# 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](https://education.ky.gov/school/csip/Documents/KCWP%201%20Strategic%20Design%20and%20Deploy%20Standards.pdf)
* [KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction](https://education.ky.gov/school/csip/Documents/KCWP%202%20Strategic%20Design%20and%20Deliver%20Instruction.pdf)
* [KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy](https://education.ky.gov/school/csip/Documents/KCWP%203%20Strategic%20Design%20and%20Deliver%20Assessment%20Literacy.pdf)
 | * [KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data](https://education.ky.gov/school/csip/Documents/KCWP%204%20Strategic%20Review%20Analyze%20and%20Apply%20Data.pdf)
* [KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support](https://education.ky.gov/school/csip/Documents/KCWP%205%20Strategic%20Design%20Align%20Deliver%20Support%20Processes.pdf)
* [KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment](https://education.ky.gov/school/csip/Documents/KCWP%206%20Strategic%20Establish%20Learning%20Culture%20and%20Environment.pdf)
 |

**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 (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 **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.): By the end of the 2023-24 school year, the Reading Proficiency percentage for ECHS will increase to 55% and the Math Proficiency percentage will increase to 50%. |
|  **Objective**  | **Strategy** | **Activities**  | **Measure of Success** | **Progress Monitoring**  | **Funding** |
| Objective 1Increase Reading KPREP P/D to 40% in 2020-21 | KCWP 1: Monitoring systems are in place to ensure the curriculum(s) istaught at a high level of fidelity (e.g., complete document isconsistently used by all staff, the intent of the standard ispreserved). | IXL reading Diagnostic given to 9th-10th grade students to measure student progress and identify gaps in student reading skills | Increase in student reading scores. | Principals and English teachers monitoring after each administration of the IXL diagnostic | $5000 (Title I and Section 6) |
|  | Incorporation of reading across content areas in each department. | Curriculum Documents and Unit Plans with evidence of reading incorporated into units. | Principals, PLC Leads, teachers updating curriculum documents and unit plans throughout the school year | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Objective 2Increase Math KPREP P/D to 35% in 2020-21 | KCWP 1: Monitoring systems are in place to ensure the curriculum(s) istaught at a high level of fidelity (e.g., complete document isconsistently used by all staff, the intent of the standard ispreserved). | IXL Math Diagnostic given to 9th-10th grade students to measure student progress and identify gaps in student reading skills | Increase in student math scores. | Principals and Math teachers monitoring after each administration of the IXL diagnostic | $5000 (Title I and Section 6) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 2: Separate Academic Indicator

|  |
| --- |
| Goal 2 (State your separate academic indicator goal.): By the end of the 2023-24 school year, the Writing Proficiency percentage for ECHS will increase to 65% and the Science Proficiency percentage will increase to 50%. |
|  **Objective**  | **Strategy** | **Activities**  | **Measure of Success** | **Progress Monitoring**  | **Funding** |
| Objective 1Increase Writing KPREP P/D to 50% | KCWP 2: Learning is monitored before, during, and after instruction. (ExplicitInstruction) | Implement Schoolwide Writing Plan  | Student improvement on benchmark assessments (KYOTE) and formative on-demand writing assessments | Monthly PLC updates on writing progress- Principals, Writing Cluster Leader, English teachers | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Objective 2Increase Science KPREP P/D to 35% | KCWP 2: Learning is monitored before, during, and after instruction. (ExplicitInstruction) | Create KPREP like assessments with multiple choice and extended response questions to gauge student mastery of standards. | Student mastery of science standards as evidenced by benchmark and formative assessments. | PLC Minutes and Agendas- assessment data and assessment samples- Principals, Science PLC Lead, Science teachers | 0-$500(if needed for purchasing sample assessment items) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 3: Achievement Gap

|  |
| --- |
| Goal 3 (State your achievement gap goal.): By the end of the 2023-24 school year, the Reading Proficiency percentage for students with IEPs at ECHS will increase to 40% and the Math Proficiency percentage for students with IEPs will increase to 40%. |
|  **Objective**  | **Strategy** | **Activities**  | **Measure of Success** | **Progress Monitoring**  | **Funding** |
| Objective 1Increase Students with IEPs KPREP Reading P/D Scores to 23%  | KCWP 2: Protocol for ensuring Tier I and Tier II instructional needs aremet and next steps for improvement are identified. | Increase use of co-teaching strategies in English classes with regular education teachers, special education teachers, and Gear-Up Reading Interventionist | Increase in co-teaching sections in master schedule | Principals, Guidance Counselors, and Special Education teachers collaboration- master schedule produced by June 2020. | 0 |
|  |  | Increase in student progress on IEP Reading Goals | Regular Education and Special Education teachers- PLC Minutes and Agendas on data for students with IEPs | 0-$1000(If needed for training on co-teaching strategies) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Objective 2Increase Students with IEPs KPREP Math P/D Scores to 23% | KCWP 2: Protocol for ensuring Tier I and Tier II instructional needs aremet and next steps for improvement are identified. | Increase use of co-teaching strategies in Math classes with regular education teachers, special education teachers, and Gear-Up Math Interventionist | Increase in co-teaching sections in master schedule | Principals, Guidance Counselors, and Special Education teachers collaboration- master schedule produced by June 2020. | 0 |
|  |  | Increase in student progress on IEP Math Goals | Regular Education and Special Education teachers- PLC Minutes and Agendas on data for students with IEPs | 0-$1000(If needed for training on co-teaching strategies) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4: Growth

|  |
| --- |
| Goal 4 (State your growth goal.): |
|  **Objective**  | **Strategy** | **Activities**  | **Measure of Success** | **Progress Monitoring**  | **Funding** |
| Objective 1N/A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Objective 2N/A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 5: Transition Readiness

|  |
| --- |
| Goal 5 (State your transition readiness goal.): By the end of the 2023-24 school year, 75% of ECHS students will be considered “transition ready”, including academic and/or career readiness. |
|  **Objective**  | **Strategy** | **Activities**  | **Measure of Success** | **Progress Monitoring**  | **Funding** |
| Objective 1Increase Transition Readiness Rate from 46.3% to 56.3% in 2020-21 | KCWP 1: District’s CTE Pathway courses monitored and evaluated for effectiveness. | Revise monitoring tool to accurately track student progress in CTE pathways for scheduling and counseling purposes. | All ECHS students are listed in the CTE pathway document with courses completed in the pathway sequence  | Ms. Wilson (CTE Coordinator) and CTE teachers- updated list quarterly | 0 |
| KCWP 3: School/district leadership analyze the data in order to identify priorities and implement actionable steps that impact instruction/studentlearning. | CERT exam (2 times per year) for all 9th-11th grade students to measure student progress toward academic readiness goals. | Individual student progress monitored for growth and identification of next steps for students academically. | Principals, Counselors, Leadership Team, Gear Up Staff will analyze results after each CERT assessment administration to measure growth and identify needed academic next steps. | Funding provided through Gear Up grant |
|  | Placement of students in ACT Prep courses as juniors and seniors based on CERT data | Improvement of student scores following placement and participation in ACT prep courses. | Principals and Guidance Counselors for placement of students in ACT Prep courses each year.ACT Prep teachers responsible for monitoring of growth in class. | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Objective 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 6: Graduation Rate

|  |
| --- |
| Goal 6 (State your graduation rate goal.): By the end of the 2023-24 school year, the graduation rate percentage for the 4- and 5- year cohort combined will increase to 98%. |
|  **Objective**  | **Strategy** | **Activities**  | **Measure of Success** | **Progress Monitoring**  | **Funding** |
| Objective 1For the 2020-21 school year, a 96% graduation rate for the combined 4- and 5- year cohort combined.  | KCWP 4: Students know where they are in their own progression oflearning. | Create a 4-year graduation plan for each incoming student beginning in the 2021-22 academic year (academic goals, career goals, course progression) | Each incoming freshman has a 4-year plan created through an individual counseling session. | Guidance Counselors and Principals- meet with each freshman individually at the beginning of the school year to develop individualized plan for each student (can be adjusted as student interests and goals change). | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Objective 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 7: Other (Optional)

|  |
| --- |
| Goal 7 (State your separate 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:** |
| **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: During the 2019-20 school year, the principal completed the NISL program and during the 2020-21 school year, the assistant principal is attending the NISL program to ensure that the school leadership has been trained in essential skills and dispositions to help increase student achievement for all students, including underperforming subgroups.** |
| **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.**Response: The process involves multiple steps for each of these resources. In terms of people, it is a collaborative process between school leadership, district leadership, and the SBDM Council to determine how to best allocate teachers to meet the learning needs of our students. In terms of time, a master schedule is developed to meet the needs of all students, and this involves our school leadership team, SBDM Council, and administrative team working together to devise a schedule that addresses the learning needs of our students. For example, working this year to increase collaborative time in our English and Math classes with our special education and regular education teachers. Our budget process involves receiving our Section 6 Budget from our District Leadership, and then working with department heads to make sure that the needs of each department are met using that money. In addition, our Perkins funding is used to create a budget for our Career and Technical Education courses .** |

|  |
| --- |
| **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 collaborative teaching strategies. | Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge: New York, NY.  | ☒ |
|  |  | ☐ |
|  |  | ☐ |
|  |  | ☐ |
|  |  | ☐ |

 |

|  |
| --- |
| **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: Participation in diversity training to better understand how to address the learning needs of students from low-socioeconomic backgrounds and those with learning disabilities.** |

## 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](https://education.ky.gov/school/evidence/Pages/default.aspx). 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](https://education.ky.gov/school/evidence/Documents/Documenting%20Evidence%20Under%20ESSA.pdf)” resource available on KDE’s [Evidence-based Practices website](https://education.ky.gov/school/evidence/Pages/default.aspx).

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.  | ☒ |
|  |  | ☐ |
|  |  | ☐ |
|  |  | ☐ |
|  |  | ☐ |