

# The Kentucky Department of Education's Compliance Requirements for Evidence-based Practices

The [Every Student Succeeds Act](#) (ESSA) requires the documentation of evidence-based practices for many federal programs, such as Title I, Part A Parent and Family Engagement, 21<sup>st</sup> Century, and school improvement. Additionally, [KRS 160.346](#) and [703 KAR 5:280](#) (Kentucky's school Improvement regulation) requires those schools identified for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) to document evidence-based practices in their school improvement plans (CSIP) and for those schools identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) to document evidence-based practices in their turnaround plans.

School districts have the responsibility to determine the most appropriate method for collecting, documenting, and monitoring the implementation of evidence-based practices. Compliance requires that evidence of these processes be uploaded to school improvement plans, turnaround plans, and certain grant applications. While a district may use any method to document its evidence-based practice, the following information should be included:

- A study citation in APA format
- A discussion of the study and its findings
- A discussion of the local context
- A discussion of stakeholder input
- An estimation of the ESSA evidence level

The Kentucky Department of Education suggests districts and/or schools use one of the two following options as documentation methods that meet the compliance requirements:

## **1. Complete the Empowered by Evidence: Reviewing Evidence Under ESSA guiding document.**

Schools may complete the Kentucky Department of Education's guiding document [Empowered by Evidence: Reviewing Evidence Under ESSA](#) and attach it to their CSIP, CSI turnaround plan, or grant application. This is KDE's preferred option.

## **2. Evaluate Evidence and Write a Narrative**

Schools may develop their own internal procedures for evaluating and selecting evidence-based practices. Upon completion, schools can write a succinct narrative to describe the process used to select the evidence based intervention. The narrative must include all of the aforementioned information. Schools may choose to use headings or highlight different components of their narrative for clarity and expediency. If a submitted narrative is determined to be insufficient by the review team, the school may be asked to complete the [Empowered by Evidence: Reviewing Evidence Under ESSA](#) guiding document before a plan or funding application is approved.

**For your convenience a sample narrative has been included. In addition to the sample narrative, you will notice several highlighted components. Each highlighted section corresponds to one of the requirements in the bulleted list above. The following example can be modeled by your school to guide its narrative.**

## Sample Narrative

Scientific Learning Corporation (2004). Improved language skills by children with low reading performance who used Fast ForWord Language. MAPS for Learning: Product Reports, 3(1), 1-13.

Commonwealth County Elementary School will be using school improvement funds to purchase and implement the Fast ForWord Language program with our students. The study cited above was reviewed by our advisory leadership team who made the recommendation to select this intervention. This study was conducted on 452 elementary school students who were identified as “at risk” by their teachers. Students who received the Fast ForWord Language intervention in the area of language comprehension, which is a significant area of concern for our students. This intervention will be implemented as an intensive strategy designed to help students catch-up to their peers. We will implement the intervention in line with the study by pulling students for two hour sessions daily for three weeks. Students will be selected based on their performance in the first MAP test administration. They will be pulled during their regularly scheduled reading block. At the end of the three week session, students will be re-evaluated using the MAP assessment to determine if they are ready to return to the classroom. If they have not shown the necessary growth, the student will be re-evaluated on an individual basis by the instructional team who will determine the appropriate next steps which may include more intensive RTI or special education screening. Our school has adequate technology to pursue this intervention and a special education para-educator will be allocated to supervising this program.

Based on our review of the evidence and the data for our school, we believe that this is Level I evidence because it used an experimental study design and the population overlapped both the setting and population of our school.

### LEGEND

- A study citation in APA format
- A discussion of the study and its findings
- A discussion of the local context
- A discussion of stakeholder input
- An estimation of the ESSA evidence level