

Academy at Shawnee

Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP)

Rationale

The CSIP is a plan developed by the school council with the input of parents, faculty and staff based on a review of relevant data that includes targets, strategies, activities, a time schedule to support student achievement and student growth and to eliminate achievement gaps among groups of students. Through the improvement planning process, leaders focus on priority needs, funding and closing achievement gaps among identified subgroups of students.

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).

Please note that the objectives (yearly 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 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 (and general information about goal setting) for each required planning component can be found on page 2 of this 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.**

Tools for Goal Setting:

- [Accountability Data](#)
- [ISMT](#)
- [Instructional Vision and DR eLeot Results](#)
- [Turnaround Team Minutes](#)

Operational Definitions

When completing the template sections that follow, please refer to the following operational definitions:

- **Goal:** Long-term three- to five-year targets based on the school-level state assessment results. Long-term targets should be informed by the Phase Two: Needs Assessment for Schools;
- **Objective:** Short-term yearly target to be attained by the end of the current academic year. Objectives should address state assessment results and/or aligned formative assessments. 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, as identified in the Needs Assessment for Schools, 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 Key Core Work Processes listed below or another established improvement approach (i.e., *Six Sigma*, *Shiple*y, *Baldrige*, etc.);
- **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 Results](#)

[KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support](#)

[KCWP 6: Establish Learning Environment and Culture](#)

- **Activity:** Actionable steps the school will take to deploy the chosen strategy. There can be multiple activities for each strategy;
- **Progress Monitoring:** Process used to collect and analyze measures of success to assess the level of implementation, the rate of improvement and the effectiveness of the plan. The measures may be quantitative or qualitative but are observable in some way. The description should include the artifacts to be reviewed, specific timelines, and responsible individuals; and
- **Funding:** Local, state or federal funds/grants used to support (or needed to support) the activities.

Goal Setting:

When developing goals, all schools must establish achievement gap targets and set goals in the area of state assessment results in reading and mathematics. Other goals aligned to the indicators in the state's

accountability system and deemed priority areas in the Phase Two: Needs Assessment for Schools are optional.

Required Goals

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. Additional rows may be added for multiple targets, strategies and activities.

Objective(s):

- The percentage of African American students scoring P/D in Reading will grow from 11% to 14%
- The percentage of African American students scoring Novice in Reading will reduce from 67% to 64%
- The percentage of African American students scoring P/D in Math will grow from 2% to 5%
- The percentage of African American students scoring Novice in Math will reduce from 80% to 75%

Strategy:

- [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 Results](#)
- [KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support](#)
- [KCWP 6: Establish Learning Environment and Culture](#)

- To address the achievement gap for African American students—specifically aiming to increase Reading proficiency to 14% and Math to 5%—the school will implement a systemic strategy focused on KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction to ensure universal, high-quality Tier I instruction that is strictly aligned to Kentucky Academic Standards. This approach prioritizes meeting the needs of at least 80% of students through universal instruction by utilizing intentional scaffolding and differentiation within every classroom. Key actions include the consistent execution of the Shawnee White Board Protocol to ensure all

students are active participants, the collaborative internalization of HQIR-aligned lessons within Curriculum-Based PLCs, and the daily unpacking of learning targets to empower students with a clear understanding of success criteria. To sustain this growth, leadership will rigorously monitor instruction before, during, and after delivery, ensuring that high-yield strategies like modeling and feedback are responsive to student needs and directly congruent with intended learning goals.

Activities:

- **Executing the Shawnee White Board Protocol (Instructional Framework for Engagement)** – to create classroom environments where all students are active participants in their learning through structured, routine lesson execution.
 - 2.3: Daily grade level and appropriate learning targets/goals are posted, unpacked with students, and referenced throughout the lesson. Learning targets/goals are aligned to HQIRs as adopted.
- **Participating in Curriculum-Based Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)** – to plan collaboratively, internalize units and lessons, analyze data, and adjust instruction to drive student growth.
 - 3.3: Collaborative teams use the HQIRs in conjunction with student work and data to engage in planning, data analysis, and internalization of lessons and protocols.
- **Strategic Data Analysis** – 1.5: The Instructional Leadership Team(s) review disaggregated assessment data (Screeners, Diagnostics, HQIR assessments, Milestones) at least three times per year AND communicates progress toward the vision and goals to relevant stakeholders.
 - 4.3: All teachers and leaders in the school routinely analyze the results of student screeners, diagnostics, HQIR assessments, common formative/summative assessments, and district vital signs to plan tiered instruction through an intentional data system. Data is evaluated at a cadence that is aligned with the appropriate tier.
- **High School Literacy Intervention Pilot in the 9th Grade** – The high school literacy coach, with district support, will utilize CERT benchmark data and ORF screener data to identify Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students in order to tailor instructional interventions to meet the needs of those students.
 - [Decision Tree \(Pilot\)](#)
- **Middle School Literacy Periods** – Each grade in middle school has an added literacy class in which students can receive targeted literacy instruction.

Progress Monitoring:

- CERT Data (High School)
- MAP Data (Middle School)
- ORF Screener Data (Both)

- HQIR-aligned Summative Assessment Data (monitored in PLCs)
- Instructional Walkthrough Data

Funding:

Allocation of general, Title I, and SIF funding.

State Assessment Results in Reading and Mathematics

Kentucky's accountability system uses multiple academic and school quality measures, with each indicator contributing to the overall score. Reading and math proficiency are foundational to student success, and state assessment results in reading and mathematics carry the greatest weight when calculating the overall score at each level (elementary, middle and high school). This indicator is a required goal area for all schools.

Five Year Goal:

Reading: By May of 2030, Reading will increase from 14% to 29% P/D for all students on KSA.

Mathematics: By May of 2030, Math will increase from 5% to 20% P/D for all students on KSA.

Achievement Gap: By May of 2026, the Achievement Gap will go from 11% to 15% P/D for African American students on KSA Math.

By May of 2026, the Achievement Gap will go from 7% to 12% P/D for ECE students on KSA Math.

Objective(s):

- The percentage of students scoring P/D in Reading will grow from 14% to 17%.
- The percentage of students scoring Novice in Reading will reduce from 64% to 61%
- The percentage of students scoring P/D in Math will grow from 5% to 8%
- The percentage of students scoring Novice in Math will reduce from 74% to 69%

Strategy:

- [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 Results](#)
- [KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support](#)
- [KCWP 6: Establish Learning Environment and Culture](#)

- To achieve the state assessment objectives of increasing Reading proficiency to 18% and Math to 8% while significantly reducing Novice scores, the school will integrate KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards and KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction to ensure a guaranteed and viable curriculum is paired with high-quality teaching. Systemically, the school will move toward a model of high-quality planning and delivery where teachers

utilize Curriculum-Based PLCs to gain clarity on Kentucky Academic Standards and internalize High-Quality Instructional Resources (HQIRs), ensuring instruction is vertically aligned and masters content appropriately. This curriculum work will be operationalized through the Shawnee White Board Protocol, which facilitates active participation and deep cognitive engagement by utilizing evidence-based practices such as modeling, questioning, and feedback. To ensure at least 80% of students succeed through universal Tier I instruction, teachers will explicitly post and unpack daily learning targets to provide clear success criteria, while leadership monitors teaching before, during, and after delivery to ensure alignment and responsiveness to students' needs. By using strategic data analysis from tools like MAP, the Turnaround Team will identify immediate next steps for improvement, ensuring all instructional practices are congruent with the intended learning and directly contribute to the school's long-term proficiency goals.

Activities:

- **Executing the Shawnee White Board Protocol (Instructional Framework for Engagement)** – to create classroom environments where all students are active participants in their learning through structured, routine lesson execution.
 - 2.3: Daily grade level and appropriate learning targets/goals are posted, unpacked with students, and referenced throughout the lesson. Learning targets/goals are aligned to HQIRs as adopted.
- **Participating in Curriculum-Based Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)** – to plan collaboratively, internalize units and lessons, analyze data, and adjust instruction to drive student growth.
 - 3.3: Collaborative teams use the HQIRs in conjunction with student work and data to engage in planning, data analysis, and internalization of lessons and protocols.
- **Strategic Data Analysis** – 1.5: The Instructional Leadership Team(s) review disaggregated assessment data (Screeners, Diagnostics, HQIR assessments, Milestones) at least three times per year AND communicates progress toward the vision and goals to relevant stakeholders.
 - 4.3: All teachers and leaders in the school routinely analyze the results of student screeners, diagnostics, HQIR assessments, common formative/summative assessments, and district vital signs to plan tiered instruction through an intentional data system. Data is evaluated at a cadence that is aligned with the appropriate tier.'
- **High School Literacy Intervention Pilot in the 9th Grade** – The high school literacy coach, with district support, will utilize CERT benchmark data and ORF screener data to identify Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students in order to tailor instructional interventions to meet the needs of those students.
 - [Decision Tree \(Pilot\)](#)

- **Middle School Literacy Periods** – Each grade in middle school has an added literacy class in which students can receive targeted literacy instruction.

Progress Monitoring:

- CERT Data (High School)
- MAP Data (Middle School)
- ORF Screener Data (Both)
- HQIR-aligned Summative Assessment Data (monitored in PLCs)
- Instructional Walkthrough Data

Funding:

Allocation of general, Title I, and SIF funding.

Alignment to Needs: Optional Goals

Through the Phase Two: Needs Assessment for Schools, priorities were identified, and processes, practices and/or conditions were chosen for focus. Identify any additional indicators that will be addressed by the school in order to build staff capacity and increase student achievement by selecting “yes” or “no” from the dropdown options (beside each indicator) below. For any indicator noted as a priority with a “yes,” schools must complete the below fields. For any indicator marked with a “no,” no further information is needed. Each indicator must have a “yes” or “no” response in the below table.

Indicator	Priority Indicator?
State Assessment Results in science, social studies and writing	Yes
English Learner Progress	Yes
Quality of School Climate and Safety	Yes
Postsecondary Readiness (high schools and districts only)	No
Graduation Rate (high schools and districts only)	No

Priority Indicator Goals:

Complete the fields below for each indicator that was chosen as a priority with a “yes” response above.

Priority Indicator #1: Combined Writing

Three- to Five-Year Goal:

By May of 2028, Writing will grow to 10% P/D for All students on KSA.

Objective(s):

By May of 2026, Writing will grow to 6% P/D for All students on KSA.

Strategy:

- [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 Results](#)
- [KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support](#)
- [KCWP 6: Establish Learning Environment and Culture](#)

- To achieve the state assessment objective of increasing Combined Writing proficiency to 6% P/D by May 2026, the school will integrate KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards and

KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction to ensure every student has access to a standards-aligned, high-quality writing instruction. This systemic strategy focuses on utilizing Curriculum-Based PLCs where teachers collaboratively internalize High-Quality Instructional Resources (HQIRs) and ensure that instruction is vertically aligned and masters the content required by the Kentucky Academic Standards. Teachers will operationalize this through the Shawnee White Board Protocol, ensuring all students are active participants through structured lesson execution and the purposeful use of high-yield strategies such as modeling and feedback. By explicitly unpacking daily learning targets and success criteria, the school aims to meet the needs of at least 80% of students within Tier I instruction through intentional scaffolding and differentiation. Leadership will sustain this growth by monitoring teaching before, during, and after instruction, using data from HQIR assessments and instructional walkthroughs to identify immediate next steps and ensure that all writing instruction remains congruent with intended learning goals.

Activities:

- **Executing the Shawnee White Board Protocol (Instructional Framework for Engagement)** – to create classroom environments where all students are active participants in their learning through structured, routine lesson execution.
 - 2.3: Daily grade level and appropriate learning targets/goals are posted, unpacked with students, and referenced throughout the lesson. Learning targets/goals are aligned to HQIRs as adopted.
- **Participating in Curriculum-Based Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)** – to plan collaboratively, internalize units and lessons, analyze data, and adjust instruction to drive student growth.
 - 3.3: Collaborative teams use the HQIRs in conjunction with student work and data to engage in planning, data analysis, and internalization of lessons and protocols.
- **Strategic Data Analysis** – 1.5: The Instructional Leadership Team(s) review disaggregated assessment data (Screeners, Diagnostics, HQIR assessments, Milestones) at least three times per year AND communicates progress toward the vision and goals to relevant stakeholders.
 - 4.3: All teachers and leaders in the school routinely analyze the results of student screeners, diagnostics, HQIR assessments, common formative/summative assessments, and district vitals signs to plan tiered instruction through an intentional data system. Data is evaluated at a cadence that is aligned with the appropriate tier.

Progress Monitoring:

- CERT Data (High School)

- MAP Data (Middle School)
- ORF Screener Data (Both)
- HQIR-aligned Summative Assessment Data (monitored in PLCs)
- Instructional Walkthrough Data

Funding:

Allocation of general, Title I, and SIF funding.

Priority Indicator #2: English Learner Progress

Three- to Five-Year Goal:

By May of 2026, English Learner Progress will grow to 5% Proficient for ML students on ACCESS.

Objective(s):

By May of 2026, English Learner Progress will grow to 5% Proficient for ML students on ACCESS.

Strategy:

- [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 Results](#)
- [KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support](#)
- [KCWP 6: Establish Learning Environment and Culture](#)

➤ To achieve the target of growing English Learner Progress to 5% proficiency on the ACCESS assessment by May 2026, the school will integrate KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards and KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction to establish a systemic environment of universal, equitable Tier I instruction. This strategy centers on Curriculum-Based PLCs where teachers collaboratively internalize High-Quality Instructional Resources (HQIRs) and gain clarity on standards to ensure instruction is vertically aligned and content is mastered at high levels. These instructional plans will be operationalized through the Shawnee White Board Protocol to foster active participation and cognitive engagement, supported by the purposeful use of high-yield strategies like modeling and feedback. By explicitly posting and unpacking daily grade-level learning targets, teachers will provide clear success criteria for ML students, allowing for intentional scaffolding and differentiation to ensure that at least 80% of students have their needs met within the universal instruction setting. To sustain this progress, the Instructional Leadership Team will engage in strategic data analysis of ACCESS scores, screeners, and HQIR assessments to identify immediate improvements, ensuring all teaching remains congruent with intended learning and the cultural needs of the student population.

Activities:

- **Executing the Shawnee White Board Protocol (Instructional Framework for Engagement)** – to create classroom environments where all students are active participants in their learning through structured, routine lesson execution.
 - 2.3: Daily grade level and appropriate learning targets/goals are posted, unpacked with students, and referenced throughout the lesson. Learning targets/goals are aligned to HQIRs as adopted.
- **Participating in Curriculum-Based Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)** – to plan collaboratively, internalize units and lessons, analyze data, and adjust instruction to drive student growth.
 - 3.3: Collaborative teams use the HQIRs in conjunction with student work and data to engage in planning, data analysis, and internalization of lessons and protocols.
- **Strategic Data Analysis** – 1.5: The Instructional Leadership Team(s) review disaggregated assessment data (Screeners, Diagnostics, HQIR assessments, Milestones) at least three times per year AND communicates progress toward the vision and goals to relevant stakeholders.
 - 4.3: All teachers and leaders in the school routinely analyze the results of student screeners, diagnostics, HQIR assessments, common formative/summative assessments, and district vital signs to plan tiered instruction through an intentional data system. Data is evaluated at a cadence that is aligned with the appropriate tier.

Progress Monitoring:

- CERT Data (High School)
- MAP Data (Middle School)
- ORF Screener Data (Both)
- HQIR-aligned Summative Assessment Data (monitored in PLCs)
- ACCESS Data

Funding:

Allocation of general, Title I, and SIF funding.

Priority Indicator #3: Quality of School Climate and Safety Survey

Three- to Five-Year Goal:

By May of 2028, Quality of School Climate & Safety will go from 63 to 73 indicator status for All students on QSCS Climate.

Objective(s):

By May of 2026, Quality of School Climate & Safety will go from 63 to 73 indicator status for All students on QSCS Climate.

Strategy:

- [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 Results](#)
- [KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support](#)
- [KCWP 6: Establish Learning Environment and Culture](#)

- To improve the Quality of School Climate and Safety indicator status from 63 to 73 by May 2026, the school will implement KCWP 6: Establish Learning Environment and Culture to ensure the learning environment is intentionally inclusive, safe, and accessible for every student. This systemic strategy focuses on building a culture where learning and growth are the primary focus, driven by shared goals and the implementation of building-wide SOAR Expectations and a PBIS Store and behavior monitoring system. To foster active engagement and predictable routines, classrooms will utilize the Shawnee White Board Protocol, while students will receive additional social-emotional support through targeted groups like BMEN and Girls' Group. Safety protocols and procedures will be strictly maintained to ensure a secure environment, with progress monitored through Environmental Walkthrough data, the Comprehensive School Survey, and the Upbeat Survey to identify and address any remaining gaps in school climate.

Activities:

- **Executing the Shawnee White Board Protocol (Instructional Framework for Engagement)** – to create classroom environments where all students are active participants in their learning through structured, routine lesson execution.
 - 2.3: Daily grade level and appropriate learning targets/goals are posted, unpacked with students, and referenced throughout the lesson. Learning targets/goals are aligned to HQIRs as adopted.
- **Participating in Curriculum-Based Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)** – to plan collaboratively, internalize units and lessons, analyze data, and adjust instruction to drive student growth.
 - 3.3: Collaborative teams use the HQIRs in conjunction with student work and data to engage in planning, data analysis, and internalization of lessons and protocols.
- **Strategic Data Analysis** – 1.5: The Instructional Leadership Team(s) review disaggregated assessment data (Screeners, Diagnostics, HQIR assessments, Milestones) at least three times per year AND communicates progress toward the vision and goals to relevant stakeholders.
 - 4.3: All teachers and leaders in the school routinely analyze the results of student screeners, diagnostics, HQIR assessments, common formative/summative assessments, and district vital signs to plan tiered instruction through an intentional data system. Data is evaluated at a cadence that is aligned with the appropriate tier.
- SOAR Expectations – Building-wide behavior expectations communicated to students and teachers
- PBIS Store with Behavior Monitoring Point System
- Outside Student Supports – BMEN, Girls' Group
- Safety Protocols and Procedures

Progress Monitoring:

- Environmental Walkthrough Data
- Comprehensive School Survey
- Upbeat Survey

Funding:

Allocation of general, Title I, and SIF funding.

Addendum for **Schools** Identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement

A turnaround plan created by schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) pursuant to KRS 160.346(8)(g) must be embedded in the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) required by 703 KAR 5:225.

This addendum outlines the specific requirements that must be addressed in the CSIP to meet federal and state expectations for schools identified for CSI. These requirements include targeted strategies and activities to support improvement in the identified areas of need addressed in the goal-building template. Evidence-based practices and activities chosen to address any priority goal area must be informed by the Needs Assessment for Schools and feedback from any onsite review conducted by the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE).

Special Considerations for CSI Schools

Schools identified for CSI must complete the CSIP process and meet all applicable deadlines while identified for 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 local education agency (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:		
Team Members Present	Title	Role
Hollie Smith	Executive Principal	Implementation Data Manager
Joni Britt	High School Principal	Culture of Learning
Sade McKnight	Middle School Principal	Culture of Learning

Andrew Howard	High School AIC	Assessment
Kelly Peak	Middle School AIC	Standards
Benjamin Harris	Assistant Principal	Standards
Erika Tones	HS Counselor	Support
Rachelle Wood	Academy Coach	Support
Lexi Sparks	BAC	Support
Gillian Seals	Math Interventionist	Support
Kellye Cunningham	ECE IC	Support
Cameel Clough	Interventionist	Support
Christian Gibson	ER	Facilitator
William Sims	ER	Facilitator
Nick Pannell	ER	Facilitator

Nate Meyer	Asst. Superintendent	
Jamie Whitaker	Teacher	
John Brewer	Teacher	
Christopher Lyons	Teacher	
Martha Berry	Teacher	
Lyron Murphy	Teacher	
Jeramiah Elsner	Teacher	

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 Academy @ Shawnee convened a diverse team of school leaders, instructional coaches, teachers, counselors, interventionists, and district partners to comprehensively review resource allocation and alignment to school priorities. The team included representation from each critical function, leadership, instructional support, assessment, standards alignment, student support, intervention, culture of learning, and district support, ensuring multiple perspectives on the allocation and use of people, time, and financial resources.

The review process included:

1. **Analysis of staffing assignments and instructional roles** to determine alignment with the needs of students in literacy, numeracy, behavioral support, and postsecondary readiness.
2. **Review of master schedule, intervention blocks, and duty schedules** to determine if time was being used strategically to support Tier 1 instruction and targeted interventions.
3. **Examination of funding sources** (SBDM, ESSER, Title I, SIG, etc.) and spending patterns to identify gaps in materials, curricular resources, and staff capacity.

4. **Stakeholder feedback** from teachers, counselors, and district partners on barriers to implementation and unmet resource needs.
5. **Data analysis** (achievement, behavior, attendance, PSR, MAP/MAP Growth) to identify resource inequities tied to student outcomes and subgroup performance.

From this analysis, several resource inequities were identified as contributing to underperformance:

- **Insufficient certified and classified staffing to support targeted interventions**, particularly in math, reading, and behavior.
- **Limited access to high-quality instructional materials**, consumables, and technology tools needed to execute Tier 1 and intervention curricula with fidelity.
- **Time allocation challenges** due to schedule structures that restricted access to intervention, collaboration, or extended learning opportunities for students and staff.
- **Gaps in professional learning** for teachers around data literacy, standards alignment, and instructional strategies.
- **Insufficient systems for monitoring resource use**, resulting in inconsistent implementation across classrooms and grade levels.

To address these inequities, the following actions are being implemented:

1. **Reallocation of staff roles and addition of intervention positions** to increase Tier 2/Tier 3 instructional support, including math interventionists, ECE instructional coaches, and academy coaches.
2. **Restructuring the master schedule** to create dedicated intervention blocks, PLC time, and opportunities for standards-aligned collaborative planning.
3. **Purchase and deployment of high-quality instructional resources and technology**, prioritized for math and literacy, including adaptive platforms that support progress monitoring.
4. **Investment in professional learning** focused on standards alignment, assessment literacy, and high-quality instruction for all staff, delivered by school and district facilitators.
5. **Development of resource monitoring systems** to track usage, implementation, and impact through walkthroughs, coaching cycles, and data reviews.
6. **Alignment of budget priorities to school improvement goals**, including strategic use of SIF and Title I funds to close gaps and build sustainability.

This team-based, iterative process allows the school to continuously monitor the effectiveness of resource allocation, adjust strategies based on student data, and ensure that people, time, and funding are aligned to the goals of improving student outcomes, reducing inequities, and increasing teacher and student capacity.

CSI Evidence-based Practices

CSI improvement/turnaround plans must include at least one evidence-based practice (EBP) that is implemented to improve student outcomes that meet the definition of “evidence-based” under ESEA section 8101(21). The definition of “evidence-based” in ESEA section 8101(21) includes four levels of evidence from which interventions may be selected:

- **Strong evidence** from at least one well-designed and well-implemented *experimental study*;
- **Moderate evidence** from at least one well-designed and well-implemented *quasi-experimental study*;
- **Promising evidence** from at least one well-designed and well-implemented *correlational study* with statistical controls for selection bias; or
- **Demonstrates a rationale** based on high-quality research findings or positive evaluation that such activity, strategy or intervention is likely to improve student outcomes or other relevant outcomes and includes ongoing efforts to examine the effects of such activity, strategy, or intervention.

More specific information regarding EBPs can be found on the Kentucky Department of Education’s [Evidence-based Practices website](#).

Complete the table below to document the evidence that supports the evidence-based intervention outlined in this plan.

Evidence-based Activity	Evidence Citation
Example: Train staff to implement inductive teaching strategies.	Example: Hattie, J. (2009). <i>Visible Learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement</i> . Routledge: New York, NY.
Adopt high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs) aligned to KAS to build content knowledge and reduce instructional variability	Steiner, D., & Weisberg, D. (2020). <i>Better Curriculum, Better Teachers, Better Results</i> . Johns Hopkins Institute for Education Policy.
Provide ongoing, job-embedded coaching for teachers, including modeling, observation/feedback cycles, and PLC-based professional learning	Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). “The Effect of Teacher Coaching on Instruction and Achievement: A Meta-analysis of the Causal Evidence.” <i>Review of Educational Research</i> .
Implement targeted small-group intervention in literacy and mathematics using diagnostic data (MAP, IXL, CAPTI) for progress monitoring	Gersten, R., et al. (2009). <i>Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for Elementary and Middle Schools</i> . IES Practice Guide.

Evidence-based Activity	Evidence Citation
Provide professional development focused on culturally responsive teaching to reduce disproportionality and increase engagement for students of color	Gay, G. (2010). <i>Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice</i> . Teachers College Press.
Use data-driven cycles and collaborative PLC teams to monitor student progress, adjust instruction, and reduce novice performance	DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Many, T. (2010). <i>Learning by Doing: A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work</i> . Solution Tree Press.
Implement ninth-grade academies and transition supports to reduce dropouts and improve long-term achievement	Balfanz, R., & Legters, N. (2004). <i>Locating the Dropout Crisis</i> . Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools.
Increase access to career pathways, dual credit, and postsecondary readiness preparation and advising	Hooker, S. & Brand, B. (2009). <i>Success at Every Step: How 23 Programs Support Youth on the Path to College and Beyond</i> . American Youth Policy Forum.
Strengthen schoolwide SEL, relationships, and positive behavior supports to improve belonging, culture, and attendance	Durlak, J. A., et al. (2011). "The Impact of Enhancing Students' Social and Emotional Learning: A Meta-Analysis of School-Based Universal Interventions." <i>Child Development</i> .

How this aligns to Shawnee's needs

These EBPs directly target Shawnee's identified challenges:

- Low proficiency in reading and math
- High novice rates
- Chronic absenteeism and behavior concerns
- Staff turnover and inconsistent implementation
- Low postsecondary readiness and access
- High concentration of students of color with historical inequities

The activities are selected to raise Tier 1 instruction, strengthen intervention, support teachers, and remove systemic barriers for students.