

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.

KERRICK SPECIFIC CONTEXT

Priorities/Concerns from Needs Assessment for Schools

19% of students were labeled Proficient or Distinguished in reading on 2025 KSA, an increase of 4% from 2024 KSA. 17% of students were labeled Proficient or Distinguished in math, which represents an increase of 4% from 2024. The percentage of African American students scoring at the Proficient or Distinguished levels was exactly 6% lower than all students in both reading and math on 2025 KSA. Additionally, there was a significant decline in ELP from 67.6% in 2024

to 36% in 2025 despite the fact that more English Language Learners scored Proficient or Distinguished in Reading (20%) than all students (19%). ([Link to Kerrick Needs Assessment](#))

Priorities from Cognia Diagnostic Review completed January 2026

IMPROVEMENT PRIORITY 1: Sustain and further develop established continuous improvement initiatives while strategically narrowing the scope of work to the most urgent and high-impact priorities. (Standard 7)

IMPROVEMENT PRIORITY 2: Strengthen the quality of Tier 1 instruction by maintaining a focus on the implementation of consistent, rigorous instructional practices for all learners, while ensuring that evidence-based instructional strategies are applied with fidelity across classrooms. (Standard 21)

Kerrick Turnaround Team Members: Jennifer Forseth (Principal), Kyle Patterson (Academic Instructional Coach), Kathryn Robson (Teacher), Olivia Penland (Teacher), Dimitra Collier (Counselor), Erin Leanhart (Resource Teacher), Jeremy Jenkins (Assistant Principal), Robyn Baxter (KDE Education Recovery Leader).

(Link to [Kerrick CSIP Addendum](#))

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):

By May of 2027, the combined proficient/distinguished percentage for AA students in reading will increase from 13% to 43.1% as measured by KSA.

Strategy:

KCWP 2: Design & Deliver Instruction:

An aligned instructional process by ensuring congruence is present between standards, learning targets, and assessment measures. Kerrick will design, implement, develop, monitor and evaluate a system for teacher planning and preparation that includes differentiation for individual students.

KCWP 4: Review, Analyze, and Apply Data Results

The instructional leadership team will ensure deployment of an effective cyclical process that includes regular review, analysis, and application of various student data and HQIR lesson and unit internalization through professional learning cycles. The PLC protocol will include a uniform method of monitoring and analyzing data from a variety of sources (e.g. formative and summative assessments) and internalizing HQIR lessons and units in order to scaffold instruction for individual student success.

Activities:

Unit and Lesson Internalization experiences that includes intellectual preparation as well as preparation of materials to deploy instruction and scaffolds needed to support all learners engaging at the levels required by Kentucky Academic Standards.

- **Team Extended Planning Sessions** w/intentional coaching to support intellectual preparation required to implement HQIRs through unit and lesson internalization.
- **Item Analysis** methods are occurring within PLCs to evaluate instructional effectiveness and scaffolds needed to support individual students.

Teacher Coaching and Feedback System Targeted Coaching on HQIR Lessons to increase teacher understanding of lesson design in support of meeting high expectations of Kentucky Academic Standards as part of our tiered Coaching, Feedback and Professional Learning Cycles.

Family partnership development around school reading proficiency goals including:

- Family Cafe implemented through partnership with NCFL
- Family Reading Workshop series through partnership with IWRBR
- Adult Education offerings for ESL and GED held on site

Continue Hype and Help Tiered Intervention and Supports System for Students

Continue Developing, Monitoring, and Evaluating student and teacher support systems utilizing continuous improvement process and data protocol.

Progress Monitoring:

- PLC agenda/minutes; weekly monitoring, person responsible Resource Teachers and Collaborative Team Leads (IP2)
- Before, During and End Perception Surveys on Curriculum Based Professional Learning, ER / Principal 3 x per year (IP2)
- Lesson/Unit Internalization Plans person responsible Resource Teachers and Collaborative Team Leads (IP2)
- Walkthrough/Class Visit data, Clearly defined coaching cycles and feedback logs (IP2)
- Peer to Peer coaching and feedback reflections; weekly monitoring by Command Central/admin (IP2)
- Student academic growth on Universal Screener; monitored Fall, Winter, Spring by Resource Teachers, Interventionists, and Homeroom Teachers with oversight by Command Central/admin (IP2)
- Budget Needs Survey and analysis of student benchmark data from the to determine programmatic priorities for the next school year. For 26-27 we concluded that investment in two on-site resource teachers and two full time interventionists are vital to addressing the needs of students based on the needs assessment. (IP2)
- Kerrick STaT team in cooperation with our Academic Coach, Command Central Team collaboration on the development, implementation, and monitoring of a school-side MTSS system for behavior, reading and math that is referred to as Hype and Help. Experts from every area of the building come together on Hype and Help days to celebrate successes and provide interventions and supports for needs that arise in student data meeting on a set cadence - every 4 weeks for behavior, 5 weeks for math, and every 6 weeks for ELA. Student progress is monitored weekly and reported out at the next Hype and Help session or beforehand if students show a need for a mid-course adjustment. (IP1, IP2)
- Continuous Improvement efforts are monitored weekly during ER/Principal meetings where the impacts of SIF activities , progress toward IPs, and continuous improvement planning are regularly monitored and measured through our agenda and 45 day plan. (IP1)
- Data analysis protocols and resulting change ideas are implemented, monitored, and evaluated during weekly Command Central meetings and bi-weekly STaT meetings with a set cadence for behavior, attendance, math, reading, Special Education, English Language Learner specific data as well as other school wide data such as classroom visits, SPMR, etc. (IP1)
- The turnaround team will address DR relevant findings that speak to inequities and inconsistencies with instruction at Kerrick. To address IP2, the team will complete improvement science based activities to increase clarity and consistency around instructional expectations. (IP2)
- Kerrick Command Central Team will continue Learning Walks for EL and IM to build instructional leadership capacity in HQIR scaffolds, supports, and design. We anticipate as we move through this process we will provide more meaningful coaching and feedback, clarify building-wide instructional expectations, and look for strategies that are recommended for ELLs which will support all Kerrick students and refine our internalization structure for EL and IM units and lessons. (IP2)

Funding:

SIF available July 2026: Central Creativity extended teacher planning days @ \$10,000 = \$20,000

High Needs Index Funds: Two Interventionists and Two Resource Teachers

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.

Three- to Five-Year Goal:

By May 2029, Kerrick will increase the percentage of students scoring proficient and distinguished in both reading and math.

- KSA Reading from 19% P/D(May 2025) to 61.3.% *
- KSA Math from 17.0% P/D (May 2025) to 54.9 % *

Objective(s):

- By May 2026, Kerrick will increase P/D in reading from 19% P/D to 53% P/D as measured by KSA.
- By May 2026, Kerrick will increase P/D in math from 17% P/D to 45.3% P/D as measured by KSA.

Strategy:

KCWP 2: Design & Deliver Instruction:

An aligned instructional process by ensuring congruence is present between standards, learning targets, and assessment measures. Kerrick will design, implement, develop, monitor and evaluate a system for teacher planning and preparation that includes differentiation for individual students.

KCWP 4: Review, Analyze, and Apply Data Results:

The instructional leadership team will ensure deployment of an effective cyclical process that includes regular review, analysis, and application of various student data and HQIR lesson and unit internalization through professional learning cycles. The PLC protocol will include a uniform method of monitoring and analyzing data from a variety of sources (e.g. formative and summative assessments) and internalizing HQIR lessons and units in order to scaffold instruction for individual student success.

Activities:

Unit and Lesson Internalization experiences that includes intellectual preparation as well as preparation of materials to deploy instruction and scaffolds needed to support all learners engaging at the levels required by Kentucky Academic Standards.

- **Team Extended Planning Sessions** w/intentional coaching to support intellectual preparation required to implement HQIRs through unit and lesson internalization.
- **Item Analysis** methods are occurring within PLCs to evaluate instructional effectiveness and scaffolds needed to support individual students.

Teacher Coaching and Feedback System Targeted Coaching on HQIR Lessons to increase teacher understanding of lesson design in support of meeting high expectations of Kentucky Academic Standards as part of our tiered Coaching, Feedback and Professional Learning Cycles.

Family partnership development around school reading proficiency goals including:

- Family Cafe implemented through partnership with NCFL
- Family Reading Workshop series through partnership with IWRBR
- Adult Education offerings for ESL and GED held on site

Continue Hype and Help Tiered Intervention and Supports System for Students

Continue Developing, Monitoring, and Evaluating student and teacher support systems utilizing continuous improvement process and data protocol.

Progress Monitoring:

- PLC agenda/minutes; weekly monitoring, person responsible Resource Teachers and Collaborative Team Leads (IP2)
- Before, During and End Perception Surveys on Curriculum Based Professional Learning, ER / Principal 3 x per year (IP2)
- Lesson/Unit Internalization Plans person responsible Resource Teachers and Collaborative Team Leads (IP2)

- Walkthrough / Class Visit data, Clearly defined coaching cycles and feedback logs (IP2)
- Peer to Peer coaching and feedback reflections; weekly monitoring by Command Central/admin (IP2)
- Student academic growth on Universal Screener; monitored Fall, Winter, Spring by Resource Teachers, Interventionists, and Homeroom Teachers with oversight by Command Central/admin (IP2)
- Budget Needs Survey and analysis of Spring KSA and Winter student benchmark data to determine programmatic priorities for the next school year. For 26-27 we concluded that investment in two on-site resource teachers and two full time interventionists are vital to addressing the needs of students based on the needs assessment. (IP2)
- Kerrick STaT team in cooperation with our Academic Coach, Command Central Team collaboration on the development, implementation, and monitoring of a school-side MTSS system for behavior, reading and math that is referred to as Hype and Help. Experts from every area of the building come together on Hype and Help days to celebrate successes and provide interventions and supports for needs that arise in student data meeting on a set cadence - every 4 weeks for behavior, 5 weeks for math, and every 6 weeks for ELA. Student progress is monitored weekly and reported out at the next Hype and Help session or beforehand if students show a need for a mid-course adjustment. (IP1, IP2)
- Continuous Improvement efforts are monitored weekly during ER/Principal meetings where the impacts of SIF activities , progress toward IPs, and continuous improvement planning are regularly monitored and measured through our agenda and 45 day plan. (IP1)
- Data analysis protocols and resulting change ideas are implemented, monitored, and evaluated during weekly Command Central meetings and bi-weekly STaT meetings with a set cadence for behavior, attendance, math, reading, Special Education, English Language Learner specific data as well as other school wide data such as classroom visits, SPMR, etc. (IP1)
- The turnaround team will address DR relevant findings that speak to inequities and inconsistencies with instruction at Kerrick. To address IP2, the team will complete improvement science based activities to increase clarity and consistency around instructional expectations. (IP2)
- Kerrick Command Central Team will continue Learning Walks for EL and IM to build instructional leadership capacity in HQIR scaffolds, supports, and design. We anticipate as we move through this process we will provide more meaningful coaching and feedback, clarify building-wide instructional expectations, and look for strategies that are recommended for ELLs which will support all Kerrick students and refine our internalization structure for EL and IM units and lessons. (IP2)

Funding:

SIF available July 2026: Central Creativity extended teacher planning days @ \$10,000 = \$20,000

High Needs Index Funds: Two Interventionists and Two Resource Teachers

ALIGNMENT TO EVIDENCE BASED PRACTICES

EPB #1 Professional Learning Communities: Saunders, W. M., Goldenberg, C. N., & Gallimore, R. (2009).

Increasing achievement by focusing grade-level teams on improving classroom learning: A prospective, quasi-experimental study of Title I schools. [Live link.](#)

Challenge: Professional Development around Planning and Preparation: To increase teacher efficacy and knowledge base to create learning opportunities, analyze data, and more effectively work to deliver instruction that is aligned to high expectations of Kentucky Academic Standards and include learner-centered practices. The January 2026 Cognia Diagnostic Review referenced inconsistencies in our implementation of Tier 1 instruction.

Evidence Citation: Saunders, W. M., Goldenberg, C. N., & Gallimore, R. (2009). Increasing achievement by focusing grade-level teams on improving classroom learning: A prospective, quasi-experimental study of Title I schools. [Live link.](#)

Estimated Evidence Level: Level II

Study Discussion: In the listed study above, the Kerrick Turnaround team was impressed by the focus on grade level teams in Title 1 schools for various reasons. Specifically, by the last year, the effect size on student achievement as measured by the mandated state assessment quadrupled, increasing from 0.22 to 0.88. The state assessment was a standardized, norm-referenced achievement test with subtests in reading, language, spelling, and mathematics. Comparatively, an increasing effect size from 0.18 to 0.98 was observed on the state academic performance index (API). The API was devised by the state department of education which provides a single, numeric, composite index of

school-level achievement. Analyses of student achievement and API showed that experimental schools had significantly greater gains than comparison schools in the last 3 years of the study. Following findings from the needs assessment process and research into possible strategies, the turnaround and advisory teams at Kerrick determined that implementation of the intervention focused on grade level teams, will best support the needs of our students and can be implemented within our schedule and staffing structures. Through deployment of this EBP, Kerrick Elementary academic outcomes will reflect improved proficiency as measured by KSA in all content areas, grades 3-5. We expect a 10% gain across all disciplines.

Kerrick Elementary Turnaround team will use a diversified strategy to implement this evidence-based practice through professional learning communities (PLCs) for teacher intellectual planning and preparation (will also be used as way to monitor instruction), providing resources for students and teachers to deploy effective practice such as differentiated scaffolds to meet individual student needs, feedback and coaching, and professional learning. The PLC structure supports teacher collaboration and builds collective teacher efficacy through shared planning and reflection on curriculum, instruction and assessment.

EPB #2: Feedback and Instructional Coaching: Garet, M. S., Wayne, A. J., Brown, S., Rickles, J., Song, M., & Manzeske, D. (2017). The Impact of Providing Performance Feedback to Teachers and Principals. NCEE 2018-4001. *National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED578873.pdf>

Challenge: Based on the diagnostic review, coaching and feedback will support IP2 ensuring evidence-based instructional strategies are applied with fidelity across classrooms.

Evidence Citation: Garet, M. S., Wayne, A. J., Brown, S., Rickles, J., Song, M., & Manzeske, D. (2017). The Impact of Providing Performance Feedback to Teachers and Principals. NCEE 2018-4001. *National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED578873.pdf>

Estimated Evidence Level: Level 1

Study Discussion: The study conducted by the American Institute for Research included eight school districts that had at least 20 elementary and middle schools and included urban districts and schools that mirrored Title 1 school demographics. They used the Classroom Assessment and Scoring System (CLASS) and the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching to measure teacher effectiveness pre- and post-coaching and feedback. 63 treatment schools and 64 control schools participated in the study.

Following findings from the diagnostics review, feedback and coaching was determined to be vital to ensuring consistent, rigorous instructional practices are happening with fidelity in every classroom. The evidence based practice found ongoing feedback increased effectiveness of classroom practices. As a result of increasing the effectiveness of classroom instructional practices, student achievement showed growth.

The turnaround team at Kerrick determined that coaching and feedback with staff will increase teacher understanding of the components included in our HQIRs support rigorous learning experiences that meet the high expectations of Kentucky Academic Standards. As a result of a deeper understanding, classroom instructional practices will improve in effectiveness and consistency across classrooms. As a result of improved instruction we are expecting to see growth in student achievement.

EPB #3: EL Education: [Link to West-Ed external study](#)

Challenge: 2025 KSA data shows 19% of students at Kerrick scored proficient or distinguished in reading. The data reveals most students are performing below grade level in reading.

Evidence Citation: [Link to West-Ed external study](#)

Estimated Evidence Level: Level II

Study Discussion: Two studies conducted by West-Ed, a national non-profit research organization. The first study compared the MAP Reading assessment results of students in schools who used both the EL Module Lessons and Skills Block to students who did not use the EL curriculum at all. The second study compared student scores within the district at schools using only EL Module Lessons with those using both EL Module Lessons and Skills Block. The second study represents a quasi-experimental design and meets Level II criteria. Similarly, Kerrick Elementary is a Title 1 elementary school. The school is located in a large urban school district (Jefferson County Public Schools) and, through the utilization of EL as an HQIR have made steady progress toward increasing the percentage of students performing proficient or distinguished in reading on the Kentucky Summative Assessment. The population at Kerrick is becoming increasingly more diverse. The diagnostic review determined consistency in quality of Tier 1 instruction is necessary. Kerrick is committed to full implementation of EL education reading curriculum.

EPB #4: Experiential Math Material (Illustrative Math): Mutmainah; Rukayah; and Mintasih, I. **Effectiveness of Experiential Learning-Based Teaching Material in Mathematics.** *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, v8 n1 p57-63 Mar 2019

Challenge: 2025 KSA data shows 17% of students at Kerrick scored proficient or distinguished in math. The data reveals most students are performing below grade level in math.

Evidence Citation: Mutmainah; Rukayah; and Mintasih, I. **Effectiveness of Experiential Learning-Based Teaching Material in Mathematics.** *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, v8 n1 p57-63 Mar 2019

Estimated Evidence Level: Level 1

Study Discussion: A 30 question, multiple-choice test was administered to the experimental and control group as a pre- and post-test. There were significant differences between pre- and post-test scores. The pre-test average for the experimental group was 44.29 while for the control group it was 42.95. Teaching materials that related to real, daily experiences that made students think, explore, ask questions, make decisions, and apply what they learned were used with students in the experimental group while the comparison group used a textbook with high levels of abstract, low-visualization material. The experimental group average score rose to 75.71 in the post-test versus the average of the comparison group, which was 11.99 points lower (63.72) on the post-test. The IM K–5 Math certified curriculum is rigorous, problem-based, and fully aligned to the standards, with coherence across grade bands. The diagnostic review determined consistent deployment of high quality Tier 1 instruction is necessary to increase student achievement. IM will aid students in becoming critical thinkers and problem solvers. The curriculum will also help support Kerrick’s increasingly diverse population. The curriculum affirms students’ backgrounds and meets them where they are as learners. IM includes problem-solving contexts that positively reflect ethnically diverse cultures and support the implementation of culturally relevant and responsive pedagogy.

EPB #5: Intervention: Dietrichson, J., Bøg, M., Filges, T., & Klint Jørgensen, A.-M. (2017). Academic Interventions for Elementary and Middle School Students With Low Socioeconomic Status: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 87(2), 243-282. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316687036>

Challenge: 2025 KSA data shows 19% of students at Kerrick scored proficient or distinguished in reading. The data reveals most students are performing below grade level in reading. 2025 KSA data shows 17% of students at Kerrick scored proficient or distinguished in math. The data reveals most students are performing below grade level in math.

Evidence Citation: Dietrichson, J., Bøg, M., Filges, T., & Klint Jørgensen, A.-M. (2017). Academic Interventions for Elementary and Middle School Students With Low Socioeconomic Status: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 87(2), 243-282. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316687036>

Estimated Evidence Level: Level 1

Study Discussion: Socioeconomic status is a major predictor of economic achievement. This systematic review and meta-analysis seeks to identify effective academic interventions for elementary and middle school students with low socioeconomic status. The effect sizes (ES) of many interventions indicate that it is possible to substantially improve educational achievement for the target group. The effect sizes (ES) of many interventions indicate that it is possible to substantially improve educational achievement for the target group. Intervention components such as tutoring (ES = 0.36), feedback and progress monitoring (ES = 0.32), and cooperative learning (ES = 0.22) have average ES that are educationally important, statistically significant, and robust.

Alignment to Needs: Optional Goals

(Kerrick Turnaround Team chose not to complete at this time.)

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.