Improvement Plan Monitoring Instrument

Comprehensive District Improvement Plan (CDIP) with Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) Addendum

District:
Reviewer:

District improvement efforts are a collaborative process involving multiple stakeholders. The following definition is 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.

Pursuant to 703 KAR 5:225, the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) is tasked with reviewing CDIPs. During the review process, KDE staff provide feedback on several planning elements to assist districts with improvement planning to ensure plans are developed and implemented effectively. This process of monitoring enables 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 describes the criteria that will be used to evaluate responses within the reviewed planning elements. Feedback will be provided as comments in the Cognia Improvement Platform (CIP) that must be addressed until expectations are met.

Revisions **must** be completed in the Needs Assessment element of Phase Two, and/or the District Goals and Objectives, and Strategies and Activities sections of Phase Three. Once revisions are completed, reply to the comments under each element or section and resubmit the applicable phase(s) to the CIP.

Needs Assessment

Element Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission
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.
Trends	It is not clear that data from the previous two years has been analyzed. No specific numbers or percentages are included.	The response clearly indicates analysis of data from the two previous years. The description includes specific numbers or percentages.
Current State of Academics	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.
Current State of Climate and Culture	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.

Element Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission
Strengths	No strengths have been identified. Precise numbers and percentages are not provided.	Strengths 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.
Priority Needs	Priority needs are not identified, are unclear or are not supported by the data analysis provided in other sections of the Needs Assessment.	Two or three areas of need are identified and align to the data analysis provided in other sections of the Needs Assessment.
Priority Indicators	Priority indicators have not been selected when the Needs Assessment indicates that one or more is necessary.	Appropriate priority indicators have been selected based on the Needs Assessment.
Strategies to Address Identified Needs	The district has not selected two or three Key Core Work Processes (KCWPs) to focus its resources and efforts upon. There is no alignment between the focus areas chosen and the strategy section of the CSIP.	The district has selected two or three KCWPs to focus its resources and efforts upon. There is alignment between the focus areas chosen and the strategy section of the CSIP.

Element Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission
Protocol	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.
Feedback:		

Achievement Gap (Required)

Element Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission
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.
Feedback:		
Achievement Gap Strategy	The strategy does not systematically address a process, practice, or condition within the identified KCWP or other established improvement approach.	The strategy systematically addresses a process, practice, or condition within the identified KCWP or other established improvement approach.
Achievement Gap Activities	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.
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.	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.
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.
Feedback:		

Math and Reading (Required)

Element Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission
Math and Reading Goal	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.	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.
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.
Feedback:		
Math and Reading Strategy	The strategy does not systematically address a process, practice, or condition within the identified KCWP or other established improvement approach.	The strategy systematically addresses a process, practice, or condition within the identified KCWP or other established improvement approach.
Math and Reading Activities	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.

Element Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission
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.	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.
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.
Feedback:		

Priority Indicator #1 (Optional)

Element Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission
Priority Indicator #1 Goal	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.	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.
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.
Feedback:		
Priority Indicator #1 Strategy	The strategy does not systematically address a process, practice, or condition within the identified KCWP or other established improvement approach.	The strategy systematically addresses a process, practice, or condition within the identified KCWP or other established improvement approach.
Priority Indicator #1 Activities	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.

Element Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission
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.	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.
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.
Feedback:		

Priority Indicator #2 (Optional)

Element Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission
Priority Indicator #2 Goal	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.	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.
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.
Feedback:		
Priority Indicator #2 Strategy	The strategy does not systematically address a process, practice, or condition within the identified KCWP or other established improvement approach.	The strategy systematically addresses a process, practice, or condition within the identified KCWP or other established improvement approach.
Priority Indicator #2 Activities	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.

Element Component	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission
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.	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.
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.
Feedback:		

Special Considerations for Districts with CSI Schools

KRS 160.346(8)(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 **Needs Improvement** rating, districts must revise their responses on the appropriate element or form until found to meet criteria.

Once revisions are completed, reply to the comments under each element or section and resubmit the applicable phase to the CIP.

CSI Requirement	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations
Improvement Priorities	The response does not list the improvement priorities or potential leader actions from the most recent Diagnostic Review report, or the response provided is incomplete.	The response clearly lists the improvement priorities and potential leader actions from the most recent Diagnostic Review report that enhance the district's capacity to reach a higher level of performance and improve organizational effectiveness.
Intensive Support to Principals	The Training and Support Plan for Principals Requiring Intensive Support form is incomplete or lacks detail about the supports provided for any principal whose capacity review resulted in an intensive support determination	The Training and Support Plan for Principals Requiring Intensive Support form provides thorough detail about the supports provided for any principal whose capacity review resulted in an intensive support determination.
Feedback:		