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:
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 **Response:** The turnaround team consists of members of the school leadership/curriculum team, teacher leaders, and the ER team. The curriculum/leadership team deconstructed the improvement priorities, and the turnaround team identified KCWPs that aligned with each IP, solicited feedback from the faculty, reviewed the current CSIP and determined which systems/practices/processes to adopt and/or adapt. Kelli Abney MCHS Principal Elizabeth Hagerman MCHS Assistant Principal Jodi Blackburn Menifee County Schools Chief Academic Officer Kim Valerio MCHS Teacher Tracy Nickell MCHS Teacher Adam Adkins MCHS Teacher Kevin Gay KDE ERL

Heather Hall KDE ERL
Stacey Davidson KDE ERL

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:

The district evaluates resource allocation through several structured cycles:

- **Comprehensive Improvement Planning (CDIP/CSIP):** Annually, the district and individual schools conduct a Needs Assessment. This process involves reviewing state assessment data (KSA), iReady data, and "Plus/Delta" feedback from stakeholders. This data helps determine if current human and financial resources are effectively driving proficiency in core areas like reading and math. Upon review of the CSIP by the turnaround team, we determined that while resources were in place, there was a need to strengthen how those resources were utilized—particularly in the area of instructional support for teachers. This includes intentional co-planning opportunities, dedicated time for teachers to collaboratively analyze student data and share instructional strategies, and the use of student performance data to guide coaching conversations and determine next instructional steps. Additionally, feedback to teachers will be more closely aligned to clear instructional expectations, using walkthrough data to provide targeted support and ensure consistent follow-up. Teachers will also be supported in reflecting on their instructional practices and making data-informed adjustments.

- **SBDM Councils:** At the school level, SBDM councils/Advisory Leadership Team (composed of parents, teachers, and administrators) have the authority to review and approve the school's budget and staffing plan. They are responsible for ensuring that the school's budget aligns with the goals of their Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP). Upon review, the turnaround team determined that while staffing levels are sufficient, there is an inequity in how instructional support is experienced across classrooms. Specifically, the need for more consistent and targeted coaching for teachers was identified as a factor that may contribute to underperformance. To address this, the school will prioritize strengthening support systems by more strategically utilizing time and personnel to enhance instructional coaching.

- **Achievement Gap:** At the school level, a review of KSA data revealed that economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities have a significant gap when compared with all students. The turnaround team determined the level of targeted instructional support and intervention provided to these high-need groups is insufficient. In particular, inconsistencies in specialized instruction, differentiation, and progress monitoring practices may be contributing to underperformance. To address these inequities, the school will prioritize strengthening support structures by allocating time for intentional PLC collaboration focused on analyzing subgroup data, co-planning targeted instruction, and sharing effective strategies based on valid and reliable data.

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.
Using curriculum-based professional learning (supported by professional learning communities) and curriculum-based intervention to support core instruction and intervention	Taylor, J., Getty, S., Kowalski, S., Wilson, C., Carlson, J., & Scotter, P. (2015). An efficacy trial of research-based curriculum materials with curriculum-based professional development. American Education Research Journal, 52(5), 984-1017. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED556336.pdf
Using feedback and coaching in support of instructional expectations to provide on-going, job-embedded support for teachers	Pierce, J., Davis, B., Berry Kuchle, L., Peterson, A. & Nagle, K. (2025). Defining effective coaching practices to support teachers and improve student outcomes. WestEd. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED677398.pdf
Implement a systematic Data-Driven Decision Making (DDDM) process using Pear Assessment to collect, analyze, and apply student performance data to instructional planning and MTSS placement.	Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Schatschneider, S., Schwartz, K., Miller, A., Talbert, J., & Knudson, C. (2009). *Using student data to guide instruction and intervention* (NCEE 2009-4039). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/dddm_pg_092909.pdf