

Johnson MS Turnaround Plan with Addendum for 26-27

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.

Improvement Priority #1: Consistently engage students, parents and staff in a systematic, continuous improvement process that includes data analysis, prioritizing areas of focus, implementation of action steps and progress monitoring to improve student outcomes.

Improvement Priority #2: Identify and implement common instructional practices and strategies that promote rigor, critical thinking, student engagement and differentiated grade-level learning opportunities to support student growth and mastery.

Objective(s):

By May of 2027, Achievement GAP will go from 19% to 20% P/D for African-American students on KSA Reading.

By May of 2027, Achievement GAP will go from 12% to 13% P/D for African-American students on KSA Math.

Strategy:

KCWP #6; Develop and implement a vision/mission based on core beliefs and values that promotes collective teacher efficacy and serves as a lens through which educational decisions are made.

KCWP #6: Develop a system for identifying and addressing gaps in school-wide and classroom culture, climate and safety.

Activities:

1. Develop, implement, and monitor a review of protocols and systems within the school and ensure they are meeting the intended goal and adapt them for increase impact on student learning. (IP#1)
2. Facilitate structured opportunities for staff to collaboratively develop and refine a shared student vision. (IP#1)
 - a. Provide dedicated time within PLCs for teams to align instructional planning and assessment practices to the shared student vision.
 - b. Implement structures for gathering and analyzing student and family feedback to ensure alignment with the school's shared student vision.
 - c. Facilitate student focus groups to gather qualitative data on school climate and sense of safety.

3. Engage staff in ongoing professional learning focused on building collective teacher efficacy and its impact on student achievement. (IP#1)
 - a. Establish a system to recognize and celebrate staff practices that exemplify the vision, mission, and collective efficacy (learning walks, teacher to teacher visits, etc.)
 - b. Provide professional learning on culturally responsive practices, restorative practices, and positive behavior systems.
 - c. Review procedures and purpose for faculty protocols utilized in the school.
4. Develop and implement instructional walkthroughs focused on identifying evidence of (student or school) vision-aligned practices in classrooms. (IP#1)
5. Develop and use a consistent behavior and climate data dashboard to track trends in referrals, attendance, and incidents. (IP#1)
 - a. Establish structured PLC time to analyze culture and climate data and identify priority areas for improvement.
 - b. Establish structured admin time to analyze culture and climate data and identify priority areas for improvement.
 - c. Facilitate student focus groups to gather qualitative data on school climate and sense of safety.
6. Establish a data room and data process to utilize for Admin Meetings, PLC, Professional Development, Team Meetings to enable real-time data analysis to measure impact and progress for students on both cognitive and non-cognitive goals. (IP#1)
 - a. Provide opportunities for students to interact with stakeholders (teachers/caregivers) to engage in goal setting conversations multiple times throughout the school year.
7. Teachers at every grade level and content area ensure students continuously collect high quality, curriculum-based artifacts. Students are provided the opportunity to use artifacts from their own life experiences outside the classroom.

Progress Monitoring:

1. Utilize a common calendar that documents times for system review and links to protocols for review and improvement of the system. (Principal with support of the Admin Team) - Documentation review monthly
2. The shared student vision will be monitored through agendas and quarterly staff survey data demonstrating development, refinement, and understanding of the shared student vision. (Principal) - Quarterly
3. The shared vision through PLCs will be monitored by walkthroughs, PLC minutes, and aligned lesson plans and assessments reflecting the shared student vision. (Instructional Coach) - Monthly
4. Professional learning will be monitored by:
 - a. PD plan feedback (Instructional Coach) - After each session
 - b. staff surveys on collective efficacy (Principal) - Quarterly, and
 - c. evidence of instructional strategy implementation (Admin Team).- Monthly
5. Walkthroughs will be monitored by observation tools and trend data on vision-aligned instructional practices. (Principal leading the Instructional Leadership Team) - Monthly
6. Behavior and climate dashboards reviewed on a regular cycle, with trend reports on referrals, attendance, and incidents used in leadership and PLC meetings. (Principal leading the Admin Team) - Rotation by week/never longer than one month

Funding:

1. Systems Training (\$10,000 for conference registration - Carnegie in November in Chicago, boarding and food and travel) - SIF

2. Travel for KY Continuous Improvement Summit in September-To pay for 6 staff members' mileage (\$700) - SIF
3. Stipends or hourly pay for staff participation in student focus groups and climate data training sessions (\$1,000) - SIF
4. Purchase additional teacher positions (\$237,000) - Title I

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:

Reading:

- By May 2029, Reading will increase from 21% to 26% P/D for all students on KSA.

Math:

- By May 2029, Math will increase from 14% to 17% P/D for all students on KSA.

Objective(s):

Reading:

- By May 2027, Reading will increase from 21% to 22% P/D for all students on KSA.

Math:

- By May 2027, Math will increase from 14% to 15% P/D for all students on KSA.

Strategy:

KCWP #2: Through intentional monitoring, ensure the Tier 1 instruction is high quality and meets the intent of grade level standards (e.g., walk-throughs, classroom data, collaboration during PLCs).

Activities:

1. Provide professional learning to support teachers' mastery of their HQIR curriculum's specific definitions, representations, procedures, and examples for implementation. (IP#2)
 - a. Create and monitor a series of non-negotiable strategies and methods to ensure consistency and coherence for all students.
2. Conduct regular instructional walkthroughs and learning walks using a Tier 1 look-for tool aligned to grade-level standards and rigor expectations. (IP#2)
3. Provide targeted feedback and coaching to teachers based on walkthrough observations tied to Tier 1 instructional expectations. (IP#2)
4. Structure PLC protocols to ensure they focus on the following: (IP#2)
 - a. Collaborative teams will work to set goals for success in each classroom.
 - b. Implement common formative assessments (and common rubrics) to monitor student learning and the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction.
 - c. Internalize lesson plans during PLCs to ensure alignment with grade-level standards, rigor, and instructional best practices.
 - d. Data meetings focused on analyzing student mastery (including looking at student work) of Tier 1 standards and adjusting instruction accordingly.
5. Department analysis of classroom assessment data trends to determine gaps in Tier 1 instructional delivery. (IP#1)
6. Conduct co-teaching and coaching cycles focused on strengthening Tier 1 instructional practices. (IP#2)

Progress Monitoring:

1. Learning Walks to analyze transfer of planning to classroom practice. (Instructional Coach leading the Admin Team) - Monthly or Unit, whichever is shorter
2. Walkthrough data and trend reports using the Tier 1 look-for tool aligned to grade-level standards and rigor expectations. (Instructional Coach leading the Instructional Leadership Team) - Monthly or Unit, whichever is shorter
3. Walkthrough feedback forms and coaching notes showing targeted feedback provided to teachers. (Instructional Coach) - Weekly
4. Coaching cycle documentation, including observation notes, feedback, and teacher reflection artifacts. (Principal) - Differs based on teacher experience and need
5. PLC minutes and documented instructional adjustments based on student mastery of Tier 1 standards. (Instructional Coach) - Common Formative Assessment Cycles
6. Common formative assessment results and data analysis showing student growth and instructional impact. (PLC Leads) - Common Formative Assessment Cycles
7. PLC student work protocols (PLC Leads) - Curriculum Based Professional Learning Cycle
8. Assessment trend analyses identifying gaps in Tier 1 instructional delivery across classrooms and grade levels. (Instructional Leadership Team) - Monthly
9. Monitoring of ECE student data especially in comparison of GAP closure to All Students (ECE Implementation Coach) - 3 week cycles

Funding:

1. Curriculum support specialist for EL (\$30,000) - SIF
2. Curriculum support specialist for IM (\$20,000) - SIF
3. Instructional coaches to support Tier 1 instruction improvement and follow-up coaching cycles. (\$200,000 - 1 coach \$100,000/year for 2 years) - SIF
4. Purchase the digital platform for EL (\$25,000 for 2 years) - SIF
5. Purchase the digital platform for IM (\$12,000 for year 2) - SIF
6. Substitute teachers for release days to support Unit Reflection and Unit Internalization and Peer Observation (\$14,000: 5 subs per day for 8 release days @ \$175/year for 2 years) - SIF

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:

<p>Turnaround Team:</p> <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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dr. Rhonda Branch, Principal (Facilitator - Guide the plan and ensure it is implemented and monitored.) - Jolie Beville, Academic Instructional Coach (Provide support and voice from teachers, liaison with teachers to gain insight and feedback on needs and ideas.) - Jeffrey Marshall, Assistant Principal (Data monitor, and voice from administrators and support staff to gain insight and feedback on needs and ideas.) - Roger Kissling, Education Recover (Process coach - Support the use of quality tools)
<p>Identification of Critical Resources Inequities:</p>

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 Johnson Turnaround Team met to review budget and resource allocations. They analyzed and identified current areas of need and necessary resources for the school. Next, 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. Then, they completed a root cause analysis to address these concerns.
- Additionally, they identified a need to develop a system for reviewing the school’s core principles and how the work in the school aligns to it and is monitored for implementation and impact. Next, the Turnaround Team brainstormed possible solutions and conducted a research scan to inform best practices to address the needs. Then, they collected feedback from teachers and prioritized next steps. To address these needs, the school requires a mixture of outside support (Curriculum Support and Systems monitoring development) and internal support (distributed leadership opportunities, communication of vision and core principles, and development of academic focus across all stakeholder groups).

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.
Structure Professional Learning to support teacher preparedness for their curriculum in order to strengthen Tier I instruction in all classrooms.	Hill, H. C., & Papay, J. P. (2022). Building better PL: How to strengthen teacher learning. <i>Research Partnership for Professional Learning</i> , 1-19.
Collective Teacher Efficacy	Donohoo, J., Hattie, J., & Eells, R. (2018). The power of collective efficacy. <i>Educational leadership</i> , 75(6), 40-44. Pitkäniemi, H. (2017). A teacher's practical theories, self-efficacy, and emotions. <i>Nordisk Tidskrift för Allmän Didaktik</i> .

Evidence-based Activity	Evidence Citation
Continuous Improvement in Education	Park, S., Hironaka, S., Carver, P., & Nordstrum, L. (2013). Continuous Improvement in Education. Advancing Teaching--Improving Learning. White Paper. Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching.