

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: Heather Hoerter - Executive Principal Moore Traditional School, Lead. Shelly Hendricks, Amy Jennings, Whitney Lanham, Henry Robbins, Jessica Simpson - Assistant Principals, Academy Leaders. Lisa McAtee, Renee Schumate - Academic Instructional Coaches, Teacher Support and Training. Chelsea Beckemeyer, Christopher Bissinger, Mark Duckwall, Megan Eklund, Edward Groton, Krista Mills, Amy Skeeters, Lana Wingham, Abigail Yeazell - teachers, Provide teacher voice and insight. Heather Moss - Executive Administrator, Principal Supervisor Kevin Cook, Sara West - Educational Recovery Leaders</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:

Moore’s administrative leadership team met to review budget and resource allocations. The school’s turn around team analyzed and identified current areas of need and necessary resources for the school. The turnaround team identified a need for more time to build an understanding around Tier 1 instruction (non-negotiable practices, evidence based instructional strategies), use of data in PLCs to address gap groups, and understanding of effective coaching and feedback. Resources need to be allocated for ALM professional learning focused on effective Tier 1 instruction and coaching and feedback and extra time in PLCs to internalize HQIRs and implement the intellectual preparation cycle for staff.

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
Professional Learning Communities	Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. <i>Teaching and teacher education</i> , 24(1), 80-91.
Feedback and Coaching	Garet, M. S., Wayne, A. J., Brown, S., Rickles, J., Song, M., & Manzeske, D. (2017). The Impact of Providing Performance Feedback to Teacher and Principals. NCEE 2018-4001. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
Professional Learning	Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence. <i>Review of educational research</i> , 88(4), 547-588.

Evidence-based Activity	Evidence Citation