



Kentucky Department of Education
CSIP Monitoring Instrument 2025-2026

School:

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 CSIP. For each area highlighted under **Needs Improvement**, schools must revise their responses on the appropriate diagnostic until expectations are met. Complete the revisions on the **Needs Assessment Diagnostic and/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	The protocol process is not clearly detailed. Names of school 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 school 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 school 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.
Review of Previous Plan	The implementation of the goals, objectives, strategies, and activities from the previous year's CSIP 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 CSIP 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 CSIP 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 CSIP.

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
Trends	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 CSIP.
Current State of Academics	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 school, 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
Current State of Climate and Culture	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 school, 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.
Strengths	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.
Leverages/Assets	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 school needs.

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
Evaluation of the Teaching and Learning Environment	The school 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 school will work to improve.	The school 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 school will work to improve. There is alignment between the focus areas chosen and the strategy section of the CSIP.	The school 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 school 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:

CSIP Template Rubric- Achievement Gap (Required)

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
Achievement Gap Objective	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.
Achievement Gap Strategy	The strategy does not systematically address the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Schools. There is no clear alignment with an established improvement.	The strategy systematically addresses the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Schools. 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
Achievement Gap Activities	The activities are not listed or do not provide clear, actionable steps that the school will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	Each activity describes clear, actionable steps that the school 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.
Achievement Gap Progress Monitoring	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.
Achievement Gap Funding	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:

CSIP Template Rubric- Math and Reading (Required)

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
Math and Reading Goal	The goal statement does not indicate long-term three- to five-year targets based on school-level state assessment results. There is no indication that the long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Schools.	The goal statement clearly articulates long-term three- to five-year targets based on school-level state assessment results. The long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Schools.	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.
Math and Reading Objective	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
Math and Reading Strategy	The strategy does not systematically address the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Schools. There is no clear alignment with an established improvement.	The strategy systematically addresses the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Schools. 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.
Math and Reading Activities	The activities are not listed or do not provide clear, actionable steps that the school will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	Each activity describes clear, actionable steps that the school 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
Math and Reading Progress Monitoring	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.
Math and Reading Funding	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:

CSIP Template Rubric- Priority Indicator # 1 (Optional)

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
Priority Indicator #1 Goal	The goal statement does not indicate long-term three- to five-year targets based on school-level state assessment results. There is no indication that the long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Schools.	The goal statement clearly articulates long-term three- to five-year targets based on school-level state assessment results. The long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Schools.	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.
Priority Indicator #1 Objective	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
Priority Indicator #1 Strategy	The strategy does not systematically address the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Schools. There is no clear alignment with an established improvement.	The strategy systematically addresses the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Schools. 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.
Priority Indicator #1 Activities	The activities are not listed or do not provide clear, actionable steps that the school will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	Each activity describes clear, actionable steps that the school 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
Priority Indicator #1 Progress Monitoring	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.
Priority Indicator #1 Funding	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:

CSIP Template Rubric- Priority Indicator #2 (Optional)

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
Priority Indicator #2 Goal	The goal statement does not indicate long-term three- to five-year targets based on school-level state assessment results. There is no indication that the long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Schools.	The goal statement clearly articulates long-term three- to five-year targets based on school-level state assessment results. The long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Schools.	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.
Priority Indicator #2 Objective	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
Priority Indicator #2 Strategy	The strategy does not systematically address the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Schools. There is no clear alignment with an established improvement.	The strategy systematically addresses the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Schools. 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.
Priority Indicator #2 Activities	The activities are not listed or do not provide clear, actionable steps that the school will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	Each activity describes clear, actionable steps that the school 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
Priority Indicator #2 Progress Monitoring	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.
Priority Indicator #2 Funding	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:

CSIP Template Rubric- Priority Indicator #3 (Optional)

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
Priority Indicator #3 Goal	The goal statement does not indicate long-term three- to five-year targets based on school-level state assessment results. There is no indication that the long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Schools.	The goal statement clearly articulates long-term three- to five-year targets based on school-level state assessment results. The long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Schools.	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.
Priority Indicator #3 Objective	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
Priority Indicator #3 Strategy	The strategy does not systematically address the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Schools. There is no clear alignment with an established improvement.	The strategy systematically addresses the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Schools. 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.
Priority Indicator #3 Activities	The activities are not listed or do not provide clear, actionable steps that the school will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	Each activity describes clear, actionable steps that the school 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
Priority Indicator #3 Progress Monitoring	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.
Priority Indicator #3 Funding	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:

CSIP Template Rubric- Priority Indicator #4 (Optional)

Diagnostic Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Indicates High-Quality Planning
Priority Indicator #4 Goal	The goal statement does not indicate long-term three- to five-year targets based on school-level state assessment results. There is no indication that the long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Schools.	The goal statement clearly articulates long-term three- to five-year targets based on school-level state assessment results. The long-term targets are informed by the Needs Assessment for Schools.	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.
Priority Indicator #4 Objective	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
Priority Indicator #4 Strategy	The strategy does not systematically address the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Schools. There is no clear alignment with an established improvement.	The strategy systematically addresses the process, practice, or condition identified in the Needs Assessment for Schools. 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.
Priority Indicator #4 Activities	The activities are not listed or do not provide clear, actionable steps that the school will take to deploy the chosen strategy.	Each activity describes clear, actionable steps that the school 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
Priority Indicator #4 Progress Monitoring	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.
Priority Indicator #4 Funding	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: