

Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP)

Rationale

School improvement efforts are a collaborative process involving multiple stakeholders. Through the improvement planning process, leaders focus on priority needs, funding, and closing achievement gaps among identified subgroups of students. When implemented with fidelity, the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) cultivates an environment that promotes student growth and achievement.

Operational Definitions

Goal: Long-term three to five year targets based on the required school level goals. Elementary/middle schools must have goals for proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, and growth. High schools must have goals for proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, graduation rate, and transition readiness. Long-term targets should be informed by The Needs Assessment for Schools.

Objective: Short-term target to be attained by the end of the current academic year. 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 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 (6) Key Core Work Processes listed below or another established improvement approach (i.e. *Six Sigma, Shipley, Baldrige, etc.*).

Activity: Actionable steps used to deploy the chosen strategy. There can be multiple activities for each strategy.

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](#)
- [KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support](#)
- [KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment](#)

Measure of Success: Criteria that shows the impact of the work. The **measures** may be quantitative or qualitative, but are observable in some way.

Progress Monitoring: Process used to assess the implementation of the plan, the rate of improvement, and the effectiveness of the plan. Should include timelines and responsible individuals.

Funding: Local, state, or federal funds/grants used to support (or needed to support) the improvement initiative.

Requirements for Building an Improvement Plan

- There are six (6) required district goals: proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, graduation rate, growth, and transition readiness.
- The required school goals include the following:
 - For elementary/middle school, these include: proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, and, growth.
 - For high school, these include: proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, graduation rate, and transition readiness.

Explanations/Directions

Goal: *To increase overall Reading and Math proficiency by 2025 as follows: Reading from 63.3% to 72.4% and Math from 61% to 68.5%. Baseline data is taken from 18-19 K-PREP assessment results.*

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
<p>Objective 1: To increase the overall proficiency rate of students in both reading and math as follows: Reading – From 63.3% to 70% in 2023. Based on internal Common Formative Assessment and Proficiency Data</p> <p>Math – From 61% to 70% in 2023 Based on internal Common Formative Assessment and Proficiency Data.</p>	<p>Review, Analyze and Apply Data: Monitoring to ensure curriculum is delivered at high levels/re-adjusting curriculum to ensure it meets the needs of all students.</p>	<p>PLC teams working to deconstruct standards and develop common formative assessments that match the rigor of standards and that meet the needs of all students at the Core/Tier 1 level.</p>	<p>Improved percentage of students making proficiency in accordance with benchmark assessments as measured by Common Formative Assessment Data.</p> <p>Process Goal: The development of 6-8 Rubrics and CFA's based on teacher-defined power standards specifically in the area of mathematics.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On-Going CFA and PLC Discussion - Internal Benchmark Proficiency Assessment Data - Universal Screening Data (MAP, DRA, Phonological and Phonemic Assessment Data) 	<p>N/A</p>
	<p>Design and Deploy Standards and Deliver Instruction: Strengthening the core instruction to ensure teachers fully understand the standards and have relevant resources to ensure they support the curriculum at rigorous levels.</p>	<p>PLC teams developing learning targets from newly adopted ELA and Math resources to ensure all students have access to grade level curriculum matched to the standards.</p>			
	<p>Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy: Proper identification of power standards.</p>	<p>PLC teams and the leadership team successfully align instructional practices and resources both vertically and horizontally to ensure continuity and proper progression from Tier 1 to Tier 2 to Tier 3 instruction.</p>			

Goal: *To increase overall Reading and Math proficiency by 2025 as follows: Reading from 63.3% to 72.4% and Math from 61% to 68.5%. Baseline data is taken from 18-19 K-PREP assessment results.*

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
	<p>Design and Deploy Standards: Development of Common Formative Assessments and Standards-Based Rubrics</p>	<p>Development of Common Formative Assessments and Standards-Based Rubrics</p>			
	<p>Review, Analyze and Apply Data: After the development of power standards and instructional outcomes begin deploying necessary protocol to build a data-driven decision-making culture with teams</p>				

2: Separate Academic Indicator

Goal 2 (State your separate academic indicator goal.): <i>To increase overall proficiency rate of students as follows:</i>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Science from 31.5% to 65.8% by 2030 as measured by the K-PREP Assessment.</i> - <i>Social Studies from 67.1% to 83.5% by 2030 as measured by the K-PREP Assessment.</i> - <i>Writing from 63.6% to 82% by 2030 as measured by the K-PREP Assessment.</i> 					
Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
5 th grade students in Social Studies from 72.4 to 76% in 2023, based on K-PREP assessment results.	Design and Deploy Standards: Work in conjunction with the district level student learning division to analyze and apply standards. Teachers will review new KAS standards for social studies. Teachers will discuss and plan for the emphasis on inquiry and review the curriculum frameworks. Teachers will review compelling and supporting questions, formative assessment tasks, and summative assessments in units.	<p>PLC teams are working to deconstruct standards and develop standards-based common formative assessments. PLC's will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Determine Power Standards - Create CFA's to assess student learning compared to the standard <p>Create rubrics that align with the standard and appropriate depth of knowledge where applicable</p>	<p>On-boarding and orientation to new KCSS standards grades K-5</p> <p>On-Going CFA and PLC work analysis and rubric development</p> <p>Initial development of rubrics, determination of power standards, Development of Common Formative Assessment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On-Going CFA and PLC Discussion - Walk-thru and drop-in(virtual) observation feedback - Student Performance on teacher developed CFA assessments 	N/A
5 th grade students in Writing from 68.5% to 71% in 2023, based on K-PREP assessment results.	Design and Deliver Instruction: Teachers and coaches will participate in the virtual institute in order to develop and deliver a guaranteed and viable curriculum for all learners. Due to the cost, this is a multi-year on-boarding professional development project.	<p>Home Grown Institutes are one of the most effective ways to galvanize the Reading & Writing Project's work across a school or district.</p> <p>These 4-5 day institutes are tailored to a district or school's needs, assessments, prior knowledge, and hopes. That is, they are designed to help educators in a particular community invigorate their own unique professional learning culture. The course of study created for a Home-Grown Institute will vary,</p>	<p>Improved percentage of students making proficiency in accordance with benchmark assessments as measured by Common Formative Assessment Data.</p> <p>Conferring and observation improvement as evidenced through anecdotal notes and peer observation.</p> <p>Process Goal: The development of 6-8 Rubrics</p>		

Goal 2 (State your separate academic indicator goal.): *To increase overall proficiency rate of students as follows:*

- *Science from 31.5% to 65.8% by 2030 as measured by the K-PREP Assessment.*
- *Social Studies from 67.1% to 83.5% by 2030 as measured by the K-PREP Assessment.*
- *Writing from 63.6% to 82% by 2030 as measured by the K-PREP Assessment.*

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
		too, depending on a school's involvement with the Project and its experience with Reading and Writing Workshop teaching.	and CFA's based on teacher-defined power standards specifically in the area of writing.		
4 th grade students in Science from 31.5% to 45% in 2023.	Design and Deliver Instruction: Strengthening the core instruction to ensure teachers fully understand the standards and have relevant resources to ensure they support the curriculum at rigorous levels.	K-5 support and coaching will be provided by the instructional coach in order to support the design and delivery of science instruction during in-person and virtual instructional settings.	Process Goal: The development of 6-8 Rubrics and CFA's based on teacher-defined power standards specifically in the area of science.		

3: Achievement Gap

Goal 3 (State your achievement gap goal.): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Reading among students with disabilities from 32% to 47% by 2025</i> - <i>Math among students with disabilities from 26% to 41% by 2025</i> - <i>Reading among students of poverty from 53.2% to 65% by 2025</i> - <i>Math among students of poverty from 49.4% to 62% by 2025</i> 					
Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1: Objective 1: Increase the percentage of Free / Reduced students scoring at or above proficiency in Reading and Math as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Reading among students of poverty from 53.2% to 62% by 2023</i> - <i>Math among students of poverty from 49.4% to 58% 2023</i> 	Design and Deliver Support: Ensure that Free/Reduced students have access to the general curriculum at high levels, sufficient intervention supports are available via Title 1 when needed, and that rigorous and relevant IEP goals are established for eligible students.	Intervention protocols are implemented with fidelity utilizing a variety of assessment measures to identify students in need of instructional support. PLC teams will implement Tiered levels of support including Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 as needed. Leadership team will develop a master schedule that allows no missed core instructional time during intervention pullout.	On-Going CFA and PLC Discussion Benchmark Assessments 3 times per year K-PREP Assessment Data Internal Data Tracking Mechanism Reduction in referral for Tier 3 intervention services	Weekly analysis and progress monitoring discussion at Tier 3 meetings in addition to weekly progress monitoring of student growth in relation to power standards at PLCs	IMSE: Orton-Gillingham Professional Development: \$3,825

Goal 3 (State your achievement gap goal.):

- *Reading among students with disabilities from 32% to 47% by 2025*
- *Math among students with disabilities from 26% to 41% by 2025*
- *Reading among students of poverty from 53.2% to 65% by 2025*
- *Math among students of poverty from 49.4% to 62% by 2025*

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
<p>Objective 2: Increase the percentage of students with disabilities scoring at or above proficiency in Reading and Math as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Reading among students with disabilities from 32% to 41% by 2023</i> - <i>Math among students with disabilities from 26% to 35% by 2023</i> 	<p>Design and Deliver Instruction: Strengthening the core to ensure teacher knowledge of standards assessed</p> <p>Review Analyze and Apply Data: Developing and frequently monitoring at-risk populations and ensuring tracking of all students through weekly PLC's</p>	<p>PLC teams are working to deconstruct standards and develop standards-based common formative assessments. PLC's will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Determine Power Standards - Create CFA's to assess student learning compared to the standard - Create rubrics that align with the standard and appropriate depth of knowledge where applicable <p>Grade Level and Intervention PLC's working collaboratively to provide immediate push-in intervention services for struggling learners during the instructional response process.</p>	<p>Embedded phonological instruction into classroom practice as observed through anecdotal and informal observations.</p> <p>Reduction in referral for Tier 3 intervention services</p> <p>On-Going CFA and PLC Discussion</p>		

Goal 3 (State your achievement gap goal.):

- *Reading among students with disabilities from 32% to 47% by 2025*
- *Math among students with disabilities from 26% to 41% by 2025*
- *Reading among students of poverty from 53.2% to 65% by 2025*
- *Math among students of poverty from 49.4% to 62% by 2025*

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
	<p>Design, Align and Deliver Support: Provide Grades 3-5 training on phonological awareness and phonics instruction in order to develop core and intervention instructional strategies that support students with learning differences.</p>	<p>The Comprehensive Training provides participants with an in-depth understanding of IMSE's Orton-Gillingham methodology over the course of 30 hours. This course is a <i>more traditional OG approach</i> that focuses primarily on phonological awareness and phonics (along with encoding/decoding). Participants will also discuss how to teach fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension using the OG philosophy of multi-sensory, sequential, direct instruction.</p>			

4: Growth

Goal 4 (State your growth goal.): Increase the growth rate of students in reading and math from 63.1 to 81.5 by 2030.					
Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
<p>Objective 1: Increase the total growth indicator rate in reading and math from 63.1 to 68 by 2023 as measured by K-PREP</p>	<p>Review analyze and apply data classroom activities: Ensure that formative, interim, summative assessment results, as well as universal screener data, are used appropriately to determine tiered intervention needs.</p> <p>Assess with formative and summative assessments that are aligned to the standards and learning targets.</p> <p>Implement data teaming methodologies, including collection and charting of data, analysis of strengths and obstacles to student learning (using SWOT analysis), creation SMART goals for improvement, and development of a method of quality assurance monitoring.</p>	<p>PLC teams are working to deconstruct standards and develop standards-based common formative assessments. PLC's will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Determine Power Standards - Create CFA's to assess student learning compared to the standard - Create rubrics that align with the standard and appropriate depth of knowledge where applicable <p>Grade Level and Intervention PLC's working collaboratively to provide immediate push-in intervention services for struggling learners during the instructional response process.</p>	<p>Embedded phonological instruction into classroom practice as observed through anecdotal and informal observations.</p> <p>Reduction in referral for Tier 3 intervention services</p> <p>On-Going CFA and PLC Discussion</p>	<p>Map assessment analysis 3 times per year</p> <p>Whole-school CFA analysis 5 times per year</p> <p>PLC analysis of CFA results weekly</p> <p>Weekly analysis and progress monitoring discussion at Tier 3 meetings in addition to weekly progress monitoring of student growth in relation to power standards at PLCs</p>	

Goal 4 (State your growth goal.): Increase the growth rate of students in reading and math from 63.1 to 81.5 by 2030.

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
<p>Objective 2: Increase the school proficiency rate on common formative assessments to 80% at all grade levels by 2023.</p>	<p>PLC will be attended by 2 members of the Leadership team each week to provide guidance and support</p> <p>3 Team members will attend the PLC summit to build capacity in the purpose and function of effective PLC's</p> <p>Collaboration with district leadership (Dr. Dylan Smith) to analyze current assessment validity and reliability as well as develop effective protocols for identifying assessment quality to ensure alignment to state standards.</p>	<p>PLC teams are working to deconstruct standards and develop standards-based common formative assessments. PLC's will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Determine Power Standards - Create CFA's to assess student learning compared to the standard - Create rubrics that align with the standard and appropriate depth of knowledge where applicable <p>Grade Level and Intervention PLC's working collaboratively to provide immediate push-in intervention services for struggling learners during the instructional response process.</p> <p>Increase resources and provide professional development in grade K-2 to increase proficiency among all learners to 70% by the time students are entering 3rd grade.</p>	<p>CFA and benchmark assessment proficiency results</p> <p>Continued development of teacher efficacy in the area instructional decision making.</p> <p>Investment in and application of standard acquisition and breakdown for teachers.</p>	<p>Map assessment analysis 3 times per year</p> <p>Whole-school CFA analysis 5 times per year</p> <p>PLC analysis of CFA results weekly</p> <p>Weekly analysis and progress monitoring discussion at Tier 3 meetings in addition to weekly progress monitoring of student growth in relation to power standards at PLCs</p>	