

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: Increase the percentage³ of students scoring proficient or better (combined reading and mathematics) from 33% in 2019 to 60% by 2023 as measured by KPREP.

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

1: Proficiency Goal

Goal: Increase the percentage³ of students scoring proficient or better (combined reading and mathematics) from 33% in 2019 to 60% by 2023 as measured by KPREP.

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|--|--|--|--|---|---------|
| Objective 1 During the 2019-2020 school year, increase the percentage of students scoring proficient or better in reading from 37% to 42% as measured by KPREP. | KCWP 2 Provide training, peer observation opportunities, and horizontal/vertical planning opportunities for unpacking new standards | Provide-ongoing professional development for teachers in the new reading standards through after school PLC's, Horizontal team meetings and vertical meetings. | 42% students scoring proficient or better in reading as measured by KPREP. | People Responsible: Principal, Curriculum Facilitator, Teachers | N/A |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Goal: Increase the percentage³ of students scoring proficient or better (combined reading and mathematics) from 33% in 2019 to 60% by 2023 as measured by KPREP.

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|---|--|---|---|---|---------|
| Objective 2 During the 2019-2020 school year, increase the percentage of students scoring proficient or better in math from 28.5% to 33.5% | KCWP 2 | | | | |
| | Providing training, support and discussion opportunities for unpacking new math standards. | Provide ongoing professional development for teachers in the new reading standards through after school PLC's, Horizontal Team Meetings, and Vertical Meetings. | 33.5% students scoring proficient or better in math as measured by KPREP. | People Responsible: Principal, Curriculum facilitator, Teachers | N/A |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

2: Separate Academic Indicator

| Goal 2 Increase the percentage of students scoring proficient or better in on-demand writing from 19.5% in 2019 to 40% by 2023 as measured by KPREP | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---------|
| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
| Objective 1 During the 2019-2020 school year, increase the percentage of students scoring proficient or better in on-demand writing from 19.5% to 24.5 as measured by KPREP. | KCWP 2: Provide training for 5 th grade teachers for on-demand writing. | | | | |
| | | Provide Professional development in on-demand writing through team meetings and afterschool PLC's. | 24.5% students scoring proficient or better in on-demand writing as measured by KPREP. | People responsible: Principal, curriculum facilitator, teachers | NA |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Objective 2 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

3: Achievement Gap

| Goal 3 Increase the math proficiency percentage for students in the disability group from 6.3% in 2019 to 40% on KPREP by 2023. | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|---------|
| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
| Objective 1 Increase the math proficiency percentage for students in the disability group from 6.3% to 16.3% | KCWP2: Design and Deliver Instruction | Provide training in specially designed instruction, setting IEP goals, and writing IEPs through special education district training. | Students in the disability group scoring 16.3 or higher on KPREP by 2020. | Person Responsible: Principal, Special Education Director/Department, special education teachers, general education teachers. | N/A |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Objective 2 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

4: Growth

| Goal 4: Decrease the percentage of third, fourth, fifth grade students scoring novice in math from 23% in 2019 to 14% in 2023 as measured by KPREP | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---------|
| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
| Objective 1 Decrease the percentage of students scoring novice in math from 23% in 2019 to 19% 2020 as measured by KPREP. | KCWP4: Review, Analyze, and Apply Data | Meet with third, fourth, fifth grade teachers to share and analyze data. Assist teachers in developing individual novice reduction plans. | No more than 19% of third, fourth and fifth grade students scoring novice on KPREP. | Person Responsible: Principal, Curriculum Facilitator, Teachers | N/A |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Objective 2 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

5: Transition Readiness

| Goal 5 Based on MAP grade level scores, 80% of students will be prepared to exit primary and enter fourth grade by 2023 | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|---------|
| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
| Objective 1 65% of third grade students will be reading at or above the 40 th percentile by Spring 2020. | KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data | Meet with individual teachers twice per year to analyze MAP results and develop plans based on results. | 65% of third grade at or above the 40 th percentile in reading. | Person Responsible: Principal, curriculum facilitator, teachers | N/A |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Objective 2 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

6: Graduation Rate

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

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"/> |