Sinking Fork Elementary School

Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2019 – 2020

2019-20 Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools_10292019_14:19

2019-20 Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools

Sinking Fork Elementary School
Leslie Lancaster
5005 Princeton Road
Hopkinsville, Kentucky, 42240
United States of America

Last Modified: 12/06/2019
Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

e Prove diagnostics

2019-20 Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools

2019-20 Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools

Description of the School

Describe the school's size, community/communities, location, and changes it has experienced in the last three years. Include demographic information about the students, staff, and community at large. What unique features and challenges are associated with the community/communities the school serves?

Sinking Fork Elementary School is located in Christian County, Kentucky. Christian County is situated on the Kentucky-Tennessee border in what is considered Western Kentucky. Christian County covers 724 square miles and is one of the largest school districts in the state of Kentucky. Sinking Fork is one of eight elementary schools in Christian County. Sinking Fork is located in a rural setting and houses preschool through sixth grade. We stress academic excellence and encourage all students to develop skills to become life-long learners. Sinking Fork's mission statement is to provide a safe encouraging environment which all students are expected to meet their highest potential. Sinking Forks student population is 468 and is reflective of the large diverse Christian County community. 57% of the schools populations is Caucasian, 35.5% is African American, and 8 % other. Over 72% of Sinking Fork Students receive either free or reduced lunch. Sinking Fork's teachers experience range from first year teachers to over 27 years of experience, with over 30% of our teachers having at least 15 years of teaching experience. Sinking Fork's Community Partners include Amfine Chemical and Sinking Fork Baptist Church. Our partners assist us with parent involvement nights, students incentives, our backpack programs, positive behavior rewards and end of the year academic awards. These partners in addition to our parent volunteers, allow us to focus on instruction.

School's Purpose

Provide the school's purpose statement and ancillary content such as mission, vision, values, and/or beliefs. Describe how the school embodies its purpose through its program offerings and expectations for students.

The vision at Christian County Public Schools is to create an educational culture of continuous growth through shared partnerships and responsibilities. The vision in the district is transform the educational environment to meet the ongoing demands of the 21st Century learning so that all students are engaged in a high quality, equitable education and are prepared for community and global responsibilities. Our mission at Sinking Fork Elementary School is to provide a safe, encouraging, environment in which all students are expected to reach their highest potential. Our vision statement is "Investing in the future!" We believe that all students, regardless of race, gender, or socioeconomic background, can learn and succeed in school. The school works in collaboration with school leadership and in partnership with our community to establish and support rigorous learning standards for all students. Sinking Fork's teachers value every student through research-based, individualized and differentiated instruction. Our goal for all students is to reach proficient level and attain one year's growth. The school offers primary talent pool and GT cluster groups for qualifying students. Response to interventions ensures students receive targeted instruction in their areas of deficiency. Reading Inventory and Math Inventory assessments are administered three times a year to kindergarten students through 6th grade and are used as the basis for grouping students to ensure growth can occur at all levels. Common Assessments are given after each unit taught at each grade level. These assessments provide teachers with data on mastery of standards and lead to reteaching and enrichment activities. Intermediate students participate in district benchmarks two times a year to measure students success as compared to the other elementary schools in the district. Using multiple data points teachers are able to tailor instruction to meet the needs of their students. Extracurricular Activities include Art club, Sinking

Fork Choir, K-Kids (Kiwanis's) Student Technology Leadership Program, STEM Team, 4-H , Dance Team, Cheer Team, and Student Council .

Notable Achievements and Areas of Improvement
Describe the school's notable achievements and areas of improvement in the last three years. Additionally, describe areas for improvement that the school is striving to achieve in the next three years.

Sinking Fork's KPREP score was 66.9. Our most notable achievement is closing our achievement gap by reducing the number of students scoring at the novice level in math and over seventy percent of our students scoring growth points. The KPREP data has shown the need for improvement in the area of reading ,writing and in Science, Social Studies and On Demand in 3rd-6th grade. We see the urgency to move the students towards proficiency and to have a goal for all students to show a years growth. Target areas are working with teachers on differentiated instruction with higher level questioning , whole based literacy approach and using High Impact learning strategies with students to guide instruction and learning. Engaging students in rigorous learning opportunities. Focusing on small group instruction based on data from formative and summative assessments. Closely monitoring data and identifying GAP students to track data and compare to the data of our students overall.

Additional Information
CSI/TSI Schools Only: Describe the procedures used to create the school's improvement plan and briefly state the specific efforts to address the causes of low student performance and resource inequities.

Sinking Fork Elementary is not a TSI or CSI school.

Additional Information
Provide any additional information you would like to share with the public and community that were not prompted in the previous sections.

Sinking Fork Elementary School is a wonderful place to learn, work, and play. Of all the attributes of the school, having a diverse school culture is one of the best. From our inner city students to our rural area students, we are a great melting pot that offers many unique ideas and opportunities. Many exceptional programs and services are offered to students beyond the core academic program. Programs such as: Panther Choir, Gifted and Talented Program, Art Club, K-Kids, STLP, Career Fair, Family Reading Nights, STEM Club,Duke Talent Search, Jr. Pro Basketball, District Choir, Student Council, Good News Club and Academic Team. The faculty and staff at Sinking Fork Elementary will maintain an attitude of continuous improvement and commitment to excellence for students of this community.

e Prove diagnostics

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)

e Prove diagnostics

2019-20 Phase One: Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools_09042019_11:53

2019-20 Phase One: Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools

Sinking Fork Elementary School
Leslie Lancaster
5005 Princeton Road
Hopkinsville, Kentucky, 42240
United States of America

Target Completion Date: 09/30/2019
Last Modified: 09/17/2019
Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

e Prove diagnostics

2019-20 Phase One: Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools

2019-20 Phase One: Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools

The **Comprehensive School Improvement Plan or CSIP** is defined as 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 gaps among groups of students.*

The comprehensive school and district improvement plan process is outlined in 703 KAR 5:225. The requirements included in the administrative regulation are key components of the continuous improvement process in Kentucky and ultimately fulfillment of school, district, and state goals under the Kentucky State Plan as required by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

While the regulation outlines a timeline for compliance purposes, the plan itself is a strategic and proven approach to improve processes and to ensure students achieve. The timeline for the school's 2019-20 diagnostics is as follows:

Phase One: August 1 - October 1
• Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools

Phase Two: October 1 - November 1
• The Needs Assessment for Schools
• School Assurances
• School Safety Report

Phase Three: November 1 - January 1
• Comprehensive School Improvement Plan
• Executive Summary for Schools
• Closing the Achievement Gap Diagnostic for Schools
• Title I Annual Review[*] Diagnostic

Phase Four: January 1 - December 31
• Progress Monitoring

As principal of the school, I hereby commit to implementing continuous improvement processes with fidelity to support student achievement and student growth and to eliminate achievement gaps among groups of students.

Please enter your name and date below to certify.

Leslie Lancaster 9/4/2019

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10212019_07:40 Sinking Fork

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Sinking Fork Elementary School
Leslie Lancaster
5005 Princeton Road
Hopkinsville, Kentucky, 42240
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/30/2019
Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment

In its most basic form, continuous improvement is about understanding the **current state** and formulating a plan to move to the **desired state**. The comprehensive needs assessment is a culmination of an extensive review of multiple sources of data collected over a period of time (e.g. 2-3 years). It is to be conducted annually as an essential part of the continuous improvement process and precedes the development of strategic goals (i.e. desired state).

The needs assessment requires synthesis and analysis of multiple sources of data and should reach conclusions about the **current state** of the school/district, as well as the processes, practices and conditions that contributed to that state.

The needs assessment provides the framework for **all** schools to clearly and honestly identify their most critical areas for improvement that will be addressed later in the planning process through the development of goals, objectives, strategies and activities. 703 KAR 2:225 requires, as part of continuous improvement planning for schools, each school complete the needs assessment between October 1 and November 1 of each year and include: (1) a description of the data reviewed and the process used to develop the needs assessment; (2) a review of the previous plan and its implementation to inform development of the new plan; and, (3) perception data gathered from the administration of a valid and reliable measure of teaching and learning conditions. Further, as required by Section 1114 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), Title I schools implementing a schoolwide program must base their Title I program on a comprehensive needs assessment.

Protocol

Clearly detail the process used for reviewing, analyzing and applying data results. Include names of school/ district councils, leadership teams and stakeholder groups involved. How frequently does this planning team meet and how are these meetings documented?

1. Continuous Improvement Team:The Leadership Team is made up of the principal, Guidance Counselor, Curriculum Specialist, 2 classroom teachers and one special education teacher. The Leadership Team was responsible for the first breakdown of the School Report Card data and planning our professional development sessions to share/analyze data with the faculty.2. Gather and organize data: School leadership gathers and organizes data. Data is reviewed at monthly Curriculum Leadership Team meetings. School leader ship reviews: state accountability data, attendance data, Quantile, Lexile, District Standard Assessment Data, common and formative assessment data. The data is shared by the schools with the district through a shared Google spreadsheet that is used for monitoring purposes. Review current performance: Continuous Improvement Team identifies areas where the school met/failed to meet district, state/federal targets, or school expectations for academic proficiency, academic gap, academic growth, transition readiness, and graduation rate. Continuous Improvement Team conducts disaggregated analysis by grade level, content area, within content strands (e.g. number sense in mathematics) and by gap groups.Describe performance trends: Current performance is compared to past performance. Directions of trends for every performance indicator are identified.Prioritize performance concerns: Continuous Improvement Team identifies priority performance concerns for every indicator (academic proficiency, academic gap, academic growth, transition readiness, and graduation rate) for which the school did not meet federal, state and/or local expectations. Identify root and hypothesize potential causes: Continuous Improvement Team identifies root causes or hypothesizes potential causes for each priority performance concern. Specific data protocols are used to analyze performance data. Multiple sources of data are used to analyze root causes and reflection explicitly considers broad, systemic root causes. Teams consider the level of root causes (incidental or procedural; programmatic; systemic; external). The root cause identification identifies what schools can control rather than factors that the school cannot control. Set measurable performance targets: Long range goals based on the Kentucky Board of Education goals are set to address priority concerns. Objectives with short term targets to be attained by the end of the current school year are established. Identify solutions and actions steps: Based on the root cause analysis, Continuous Improvement Teams identifies research-based strategies and activities to systematically address process, practice, or condition to address the root cause in order to reach goals/objectives.Implement plan: The improvement plan is communicated to all stakeholders and implemented.Progress monitor: The improvement plan will monitor progress toward meeting performance targets. The Continuous Improvement Team will utilize 5X monitoring, PLCs, and RTI meetings. The implementation plan will be responsive and changed based upon progress monitoring. The school will utilize the school scorecard for short cycle planning and monitoring of the implementation of the CSIP.

Current State

Plainly state the current condition using precise numbers and percentages as revealed by past, current and multiple sources of data. These should be based solely on data outcomes. Cite the source of data used.

Example of Current Academic State:

-Thirty-four (34%) of students in the achievement gap scored proficient on KPREP Reading.

-From 2017 to 2019, we saw an 11% increase in novice scores in reading among students in the achievement gap.

-Fifty-four (54%) of our students scored proficient in math compared to the state average of 57%.

Example of Non-Academic Current State:

-Teacher Attendance: Teacher attendance rate was 84% for the 2018-19 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2017-18.

-The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2017-18 to 288 in 2018-19.

-Kentucky TELL Survey results indicated 62% of the school's teachers received adequate professional development.

Sinking Fork's overall achievement score for 2019 was a 66.9 and we are classified as a 3 star school.Sinking Fork's 2019 KPREP Reading Data Indicates: -54% of our students scored Novice/ Apprentice - 75% of African American students scored Novice/Apprentice -60% of our economically disadvantaged students scored Novice/Apprentice Sinking Fork's 2019 KPREP Math Data Indicates:- 38% of our students scored Novice/ Apprentice - 51% of African American students scored Novice/Apprentice - 46% of our economically disadvantaged students scored Novice/ApprenticeA teacher attendance rate baseline rate is being established of 95.45% was established during the 2018-2019 school year. The school & district struggles to find substitute teachers to fill classrooms on a daily basis.During the 2018-2019 school year the Employee Engagement Survey mean score was 4.16. The school goal for the 2019-2020 school year is 4.21.The student attendance rate for the 2018-2019 school year was 95.2. The school goal for 2019-2020 is 96%.The district goal for the 2019-2020 school year is 94.48.

Priorities/Concerns

Clearly and concisely identify areas of weakness using precise numbers and percentages.
NOTE: These priorities will be thoroughly addressed in the Continuous Improvement Planning Diagnostic for Schools.

Example: Sixty-eight (68%) of students in the achievement gap scored below proficiency on the KPREP test in reading as opposed to just 12% of non-gap learners.

After reviewing the data it is clear that our African American population is under performing in both reading and math. - 75% of our AA students scored Novice/ Apprentice in Reading- 51% of our AA students scored Novice/ Apprentice in Math

Trends

Analyzing data trends from the previous two academic years, which academic, cultural and behavioral measures remain significant areas for improvement?

Sinking Fork Elementary's African American GAP group continues to under perform compared to our white students. Two sub populations are a trend when looking at GAPS for Sinking Fork , African Americans and free/reduced in reading and math.Currently we are providing intervention services to the lowest 20% of each grade level in reading and math determined by reading and mathRI & MI assessments, common assessments and district benchmarks.

e Prove diagnostics

Potential Source of Problem

Which processes, practices or conditions will the school focus its resources and efforts upon in order to produce the desired changes? Note that all processes, practices and conditions can be linked to the six Key Core Work Processes outlined below:

KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards
KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction
KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy
KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data
KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support
KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment

1- Deployment of StandardsMath , Reading and Language Arts are areas that need improvements at Sinking Fork. Reading Content District supported programs such as IREAD, Read 180, and System 44 are being implemented K-6th to target students who struggle in reading content. These programs are used in addition to their core reading instruction. This is helping to ensure the targeted students are receiving extra Reading practice on specific skills that are tailored to fit Individual needs according to assessment data.6-Establish a Learning Culture and EnvironmentTwo sub populations are a trend when looking at GAPS for Sinking Fork. African American and free/reduced in reading and math.Currently we are providing intervention services to the lowest 20% of each grade level in reading and math determined by reading and mathRI & MI assessments, common assessments and district benchmarks. We have 3 tier levels, Tier 1 is serviced in the classroom, Tier 2 and 3 isa pullout program in a small group setting or 1 to 1 services provided to help in the content area. RTI monitoring is done every week/bi weeklywith the RTI committee meeting monthly to look at progress and determine what students are showing growth and what students needfurther instruction. Each student will continue to receive interventions until the next assessment is administered. Data will then be looked at to determine if the student will remain receiving interventions or if they are able to test out. Ongoing professional development will be held during Professional Learning Communities and faculty meetings to address our GAP area. GAP students are also provided adult mentors in the building to encourage those students and build relationships.

Strengths/Leverages

Plainly state, using precise numbers and percentages revealed by current data, the strengths and leverages of the school.

Example: Graduation rate has increased from 67% the last five years to its current rate of 98%.

Overall proficiency scores indicated that Sinking Fork qualified for a medium proficiency rating with a 74.3 . In the area of Separate Academic Indicators students scored overall a 56.9 which is a low rating but improved from the previous year that was a 54.1 . Sinking Fork Elementary received a growth indicator score of 67 which is classified as a high rating. Even though our GAP groups are not meeting the proficiency goals we are making progress and showing tremendous growth in all areas.

e Prove diagnostics

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)

e Prove diagnostics

2019-20 Phase Two: School Assurances_10212019_10:28 Sinking Fork

2019-20 Phase Two: School Assurances

Sinking Fork Elementary School
Leslie Lancaster
5005 Princeton Road
Hopkinsville, Kentucky, 42240
United States of America

Last Modified: 12/06/2019
Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

e Prove diagnostics

2019-20 Phase Two: School Assurances

2019-20 Phase Two: School Assurances

e Prove diagnostics

Introduction

Assurances are a required component of the CSIP process (703 KAR 5:225). Please read each assurance and indicate whether your school is in compliance by selecting the appropriate response (Yes, No or N/A). If you wish to provide further information or clarify your response, space for comments is provided. Comments are optional. You may upload any supporting documentation as needed.

Teacher Performance

1. The Every Study Succeeds Act (ESSA) requires each school to report data regarding ineffective teachers. An ineffective teacher receives a summative effectiveness rate of "Ineffective" as determined through the local performance evaluation system that meets the requirements established by KRS 157.557. An ineffective teacher consistently fails to meet expectations as determined by a trained evaluator, in competencies identified as the performance criteria in the Kentucky Framework for Teaching.

Responses to this assurance will be collected in the Kentucky Teacher Performance survey. Responses to each survey question should be based on data from the 2018-19 school year. Once you have completed the survey, return to the 2019-20 Phase Two: School Assurances diagnostic to certify that your school has completed the survey and to complete the remaining assurances on the diagnostic.

I certify this school has completed the Kentucky Teacher Performance survey.

- ● **Yes**
- ○ No
- ○ N/A

Title I Schoolwide Programs

2. If the school is implementing a schoolwide program, the school developed a comprehensive plan during a 1-year period or qualifies for an exception under Section 1114(b)(1) of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

- ● **Yes**
- ○ No
- ○ N/A

3. If the school is implementing a schoolwide program, the school developed a comprehensive plan with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served as well as individuals who will carry out such plan (e.g. teachers, administrators, classified staff, etc.) as required by Section 1114(b)(2) of ESSA.

- ● **Yes**
- ○ No
- ○ N/A

4. If the school is implementing a schoolwide program, the school developed a comprehensive plan that will remain in effect for the duration of the school's participation under Title I, Part A of ESSA as required by Section 1114(b)(3) of ESSA.

- ● **Yes**
- ○ No
- ○ N/A

5. If the school is implementing a schoolwide program, the school developed a comprehensive plan that is available to district leadership, parents, and the public and in an understandable and uniform format as required by Section 1114(b)(4) of ESSA.

- ● **Yes**
- ○ No
- ○ N/A

6. If the school is implementing a schoolwide program, the school developed a comprehensive plan that, to the extent appropriate and applicable, coordinates with other federal, state, and local programs, including but not limited to the implementation of improvement activities in schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, as required by Section 1114(b)(5) of ESSA.

- ● **Yes**
- ○ No
- ○ N/A

7. If the school is implementing a schoolwide program, the school developed a comprehensive plan that is based on a comprehensive needs assessment, which included a review of academic achievement data, and includes, among other items, a description of the strategies the school will implement to address school needs as required by Section 1114(b)(6) of ESSA.

- ● **Yes**
- ○ No
- ○ N/A

8. If the school is implementing a schoolwide program, the school developed, pursuant to Section 1114(b)(7), a comprehensive plan that includes a description of the strategies to be implemented to address school needs, including how such strategies: (1) provide opportunities for all children; (2) use methods and instructional strategies that strengthen the academic program in the school, increase learning time, and provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum; and, (3) address the needs of all children through, for example, the following activities: school-based mental health programs; a tiered model to prevent and address behavioral problems; professional development to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers; and/or, strategies for assisting preschool children transition to local elementary school programs.

- ● **Yes**
- ○ No
- ○ N/A

Title I Targeted Assistance School Programs

9. If the school is implementing a targeted assistance school program, participating students are identified in accordance with Section 1115(c) and on the basis of multiple, educationally related, objective criteria.

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ● **N/A**

10. If the school is implementing a targeted assistance school program, the school serves participating students using resources under Title I, Part of ESSA to meet challenging state academic standards as required by Section 1115(b)(2)(A) of ESSA.

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ● **N/A**

11. If the school is implementing a targeted assistance school program, the school serves, pursuant to Section 1115(b)(2)(B) of ESSA, participating students using methods and instructional strategies to strengthen the academic program of the school, which may include, for example, expanded learning time, summer programs, and/or a tiered model to prevent and address behavioral problems.

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ● **N/A**

12. If the school is implementing a targeted assistance school program, the school serves participating students by coordinating with and supporting the regular educational program as required by Section 1115(b)(2)(C) of ESSA.

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ● **N/A**

13. If the school is implementing a targeted assistance school program, the school serves participating students by providing professional development to, for example, teachers, administrators, classified staff, and/or other school personnel who work with participating students as required by Section 1115(b)(2)(D) of ESSA.

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ● **N/A**

14. If the school is implementing a targeted assistance school program, the school serves, pursuant to Section 1115(b)(2)(E) of ESSA, participating students by implementing strategies to increase the involvement of parents of participating students in accordance with Section 1116 of ESSA.

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ● **N/A**

15. If the school is implementing a targeted assistance school program, the school serves participating students, to the extent appropriate and applicable, by coordinating with other federal, state, and local programs, including but not limited to the implementation of improvement activities in schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, as required by Section 1115(b)(2)(F) of ESSA.

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ● **N/A**

16. If the school is implementing a targeted assistance school program, the school serves participating students by reviewing the progress of participating students on an ongoing basis and revising the targeted assistance program, if necessary, to provide additional assistance to meet challenging state academic standards as required by Section 1115(b)(2)(G) of ESSA.

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ● **N/A**

Schools Identified for Targeted Support and Improvement

17. If identified for targeted support and improvement pursuant to Section 1111(d)(2) of ESSA, the school developed and implemented a plan to improve student outcomes that, among other items, was informed by all indicators, including student performance against long-term goals; included evidence-based interventions; and, approved by local leadership. For reference, "evidence-based" is defined in ESSA Section 8101(21).

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ● **N/A**

All School Programs

18. The school provides professional development for staff that is in accordance with the purpose of Title II of ESSA; addresses the needs of all students; and, strives to ensure all students are college, career and transition ready as intended by Section 2103 of ESSA, which governs the local use of Title II funding.

- ● **Yes**
- ○ No
- ○ N/A

19. The school collects and publicly disseminates, in compliance with Kentucky's Consolidated State Plan and in alignment with Section 1111(g)(1)(B), data through the School Report Card that addresses students' access to effective/experienced teachers.

- ● **Yes**
- ○ No
- ○ N/A

20. The school ensures that, if the Title I application includes funding for certified or classified positions (e.g. counselors, nurses, media specialists, etc.), there is documentation indicating such is needed to improve student achievement. This ensures the use is reasonable and necessary in compliance with the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), including 2 CFR 200.403 and 200.405.

- ● **Yes**
- ○ No
- ○ N/A

21. The school ensures that all teachers and paraprofessionals working in a program supported with Title I, Part A funding meet applicable state certification and licensure requirements as required by Section 1111(g)(2)(J) of ESSA.

- ● **Yes**
- ○ No
- ○ N/A

22. The school distributes to parents and family members of participating children a written parent and family engagement policy, agreed on by such parents, that complies with Section 1116(c)-(f) of ESSA and is in an understandable and uniform format as required by Section 1116(b) of ESSA. For reference, Section 1116(b) of ESSA allows existing parent and family engagement policies the school may have in place to be amended to meet the requirements under Title I, Part A.

- ● **Yes**
- ○ No
- ○ N/A

All School Programs

e Prove diagnostics

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)

2019-20 Phase Three: Title I Annual Review Diagnostic_10292019_14:22

2019-20 Phase Three: Title I Annual Review Diagnostic

Sinking Fork Elementary School
Leslie Lancaster
5005 Princeton Road
Hopkinsville, Kentucky, 42240
United States of America

Last Modified: 11/13/2019
Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

e Prove diagnostics

2019-20 Phase Three: Title I Annual Review Diagnostic

2019-20 Phase Three: Title I Annual Review Diagnostic

Schools with a Title I schoolwide program must conduct a yearly evaluation of the program as required under 34 CFR §200.26 and ESSA Section 1114(b)(3). Please respond to each of the following questions about the annual evaluation of your school's schoolwide program. For more information about schoolwide program requirements, consult the Title I Handbook and 34 CFR §200.26. Documentation is not required and, therefore, is optional.

e Prove diagnostics

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Rationale: A school operating a schoolwide program must conduct a comprehensive needs assessment in accordance with ESSA Section 1114(b). Through the needs assessment, a school must consult with a broad range of stakeholders and examine relevant data to understand students' needs and their root causes.

1. Describe the effectiveness of your needs assessment process.

The Continuous Improvement Team for Sinking Fork Elementary School follows a protocol to review data to determine effectiveness of strategies implemented. The Continuous Improvement Team consists of the principal, assistant principal, guidance counselors, teachers, parents, and students. School Administrators participate in monthly Administrator Academy and monthly Curriculum Leadership Team Meetings. Gather and organize data: School leaders gather and organize data. Data is reviewed at monthly Curriculum Leadership Team meetings. School leaders review: state accountability data, attendance data, Quantile, Lexile, District Standard Assessment Data, common and formative assessment data. The data is shared by the schools with the district through a shared Google spreadsheet that is used for monitoring purposes. (See Attached 5X monitoring) Review current and past performance: Continuous Improvement Team identifies areas where the school met/failed to meet district, state/federal targets, or school expectations for academic proficiency, academic gap, academic growth, transition readiness, and graduation rate. Continuous Improvement Team conducts disaggregated analysis by grade level, content area, within content strands (e.g. number sense in mathematics) and by gap groups.

Schoolwide Plan

Rationale: The schoolwide program must incorporate strategies to improve academic achievement throughout the school, but particularly for the lowest-achieving students, by addressing the needs identified in the comprehensive needs assessment. ESSA Section 1114(b)(7). The schoolwide plan must include a description of how the strategies the school will be implementing will provide opportunities and address the learning needs of all students in the school, particularly the needs of the lowest-achieving students. The plan must explain how the methods and instructional strategies that the school intends to use will strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum, including programs and activities necessary to provide a well-rounded education. ESSA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii).

2. Describe the effectiveness of the strategies that were implemented as part of the schoolwide program in meeting the requirements above. Please cite the data sources used in the evaluation of the strategies.

K-6 Literacy Cohort: Provide training for teacher leaders and Instructional Coaches to develop, implement, and support a district wide guided reading model at elementary and middle school levels. Data source: F&P Levels; Reading Inventory; KPREP data; District Standards Assessments; Coaching observations Instructional Rounds/Deep Dive Data protocol work.Teachers Intentionally Learning Together (TILT): Literacy Academy - Robust classroom cultures, teacher teams who study to interpret standards and develop plans, students who engage in meaningful discussions. In order for our excellence to become systemic, we need to leverage the most effective instructional practices, putting teacher leaders at the center of engaging, relevant professional dialogues aimed at improving practice districtwide to benefit ALL students. TILT is the mechanism we will use to transfer knowledge and skills teachers need in order to help ALL students meet the cognitive demand of standards for 21st century success. Data source: F&P Levels; Reading Inventory; KPREP data; District Standards Assessments; Coaching observations Instructional Rounds/Deep Dive Data protocol work Content Area/Disciplinary Reading: Grades 6 - 12 Literacy Intervention Project in partnership with KDE. In partnership with Literacy Specialists from KDE, pilot teams at CCMS and CCHS are engaging in embedded professional learning to develop a shared vision of disciplinary literacy and implement instructional strategies to support student acquisition of necessary skills. Job-embedded coaching and collaborative teacher planning will occur through school-based professional learning communities. Data source: F&P Levels RI Growth DSA Proficiency Coaching observations Instructional Rounds dataProfessional Learning and Coaching: Content area teachers will be provided with training and resources in order to deliver instruction that matches the cognitive demand of the standards. Included in this strategy is resource development, job-embedded training, and coaching. Job embedded coaching follow up for K-6 Literacy Cohort and Literacy Academy TILT sessions. Data source: F&P Levels; Reading Inventory; KPREP data; District Standards Assessments; Coaching observations Instructional Rounds/Deep Dive Data protocol work ; PLC minutesCurriculum Planning and Unit Planning: Participation in developing and refining district curriculum documents and benchmark assessments. Teacher representatives from our school participated in collaborative curriculum review and planning. Data source: F&P Levels; RI Growth; DSA Proficiency Professional Learning Communities (PLCs): will be implemented district wide for whole-staff involvement in a process of intensive reflection upon instructional practices and desired student benchmarks, as well as monitoring of outcomes to ensure success. PLCs enable teachers to continually learn from one another via shared visioning and planning, as well as in-depth critical examination of what does and doesn't work to enhance student achievement. Data source: F&P Levels, RI Growth DSA Proficiency Coaching observations Instructional Rounds dataPBIS: Implementing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) to minimize the impact of negative behaviors impacting instructional time. Data source: Discipline data, PBIS fidelity audits

3. Describe the method used to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies to improve academic achievement throughout the school, but particularly for the lowest achieving students.

Sinking Fork Elementary school implements the the Plan-Do-Study-Act Cycle (PDSA) as part of our Professional Learning Community (PLC) for continuous improvement. The school focuses on the following questions: 1) What problem are we trying to solve? 2) What changes might we introduce and why? 3) How will we know what change is an actual improvement?We identify clear and specific measures we will use to determine success. Measures include such things as - such as F&P Levels; Reading/Math Inventory; KPREP data; District Standards Assessments; Coaching observations; Instructional Rounds/Deep Dive Data protocol work; PLC minutes to capture both the processes and the outcomes. The PDSA cycle consists of:Plan: This step clarifies the problem and identifies the overall aim; the tool, process, or change to implement; and more specific targets or objectives of the continuous improvement process. Do: This step involves the implementation of the tool, process, or change and the collection of both process and outcome data. Study: In this step, participants examine the collected data and consider the extent to which the specific targets or objectives met those identified in the Plan step, as well as the overall aim. Act: This last step integrates all the learning generated throughout the process. The stakeholders, as needed, make adjustments to the specific objectives or targets, formulate new theories or predictions, make changes to the overarching aim of the continuous improvement work, and/or modify any tools or processes being tested. Sinking Fork Elementary School also engages students in goal setting. Goals are short-term and achievable. Goals are reviewed with students and progress is monitored. Student success is celebrated and intervention is provided when students struggle to meet goals.Sinking Fork Elementary School provides Tier II and Tier III intervention for those students who are struggling to meet academic and behavior standards. Progress is monitored through the PLC process, PBiS committee, and specific RTI meetings to determine if the intervention is successful.

Evaluation of the Schoolwide Program

Rationale:

Schools with Title I schoolwide programs are required to annually evaluate the schoolwide plan, using data from state assessments, other student performance data, and perception data to determine if the schoolwide program has been effective in addressing the major problem areas and, in turn, increasing student achievement, particularly for the lowest-achieving students. Schools must annually revise the plan, as necessary, based on student needs and the results of the evaluation to ensure continuous improvement. ESSA Section 1114(b)(3); 34 C.F.R. § 200.26(c).

4. What revisions will be made to next year's schoolwide plan based on the results of the evaluation?

Collaboration- Sinking Fork Special Education resource teachers will collaborate with classroom teachers to ensure academic proficiency of students.Sinking Fork Elementary school implements the the Plan-Do-Study-Act Cycle (PDSA) as part of our Professional Learning Community (PLC) for continuous improvement. The school focuses on the following questions: 1) What problem are we trying to solve? 2) What changes might we introduce and why? 3) How will we know what change is an actual improvement?Vertical PLC/ Planning: Sinking Fork teachers will participate in vertical planning meetings (PLC's) to collaboratively create learning maps/guiding questions/ formative assessments for upcoming units.Reading Intervention: System-wide reading intervention programs, professional learning, and coaching support

Parent and Family Engagement (ESSA Section 1116)

Rationale:

Each school receiving Title I, Part A funds is required to conduct parent and family involvement activities as specified in ESSA Section 1116 (c)(1)-(5). Title I, Part A requires schools to develop jointly with, and distribute to, parents and family members of participating children a written parent and family engagement policy. In addition, as a component of the school-level parent and family engagement policy, each school shall jointly develop with parents for all children served a school-parent compact that outlines how parents, the entire school staff, and students will share the responsibility for improved student academic achievement and the means by which the school and parents will build and develop a partnership to help children achieve the State's high academic standards. ESSA Section 1116(d).

Districts must build the capacity for involvement of parents and family members as described in ESSA Section 1116(e). To the extent practicable, districts must provide opportunities for the informed participation of parents and family members, including parents and family members who have limited English proficiency, parents and family members with disabilities, and parents and family members of migratory children, as described in ESSA Section 1116(f).

5. Describe the effectiveness of your school's parent and family engagement program and the processes and data sources used to make this determination.

Sinking Fork Elementary School works with parents and families to review and revise the Parent/School/Student Compact each year. The compact outlines how parents, school staff, and students will share the responsibility for improved student achievement.Board Policy 02.4241 establishes that each school: 1) Commitment to a parent involvement process that provides for establishing an open, parent-friendly environment; Increasing parental participation; Improving two-way communication between school and home, including what their child will be expected to learn; and developing parental outreach programs. Sinking Fork Elementary School's SBDM Parent Involvement policy is reviewed each year by the SBDM council. An Annual Title I meeting is held each fall. The following parent and family engagement activities were held last year: Family Literacy Night, Family Math Night, Family STEM Night, Fall Parent Teacher Conferences, Spring Parent Teacher Conferences, Muffins With Mom, Donuts With Dad, Kindergarten Boo Hoo Breakfast, Winter Celebration, KIDS 2019 Event surveys, annual survey, and parent feedback are used to determine the effectiveness of offerings. Sinking Fork Elementary School also works very closely with the Family Resource and Youth Services Centers to support student achievement by supporting families.

6. Describe any changes that will be made to next year's parent and family engagement program based on your evaluation.

Based on feedback, Sinking Fork Elementary School will make the following changes to our Parent and Family Engagement program for the SY 18 - 19 school year: Sinking Fork Elementary will offer multiple opportunities for make and take parent events so that parents feel equipped to assist and support their child in their learning. Make and take opportunities will be incorporated into Reading, Math & STEM nights.Programs will be held at times that are convenient for more of the families working and will be advertised in multiple ways including newsletters, social media, websites and school announcement board.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
⊞ 5x Monitoring	state accountability data, attendance data, Quantile, Lexile, District Standard Assessment Data, common and formative assessment data. The data is shared by the schools with the district through a shared Google spreadsheet that is used for monitoring purposes	•

2019-20 Phase Three: Comprehensive Improvement Plan for Schools_10292019_14:19

2019-20 Phase Three: Comprehensive Improvement Plan for Schools

Sinking Fork Elementary School
Leslie Lancaster
5005 Princeton Road
Hopkinsville, Kentucky, 42240
United States of America

Last Modified: 12/06/2019
Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019-20 Phase Three: Comprehensive Improvement Plan for Schools

2019-20 Phase Three: Comprehensive Improvement Plan for Schools
Rationale
School improvement efforts are a collaborative process involving multiple stakeholders. Through the improvement planning process, leaders focus on priority needs, funding, and closing achievement gaps between identified subgroups of students. When implemented with fidelity, the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) cultivates an environment that promotes student growth and achievement.

Operational Definitions
Goal: Long-term three to five year targets based on the five (5) required school level goals. Elementary/middle schools must have goals for proficiency, separate academic indicator, gap, growth, and transition readiness. High schools must have goals for proficiency, separate academic indicator, gap, graduation rate, and transition readiness. Long-term targets should be informed by The Needs Assessment for Schools.

Objective: Short-term target to be attained by the end of the current academic year. There can be multiple objectives for each goal.

Strategy: An approach to systematically address the process, practice, or condition that the school will focus its efforts upon in order to reach its goals or objectives. There can be multiple strategies for each objective. The strategy can be based upon Kentucky's six (6) Key Core Work Processes listed below or another established improvement approach (i.e. *Six Sigma, Shipley, Baldridge, etc.*).

Activity: Actionable steps used to deploy the chosen strategy. There can be multiple activities for each strategy.

Key Core Work Processes: A series of processes identified by the Kentucky Department of Education that involve the majority of an organization's workforce and relate to its core competencies. These are the factors that determine an organization's success and help it prioritize areas for growth.

KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards
KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction
KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy
KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data
KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support
KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment

Measure of Success: Criteria that shows the impact of the work. The **measures** may be quantitative or qualitative, but are observable in some way.

Progress Monitoring: Process used to assess the implementation of the plan, the rate of improvement, and the effectiveness of the plan. Should include timelines and responsible individuals.

Funding: Local, state, or federal funds/grants used to support (or needed to support) the improvement initiative.

Requirements for Building an Improvement Plan
There are six (6) required district goals:
• Proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap closure, graduation rate, growth, and transition readiness.

The required school goals include the following:
• For elementary/middle school, these include: proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, and, growth.
• For high school, these include: proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, graduation rate, and transition readiness.

Using the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan Template

a. Develop your Strategic Goals using the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan Template.

b. **Upload** your completed Comprehensive School Improvement Plan in the attachment area below.

You may enter an optional narrative about your Comprehensive School Improvement Plan below. If you do not have an optional narrative, enter N/A.

Goal Builder Attached

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name

📄 Goal Builder 2019-2020

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
📄 Goal Builder 2019-2020	Goal Builder 2019-2020	•

Sinking Fork Elementary School

Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2019 – 2020

Understanding Continuous Improvement: Goals, Objectives, Strategies and Activities

Rationale: The development of goals and objectives to be obtained through strategies and activities is an essential component of executing a continuous improvement plan. In short, the Needs Assessment completed during Phase II expresses the school or district's CURRENT STATE, while goals, objectives, strategies and activities should succinctly plot the school or district's course to their DESIRED STATE. Here are the operational definitions of each:

Goal: Long-term target based on Kentucky Board of Education Goals. Schools may supplement with individual or district goals.

Objective: Short-term target to be attained by the end of the current school year.

Strategy: Research-based approach based on the 6 Key Core Work Processes designed to systematically address the process, practice or condition that the school/district will focus its efforts upon in order to reach its goals/objectives.

Activity: The actionable steps used to deploy the chosen strategy.

Key Core Work Processes: A series of processes that involve the majority of an organization's workforce and relate to its core competencies. These are the factors that determine an organization's success and help it prioritize areas for growth.

Guidelines for Building an Improvement Plan

- There are 5 required District Goals: Proficiency, Gap, Graduation rate, Growth, and Transition readiness.

- There are 4 required school-level goals:
  For elementary/middle school: Proficiency, Gap, Growth, and Transition readiness.
  For high school: Proficiency, Gap, Graduation rate, and Transition readiness.

Goal 1: Sinking Fork Elementary will Increase the number of students scoring proficient or above in combined reading and mathematics from 53.95% to 57.46% by 2020.

Objective	Strategy	Activities to deploy strategy	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring Date & Notes	Funding
Objective 1: Increase the number of students scoring proficient or above in reading from **46.1% to 55%** as indicated by EOY District Standards Assessments by June 2020 (grades 3-6).	**KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards** **KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction**	**K-6 Literacy Cohort:** Provide training and resources for teacher leaders and Instructional Coaches to develop, implement, and support a district wide guided reading model at the elementary and middle school levels.	F&P Levels RI Growth DSA Proficiency Coaching observations Instructional Rounds data	5X plans and data monitoring will be reviewed and feedback provided 45-90-135-180 day cycle.	Instructional Budget
	KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy **KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Interpret Data** **KCPW 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support** **KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment**	**Teachers Intentionally Learning Together (TILT):** In order for excellence to become systemic, we need to leverage the most effective instructional practices, putting teacher leaders at the center of engaging, relevant professional dialogues aimed at transferring and improving practice districtwide to benefit ALL students. TILT is the mechanism we will use to transfer knowledge and skills teachers need in order to help ALL students meet the cognitive demand of standards for 21st century success. Teachers will earn 6 hours of professional development credit through peer-facilitated professional learning aligned to teacher growth plans.	F&P Levels RI Growth DSA Proficiency Coaching observations Instructional Rounds data	5X plans and data monitoring will be reviewed and feedback provided 45-90-135-180 day cycle. See TILT calendar.	Grant Funded
		Vertical PLC/ Planning: Sinking Fork teachers will participate in vertical planning meetings (PLC's) to collaboratively create learning maps/guiding questions/formative assessments for upcoming units.	RI Growth DSA Proficiency Lesson Planning during PLCs Classroom Observations Instructional Rounds data	5X plans and data monitoring will be reviewed and feedback provided 45-90-135-180 day cycle. KDE support meetings PLC documentation	Grant Funded KDE Supported
		Professional Learning and Coaching: Content area teachers will be provided with training and resources in order to deliver instruction that matches the cognitive demand of the standards. Included in this strategy is resource development, job-embedded training, and coaching. Job embedded coaching follow up for K-6 Literacy Cohort and Literacy Academy TILT sessions.	F&P Levels RI Growth DSA Proficiency Coaching observations Instructional Rounds data	5X plans and data monitoring will be reviewed and feedback provided 45-90-135-180 day cycle.	Title II

Strategy	Evidence / Metrics	Monitoring	Funding
Curriculum Alignment: Sinking Fork will work in partnership with the District as we continue to implement a systemic process for developing and refining district curriculum documents and benchmark assessments. Teacher representatives from all schools participate in collaborative curriculum review and planning with support from LDC partners who will conduct an audit and recommend changes.	F&P Levels RI Growth DSA Proficiency	SX plans and data monitoring will be reviewed and feedback provided 45-90-135-180 day cycle.	SRCL Grant Funded
Deep Dive - Professional learning provided to all school teams districtwide. School team determines a problem of practice after completing a needs assessment related to differentiation practices in the school. The School Team will also complete a deep analysis into multiple data points using the district data protocol to further inform action plans. . Partner teams and district staff conduct instructional rounds for the problem of practice. Additional district observations will be conducted as well. Sinking Fork's problem of practice is authentic learning for 2019-2020.	Observable evidence of differentiation Instructional Rounds data	School Implementation Plans Data: October Rounds: November - March	District Funded
Stakeholder Engagement: Survey staff, parents, students. Provide training and support on collecting information, survey data rollout to stakeholders, and creation of action plans. Utilize information to reward and recognize, build relationships, validate key behaviors, and support employee retention.	Employee Engagement Survey results	Division meetings to debrief rounds data Administrator Academy Curriculum Leadership Team	Title II
Curriculum Leadership Team: Monthly curriculum meetings led by the Chief Instructional Officer and instructional staff to build school leader efficacy around professional learning communities, data analysis, response protocols, and instructional practices.	School teams engage in data-driven decision making to support quality instruction	Observations of school teams during CLT School Plans from CLT	No Funding Required
Professional Learning Communities (PLCs): Sinking Fork's PLC schedule and routine is set to include- Plan, Do, Study, Act model. This model will include planning (pacing, learning map and guiding questions), assessment building, quality instruction, formative assessment, RTI and data analysis weeks to ensure academic proficiency of students. PLCs enable teachers to continually learn from one another via shared visioning and planning, as well as in-depth critical examination of what *does* and *doesn't* work to enhance student achievement. Sinking Fork's PLC's are differentiated for each teacher, grade and content area.	F&P Levels RI Growth DSA Proficiency Coaching observations Instructional Rounds data	SX plans and data monitoring will be reviewed and feedback provided 45-90-135-180 day cycle.	No Funding Required

Initiative	Data/Measure	Monitoring	Funding
Instructional Rounds:	Instructional Rounds data School Plans based on Rounds data	Instructional Rounds problem of practice focused on improving instructional practice connected to 5X Monitoring plans 45-90-135-180 day cycle.	No Funding Required
Assessment Plan: School assessment plan developed aligning to 5X monitoring utilizing consistent data points	School Assessment Plan	5X plans and data monitoring will be reviewed and feedback provided 45-90-135-180 day cycle.	No Funding Required
Attendance Matters: Participation in national campaign promoting the fact that missing school matters.	Attendance Records	5X plans and data monitoring will be reviewed and feedback provided 45-90-135-180 day cycle.	No Funding Required
Curriculum Leadership Team: Sinking Fork Elementary School leadership will participate in Monthly curriculum meetings led by the chief instructional officer and instructional staff focusing professional learning community data analysis and response protocols.	engage in data-driven decision making to support quality instruction	Observations of school teams during CLT School Plans from CLT	No Funding Required
Leader Rounding on Staff: Collect vital information, reward and recognize, build relationships, validate key behaviors, build engagement for all stakeholders.	Employee Engagement Survey results	Division meetings to debrief rounds data	No Funding Required
Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy initiatives The following initiatives are offered through the support of this grant and a K12 Literacy Coach: **Kentucky Literacy Intervention Project:** Grades 6 - 12 Literacy Intervention Project in partnership with KDE through the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy grants. In partnership with Literacy Specialists from KDE, teams at the middle and high schools are engaging in professional learning to develop a shared vision of disciplinary literacy and implement instructional strategies to support student acquisition of necessary skills. Job-embedded coaching and collaborative teacher planning will occur through school-based	RI Growth DSA Proficiency Lesson Planning during PLCs Classroom Observations Instructional Rounds data	5X plans and data monitoring will be reviewed and feedback provided 45-90-135-180 day cycle. KDE support meetings PLC documentation	Grant Funded; KDE Supported

		professional learning communities and the administrator who is participating in the learning as well.			Online support documentation (FlipGrid and Google Classroom) School Literacy Plans and School Literacy Team agendas (3x per semester) Monthly Online submissions through cohort Google Classroom
		Literacy Design Collaborative Coach and Learn Teams: Grades 3-12 Professional learning through the intensive LDC coach training for district staff, as well as one coach per building in elementary/middle and 2 per building for each high school. LDC Learn teams are supported by LDC Coach, and participate in creation of high-quality tasks built on focus standards, disciplinary literacy, and aligned instruction.			
		Early Childhood Literacy Academy: Preschool teachers in every building participate in the academy to build capacity around quality early childhood literacy instruction.			
		School Literacy Plans supported by Literacy Teams: As required by the grant, every school will establish School Literacy Teams that will monitor implementation of School Literacy Plans and report to SBDM 3 times per semesters.			
		Supplemental Phonics Program: Select and purchase a supplemental phonics program K-6 to create a cohesive approach to phonics instruction K-6 districtwide. Professional learning support will be offered for implementation and administrator monitoring of phonics instruction.			
		PBIS: Support teachers in implementing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) to minimize the impact of negative behaviors impacting instructional time.	Students will not lose instruction due to disciplinary issues	Discipline Reports	General Fund
		K - 6 Math Cohort: Provide content and pedagogical instruction for teacher leaders and Instructional Coaches to develop, implement, and support district wide best-practices instruction in mathematics at elementary .	MI Growth DSA Proficiency Coaching observations Instructional Rounds data	5X plans and data monitoring will be reviewed and feedback provided 45-90-135-180 day cycle.	Grant Funded
		Teachers Intentionally Learning Together (TILT): See Goal 1 - Objective 1			
Objective 2: Increase the number of students scoring proficient or above in mathematics from 57.7% to 62.7 as indicated by EOY District Standards Assessment by June 2020 (Grades 3-6.)	KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards	**Professional Learning and Coaching:** See Goal 1 - Objective 1			
	KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction	**Curriculum Planning and Unit Planning:** See Goal 1 - Objective 1			
		Professional Learning Communities (PLCs): See Goal 1 - Objective 1			
	KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy	**Deep Dive:** See Goal 1 - Objective 1			
		Assessment Plan: See Goal 1 - Objective 1			
		Attendance Matters: See Goal 1 - Objective 1			

KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Interpret Data	Curriculum Leadership Team: See Goal 1 - Objective 1
	PBIS: See Goal 1 - Objective 1
	Deep Dive: See Goal 1 - Objective 1
KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment	Google Classroom - support teachers in the use of Google classroom to save time, collaborate, communicate, and better meet the needs of all students
	Professional Learning and Coaching: See Goal 1 - Objective 1
	Professional Learning Communities (PLCs): See Goal 1 - Objective 1
	Curriculum Planning and Unit Planning: See Goal 1 - Objective 1
	Teachers Intentionally Learning Together (TILT): See Goal 1 - Objective 1

2: Separate Academic Indicator

Goal 2 Separate Academic Indicators: Sinking Fork will Increase the combined percentage of students scoring proficient or above in Science, Social Studies, and Writing from 32.83 % to 32.83% by 2022.

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1: Increase the percentage of elementary students scoring proficient or above in science from 29.16% to31.10% by 2020.	KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment	**Science:** Continue formally established protocols for completing Through Course Tasks with science teachers K-6 and for student work analysis. Continue to support K-6 Science Cohort with demonstration lessons and TILT sessions. **Literacy in Science:** LDC Anchor Modules will be implemented with a common focus across all schools. Ongoing professional learning will occur in development of rigorous tasks, standards and instruction alignment, and best practice in science 3-dimensional instructional practices.	Teacher participation in science specific professional learning Teacher created science assessments and lessons Student writing products Student Scores Sheets for LDC Completion of LDC learning modules for Learn participants	Monitoring of aligned instruction and assessment practices through PLCs Data protocol in PLCs Student writing products Students Scores Sheets for LDC Anchor Modules Teacher feedback from LDC Learn Cohorts LDC Core Tools reports	General Fund General Fund

Objective	Strategy (KCWP)	Activities	Measures of Success	Evidence	Funding Source
Objective 2: Increase the percentage of elementary students scoring proficient or above in **social studies** from 35.48to 37.84% by 2020.	KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment	**Social Studies:** Social studies teachers will engage in work to understand the depth and breadth of newly-adopted social studies standards, including deconstruction, mapping, assessment development, and instructional practices aligned to meet the cognitive demand of the standards. Continue formally established protocols for completing Literacy Design Collaborative through-course tasks with social studies teachers K-6. Teachers will design, plan, and implement a LDC task and will follow a protocol for student work analysis.	Completion of standards learning modules through PLCs or professional learning Completion of pacing/mapping/deconstruction Teacher created Social Studies assessments and lessons	Monitoring of aligned instruction and assessment practices through PLCs Data protocol in PLCs	General Fund
Objective 3: Increase the percentage of elementary students scoring proficient or above in **writing** from 33.87% to 36.13% by 2020.	KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment	**Literacy in Social Studies:** LDC Anchor Modules will be implemented with a common focus across all schools. Ongoing professional learning will occur in development of rigorous tasks, standards and instruction alignment, and best practice in social studies instructional practices around inquiry and historical thinking. Sinking Fork will revise/ create a writing plan.	Student writing products Student Scores Sheets for LDC Completion of LDC learning modules for Learn participants School Writing PlansSystemwide implementation of School Writing Plans with attention to disciplinary writing and LDC implementation) DSA for Reading, Writing, and Math Attainment of writing goals on Scorecard	Student writing products Students Scores Sheets for LDC Anchor Modules Teacher feedback from LDC Learn Cohorts LDC Core Tools reports Student writing products DSA Extended Responses Teacher/administrator feedback in PLCs Monitoring of writing plan implementation and writing portfolio	General Fund General Fund
		Sinking Fork will implement and monitor their writing plan.			

	Description	Measures	Funding Source
Writing: Teachers K-6 engaged in foundational learning experiences to prepare for the development of a school -wide vision for writing across all content areas to meet the demand of standards (Literacy Design Collaborative, KAS ELA and Content Literacy Standards, TCT for Science). Moving forward, additional professional learning opportunities will be provided through TILT to support teacher acquisition of skills needed to teach students 21st century literacy skills.	School Writing Plan Systemwide implementation of School Writing Plan (with attention to disciplinary writing and LDC implementation) DSA for Reading, Writing, and Math Attainment of writing goals on Scorecard	Student writing products DSA Extended Responses Teacher/administrator feedback in PLCs Monitoring of writing plan implementation and writing portfolio	General Fund
Literacy Design Collaborative: Implementation of Anchor Modules aligned to a district LDC Curriculum Map will occur with emphasis on disciplinary writing and authentic writing products.	Student writing products Student Scores Sheets for LDC Completion of LDC learning modules for Learn participants	Student writing products Students Scores Sheets for LDC Anchor Modules Teacher feedback from LDC Learn Cohorts LDC Core Tools reports	General Fund Title II SRCL Grant

Goal 3 Growth: Increase the combined average growth score for Sinking Fork students from 53.92 to 64.70 by 2022.

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1: Increase the combined growth score for students from 53.92 to 57.51 by 2020.	KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards KCWP 2: Design and Delivery of Instruction	Provide feedback to students on their progression of learning	Lexile growth Quantile growth DSA Proficiency KPREP	RTI/MTSS meetings PLC data meetings Mid-year and End of Year Gains Analysis DSA Proficiency	Title I Instructional Budget General Fund
		Assist students in understanding of learning expectations (e.g., learning targets, goal setting, purpose) and know the criteria for success	Lexile growth Quantile growth DSA Proficiency KPREP	RTI/MTSS meetings PLC data meetings Mid-year and End of Year Gains Analysis DSA Proficiency	Title I Instructional Budget General Fund
	KCWP 2: Design and Delivery of Instruction KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy	Use appropriate and effective high yield strategies in order to ensure congruency to the intent of the learning target	Lexile growth Quantile growth DSA Proficiency KPREP	Observations PLCs	Instructional Budget General Fund
	KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data	Utilize formative and summative information for increased student achievement	Common, formative, summative assessments	PLCs	General Fund
	KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support Processes	Monitor and evaluate the use of assessment results to guide instruction and determine the grouping of students	Lexile growth Quantile growth DSA Proficiency KPREP	PLCs Observations RTI/MTSS meetings Transition meetings	General Fund Title I
		Determine which best practice strategies (e.g., interventionist, Read 180, ALEKS, modifications to schedules) will meet the identified needs of the students	Lexile growth Quantile growth DSA Proficiency KPREP	PLCs Observations RTI/MTSS meetings	General Fund Title I
	KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy	Design high quality assessments and aligned to the rigor of the	Common, formative, summative assessments	PLCs	General Fund

	KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data	standards resulting in quality data that is useful for guiding instruction

4: Achievement Gap

Goal 4 Achievement Gap: Increase the combined average percentage of students in the Consolidated Gap Group scoring proficient or above in reading and math from 34.90% to 42.18% by 2022.

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1: Increase the combined average percentage of **African American** students in the Consolidated Gap Group scoring proficient or above in reading and math from38.53 %to 39.82% by 2020.	KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment	**Reading Intervention:** System-wide reading intervention programs, professional learning, and coaching support will be provided by the district to all schools (READ 180, SYSTEM 44)	Improvement in Lexile scores	Quarterly implementation monitoring	Grant Funded
		Professional Learning Communities (PLCs): will be implemented district wide for whole-staff involvement in a process of intensive reflection upon instructional practices and desired student benchmarks, as well as monitoring of outcomes to ensure success. PLCs enable teachers to continually learn from one another via shared visioning and planning, as well as in-depth critical examination of what *does* and *doesn't* work to enhance student achievement.	Improvement in student achievement	Random PLC visits provided by administrative team to support SX Plan follow through.	No Funding Required

Objective	Strategy (KCWP)	Activity	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
		Cultural Leadership: Support and engage in positive cultural traditions of the community (Back-to-School Bash; Boys & Girls Club; Junior Achievement; EDC; Chamber of Commerce; Community Back-to-School prayer services; regional and community activities)	Increased Workplace Readiness/ College Readiness	Collaborative Planning	No Funding Required
Objective 2: Increase the combined average percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students in the Consolidated Gap Group scoring proficient or above in reading and math from 46.67% to 48.22%by 2020.	KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards KCWP 2: Design and Delivery of Instruction	Provide feedback to students on their progression of learning	Lexile growth Quantile growth DSA Proficiency KPREP	RTI/MTSS meetings PLC data meetings Mid-year and End of Year Gains Analysis DSA Proficiency	Title I Instructional Budget General Fund
		Assist students in understanding of learning expectations (e.g., learning targets, goal setting, purpose) and know the criteria for success	Lexile growth Quantile growth DSA Proficiency KPREP	RTI/MTSS meetings PLC data meetings Mid-year and End of Year Gains Analysis DSA Proficiency	Title I Instructional Budget General Fund
	KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment	Ensure equitable access to a meaningful and rigorous academic curriculum that is respectful to diverse learners, helps to develop their character, and helps them to be successful	Culturally appropriate teaching and learning	Observations PLCs	General Fund
		Communicate with and support parents/families in order to address barriers to learning	Addressing student needs	FRYSC Nursing logs SRO Mental Health PLCs	Title I General Fund
Objective 3: Increase the combined average percentage of Students with Disabilities in the Consolidated Gap Group scoring proficient or above in reading and math from 21.42 %to 22.13%by 2020.	KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment	Priority scheduling: Refine the process for priority scheduling for students with disabilities that ensures the master schedule meets individual needs identified in students Individual Education Plans (IEPs).	Achievement Gap Closure Increased Proficiency	Collaborative Planning	General Fund
		Specially Designed Instruction: Ensure students with disabilities are receiving SDI as stated on their IEP's.	Achievement Gap Closure Increased Proficiency	Collaborative Planning	IDEA B

		Accommodations: Ensure appropriate accommodations are being used throughout the school year for students with disabilities to provide equal access to the general curriculum.	Achievement Gap Closure Increased Proficiency	Collaborative Planning	General Fund IDEA B
Objective 4: Increase the combined average percentage of English Learners including Monitored in the Consolidated Gap Group scoring proficient or above in reading and math from 33.33% to 34.44 by 2020.	KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment	PLC Cycle 1 Planning for Instruction: EL teachers will participate in cycle 1 of professional learning communities to provide job-embedded support to general education teachers as they plan for instruction for English Learners. English Learners: Build language proficiency with differentiated, supplemental instructional resources that target listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Quarterly conferences	Participation in PLCs Observations ACCESS scores DSA scores Rubrics	Observations District EL Teacher PLC Observations PLC	No Funding Required Title III
Objective 5: Increase Kindergarten readiness scores by 10% District wide as measured by Brigance by October 2020.	KCWP2: Design and Deliver Instruction KCWP4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data KCWP5: Design, Align and Deliver Support KCWP6: Establishing Learning culture and Environment	Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy grant initiatives Early Childhood Literacy Academy: Preschool teachers in every building participate in the academy to build capacity around quality early childhood literacy instruction. School Literacy Plans supported by Literacy Teams: As required by the grant, every school will establish School Literacy Teams that will monitor implementation of School Literacy Plans and report to SBDM 3 times per semesters. Engage daycare/preschool partners to increase quality literacy experiences for early literacy learners through professional learning and resources provided by SRCL grant.	Brigance kindergarten readiness scores Documentation of online participation in Early Childhood Literacy Academy	Grant Reporting	Grant Funded

		Lexile growth Quantile Growth	State/Grant Funded
Primary Program Success: Preschool students (at-risk and students with disabilities) are tracked throughout their primary program to measure their level of success.	Data spreadsheet Reading Inventory Math Inventory Former MAP Scores		
Preschool Literacy Curriculum: Review and select reading program to support students and prepare them for Kindergarten.	Brigance kindergarten readiness scores	Grant Reporting	Grant Funded

5: Partnerships

Goal 7: *Encourage sustainable partnerships among all stakeholder groups and with the Christian County community*

Objective	Strategy	Activities to deploy strategy	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring Date & Notes	Funding
Objective 1: Participation in Parent Satisfaction Survey will have 25% of households responding.	KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment	**Parent and family participation:** Sinking Fork will communicate with to stakeholders the opportunity to participate in the parent satisfaction. Stakeholder feedback will be used to create school and district action plans.	Measure of parent and family participation	Monitoring participation School action plans Review at Administrator Academy School Scorecard	Title I Parent & Family Engagement
Objective 2: Achieve parent satisfaction baseline from 3.84 to 3.90 on *"I receive positive phone calls, emails, or notes about my child from school"* *This goal has been updated*	KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment	**Positive Communication:** Families will receive a visit, call, personal note home to communicate something positive about the child.	Improvement of parent satisfaction	Monitoring teacher communication of positive contacts at Administrator Academies.	Title I Parent & Family Engagement
		Positive Communication: District will provide postage-paid 'Good News' postcards to all schools to communicate with parents and families.		Monitoring teacher communication of positive contacts at Administrator Academies School Scorecard	Title I Parent & Family Engagement

Objective	KCWP		Measures		Funding Sources
Objective 3: Increase parent satisfaction baseline from 3.95 to 4.0 on *"I regularly receive feedback from school staff on how well my child is learning"*	KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment	**Communication:** Families will receive communication about the child's learning and behavior progress at school.	Improvement of parent satisfaction	Share their process of communicating at Administrator Academies School Scorecard	Title I Part A Parent & Family Engagement Title II
Objective 4: Increase Kindergarten Readiness by ten percent from 44% to 54% by September 2020.	KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment	**Partnerships:** Collaborate with community partners to provide education to parents and families, early learning centers, and health care providers to better prepare young learners for Kindergarten entry.	Kindergarten Readiness Rates	Agenda Attendance Community participation School Scorecard	Striving Reader Grant Title I Part A Parent & Family Engagement