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.

While the focus of continuous improvement is student performance, the work must be guided by the aspects of teaching and learning that affect performance. An effective improvement process should address the contributing factors creating the learning environment (inputs) and the performance data (outcomes). Through the Needs Assessment for Schools, priorities were identified and processes, practices, and/or conditions were chosen for focus. This goal building template will assist your improvement team to address those priorities and outline your targets and the activities intended to produce the desired changes. Progress monitoring details will ensure that your plan is being reviewed regularly to determine the success of each strategy.

Please note that the objectives (short-term targets) set by your school under the Achievement Gap section of this planning template will be used by the district's superintendent to determine whether or not your school met its targets to reduce the gap in student achievement for any student group for two consecutive years as required by KRS 158.649. Likewise, operational definitions for each required planning component can be found on page 2 of the planning template.

For those schools operating a Title I Schoolwide Program, this plan meets the requirements of Section 1114 of the Every Student Succeeds Act as well as state requirements under 703 KAR 5:225. No separate Schoolwide Program Plan is required.

Requirements for Building an Improvement Plan

- The required goals for elementary/middle schools include the following:
 - o State Assessment Results in reading and mathematics
 - o State Assessment Results in science, social studies and writing
 - Achievement Gap
 - o English Learner Progress
 - o Quality of School Climate and Safety
- The required goals for high schools include the following:
 - o State Assessment Results in reading and mathematics
 - o State Assessment Results in science, social studies and writing
 - Achievement Gap
 - o English Learner Progress
 - o Quality of School Climate and Safety

- o Postsecondary Readiness
- o Graduation Rate

Explanations/Directions

Goal: Schools should determine long-term goals that are three to five year targets for each required school level indicator. Elementary/middle schools must address proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, and growth. High schools must address 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 |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Schools should determine short-term objectives to be attained by the end of the current academic year. There can be multiple objectives for each goal. | Describe your approach to systematically address a process, practice, or condition that was identified as a priority during the Needs Assessment for Schools. There can be multiple strategies for each objective. The strategy can be based upon Kentucky's six (6) Key Core Work Processes or another established improvement approach (i.e. Six Sigma, Shipley, Baldridge, etc.). | Describe the actionable steps that will occur to deploy the chosen strategy. There can be multiple activities for each strategy. | List the criteria that will gauge the impact of your work. The measures may be quantitative or qualitative but are observable in some way. Consider measures of input as well as outcomes for both staff and students. | Describe the process used to assess the implementation of the plan, the rate of improvement, and the effectiveness of the plan. Your description should include the artifacts to be reviewed, specific timelines, and responsible individuals. | List the specific federal, state, or local funding source(s) used to support each improvement initiative. If your school is a recipient of Title I, Part A funds, your CSIP serves as your annual plan and must indicate how Title I funds are utilized to carry out the planned activities. |

1: State Assessment Results in reading and mathematics

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| Objective 1 | KCWP 1: Design and | Standards Deconstruction - | Revised common | Digital document kept with ongoing | General Fund |
| By May 2023, student proficiency | Deploy Standards | Teachers will deconstruct standards | assessments based on | deconstructed standards | |
| rates for reading will be 44%. | | during summer PD and throughout | deconstructed | PLC agendas | |
| | | the school year during PLC | standards. | | |
| | | meetings. | | | |
| | KCWP 2: Design and | Evidence-Based Instructional | Standards mastery on | Walk through data | General Fund |
| | <u>Deliver Instruction</u> | Strategies- Teachers will engage | formative and | Lesson Plan Checks | |
| | | in instructional coaching and | summative | | |
| | | professional learning focused on | assessments | | |
| | | the areas of best practice/high | | | |
| | | yield instructional strategies to | | | |
| | | aid in curricular decisions | | | |
| | | iReady personalized instruction – | Quarterly iReady data | iReady data | General Fund |
| | | Each student will be assigned an | analysis | | |
| | | individualized pathway based on | iReady Diagnostic | | |
| | | the iReady diagnostic results. An | Growth | | |
| | | expectation will be set for | | | |
| | | students to complete and pass 15 | | | |
| | | reading lessons per quarter. | | | |
| | | Students will be recognized for | | | |
| | | their achievements. | | | |
| | | School/Classroom Visits – ELA | New strategies added | Google Form completed for classroom | General Fund |
| | | teachers will visit North | to lesson plans | visits | |
| | | Washington Elementary School | | Staff reflection on school visits | |
| | | and Boyle County Middle School | | | |
| | | on the October 10 workday. | | | |
| | | Teachers will also make monthly | | | |
| | | visits to other classrooms in the | | | |

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|-----------|--|--|--|---|--------------|
| | | building to add to their repertoire of instructional strategies. | | | |
| | KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy | Balanced Assessment – Teachers will use a system of formative and summative assessment to determine next steps for instruction. Formative assessments will be documented in lesson plans daily and data will be analyzed weekly using the subgroups analysis document. | Standards mastery documented in IC | Lesson Plan Checks Walk through data OTUS data Subgroup analysis document | General Fund |
| | KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data | Data Analysis – In biweekly PLC meetings, teachers will analyze formative and summative assessment data and determine next steps for instruction. | Revisions made on weekly lesson plan documents reflecting reteaching strategies used | PLC agendas Subgroup analysis document | General Fund |
| | KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support | Interventions – Reading interventions will be provided during WIN time. Tier 3 services provided by the reading interventionist. Tier 2 services provided by the ELA teachers. Groups will be adjusted after each administration of the iReady diagnostic. | iReady diagnostic growth Aims Web probe data used for RTI | PLC agendas iReady data | Title 1 |
| | | Resources – iReady phonics workbooks were purchased for the reading interventionist to use with our lowest readers in Tier 3 reading interventions. | iReady diagnostic growth Aims Web probe data used for RTI | Walk through data | Title 1 |

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| | | Extended School – Teachers may | Standards mastery on | ESS rosters | ESS |
| | | refer students for after school | formative and | Failure report | |
| | | extended school services offered on | summative | | |
| | | Monday and Wednesday with bus | assessments | | |
| | | transportation provided. | | | |
| Objective 2 | KCWP 1: Design and | Standards Deconstruction - | Revised common | Digital document kept with ongoing | General Fund |
| By May 2023, student proficiency | Deploy Standards | Teachers will deconstruct standards | assessments based on | deconstructed standards | |
| rates for math will be 39%. | | during summer PD and throughout | deconstructed | PLC agendas | |
| | | the school year during PLC | standards. | | |
| | | meetings. | | | |
| | KCWP 2: Design and | Evidence-Based Instructional | Standards mastery on | Walk through data | General Fund |
| | <u>Deliver Instruction</u> | Strategies- Teachers will engage in | formative and | Lesson Plan Checks | |
| | | instructional coaching and | summative | | |
| | | professional learning focused on | assessments | | |
| | | the areas of best practice/high yield | | | |
| | | instructional strategies to aid in | | | |
| | | curricular decisions | | | |
| | | iReady personalized instruction – | Quarterly iReady data | iReady data | General Fund |
| | | Each student will be assigned an | analysis | | |
| | | individualized pathway based on | iReady Diagnostic | | |
| | | the iReady diagnostic results. An | Growth | | |
| | | expectation will be set for students | | | |
| | | to complete and pass 15 math | | | |
| | | lessons per quarter. Students will | | | |
| | | be recognized for their | | | |
| | | achievements. | | | |
| | | School/Classroom Visits – Math | New strategies added | Google Form completed for classroom | General Fund |
| | | teachers will visit North | to lesson plans | visits | |
| | | Washington Elementary School on | | Staff reflection on school visits | |
| | | the October 10 workday. Teachers | | | |
| | | will also make monthly visits to | | | |
| | | other classrooms in the building to | | | |

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------|
| | | add to their repertoire of | | | |
| | | instructional strategies. | | | |
| | KCWP 3: Design and | Balanced Assessment – Teachers | Standards mastery | Lesson Plan Checks | Title 1 |
| | Deliver Assessment | will use a system of formative and | documented in IC | Walk through data | |
| | Literacy | summative assessment to | | OTUS data | |
| | | determine next steps for | | Subgroup analysis document | |
| | | instruction. Teachers will be | | | |
| | | exposed to a variety of types of | | | |
| | | formative assessment strategies | | | |
| | | through PLC and faculty meetings, | | | |
| | | including card sorts and white | | | |
| | | boards. Formative assessments will | | | |
| | | be documented in lesson plans daily | | | |
| | | and data will be analyzed weekly | | | |
| | | using the subgroups analysis | | | |
| | | document. | | | |
| | | Live Scoring – All math students will | Live Scoring Data | Schedule of Live scoring | General Fund |
| | | complete a minimum of 2 Extended | | Live Scoring Prompts/Rubrics | |
| | | Response questions with feedback | | | |
| | | from the teacher, instructional | | | |
| | | coach or principal. | | | |
| | KCWP 4: Review, Analyze | Data Analysis – In biweekly PLC | Revisions made on | PLC agendas | General Fund |
| | and Apply Data | meetings, teachers will analyze | weekly lesson plan | Subgroup analysis document | |
| | | formative and summative | documents reflecting | | |
| | | assessment data and determine | reteaching strategies | | |
| | | next steps for instruction. | used | | |
| | KCWP 5: Design, Align | Interventions – Math interventions | iReady diagnostic | PLC agendas | General Fund |
| | and Deliver Support | will be provided during WIN time. | growth | iReady data | |
| | | Tier 2 and 3 services will be | Aims Web probe data | | |
| | | provided by the math teacher with | used for RTI | | |
| | | assistance from an instructional | | | |
| | | assistant. Groups will be adjusted | | | |

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|-----------|----------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| | | after each administration of the | | | |
| | | iReady diagnostic. | | | |
| | | Extended School – Teachers may | Standards mastery on | ESS rosters | ESS |
| | | refer students for after school | formative and | Failure report | |
| | | extended school services offered on | summative | | |
| | | Monday and Wednesday with bus | assessments | | |
| | | transportation provided. | | | |
| | | Advanced Math Courses – An | Students referred for | Curriculum maps | General Fund |
| | | advanced math track is offered for | Algebra I in 8 th grade | Lesson Plans | |
| | | students showing mastery of | | | |
| | | content standards based on iReady | | | |
| | | assessment and teacher | | | |
| | | recommendation. These courses | | | |
| | | have been developed to accelerate | | | |
| | | students through the grade level | | | |
| | | standards and begin on standards | | | |
| | | for the next grade level. | | | |

2: State Assessment Results in science, social studies and writing

Goal 2 (State your science, social studies, and writing goal.): By 2027, the percentage of students proficient in science will increase from 16% to 30% at Marion County Middle School.

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---|------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| Objective 1 | KCWP 1: Design and | Standards Deconstruction - | Revised common | Digital document kept with ongoing | General Fund |
| By May 2023, student | Deploy Standards | Teachers will deconstruct standards | assessments based on | deconstructed standards | |
| proficiency rates for science | | during summer PD and throughout | deconstructed | PLC agendas | |
| will be 19%. | | the school year during PLC | standards. | | |
| | | meetings. | | | |
| | | District Support – Teachers will | Development of | Digital document kept with ongoing | General Fund |
| | | receive support from the district gap | formative assessments. | deconstructed standards | |
| | | closure science specialist with | | Learning targets posted and on lesson | |
| | | deconstructing standards and | | plans | |
| | | writing learning targets. | | | |
| | KCWP 2: Design and | Evidence-Based Instructional | Standards mastery on | Walk through data | General Fund |
| | Deliver Instruction | Strategies- Teachers will engage in | formative and | Lesson Plan Checks | |
| | | instructional coaching and | summative | | |
| | | professional learning focused on | assessments | | |
| | | the areas of best practice/high yield | | | |
| | | instructional strategies to aid in | | | |
| | | curricular decisions | | | |
| | | Resources – Open Sci Ed kits were | Standards mastery on | Walk through data | ESSER |
| | | purchased for 6 th and 7 th grade | formative and | Lesson Plan Checks | Section 6 |
| | | science teachers to provide for | summative | | |
| | | phenomenon based instruction. | assessments | | |
| | | School/Classroom Visits – Science | New strategies added | Google Form completed for classroom | General Fund |
| | | teachers will visit Boyle County | to lesson plans | visits | |
| | | Middle School on the October 10 | | Staff reflection on school visits | |
| | | workday. Teachers will also make | | | |
| | | monthly visits to other classrooms | | | |
| | | in the building to add to their | | | |
| | | repertoire of instructional | | | |
| | | strategies. | | | |

Goal 2 (State your science, social studies, and writing goal.): By 2027, the percentage of students proficient in science will increase from 16% to 30% at Marion County Middle School.

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|-----------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| | KCWP 3: Design and | Balanced Assessment – Teachers | Standards mastery | Lesson Plan Checks | General Fund |
| | Deliver Assessment | will use a system of formative and | documented in IC | Walk through data | |
| | Literacy | summative assessment to | | OTUS data | |
| | | determine next steps for instruction | | | |
| | | Formative Assessments – Teachers | Formative assessment | Lesson Plan Checks | General Fund |
| | | will develop formative assessments | data | PLC agendas | |
| | | with assistance from the | | | |
| | | instructional coach and the district | | | |
| | | gap closure science specialist that | | | |
| | | align to learning targets. Formative | | | |
| | | assessments will be documented in | | | |
| | | lesson plans daily and data will be | | | |
| | | analyzed weekly using the | | | |
| | | subgroups analysis document. | | | |
| | KCWP 4: Review, Analyze | Data Analysis – In biweekly PLC | Revisions made on | PLC agendas | General Fund |
| | and Apply Data | meetings, teachers will analyze | weekly lesson plan | Subgroup analysis document | |
| | | formative and summative | documents reflecting | | |
| | | assessment data and determine | reteaching strategies | | |
| | | next steps for instruction. | used | | |
| | KCWP 5: Design, Align | ECE Collaboration – ECE teacher | Standards mastery for | Master schedule | General Fund |
| | and Deliver Support | schedules have been revised to | ECE students | | |
| | | allow for collaboration in science | documented in IC | | |
| | | classrooms with clusters of ECE | | | |
| | | students. | | | |
| | | Extended School – Teachers may | Standards mastery on | ESS rosters | ESS |
| | | refer students for after school | formative and | Failure report | |
| | | extended school services offered on | summative | · | |
| | | Monday and Wednesday with bus | assessments | | |
| | | transportation provided. | | | |

3: Achievement Gap

KRS 158.649 requires the school-based decision making (SBDM) council, or the principal if no council exists, to set the school's yearly targets for eliminating any achievement gap. The targets should be established with input from parents, faculty, and staff and submitted to the superintendent for consideration and the local board of education for adoption. In addition to being a statutory requirement, intentionally focusing on the achievement gaps that exist among a school's underserved student populations is also a vital component of the continuous improvement process. Schools should use a variety of measures and analysis when conducting its review of its achievement gaps, including a review of the school's climate and culture. Schools are not required to establish long term achievement gap goals; however, schools must establish yearly targets (objectives).

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| Objective 1 | KCWP 5: Design, Align | EL PD Day – Teachers participated in | Common assessment | Walk through data | General Fund |
| By May 2023, the percentage | and Deliver Support | a 3 hour PD focused around | data for the EL | | |
| of EL plus monitored students | | supports for EL students. Mini | subgroup | | |
| that score proficient in | | sessions included resources, | | | |
| reading will increase from 6% | | strategies, etc. | | | |
| to 10% and increase from | | Microsoft translator – Teachers | Common assessment | Walk through data | N/A |
| 20% to 25% of EL proficient in | | received training on how to use the | data for the EL | | |
| math. | | Microsoft translator app to | subgroup | | |
| | | communicate with students and | | | |
| | | families. This can be used to | | | |
| | | provide a live, translated | | | |
| | | transcription for students in the | | | |
| | | classroom. | | | |
| | | SIPPS – Program has been | Common assessment | EL/migrant staff schedules | ESSER |
| | | purchased by the district to be used | data for the EL | SIPPS data | |
| | | with older non-reader students. | subgroup | | |
| | | The program will be implemented | | | |
| | | by EL and migrant staff. | | | |
| | KCWP 4: Review, Analyze | PLC Data Analysis Subgroup Sheet – | Formative assessment | PLC agendas | General Fund |
| | and Apply Data | The district has developed a | data for the EL | | |
| | | subgroup analysis sheet for teachers | subgroup | | |
| | | to analyze formative assessment | | | |
| | | data specifically looking at | | | |
| | | subgroups. | | | |

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|---|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| Objective 2 | KCWP 5: Design, Align | ECE teachers visit Pulaski county – | Common assessment | Walk through data | General Fund |
| By May 2023, 15% of | and Deliver Support | ECE teachers will visit Pulaski County | data for the Disability | Master schedule indicating coteaching | |
| disability students will score | | High School (a KDE hub school) to | subgroup | | |
| proficient in reading and 15% | | observe their coteaching model. | | | |
| of disability students will | | Headphones – Headphones were | Common assessment | Walk through data | Title 1 |
| score proficient in math. | | purchased for disability students to | data for the Disability | | |
| | | use in order to access the online | subgroup | | |
| | | reader feature of the chromebook | | | |
| | | in order to prepare for KSA. | | | |
| | | Coteaching – The master schedule | Common assessment | Master schedule | General Fund |
| | | was revised to allow for coteaching | data for the Disability | | |
| | | in 7 th grade science classes. | subgroup | | |
| | KCWP 4: Review, Analyze | PLC Data Analysis Subgroup Sheet – | Formative assessment | PLC agendas | General Fund |
| | and Apply Data | The district has developed a | data for the Disability | | |
| | | subgroup analysis sheet for teachers | subgroup | | |
| | | to analyze formative assessment | | | |
| | | data specifically looking at | | | |
| | | subgroups. | | | |
| | | ECE Progress Monitoring – ECE staff | Progress monitoring | Results shared in ARC meetings | General Fund |
| | | will be responsible for monitoring | data | | |
| | | IEP goals. | | | |

4: English Learner Progress

Goal 4 (State your English Learner goal.): By 2027, 30% of English Learner students at Marion County Middle School will score 60 or greater on the growth table for the ACCESS test.

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| Objective 1 | KCWP 5: Design, Align | EL PD Day – Teachers participated in | Common assessment | Walk through data | General Fund |
| By May 2023, 18% of English | and Deliver Support | a 3 hour PD focused around | data for the EL | | |
| Learner students at Marion | | supports for EL students. Mini | subgroup | | |
| County Middle School will | | sessions included resources, | | | |
| score 60 or greater on the | | strategies, etc. | | | |
| growth table for the ACCESS | | Microsoft translator – Teachers | Common assessment | Walk through data | N/A |
| test. | | received training on how to use the | data for the EL | | |
| | | Microsoft translator app to | subgroup | | |
| | | communicate with students and | | | |
| | | families. This can be used to | | | |
| | | provide a live, translated | | | |
| | | transcription for students in the | | | |
| | | classroom. | | | |
| | | SIPPS – Program has been | Common assessment | EL/migrant staff schedules | ESSER |
| | | purchased by the district to be used | data for the EL | SIPPS data | |
| | | with older non-reader students. | subgroup | | |
| | | The program will be implemented | | | |
| | | by EL and migrant staff. | | | |
| | | PLC Data Analysis Subgroup Sheet – | Formative assessment | PLC agendas | General Fund |
| | KOMP 4. Daview Arakes | The district has developed a | data for the EL | | |
| | KCWP 4: Review, Analyze | subgroup analysis sheet for teachers | subgroup | | |
| | and Apply Data | to analyze formative assessment | | | |
| | | data specifically looking at | | | |
| | | subgroups. | | | |

5: Quality of School Climate and Safety

Goal 5 (State your climate and safety goal.): By 2027, the indicator score for Quality of School Climate and Safety will be 80 at Marion County Middle School.

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| Objective 1 | KCWP 5: Design, | PASS SEL Screener – The PASS SEL | Behavioral data – IC | PASS Data | Title IV |
| By May 2023, the indicator | Align and Deliver | Screener will be administered to | referrals, rate and | Schedule of intervention groups | TICICIV |
| score for Quality of School | Support | students twice during the 22-23 | relate, etc. | Schedule of intervention groups | |
| Climate and Safety will be 71. | | school year. Data from this | relate, etc. | | |
| enmate and surety win be 71. | | screener will guide the guidance | | | |
| | | counselor and behavior | | | |
| | | interventionist in setting up small | | | |
| | | groups to provide emotional and | | | |
| | | behavioral interventions. | | | |
| | KCWP 6: | Shield Shop – A school store has | Behavioral data – IC | Walk through data | School Activity Fund |
| | Establishing | been created in which students can | referrals, rate and | Shield Shop schedule | PTO donations |
| | Learning Culture and | redeem the reward bucks they | relate, etc. | · | |
| | <u>Environment</u> | receive from teachers for positive | · | | |
| | | behaviors. | | | |
| | | KAAC Audit – MCMS participated in | Safe School | SBDM minutes | N/A |
| | | a School Safety Audit completed by | Assessment Report | Faculty Meeting Agenda | |
| | | the Kentucky Center for School | | | |
| | | Safety. This audit included | | | |
| | | observations, interviews and | | | |
| | | surveys in the areas of safety, | | | |
| | | morale, student services, | | | |
| | | communication, supervision, etc. | | | |
| | | House System – A house system has | IC data – academic and | House Meeting schedule | N/A |
| | | been developed with 2 houses per | behavior | House Meeting minutes | |
| | | grade level. House teachers meet | | Communication logs | |
| | | once per month after school to | | | |
| | | discuss grades, behavior, etc for | | | |
| | | students in their house. | | | |

Goal 5 (State your climate and safety goal.): By 2027, the indicator score for Quality of School Climate and Safety will be 80 at Marion County Middle School.

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|-----------|----------|---|---|---|--------------|
| | | Parent Engagement Activities – An open house, parent teacher conferences and other Title 1 parent engagement activities are held throughout the year. | Parent Engagement survey results | Parent Engagement sign in sheets | Title 1 |
| | | Parent Communication – A weekly parent newsletter will be shared with parents through email and social media. All communications with parents will be logged in IC. | Parent Engagement survey results | Weekly social media posts IC Communication tab | N/A |
| | | 6 th grade camp – A half day sixth grade camp was held as a transition activity. Teachers went over expectations with students and they were able to practice their schedule. | 6 th grade academic and behavioral data | 6 th grade camp sign in sheet | General Fund |
| | | Student Conduct – The discipline matrix was revised and approved by SBDM to make it more streamlined. Teachers reviewed the discipline matrix with students in the first week of school. Copies were sent home to be signed by parents. | IC behavior referral data | First week plans shared with teachers Signed forms | N/A |
| | | Attendance – MCMS will work with students and families to encourage good attendance and to limit chronic absenteeism. Attendance meetings will be held with families of students with over 3 unexcused | Attendance rates | Attendance call and meetings documented in IC | General Fund |

Goal 5 (State your climate and safety goal.): By 2027, the indicator score for Quality of School Climate and Safety will be 80 at Marion County Middle School.

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|-----------|--|---|---|---------------------|--------------|
| | | absences. We will explore the truancy diversion program with the Court Designated Worker. | | | |
| | | Student Recognition – A student of the month will be recognized from each house. Top iReady students will be recognized weekly from each house. | QSCS survey results | Social media | N/A |
| | KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction | SEL Lessons – The school counselor creates and shares SEL lessons with teachers through a Google Classroom. These lessons are completed during WIN each Monday. | Behavioral data – IC referrals, rate and relate, etc. | Google Classrooms | General Fund |

6: Postsecondary Readiness (high school only)

Goal 6 (State your postsecondary goal.):

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|-------------|----------|------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------|
| Objective 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Objective 2 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

7: Graduation Rate (high school only)

Goal 7 (State your graduation goal.):

| Objective | Strategy | Activities | Measure of Success | Progress Monitoring | Funding |
|-------------|----------|------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------|
| Objective 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Objective 2 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

8: Other (Optional)

Goal 8 (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) 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:

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: MCMS is under the leadership of a new principal and assistant principal for the 22-23 school year. Both of these new administrators work closely with district leadership including the superintendent, assistant superintendent, instructional supervisors and director of student services to ensure that the needs of all students in the building are being met. The principal and AP participate in district leadership meetings. The principal attended the School Improvement Planning for Performance Excellence offered by KDE for TSI schools.

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: SBDM reviews the budgets and master schedule to analyze the allocation of resources. An inequity that was identified was lack of coteaching between ECE and regular education teachers in the area of science. Changes were made in the master schedule to allow for this to happen 3 periods of the day. WIN has been built into the master schedule to allow a period for all students to receive needed interventions.

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: A subgroup data analysis protocol has been implemented. Teachers document data once per week using formative assessments and then analyze this data in biweekly PLC meetings. OTUS is used to analyze subgroup data on common assessments.

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:

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 "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 |
|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------|
| Establishing the Learning Environment | Evidence-based instructional practices (ebips). KYstandards. (2022, April 23). Retrieved November 25, 2022, from https://kystandards.org/standards-resources/pl-mods/evidence-based-instructional-practices-ebips/ | |
| Clarifying and Sharing Learning Goals | Evidence-based instructional practices (ebips). KYstandards. (2022, April 23). Retrieved November 25, 2022, from https://kystandards.org/standards-resources/pl-mods/evidence-based-instructional-practices-ebips/ | |
| Explicit Teaching and Modeling | Evidence-based instructional practices (ebips). KYstandards. (2022, April 23). Retrieved November 25, 2022, from https://kystandards.org/standards-resources/pl-mods/evidence-based-instructional-practices-ebips/ | |
| SIPPS | SEG Measurement. (2022). Evaluating the effects of the SIPPS program. Newtown, PA: Author. | |
| | | |

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.

Provide narrative information regarding the additional requirements for CSI schools in the following chart:

| Turnaround Team: |
|---|
| Consider: Provide 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 Response: |
| |
| |
| 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: |
| |
| |
| |

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 (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 |
|---|--|--------------------|
| 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. | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |