

Shacklette Elementary TAP with Addendum

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 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.

Objective(s):

By May of 2027, the Achievement Gap will increase from 0% to 11% P/D for ECE students on KSA Reading.

Strategy:

A. KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction

School leaders will provide support that builds teacher capacity of HQIR implementation and best practices in literacy and math while providing feedback and coaching to strengthen Tier 1 instruction (academics and SEL). Leadership will lead staff through a continuous improvement process aligned to improvement priorities. Specific instructional scaffolds to address differentiated needs of students will be targeted, specifically needs of ECE students.

B. KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data Results

While teachers are building capacity of the intellectual prep cycle and using the process to increase knowledge of the high quality instructional resource, formative and summative assessment data from the HQIRs will be analyzed to plan intentional tiered instruction differentiated to meet student needs. There will be a designated time within the data analysis process of Tier 1 summative and formative assessment and MAP data to review student data aligned with ECE student performance. Leadership will also monitor SEL walkthrough and individual student behavior progress data to build teacher capacity in classroom environments ensuring all students can learn effectively.

Activities:

1. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, ELA PBIS resource teacher, and ECE Implementation Coach) will engage all teachers in monthly professional learning designed to improve teacher efficacy in rigorous Tier I instruction using a continuous improvement cycle through unit internalization, lesson internalization, and lesson rehearsal focused on explicit teaching and modeling. The plan will be developed for the current school year and adjusted through a continuous improvement model based on data through PDSA cycles.

Purpose: Collaboratively strengthen, communicate, implement and monitor a systematic continuous improvement process that defines clear measures of success, uses data to inform instructional decisions

and includes ongoing progress monitoring to strengthen instruction and enhance student learning. (IP1)(Key Core Work Process 2)

2. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, ELA PBIS resource teacher, and ECE Implementation Coach) will train all teachers on a newly devised PLC protocol which will be implemented by the Academic Team. The protocol will build teacher capacity (J Hattie: Collective teacher efficacy) with an intentional focus on ECE teachers around the delivery of rigorous Tier I instruction using a continuous improvement cycle through unit internalization, lesson internalization, and lesson rehearsal.

Purpose: Collaboratively strengthen, communicate, implement and monitor a systematic continuous improvement process that defines clear measures of success, uses data to inform instructional decisions and includes ongoing progress monitoring to strengthen instruction and enhance student learning. (IP1)(Key Core Work Process 2)

3. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, ELA PBIS resource teacher, and ECE Implementation Coach) along with district academic staff will engage all teachers in monthly professional learning designed to improve teacher efficacy in providing support and scaffolds for students.

Purpose: Clearly communicate and monitor high expectations for Tier 1 instruction, ensuring teachers implement evidence-based, high-yield instructional strategies, and prioritize learner-centered experiences that shift the focus from the teacher delivery to active student engagement, challenging all students to reach their potential. (IP2) (Key Core Work Process 2 & 4)

4. Participating teachers will engage in professional learning from GLEC which includes monthly observation, coaching, and planning sessions designed to develop a strong co-teaching model between our general education, ECE teachers, and ELD teachers.

Purpose: Collaboratively strengthen, communicate, implement and monitor a systematic continuous improvement process that defines clear measures of success, uses data to inform instructional decisions and includes ongoing progress monitoring to strengthen instruction and enhance student learning. (IP1) (Key Core Work Process 2 & 4)

5. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, ELA PBIS resource teacher, and ECE Implementation Coach) will implement walkthroughs and provide ECE teachers coaching and feedback bi-weekly to monitor quality Tier 1 instruction based on identified instructional expectations. *Purpose: Clearly communicate and monitor high expectations for Tier 1 instruction, ensuring teachers implement evidence-based, high-yield instructional strategies, and prioritize learner-centered experiences that shift the focus from the teacher delivery to active student engagement, challenging all students to reach their potential. (IP2) (Key Core Work Process 2)*

6. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, ELA PBIS resource teacher, and ECE Implementation Coach) will create and utilize a data analysis protocol during ILT meetings, PLCs, and PBIS meetings designed to analyze academic and behavior data for ECE students to inform instructional decisions that supports differentiation of instruction to enhance student learning outcomes.
Purpose: Collaboratively strengthen, communicate, implement and monitor a systematic continuous improvement process that defines clear measures of success, uses data to inform instructional decisions and includes ongoing progress monitoring to strengthen instruction and enhance student learning. (IP1) (Key Core Work Process 2 & 4)

7. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, ELA PBIS resource teacher, and ECE Implementation Coach) will engage teachers in monthly professional learning that supports high quality Tier 1 instruction/HQIR implementation including student engagement, behavior expectations, and proactive strategies for challenging behaviors. Focus will be on helping teachers support students around engagement strategies and increasing student outcomes and improved student behaviors in the classroom so that students and their classmates can engage in learning.
Purpose: Clearly communicate and monitor high expectations for Tier 1 instruction, ensuring teachers implement evidence-based, high-yield instructional strategies, and prioritize learner-centered experiences that shift the focus from the teacher delivery to active student engagement, challenging all students to reach their potential. (IP2) (Key Core Work Process 2)

Progress Monitoring:

1. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, and ELA PBIS resource teacher) will monitor the PLC protocol bi-weekly through PLC agendas and minutes, the PLC observation tool completed by the principal or assistant principal, teacher feedback, and teacher perception fall and spring surveys. (Activities 1 & 2) (IP 1) *(Key Core Work Process 2)*
2. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, ELA PBIS resource teacher, and ECE Implementation Coach) will meet monthly to analyze walkthrough data that includes teacher feedback, coaching, and action steps through meeting agendas and minutes along with completed data analysis protocols. (Activities 1, 3, & 5) (IPs 1 & 2) *(Key Core Work Process 2 & 4)*
3. The Building Implementation Team (BIT) (principal, AP, ECE Implementation Coach, participating general education teachers, ECE teachers, and ELD teachers) will meet monthly to review observation data, coaching, feedback, and action steps through BIT meeting agendas and minutes. (Activity 4)(IP 1) *(Key Core Work Process 2 & 4)*
4. The following teams (Instructional Leadership Team, PLCs, and PBIS committees) will meet monthly to analyze academic and behavior data for ECE students, identify trends, and action steps to enhance student outcomes through ILT agendas and minutes, PLC agendas and minutes, PBIS agendas and minutes, and completed data analysis protocols with documented action steps. (Activities 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7) (IPs 1 & 2) *(Key Core Work Process 2 & 4)*

Funding:

1. SIF Grant: Year-long professional learning for teachers around high quality Tier 1 instruction including active student engagement strategies, behavior expectations, proactive strategies, scaffolds, intellectual prep cycle, and data analysis. (Funding for a one hour staff monthly meeting for 31 certified staff) (Activity 1, 2 & 3) (IPs 1 &2) (See Funding for Reading and Math Activities Funding) (*Key Core Work Process 2 & 4*)
2. Year-long Professional Learning for teachers around high quality Tier 1 instruction including student engagement strategies, behavior expectations, proactive strategies, scaffolds, and data analysis. (See below for reading and math funding) (Activity 1, 2, 3 & 7) (IPs 1 & 2) (*Key Core Work Process 2 & 4*)
3. SIF Grant: \$21,372 Year-long Professional Learning and Planning: Effective Co-Teaching Practices for ECE Teachers, ELD Teachers, and General Education Teachers. (Funding includes 7 GLEC meetings & 27 hour long planning sessions for 8 teachers based on the average annual salary) (Activity 4) (IP 1) (*Key Core Work Process 2 & 4*)
4. SIF Grant: \$8,100 Orton Gillingham Training (Funding includes 4 ECE teachers, 1 interventionist, and ELA resource teacher-\$1350 per person) (Activity 3) (IP 2) (*Key Core Work Process 2 & 4*)
5. Academic Team Professional Learning: Cognitive Coaching (Activity 5) (IP 2) (*Key Core Work Process 2*)
6. General Fund: ILT, PBIS, and PLC meetings (Activity 6) (IP 1) (*Key Core Work Process 2 & 4*)

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 24% to 55% P/D for All students on KSA.

By May of 2029, Math will increase from 25% to 50% P/D for all students on KSA.

Objective(s):

By May of 2027, Reading will increase from 24% to 34% P/D for All students on KSA.

By May of 2027, Math will increase from 13% to 25% P/D for All students on KSA.

Strategy:

A. KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction

School leaders will provide support that builds teacher capacity of HQIR implementation and best practices in literacy and math while providing feedback and coaching to strengthen Tier 1 instruction (academics and SEL). Leadership will lead staff through a continuous improvement process aligned to improvement priorities. Specific instructional scaffolds to address differentiated needs of students will be targeted.

B. KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data Results

While teachers are building capacity of the intellectual prep cycle and using the process to increase knowledge of the high quality instructional resource, formative and summative assessment data from the HQIRs will be analyzed to plan intentional tiered instruction differentiated to meet student needs. There will be a designated time within the data analysis process of Tier 1 summative and formative assessment and MAP data to review student data aligned with student performance. Leadership will also monitor SEL walkthrough and individual student behavior progress data to build teacher capacity in classroom environments ensuring all students can learn effectively.

Activities:

1. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, and ELA PBIS resource teacher) will train all teachers on a PLC protocol which will be implemented to build teacher capacity (J Hattie: Collective teacher efficacy) around the delivery of rigorous Tier I instruction using a continuous improvement cycle through unit internalization, lesson internalization, and lesson rehearsal.
Purpose: Collaboratively strengthen, communicate, implement and monitor a systematic continuous improvement process that defines clear measures of success, uses data to inform instructional decisions and includes ongoing progress monitoring to strengthen instruction and enhance student learning. (IP1) (Key Core Work Process 2)

2. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, and ELA PBIS resource teacher) will engage all teachers in monthly professional learning designed to improve teacher efficacy in rigorous Tier I instruction using a continuous improvement cycle through unit internalization, lesson internalization, and lesson rehearsal focused on explicit teaching and modeling. The plan will be developed for the current school year and adjusted through a continuous improvement model based on data through PDSA cycles.

Purpose: Collaboratively strengthen, communicate, implement and monitor a systematic continuous improvement process that defines clear measures of success, uses data to inform instructional decisions and includes ongoing progress monitoring to strengthen instruction and enhance student learning. (IP1) (Key Core Work Process 2)

3. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, and ELA PBIS resource teacher) along with district academic staff will engage all teachers in monthly professional learning designed to improve teacher efficacy in providing support and scaffolds for students.

Purpose: Clearly communicate and monitor high expectations for Tier 1 instruction, ensuring teachers implement evidence-based, high-yield instructional strategies, and prioritize learner-centered experiences that shift the focus from the teacher delivery to active student engagement, challenging all students to reach their potential. (IP2) (Key Core Work Process 2)

4. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, and ELA PBIS resource teacher) will create and utilize a data analysis protocol during ILT meetings, PLCs, and PBIS meetings designed to analyze academic and behavior data to inform instructional decisions that supports differentiation of instruction to enhance student learning outcomes.

Purpose: Collaboratively strengthen, communicate, implement and monitor a systematic continuous improvement process that defines clear measures of success, uses data to inform instructional decisions and includes ongoing progress monitoring to strengthen instruction and enhance student learning. (IP1) (Key Core Work Process 2 & 4)

5. Participating teachers will engage in professional learning from GLEC which includes monthly observation, coaching, and planning sessions designed to develop a strong co-teaching model between our general education, ECE teachers, and ELD teachers.

Purpose: Collaboratively strengthen, communicate, implement and monitor a systematic continuous improvement process that defines clear measures of success, uses data to inform instructional decisions and includes ongoing progress monitoring to strengthen instruction and enhance student learning. (IP1) (Key Core Work Process 2 & 4)

6. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, and ELA PBIS resource teacher) will implement walkthroughs and provide teacher coaching and feedback in every classroom bi-weekly to monitor quality Tier 1 instruction based on identified instructional expectations.

Purpose: Clearly communicate and monitor high expectations for Tier 1 instruction, ensuring teachers implement evidence-based, high-yield instructional strategies, and prioritize learner-centered experiences that shift the focus from the teacher delivery to active student engagement, challenging all students to reach their potential. (IP2) (Key Core Work Process 2)

7. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, and ELA PBIS resource teacher) will engage all teachers in monthly professional learning that supports high quality Tier 1 instruction/HQIR Implementation including student engagement, behavior expectations, and proactive strategies for challenging behaviors. Focus will be on helping teachers support students around engagement strategies and increasing student outcomes and improved student behaviors in the classroom so that students and their classmates can engage in learning.

Purpose: Clearly communicate and monitor high expectations for Tier 1 instruction, ensuring teachers implement evidence-based, high-yield instructional strategies, and prioritize learner-centered experiences that shift the focus from the teacher delivery to active student engagement, challenging all students to reach their potential. (IP2) (Key Core Work Process 2)

8. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, and ELA PBIS resource teacher) will implement three day learning walk cycles for all general education classroom teachers with one full cycle per teacher during the 2026-2027 school year. The sessions will include pre-brief, observation, debrief, and action steps leading to professional learning opportunities.

Purpose: Collaboratively strengthen, communicate, implement and monitor a systematic continuous improvement process that defines clear measures of success, uses data to inform instructional decisions and includes ongoing progress monitoring to strengthen instruction and enhance student learning. (IP1) (Key Core Work Process 2)

Progress Monitoring:

1. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, and ELA PBIS resource teacher) will meet monthly to monitor and ensure the communication of the PD plan through meeting agendas, PLC agendas, staff meeting agendas and minutes, ILT agendas and minutes, staff newsletters, and school calendars. (Activities 1, 3, 4 & 7) (IPs 1 & 2) (Key Core Work Process 2)
2. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, and ELA PBIS resource teacher) will meet monthly to monitor and make adjustments to the PD plan through PDSA cycle/documentation, PLC meeting agendas and minutes, staff meeting agendas and minutes, and staff sign in sheets. (Activities 1, 3, 4 & 7) (IPs 1 & 2) (Key Core Work Process 2)
3. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, and ELA PBIS resource teacher) will meet monthly to analyze walkthrough data that includes teacher feedback, coaching, and action steps through meeting agendas and minutes and completed data analysis protocols. (Activities 1, 3 & 6) (IPs 1 & 2) (Key Core Work Process 2 & 4)

4. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, and ELA PBIS resource teacher) will monitor the PLC protocol monthly through PLC agendas and minutes, PLC observation tool, teacher feedback, teacher perception surveys (fall and spring), and data through PDSA cycles of continuous improvement. (Activities 2 & 4) (IP 1) (*Key Core Work Process 2 & 4*)
5. The Building Implementation Team (BIT) (principal, AP, ECE Implementation Coach, participating general education teachers, ECE teachers, and ELD teacher) will meet monthly to discuss co-teaching practices and feedback from the three observation cycles through BIT meeting agendas and minutes. (Activity 5) (IP 1) (*Key Core Work Process 2 & 4*)
6. The Instructional Leadership Team, PLC, and PBIS committee will meet monthly to analyze academic and behavior data, identify trends, and next steps to enhance student outcomes through ILT agendas and minutes, PLC agendas and minutes, PBIS agendas and minutes, and completed data analysis protocols with documented action steps. (Activities 1, 2, 3, 4 & 7) (IPs 1 & 2) (*Key Core Work Process 2 & 4*)
7. The Academic Team (principal, assistant principal, math PBIS resource teacher, and ELA PBIS resource teacher) will meet quarterly to monitor the three day learning walk cycles through learning walk schedules, lesson notes, and documentation of the observations. The debrief will include a follow up of action steps and implementation of professional learning opportunities. (Activities 1 & 8) (IP 1) (*Key Core Work Process 2*)

Funding:

1. SIF Grant: \$8,486 for Bi-monthly Turnaround Team meetings to monitor the Turnaround Plan (*Key Core Work Process 4*)
2. SIF Grant: \$21,922 Year-long professional learning for teachers around high quality Tier 1 instruction including active student engagement strategies, behavior expectations, proactive strategies, scaffolds, intellectual prep cycle, and data analysis. (Funding for a one hour staff monthly meeting for 31 certified staff) (Activities 1, 2 & 3) (IPs 1 & 2) (*Key Core Work Process 2 & 4*)
3. Free: Academic Team Professional Learning: Cognitive Coaching (Activities 6) (IP 2) (*Key Core Work Process 2 & 4*)
4. SIF Grant: \$41,700 Two Six Hour Professional Learning Days in July for teachers around active student engagement strategies and the intellectual prep cycle. (31 certified staff and 8 classified instructional support staff) (Activities 1 & 7) (IPs 1 & 2) (*Key Core Work Process 2 & 4*)
5. SIF Grant: \$7,207 for Decodables to be used in conjunction with during small group instruction to reinforce the skills taught in the whole group phonics lessons to support high quality Tier 1 instruction (Activities 1 & 3) (IPs 1 & 2) (*Key Core Work Process 2*)
6. SIF Grant: \$6,324 for HQIR Tradebooks to be used to support high quality Tier 1 whole group reading lessons and independent work time (Activities 1 & 3) (IPs 1 & 2) (*Key Core Work Process 2*)
7. SIF Grant: \$576 for Letter Trays will be used to support high quality Tier 1 whole group and small group phonics instruction (Activities 1 & 3) (IPs 1 & 2) (*Key Core Work Process 2*)
8. SIF: \$2,159 for Classroom Magnetic Letters Kit that will be used for letter trays to support high quality Tier 1 whole group and small group phonics instruction (Activities 1 & 3) (IPs 1 & 2) (*Key Core Work Process 2*)
9. SIF: \$3,000 for Administrative Retreat to provide five extra days for the Assistant Principal to collaborate on the strategic thinking of summer and fall professional learning sessions, PLC protocol

and data analysis protocol, and develop a schedule for intellectual prep cycles. (Activities 1, 2, 3, 4, & 7) (IPs 1 & 2) (*Key Core Work Process 2 & 4*)

10. SIF Grant: Professional Learning and Planning: Effective Co-Teaching Practices for ECE and General Education Teachers. (See above for Funding for Achievement Gap) (Activity 5) (IP 1) (*Key Core Work Process 2 & 4*)
11. General Fund: ILT, PBIS, and PLC meetings (Activity 4) (IP 1) (*Key Core Work Process 2 & 4*)
12. SIF Grant: \$1571.00 for Resource Teacher Participation in Academic Team Meetings Monthly Before School (Activities 1, 2, 3 & 4) (IPs 1 & 2) (*Key Core Work Process 2 & 4*)
13. General Fund: Academic Team Member Participation in Learning Walk Cycles (Activity 8) (IP 1) (*Key Core Work Process 2 & 4*)

SIF Funding Total: \$122,417

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	No
Quality of School Climate and Safety	No
Postsecondary Readiness (high schools and districts only)	No
Graduation Rate (high schools and districts only)	No

[CSI Addendum](#)

Addendum for Schools Identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement

A turnaround plan created by schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) pursuant to KRS 160.346(8)(g) must be embedded in the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) required by 703 KAR 5:225.

This addendum outlines the specific requirements that must be addressed in the CSIP to meet federal and state expectations for schools identified for CSI. These requirements include targeted strategies and activities to support improvement in the identified areas of need addressed in the goal building template. Evidence-based practices and activities chosen to address any priority goal area must be informed by the Needs Assessment for Schools and feedback from any onsite review conducted by the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE).

Special Considerations for CSI Schools

Schools identified for CSI must complete the CSIP process and meet all applicable deadlines while identified for CSI. Following the completion of the school audit, CSI schools must revise their CSIP to account for the improvement priorities identified by the audit team. The newly revised CSIP, referred to as a turnaround plan, must include the following items: (1) evidence-based interventions to be utilized to increase student performance and address the critical needs identified in the school audit, (2) a comprehensive list of persons and entities involved in the turnaround efforts and the specific roles each shall play in the school's turnaround process, and (3) a review of resource inequities, which shall include an analysis of school level budgeting to ensure resources are adequately channeled towards school improvement (703 KAR 5:280). Each of the three aforementioned requirements must be embedded throughout the CSIP document. Once the CSIP has been revised, the turnaround plan must be submitted to the local education agency (LEA) for approval before it is submitted to the Commissioner of Education for final approval.

Provide narrative information regarding the additional requirements for CSI schools in the following chart:

Turnaround Team:
Consider: Provide a comprehensive list of persons and entities involved in the turnaround efforts and the specific roles each shall play in the school's turnaround process
Response:
Charita Kimbrough (Principal), Bethany Collins (Assistant Principal), Elizabeth Knotts (AIC), Emily Dunn (4th Grade ELA teacher), Alicia Merten (Intervention Teacher), Dana Graham (ERL), Catherine Bacon (Kindergarten teacher), Carol Wilcox (5th Grade teacher)
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 academic team (Principal, AP, and AIC) has analyzed Shacklette’s academic and behavior data and determined some of the school’s needs. In February of 2026, all staff were given a survey to determine their recommendations for staffing and additional resources. The ILT also met to discuss the feedback and to discuss staffing allocations and resources in February 2026. Teachers were given perception surveys to determine their strengths and areas for growth regarding their confidence in implementing HQIRs and the unit internalization process in February and March of 2026. The Turnaround team has also participated in data analysis of KSA data, Impact data, and vital signs to build capacity of the current reality at Shacklette.

Based on Spring 2025 Reading KSA data, only 18% of the student population scored proficient/distinguished. Based on Spring 2025 Math KSA data, only 13% of the student population scored proficient/distinguished. Our KSA data indicates the need to strengthen our Tier 1 high quality instruction for all students. Shacklette currently has 5 new teachers. One teacher is an early childhood teacher, and she is new to the elementary level. Three teachers are in their second year. As a result, most of the teachers do not have the experience, and they are still learning the standards, curriculum resources, and best instructional practices. School leaders need to provide support and training that builds teacher capacity of HQIR implementation and best practices in literacy and math while providing feedback and coaching to strengthen Tier 1 instruction. Staff will be trained and staff will implement a PLC protocol around the delivery of rigorous Tier I instruction using a continuous improvement cycle through unit internalization, lesson internalization, and lesson rehearsal. Grade level teams and school leaders will use the HQIRs in conjunction with student work and data to engage in planning, data analysis, and internalization of lessons and protocols during PLCs. School leaders will also provide training on providing support and scaffolds for students.

According to the 2025-26 Impact KY Survey, 47% of respondents answered 'Quite effective' or 'Extremely effective' to the question “How effective do you think you are at managing disruptive classes?” This response was 29 percentage points lower than the result for the same question according to the 2023-24 Impact KY Survey. According to the 2025-26 Impact Survey, 0% of respondents answered 'Almost never' or 'Once in a while' to the question “How often does student misconduct disrupt the learning environment at your school?” This response was 6 percentage points lower than the result for the same question according to the 2023-24 Impact KY Survey. This data indicates the need to strengthen our Tier 1 SEL instruction. School leaders will provide training on active engagement strategies, behavior expectations, and proactive strategies to support challenging behavior.

Twenty-eight percent of the students at Shacklette qualify for special education services. Based on Spring 2025 Reading KSA data, 0% of the ECE students scored proficient/distinguished. Our KSA data demonstrates the need to strengthen our Tier 1 high quality instruction for all students including ECE students. In the fall of 2025, scheduling conflicts arose with ECE service minutes causing some students to miss their Tier 1 instruction. School leaders revised ECE caseloads and adjusted some individual classroom schedules at the end of December to ensure that all ECE students received their Tier 1 instruction. School leaders will provide training on providing support and scaffolds for students, active engagement strategies, behavior expectations, and proactive strategies to support challenging behavior. Teachers will also participate in professional development from GLEC which

includes monthly observation and coaching sessions designed to develop a strong co-teaching model between our general education and ECE teachers. The ECE Team will have monthly data driven PLC's where they analyze student progress toward high quality grade level student IEP goals.

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.
Train staff on the PLC process and implement a PLC protocol around the delivery of rigorous Tier I instruction using a continuous improvement cycle through unit internalization, lesson internalization, and lesson rehearsal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hattie, J. (2008). Visible Learning. Abington, Oxon: Routledge: New York, NY. ● Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. Teaching and Teacher Education (24), 80-91.
School leaders will provide feedback and coaching to strengthen Tier 1 instruction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Killion, Joellen. (2017, March 31). Meta-Analysis Reveals Coaching's Positive Impact on Instruction and Achievement. Learning Professional, 38 (2), pp. 20-23 ● Kraft, M.A., Blazar, D., Hogan*, D. (2018). The effect of teaching coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence. Review of Educational Research, 88(4), 547-588.

Evidence-based Activity	Evidence Citation
Professional Learning to support engagement for all students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hattie, J. (2008). Visible Learning. Abington, Oxon: Routledge: New York, NY. ● Bradshaw, C.P., Mitchell, M.M., & Leaf, P.J. (2010). Examining the effects of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports on student outcomes: Results from a randomized controlled effectiveness trial in elementary schools. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 12(3), 133-148. ● Cook, C.R.(2018) “ Positive greetings at the door: Evaluation of a low-cost, high-yield proactive classroom management strategy