



Kentucky Department of Education  
CDIP With TSI Addendum  
Monitoring Instrument 2025-2026  
District:

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. 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 CDIP. For each area highlighted under **Needs Improvement**, districts must revise their responses on the appropriate diagnostic until expectations are met. Complete the revisions on the **Needs Assessment Diagnostic and/or CDIP 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
<b>Protocol</b>	The protocol process is not clearly detailed. Names of district leadership teams and stakeholder groups involved are not provided. A timeline of the process, specific data sources reviewed and analyzed, and how and where the meetings were documented are not included.	The protocol process is clearly detailed. Names of district leadership teams and stakeholders involved are provided. A timeline of the process is included, along with the specific data sources reviewed and analyzed. The documentation of meetings is described, including how and where they were documented.	The protocol process is thoroughly detailed, including active and meaningful engagement of district leadership teams and a variety of stakeholder groups. The timeline of the process is comprehensive. Multiple specific data sources were reviewed, analyzed and are clearly identified. The documentation of meetings is thoroughly described, including how and where they were documented. The approach is both needs-driven and context-specific.
<b>Review of Previous Plan</b>	The implementation of the goals, objectives, strategies, and activities from the previous year's CDIP is not summarized. There is no identification of what was successful, and no explanation of how the results will inform this year's plan.	The implementation of the goals, objectives, strategies, and activities from the previous year's CDIP is summarized. The summary includes reflections on what was successful. An explanation of how these results will inform this year's plan is provided.	The implementation of the goals, objectives, strategies, and activities from the previous year's CDIP is thoroughly summarized. The summary includes a detailed analysis of what was successful, with specific examples. Clear steps for utilizing these findings in this year's planning process are provided, and these steps are addressed in the CDIP.

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Trends</b>	The analysis of data trends from the previous two academic years is not evident. Significant academic, cultural, or behavioral measures that remain areas for improvement are not identified.	The analysis of data trends from the previous two academic years is clearly presented. Significant academic, cultural, or behavioral measures that remain areas for improvement are identified.	The analysis of data trends from the previous two academic years is comprehensive. The data is derived from multiple sources and perspectives. At least some data points are cross-referenced or triangulated to create a fuller picture of the issue. Significant academic, cultural, or behavioral measures that remain areas for improvement are thoroughly identified and addressed in the CDIP.
<b>Current State of Academics</b>	The narrative does not include precise numbers and percentages. Multiple sources of data are not provided. Data sources are not cited.	The narrative includes precise numbers and percentages from varied sources of data. The sources are cited.	The narrative provides a comprehensive description of the current academic state of the district, including precise numbers and percentages. The data is derived from multiple sources. The data includes a balance of input data, output data and demographic or community context data.

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Current State of Climate and Culture</b>	The narrative does not include precise numbers and percentages. Multiple sources of data are not provided. Data sources are not cited.	The narrative includes precise numbers and percentages from varied sources of data. The sources are cited.	The narrative provides a comprehensive description of the current academic state of the district, including precise numbers and percentages. The data is derived from multiple sources. The data includes a balance of input data, output data and demographic or community context data.
<b>Strengths</b>	No strengths have been identified. Precise numbers and percentages are not provided.	Strengths have been identified using precise numbers and percentages.	Strengths in both academic and climate/culture have been identified using precise numbers and percentages.
<b>Leverages/Assets</b>	No leverages/assets or community resources are provided or the response is vague with little detail or clear connection to the identified areas for improvement.	The response identifies specific leverages/assets and community resources and explains how they will support areas for improvement.	The response outlines a strategic and well-aligned plan for using clearly defined leverages/assets and community partnerships to address areas for improvement. It includes concrete examples and demonstrates thoughtful, sustainable collaboration tied directly to district needs.

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Evaluation of the Teaching and Learning Environment</b>	The district has not selected two or three KCWPs to focus its resources and efforts upon. There is no description of the specific processes, practices or conditions within the KCWPs that the district will work to improve.	The district has selected two or three KCWPs to focus its resources and efforts upon. For each selected KCWP, there is a description of the specific processes, practices or conditions that the district will work to improve. There is alignment between the focus areas chosen and the strategy section of the CSIP.	The district has thoughtfully selected two or three KCWPs to focus its resources and efforts upon. For each selected KCWP, there is a detailed description of the specific processes, practices, or conditions that the district will work to improve. The plan demonstrates a strategic and data-driven approach to addressing the identified areas for improvement. There is strong alignment between the focus areas chosen and the strategy section of the CSIP.

### **Needs Assessment Feedback**

**Areas of Strength:**

**Areas of Improvement:**

**Things to Consider:**

## CDIP Template Rubric- Achievement Gap (Required)

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Achievement Gap Objective</b>	Objective(s) do not indicate targets for the current school year based on data from state assessment results and/or aligned formative assessments. Objectives are not informed by the needs assessment.	Objective(s) clearly indicate targets for the current school year based on data from state assessment results and/or aligned formative assessments. Objectives are informed by the needs assessment.	Objective(s) meet expectations for submission, are measurable and describe an ambitious but attainable target.
<b>Achievement Gap Strategy</b>	The strategy does not systematically address the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Districts. There is no clear alignment with an established improvement.	The strategy systematically addresses the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Districts. It is clearly aligned with an established improvement approach.	The strategy meets expectations for submission and descriptions of the strategies are explicit, noting how the strategy will lead to changes that will clearly enable the school to achieve the stated target.

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Achievement Gap Activities</b>	The activities are not listed or do not provide clear, actionable steps that the district will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	Each activity describes clear, actionable steps that the district will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	The activity meets expectations for submission and descriptions include what the action is and its purpose, when and how often the action will occur, and the audience or recipient of the action. The plan demonstrates a strategic and thorough approach to implementing the chosen strategy.
<b>Achievement Gap Progress Monitoring</b>	The process used to collect and analyze observable measures of success is not described. There are no specific timelines, responsible individuals, or artifacts to be reviewed mentioned.	The process used to collect and analyze observable measures of success is clearly described. Specific timelines and responsible individuals are included. The description includes the artifacts to be reviewed.	The process meets expectations for submission and demonstrates a strategic approach to monitoring progress. The distribution of action steps to responsible parties is varied and not concentrated around a few people or groups.
<b>Achievement Gap Funding</b>	The funding sources to support the activities are not clearly identified for each activity. There is no indication of whether local, state or federal funds/grants are used or needed.	Specific funding sources are identified for each activity. The description includes whether local, state or federal funds/grants are used or needed to support the activities.	The section meets expectations for submission and estimated amounts for funding sources are included. Details are provided for specific materials, services or personnel to be funded.

**Achievement Gap Feedback**

**Indicator Areas of Strength:**

**Indicator Areas of Improvement:**

**Things to Consider:**



## CDIP Template Rubric- Math and Reading (Required)

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Math and Reading Goal</b>	The goal statement does not indicate long-term three- to five-year targets based on district-level state assessment results. There is no indication that the long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Districts.	The goal statement clearly articulates long-term three- to five-year targets based on district-level state assessment results. The long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Districts.	The goal statement meets expectations for submission and Goals are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound) and clearly address critical school challenges identified in the needs assessment.
<b>Math and Reading Objective</b>	Objective(s) do not indicate targets for the current school year based on data from state assessment results and/or aligned formative assessments. Objectives are not informed by the needs assessment.	Objective(s) clearly indicate targets for the current school year based on data from state assessment results and/or aligned formative assessments. Objectives are informed by the needs assessment.	Objective(s) meet expectations for submission, are measurable and describe an ambitious but attainable target.

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Math and Reading Strategy</b>	The strategy does not systematically address the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Districts. There is no clear alignment with an established improvement.	The strategy systematically addresses the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Districts. It is clearly aligned with an established improvement approach.	The strategy meets expectations for submission and descriptions of the strategies are explicit, noting how the strategy will lead to changes that will clearly enable the school to achieve the stated target.
<b>Math and Reading Activities</b>	The activities are not listed or do not provide clear, actionable steps that the district will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	Each activity describes clear, actionable steps that the district will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	The activity meets expectations for submission and descriptions include what the action is and its purpose, when and how often the action will occur, and the audience or recipient of the action. The plan demonstrates a strategic and thorough approach to implementing the chosen strategy.

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Math and Reading Progress Monitoring</b>	The process used to collect and analyze observable measures of success is not described. There are no specific timelines, responsible individuals, or artifacts to be reviewed mentioned.	The process used to collect and analyze observable measures of success is clearly described. Specific timelines and responsible individuals are included. The description includes the artifacts to be reviewed.	The process meets expectations for submission and demonstrates a strategic approach to monitoring progress. The distribution of action steps to responsible parties is varied and not concentrated around a few people or groups.
<b>Math and Reading Funding</b>	The funding sources to support the activities are not clearly identified for each activity. There is no indication of whether local, state or federal funds/grants are used or needed.	Specific funding sources are identified for each activity. The description includes whether local, state or federal funds/grants are used or needed to support the activities.	The section meets expectations for submission and estimated amounts for funding sources are included. Details are provided for specific materials, services or personnel to be funded.

**Math and Reading Feedback**

**Indicator Areas of Strength:**

**Indicator Areas of Improvement:**

**Things to Consider:**

## CDIP Template Rubric- Priority Indicator # 1 (Optional)

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Priority Indicator #1 Goal</b>	The goal statement does not indicate long-term three- to five-year targets based on district-level state assessment results. There is no indication that the long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Districts.	The goal statement clearly articulates long-term three- to five-year targets based on district-level state assessment results. The long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Districts.	The goal statement meets expectations for submission and Goals are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound) and clearly address critical school challenges identified in the needs assessment.
<b>Priority Indicator #1 Objective</b>	Objective(s) do not indicate targets for the current school year based on data from state assessment results and/or aligned formative assessments. Objectives are not informed by the needs assessment.	Objective(s) clearly indicate targets for the current school year based on data from state assessment results and/or aligned formative assessments. Objectives are informed by the needs assessment.	Objective(s) meet expectations for submission, are measurable and describe an ambitious but attainable target.

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Priority Indicator #1 Strategy</b>	The strategy does not systematically address the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Districts. There is no clear alignment with an established improvement.	The strategy systematically addresses the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Districts. It is clearly aligned with an established improvement approach.	The strategy meets expectations for submission and descriptions of the strategies are explicit, noting how the strategy will lead to changes that will clearly enable the school to achieve the stated target.
<b>Priority Indicator #1 Activities</b>	The activities are not listed or do not provide clear, actionable steps that the district will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	Each activity describes clear, actionable steps that the district will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	The activity meets expectations for submission and descriptions include what the action is and its purpose, when and how often the action will occur, and the audience or recipient of the action. The plan demonstrates a strategic and thorough approach to implementing the chosen strategy.

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Priority Indicator #1 Progress Monitoring</b>	The process used to collect and analyze observable measures of success is not described. There are no specific timelines, responsible individuals, or artifacts to be reviewed mentioned.	The process used to collect and analyze observable measures of success is clearly described. Specific timelines and responsible individuals are included. The description includes the artifacts to be reviewed.	The process meets expectations for submission and demonstrates a strategic approach to monitoring progress. The distribution of action steps to responsible parties is varied and not concentrated around a few people or groups.
<b>Priority Indicator #1 Funding</b>	The funding sources to support the activities are not clearly identified for each activity. There is no indication of whether local, state or federal funds/grants are used or needed.	Specific funding sources are identified for each activity. The description includes whether local, state or federal funds/grants are used or needed to support the activities.	The section meets expectations for submission and estimated amounts for funding sources are included. Details are provided for specific materials, services or personnel to be funded.

**Priority Indicator #1 Feedback**

**Indicator Areas of Strength:**

**Indicator Areas of Improvement:**

**Things to Consider:**

## CDIP Template Rubric- Priority Indicator #2 (Optional)

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Priority Indicator #2 Goal</b>	The goal statement does not indicate long-term three- to five-year targets based on district-level state assessment results. There is no indication that the long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Districts.	The goal statement clearly articulates long-term three- to five-year targets based on district-level state assessment results. The long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Districts.	The goal statement meets expectations for submission and Goals are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound) and clearly address critical school challenges identified in the needs assessment.
<b>Priority Indicator #2 Objective</b>	Objective(s) do not indicate targets for the current school year based on data from state assessment results and/or aligned formative assessments. Objectives are not informed by the needs assessment.	Objective(s) clearly indicate targets for the current school year based on data from state assessment results and/or aligned formative assessments. Objectives are informed by the needs assessment.	Objective(s) meet expectations for submission, are measurable and describe an ambitious but attainable target.

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Priority Indicator #2 Strategy</b>	The strategy does not systematically address the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Districts. There is no clear alignment with an established improvement.	The strategy systematically addresses the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Districts. It is clearly aligned with an established improvement approach.	The strategy meets expectations for submission and descriptions of the strategies are explicit, noting how the strategy will lead to changes that will clearly enable the school to achieve the stated target.
<b>Priority Indicator #2 Activities</b>	The activities are not listed or do not provide clear, actionable steps that the district will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	Each activity describes clear, actionable steps that the district will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	The activity meets expectations for submission and descriptions include what the action is and its purpose, when and how often the action will occur, and the audience or recipient of the action. The plan demonstrates a strategic and thorough approach to implementing the chosen strategy.



Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Priority Indicator #2 Progress Monitoring</b>	The process used to collect and analyze observable measures of success is not described. There are no specific timelines, responsible individuals, or artifacts to be reviewed mentioned.	The process used to collect and analyze observable measures of success is clearly described. Specific timelines and responsible individuals are included. The description includes the artifacts to be reviewed.	The process meets expectations for submission and demonstrates a strategic approach to monitoring progress. The distribution of action steps to responsible parties is varied and not concentrated around a few people or groups.
<b>Priority Indicator #2 Funding</b>	The funding sources to support the activities are not clearly identified for each activity. There is no indication of whether local, state or federal funds/grants are used or needed.	Specific funding sources are identified for each activity. The description includes whether local, state or federal funds/grants are used or needed to support the activities.	The section meets expectations for submission and estimated amounts for funding sources are included. Details are provided for specific materials, services or personnel to be funded.

**Priority Indicator #2 Feedback**

**Indicator Areas of Strength:**

**Indicator Areas of Improvement:**

**Things to Consider:**

## CDIP Template Rubric- Priority Indicator #3 (Optional)

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Priority Indicator #3 Goal</b>	The goal statement does not indicate long-term three- to five-year targets based on district-level state assessment results. There is no indication that the long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Districts.	The goal statement clearly articulates long-term three- to five-year targets based on district-level state assessment results. The long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Districts.	The goal statement meets expectations for submission and Goals are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound) and clearly address critical school challenges identified in the needs assessment.
<b>Priority Indicator #3 Objective</b>	Objective(s) do not indicate targets for the current school year based on data from state assessment results and/or aligned formative assessments. Objectives are not informed by the needs assessment.	Objective(s) clearly indicate targets for the current school year based on data from state assessment results and/or aligned formative assessments. Objectives are informed by the needs assessment.	Objective(s) meet expectations for submission, are measurable and describe an ambitious but attainable target.

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Priority Indicator #3 Strategy</b>	The strategy does not systematically address the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Districts. There is no clear alignment with an established improvement.	The strategy systematically addresses the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Districts. It is clearly aligned with an established improvement approach.	The strategy meets expectations for submission and descriptions of the strategies are explicit, noting how the strategy will lead to changes that will clearly enable the school to achieve the stated target.
<b>Priority Indicator #3 Activities</b>	The activities are not listed or do not provide clear, actionable steps that the district will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	Each activity describes clear, actionable steps that the district will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	The activity meets expectations for submission and descriptions include what the action is and its purpose, when and how often the action will occur, and the audience or recipient of the action. The plan demonstrates a strategic and thorough approach to implementing the chosen strategy.

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Priority Indicator #3 Progress Monitoring</b>	The process used to collect and analyze observable measures of success is not described. There are no specific timelines, responsible individuals, or artifacts to be reviewed mentioned.	The process used to collect and analyze observable measures of success is clearly described. Specific timelines and responsible individuals are included. The description includes the artifacts to be reviewed.	The process meets expectations for submission and demonstrates a strategic approach to monitoring progress. The distribution of action steps to responsible parties is varied and not concentrated around a few people or groups.
<b>Priority Indicator #3 Funding</b>	The funding sources to support the activities are not clearly identified for each activity. There is no indication of whether local, state or federal funds/grants are used or needed.	Specific funding sources are identified for each activity. The description includes whether local, state or federal funds/grants are used or needed to support the activities.	The section meets expectations for submission and estimated amounts for funding sources are included. Details are provided for specific materials, services or personnel to be funded.

**Priority Indicator #3 Feedback**

**Indicator Areas of Strength:**

**Indicator Areas of Improvement:**

**Things to Consider:**

## CDIP Template Rubric- Priority Indicator #4 (Optional)

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Priority Indicator #4 Goal</b>	The goal statement does not indicate long-term three- to five-year targets based on district-level state assessment results. There is no indication that the long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Districts.	The goal statement clearly articulates long-term three- to five-year targets based on district-level state assessment results. The long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Districts.	The goal statement meets expectations for submission and Goals are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound) and clearly address critical school challenges identified in the needs assessment.
<b>Priority Indicator #4 Objective</b>	Objective(s) do not indicate targets for the current school year based on data from state assessment results and/or aligned formative assessments. Objectives are not informed by the needs assessment.	Objective(s) clearly indicate targets for the current school year based on data from state assessment results and/or aligned formative assessments. Objectives are informed by the needs assessment.	Objective(s) meet expectations for submission, are measurable and describe an ambitious but attainable target.

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Priority Indicator #4 Strategy</b>	The strategy does not systematically address the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Districts. There is no clear alignment with an established improvement.	The strategy systematically addresses the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Districts. It is clearly aligned with an established improvement approach.	The strategy meets expectations for submission and descriptions of the strategies are explicit, noting how the strategy will lead to changes that will clearly enable the school to achieve the stated target.
<b>Priority Indicator #4 Activities</b>	The activities are not listed or do not provide clear, actionable steps that the district will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	Each activity describes clear, actionable steps that the district will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	The activity meets expectations for submission and descriptions include what the action is and its purpose, when and how often the action will occur, and the audience or recipient of the action. The plan demonstrates a strategic and thorough approach to implementing the chosen strategy.

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
<b>Priority Indicator #4 Progress Monitoring</b>	The process used to collect and analyze observable measures of success is not described. There are no specific timelines, responsible individuals, or artifacts to be reviewed mentioned.	The process used to collect and analyze observable measures of success is clearly described. Specific timelines and responsible individuals are included. The description includes the artifacts to be reviewed.	The process meets expectations for submission and demonstrates a strategic approach to monitoring progress. The distribution of action steps to responsible parties is varied and not concentrated around a few people or groups.
<b>Priority Indicator #4 Funding</b>	The funding sources to support the activities are not clearly identified for each activity. There is no indication of whether local, state or federal funds/grants are used or needed.	Specific funding sources are identified for each activity. The description includes whether local, state or federal funds/grants are used or needed to support the activities.	The section meets expectations for submission and estimated amounts for funding sources are included. Details are provided for specific materials, services or personnel to be funded.

**Priority Indicator #4 Feedback**

**Indicator Areas of Strength:**

**Indicator Areas of Improvement:**

**Things to Consider:**

## Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), Including Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) Improvement Plan Addendum

This portion of the rubric addresses the required elements for districts with schools identified for targeted support and improvement (TSI), including additional targeted support and improvement (ATSI). The rubric that follows will indicate a rating of Not Present, Developing or Meets Criteria highlighted in yellow for each additional requirement of the improvement plan. Also, the rubric includes a summary of elements to address.

For any **Not Present or Developing** rating, districts must revise their responses on the appropriate diagnostic until found to meet criteria.

Complete the revisions on the **CDIP 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.



TSI/ATSI Requirement	Not Present	Developing	Meets Criteria
<b>Monitoring and Support</b>	The plan includes no specific process for monitoring and supporting the improvement plans and/or does not include the process for local board review and approval of the plan of any school(s) identified as TSI/ATSI.	The plan includes a process for monitoring and supporting the improvement plans and/or includes the process for local board review and approval of the plan of any school(s) identified as TSI/ATSI, but the response is vague.	The plan includes specific steps for monitoring and supporting the improvement plans and includes the process for local board review and approval of the plan of any school(s) identified as TSI/ATSI.
<b>TSI: Additional/More Rigorous Actions</b>	The plan does not include a list of any school(s) that failed to exit TSI status this year and/or it does not include the additional actions and supports to be provided, or who will be providing those supports.	The plan includes a list of any school(s) that failed to exit TSI status this year but does not describe specific details regarding additional actions and support to be provided, and who will be providing those supported.	The plan includes a list of any school(s) that failed to exit TSI status this year and describes specific additional actions and supports to be provided and identifies who will be providing those supports.
<b>ATSI: More Rigorous Actions</b>	The plan does not include a list of any school(s) that were identified as ATSI status this year and/or it does not include the additional actions and supports to be provided, or who will be providing those supports.	The plan includes a list of any school(s) that were identified as ATSI status this year but does not describe specific details regarding additional actions and support to be provided, and who will be providing those supported.	The plan includes a list of any school(s) that were identified as ATSI status this year and describes specific additional actions and supports to be provided and identifies who will be providing those supports.

## Special Considerations for Districts with Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) Schools

KRS 160.346(7)(a)(6) requires an evaluation of a principal's capacity to lead the turnaround efforts during the audit process. This assessment supports identifying effective strategies and actions needed to improve school performance. It also helps determine whether the principal has the skills to implement and sustain turnaround efforts. When making this determination, the audit team considers evidence aligned with the Professional Standards for Education Leaders (PSEL) Standard 10: School Improvement. The outcome of this assessment becomes a formal part of the school's audit.

For any **Not Present or Developing** rating, districts must revise their responses on the appropriate diagnostic until found to meet criteria.

Complete the revisions on the **addendum and/or associated form 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.

CSI Requirement	Not Present	Developing	Meets Criteria
<b>Intensive Support to Principals</b>	The plan includes no response to the Special Considerations for Districts with Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) Schools on the addendum.	The plan includes a response to the question, but the Training and Support Plan for Principals Requiring Intensive Support form is incomplete or lacks detail on the supports provided.	The plan includes a response to the question and, if applicable, the Training and Support Plan for Principals Requiring Intensive Support form provides thorough detail for all entries.