

### 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:

<b>Components of Turnaround Leadership Development and Support:</b>
<p><b>Consider:</b> 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><b>Response:</b> Montgomery County Schools will engage all school leadership in a focused and targeted professional learning sequence. First, both district and school administrators will read the book <i>Great Instruction Great Achievement for Students with Disabilities</i> by John L. O’Connor. This book will be the focus of professional learning for the remainder of the 22-23 school year and will be discussed in monthly Principal Learning Labs. In addition to the book study, school and district administrators will identify schools in Kentucky that have similar demographics but whose subpopulation is performing well according to recent KSA data. For the 22-23 school year, district and school level administration will engage in a book study with the book <i>Clarity for Learning</i> by John Almarode and Kara Vandas.</p>
<b>Identification of Critical Resources Inequities:</b>
<p><b>Consider:</b> 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><b>Response:</b> A thorough needs assessment was completed by both the district and school level teams to review for resource inequities. Due to the increase in funding from ESSER allocations, money was not determined to be a factor. In addition, each building’s special education staffing allocation is determined based on the number of special education students served. Special education teacher caseloads were determined to be at an adequate number based on number of students with disabilities (most range from 10 – 15 students on their caseload). However, it was determined that if in the future an emphasis was placed on co-teaching that there could be a need to allocate additional staffing in order to provide appropriate planning time as well as support for students. The one area that the teams identified as a possible contributing factor to the underperformance of students with disabilities was the amount of time provided for planning and professional learning for both special education and general education teachers. Often times, teachers are losing their planning due to having to cover classrooms due to a substitute teacher shortage, or participating in ARC meetings or other parent meetings, and other duties that pull them away from being able to co-plan and review data. One way that the school, through district support, will begin to address this inequity is by providing release days for professional learning as well as paid time after the workday to engage in planning and professional learning.</p>

**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:** The process used to review the learning culture related to the school’s students with disabilities was completed through multiple activities. First, school and district administrators reviewed the data around this subgroup through our district MTSS structure (data reviewed was academic, behavior, mental health, and attendance). In addition, school walkthroughs generated data around explicit instruction and areas of growth. Data was also reviewed by teacher teams on a district provided “data day” in the fall of 2022. Further, the SBDM Council reviewed data, approved achievement gap targets, and approved a school improvement plan for addressing targeted subgroups and increasing student achievement for all. The comprehensive data review revealed a need to be more intentional when creating master schedules and creating specially designed instruction.

**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?

**Response:**

Montgomery County Schools will focus on two specific evidence-based practices to support students with disabilities. First, administration will focus on “clarifying and sharing clear learning goals” through a variety of methods including a book study and professional learning to support implementation and professional learning of all teachers (general and special education). Second, the school and district team will implement “explicit teaching and modeling.” Both evidence-based practices have been proven to increase student achievement with not only students with disabilities, but with all students.

In order to monitor implementation and ensure it is implemented with fidelity, the district and school teams will create 30-60-90 day plans that will be reviewed and updated monthly during the district MTSS meetings as well as reviewed by district leadership during weekly cabinet meetings. In addition, both district and school teams will conduct specific, targeted classroom visits to monitor and provide feedback on co-teaching and resource classrooms. Further, additional classroom visits will be conducted to observe and provide feedback on Tier One instruction.

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.

**TSI/ATSI 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) including Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) 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, ATSI 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 “[Compliance Requirements](#)” 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
Clarifying and Sharing Clear Learning Goals	Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge: New York, NY.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Explicit Teaching and Modeling	Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge: New York, NY.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarifying and Sharing Clear Learning Goals and Explicit Teaching and Modeling	Ferretti, R. P., Lewis, W. E., & Andrews-Weckerly, S. (2009). Do goals affect the structure of students’ argumentative writing strategies? <i>Journal of Educational Psychology</i> , 101(3), 577–589. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014702">https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014702</a>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>

