

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: Brandy Corbin (Principal), Dotti Smith (Counselor), Dr. Joseph Ellison (Assistant Superintendent), Lisa Garrett (Interventionist), Nicholas Chlon (Assistant Principal), Joe Matthews (KDE ER), Holly Young (Resource Teacher), Rebecca Vickerstaff (Academic Coach)</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:

Spring 2025, Shared Leadership Team reviewed and revised needs assessment and school-based improvement systems:

- Reviewed report from voluntary 2-Day Review
- Debrief of qualitative data around testing conditions of Spring 2025
- Analysis of PSR data and monitoring and collection systems for PSR Spring 2025
- Analysis of Spring 2025 CERT data
- Analysis of ACT data

Identified Inequities:

- Lack of standards alignment across content areas
- Lack of teacher awareness of connections between ELA and Math standards and standards in other content areas
- Teacher Master schedule assignments made with limited consideration of teacher instructional effectiveness
- ECE teacher assignments made based primarily on IEP requirements
- Limited differentiation of ML instruction to support varying levels of English language proficiency
- Limited differentiation of CREW teacher and student assignments to better support academics (all students) and ECE student goals
- Professional development plan mostly focused on culture and climate
- Limited opportunities for college and career readiness
- Limited opportunities for tiered academic interventions
- Limited data to track implementation of schoolwide instructional practices and expectations

Fall 2025, Shared Leadership Team reviewed school performance data and voluntary 2-Day KDE Review to determine strategic next steps that included:

- professional development plan to increase student-centered teaching and learning practices
- master scheduling to maximize instructional time in literacy and math
- supports for college and career readiness through more effective monitoring
- Adjusted supports for ML students
- Adjusted supports for ECE students
- Expanded CTE pathway opportunities and WBL
- Expanded dual credit opportunities for students
- Adjusted school instructional monitoring systems
- Daytime ESS waiver to support ESS programming in ELA and Math

2026-2027 Next Steps:

- Identify Turnaround-Team and process for inclusion of relevant stakeholder collaboration
- Realign and recalculate goals based on KSA data
- Evaluate impact of adjustments to school systems
- Recalculation of school goals based on forecast model

- **Build capacity and implementation with identified HQIR curriculums and student-centered instructional strategies**
- **Continue implementation of EL Work Plan**
- **Continue implementation of SIOP protocols to support ELL students**

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
Train staff in EL Education and Expeditionary Learning CREW structure and Core Practices	<p>Nichols-Barrer, Ira; Haimson, Joshua (2013). <u>Impacts of Five Expeditionary Learning Middle Schools on Academic Achievement</u>. <i>Mathematica Policy Research</i>. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED618299 WWC Tier 2</p> <p>EL Education Annual Reports https://www.eleducation.org/our-results/annual-reports EL Education Case Studies https://www.eleducation.org/our-results/case-studies EL Education Research Studies https://www.eleducation.org/our-results/research-studies EL Education Ratings and Reviews https://www.eleducation.org/our-results/ratings-and-reviews</p>
Train staff in Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol best practices for ESL/ELL success	<p>Tran, Z. (2005). <u>Help with English Language Proficiency “HELP” program evaluation of sheltered instruction multimedia lessons</u>. Retrieved from: www.helpprogram.net. WWC Tier 3</p> <p>Markos, Amy; Himmel, Jennifer (2016). <u>Using Sheltered Instructions to Support English Learners</u>. <i>CAL Practitioner Brief</i>. Retrieved from: https://www.cal.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/UsingShelteredInstructiontoSupportEnglishLearners.pdf</p>

