

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.

Objective(s):

By May 2027, the percentage of ECE students scoring Novice in reading will decrease from 74% to 69%.

Strategy:

KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction

Establish a cycle of intellectual preparation and implementation planning for HQIRs. By using frequent learning walks to gather real-time instructional data, we will engage in responsive coaching and professional adjustment to ensure consistent, high-leverage instruction that progressively reduces novice performance within the ECE subgroup.

KCWP 4: Review, Analyze, Apply Data Results

Establish a systematic, data-driven decision-making cycle in which school teams routinely analyze multiple measures of student performance to identify learning gaps, determine root causes, and adjust instruction and interventions. By consistently using timely and triangulated data to guide instructional decisions, we will ensure that supports are targeted, responsive and aligned to student needs, resulting in improved academic outcomes and reduced subgroup performance gaps.

Activities:

- 1. School administrators (principal, assistant principal, resource teachers) will deliver professional learning every two weeks for all certified teachers during staff meetings and designated professional learning sessions throughout the 2026-2027 school year to build teacher capacity in explicit teaching, modeling, engagement strategies, data analysis, and differentiated Tier 1 instruction.**

Purpose: to strengthen core instructional practices and improve the quality and consistency of classroom instruction across the building. (IP2)

- 2. General education teachers and ECE teachers will engage in a structured co-planning protocol during weekly PLC meetings throughout the 2026-2027 school year to analyze student data, plan instruction, determine needed scaffolds and accommodations, and align supports for students receiving specialized services.**

Purpose: to ensure students have access to high-quality Tier 1 instruction that is responsive to individual learning needs. (IP2)

3. School administrators (principal, assistant principal, resource teachers) and ECE staff will participate in a systematic student data review process during weekly PLCs, monthly progress-monitoring meetings, and quarterly data-review sessions throughout the 2026-2027 school year to analyze multiple sources of student data and determine instructional next steps.
Purpose: to ensure instructional decisions are responsive, timely, and grounded in evidence of student learning. (IP1)

4. ECE teachers will implement UFLI during designated resource time throughout the 2026-2027 school year to provide explicit, systematic foundational literacy instruction aligned to student needs. Instruction will be informed by ongoing progress monitoring data (Oral Reading Fluency) and tailored to target specific skill gaps in phonics, decoding, and fluency. School leaders and resource teachers will support implementation through coaching, modeling, and regular learning walks to ensure fidelity and effectiveness of instruction.

Purpose: to strengthen foundational literacy skills for ECE students through consistent, research-based instruction, resulting in improved reading outcomes and reduction in novice performance. (IP2)

Progress Monitoring:

1. School administrators (principal, assistant principal, resource teachers) will monitor the delivery of biweekly professional learning through meeting agenda, sign-in sheets, and professional learning materials collected during staff meetings, and designated sessions once per month throughout the 2026-2027 school year. Implementation will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, observation data, and feedback cycles to assess the transfer of learning into instructional practice. Leadership will analyze trends to determine effectiveness and adjust professional learning to strengthen instruction. (Activity 1)
2. Implementation of structured co-planning protocol will be monitored through weekly PLC agendas, note catchers, and collaborative planning artifacts throughout the 2026-2027 school year. School administrators will attend PLCs to ensure active participation of general education, ECE, and Multilingual Learner teachers and alignment of instructional planning, scaffolds, and support. Evidence will be reviewed weekly to ensure consistency and to inform ongoing coaching and support. (Activity 2)
3. The systematic student data review process will be monitored monthly through PLC agendas, progress-monitoring records, and quarterly data-review throughout the 2026-2027 school year. School leadership (principal, assistant principal, resource teachers) will review evidence of data analysis, identified trends, and documented instructional next steps to ensure decisions are timely

and grounded in multiple data sources. Findings will be used to adjust instruction, interventions, and supports to improve student outcomes. (Activity 3)

- 4. Implementation of UFLI will be monitored through weekly classroom walkthroughs to ensure fidelity of implementation throughout the 2026-2027 school year. Student progress will be tracked biweekly using AimsWeb data, with a specific focus on Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) to measure growth in foundational literacy skills. School leadership (principal, assistant principal, resource teachers) and ECE teachers will review AimsWeb reports and progress-monitoring data during weekly PLCs to identify trends, evaluate effectiveness, and make timely instructional adjustments. (Activity 4)**

Funding:

- 1. Free: Admin Team Professional Learning: Cognitive Coaching (Shannon Gullett, Education Recovery Director – KDE) 2026-2027 School Year**
- 2. Free: ECE Professional Learning: Effective Co-Teaching Practices (Deidra Hightower, Novice Reduction Coach – KDE) 2026-2027 School Year**
- 3. SIF Grant: \$10,000, ECE/ML Professional Learning 2026-2027 School Year**

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:

Increase the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading from 25% in 2025 to 40% in 2029.

Increase the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math from 19% in 2025 to 34% in 2029.

Objective(s):

The percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading will increase from 25% to 30% by May 2027.

The percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math will increase from 19% to 24% by May 2027.

Strategy:

KCWP #4: Review, Analyze, Apply Data Results

The principal will implement a distributive leadership structure by utilizing the Instructional Leadership Team to lead cycles of data analysis, vision setting, and monitoring of school improvement priorities. Academic teams within the larger ILT will analyze student performance, identify trends and gaps, and guide instructional adjustments aligned to schoolwide goals. This shared leadership and continuous monitoring process will strengthen instructional practices and increase the percentage of Proficient/Distinguished in reading and math.

KCWP #2: Design and Deliver Instruction

Professional staff will engage in sustained cycles of professional learning focused on explicit teaching and modeling, engagement strategies, and differentiated supports within Tier 1 instruction to strengthen implementation of our HQIRs. As part of this work, the school will establish clear expectations and non-negotiable instructional practices to promote coherence and consistency across classrooms. Through structured lesson internalization, collaborative planning, and ongoing monitoring of instructional practices, professional staff will strengthen their ability to deliver effective tier 1 instruction for all students. This aligned system of professional learning and instructional expectations will improve the quality and consistency of Tier 1 instruction and support increased student achievement.

Activities:

- 1. In May 2026, school faculty and staff will collaboratively develop a schoolwide mission and vision grounded in core beliefs and values. This mission and vision will be consistently implemented and revisited during staff meetings, PLCs, and leadership team meetings throughout the 2026-2027 school year to guide decision-making and strengthen collective teacher efficacy.**

Purpose: to establish a shared direction and ensure alignment of all instructional and organizational practices (IP1)

2. School administrators (principal, assistant principal, and resource teachers) will develop and facilitate monthly Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) meetings throughout the 2026-2027 school year to analyze student performance data, identify trends, monitor progress toward school improvement goals, and determine schoolwide instructional priorities. In addition, the administrative team will participate in a retreat focused on team building and establishing a clear, shared framework for instructional leadership to ensure coherence and alignment in practices.

Purpose: to drive data-informed decision-making and monitor progress toward improvement goals (IP1)

3. Academic sub-teams composed of all certified staff members will meet monthly throughout the 2026-2027 school year to analyze student work and assessment data, identify instructional strengths and gaps, and determine targeted supports and instructional next steps.

Purpose: to ensure instruction is responsive to student needs and aligned across content areas and student groups. (IP1)

4. School administrators (principal, assistant principal, and resource teachers) will implement Three-Day Learning Walk cycles for all classroom teachers, with one full cycle per teacher during the 2026-2027 school year and two cycles per teacher during the 2027-2028 school year, including pre-briefs, classroom observations, and feedback sessions.

Purpose: to monitor instructional practices, provide actionable feedback, and ensure consistent implementation of schoolwide instructional expectations. (IP1)

5. School leaders will deliver professional learning every two weeks for all certified teachers during staff meetings and designated professional learning sessions throughout the 2026-2027 school year to build teacher capacity in explicit teaching, modeling, engagement strategies, data analysis, and differentiated Tier 1 instruction.

Purpose: to strengthen core instructional practices and improve the quality and consistency of classroom instruction across the building. (IP2)

6. Classroom teachers will engage in a structured intellectual preparation cycle during weekly PLC meetings throughout the 2026-2027 school year, focused on deep planning and implementation of district HQIRs, including unit internalization, lesson preparation, and alignment of instructional strategies.

Purpose: to strengthen teacher planning and implementation of high-quality instructional materials, ensuring consistent, standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction that improves student outcomes and meets diverse learning needs. (IP2)

Progress Monitoring:

- 1. Development of the schoolwide mission and vision will be monitored through completion of three structured planning sessions in May 2026, with agendas, notes, and finalized artifacts. Ongoing implementation will be monitored throughout the 2026-2027 school year through staff meeting, PLC and ILT agendas, weekly staff bulletin, school website, and observation of aligned practices, along with quarterly feedback to assess understanding, consistency, and impact on collective teacher efficacy. (Activity 1)**
- 2. Implementation of Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) meetings and academic sub-team collaboration will be monitored through monthly meeting agendas, notes, and data analysis protocols throughout the 2026-2027 school year. Artifacts will include student performance data reviews, identification of trends, and documented instructional priorities, supports, and next steps. School leadership (principal, assistant principal, resource teachers) will analyze patterns across ILT and sub-team work to ensure alignment between schoolwide priorities and classroom-level instructional decisions, and to monitor progress toward school improvement goals. Findings will be used to adjust instructional priorities, supports, and professional development. (Activities 2, 3)**
- 3. School administrators (principal, assistant principal, resource teachers) will monitor implementation of Three-Day Learning Walk cycles through observation schedules, pre-brief and debrief documentation, and feedback records for each teacher, ensuring completion of one full cycle per teacher during the 2026-2027 school year. Leadership will analyze trends from observation data to assess the consistency of instructional practices, inform ongoing professional learning, and adjust supports to strengthen Tier 1 instruction. (Activity 4)**
- 4. School leaders (principal, assistant principal, resource teachers) will monitor delivery of professional development through meeting agendas, sign-in sheets, and professional development materials collected during staff meetings and designated sessions throughout the 2026-2027 school year. Implementation will be monitored through classroom walkthrough data, observation trends, and feedback cycles to assess the transfer of learning into instructional practice. Leadership will analyze this data monthly to determine effectiveness, identify areas of need, and adjust professional development to strengthen Tier 1 instruction. (Activity 5)**
- 5. Implementation of the intellectual preparation cycle will be monitored through weekly PLC agendas, lesson internalization artifacts, and collaborative planning documents throughout the 2026-2027 school year. School leadership (principal, assistant principal, resource teachers) will review evidence of teacher planning and implementation of HQIRs, including alignment of standards, tasks, and instructional strategies. Trends in planning and instructional delivery will be analyzed through PLC artifacts and classroom observations to ensure consistency and to inform ongoing coaching and support. (Activity 6)**

Funding:

- 1. SIF Grant: \$45,000, Year-long professional learning for teachers around explicit teaching and modeling, engagement strategies, and differentiated instruction; 2026-2027 school year**
- 2. SIF Grant: \$25,000 Explicit Teaching Institute with Zach Groshell; July 2027**
- 3. Free: Adaptive Schools (Shannon Gullett, Education Recovery Director – KDE) 2026-2027 school year**

4. **SIF Grant: \$30,000 (based on an 10 teachers participating; \$1500 at the completion of year 1 work and \$1500 at the completion of year 2 work); 2026-2027 school year and 2027-2028 school year**
5. **SIF Grant: \$16,000, Leadership Team Strategic Planning Retreat, July 2026**

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.

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>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</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>Joy Billops – Principal</p> <p>Ashley Burd – Education Recovery Leader</p> <p>Desiree Bush – Executive Administrator</p> <p>Chris Klakamp – Asst. Principal</p> <p>Beth Sample – Academic Instructional Coach</p> <p>Molly Smith – School Psychologist/MTSS Lead</p> <p>Patricia Cummane – School Counselor</p> <p>Ashley Marshall – Teacher Leader</p> <p>Jenny Goss – Teacher Leader</p>
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:
 Our team (principal, assistant principal, AIC, bookkeeper, and secretary) began with a comprehensive needs assessment to identify gaps in student achievement, trends in culture and behavior, the current state of academics, and the effectiveness of our core teaching and learning processes. We analyzed the master schedule, staffing allocations, KSA data, and the school budget to determine areas of need and resource alignment. Staffing decisions and scheduling adjustments were considered in conjunction with both the master schedule and the current year’s budget to ensure the most strategic use of personnel and funding.
 At the beginning of the school year, special education caseloads exceeded recommended limits. The district subsequently allocated an additional special education teacher, bringing caseloads within the required range.
 Ongoing staffing shortages—particularly the limited availability of substitute teachers—have required reading and math interventionists, as well as members of the administrative team (AIC, principal, counselor, and assistant principal), to provide classroom coverage. While necessary, this has reduced our capacity to fully execute leadership and instructional support responsibilities.
 Additionally, professional services contracts were frozen, preventing the allocation of funds toward professional learning. As a result, we have not been able to provide the level of high-quality, HQIR-aligned professional development needed to strengthen instructional practice.
 Moving forward, we will leverage School Improvement Funds (SIF) to intentionally build internal capacity in instructional pedagogy through sustained professional learning with our current staff. This investment will ensure that instructional improvements are not only implemented but sustained as we work toward exiting CSI status.

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). Visible Learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge: New York, NY.

Evidence-based Activity	Evidence Citation
<p>Train staff to implement explicit teaching and modeling using current district HQIRs in reading and math and other district curricular resources.</p> <p>Utilize a research supported problem solving model (Team-Initiated Problem Solving) within the Instructional Leadership Team.</p>	<p>Simons, K.D., & Klein, J.D. (2007). The impact of scaffolding and student achievement levels in a problem-based learning environment. <i>Instructional Science</i>, 35, 41-72. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-006-9002-5 (ESSA Level 1)</p> <p>Gersten, R., Keating, T., & Becker, W. C. (1988). The continued impact of the direct instruction model: Longitudinal studies of follow through students. <i>Education and Treatment of Children</i>, 11(4), 318–327. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ403955 (ESSA Level II)</p> <p>Horner, Robert H.; Newton, James S.; Todd, Anne W.; Algozzine, Bob; Algozzine, Kate; Cusumano, Dale; Preston, Angela (2018). A Randomized Waitlist Controlled Analysis of Team-Initiated Problem Solving Professional Development and Use. <i>Behavioral Disorders</i>, v43 n4 p444-456 Aug 2018. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1185345 (ESSA Level I)</p>