

OAS Turnaround Plan Feb. 2026

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.**

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, Shipley, 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.

Three- to Five-Year Goal:

By May 2029, Frederick Law Olmsted Academy South will increase the English language proficiency of its Multilingual Learners (ML) so that 50% of students meet or exceed their annual growth targets and the percentage of students exiting ESL status (achieving a composite score of 4.5 or higher on ACCESS) increases to 40%.

Objective:

By May 2026, OAS will increase the English language proficiency of its Multilingual Learners (ML) from 27% to 32% of students meeting or exceeding their annual growth targets.

Strategy:

KCWP #2 - Design and Deliver Instruction
KCWP #6 - Establish Learning Environment and Culture

Activities:

- Establish a data analysis protocol within PLCs to measure the effectiveness of the English Language Development (ELD) curriculum.
- Through intentional monitoring, ensure teachers are internalizing high-quality instructional resources and utilizing evidence-based/high-yield instructional practices aimed at meeting the needs of all students in core classes.
- Develop/Revisit/Refine a lesson design framework that embeds authentic learning experiences and is scaffolded for ML students, prioritizing access to high-quality discourse, exploration, and discovery.
- Bi-weekly ML coach support from the district in ELD PLCs.
- Intentional advisory intervention for students qualifying for Foundational English Language Development (FELD) services.
- Intentional scheduling support from district ML advisors.
- Embedded professional development (EPD) for learning regarding ML scaffolds

Progress Monitoring:

- Scheduled on a schoolwide visual calendar
- Turnaround Team 30.60.90 Day Plan
- Walkthroughs (monthly)
- PLC Documentation (weekly)
- OAS Coaching Plan (quarterly)
- Name and Claim Student lists (quarterly)

Funding:

- Anticipated SIF for additional training and release time monthly for teachers for coaching sessions and data analysis. \$30,000
- Curricular Resources for ELD courses \$8,000

State Assessment Results in Reading

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.

Three- to Five-Year Goal:

By May 2029, Frederick Law Olmsted Academy South will increase the overall percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in Reading from 17% to 37% and reduce the percentage of students scoring Novice by 20 percentage points as measured by the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA)

Objective(s):

By May 2026, reading proficiency will increase from 17% to 20% P/D for all students on KSA.

Strategy:

- KCWP #2 - Design and Deliver Instruction
- KCWP #6 - Establish Learning Environment and Culture

Activities:

- Establish a data analysis protocol within PLCs to measure the effectiveness of EL Education resource implementation.
- Through intentional monitoring, ensure teachers are internalizing high-quality instructional resources and utilizing evidence-based/high-yield instructional practices aimed at meeting the needs of all students.

- Refine a lesson design framework that embeds authentic learning experiences for students, prioritizing high-quality discourse, the effective facilitation of Adolescent Literacy Model (ALM) strategies, and embedded high-yield instructional strategies, to promote exploration and discovery.
- Tiered reading intervention with the use of Rewards curriculum.
- Intentional use of strategies regarding literacy skills in other classes, i.e. Science, Social Studies, Related Arts.
- Intentional use of Lexia in advisory for extension or intervention.

Progress Monitoring:

- Scheduled on a schoolwide visual calendar
- Turnaround Team 30.60.90 Day Plan
- Walkthroughs (monthly)
- PLC Documentation (weekly)
- OAS Coaching Plan (quarterly)
- Name and Claim Student lists (quarterly)

Funding:

- 2 Additional teacher days before the start of the 26-27 school year for curriculum based professional learning. \$40,000 (anticipated SIF)
- Rewards intervention consumables \$10,000 (anticipated SIF)
- Additional training and release time monthly for ELA teachers for coaching sessions and data analysis. \$15,000 (anticipated SIF)
- Lexia PowerUp licenses \$10,000
- NewsELA Licenses for Science and Social Studies to support literacy differentiation \$15,000
- Teaching and Learning Conference (TLC) for coaching \$12,000

State Assessment Results in 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.

Three- to Five-Year Goal:

By May of 2030, Math proficiency will increase from 11% to 26% P/D for all students on KSA.

Objective(s):

By May 2026, Math proficiency will increase from 11% to 14% P/D for all students on KSA.

Strategy:

KCWP #2 - Design and Deliver Instruction

KCWP #6 - Establish Learning Environment and Culture

Activities:

- Establish a data analysis protocol within PLCs to measure the effectiveness of Illustrative Math (IM) resources.
- Through intentional monitoring, ensure that teachers are internalizing high-quality instructional resources and using evidence-based/high-yield instructional practices to meet the needs of all students.
- Refine a lesson design framework that embeds authentic learning experiences and the effective facilitation of embedded high-yield instructional strategies, including Math Language routines for all students, prioritizing high-quality discourse, exploration, and discovery.
- Intentional implementation of math concepts in related arts courses.
- Intentional use of IXL in advisory for either extension or intervention.

Progress Monitoring:

- Scheduled on a schoolwide visual calendar
- Turnaround Team 30.60.90 Day Plan
- Walkthroughs (monthly)
- PLC Documentation (weekly)
- OAS Coaching Plan (quarterly)
- Name and Claim Student lists (quarterly)

Funding:

- Additional teacher guides for HQIR (IM)
- 2 Additional teacher days before the start of the 26-27 school year for curriculum-based professional learning. \$40,000

- Digital intervention resources aligned with IM \$8,000
- Additional training and release time monthly for math teachers for coaching sessions and data analysis. \$15,000
- IXL School Subscription \$10,000
- Teaching and Learning Conference (TLC) for coaching \$12,000

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	Choose an item.
English Learner Progress	Choose an item.
Quality of School Climate and Safety	Choose an item.
Postsecondary Readiness (high schools and districts only)	Choose an item.
Graduation Rate (high schools and districts only)	Choose an item.

Priority Indicator Goals:

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

Priority Indicator #1: Choose an item.

Three- to Five-Year Goal:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Objective(s):

Click or tap here to enter text.

Strategy:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Activities:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Progress Monitoring:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Funding:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Priority Indicator #2: Choose an item.

Three- to Five-Year Goal:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Objective(s):

Click or tap here to enter text.

Strategy:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Activities:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Progress Monitoring:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Funding:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Priority Indicator #3: Choose an item.

Three- to Five-Year Goal:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Objective(s):

Click or tap here to enter text.

Strategy:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Activities:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Progress Monitoring:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Funding:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Priority Indicator #4: Choose an item.

Three- to Five-Year Goal:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Objective(s):

Click or tap here to enter text.

Strategy:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Activities:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Progress Monitoring:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Funding:

Click or tap here to enter text.

OAS CSI Addendum

Olmsted Academy South 2025-2026

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:
<p>Synthia Shelby – Principal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Leads the turnaround effort and ensures alignment to student-achievement goals● Makes final decisions on resource allocation and staffing● Monitors implementation fidelity of instructional initiatives and interventions <p>Lisa McGarry – Assistant Principal (6th)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Monitors 6th-grade instructional practices and student data

- Identifies resource needs (staffing, materials, interventions) for 6th grade
- Ensures consistent implementation of schoolwide systems at the grade level

Jennifer Schofield – Assistant Principal (7th)

- Tracks 7th-grade student performance and intervention effectiveness
- Communicates grade-level needs for staffing, scheduling, and instructional supports
- Ensures alignment between classroom practice and school improvement goals

Nick Schulz – Assistant Principal (8th)

- Monitors 8th-grade achievement data and identifies resource gaps
- Supports teachers in implementing curriculum and interventions
- Ensures students are on track for high-school readiness

Abby Miller – Academic Instructional Coach

- Monitors instructional resource use and fidelity to curriculum
- Identifies teacher support needs and recommends PD
- Provides real-time feedback to improve instructional quality

Neal Anderson – Resource Teacher

- Tracks intervention effectiveness and student response to instruction
- Advises on allocation of intervention staff and materials
- Provides up to date data dashboards as needed

Athraa Alabudy – Math Teacher

- Provides classroom-level feedback on math resource needs
- Helps evaluate the effectiveness of math interventions and materials
- Represents teacher voice in decision-making about instructional supports

Jason Rahmel – Related Arts Teacher

- Highlights resource needs beyond core content areas
- Identifies student strengths and needs that appear outside academic classes
- Ensures turnaround efforts support a well-rounded student experience

Jennifer Cox – Educational Recovery Leader

- Guides the team in using data to drive resource decisions
- Ensures strategies align with state expectations and ESSA evidence tiers
- Supports progress-monitoring cycles and continuous-improvement processes

Identification of Critical Resources Inequities:

This updated addendum (February, 2026) is largely informed by the school's most recent Cognia Diagnostic Review. The improvement priorities identified in the review completed in January, 2026 are as follows:

1. Implement a systemic approach to monitor instruction, provide high-yield coaching practices and ensure a continuous feedback loop that will inform professional practices to increase student achievement.
2. Implement a curriculum-aligned instructional process that delivers rigorous Tier 1 instruction and consistently meets the needs of all students.

Upon receiving the Diagnostic Review Report, the Turnaround Team held six planning sessions to accomplish the following:

- Deconstruct the new improvement priorities with the guidance of KDE Continuous Improvement partners.
- Plan effective communication of the report contents to stakeholder groups.
- Review the previous school improvement plan for strategies to keep, adjust, or eliminate from the new plan.
- Review updated data from KSA, MAP, reading intervention classes, PLC processes, SPMR, elite classroom observations, diagnostic review interviews, and classroom walkthroughs.
- Set updated long-range goals, yearly objectives, strategies, activities, and progress monitoring for the remainder of 2026 and the beginning of the 2027 school year based upon trends from the reviewed data mentioned above.

The Turnaround Team collaborated to ensure the Potential Leader Actions from the Diagnostic Review are part of the new Turnaround Plan.

- Focus on ensuring the delivery of effective and rigorous Tier 1 instruction.
- Schedule dedicated time to plan, prepare for, and use data to monitor the instructional needs of all students.
- Elevate efficacy among staff to identify and facilitate effective instructional strategies to increase student engagement.
- Monitor and use curriculum-embedded strategies and assessments to strengthen instructional efficacy.
- Conduct frequent and regular classroom observations to collect data on instructional strategies and curriculum alignment.
- Plan for individual and collective professional development to improve high-yield instructional strategy use.
- Plan for resources necessary to strengthen the system of feedback, coaching, and professional learning to support implementation of the high-quality instructional resources required by the district with integrity and fidelity.

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
Effective Professional Learning Communities	Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Stoll, L., Thomas, S. M., & Wallace, M. (2005). <i>Creating and Sustaining Effective Professional Learning Communities</i>. Department for Education and Skills: London.
Curriculum aligned, content focused professional learning	Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). <i>Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement</i>. IES, U.S. Department of Education.
Instructional Coaching	Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). <i>The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence</i>. <i>Review of Educational Research</i>, 88(4), 547–588.