## Kentucky Department of Education
## CSIP with CSI Addendum
## Monitoring Instrument 2024-2025

School and district improvement efforts are a collaborative process involving multiple stakeholders. The following definitions are outlined in 703 KAR 5:225:

"Comprehensive District Improvement Plan" or "CDIP" means a plan developed by the local school district with the input of parents, faculty, staff and representatives of school councils from each school in the district, based on a review of relevant data that includes targets, strategies, activities and a time schedule to support student achievement and student growth, and to eliminate achievement gaps among groups of students.

"Comprehensive School Improvement Plan" or "CSIP" means a plan developed by the school council, or successor and charter schools with the input of parents, faculty and staff, based on a review of relevant data that includes targets, strategies, activities and a time schedule to support student achievement and student growth, and to eliminate achievement gaps among groups of students.

Pursuant to 703 KAR 5:225, the Kentucky Department of Education is tasked with reviewing CSIPs and CDIPs. During the review process, KDE staff provide feedback to assist schools and districts with improvement planning to ensure plans are developed and implemented effectively. While improvement plans are developed through the completion of several diagnostics, this review will only include the Needs Assessment for Schools and Comprehensive School Improvement Plan diagnostics. This process of monitoring enables schools and districts to ensure compliance with state and federal regulations and focus on ways to develop more effective programs through collaboration and self-evaluation.

The rubric that follows will indicate a rating of *Needs Improvement*, *Meets Expectations for Submission* or *Indicates High-Quality Planning* highlighted in yellow for each component of the CSIP/CDIP. For each area highlighted under **Needs Improvement,** districts/schools must revise their responses on the appropriate diagnostic until expectations are met. Complete the revisions on the **Needs Assessment Diagnostic or CSIP template and resubmit to the Continuous Improvement Platform (CIP).** Please send email confirmation to the assigned KDE Program Consultant once the revision has been uploaded to the platform.

# Needs Assessment Rubric

| Diagnostic Component | Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations for Submission | Indicates High- Quality Planning |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Protocol** | A data review process to identify this year's areas of focus is not described. Participating stakeholder groups are not identified. Meeting timeline and/or documentation is not described. | A data review process is described, including review, analysis and application of results. A timeline for meetings is described and includes stakeholder groups engaged and description of documentation. | The process includes active and meaningful stakeholder engagement and an approach that is both needs-driven and context-specific, including a review of the previous plan and its implementation. |
| **Review of Previous Plan** | A summary of the implementation of last year's improvement plan, including goals, objectives, strategies and activities, is not provided. An explanation of how the review will inform this year's plan is not included. | A summary of the implementation of last year's improvement plan is provided and includes reflection on the goals, objectives, strategies and activities. Successes are identified and an explanation of how the review will inform this year's plan is described. | The summary provides analysis of implementation with specific steps for utilizing the findings in this year's planning process. These steps are addressed in the CSIP diagnostic and template. |
| **Trends** | It is not clear that data from the previous two years has been analyzed. Areas for improvement are not identified. | The response clearly indicates analysis of data from the two previous years and identifies significant areas for improvement. | Trends are supported by strong data from the past two academic years with academic, cultural and behavioral data points. Data is derived from multiple data sources or voices. All data points are cross-referenced or triangulated to create a fuller picture of the issue. |

| Diagnostic Component | Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations for Submission | Indicates High- Quality Planning |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Current State** | Precise numbers and percentages are not included. Data sources are not cited. Multiple sources of data are not provided. | Varied sources of data are cited, including precise numbers and percentages. | The data includes a balance of input data, output data and demographic or community context data. |
| **Priorities/Concerns** | Areas of weakness are not identified. Precise numbers and percentages are not provided. | Two or three areas of weakness are identified using precise numbers and percentages. | A manageable number of priorities have been identified and are thoroughly addressed in the CSIP diagnostic and template. |
| **Strengths/Leverages** | No strengths or leverages have been identified. Precise numbers and percentages are not provided. | Strengths and leverages have been identified using precise numbers and percentages. | Identified strengths and leverages are thoroughly addressed in the CSIP diagnostic template |
| **Key Elements** | No processes, practices or conditions have been identified as a focus. | Processes, practices or conditions are identified as a focus for resources and effort. | Processes, practices or conditions are identified and clearly linked to a Key Core Work Process or other improvement system. |

**Needs Assessment**
**Needs Assessment Areas of Strength:**
**Needs Assessment Areas of Improvement:**
**Things to Consider:**

Alignment to Needs Rubric

| Diagnostic Component | Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations for Submission | Indicates High-Quality Planning |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Priorities/Concerns from Needs Assessment** | No areas of weakness aligned to question #5 of the Needs Assessment are identified. | Two to three areas of weakness aligned to question #5 of the Needs Assessment are identified. | The two to three areas of weakness aligned to question #5 of Needs Assessment are thoroughly addressed in the strategies and activities outlined in the CSIP. |
| **Processes, Practices, or Conditions to be Addressed from Key Elements Template** | No processes, practices, or conditions aligned to the School Key Elements Template are identified. | Two to three processes, practices, or conditions identified as a focus on the School Key Elements Template are referenced. | The two to three processes, practices, or conditions identified are thoroughly addressed in the strategies and activities sections within the CSIP. |
| **Indicator Scores** | The overall scores of status and change are not listed for each indicator as required by school level. | The overall scores of status and change are listed for each indicator as required by school level. | |

**Alignment of Needs Areas of Improvement:**
**Areas of Strength:**
**Areas of Improvement:**
**Things to Consider:**

## CSIP Template Rubric

| Diagnostic Component | Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations for Submission | Indicates High-Quality Planning |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Math and Reading Goal** | The goal statement does not indicate a three- to five-year goal based on relevant data. | The goal statement clearly articulates a three- to five-year goal based on relevant data. | Goals are SMART. Goals clearly address critical school challenges identified in the needs assessment. |
| **Math and Reading Objective** | Objective statements do not indicate a target for the current school year based on relevant data. | Objective statements clearly indicate a target for the current school year based on relevant data. | Objective statements are measurable and describe an ambitious but attainable target. |
| **Math and Reading Strategy** | It is not clear that the chosen strategy is based on an established improvement approach. | Each strategy is specific and clearly aligned to an established improvement approach. | Descriptions of the strategies are explicit, noting how the strategy will lead to changes that will clearly enable the school to achieve the stated goal. Strategies are clearly aligned to identified needs and are mostly evidence-based strategies. |
| **Math and Reading Activities** | Listed activities are not actionable steps. | Each activity describes an actionable step. | Descriptions of the action steps provide details regarding the actions to be taken including as appropriate: what the action is and its purpose, when and how often the action will occur, the audience or recipient of the action, the alignment of the audience to the stated goal and strategy, and how it will be completed. All action steps are intentionally aligned with and provide a logical scaffolding to realize all process outcomes. |

| Diagnostic Component | Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations for Submission | Indicates High-Quality Planning |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Math and Reading Measure of Success** | Criteria is not based on observable measures. | Success criteria is based on quantitative and/or qualitative measures that can be observed. | Measures include student achievement data as well as implementation data. |
| **Math and Reading Progress Monitoring** | No process is described. Timelines and persons responsible are not included. | A clear process is described, including timelines and persons responsible. | Estimated dates of completion are appropriate and all dates are not end-of-year dates. The distribution of action steps to responsible parties is varied and not concentrated around a few people and/or groups. |
| **Math and Reading Funding** | Funding sources are not clearly identified. | Specific funding sources are identified or there is an indication of no need for funding. | Estimated amounts for each funding source are included. Specific materials, services or personnel to be funded are listed. |

**Math and Reading**
**Math and Reading Indicators Areas of Strength:**
**Math and Reading Indicators Areas of Improvement:**
**Things to Consider:**

| Diagnostic Component | Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations for Submission | Indicates High-Quality Planning |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Science, Social Studies and Writing Goal** | The goal statement does not indicate a three- to five-year goal based on relevant data. | The goal statement clearly articulates a three- to five-year goal based on relevant data. | Goals are SMART. Goals clearly address critical school challenges identified in the needs assessment. |
| **Science, Social Studies and Writing Objective** | Objective statements do not indicate a target for the current school year based on relevant data. | Objective statements clearly indicate a target for the current school year based on relevant data. | Objective statements are measurable and describe an ambitious but attainable target. |
| **Science, Social Studies and Writing Strategy** | It is not clear that the chosen strategy is based on an established improvement approach. | Each strategy is specific and clearly aligned to an established improvement approach. | Descriptions of the strategies are explicit, noting how the strategy will lead to changes that will clearly enable the school to achieve the stated goal. Strategies are clearly aligned to identified needs and are mostly evidence-based strategies. |
| **Science, Social Studies and Writing Activities** | Listed activities are not actionable steps. | Each activity describes an actionable step. | Descriptions of the action steps provide details regarding the actions to be taken, including as appropriate: what the action is and its purpose, when and how often the action will occur, the audience or recipient of the action, the alignment of the audience to the stated goal and strategy, and how it will be completed. All action steps are intentionally aligned with and provide a logical scaffolding to realize all process outcomes. |

| Diagnostic Component | Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations for Submission | Indicates High-Quality Planning |
|---|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Science, Social Studies and Writing Measure of Success** | Criteria is not based on observable measures. | Success criteria is based on quantitative and/or qualitative measures that can be observed. | Measures include student achievement data as well as implementation data. |
| **Science, Social Studies and Writing Progress Monitoring** | No process is described. Timelines and persons responsible are not included. | A clear process is described, including timelines and persons responsible. | Estimated dates of completion are appropriate and all dates are not end-of- year dates. The distribution of action steps to responsible parties is varied and not concentrated around a few people and/or groups. |
| **Science, Social Studies, and Writing Funding** | Funding sources are not clearly identified. | Specific funding sources are identified or there is an indication of no need for funding. | Estimated amounts for each funding source are included. Specific materials, services or personnel to be funded are listed. |

**Social Studies and Writing**
**Science, Social Studies and Writing Indicators Areas of Strength:**
**Science, Social Studies and Writing Indicators Areas of Improvement:**
**Things to Consider:**

| Diagnostic Component | Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations for Submission | Indicates High-Quality Planning |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Achievement Gap Objective** | Objective statements do not indicate targets for the current school year based on data from state assessments. | Objective statements clearly indicate targets for the current school year based on data from state assessments. | Objective statements are measurable and describe an ambitious but attainable target. |
| **Achievement Gap Strategy** | It is not clear that the chosen strategy is based on an established improvement approach. | Each strategy is specific and clearly aligned to an established improvement approach. | Descriptions of the strategies are explicit, noting how the strategy will lead to changes that will clearly enable the school to achieve the stated goal. Strategies are clearly aligned to identified needs and are mostly evidence-based strategies. |
| **Achievement Gap Activities** | Listed activities are not actionable steps. | Each activity describes an actionable step. | Descriptions of the action steps provide details regarding the actions to be taken, including as appropriate: what the action is and its purpose, when and how often the action will occur, the audience or recipient of the action, the alignment of the audience to the stated goal and strategy, and how it will be completed. All action steps are intentionally aligned with and provide a logical scaffolding to realize all process outcomes. |
| **Achievement Gap Measure of Success** | Criteria is not based on observable measures. | Success criteria is based on quantitative and/or qualitative measures that can be observed. | Measures include student achievement data as well as implementation data. |

| Diagnostic Component | Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations for Submission | Indicates High-Quality Planning |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Achievement Gap Progress Monitoring** | No process is described. Timelines and persons responsible are not included. | A clear process is described, including timelines and persons responsible. | Estimated dates of completion are appropriate and all dates are not end-of-year dates. The distribution of action steps to responsible parties is varied and not concentrated around a few people and/or groups. |
| **Achievement Gap Funding** | Funding sources are not clearly identified. | Specific funding sources are identified or there is an indication of no need for funding. | Estimated amounts for each funding source are included. Specific materials, services or personnel to be funded are listed. |

**Achievement Gap**
**Achievement Gap Indicators Areas of Strength:**
**Achievement Gap Indicators Areas of Improvement:**
**Things to Consider:**

| Diagnostic Component | Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations for Submission | Indicates High- Quality Planning |
|---|---|---|---|
| **English Learner Progress Goal** | Goal statement does not indicate a three- to five-year goal based on relevant data. | Goal statement clearly articulates a three- to five-year goal based on relevant data. | Goals are SMART. Goals clearly address critical school challenges identified in the needs assessment. |
| **English Learner Progress Objective** | Objective statements do not indicate a target for the current school year based on relevant data. | Objective statements clearly indicate a target for the current school year based on relevant data. | Objective statements are measurable and describe an ambitious but attainable target for the current school year. |
| **English Learner Progress Strategy** | It is not clear that the chosen strategy is based on an established improvement approach. | Each strategy is specific and clearly aligned to an established improvement approach. | Descriptions of the strategies are explicit and clearly connected to an established improvement approach. It is clear how the strategy will lead to changes that will enable the school to achieve the stated goal. Strategies are clearly aligned to identified needs and are mostly evidence-based strategies. |
| **English Learner Progress Activities** | Listed activities are not actionable steps. | Each activity describes an actionable step. | Descriptions of the action steps provide details regarding the actions to be taken, including as appropriate: what the action is and its purpose, when and how often the action will occur, the audience or recipient of the action, the alignment of the audience to the stated goal and strategy, and how it will be completed. All action steps are intentionally aligned with and provide a logical scaffolding to realize all process outcomes. |

| Diagnostic Component | Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations for Submission | Indicates High-Quality Planning |
|---|---|---|---|
| **English Learner Progress Measure of Success** | Criteria is not based on observable measures. | Success criteria is based on quantitative and/or qualitative measures that can be observed. | Measures include student achievement data as well as implementation data. |
| **Progress Monitoring for English Learner Progress** | No process is described. Timelines and persons responsible are not included. | A clear process is described, including timelines and persons responsible. | Estimated dates of completion are appropriate and all dates are not end-of-year dates. The distribution of action steps to responsible parties is varied and not concentrated around a few people and/or groups. |
| **English Learner Progress Funding** | Funding sources are not clearly identified. | Specific funding sources are identified or there is an indication of no need for funding. | Estimated amounts for each funding source are included. Specific materials, services or personnel to be funded are listed. |

**English Learner Progress**
**English Learner Indicators Areas of Strength:**
**English Learner Indicators Areas of Improvement:**
**Things to Consider:**

| Diagnostic Component | Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations for Submission | Indicates High-Quality Planning |
|---|---|---|---|
| **School Climate and Safety Goal** | The goal statement does not indicate a three- to five-year goal based on relevant data. | The goal statement clearly articulates a three- to five-year goal based on relevant data. | Goals are SMART. Goals clearly address critical school challenges identified in the needs assessment. |
| **School Climate and Safety Objective** | Objective statements do not indicate a target for the current school year based on relevant data. | Objective statements clearly indicate a target for the current school year based on relevant data. | Objective statements are measurable and describe an ambitious but attainable target for the current school year. |
| **School Climate and Safety Strategy** | It is not clear that the chosen strategy is based on an established improvement approach. | Each strategy is specific and clearly aligned to an established improvement approach. | Descriptions of the strategies are explicit and clearly connected to an established improvement approach. It is clear how the strategy will lead to changes that will enable the school to achieve the stated goal. Strategies are clearly aligned to identified needs and are mostly evidence-based strategies. |
| **School Climate and Safety Activities** | Listed activities are not actionable steps. | Each activity describes an actionable step. | Descriptions of the action steps provide details regarding the actions to be taken, including as appropriate: what the action is and its purpose, when and how often the action will occur, the audience or recipient of the action, the alignment of the audience to the stated goal and strategy, and how it will be completed. All action steps are intentionally aligned with and provide a logical scaffolding to realize all process outcomes. |

| Diagnostic Component | Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations for Submission | Indicates High-Quality Planning |
|---|---|---|---|
| **School Climate and Safety Measure of Success** | Criteria is not based on observable measures. | Success criteria is based on quantitative and/or qualitative measures that can be observed. | Measures include student achievement data as well as implementation data. |
| **School Climate and Safety Progress Monitoring** | No process is described. Timelines and persons responsible are not included. | A clear process is described, including timelines and persons responsible. | Estimated dates of completion are appropriate and all dates are not end-of- year dates. The distribution of action steps to responsible parties is varied and not concentrated around a few people and/or groups. |
| **School Climate and Safety Funding** | Funding sources are not clearly identified. | Specific funding sources are identified or there is an indication of no need for funding. | Estimated amounts for each funding source are included. Specific materials, services or personnel to be funded are listed. |

**School Climate and Safety**
**School Climate and Safety Indicators Areas of Strength:**
**School Climate and Safety Indicators Areas of Improvement:**
**Things to Consider:**

| Diagnostic Component | Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations for Submission | Indicates High-Quality Planning |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Postsecondary Readiness Goal** | The goal statement does not indicate a three- to five-year goal based on relevant data. | The goal statement clearly articulates a three- to five-year goal based on relevant data. | Goals are SMART. Goals clearly address critical school challenges identified in the needs assessment. |
| **Postsecondary Readiness Objective** | Objective statements do not indicate a target for the current school year based on relevant data. | Objective statements clearly indicate a target for the current school year based on relevant data. | Objective statements are measurable and describe an ambitious but attainable target. |
| **Postsecondary Readiness Strategy** | It is not clear that the chosen strategy is based on an established improvement approach. | Each strategy is specific and clearly aligned to an established improvement approach. | Descriptions of the strategies are explicit, noting how the strategy will lead to changes that will clearly enable the school to achieve the stated goal. Strategies are clearly aligned to identified needs and are mostly evidence-based strategies. |
| **Postsecondary Readiness Activities** | Listed activities are not actionable steps. | Each activity describes an actionable step. | Descriptions of the action steps provide details regarding the actions to be taken, including as appropriate: what the action is and its purpose, when and how often the action will occur, the audience or recipient of the action, the alignment of the audience to the stated goal and strategy, and how it will be completed. All action steps are intentionally aligned with and provide a logical scaffolding to realize all process outcomes. |

| Diagnostic Component | Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations for Submission | Indicates High-Quality Planning |
|---|---|---|---|

| Postsecondary Readiness Measure of Success | Criteria is not based on observable measures. | Success criteria is based on quantitative and/or qualitative measures that can be observed. | Measures include student achievement data as well as implementation data. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Postsecondary Readiness Progress Monitoring | No process is described. Timelines and persons responsible are not included. | A clear process is described, including timelines and persons responsible. | Estimated dates of completion are appropriate and all dates are not end-of-year dates. The distribution of action steps to responsible parties is varied and not concentrated around a few people and/or groups. |
| Postsecondary Readiness Funding | Funding sources are not clearly identified. | Specific funding sources are identified or there is an indication of no need for funding. | Estimated amounts for each funding source are included. Specific materials, services or personnel to be funded are listed. |

**Postsecondary Readiness**
**Postsecondary Readiness Indicators Areas of Strength:**
**Postsecondary Readiness Indicators Areas of Improvement:**
**Things to Consider:**

| Diagnostic Component | Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations for Submission | Indicates High-Quality Planning |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Graduation Rate Goal** | The goal statement does not indicate a three- to five-year goal based on relevant data. | The goal statement clearly articulates a three- to five-year goal based on relevant data. | Goals are SMART. Goals clearly address critical school challenges identified in the needs assessment. |
| **Graduation Rate Objective** | Objective statements do not indicate a target for the current school year based on relevant data. | Objective statements clearly indicate a target for the current school year based on relevant data. | Objective statements are measurable and describe an ambitious but attainable target. |
| **Graduation Rate Strategy** | It is not clear that the chosen strategy is based on an established improvement approach. | Each strategy is specific and clearly aligned to an established improvement approach. | Descriptions of the strategies are explicit, noting how the strategy will lead to changes that will clearly enable the school to achieve the stated goal. Strategies are clearly aligned to identified needs and are mostly evidence-based strategies. |
| **Graduation Rate Activities** | Listed activities are not actionable steps. | Each activity describes an actionable step. | Descriptions of the action steps provide details regarding the actions to be taken, including as appropriate: what the action is and its purpose, when and how often the action will occur, the audience or recipient of the action, the alignment of the audience to the stated goal and strategy, and how it will be completed. All action steps are intentionally aligned with and provide a logical scaffolding to realize all process outcomes. |

| Diagnostic Component | Needs Improvement | Meets Expectations for Submission | Indicates High-Quality Planning |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Graduation Rate Measure of Success** | Criteria is not based on observable measures. | Success criteria is based on quantitative and/or qualitative measures that can be observed. | Measures include student achievement data as well as implementation data. |
| **Graduation Rate Progress Monitoring** | No process is described. Timelines and persons responsible are not included. | A clear process is described, including timelines and persons responsible. | Estimated dates of completion are appropriate and all dates are not end-of-year dates. The distribution of action steps to responsible parties is varied and not concentrated around a few people and/or groups. |
| **Graduation Rate Funding** | Funding sources are not clearly identified. | Specific funding sources are identified or there is an indication of no need for funding. | Estimated amounts for each funding source are included. Specific materials, services or personnel to be funded are listed. |

**Graduation Rate**
**Graduation Rate Indicators Areas of Strength:**
**Graduation Rate Indicators Areas of Improvement:**
**Things to Consider:**

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) Turnaround Plan Addendum

This portion of the rubric addresses the required elements for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI). The rubric that follows will indicate a rating of Sufficient or Not Sufficient highlighted in yellow for each component of the Turnaround Plan. Also, the rubric includes a summary of elements to address.

For any **Not Sufficient** rating, schools must revise their responses on the appropriate diagnostic until found sufficient.

Complete the revisions on the **CSIP goal building template and resubmit to the Continuous Improvement Platform (CIP).** Please send email confirmation to the assigned KDE Program Consultant once the revision has been uploaded to the platform.

| Requirement | Not Sufficient | Sufficient |
|---|---|---|
| **Uploaded to Continuous Improvement Platform** | No plan has been uploaded or the format does not include all required CSIP elements. | The plan has been uploaded and includes all required CSIP elements. |
| **Turnaround Team** | A comprehensive list of people and entities involved in the turnaround efforts is not included or is missing specific details. | A comprehensive list of persons and entities involved in the turnaround efforts is provided and includes the specific role each plays in the school's turnaround process. |
| **Identification of Critical Resources** | There is no description of the process used to review the allocation and use of resources including people, time and money. The process described may not suggest how those inequities will be addressed through the plan. | The process used to review the allocation and use of resources, including people, time and money, is described and explains how identified inequities may have contributed to underperformance and how those inequities will be addressed. |
| **Improvement Priorities Clearly Embedded** | The plan lists no improvement priorities from the Diagnostic Review report, or the improvement priorities are not supported through the strategies and activities of the plan. | The plan lists one or more improvement priorities from the Diagnostic Review report. The improvement priorities are clearly supported by strategies and activities aligned to the intent of the priorities as well as the school's needs assessment. |
| **Includes Three-year Goals** | The plan does not include long-term targets for each required indicator. The plan may include goals that are impractical or unambitious. Goals may not be appropriately aligned to the identified improvement priorities. | The plan includes specific, feasible three- to five-year goals for each required indicator that are sufficiently ambitious to help realize the school's identified improvement priorities. |
| **Evidence-based Practices (EBPs) Identified** | No EBPs are identified in the plan's activities, or they do not align to the improvement priorities. | The plan includes one or more EBPs that are aligned to the improvement priorities. |
| **Evidence-based Practices Documentation Provided** | Compliance requirements are not uploaded or lack the required components. Documentation may not support evidence that meets requirements for Level I, II or III evidence. | Compliance requirements in the form of a logic model developed utilizing both the local context and stakeholder input, is appropriately aligned to an improvement priority and meets requirements for Level I, II or III evidence. |

**Elements to Address:**