

Doss High School (Jefferson County)

Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP)

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 factors 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 they must be 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 for 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.

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 within a school's underserved student populations is a vital component of the continuous improvement process. Schools should use a variety of measures and analyses when conducting their review of their 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.

Needs Assessment Process:

The Doss reading achievement data shows a continued decline in student performance. The percentage of 10th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA Reading Assessment decreased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 13% in 2023-2024 and to 10% in 2024-2025, while state averages remained relatively stable.

Using multiple data sources and stakeholder feedback, we completed the needs assessment. In October 2025, the Guiding Coalition completed the Phase 2 CSIP process and identified several strengths, including strong community and business partnerships that support the Academies of Louisville pathways. Additionally, 83% of teachers have completed the High-Quality Learning Practices (HQLP) training through the Kentucky Reading Academies.

On January 13, 2026, the Doss Leadership Team completed the ASA/MTSS Behavior Needs Assessment with support from OVEC consultants and KDE ERLs. From March 2-5, 2026, a KDE/Cognia Diagnostic Review Team was conducted. The review team noted, "Student performance data indicate persistent and significant gaps between the school and state averages across assessed content areas, underscoring the importance of establishing strong, collaborative engagement structures that ensure stakeholders clearly understand and support the school's academic priorities." They identified two improvement areas. Using those Improvement Priorities, the Guiding Coalition completed a heat-mapping activity aligned to Key Core Work Processes (KCWP) 1 & 2 on April 9, 2026, followed by KCWPs 4 & 5 on April 16, 2026.

The Impact Kentucky Teacher Survey included 80 respondents in 2021-2022, 76 respondents in 2023-2024, and 89 respondents in 2025-2026.

- Understanding how to best use a process for determining data-based needs, 2021-22 responded 38% positively, 31% for 2023-2024, and 34% for 2025-2026.

- Professional learning aligned to specific data-based school and teacher needs for the 2021-2022 school year, 45% responded positively, 21% in 2023-2024, and 25% in 2025-2026.
- Feedback and coaching category on aligning to data-based teacher needs, 49% responded positively in 2021-2022, 17% in 2023-2024, and 28% in 2025-2026.
- Educating all students for the 2021-2022 school year, 69% responded positively, 65% for 2023-2024, and 56% for 2025-2026.
- Emotional well-being and sense of belonging were 35% positive in the 2021-2022 school year, 20% in 2023-2024, and 19% in 2025-2026.
- School leadership with a commitment to high expectations and follow-through on the “Doss way” and on inclusive problem-solving teams and processes were 41% positive in the 2021-2022 school year, 15% in the 2023-2024 school year, and 19% in the 2025-2026 school year.
- In the 2021-2022 school year, staff and leadership relationships had a 54% positive response rate; in 2023-2024, the rate was 29%; and in 2025-2026, it was 30%.
- School climate with clear expectations, protocols, and faith that data was tracked with fidelity for 2021-2022, the positive response rate was 35%; for the 2023-2024 school year, it was 16%; and for the 2025-2026 school year, 20% responded positively.
- Managing student behavior with clear expectations and follow-through had a positive response rate of 33%, for 2023-2024 it was 19%, and it was 19% as well for the 2025-2026 school year.

The TurnAround Team convened on April 20, 2026, to develop a trend analysis using data from all of the aforementioned needs assessments. They conducted a SWOT analysis and landed on the following items:

Strengths: We have “things” (products, partnerships, data, etc) to support the work. FIRE Expectations are fully in place and are now carrying over into other areas.

Weaknesses: We have data, but oftentimes we do not use it effectively to drive improvements. We need to master each system before moving on to others, ensuring they are solidly in place and working well.

Opportunities: Instructional Training to support teachers. (three focus areas. The Master Schedule for 26-27 SY is intended to allow for teacher swaps. MTSS (ABS: Academics, Behavior, Social-Emotional) is streamlined across all initiatives. We have a lot of Behavior data; we need to highlight a weekly focus. The PLC Team's structure is solid; monitoring is an area of growth and opportunity. Accountability systems for each adult in the building. To show and take ownership of various elements. With Modeling for support.

Threats: Currently, the system is a person and cannot function without that person. To create a plan that is not well defined or clearly stated without success criteria. The why needs to be articulated so we can fight the cynics. We have a culture and climate issue right now. This is tied to communication. Goals and action steps are clearly articulated and owned by the team. Issue with change. They want things to get better, but refuse to change. Teacher retention.

Turnaround Team Members/Roles:

- Problem Solver (Julie Chancellor - principal, JR Drummond - teacher)
- Urgency and Drive (Alisha O'Connor - KDE ERL, Sophie Luvisi - teacher)
- Flexibility and Adaptability (Andrew Zemanski - teacher)
- Growth Mindset (Julie Chancellor - principal, Sara Butryn - teacher)
- Critical Thinker (Julie Chancellor - principal, Amanda Davis - teacher)
- Collaboration (Alisha O'Connor - KDE ERL, Vaughn Fielding-Chiles - teacher)
- Positivity (Kelli Stein - AP, Joseph Frech - AIC)
- Confront Issues (Julie Thorne - teacher, Sophie Luvisi - teacher)
- Data-driven (Shawn Hinds - AP, Sara Butryn - teacher)
- Strategic Thinker (Alisha O'Connor - KDE ERL, Joseph Frech - AIC)
- Cost Cutting and Budget (Kelli Stein - AP, Julie Chancellor - principal)
- Operational and Efficiency (Sara Butryn - teacher, Vaughn Fielding-Chiles - teacher)
- Communication expert (Amanda Davis - teacher, JR Drummond - teacher)

Improvement Priorities:

#1: Develop, implement and monitor a process to strengthen stakeholder engagement, focusing on data analysis and using two-way communication structures that go beyond information-sharing to ensure families, staff and students clearly understand and actively support the school's academic priorities and staff and students' well-being.

#2: Develop, implement and monitor a system to collect and analyze data from multiple sources, resulting in clearly defined action steps that are communicated to all stakeholders in a timely manner.

Instructional Vision 4/17/26 DRAFT:

At Doss, we create safe, supportive classrooms where every student and staff member feels seen, valued, and respected for their individuality and diversity. We ensure every student continually experiences grade-level instruction and content in every assigned class. We align our school-wide practices, resources, and systems so that teaching and learning are focused, purposeful, and results-driven, fostering a culture of honest self-reflection and a growth mindset.

Big Rock #1: Data-driven Academics

Big Rock #2: Data-driven Support

Big Rock #3: Responsive Culture

Overall Goal: 10% yearly increase in students scoring P/D and 10% yearly decrease in students scoring Novice

Three- to Five-Year Goal:

Reading: By May of 2029, the Achievement Gap will go from 10% to 43.4% P/D for economically disadvantaged students on KSA Reading.

Math: By May of 2029, the Achievement Gap will go from 8% to 40.9% P/D for economically disadvantaged students on KSA Math.

Objective(s):

Reading: By May of 2027, the Achievement Gap will go from 10% to 22.2% P/D for economically disadvantaged students on KSA Reading.

Math: By May of 2027, the Achievement Gap will go from 8% to 19% P/D for economically disadvantaged students on KSA Math.

Strategy #1:

- **KCWP 4:** The TurnAround Team, MTSS Behavior/Academic Team, and the Guiding Coalition will communicate and implement a sustainable system for reviewing, analyzing, and applying data results. These teams, consisting of school leaders, will ensure a consistent approach to eliciting, interpreting, and acting on meaningful evidence of student learning to determine priorities for student growth and achievement.

Short-term/one-time Activities

- Guiding Coalition representatives will create a standard template for data documentation. **July 2026**
- MTSS Academic/Behavior Team will create/adopt a schoolwide data review protocol (RUN Protocol?) **July 2026**
- Guiding Coalition representatives will develop data dashboards (e.g., Looker Studio and Panorama as data platforms for MTSS, PLCs, Feedback & Coaching data) **July 2026**
- Principal/Counselors will create and communicate the Master Schedule and Doss Meeting Calendar for Departments and PLCs. **July 2026**
- TurnAround Team will create a Data System Calendar: Data Collection, Review, Monitoring, and Feedback (PLCs and Departments). **Before August 6, 2026**
- MTSS Academic/Behavior Team will train the PLC Leads Team and Department Chairs on the data documentation template, protocol, and dashboard. **Before August 6, 2026**
- PLC Team Leads will train Staff on the data documentation template, protocol, and dashboard. **August 2026 Gold Days**
- MTSS Academic/Behavior Team will develop an Embedded Professional Learning calendar that occurs in 6-week PDSA cycles, with the first training/review on data collection, the next on data analysis and response, and the third on monitoring the effectiveness of the interventions.
- Guiding Coalition will review and refine the Doss PLC documents, considering HQIR, unit/lesson internalization, and student work/data analysis.

- Guiding Coalition will create uniform resources for Instructional Preparation Protocol Artifacts (*Course Calendar, Course Plan, Unit/Lesson Internalization, PLC Documentation*)
- Guiding Coalition will train and model with the PLC Lead Team on the Doss Instructional Preparation Protocol and Artifacts, and **calibrate** the success criterion.
- MTSS Academics/Behavior Team will create a PDSA cycle calendar, that includes artifact submission deadlines, review, monitoring, and feedback (PLCs and Departments).

Long-term/Ongoing Activities

- MTSS Academic/Behavior Team will provide monthly refresher training for Team Leads (PLC Captains and Department Chairs) on the data documentation template, protocol, and dashboard. Initial before August 6, 2026, and monthly thereafter.
- MTSS Academic/Behavior Team will utilize the Embedded Professional Learning calendar occurring in 6-week PDSA cycles with the first training/review on data collection, the next on data analysis and response, and the third on monitoring the effectiveness of the interventions.
- Guiding Coalition will monitor the Doss Instructional Protocol and Artifacts, and relevant data to provide coaching and feedback by Department Chairs for ongoing training.

Progress Monitoring:

- MTSS Academic/Behavior Team will provide ongoing monthly training to the PLC Leads Team and Department Chairs on the data documentation template, protocol, and dashboard as indicated by the agenda/minutes
- MTSS Academic/Behavior Team will monitor the implementation and **impact** of the data review protocol, and provide coaching and feedback to Department Chairs in 6-week PDSA cycles
- PLC Team Leads will provide the implementation and **impact** data from the data review protocol, and will receive coaching and feedback from the Guiding Coalition in 6-week PDSA cycles
- Guiding Coalition will review data from the PLC Team Leads to determine the implementation and **impact** data from the data review protocol, and determine coaching and feedback for the PLC Team Leads in 6-week PDSA/coaching cycles
- MTSS Academic/Behavior Team will review academic data from the Guiding Coalition to determine the implementation and **impact** data from the grade level data review analysis, and determine coaching and feedback for the Guiding Coalition in 6-week PDSA/coaching cycles
- TurnAround Team will review academic/behavior data from the MTSS Academic/Behavior Team to determine the implementation and **impact** data from the schoolwide level data review analysis, and to determine schoolwide professional learning needs in 6-week PDSA/coaching cycles
- Guiding Coalition will monitor Instructional Protocol and Artifacts, and provide coaching and feedback by Department Chairs in 6-week PDSA/coaching cycles
- MTSS Academic/Behavior Team and Guiding Coalition representatives will review monthly PLC minutes
- Administrators and Guiding Coalition representatives will monitor the effectiveness of the

PLC protocol/data analysis through bi-weekly attendance at PLCs, PLC minutes, data analysis evidence, and walkthrough data.

Funding:

1. SIF Grant: (\$216,306.00) - For professional learning extra service pay. These funds are allotted in our Cohort 6 Continuation Funds. Monies will be spent on Professional Development related to the PLC Process (including the use of data and the PDSA cycle). In addition, these funds were used to train teachers on the Science of Reading and to train teachers with PBL supports
2. SIF Grant: (\$59,230.00) - Educational Consultants. These funds have been allocated through our Cohort 6 Continuation Funds and support our work with Solutional Tree and the Buck Institute to ensure our staff is supported in the training needed to make the necessary instructional improvements.
3. Title 1: (\$691,951.73) All these funds are spent on the staff of teachers to ensure class size is under the district-allocated cap.

Evidence-based Practice(s):

EBP: [Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making](#)

Rationale: Student performance data indicate persistent and significant gaps between the school and state averages across assessed content areas, underscoring the importance of establishing strong, collaborative engagement structures that ensure stakeholders clearly understand and support the school's academic priorities.

EBP: Research-Based Curriculum Materials with Curriculum-Based Professional Development

Specific recommendations:

- ❖ Adapt instruction to individual and small group needs by engaging professional learning communities (PLCs) in planning and data analysis
- ❖ Provide professional development and ongoing coaching/instructional support to all educators

EBP: [Preventing Dropout in Secondary Schools](#)

Rationale: Student performance data indicate persistent and significant gaps between the school and state averages across assessed content areas, underscoring the importance of establishing strong, collaborative engagement structures that ensure stakeholders clearly understand and support the school's academic priorities. The systemic use of data across all collaborative teams will support student progress toward mastery of essential standards and skills, ensuring that all students remain on track to graduate on time.

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 of 2029, scores will go from 9% to 44.2% P/D for all students on KSA Reading.

Math: By May of 2029, scores will go from 8% to 40.8% P/D for all students on KSA Math.

Objective(s):

Reading: By May of 2027, scores will go from 9% to 22.2% P/D for all students on KSA Reading.

Math: By May of 2027, scores will go from 8% to 19% P/D for all students on KSA Math.

Strategy:

- **KCWP 5:** The TurnAround Team, MTSS Behavior/Academic Team, and the Guiding Coalition will establish a framework that organizes systems, data, and practices to promote positive, equitable, and inclusive learning experiences for all students. We will ensure that continuous improvement and data-based decision-making occur at all levels to match instruction, intervention, and support to the identified needs of all learners. We will align resources to needs to ensure all systems work together for continuous improvement and success for all learners.

Short-term/One-time Activities:

- Guiding Coalition will define the Doss Way of Instruction (tier 1)
- Guiding Coalition representative(s) will create Doss Data Dashboard
- MTSS Behavior/Academic Team will define Doss Support System (tier 2 & 3)
- MTSS Behavior/Academic Team will provide initial training to the PLC Leads Team on the Doss Way of Instruction and the Doss Support System
- PLC Team Leads will provide initial training to staff on the Doss Way of Instruction and the Doss Support System
- MTSS Academic/Behavior Team will create a Doss Instruction and Supports System Calendar, including tier 2 & 3 student identification deadlines, indicators (use KDE tool verbage), and strategies.

Long-term/ongoing Activities

- MTSS Academic/Behavior Team will continue Doss Intellectual Preparation Training
- MTSS Behavior/Academic Team will utilize the Doss Support System (Tier 2 & 3)
- MTSS Behavior/Academic Team will provide ongoing training to PLC Lead Teams on the

- Doss Way of Instruction and the Doss Support System
- PLC Team Leads will provide ongoing training to staff on the Doss Way of Instruction and the Doss Support System
- MTSS Academic/Behavior Team will monitor a Doss Instruction and Supports System Calendar, including tier 2 & 3 student identification deadlines, indicators (use KDE tool verbage), and strategies.
- TurnAround Team will use monitoring data to design targeted professional learning and coaching cycles.

Progress Monitoring:

- Guiding Coalition will utilize the Doss Instruction and Supports System Calendar, including tier 2 & 3 student identification deadlines, indicators (use KDE tool verbage), and strategies to engage in 6-week PLC/PDSA cycles
- MTSS Academic/Behavior Team will monitor the Doss Instruction and Supports System (tiers 1, 2, and 3) and provide coaching and feedback to the Guiding Coalition in 6-week MTSS/PDSA cycles.
- In the Doss Data Room, each PLC team will be responsible for specific data they monitor and report at the school level during 6-week PDSA Cycles. PLC data analysis will be implemented to ensure students are on track to complete the courses required to graduate in their grade cohort, supporting CSIP goals.

Funding:

1. **SIF Grant:** (\$31,500) - For professional development. Utilizing our existing Cohort 6 Grant, training will be attended to support MTSS Academic and Behavior initiatives implemented schoolwide.
2. **SIF Grant:** (\$15,560) - For professional development and extra service pay. Utilizing our existing Cohort 6 Grant, training will be provided to support MTSS Academic/Behavior Team initiatives implemented schoolwide, including OVEC Behavior Solutions Cohort and RTI at Work Conferences.
3. **Title 1:** (\$691,951.73) All these funds are spent on staff of teachers to ensure class size is under the district-allocated cap.

Evidence-based Practice(s):

EBP: [Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making](#)

Rationale: Student performance data indicate persistent and significant gaps between the school and state averages across assessed content areas, underscoring the importance of establishing strong, collaborative engagement structures that ensure stakeholders clearly understand and support the school's academic priorities.

Evidence-Based Practice: Research-Based Curriculum Materials with Curriculum-Based Professional Development

Specific recommendations:

- ❖ Adapt instruction to individual and small group needs by engaging professional learning communities (PLCs) in planning and data analysis
- ❖ Provide professional development and ongoing coaching/instructional support to all educators

EBP: [Preventing Dropout in Secondary Schools](#)

Rationale: Student performance data indicate persistent and significant gaps between the school and state averages across assessed content areas, underscoring the importance of establishing strong, collaborative engagement structures that ensure stakeholders clearly understand and support the school's academic priorities. The systemic use of data in all collaborative teams will support student progress towards mastery of essential standards and skills that ensure all students remain on cohort to graduate on time.

Identification of Critical Resources Inequities

Describe the **process** you used/will use to review the allocation and use of resources (people, time, and money). The process used to review the allocation and use of resources, including people, time and money, is described, explains how **identified inequities** may have contributed to underperformance, and how those inequities will be addressed.

1. ***How does Doss determine SCHOOLWIDE needs?***

The master schedule was intentionally created to include time during the school day for PLCs. ECE teachers are included in the PLC. ECE and content area teachers give feedback on their area of greatest interest. Embedded Professional Learning is included during the school day so that all content area teachers can attend. The use of SIF funds included Solution Tree coaching, attending conferences focused on school priorities, and investing in classroom infrastructure, such as seating arrangements that allow students to more easily interact with their peers.

2. **What teams reviewed/will review resource allocation?**

The leadership team is the primary team responsible for resource allocation decisions. Having external consultation would improve teacher buy-in and increase implementation. The SBDM also contributes to any budgetary decision-making. The Guiding Coalition contributes to instructional decisions regarding time, such as master schedule changes. Departments then provide additional feedback, which is brought back to the Guiding Coalition meeting, where final instructional decisions are made.

3. **How frequently did/will SCHOOLWIDE teams review the allocation and use of resources?**

For example, Acceleration was one decision the Guiding Coalition deemed ineffective, leading to a modified schedule for the 2026-2027 school year. Using teacher surveys, it is essential that classroom teachers have input and choice regarding their content/classes taught.

4. **What processes or tools were used to review the allocation and use of resources? Which stakeholders were/will be involved in reviewing/monitoring this process?**

In the 2025-26 SY, we lacked a defined process or tool to review resource allocation and use. However, moving into 2026-2027 SY, our goal is to create an intentional data collection, analysis, and use system aligned with the Big Rocks. Title 1 funds are mostly allotted to staffing. SIF funds will be used to purchase Solution Tree support to build teacher and leader capacity within PLCs. Guiding Coalition will support the review and monitoring of this process, as well as the TurnAround Team, by KDE guidelines. The TurnAround Team will be the committee that oversees the Guiding Coalition's solutions.

5. **What problem are we seeking to address with the use of our SIF/Title 1 funds? How will we address resource inequities? (people, time, money)**

Based on the recent KDE Diagnostic Review, support staff need help analyzing data and making decisions to drive student growth. Therefore, SIF/Title I funds will be used to address instructional, resource, and access inequities by strengthening Tier 1 instruction and ensuring staff have the support they need to meet students' needs. Funds will be utilized to provide staff training in data analysis, guide instructional decisions, and build capacity through training on data systems. To reduce class sizes and increase individualized student support, a portion of the funds will be used to hire additional teaching staff, while another portion will support an extra planning period for PLCs and Academy teams to engage in Intellectual Preparation, review evidence of learning, and adjust instruction. Funds will also support high-quality professional learning aligned to the Embedded PD schedule, as well as incentives that reinforce collective ownership of schoolwide goals. Doss Instructional Systems will be strengthened through consistent use of CERT data, CFAs, and progress-to-standards analysis within PLCs. To improve communication and engagement, funds may support a two-way communication platform such as Thrillshare Rooms and expand family engagement opportunities through Open Gym Nights, Literacy Nights, and other on-campus events. Together, these activities will ensure we create safe, supportive classrooms where every student and staff member feels seen, valued, and respected, and all students consistently experience grade-level instruction in every class.

6. **What barriers exist for subgroups that could be addressed using SIF/Title 1 funds? How will we address resource inequities?**

PocketTalk for new ML students (will need to write ML students into the plan to utilize SIF funds e.g., goals, current state, strategies, activities, etc.). Set money aside for dual credit classes for FRL students (IP #1). After school buses to support students to stay to engage in activities (IP #1). Equity in Field Trips and Student Experiences. Build in time for ECE/ML teachers to work together more than just PLC time. Differentiated PL for training with resource teachers. And Data Half Days for Core Contents.

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 completion of the school audit, CSI schools must revise their CSIPs to reflect 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:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Julie Chancellor - principal● Sophie Luvisi - teacher● Andrew Zemanski - teacher● Sara Butryn - teacher

- Amanda Davis - teacher
- Vaughn Fielding-Chiles - teacher
- Kelli Stein - Academic AP
- Joseph Frech - AIC
- Julie Thorne - teacher
- Shawn Hinds - AP
- JR Drummond - teacher
- Tara Conner - ECE Implementation Coach (updated 5/21/26 based on email shared with principal)
- Terra Shaver - ECE Implementation Coach (updated 5/21/26 based on email shared with principal)
- Alisha O'Connor - 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:

1. ***How does Doss determine SCHOOLWIDE needs?***

The master schedule was intentionally created to include time during the school day for PLCs. ECE teachers are included in the PLC. ECE and content area teachers give feedback on their area of greatest interest. Embedded Professional Learning is included during the school day so that all content area teachers can attend. The use of SIF funds included Solution Tree coaching, attending conferences focused on school priorities, and investing in classroom infrastructure, such as seating arrangements that allow students to more easily interact with their peers.

2. **What teams reviewed/will review resource allocation?**

The leadership team is the primary team responsible for resource allocation decisions. Having external consultation would improve teacher buy-in and increase implementation. The SBDM also contributes to any budgetary decision-making. The Guiding Coalition contributes to instructional decisions regarding time, such as master schedule changes. Departments then provide additional feedback, which is brought back to the Guiding Coalition meeting, where final instructional decisions are made.

3. **How frequently did/will SCHOOLWIDE teams review the allocation and use of resources?**

For example, Acceleration was one decision the Guiding Coalition deemed ineffective, leading to a modified schedule for the 2026-2027 school year. Using teacher surveys, it is essential that classroom teachers have input and choice regarding their content/classes taught.

4. **What processes or tools were used to review the allocation and use of resources? *Which stakeholders were/will be involved in reviewing/monitoring this process?***

In the 2025-26 SY, we lacked a defined process or tool to review resource allocation and use. However, moving into 2026-2027 SY, our goal is to create an intentional data collection, analysis, and use system aligned with the Big Rocks. Title 1 funds are mostly allotted to staffing. SIF funds will be used to purchase Solution Tree support to build teacher and leader capacity within PLCs. Guiding Coalition will support the review and monitoring of this process, as well as the TurnAround Team, by KDE guidelines. The TurnAround Team will be the committee that oversees the Guiding Coalition's solutions.

5. **What problem are we seeking to address with the use of our SIF/Title 1 funds? How will we address resource inequities? (people, time, money)**

Based on the recent KDE Diagnostic Review, support staff need help analyzing data and making decisions to drive student growth. Therefore, SIF/Title I funds will be used to address instructional, resource, and access inequities by strengthening Tier 1 instruction and ensuring staff have the support they need to meet students' needs. Funds will be utilized to provide staff training in data analysis, guide instructional decisions, and build capacity through training on data systems. To reduce class sizes and increase individualized student support, a portion of the funds will be used to hire additional teaching staff, while another portion will support an extra planning period for PLCs and Academy teams to engage in Intellectual Preparation, review evidence of learning, and adjust instruction. Funds will also support high-quality professional learning aligned to the Embedded PD schedule, as well as incentives that reinforce collective ownership of schoolwide goals. Doss Instructional Systems will be strengthened through consistent use of CERT data, CFAs, and progress-to-standards analysis within PLCs. To improve communication and engagement, funds may support a two-way communication platform such as Thrillshare Rooms and expand family engagement opportunities through Open Gym Nights, Literacy Nights, and other on-campus events. Together, these activities will ensure we create safe, supportive classrooms where every student and staff member feels seen, valued, and respected, and all students consistently experience grade-level instruction in every class.

6. **What barriers exist for subgroups that could be addressed using SIF/Title 1 funds? How will we address resource inequities?**

PocketTalk for new ML students (**will need to write ML students into the plan to utilize SIF funds e.g., goals, current state, strategies, activities, etc.**). Set money aside for dual credit classes for FRL students (**IP #1**). After school buses to support students to stay to engage in activities (**IP #1**). Equity in Field Trips and Student Experiences. Build in time for ECE/ML teachers to work together more than just PLC time. Differentiated PL for training with resource teachers. And Data Half Days for Core Contents.

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:

4. **Strong evidence** from at least one well-designed and well-implemented *experimental study*;
5. **Moderate evidence** from at least one well-designed and well-implemented *quasi-experimental study*;
6. **Promising evidence** from at least one well-designed and well-implemented *correlational study* with statistical controls for selection bias; or
7. **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
<p>EBP: Collaborative Instructional Improvement / Data Use</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <p>Implement professional learning communities (PLCs) that engage teachers in collaborative planning, analysis of student work, and data-driven instructional decision-making to improve student achievement.</p> <p>Implement continuous improvement</p>	<p>IP #2: Develop, implement, and monitor a system to collect and analyze data from multiple sources, resulting in clearly defined action steps that are communicated to all stakeholders in a timely manner.</p> <p>Estimated ESSA Tier Evidence Level: ESSA Tier 3</p> <p>Evidence Citation:</p> <p>Park, Sandra, et al. “Continuous Improvement in Education.” Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2013, pp. 1-48.</p> <p>Saunders, W. M., Goldenberg, C. N., & Gallimore, R. (2009). Increasing achievement by focusing grade-level teams on improving classroom learning: A prospective, quasi-experimental study of Title I schools.</p> <p>Study Discussion: Research from Park et al. shows that continuous improvement in education shapes the planning and decision-making process. Their work emphasizes that meaningful school improvement occurs when organizations use disciplined inquiry, multiple sources of data, rapid feedback cycles, and continuous reflection to refine practices over time. Through the use of continuous improvement cycles,</p>

Evidence-based Activity	Evidence Citation
<p>cycles (Plan-Do-Study-Act) to identify needs, test instructional strategies, analyze results, and refine practices to improve student outcomes.</p>	<p>such as Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA), schools experience a more coherent and responsive process for instructional decision-making that supports both teacher growth and improved student outcomes.</p> <p>Saunders et al. found that schools improved student achievement when teacher teams focused consistently on classroom learning, used structured collaboration routines, and engaged in ongoing analysis of instructional practices and student results. Their research supports the use of PLCs as more than meeting structures; instead, PLCs become systems for collective problem-solving, shared accountability, and instructional refinement.</p>
<p>EBP: Early Warning System (EWS) with credit monitoring and targeted intervention</p> <p>Rationale: Student performance data indicate persistent and significant gaps between the school and state averages across assessed content areas, underscoring the importance of establishing strong, collaborative engagement structures that ensure stakeholders clearly understand and support the school’s academic priorities. The systemic use of data across all collaborative teams will support student progress toward mastery of essential standards and skills, ensuring that all students remain on track to graduate on time.</p>	<p>IP #1: Develop, implement and monitor a process to strengthen stakeholder engagement, focusing on data analysis and using two-way communication structures that go beyond information-sharing to ensure families, staff and students clearly understand and actively support the school’s academic priorities and staff and students’ well-being.</p> <p>Estimated ESSA Tier Evidence Level: ESSA Tier 3</p> <p>Evidence Citation</p> <p>Allensworth, E. M., & Easton, J. Q. (2007). <i>What matters for staying on-track and graduating in Chicago public high schools: A close look at course grades, failures, and attendance in the freshman year</i> (Research Report No. ED498350). Consortium on Chicago School Research. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED498350</p> <p>Study Discussion: Despite increasing recognition that a high school diploma is a minimum requirement for success in the workplace, nearly half of Chicago Public Schools (CPS) students fail to graduate, and in some CPS high schools, more students drop out than graduate. Research on dropping out has shown that the decision to persist in or leave school is affected by multiple contextual factors interacting in a cumulative way over the life course of a student. Often overlooked in this discussion is one most directly related to graduation: student course performance. This report looks at student performance in freshman coursework, how it is related to eventual graduation and how personal and school factors contribute to success of failure in freshman-year courses. Data on course performance can be used to identify future dropouts and graduates with precision, and performance indicators are compared to discern how they might be used for nuanced targeting of students at risk of dropping out. Factors contributing to successful</p>

Evidence-based Activity	Evidence Citation
	course performance demonstrate that what students do while in high school is more important than their background or preparation for high school.
<p>EBP: Research-Based Curriculum Materials with Curriculum-Based Professional Development</p> <p>Specific recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Adapt instruction to individual and small group needs by engaging professional learning communities (PLCs) in planning and data analysis ❖ Provide professional development and ongoing coaching/instructional support to all educators 	<p>IP #1: Develop, implement and monitor a process to strengthen stakeholder engagement, focusing on data analysis and using two-way communication structures that go beyond information-sharing to ensure families, staff and students clearly understand and actively support the school’s academic priorities and staff and students’ well-being.</p> <p>Evidence Citation</p> <p><i>Biancarosa, G., Bryk, A.S., & Dexter, E.R. (2010, September). Assessing the value-added effects of Literacy Collaborative professional development on student learning. The Elementary School Journal, 111(1), 7-34. Retrieved from Assessing the Value Added.pdf - Google Drive</i></p> <p><i>Saunders, W.M., Goldenberg, C.N., & Gallimore, R. (2009, December). Increasing achievement by focusing grade-level teams on improving classroom learning: A prospective, quasi-experimental study of Title I schools. American Educational Research Journal, 46(4), 1006–1033. Retrieved from am educ res j-2009-saunders-1006-33.pdf (stanford.edu)</i></p> <p><i>Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs</i></p> <p>Estimated Evidence Level: ESSA Tier 3</p> <p>Study Discussion: Two recent studies by Biancarosa et al. and by Saunders et al. have finally demonstrated that “job-embedded, sustained professional development” can significantly improve student achievement.</p> <p>In 2010 Gina Biancarosa, Anthony Bryk, and Emily Dexter published the results of a four-year longitudinal study providing solid evidence that instructional coaching can improve student learning. During the third</p>

Evidence-based Activity	Evidence Citation
	<p>year of implementation, instructional coaching contributed to a 32 percent increase in value-added student learning gains—a huge impact in the realm of PD research.</p> <p>The study by Yoon et al. used nine different studies to determine the effectiveness of Professional Learning on student achievement. The report finds that teachers who receive substantial professional development—an average of 49 hours in the nine studies—can boost their students’ achievement by about 21 percentile points. Teachers must receive 24 hours of professional learning during the course of the school year. Doss High School would like to improve upon this practice by providing job-embedded professional learning opportunities throughout the day to exceed the minimum number of required professional learning hours. By providing these on a weekly basis, Doss would then provide additional professional learning opportunities throughout the day (job-embedded professional learning) to the staff to reach or exceed the 49 hours referenced in the study, with the goal of increasing student achievement, as referenced in the study.</p>
<p>EBP: Explicit instruction in reading and writing within content areas</p> <p>Rationale: Implement explicit instruction in reading and writing within content areas, including teaching comprehension strategies, academic vocabulary, and structured writing tasks to support understanding of complex texts.</p>	<p>Challenge: Adolescent students need intervention in both accuracy and automaticity to increase reading achievement.</p> <p>Evidence Citation:</p> <p>Vaughn, S., Gersten, R., Dimino, J., Taylor, M. J., Newman-Gonchar, R., Krowka, S., Kieffer, M. J., McKeown, M., Reed, D., Sanchez, M., St. Martin, K., Wexler, J., Morgan, S., Yañez, A., & Jayanthi, M. (2022). Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4–9 (WWC 2022007). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from https://whatworks.ed.gov/.</p> <p>Estimated ESSA Tier Evidence Level: Meta analysis that includes randomized controlled trials across grade levels – Level I</p> <p>Study Discussion: This meta-analysis found two practices that improve students’ ability to read words accurately and automatically and two practices that help students understand the text they read. Following findings from the needs assessment process and research into possible strategies, the turnaround and advisory leadership teams determined that implementation of the four intervention strategies over the</p>

Evidence-based Activity	Evidence Citation
	next three years will best support the needs of our middle school students and can be implemented within our scheduling and staffing structures.