

# 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
<p>Include short-term targets to be attained by the end of the current academic year. There can be multiple objectives for each goal.</p>	<p>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. <i>Six Sigma, Shipley, Baldrige, etc.</i>).</p>	<p>Include actionable steps used to deploy the chosen strategy. There can be multiple activities for each strategy.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>List the funding source(s) used to support (or needed to support) the improvement initiative.</p>

## 1: Proficiency Goal

Goal 1 (State your proficiency goal.): Increase the percentage of students scoring proficient in reading from 59.9% in 2019 to 69.0% in 2024 and increase the percentage of students scoring proficient in math from 43.8% in 2019 to 56.6% in 2024.					
Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1: Increase the KPREP reading proficiency from 59.9% in 2019 to 61.7% in 2020.	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 the KPREP math proficiency from 43.8% in 2019 to 46.4% in 2020.	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.	Ensure item analysis methods are occurring during PLCs to evaluate instructional effectiveness and determine if instructional adjustments are needed, and if so, what those adjustments are.	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.
		Create and monitor a “watch list” for special education students performing below proficiency in math.	Individual teacher lists	Updated quarterly; data days	

Goal 1 (State your proficiency goal.): Increase the percentage of students scoring proficient in reading from 59.9% in 2019 to 69.0% in 2024 and increase the percentage of students scoring proficient in math from 43.8% in 2019 to 56.6% in 2024.

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
		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

## 2: Separate Academic Indicator

Goal 2 (State your separate academic indicator goal.): Increase the percentage of students scoring proficient in science from 28.4% in 2019 to 44.7% in 2024 and increase the percentage of students scoring proficient in writing from 41.6% in 2019 to 54.9% in 2024.					
Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1: Increase the KPREP science proficiency from 28.4% in 2019 to 31.7% in 2020.	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	District Funds for Instructional coach
		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	SBDM Funds for GRADE Cam; District funds for instructional coach
	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	District funds for Instructional Coach; Title II and SBDM funds for teacher stipends
Objective 2: Increase the KPREP writing proficiency from 41.6% in 2019 to 44.3% in 2020.	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	SBDM Curriculum committee and SBDM minutes	None
		Writing to learn and writing to demonstrate learning occur regularly in all content areas	Curriculum documents; unit and lesson plans	Weekly PLCs	District funds for Instructional Coach
		Development of common expectations and understanding of quality writing (exemplars)	Curriculum documents; unit and lesson plans	Professional Development document; Weekly PLCs	SBDM funds for professional development

### 3: Achievement Gap

Goal 3 (State your achievement gap goal.): Increase the percentage of disability students scoring proficient in reading from 17.5% in 2019 to 36.3% in 2024 and increase the percentage of disability students scoring proficient in math from 4.0% in 2019 to 25.8% in 2024.					
Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1: Increase the percentage of disability students scoring proficient in reading from 17.5% in 2019 to 21.3% in 2020.	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 below proficiency and/or not 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	SBDM section 6 funds for training; Special Education Funds for salaries and training; Title II funds for training and mentoring.
		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	Special Education Funds
		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	SBDM section 6 funds for training; Special Education Funds for salaries and training; Title II funds for training and mentoring.
Objective 2: Increase the percentage of disability students scoring proficient in math from 4.0% in 2019 to 8.4% in 2020.	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 below proficiency and/or not 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	SBDM section 6 funds for training; Special Education Funds for salaries and training; Title II funds for training and mentoring.
		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	Special Education Funds for training
		Utilize daily formative data collection tools, benchmark data,	MAP benchmark scores, classroom	Department PLCs, Administrative PLCs, special education team leader	SBDM section 6 funds for training;

Goal 3 (State your achievement gap goal.): Increase the percentage of disability students scoring proficient in reading from 17.5% in 2019 to 36.3% in 2024 and increase the percentage of disability students scoring proficient in math from 4.0% in 2019 to 25.8% in 2024.					
Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
		and formative/summative teacher observations to ensure high levels of teacher effectiveness and student achievement.	assessments; Framework for Teaching and Learning; instructional monitoring data	meetings; monthly special ed department meetings; school-wide data days; lesson plans; instructional walk-throughs with feedback	Special Education Funds for salaries and training; Title II funds for training and mentoring.

## 4: Growth

Goal 4 (State your growth goal.): Increase the growth indicator from 43.0 in 2019 to 57.0 in 2024.					
Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1: Increase the growth indicator in reading from 48.3 in 2019 to 52.3 in 2020.	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 “Name and claim” watch list for special education students and all students, with special attention to students who scored novice low in two or more consecutive years in reading.	Department spreadsheets tracking summative data; MAP growth scores	Department PLCs, Administrative PLCs; school-wide data days; common formative and summative assessments	None
		Implement “One More Think” strategies in reading and content area classes	Unit and Lesson plans; common assessments	Department PLCs; Administrative PLCs	Section 6 funds for training
		Review and select a common resource/program for use in RTI reading classes.	Committee minutes	SBDM minutes; SBDM budget	SBDM Section 6 funds
Objective 2: increase the growth indicator in math from 37.7 in 2019 to 41.7 in 2020.	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 “Name and claim” watch list for special education students and all students, with special attention to students who scored novice low in two or more consecutive years in math.	Department spreadsheets tracking summative data; MAP growth scores	Department PLCs, Administrative PLCs; school-wide data days; common formative and summative assessments	None
		Use classroom data and pre-assessment data to implement differentiated math instruction	Unit and Lesson plans; common assessments; <i>Laying the Foundation</i> module implementation	Department PLCs; Administrative PLCs	AdvanceKentucky grant funds
		Review and select a common resource/program for use in RTI reading math.	Committee minutes	SBDM minutes; SBDM budget	SBDM Section 6 funds



## 5: Transition Readiness

Goal 5 (State your transition readiness goal.): NA 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.): NA 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.): NONE					
Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1					
Objective 2					



**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:** NA—NOT A TSI SCHOOL

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:**

NA—NOT A TSI SCHOOL

## 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"/>
NA—NOT A CSI SCHOOL		<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>