

# Hartstern Elementary

## 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 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 LKSAAearning 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.

## Improvement Priority #1

Use a collaborative process involving teachers to define a limited, focused set of schoolwide expectations for effective instruction that promote learner-centered practices. Ensure these expectations clearly define the use of evidence-based instructional strategies and guide teaching practices across the school.

Standard #21: Instruction is characterized by high expectations and learner-centered practices.

## Improvement Priority #2

Collaboratively research, develop and implement a distributed leadership model that includes a clear process for all stakeholders (i.e., parents, students, staff) to provide input into the school's continuous improvement efforts. The leadership model should promote shared leadership and encourage open, respectful communication among all stakeholders and the school leadership.

Standard #9: Leaders cultivate effective individual and collective leadership among stakeholders.

[Link to CSI Addendum](#)

## 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.

### Objective(s):

By May of 2027, reading will increase to 38.8% P/D and math will increase to 36.9% for ECE students on KSA.

### Strategy:

KCWP #2: Design and Deliver Instruction

- Establish an instructional system to provide Tier 1 instruction that meets the intent of grade level standards and utilizes evidenced based instructional strategies and high-quality instructional resources. Monitor the instructional system through walkthroughs, collaboration in PLCs, data, and coaching and feedback.

KCWP #6: Establish Learning Environment and Culture

- Collaborate to establish opportunities for shared leadership among all stakeholders to elevate and support an equitable culture of learning.

### Activities:

- **Professional Learning** - teachers and administrators will participate in professional learning and an aligned book study on co-teaching strategies provided by Andrea Honigsfeld (IP 1).
- **Co -Teaching** - ensure the master schedule allows for co-teaching in Math and ELA and implement co-teaching strategies gained from professional learning and book study (IP 1).

**Progress Monitoring:**

- Professional Learning sessions will be monitored quarterly by administration using agendas and feedback surveys on the professional learning sessions.
- Co-Teaching strategies will be monitored weekly by the administration using an aligned walkthrough tool and data dashboard.
- All activities will be monitored monthly by the Hartstern Turnaround Team using a 30-60-90 day plan.

**Funding:**

- SIF 320 MC - \$48,448 - Andrea Honigsfeld books, 3 coaching sessions, 6 hours virtual coaching

## 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:

By May of 2029, reading will increase from 25% P/D to 67.6% P/D for all students on KSA.

By May of 2029, math will increase from 16% P/D to 63.7% P/D for all students on KSA.

### Objective(s):

By May 2027, reading will increase from 25% P/D to 63% P/D for all students on KSA.

By May 2027, math will increase from 16% P/D to 58.5% P/D for all students on KSA.

### Strategy:

KCWP #2: Design and Deliver Instruction

- Establish an instructional system to provide Tier 1 instruction that meets the intent of grade level standards and utilizes evidenced based instructional strategies and high-quality instructional resources. Monitor the instructional system through walkthroughs, collaboration in PLCs, data, and coaching and feedback.

KCWP #6: Establish Learning Environment and Culture

- Collaborate to establish opportunities for shared leadership among all stakeholders to elevate and support an equitable culture of learning.

### Activities:

- **PLCs** - PLCs will collaboratively utilize the intellectual preparation cycle and the core processes of Unit Internalization, Lesson Internalization, Lesson Rehearsal, and Student Work Analysis to design and deliver consistent instruction aligned to the HQIRs (Illustrative Mathematics and EL Education) and evidence-based instructional practices (IP 1, EBP 1)
- **Communication System** - Develop and implement a two-way communication system that allows all stakeholders to understand and implement the instructional system with consistency and provide feedback (IP 2).
- **Coaching & Feedback** - Implement instructional coaching, feedback, and peer observation cycles aligned to the HQIRs and evidenced based practices in order to support teachers in strengthening Tier 1 instruction (IP 1).
- **Professional Learning** - teachers and administrators will participate in Cognitive Coaching and Adaptive Schools to support the coaching & feedback system and collaboration among committees. Teachers and administrators will participate in curriculum based professional learning on EL Education and Illustrative Math to deepen understanding of the curriculum in order to improve instruction (IP 1, IP 2, EBP 1).

- **School Committees** - Establish and promote a distributed leadership model through academic, culture, and leadership committees. Ensure a Math and ELA lead at every grade level in order to strengthen continuous improvement efforts (IP 2).

**Progress Monitoring:**

- PLCs will be monitored weekly by administration using PLC agendas and KDE PLC Monitoring Tool. HQIRs and evidence-based instructional practices will be monitored weekly by the administration using an aligned walkthrough tool and data dashboard. Learning Walks will also be used to monitor HQIR implementation quarterly by the administration.
- Communication System will be monitored monthly via Hartstern Intranet by the academic committee, leadership committee, culture committee. Surveys regarding the communication system will be administered quarterly and reviewed by administration.
- Coaching & Feedback system will be monitored in eight week cycles by administration by a coaching conversation notecatcher and goal tracking sheet.
- Professional Learning sessions will be monitored quarterly by administration using agendas and feedback surveys on professional learning sessions.
- School committees will be monitored monthly by administration using meeting agendas and minutes.
- All activities will be monitored monthly by the Hartstern Turnaround Team using a 30-60-90 day plan.

**Funding:**

- SIF 320 MC - \$54,000 for Teacher Extended Planning
- SIF 320 MC - \$19,500 for EL Education Coach for 5 coaching sessions and 6 virtual hours
- SIF 320 MC - \$18,000 for School Kit IM Coach for 5 coaching sessions and 1 virtual day
- SIF 320 NC -\$4000 for supplies and materials for PLCs for internalization and to support HQIR Implementation
- SIF 320 NC - \$10,000 for Central Creativity 1 Fall Day and 1 Spring Day to use for unit internalization
- SIF 320 NC - \$54,000 for Teacher Extended Planning
- SIF 320 NC - \$12,000 for Retired Sub Administrator for 20 days to support while principal attends professional learning
- Title 1 - \$338,777.73 4 Teacher Salaries and 1 Permanent Auxiliary Substitute with fringe benefits

## Alignment to Needs: Optional Goals

Through the Phase Two: Needs Assessment for Schools, priorities were identified, and processes, practices and/or conditions were chosen for focus. Identify any additional indicators that will be addressed by the school in order to build staff capacity and increase student achievement by selecting “yes” or “no” from the dropdown options (beside each indicator) below. For any indicator noted as a priority with a “yes,” schools must complete the below fields. For any indicator marked with a “no,” no further information is needed. Each indicator must have a “yes” or “no” response in the below table.

Indicator	Priority Indicator?
State Assessment Results in science, social studies and writing	No
English Learner Progress	Yes
Quality of School Climate and Safety	No
Postsecondary Readiness (high schools and districts only)	No
Graduation Rate (high schools and districts only)	No

## Priority Indicator Goals:

Complete the fields below for each indicator that was chosen as a priority with a “yes” response above.

### Priority Indicator #1: English Learner Progress

#### Three- to Five-Year Goal:

By May of 2029, reading will increase from 17% P/D to 52% P/D for English Learners on KSA.

#### Objective(s):

By May of 2027, reading will increase from 17% P/D to 45.2% P/D for English Learners on KSA.

#### Strategy:

KCWP #2: Design and Deliver Instruction

- Establish an instructional system to provide Tier 1 instruction that meets the intent of grade level standards and utilizes evidenced based instructional strategies and high-quality instructional resources. Monitor the instructional system through walkthroughs, collaboration in PLCs, data, and coaching and feedback.

KCWP #6: Establish Learning Environment and Culture

- Collaborate to establish opportunities for shared leadership among all stakeholders to elevate and support an equitable culture of learning.

#### Activities:

- Professional Learning** - teachers and administrators will have the opportunity to attend the WIDA Conference, participate in Hartstern’s ESL Endorsement Cohort through Spalding University. Teachers and administrators will also participate in professional learning and aligned book studies on co-teaching strategies from Andrea Honigsfeld (IP 1, IP 2)
- Co-Teaching** - ensure the master schedule allows for co-teaching in math and ELA and implement co-teaching strategies gained from professional learning and book study (IP 1).

**Progress Monitoring:**

- Professional Learning will be monitored quarterly by administration using agendas and feedback surveys on the professional learning sessions.
- Co-Teaching strategies will be monitored weekly by the administration using an aligned walkthrough tool and data dashboard.
- All activities will be monitored monthly by the Hartstern Turnaround Team using a 30-60-90 day plan.

**Funding:**

- \$0 - uses same funding identified for Achievement Gap - Andrea Honigsfeld
- SIF 320 MC - \$48,000 ESL Endorsement Spalding University
- SIF 320 MC - \$5900 WIDA Conference Registration for 10 staff members, \$6220 for travel for WIDA Conference, \$2040 for meals and mileage reimbursement

## 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:

<b>Turnaround Team:</b>
<b>Consider:</b> 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
<b>Response:</b> Laquetta Carter, Principal, Paige Hartstern, Superintendent, Sandra Hogue, Assistant Principal ; Julia Tyson, Counselor; Melanie Cadima, ELD Teacher ; Alexandra Fluhr, Math Intervention Teacher; Amber Recktenwald, Literacy Intervention Teacher, Timothy Agne, ECE Implementation Coach, Sarah Pierce, Teacher; Charmeika Tarrence, Teacher; Morgan Eyre; Teacher, Kate Coombs; Teacher, Frances Fisher, Educational Recovery Specialist
<b>Identification of Critical Resources Inequities:</b>

**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 process to review the allocation of resources included surveys of teachers regarding instructional needs, student support and resources. Families were also surveyed by the Family Youth Resource Center regarding non-academic needs and supports. The survey data from both the teachers and families were reviewed by SBDM. This survey data revealed a need for technology upgrades, instructional materials aligned to the high-quality instructional resource, and extracurricular activities for students. Additionally, SBDM approved how money was spent.

The following inequities were identified when resources were reviewed:

**People:** The school was allocated two Bilingual Instructional Assistants (BAIs) and four ESL teachers to serve a school population with 54% English Learners. These numbers were insufficient to meet the needs of a high-density EL population. The school was allocated three full time ECE teachers. 45% of teachers are either Option 6 or a first year teacher. These inequities and limitations surrounding staffing contributed to underperformance as identified in the Improvement Priority #1 which stated the school needs a focused set of school wide expectations and to use evidenced based instructional strategies.

**Time:** Due to teacher absences and lack of substitute teachers, ESL teachers and intervention teachers had to be pulled from their duties and utilized as substitute teachers which prevented them from providing support to their targeted groups, which contributed to student underperformance on KSA. Additionally, an increase in the number of ECE students (both identified and not yet identified) has increased time administration spends with behavior management. This contributed to a decline in focus on school wide expectations for instruction and the monitoring of instruction, which is outlined in Improvement Priority #1. Finally, the three ECE teacher schedules have been a struggle due to both people and time because they have to cover multiple grades in order to meet requirements for co-teach and resource minutes.

**Funding:** Money has not contributed to underperformance due to access to a variety of funds such as Title 1, SIF, district equity funds. SIF was utilized to purchase high-quality instructional resources. The FRYSC budget was utilized to fund extracurricular activities for students as identified in the survey process.

The identified resource inequities have started to be addressed and will be addressed through the Turnaround Plan. To address the inequities around people the Office of Multilingual Learners provided two additional ESL teachers. This helps support Improvement Priority #2 by increasing

distributed leadership across the school. An additional BAI was purchased using district equity funds and three auxiliary substitute teachers were purchased using Title 1. These additional staff members will help provide more consistent instruction for students, which is in alignment with Improvement Priority #1. The master schedule was redesigned for this school year to allow for an ESL teacher to support each grade level. For the 2026-2027 school year, Leader in Me will be removed from the master schedule in order to provide additional time for core content instruction and interventions. Finally, budget needs and SIF funds will be monitored as needed through collaborating with Alicia Waskom. The goal of addressing these inequities is to work to achieving the goals of by May of 2029, reading will increase from 25% P/D to 67.6% P/D for all students on KSA and math will increase from 16% P/D to 63.7% P/D for all students on KSA.

## 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.

<b>Evidence-based Activity</b>	<b>Evidence Citation</b>
<p>Providing teachers with curriculum based professional learning in Illustrative Math and EL Education to improve implementation of the HQIRS in order to improve student outcomes in English and Math.</p>	<p>Taylor, Joseph A., Getty, Stephen R., Kowalski, Susan M., Wilson, Christopher D., Carlson, Janet, Van Scotter, Pamela (2015). An efficacy trial of research-based curriculum materials with curriculum-based professional development. <i>American Educational Research Journal</i>, 52(5), 984–1017.</p> <p><a href="#">Link to Study</a></p>
<p>Utilizing Illustrative Mathematics as a high-quality instructional resource to improve student achievement</p>	<p>May, K., &amp; Berrett, D. (2025, December). <i>Impact evaluation of Imagine IM in Cecil County Public Schools, Maryland</i>. Imagine Learning.</p> <p><a href="#">Link to Study</a></p>