#### **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, Baldridge, 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:
  - o For elementary/middle school, these include: proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, and, growth.
  - o 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 (i.e. Six Sigma, Shipley, Baldridge, etc.).	Include actionable steps used to deploy the chosen strategy. There can be multiple activities for each strategy.	List the criteria that shows the impact of the work. The <b>measures</b> 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: To increase the proficiency rate of students in Reading and Math as follows: Reading -- from 74.6% in 2019 to 85% by 2026.

Math – from 71.4% in 2019 to 84% by 2026.

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1	KCWP 1: Design and Deploy	Designing and delivering instruction	MAP, KPREP	Leadership collaboration with each	N/A
Improve the percentage of	Standards	and assessment based upon the		Collaborative Team.	
students at proficiency in		standard aligned in the new <b>ELA</b>	Grade Level Collaborative	End of Trimester check in for 6 Product	
Reading from 74.6% in 2019 to	KCWP 2: Design and Deliver	Curriculum (created in the 2018/19	Team progress toward 6	Progress.	
76.9% by June 2021	Instruction	school year) or Kentucky Academic	Products.	Tier 1 data	
		Standards for math.			
	KCWP 3: Design and Deliver				
	Assessment Literacy				
	KCWP 2: Design and Deliver	Use of READ/MATH 180 and system	MAP, KPREP	Diagnostic Testing throughout.	\$8000.00 for
Objective 2	Instruction	144 to supplement instruction through			Math/Read 180
Improve the percentage of		Special Education Services and Tier 3			
students at proficiency in Math		interventions.			
from 71.4% to 74% by June 2021		Math and ELA courses utilize Common		6-Products unit analysis	N/A
		Collaborative Assessments		·	
	KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and	Targeted groups within REACH ensure	MAP, KPREP	MTSS team will monitor the progress of	None required –
	Apply Data	students who struggle the most receive		students during bi-weekly meetings.	embedded in school
		Tier 2 support, while enrichment			schedule.
	KCWP 5: Design, Align and	sessions can offer differentiation for			
	Deliver Support	those who already know it.			
		,			

# 2: Separate Academic Indicator

Goal 2: To increase proficiency rate of students in...

Social Studies from 73.4% in 2019 to 87% by 2026, Writing from 42.6% in 2019 to 71.3 by 2026 and Science from 41% in 2019 to 70% in 2026.

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1 To increase proficiency rate of	KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards	Designing and delivering instruction and assessment based upon the	MAP, KPREP	Leadership collaboration with each Collaborative Team.	N/A
students in Social Studies from 73.4% in 2019 to 75.8% in 2021.	KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction  KCWP 3: Design and Deliver	standard aligned in the new <b>Social Studies Curriculum</b> (created in the 2019/20 school year).	Grade Level Collaborative Team progress toward 6 Products.	End of Trimester check in for 6 Product Progress. Tier 1 data	
	Assessment Literacy  KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data  KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support	Targeted groups within REACH ensure students who struggle the most receive Tier 2 support, while enrichment sessions can offer differentiation for those who already know it.	Common Assessments, KPREP	Collaborative teams will	
Objective 2 To increase proficiency rate of students in Writing from 42.6% in 2019 to 48.4% in 2021.	KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards  KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction	School wide formative writing tasks. At least twice a year, EOMS will conduct a live scoring event to provide students and teachers immediate feedback regarding the writing process.	KPREP Live scoring analysis	Live scoring analysis.	None required
	KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy	Writing across content	KPREP	Common formative assessments.	
Objective 3 To increase proficiency rate of students in Science from 41% in 2019 to 47% in 2021.	KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards  KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction	Designing and delivering instruction and assessment based upon the standard aligned in the <b>Science Curriculum.</b>	KPREP	Common Collaborative Assessments	N/A
	KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy				

# 3: Achievement Gap

Goal 3: To close the achievement gap of disabled students in reading from 32.5% to 50% P/D and in math from 22.9% to 40% P/D by 2026.

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1	KCWP 2: Design and Deliver	Use of READ/MATH 180 and System 44	MAP, KPREP	Diagnostic Testing throughout.	\$8000.00 for
Increase the number of disabled	Instruction	to supplement instruction through			Math/Read 180
students scoring P/D in reading		Special Education Services and Tier 3			
from 32.5% to 35.5% in 2021.		interventions.			
		ELA courses utilize Common		6-Products unit analysis	None required
		Collaborative Assessments			
ı	KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and	Targeted groups within REACH ensure	MAP, KPREP	MTSS team will monitor the progress of	None required –
	Apply Data	students who struggle the most receive		students during bi-weekly meetings.	embedded in school
		Tier 2 support, while enrichment			schedule.
	KCWP 5: Design, Align and	sessions can offer differentiation for			
	Deliver Support	those who already know it.			
Objective 2	KCWP 2: Design and Deliver	Use of READ/MATH 180 and System 44	MAP, KPREP	Diagnostic Testing throughout.	\$8000.00 for
Increase the number of disabled	Instruction	to supplement instruction through			Math/Read 180
students scoring P/D in math		Special Education Services and Tier 3			
from 22.9% to 26.5% in 2021.		interventions.			
		Math courses utilize Common			
		Collaborative Assessments			
	KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and	Targeted groups within REACH ensure	MAP, KPREP	MTSS team will monitor the progress of	None required –
	Apply Data	students who struggle the most receive		students during bi-weekly meetings.	embedded in school
		Tier 2 support, while enrichment			schedule.
	KCWP 5: Design, Align and	sessions can offer differentiation for			
	Deliver Support	those who already know it.			

# 4: Growth

Goal 4: To increase the growth rate of students in reading and math from 54.6 in 2019 to 64.6 by 2025.

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1	KCWP 2: Design and Deliver	Use of READ/MATH 180 and System 44	MAP, KPREP	Diagnostic Testing throughout.	\$8000.00 for
To increase the growth rate of	Instruction	to supplement instruction through			Math/Read 180
students in reading and math		Special Education Services and Tier 3			
from 56.1 in 2019 to 58 by 2020.		interventions.			
		Math/ELA courses utilize Common		6-Products unit analysis	N/A
		Collaborative Assessments			
	KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and	Targeted groups within REACH ensure	MAP, KPREP	MTSS team will monitor the progress of	None required –
	Apply Data	students who struggle the most receive		students during bi-weekly meetings.	embedded in school
		Tier 2 support, while enrichment			schedule.
	KCWP 5: Design, Align and	sessions can offer differentiation for			
	Deliver Support	those who already know it.			

# **5: Transition Readiness**

Goal 5: N/A

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1					
Objective 2 During the Spring MAP window,					
During the Spring MAP window,					

## 6: Graduation Rate

Goal 6 (State your graduation rate goal.): N/A

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1					
Objective 2					
_					

### 7: Other

Goal 7: During the COVID 19 Pandemic, internal monitoring using MAP has indicated a decrease in math growth. EOMS will increase the school conditional growth, for math, from low (less than 45<sup>th</sup> percentile) to average (46<sup>th</sup> - 63<sup>rd</sup> percentile) during the 2020/21 school year.

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1	KCWP 2: Design and Deliver	Use of READ/MATH 180 and System 44	MAP, KPREP	Diagnostic Testing throughout.	\$8000.00 for
EOMS will increase the average	Instruction	to supplement instruction through			Math/Read 180
RIT score for students on the		Special Education Services and Tier 3			
MAP assessment.		interventions.			
		Math courses utilize Common		6-Products unit analysis	N/A
		Collaborative Assessments			
	KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and	Targeted groups within REACH ensure	MAP, KPREP	MTSS team will monitor the progress of	None required –
	Apply Data	students who struggle the most receive		students during bi-weekly meetings.	embedded in school
		Tier 2 support, while enrichment			schedule.
	KCWP 5: Design, Align and	sessions can offer differentiation for			
	Deliver Support	those who already know it.			

## **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:
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?
Response:
Identification Of Critical Resources Inequities:
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.
identified resource inequities will be addressed.  Response:
·
·
·
·
·
·
·

Evidence-based Activity	Evidence Citation	Upload in ePro
ain staff to implement inductive teaching rategies.	Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge: New York, NY.	
ditional Actions That Address The Causes (	Of Consistently Underperforming Subgroups Of Students	
	he learning culture related to your targeted subgroup(s) and any additional actions that were determined to address the causes of underpe	rformance.

**Targeted Subgroups and Evidence-Based Interventions:** 

#### 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.	$\boxtimes$