but are observable in some way.

Progress Monitoring: Process used to assess the implementation of the plan, the rate of improvement, and the effectiveness of the plan. Should include timelines and responsible individuals.

Funding: Local, state, or federal funds/grants used to support (or needed to support) the improvement initiative.

Requirements for Building an Improvement Plan

- There are six (6) required district goals: proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, graduation rate, growth, and transition readiness.
- 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: Include long-term three to five year targets based on the required school level goals. Elementary/middle schools must have goals for proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, and growth. High schools must have goals for 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
Include short-term targets to be attained by the end of the current academic year. There can be multiple objectives for each goal.	An approach to systematically address the process, practice, or condition that the school will focus its efforts upon in order to reach its goals or objectives. There can be multiple strategies for each objective. The strategy can be based upon Kentucky's six (6) Key Core Work Processes listed above or another established improvement approach See blue/yellow sheets from video.	Include actionable steps used to deploy the chosen strategy. There can be multiple activities for each strategy. See gray sheets from video of KCWP for help.	List the criteria that shows the impact of the work. The measures may be quantitative or qualitative, but are observable in some way.	Discuss the process used to assess the implementation of the plan, the rate of improvement, and the effectiveness of the plan. Should include timelines and responsible individuals. Progress monitoring ensures that plans are being revisited and an opportunity to determine whether the plan is working.	List the funding source(s) used to support (or needed to support) the improvement initiative.

1: Proficiency Goal

Goal 1 (State your proficiency goal.): Increase the percentage of students scoring proficient and distinguished in math as follows: (3rd-5th) from 63.3% in 2019 to 76.5% by 2025. Increase the proficiency of students in reading as follows: Reading (3rd-5th) from 69.7% in 2019 to 85% by 2025.

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1 Increase the percentage of students scoring proficient and distinguished in math from 63.3 in 2019 to 64.2% by June 2021.	KCWP 5: Continue to enact our Tier II intervention system in order to ensure that our groups are flexible and targeted to specific students' math needs.	KCWP 3: Continue to collect, analyze and reflect on tiered math intervention data (common formative assessments).	Movement of students out of Tier II interventions.	Continual movement of students out of Tier II interventions as measured by ongoing collection of common formative assessment data and CBM data.	No funding needed
		KCWP 4: PLC participants will use protocols and "data wise" questions (what does the data tell us? What does the data not tell us? What are causes for celebration? What are	Continual PLC meetings with positive data outcomes and definitive refinement.	Continuous refinement of math intervention.	No funding needed

		causes for concern? What are next steps?) in regular PLCs.			
	KCWP 5: Continue to enact our Tier III intervention system in order to ensure that targeted groups of struggling students are receiving the foundational skills they need.	KCWP 3/4: Continue to collect, analyze and reflect on tiered math intervention data with the intervention team.	Movement of students out of Tier III Interventions.	Continual improvement of progress data of Tier III intervention students.	No funding needed
	KCWP 1/2: Continue to use evidence based instructional strategies (i.e. Concrete Building Blocks, manipulatives, discourse) in order to ensure that our students are making meaning of math content in core instruction.	KCWP 1/2: Teams will continue to plan for instruction regularly, reflecting on the activity's success based on data collected.	Modifications of instructional practices towards evidence based and effective interventions.	Documentation of evidence-based practices embedded into regular lesson plans.	No funding needed
	KCWP 1/2: Continue to offer advanced math standards for grades 3-5 in order to ensure that our distinguished students are being challenged.	KCWP 1/2: Use a protocol and monitoring/documentation tool for advanced math implementation.	Quantified student success in advanced math.	Continuous student mastery of advanced math standards.	No funding needed
		KCWP 4: Coaches to use "data wise" questions (what does the data tell us? What does the data not tell us? What are causes for celebration? What are causes for concern? What are next steps?) in regular PLCs.	Continual PLC meetings with positive data outcomes and definitive refinement.	Continuous refinement of advanced math implementation.	No funding needed
Objective 2 Improve the percentage of students at proficiency in Reading from 69.7% in 2019 to 71.4% by June 2021.	KCWP 5: Continue to refine our Tier II intervention system (RTI) in order to ensure that our groups are flexible and targeted to	KCWP 1/2: Continue to identify essential standards and create a unit plan to address those standards in intervention.	Creation of the essential standards unit plans for the year.	Ongoing creation of the essential standards unit plan.	No funding needed

	specific students' literary needs.	KCWP 4: Coaches will use “data wise” questions (what does the data tell us? What does the data not tell us? What are causes for celebration? What are causes for concern? What are next steps?) in regular PLCs.	Continual PLC meetings with positive data outcomes and definitive refinement.	Continuous refinement of ELA intervention.	No funding needed
		KCWP 4: Enact a protocol and monitoring/documentation tool for tiered reading interventions.	Student movement out of tiered intervention.	Continual movement of students out of Tier II interventions as measured by ongoing collection of common formative assessment data.	No funding needed
	KCWP 1/2: Instruct on the standards through Lucy Calkins Units of Study for grades K-5 in order to ensure a guaranteed and viable curriculum is translated into instructional steps.	KCWP 1/2: PLCs will continue to unpack the Lucy Calkins Units of Study, enact with fidelity and refine assessment matrices for each unit of study. Provide support through on-going professional development in the area of reading evidence based practices that align with our vision for students, specifically on Lucy Calkins Units of Study.	Implementation of reading evidence based practices in observations.	Documentation of activity creation, lesson plans and assessment matrices.	No funding needed

2: Separate Academic Indicator

Goal 2 (State your separate academic indicator goal.): To increase the proficiency rate of students in Science as follows: from 43.3% in 2019 to 71.8% by 2025.					
Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1: Improve the percentage of students at proficiency in science from 43.3% in 2019 to 45.9% by June 2021.	KCWP 1/2: Continue to use evidence based instructional strategies (i.e. inquiry, research, experimentation, discourse) in order to ensure that our students are making meaning of science content.	KCWP 1/2: Teams will continue to plan for instruction regularly, reflecting on the activity's success based on data collected.	Documentation of evidence-based practices embedded into year's lesson plans.	Documentation of evidence-based practices embedded into ongoing lesson plans.	No funding needed
	KCWP 1/2: Implement the science curriculum frameworks for grades K-5 in order to ensure a guaranteed and viable curriculum is translated into instructional steps.	KCWP 1/2: PLCs will continue to unpack science standards and create transferable assessments for each unit of study.	Improvement on student proficiency in Science on KPREP from 43.3% to 45.9% by June 2021.	Documentation of activity creation and matching assessments. Increase in proficiency in regular assessment data analysis.	No funding needed

3: Achievement Gap

Goal 3 (State your achievement gap goal.): To close the achievement gap by increasing the percentage of students scoring P/D with students from poverty, disabled students and EL students in reading and math according to: 81.5% math, 84% reading by 2025.

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding																								
Objective 1: To close the achievement gap of students from poverty, disabled students, and Hispanic students in reading and math by 2021 according to the chart below: <table border="1" data-bbox="110 480 567 667"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="2">Reading</th> <th colspan="2">Math</th> </tr> <tr> <th>From</th> <th>To</th> <th>From</th> <th>To</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Hisp.</td> <td>62.5</td> <td>63.7</td> <td>50</td> <td>52.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pov.</td> <td>53.7</td> <td>55.8</td> <td>35.2</td> <td>38</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dis.</td> <td>35.3</td> <td>37.9</td> <td>32.4</td> <td>35</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Reading		Math		From	To	From	To	Hisp.	62.5	63.7	50	52.3	Pov.	53.7	55.8	35.2	38	Dis.	35.3	37.9	32.4	35	KCWP 1/2: Ensure Tier I curriculum is accessible to all students via the co-teaching model, and instruction and assessments meet the intent and rigor of the standards.	KCWP 1/2: Continue to expand our understanding and regular implementation of co-teaching through professional development and planning support/feedback.	End of year evidence of growth on the “look for” document.	Regular effective co-teaching as is evidenced by the ongoing co-teaching “look for” document.	No funding needed
			Reading		Math																								
	From		To	From	To																								
	Hisp.	62.5	63.7	50	52.3																								
	Pov.	53.7	55.8	35.2	38																								
Dis.	35.3	37.9	32.4	35																									
KCWP 1/2: Utilize the “look for” document for co-teaching to ascertain the effectiveness of our current practice.	End of year evidence of growth on the “look for” document.	Continual growth on the “look for” document by all co-teachers.	No funding needed																										
KCWP 5: Ensure that resource instruction is evidence based and differentiated based on the students’ needs.	KCWP 1/2: Ensure that ECE teachers receive differentiated professional learning and monitoring about curriculum and evidence based instructional practices that can be utilized in resource or highly structured classrooms.	Evidence of differentiated trainings offered for the year.	ECS teachers to receive specific trainings on topics such as instructional best practice, reading instructional strategies, and teaching with poverty and trauma in mind.	No funding needed																									
KCWP 6: Ensure that we facilitate the acquisition of needed resources for families living in poverty to ensure that students can focus on learning while in the classroom.	KCWP 6: Ensure teachers and staff make the school counselor aware of student needs. The school counselor can then connect students and families with appropriate resources/outside agencies.	Evidence of supports offered to families over the year.	Ongoing program participation such as Angel Tree, mentoring programs, Blessings in a Backpack and the use of indigent funds to support families.	No funding needed (other than indigent funds used as needed)																									
KCWP 1/2: Ensure Tier I curriculum is accessible to all students in reading and math, and instruction and assessments meet the intent and rigor of the standards.	KCWP 1/2: Continue to expand our understanding and regular implementation of instructional best practices through professional development and planning support/feedback.	Cumulative Implementation of evidence based practices in	Documentation of evidence-based practices embedded into ongoing lesson plans.	No funding needed																									

	KCWP 6: Ensure that instruction is evidence based, and poverty and trauma responsive based on the students' needs.	KCWP ½: Lead professional development on Explicit Instruction to ensure that students are given ample opportunity to participate and respond.	observations in reading and math. Cumulative evidence of explicit instruction practices in instruction.	Documentation of explicit instruction practices in instruction.	No funding needed
		KCWP 6: Ensure that teachers receive differentiated professional learning and monitoring about curriculum and evidence based instructional practices that are responsive to students living in poverty.	Evidence of professional development rendered, specific to trauma, poverty and cultural responsiveness.	Reduction of behavioral disciplinarys among students in poverty. Increased proficiency on common formative assessments in core subjects for students in poverty.	No funding needed
	KCWP 1/2: Ensure Tier I curriculum is accessible to EL students, evidence based, and culturally responsive based on the students' needs.	KCWP 5: Ensure that students are receiving instructional modification as indicated by their PSP document.	Evidence of increased proficiency in summative assessments of EL students.	Increase in proficiency in regular formative assessment data analysis.	No funding needed
	KCWP 5: Continue to enact our Tier II intervention system in order to ensure that our groups are flexible and targeted to specific students' needs.	KCWP 3/4: Continue to collect, analyze and reflect on tiered intervention data (common formative assessments).	Movement of students out of Tier II Interventions.	Continual movement of students out of Tier II interventions as measured by ongoing collection of common formative assessment data.	No funding needed
		KCWP 3/4: PLC participants will use protocols and "data wise" questions (what does the data tell us? What does the data not tell us? What are causes for celebration? What are causes for concern? What are next steps?) in regular PLCs.	Continual PLC meetings with positive data outcomes and definitive refinement.	Continuous refinement of math and reading interventions.	No funding needed

4: Growth

Goal 4 (State your growth goal.): Increase the growth rate of students in reading and math from 16.9% (low growth) on Fall 2020 MAP to 64% (high growth) on MAP by Spring 2025.						
Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding	
Objective 1: To improve the total average growth rate of students in reading and math from 16.9% (low growth) on Fall 2020 MAP to 46% (average growth) on Spring 2021 MAP.	KCWP 1/2: Ensure Tier I curriculum is accessible to all students and instruction and assessments meet the intent and rigor of the standards.	KCWP 1/2: Continue to expand our understanding and regular implementation of instructional best practices through professional development and planning support/feedback.	Documentation of evidence-based practices embedded into regular lesson plans.	Documentation of activity creation and matching assessments. Increase in proficiency in regular assessment data analysis.	No funding needed	
	KCWP 1/2: Continue to use evidence based instructional strategies (such as modeling, opportunity to write, discourse and scaffolding) in order to ensure that our students are making meaning of ELA content.	KCWP 1/2: Teams will continue to plan for instruction regularly, reflecting on the activity's success based on data collected.	Documentation of evidence-based practices embedded into regular lesson plans.	Documentation of evidence-based practices embedded into regular lesson plans.	No funding needed	
	KCWP 5: Continue to enact our Tier II math intervention system in order to ensure that our groups are flexible and targeted to specific students' math needs.	KCWP 3/4: Continue to collect, analyze and reflect on tiered math intervention data (common formative assessments).	KCWP 3/4: PLC participants will use protocols and "data wise" questions (what does the data tell us? What does the data not tell us? What are causes for celebration? What are causes for concern? What are next steps?) in regular PLCs.	Movement of students out of Tier II math interventions.	Continual movement of students out of Tier II interventions as measured by ongoing collection of common formative assessment data.	No funding needed
				Continual PLC meetings with positive data outcomes and definitive refinement.	Continuous refinement of math intervention.	No funding needed

	KCWP 1/2: Continue to use evidence based instructional strategies (such as Concrete Building Blocks, manipulatives, modeling, opportunity to write, discourse and scaffolding) in order to ensure that our students are making meaning of math content.	KCWP 1/2: Teams will continue to plan for instruction regularly, reflecting on the activity's success based on data collected.	Cumulative Implementation of evidence based practices in math observations.	Documentation of evidence-based practices embedded into regular lesson plans.	No funding needed
	KCWP 1/2: Continue to offer extensions in math standards in order to ensure that our distinguished students are being challenged.	KCWP 1/2: Develop a protocol and monitoring/documentation tool for extension implementation.	Quantified student success in advanced math.	Continual student mastery of advanced math standards and complex text.	No funding needed
	KCWP 5: Continue to enact our Tier II reading intervention system (RTI) in order to ensure that our groups are flexible and targeted to specific students' math needs.	KCWP 3/4: Continue to collect, analyze and reflect on tiered reading intervention data (common formative assessments).	Movement of students out of Tier II reading interventions.	Continual movement of students out of Tier II interventions as measured by ongoing collection of common formative assessment data.	No funding needed
		KCWP 4: PLC participants will use protocols and "data wise" questions (what does the data tell us? What does the data not tell us? What are causes for celebration? What are causes for concern? What are next steps?) in regular PLCs.	Continual PLC meetings with positive data outcomes and definitive refinement.	Continuous refinement of math intervention.	No funding needed

5: Transition Readiness

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

7: Other (Optional)

Goal 7 (State your separate goal.): Focus our efforts on Educational Recovery for the 2020-21 school year, given the current reality we're experiencing as related to the Covid-19 pandemic to reduce the gaps in student learning.

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1: To reduce the gaps in student learning by focusing our efforts on Educational Recovery for the 2020-21 school year, given the current reality we're experiencing as relates to the Covid-19 pandemic.	KCWP 1/2: Offer professional learning focused on concepts such as gap analysis, standard deconstruction, and curriculum mapping.	KCWP ½: Host professional development around educational recovery before students arrive in summer to prepare for the 2020-21 school year.	Summative document of modified curriculum frameworks and alignment	Implementation of modified curriculum frameworks and alignment	No funding needed
	KCWP 1/2: Ensure Tier I curriculum is accessible to all students via in-person and online delivery models, depending on safety to meet the intent and rigor of the standards.	KCWP 1/2: Continue to expand our understanding and regular implementation of online instructional best practices through professional development and planning support/feedback.	Document outlining trainings received on topics such as online instructional best practice over the course of the year.	Teachers to receive specific ongoing trainings on topics such as online instructional best practice.	No funding needed
	KCWP 5: Ensure that instruction is evidence based and differentiated based on the students' needs.	KCWP 1/2: Ensure that teachers receive differentiated professional learning and monitoring about curriculum and evidence based instructional practices that can be utilized in all classrooms.	Cumulative curriculum maps, outlines, timelines and plans.	Ongoing curriculum maps, outlines, timelines and plans.	No funding needed
	KCWP 6: Ensure that we facilitate the acquisition of needed resources for families living in poverty to ensure that students can focus on learning while in the classroom.	KCWP 6: Ensure teachers and staff make the school counselor aware of student needs. The school counselor can then connect students and families with appropriate resources/outside agencies.	Evidence of supports offered to families over the year.	Participation in social programs such as Angel tree, mentoring, and use of indigent funds.	No funding needed (aside from indigent funds in specific instances)
	KCWP 6: Ensure that instruction is evidence based, and poverty and trauma	KCWP 6: Ensure that teachers receive differentiated professional learning and monitoring about curriculum and evidence based	Evidence of professional development rendered, specific to	In formal or informal observation, evidence of inclusive and culturally responsive language and actions.	No funding needed

	responsive based on the students' needs.	instructional practices that are responsive to students living in poverty.	trauma, poverty and cultural responsiveness.		
	KCWP 5: Continue to enact our Tier II intervention system in order to ensure that our groups are flexible and targeted to specific students' needs whether in person or online.	KCWP 3/4: Continue to collect, analyze and reflect on tiered intervention data (common formative assessments).	Movement of students out of Tier II interventions.	Continual movement of students out of Tier II interventions as measured by ongoing collection of common formative assessment data.	No funding needed
		KCWP 3/4: PLC participants will use protocols and "data wise" questions (what does the data tell us? What does the data not tell us? What are causes for celebration? What are causes for concern? What are next steps?) in regular PLCs.	Continual PLC meetings with positive data outcomes and definitive refinement.	Continual movement of students out of Tier II interventions as measured by ongoing collection of common formative assessment	No funding needed

Special Considerations for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) Schools

TSI 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"/>