

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):

HMS will increase its overall index score on the KSA from a 52.8 to a 64.

HMS will decrease novice reading with students with disabilities from 65.4% to 60.0%

HMS will decrease novice math with students with disabilities from 55.8% to 50.0%

Strategy:

KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards

KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction

KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment

KCWP 4: Review, Analyze, and Interpret Data

- Support high leverage instructional and assessment practices in all content areas through regular support for PLCs and teacher coaching.
- Behavior and Mental Health systems are in place to protect the learning environment.
- Guided planning schedule

Activities:

- Monitor all student data with an additional emphasis on MAP
- Weekly feedback from Instructional Supervisor
- Feedback from Instructional Reviews
- Bi-Weekly Extended Leadership Meetings to review short and long term teacher supports
- PLCs
- Employee Experience Survey
- Pulse Survey using Google Forms (Staff & Students)
- Tiered system for certified teachers

Progress Monitoring:

MAP

Classroom Observations

PUSH data

KSA Calculator

Weekly failure reports

Funding:

Title I

SBDM Funds

General School Funding/Allocations

Other Grants

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:

GOAL #1: HMS will increase our proficiency in reading from 37% to 68.6% by Spring 2028, as evidenced by state summative assessment results.

GOAL #2: HMS will increase our proficiency in mathematics from 27% to 62.2% by Spring 2028, as evidenced by state summative assessment results.

Objective(s):

HMS will increase proficiency on math state summative assessments from 27% to 38.0%.

HMS will increase proficiency on reading state summative assessments from 37% to 47%.

Strategy:

KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards

KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction

KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment

KCWP 4: Review, Analyze, and Interpret Data

Activities:

- MAP testing
- Purchase ExactPath, iLit intervention programs
- School-wide RtI plan
- Support high leverage instructional and assessment practices in all content areas through regular support for PLCs and teacher coaching.

Progress Monitoring:

- Monitor all student data with an additional emphasis on MAP/MasteryConnect
- Observation Schedules
- PLC Cycles

Funding:

Title I

SBDM Funds

General School Funding/Allocations

Other Grants

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	Yes
English Learner Progress	Yes
Quality of School Climate and Safety	Yes
Postsecondary Readiness (high schools and districts only)	N/A.
Graduation Rate (high schools and districts only)	N/A

Priority Indicator Goals:

Priority Indicator #1: State Assessment Results in science, social studies and writing

Three- to Five-Year Goal:

GOAL (S): HMS will increase the number of students scoring proficiency in Science from **18%** to **47.1%**.

GOAL (SS): HMS will increase the number of students scoring proficiency in Social Studies from **30.0%** to **64.8%**.

GOAL(W): HMS will maintain the number of students scoring proficiency in Writing at **54%**.

Objective(s):

HMS will increase the number of students scoring proficiency on science state summative assessments from 18% to 28%.

HMS will increase the number of students scoring proficiency on social studies state summative assessments from 30% to 42%.

HMS will maintain the number of students scoring proficiency on writing state summative assessments at 54%.

Strategy:

Adopt HQIRs for both Science and Social Studies

Develop and maintain PLC cycles supporting teacher growth.

Activities:

- Support high leverage instructional and assessment practices in all content areas through regular support for PLCs and teacher coaching.
- Teacher Coaching feedback
- Guided Planning

Progress Monitoring:

Observation Data

MAP/MasteryConnect Data

Formative Assessments

Funding:

Title I

SBDM Funds

General School Funding/Allocations

Other Grants

Priority Indicator #2: Quality of School Climate and Safety

Three- to Five-Year Goal:

QSCS index will increase from a 64.2 to a 77.0

Objective(s):

QSCS index will increase from a 64.2 to a 68.4.

Strategy:

KCWP 6: Establish Learning Culture and Environment

Activities:

Monthly meetings with the student advisory committee.

Monthly surveys pushed out and reviewed with students in January, February, and March.

Data rollout to faculty and staff to ensure necessary adjustments are made after review of survey data.

Monthly safety drills are conducted.

]Work with YSC to hold assemblies to promote safety and kindness to others.

Progress Monitoring:

Monthly surveys to be pushed out and reviewed with students in January, February, and March.

Funding:

Title I

SBDM Funds

General School Funding/Allocations

Other Grants

Priority Indicator #3: English Learner Progress

Three- to Five-Year Goal:

By 2028, as evidenced through state summative results, HMS will increase the percentage of students scoring proficiency with our EL learners in reading from 12% to 30%.

Objective(s):

HMS will increase the amount of EL learners scoring proficiency on state summative assessments in reading from 12% to 18%.

HMS will show 70% of their EL students will grow 1.0 point in ACCESS testing over the course of three years.

Strategy:

KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards

KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction

KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment

KCWP 4: Review, Analyze, and Interpret Data

Activities:

MAP testing

Plan and include district support staff in testing conversations

Utilize district support staff to meet the needs of students

Small group instruction with district support staff

Include district support staff in PLCs

Progress Monitoring:

MAP testing

ACCESS testing

Funding:

Title I

SBDM Funds

General School Funding/Allocations

Other Grants

Addendum for Schools Identified for Targeted or Additional Targeted Support and Improvement

A school improvement plan for schools identified for targeted support and improvement (TSI) or additional targeted support and improvement (ATSI) must be embedded within the school's comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) as required by KRS 160.346(4)-(5) and 703 KAR 5:225.

This addendum outlines the specific requirements that must be addressed in the CSIP to meet federal and state expectations for TSI and ATSI schools. These requirements include targeted strategies and evidence-based activities to support the improvement of consistently underperforming student groups 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 TSI/ATSI Schools

TSI schools (including ATSI schools) must embed their subgroup(s) plan for improvement within their CSIPs. TSI stakeholders, including the principal and other school leaders, teachers and parents, should carefully consider what must be done to ensure the subgroup(s) perform(s) at high levels in the state accountability system. In addition to identifying strategies and activities within the CSIP that address the specific needs of underperforming groups, provide narrative information regarding the additional requirements for TSI and ATSI schools in the following chart:

TSI and ATSI Additional Requirements
Components of Turnaround Leadership Development and Support: Consider: How will you ensure that school leadership has or develops the skills and disposition to achieve accelerated, meaningful and sustainable increases in student achievement for underperforming subgroups? Response: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Attending monthly Instructional Leadership Team Meetings (ILT). Instructional Leadership Team meetings will feature a dedicated workspace and time for the Special Education department to work with principals and leadership teams around new and/or existing strategies and methods to ensure our students with disabilities receive the latest evidence-based instruction. In addition, work time and collaboration time will be provided each month during ILT meetings.2. Monthly meetings with the administration and the assigned special education consultant and/or DoSE will be held to discuss building-level concerns, education on issues, and or specialized information about students with disabilities will be shared.3. Attending monthly CCPS Committee meetings to learn and apply equity practices for students with disabilities.
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: Through an examination of resource inequities, it was discovered that there was not enough support for evidence-based practices for our Special Education teachers. As a result, it

could be that our special education population underperformed in KSA and did not meet performance expectations. To remedy this situation, special education staff will have more access to the Special Education Consultants. The Consultant will be available to special education staff weekly. During this time together, the Consultant will coach, monitor observe, and provide classroom support to Special Education teachers related to evidence-based practices for students with disabilities.

Additional Actions That Address the Causes of Consistently Underperforming Subgroups of Students

Consider: Describe the process used to review the learning culture related to your targeted subgroup(s) and any additional actions that were determined to address the causes of underperformance.

Response:

The process used to review the learning culture related to Special Education was an examination of observations, resources, and student work. As a result, it was found that students in resource settings were less likely to have access to standards-based instruction and assessments, which could have been a contributing factor to the special education student's underperformance on KSA. As a result, the following actions will be implemented to ensure students with disabilities have access to grade level standards instruction and are assessed used assessments aligned to grade-level assessments:

Engage Special Education teachers in PLCs and other professional learning to develop their capacity to teach and assess grade-level standards

Conduct observations of students with disabilities will include analysis of instructional and assessment tasks, with an expectation there should be a balance of IEP skills and grade-level work

Implement standards-based benchmark/MAP assessments 3x per year to monitor and inform student learning

Establish and regularly utilize "assessment buddies" to ensure approved assessment accommodations are provided for each student

Targeted Subgroups and Evidence-Based Interventions:

Consider: Identify the areas of need revealed by the analysis of academic and non-academic data that will be addressed through CSIP activities for your targeted subgroup(s). What evidence-based practice(s) will the school incorporate that specifically targets the subgroup(s) achievement that contributed to the TSI identification? How will you monitor the evidence-based practice to ensure it is implemented with fidelity?

Response:

The area of need revealed by the analysis of academic and non-academic data that is addressed through CSIP activities is reading proficiency for our Special Education population.

We will do the following:

Conduct observations of students with disabilities will include analysis of instructional and assessment tasks, with an expectation there should be a balance of IEP skills and grade-level work

Implement standards-based benchmark/MAP assessments 3x per year to monitor and inform student learning

Establish and regularly utilize "assessment buddies" to ensure approved assessment accommodations are provided for each student

The evidence-based practice that will target reading for our students with disabilities is linked in the table below.

TSI/ATSI Evidence-based Practices Documentation

TSI improvement 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 the Every Student Succeeds Act

(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.
Reading/Secondary	Baye, A., Lake, C., Inns, A. & Slavin, R. E. (2019). Effective reading programs for secondary students. Reading Research Quarterly, 54 (2), 133-166. https://bestevidence.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/secondary-reading-01-31-18.docx