

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:

Maryville Elementary CSI Addendum 26-27	
IP #1	Implement and monitor an authentic school-wide continuous improvement process using data and feedback to guide instruction, strengthen student academic outcomes and sustain a culture of growth for all stakeholders.
IP #2	Ensure all students engage in rigorous, learner-centered instruction aligned to KAS by strategically planning, implementing and monitoring clear instructional expectations to ensure students’ academic needs are met.
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:
 Jamie Wyman, Principal, Kara Nicoulin-Counselor, Michele Grey-Instructional Coach, Stevie Trent-Primary Teacher, Erika Hart-Intermediate Teacher, Aubrey Atwell-Special Education Teacher, Kim Tabler- Special Area Teacher, Patrick Durham- District, Ronda Cox- KDE, Clint Graham- KDE
 Each member of the turnaround team plays a specific role in supporting implementation, including instructional leadership, coaching, data analysis, and monitoring of progress toward CSIP goals.

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 Maryville Elementary Turnaround Team includes the principal, instructional coach, counselor, teacher leaders, district representative, and KDE partners. Each member plays a specific role in supporting implementation, including instructional leadership, coaching, data analysis, and monitoring progress toward CSIP goals.

Following the Diagnostic Review, the principal and instructional coach led the Turnaround Team through a process of deconstructing the identified improvement priorities to ensure alignment with the Needs Assessment and CSIP. This process was extended to the full faculty during Bullitt Day professional learning to ensure shared understanding and collective ownership of the work.

The Turnaround Team met on March 19, April 13, and April 20 to analyze the Needs Assessment and CSIP rubrics, revise planning documents, and align strategies and activities to identified needs. This work established a clear and consistent focus on strengthening Tier 1 instruction, assessment practices, and student access to grade-level content.

The Turnaround Team will continue to meet regularly to monitor implementation, review data, and make adjustments to ensure progress toward CSIP goals.

As part of our needs assessment and CSIP development, we reviewed how we are using people, time, and funding to support student learning. This included analyzing our master schedule, staffing, intervention supports, and funding allocations, along with student achievement data, walkthrough trends, PLC work, and behavior data. Input from our leadership team, teachers, and district partners helped identify how resources are currently supporting instruction, assessment, and school climate.

Through this process, we identified key inequities contributing to underperformance. Tier 1 instructional time has not always been consistently protected, and there has been an over-reliance on intervention rather than strengthening core instruction. As a result, students—especially students with disabilities—have not consistently accessed rigorous, grade-level content. Inconsistent PLC practices and use of assessment data have also limited effective instructional adjustments, and variability in classroom practices has impacted student engagement and reduced instructional time.

To address these inequities, we are prioritizing strong Tier 1 instruction through explicit, standards-aligned teaching with appropriate scaffolds (EBP: Explicit Instruction). We are strengthening PLCs through a consistent PDSA cycle to guide planning and instructional adjustments (EBP: PLCs) and implementing a schoolwide assessment protocol to ensure data is used

to inform instruction (EBP: Formative Assessment). We are also protecting core instructional time and implementing PBIS consistently to improve behavior and maximize instructional time (EBP: PBIS).

Staffing, time, and funding are being reallocated to support these priorities. Title I and school-based funds will be used to support professional learning, instructional coaching, and high-quality instructional materials. The instructional coach and special education staff will be strategically utilized to support co-planning, co-teaching, and Tier 1 instructional improvement. We will monitor the impact of these changes through walkthroughs, PLC documentation, assessment data, and behavior data, and adjust resources as needed to improve student outcomes.

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
Teachers will engage in weekly PLC cycles to analyze student work, monitor progress, and adjust instruction using a structured PDSA process.	Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). <i>Impact of PLCs on Teaching and Learning</i> Lomos, C., Hofman, R., & Bosker, R. (2011). <i>PLCs and Student Achievement</i> Research on Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) (Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008; Lomos, Hofman, & Bosker, 2011) shows that structured teacher collaboration focused on student learning leads to improved instructional practices and increased student outcomes.
Teachers will use a structured assessment protocol to design, analyze, and adjust instruction based on common formative and summative assessments during PLCs.	Black, P. & Wiliam, D. (1998). <i>Inside the Black Box</i> Kingston, N. & Nash, B. (2011). <i>Formative Assessment Meta-Analysis</i> Studies on formative assessment and feedback (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Kingston & Nash, 2011) demonstrate that ongoing assessment and timely feedback significantly improve student achievement when used to guide instruction.

Evidence-based Activity	Evidence Citation
<p>Teachers will implement explicit, standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction with intentional scaffolds and supports, enabling students with disabilities to access, engage in, and demonstrate mastery of grade-level content.</p>	<p>Stockard, J. et al. (2018). <i>The Effectiveness of Direct Instruction Curricula: A Meta-Analysis</i> Archer, A. & Hughes, C. (2011). <i>Explicit Instruction</i></p> <p>Research on explicit instruction (Stockard et al., 2018; Archer & Hughes, 2011) indicates strong positive effects on student learning, particularly for students who require additional support, by providing clear, systematic, and scaffolded instruction.</p>
<p>Staff will implement PBIS practices consistently across all settings to improve behavior, increase engagement, and maximize instructional time.</p>	<p>Bradshaw, C., Mitchell, M., & Leaf, P. (2010). <i>Examining the Effects of PBIS</i> Sugai, G. & Horner, R. (2002). <i>PBIS Framework</i></p> <p>Research on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) (Bradshaw, Mitchell, & Leaf, 2010; Sugai & Horner, 2002) shows that consistent implementation improves student behavior, increases engagement, and maximizes instructional time.</p>