

## Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP)

### Rationale

District improvement efforts are a collaborative process involving multiple stakeholders. Through the improvement planning process, leaders focus on priority needs, district funding, and closing achievement gaps among identified subgroups of students. When implemented with fidelity, the Comprehensive District Improvement Plan (CDIP) cultivates an environment that promotes student growth and achievement.

### Operational Definitions

**Goal:** Long-term three to five year targets based on the six (6) required district goals: proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap closure, graduation rate, growth, and transition readiness. Long-term targets should be informed by The Needs Assessment for Districts.

**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 district 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*, *Shipleigh*, *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.

Proficiency/Gap/Growth Goals (3 year target for each)						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proficiency Goal - Reading               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By 2023, Cedar Grove Elementary will increase the percentage of proficient students in Reading to 61.0.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Proficiency Goal - Math               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By 2023, Cedar Grove Elementary will increase the percentage of proficient students in Math to 49.8.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Gap Goal               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By 2023, Cedar Grove Elementary will increase the percentage of students with disabilities scoring proficient in reading and math to 31.5.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Growth Goal               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By 2023, Cedar Grove Elementary will increase the percentage of students scoring proficient in reading and math to 55.4.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>						
Objective (Plan-Validate need w/data)	Measure of Success (outcome)	Strategy (KCWP and DO)	Activities (Do)	Progress Monitoring (Study and Act)	Funding	Title 1 Plan (NA if not applicable)
Cedar Grove Elementary had a proficiency percentage of 52.3% in reading in 2019. Cedar Grove Elementary will increase that to 56.6% in reading in 2021.	On KPREP 2021, 56.6% of 3-5 graders will be proficient in reading.	KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy	Teachers will receive regular feedback on Common Formative Assessments from the principal and instructional coach.	-Track mastery from standards mastery checklist -Common Formative Assessments analysis through the PLC Process	\$0	-Weekly ILT meetings to review formative assessment data along with data from classroom walkthroughs and observations
Cedar Grove Elementary had a proficiency percentage of 38.7% in math in 2019. Cedar Grove Elementary will increase that to 44.3% in math in 2021.	On KPREP 2021, 44.3% of 3-5 graders will be proficient in math.	KCWP 4: Review, Analyze, and Apply Data	Teachers will analyze and reflect on results of CFA's regularly through the PLC process to guide guaranteed mastery of standards.	-Standards Mastery Checklist and Mastery-Connect analysis through the PLC Process	-District Funded	-Title 1 Evaluation Survey administered Spring/Summer -Title 1 Math Night April 2021 -Title 1 Teacher provides additional reading and math instruction during daily clinic schedule
	On KPREP 2021, 56.6% of 3-5 graders will score proficient in reading and 44.3% will score proficient in math.	KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction	Teachers will implement instructional strategies such as "Thinking Focus" to increase student achievement.	-Continue to build capacity and increased student achievement through: Thinking Focus	- District Funds / Title I / Sec6 \$5000.00	

<p>Cedar Grove Elementary had a gap rate in reading for students with disabilities of 34.8 in 2019. Cedar Grove Elementary will have a gap rate in this category of 31.6 in 2021.</p>	<p>On KPREP 2021, 25% of 3-5 Students with disabilities will score proficient in reading.</p>	<p>KCWP 5: Design, Align, &amp; Deliver Support Processes</p>	<p>Teachers of Special Education will regularly and actively participate in grade level Professional Learning Communities to include activities such as analyzing student work and standards mastery checklists, differentiating instruction and coteaching strategies</p>	<p>-PLC Agendas -Monitoring Minutes -Standards Mastery Checklists analyzed for ECE students in PLC's -Walkthrough and observations</p>	<p>- \$0</p>	
<p>Cedar Grove Elementary had a gap rate in math for students with disabilities of 23.7 in 2019. Cedar Grove Elementary will have a gap rate in this category of 21.6 in 2021.</p>	<p>On KPREP 2021, 22.7% of 3-5 Students with disabilities will score proficient in math.</p>	<p>KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction</p>	<p>The Reading Interventionist and "plus 1" teacher will attend the National Reading Recovery Conference and implement learned strategies with identified students; share strategies with faculty to implement in their classroom with targeted students</p> <p>FRC collaboration with families for K Kickoff, Headstart/Pre K registration days and little Academy (All fit into transition activities)</p>	<p>-Teachers will build capacity to increase student achievement through attendance at the national conference.</p>	<p>- District Funds / Title I / Sec6 \$5000.00 (running)</p>	
<p>Cedar Grove Elementary had a combined proficiency rate (reading/math) of 45% in 2019. Cedar Grove Elementary will increase that total to 55.4% by 2023.</p>	<p>On KPREP 2021, 50.45% of 3-5 Students will score proficient in reading/math combined.</p>	<p>KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction</p> <p>KCWP 4: Review, Analyze, and Apply Data</p>	<p>All teachers will offer "clinic time" to ensure a guaranteed recovery of standards</p> <p>All teachers will track student mastery of standards through a common and accessible format.</p>	<p>- Standards Mastery Checklist &amp; Mastery Connect that demonstrates reteaching and guaranteed recovery.</p> <p>-Standards Mastery Checklist or Mastery Connect</p> <p>-CASE Binders</p>	<p>- District Funded</p> <p>-District Funded</p>	

		KCWP 4: Review, Analyze, and Apply Data	Student CASE DATA will be reviewed and analyzed through the PLC process to guide instructional decision making.	- "Red Standards Analysis" through CASE		
--	--	---	---	---	--	--

Separate Academic Indicator • SAI Goal • By 2023, Cedar Grove Elementary will have 55.5% of students scoring proficient in writing.						
Objective (Plan-Validate need w/data)	Measure of Success (outcome)	Strategy (KCWP and DO)	Activities (Do)	Progress Monitoring (Study and Act)	Funding	Title 1 Plan (NA if not applicable)
Cedar Grove Elementary had 45.6% of students score proficient in writing. Cedar Grove Elementary will improve that to 50.5% in 2021.	On KPREP 2021, 50.5% of CGES 3-5 Students will score proficient in writing.	KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction  KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction  KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy	The Writing Committee will develop a comprehensive plan for on demand writing.  Teachers will implement vertically aligned graphic organizers and rubrics for the modes of writing. Teachers will systematically score and give student feedback on writing in grade level and vertical PLC's. (includes school-wide strategy of RAP   RACE)	- Writing Folder on school Google site with Comprehensive Writing Plan - Writing Committee Meets regularly  - Writing Folder on school's Google site with graphic organizers and shared rubrics  - Common Writing Analysis Time with Evidence of RAP/RACE and quality feedback on writing and prompts. - Teachers will continue to build capacity, visible in walkthroughs and observations, for SAI Achievement through professional development and	\$500 - Title I PD	

				<i>implementing best practices.</i>		

Gap Group/Total number of students	Percentage of Total School Population
F/R - 148	31.80%
SWD - 41	8.80%
GT - 59	12.68%

[illegible]

[illegible]



[illegible]

Academic Data	CASE Data, Fall 2020	K-PREP 2018-2019
Grade 3 Reading	58% P/D	60.2% P/D in 2018-2019
Grade 4 Reading	61% P/D	43.8% P/D in 2018-19
Grade 5 Reading	51% P/D	50.5% P/D in 2018-19
Grade K Reading	N/A	N/A
Grade 1 Reading	65% P/D	N/A
Grade 2 Reading	45% P/D	N/A
	<b>CASE Data, Fall 2020</b>	
Grade 3 Math	53% P/D	38.7% P/D
Grade 4 Math	50% P/D	38.6% P/D
Grade 5 Math	45% P/D	35.5% P/D
Grade K Math	N/A	N/A
Grade 1 Math	57% P/D	N/A
Grade 2 Math	41% P/D	N/A
	<b>CASE Data, Fall 2020</b>	
Students w/Disabilities Reading (all levels)	46% P/D	52.3 % P/D
Students w/Disabilities Math (all levels)	42% P/D	38.7% P/D
Students w/Disabilities Writing (all levels)	N/A	45.6% P/D
Students w/Disabilities Science (all levels)	N/A	28.1% P/D
Students w/Disabilities Social Studies (elem/middle only)	N/A	50.0% P/D
	<b>CASE Data Fall 2020</b>	
EL Students	33% P/D	
	<b>CASE Data Fall 2020</b>	
Economically Disadvantaged Reading (all levels)	46 % P/D	43% P/D
Economically Disadvantaged Math (all levels)	36% P/D	27% P/D
Economically Disadvantaged Writing (all levels)	N/A	40% P/D
Economically Disadvantaged Science (all levels)	N/A	16% P/D
Economically Disadvantaged Social Studies (elem. & middle)	N/A	41.9% P/D
	<b>CASE Data Fall 2020</b>	
Homeless Students Reading (all levels)	50% P/D	
Homeless Students Math (all levels)	50% P/D	
Homeless Students Writing (all levels)	N/A	
Homeless Students Science (all levels)	N/A	
Homeless Students Social Studies (elem. & middle)	N/A	
	<b>CASE Data Fall 2020</b>	
Gifted and Talented (Reading)	86% P/D	

Gifted and Talented (Math)	78% P/D	
<b>Non-Academic Data</b>		
Behavior	0 Submitted Discipline Referrals	
Student Attendance	95.8% Attendance Rate for Students	
Teacher Attendance		

[illegible]

<b>Academic Data</b>	<b>Winter CASE 2020</b>	<b>Fall CASE 2020*</b>
Grade 3 Reading	41% P/D	61% P/D
Grade 4 Reading	44% P/D	51% P/D
Grade 5 Reading	53% P/D	
Grade K	37% P/D	65% P/D
Grade 1	24% P/D	45% P/D
Grade 2	49% P/D	58% P/D
Grade 3 Math	48% P/D	50% P/D
Grade 4 Math	41% P/D	45% P/D
Grade 5 Math	60% P/D	
Grade K	42% P/D	57% P/D
Grade 1	41% P/D	41% P/D
Grade 2	65% P/D	53% P/D
<b>Gifted and Talented (all levels)</b>		
<b>Non-Academic Data</b>		
<u>Behavior</u>		* The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2017-18 to 288 in 2018-19
Student Attendance		
Teacher Attendance		* Teacher attendance rate was 84% for the 2018-19 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2017-18

Academic Data	2018-2020
Elementary Reading	Percentage of students receiving Proficient/Distinguished scores on Cose assessments has increased in each grade level from Winter, 2020 to Fall 2020
Elementary Math	Percentage of students receiving Proficient/Distinguished scores on Cose assessments has increased in each grade level from Winter, 2020 to Fall 2020
Non-Academic Data	Student Points
Student Attendance	
Student Absences	