

CIWP Team & Schedules

Resources 

Indicators of Quality CIWP: CIWP Team

The CIWP team includes staff reflecting the diversity of student demographics and school programs.
 The CIWP team has 8-12 members. Sound rationale is provided if team size is smaller or larger.
 The CIWP team includes leaders who are responsible for implementing Foundations, those with institutional memory and those most impacted.
 The CIWP team includes parents, community members, and LSC members.
 All CIWP team members are meaningfully involved in the planning process for CIWP components and include other stakeholders, as appropriate for their role, with involvement along the [CPS Spectrum of Inclusive Partnerships](#) (from the CPS Equity Framework).

[CIWP Team Guidance](#)

Name	Role	Email
Louis C. Davis	Principal	lcdavis2@cps.edu
Tiffany Heard	AP	tmarshall11@cps.edu
Kelicia Hopkins	Curriculum & Instruction Lead	kljones4@cps.edu
Lynn Daguerre	Postsecondary Lead	lydaguerre@cps.edu
Paul Hoskins	Connectedness & Wellbeing Lead	phoskins@cps.edu
Sheila Garrett	LSC Member	sheliagarrett6929@gmail.com
Loretta Edwards	Teacher Leader	lcedwards@cps.edu
Eileen Ivers	Inclusive & Supportive Learning Lead	eeivers@cps.edu
Patricia Bell	Partnerships & Engagement Lead	pmbell2@cps.edu
Harlem Winston	Teacher Leader	
	Select Role	

Initial Development Schedule

Outline your schedule for developing each component of the CIWP.

CIWP Components	Planned Start Date	Planned Completion Date
Team & Schedule	5/22/23	6/2/22
Reflection: Curriculum & Instruction (Instructional Core)	6/26/23	6/26/23
Reflection: Inclusive & Supportive Learning (Instructional Core)	6/26/23	6/26/23
Reflection: Connectedness & Wellbeing	6/26/23	6/26/23
Reflection: Postsecondary Success	6/26/23	6/26/23
Reflection: Partnerships & Engagement	6/26/23	6/26/23
Priorities	7/3/23	7/3/23
Root Cause	7/3/23	7/3/23
Theory of Acton	7/3/23	7/3/23
Implementation Plans	7/10/23	7/10/23
Goals	7/10/23	7/10/23
Fund Compliance	7/17/23	7/17/23
Parent & Family Plan	7/17/23	7/17/23
Approval	7/24/23	7/24/23

SY24 Progress Monitoring Schedule

Indicate the SY24 dates when your CIWP team will hold progress monitoring check-ins.
 As a reference, these dates will auto-populate in your implementation plans.

CIWP Progress Monitoring Meeting Dates

Quarter 1	
Quarter 2	
Quarter 3	
Quarter 4	

Indicators of a Quality CIWP: Reflection on Foundations

Schools reflect by triangulating various data sources, inclusive of quantitative and qualitative data, and disaggregated by student groups.
 Reflections can be supported by available and relevant evidence and accurately represent the school's implementation of practices.
 Stakeholders are consulted for the Reflection of Foundations.
 Schools consider the impact of current ongoing efforts in the Reflection on Foundation.

Resources 

[Reflection on Foundations Protocol](#)


[Return to Top](#)

Curriculum & Instruction

Using the associated references, is this practice consistently implemented?	References	What are the takeaways after the review of metrics?	Metrics
Yes	<p>All teachers, PK-12, have access to high quality curricular materials, including foundational skills materials, that are standards-aligned and culturally responsive.</p> <p>CPS High Quality Curriculum Rubrics</p>	<p>IAR: 38% of students in 3rd-8th grade did not meet expectations for IAR ELA; 48% of students in 3rd-8th grade did not meet expectations for IAR in Math. These numbers were higher in SY22 (56% for ELA; 55% for Math). 3rd Grade students had the highest percentage of students who did not meet expectations in ELA (73%) and Math (58%). Subclaim Performance for Math is as follows: 78% did not meet or partially met expectations for Additional & Supporting Content, 82% did not meet or partially met expectations for Major Content, 77% did not meet or partially met expectations for Mathematical Reasoning, and 83% did not meet or partially met expectations for Modeling Application. Subclaim Performance for Reading is as follows: 65% did not meet or partially met expectations for Informational Text, 66% did not meet or partially met expectations for Literary Text, and 57% did not meet or partially met expectations for vocabulary. Subclaim Performance for Writing is as follows: 80% did not meet or partially met expectations for Language Conventions and 83% did not meet or partially met expectations for Written Expressions. iReady: 9% of K-2 students are two or more grade levels below in math. Compared to BOY, this is an 18% decrease. 48% of K-2 students are one grade level below, 21% are early on grade level and 22% are mid or above grade level. Kindergarten has the highest percentage of students mid or above grade level for math at 48%. 8% of K-2 students are two or more grade levels below in reading. Compared to BOY, this is a 14% decrease. 43% of students are one grade level below, 19% of students are early on grade level, and 29% of students are mid or above grade level. Kindergarten has the highest percentage of students mid or above grade level for reading at 53%. A higher percentage of male students are two or more grade levels below than female students (43%:25%). ACCESS: For the past three years, 100% of students who are eligible to participate in ACCESS testing are not reaching proficiency. Cultivate Survey: Based on Cultivate Survey Data from MOY, students in grades 5th -8th reported not having a learning environment that meets the conditions that are needed to learn. Per the survey data, our lowest Mindset and Strategies for all students were Growth Mindset, Academic Risk Taking and Belonging. Curriculum: High quality curriculums were implemented for all content subjects (My View/Perspective, EnVision, Skyline & Amplify). Grades: We ended SY23 with an on-track rate of 29%. 32% of students were almost on-track, 9% of students were near on-track, 14% of students were far from on-track and 16% of students were off-track. Students in 7th grade had the lowest on-track rate with 21% and students in 3rd and 8th grades had the highest off-track rate with 19%. Students in 4th grade had the highest on-track rate with 42% and the lowest off-track rate with 8%.</p>	<p>IAR (Math)</p> <p>IAR (English)</p> <p>Rigor Walk Data (School Level Data)</p> <p>PSAT (EBRW)</p> <p>PSAT (Math)</p>
Yes	<p>Students experience grade-level, standards-aligned instruction.</p> <p>Rigor Walk Rubric</p> <p>Teacher Team Learning Cycle Protocols</p> <p>Quality Indicators Of Specially Designed Instruction</p>	<p>What is the feedback from your stakeholders?</p> <p>Although we implemented a high quality curriculum with fidelity, teachers felt that the curriculum did not address the needs of students for ELA. In diving deep into the curriculum, it was noted that there were no opportunities for differentiated instruction aligned to student assessment data and often times the learning targets did not fully address or align the Common Core State Standards. No opportunities were embedded for the modeling of a skill/strategy and the units in the curriculum did not have a good balance of literature and informational text. Per teachers, we did not balance the learning/professional development opportunities for ELA and Math (there was more focus on ELA through the PLC). There was no intense development around providing small group instruction and progress monitoring.</p>	<p>STAR (Reading)</p> <p>STAR (Math)</p> <p>iReady (Reading)</p> <p>iReady (Math)</p> <p>Cultivate</p> <p>Grades</p> <p>ACCESS</p> <p>TS Gold</p> <p>Interim Assessment Data</p>
Partially	<p>Schools and classrooms are focused on the Inner Core (identity, community, and relationships) and leverage research-based, culturally responsive powerful practices to ensure the learning environment meets the conditions that are needed for students to learn.</p> <p>Powerful Practices Rubric</p> <p>Learning Conditions</p>	<p>What is the feedback from your stakeholders?</p> <p>Although we implemented a high quality curriculum with fidelity, teachers felt that the curriculum did not address the needs of students for ELA. In diving deep into the curriculum, it was noted that there were no opportunities for differentiated instruction aligned to student assessment data and often times the learning targets did not fully address or align the Common Core State Standards. No opportunities were embedded for the modeling of a skill/strategy and the units in the curriculum did not have a good balance of literature and informational text. Per teachers, we did not balance the learning/professional development opportunities for ELA and Math (there was more focus on ELA through the PLC). There was no intense development around providing small group instruction and progress monitoring.</p>	<p>STAR (Math)</p> <p>iReady (Reading)</p> <p>iReady (Math)</p> <p>Cultivate</p> <p>Grades</p> <p>ACCESS</p> <p>TS Gold</p> <p>Interim Assessment Data</p>
Partially	<p>The ILT leads instructional improvement through distributed leadership.</p> <p>Continuum of ILT Effectiveness</p> <p>Distributed Leadership</p>	<p>What is the feedback from your stakeholders?</p> <p>Although we implemented a high quality curriculum with fidelity, teachers felt that the curriculum did not address the needs of students for ELA. In diving deep into the curriculum, it was noted that there were no opportunities for differentiated instruction aligned to student assessment data and often times the learning targets did not fully address or align the Common Core State Standards. No opportunities were embedded for the modeling of a skill/strategy and the units in the curriculum did not have a good balance of literature and informational text. Per teachers, we did not balance the learning/professional development opportunities for ELA and Math (there was more focus on ELA through the PLC). There was no intense development around providing small group instruction and progress monitoring.</p>	<p>STAR (Math)</p> <p>iReady (Reading)</p> <p>iReady (Math)</p> <p>Cultivate</p> <p>Grades</p> <p>ACCESS</p> <p>TS Gold</p> <p>Interim Assessment Data</p>
Yes	<p>School teams implement balanced assessment systems that measure the depth and breadth of student learning in relation to grade-level standards, provide actionable evidence to inform decision-making, and monitor progress towards end of year goals.</p> <p>Customized Balanced Assessment Plan</p> <p>ES Assessment Plan Development Guide</p> <p>HS Assessment Plan Development</p>	<p>What is the feedback from your stakeholders?</p> <p>Although we implemented a high quality curriculum with fidelity, teachers felt that the curriculum did not address the needs of students for ELA. In diving deep into the curriculum, it was noted that there were no opportunities for differentiated instruction aligned to student assessment data and often times the learning targets did not fully address or align the Common Core State Standards. No opportunities were embedded for the modeling of a skill/strategy and the units in the curriculum did not have a good balance of literature and informational text. Per teachers, we did not balance the learning/professional development opportunities for ELA and Math (there was more focus on ELA through the PLC). There was no intense development around providing small group instruction and progress monitoring.</p>	<p>STAR (Math)</p> <p>iReady (Reading)</p> <p>iReady (Math)</p> <p>Cultivate</p> <p>Grades</p> <p>ACCESS</p> <p>TS Gold</p> <p>Interim Assessment Data</p>
Partially	<p>Evidence-based assessment for learning practices are enacted daily in every classroom.</p> <p>Assessment for Learning Reference Document</p>	<p>What, if any, related improvement efforts are in progress? What is the impact? Do any of your efforts address barriers/obstacles for our student groups furthest from opportunity?</p> <p>Based on feedback from teachers, we have decided to adopt the Skyline Curriculum for ELA for SY24. The impact will be that students will still have access to a high quality curriculum where learning targets are aligned to the Common Core State Standards. Instructional resources are embedded within Skyline (powerpoints, handouts, novels, etc...) that will provide a blueprint for what teachers need to explicitly model. The Interventionist will begin pulling groups Day 1 to provide Tier 3 supports based on student assessment data from SY23.</p>	<p>STAR (Math)</p> <p>iReady (Reading)</p> <p>iReady (Math)</p> <p>Cultivate</p> <p>Grades</p> <p>ACCESS</p> <p>TS Gold</p> <p>Interim Assessment Data</p>




What student-centered problems have surfaced during this reflection?

If this Foundation is later chosen as a priority, these are problems the school may address in this CIWP.

Students are not experiencing high-quality, grade-level instruction. 


Supports based on student assessment data from iReady will be implemented for K-8 for more aligned universal assessments and personalized instruction tailored to the needs of each individual student. Year-long professional development around Skyline will be provided for teachers via CoLabs.

[Return to Top](#) **Inclusive & Supportive Learning Environment**


Using the associated references, is this practice consistently implemented?	References	What are the takeaways after the review of metrics?	Metrics
No	MTSS Integrity Memo MTSS Continuum Roots Survey	 An MTSS Team and lead has been identified, however; MTSS meetings do not occur on a consistent basis, a model/plan for full implementation of Branching Minds has not yet been identified and training to gain understanding of how to use universal screening data has been minimal. Protocols have not yet been established for identifying and analyzing student data for students identified for tiered intensive supports within the Branching Minds Platform. Research-based core curriculum is used to provide tier-1 instruction for academics and behavior/SEL, teachers utilize instructional materials to intentionally plan and implement standards-based tier-1 instruction (it is not used to adjust instruction). Universal screening plans for ELA and Math are identified and embedded into the assessment plans and student support plans are developed for students to receive tiered supports by the Tutors and the interventionist. These plans are developed within and are documented. We were not proactive in prioritizing EL Learners due to blooming enrollment.	Unit/Lesson Inventory for Language Objectives (School Level Data) MTSS Continuum Roots Survey ACCESS MTSS Academic Tier Movement Annual Evaluation of Compliance (ODLSS)
No	MTSS Integrity Memo		Quality Indicators of Specially Designed Curriculum
Partially	LRE Dashboard Page		EL Program Review Tool
Partially	IDEA Procedural Manual		
No	EL Placement Recommendation Tool ES EL Placement Recommendation Tool HS	<p>What is the feedback from your stakeholders?</p>  DL students are not fully supported as often times DL teachers have to be used to serve as substitutes in other classrooms. This impacts the amount of instruction that students can receive in their Least Restrictive Environment. Per survey data, students have expressed concern about not having student choice as it pertains to what they learn in class and how they showcase their learning. The focus is more on teacher and formal instruction vs the learning that should be taking place. Students have reported not having a sense of belonging in the classroom as their interests, preferences, and learning styles are not always considered by their teachers. More training needs to be provided on how to create, implement, and progress monitor academic intervention plans in the Branching Minds platform. Teachers don't have access to all of the interventions and strategies that have been curated in the Branching Minds Platform as some of them require a paid subscription. If Branching Minds is the district mandated platform for MTSS, teachers should have access to all interventions and strategies without the school having to pay for them. No reports can be generated via Branching Minds, which makes it difficult to share data with stakeholders.	
No		<p>What, if any, related improvement efforts are in progress? What is the impact? Do any of your efforts address barriers/obstacles for our student groups furthest from opportunity?</p>  Related improvement efforts that are in progress include: identifying an MTSS lead and team and providing ongoing Professional Development and supports focused on implementing an equity MTSS framework that is consistent with the expectations of the MTSS Integrity Memo. Our goal is to develop a model/plan for full implementation of Branching Minds and the Problem Solving Process by November of SY24 and have protocols established for identifying and analyzing student data for students identified for tiered intensive supports within the Branching Minds Platform.	

What student-centered problems have surfaced during this reflection?

If this Foundation is later chosen as a priority, these are problems the school may address in this CIWP.

All students and groups do not consistently have access to personalized tiered support with interventions. 

[Return to Top](#) **Connectedness & Wellbeing**

Using the associated references, is this practice consistently implemented?	References	What are the takeaways after the review of metrics?	Metrics
Partially	BHT Key Component Assessment SEL Teaming Structure	 26% of students received tiered 2 interventions. 14% of students received tier 3. Within priority groups, 4% of DL, 4% of engagement priority students and 2% of students with chronic absences were provided tiered supports. Noticed was the trend that every 5th week reporting period indicated an increase in students receiving tiered supports and services. Misconduct behavior revealed that more punitive measures were used in response to student misbehavior. As the Schoolwide response to misbehaviors was 75% OSS/ISS.	% of Students receiving Tier 2/3 interventions meeting targets Reduction in OSS per 100 Reduction in repeated disruptive behaviors (4-6 SCC)

Partially	Student experience Tier 1 Healing Centered supports, including SEL curricula, Skyline integrated SEL instruction, and restorative practices.
Yes	All students have equitable access to student-centered enrichment and out-of-school-time programs that effectively complement and supplement student learning during the school day and are responsive to other student interests and needs.
No	Students with extended absences or chronic absenteeism re-enter school with an intentional re-entry plan that facilitates attendance and continued enrollment.

What student-centered problems have surfaced during this reflection?

If this Foundation is later chosen as a priority, these are problems the school may address in this CIWP.

Student voice has been absent when decisions which impact them are being made. Students also lack a sense of connectedness and sense of community within their respective classrooms.

<p>What is the feedback from your stakeholders?</p> <p>All students equitable have access to student-centered enrichment and out of school time programs. Universal teaming structures are in place to support student connectedness and well being. The school's Behavioral Health Team is currently more structured, as they have an established team, regular meeting cadence, and protocols and structures in place to address student needs. The school's culuture and climate team is currently in the forming process.</p>	<p>What, if any, related improvement efforts are in progress? What is the impact? Do any of your efforts address barriers/obstacles for our student groups furthest from opportunity?</p> <p>Students voice is incorporated into decision making. Schoolwide events are tailored towards student interest. We are developing a student voice Teachers are receiving professional development around restorative practices and proactive measures towards student discipline. The schoolwide attendance plan has been improved and made more robust, and student incentives are more intentional and designed with purposeThese improvement efforts have positively impacted our work to strengthen the inner core with regards to community and relationships.</p>
--	---

- [Access to OST](#)
- [Increase Average Daily Attendance](#)
- [Reconnected by 20th Day, Reconnected after 8 out of 10 days absent](#)
- [Cultivate \(Belonging & Identity\)](#)
- Staff trained on alternatives to exclusionary discipline (School Level Data)
- [Enrichment Program Participation: Enrollment & Attendance](#)
- [Student Voice Infrastructure](#)
- [Reduction in number of students with dropout codes at EOY](#)

[Return to Top](#) **Postsecondary Success**

Postsecondary only applies to schools serving 6th grade and up. If your school does not serve any grades within 6th-12th grade, please skip the Postsecondary reflection.


Using the associated references, is this practice consistently implemented? (If your school does not serve any grade level listed, please select N/A)	References	What are the takeaways after the review of metrics?	Metrics
Yes	College and Career Competency Curriculum (C4) An annual plan is developed and implemented for providing College and Career Competency Curriculum (C4) instruction through CPS Success Bound or partner curricula (6th-12th).	Algebra is offered as a postsecondary course for eligible 8th grade students. Postsecondary instruction is offered to Middle School students via Success Bound. Two grade levels had a 75% completion rate in Navience. 8th grade graduation rate for SY23 was 93%. Three 8th grade students attended summer bridge due to not meeting the grade requirements for their math course. 6th grade students ended SY23 with a 22% on-track rate, 7th grade with a 21% on-track rate and 8th grade with 35% on-track rate.	Graduation Rate Program Inquiry: Programs/participation/attainment rates of % of ECCC 3 - 8 On Track
Yes	Individualized Learning Plans Structures for supporting the completion of postsecondary Individualized Learning Plans (ILPs) are embedded into student experiences and staff planning times (6th-12th).		Learn, Plan, Succeed % of KPIs Completed (12th Grade) College Enrollment and Persistence Rate
Yes	Work Based Learning Toolkit Work Based Learning activities are planned and implemented along a continuum beginning with career awareness to career exploration and ending with career development experiences using the WBL Toolkit (6th-12th).		9th and 10th Grade On Track Cultivate (Relevance to the Future) Freshmen Connection Programs Offered (School Level Data)
N/A	Early College courses (under Advanced Coursework) are strategically aligned with a student's Individualized Learning Plan goals and helps advance a career pathway (9th-12th).		
N/A	ECCE Certification List Industry Recognized Certification Attainment is backward mapped from students' career pathway goals (9th-12th).		
N/A	PLT Assessment Rubric There is an active Postsecondary Leadership Team (PLT) that meets at least 2 times a month in order to: intentionally plan for postsecondary, review postsecondary data, and develop implementation for additional supports as needed (9th-12th).		
		<p>What is the feedback from your stakeholders?</p> <p>Success Bound coursework should be implemented as a separate class for 8th grade students. Students need more opportunities to engage in work based learning activities focused in career exploration. When planning for postsecondary field trips, include vocational schools that have fields of study that students are intersted in. Parent meetings need to be held quarterly to ensure that parents understand on-track and how on-track impacts their child's academic standing. More promoting of Freshmen Connection for 8th Grade Students. Have workshops at the school for parents and students who need assistance with navigating GO CPS and the high school application process. More thorough communication around high school admission testing. Consider offering the Algebra course for 7th grade students as well.</p> <p>What, if any, related improvement efforts are in progress? What is the impact? Do any of your efforts address barriers/obstacles for our student groups furthest from opportunity?</p> <p>Related improvement areas for Postsecondary Success include: havina quarterly High School/Colleeae fairs for Middle</p>	

N/A Staffing and planning ensures alumni have access to an extended-day pay "Alumni Coordinator" through the Alumni Support Initiative during both the summer and winter/spring (12th-Alumni). [Alumni Support Initiative One Pager](#)

include having quarterly High School/College Tours for Middle School students; planning High School and College Tours for Middle School students; provide structured workshops (for students and parents) around navigating GO CPS and the High School selection process and qualification/requirements for postsecondary education. Success Bound will be implemented to help Middle School students learn skills to take ownership of their learning, seek help from others and respond to adversity.





What student-centered problems have surfaced during this reflection?

If this Foundation is later chosen as a priority, these are problems the school may address in this CIWP.

Middle School students don't have an equitable amount of learning experiences that include postsecondary activities. 

[Return to Top](#)

Partnership & Engagement

Using the associated references, is this practice consistently implemented?	References	What are the takeaways after the review of metrics?	Metrics
Partially	The school proactively fosters relationships with families, school committees, and community members. Family and community assets are leveraged and help students and families own and contribute to the school's goals. Spectrum of Inclusive Partnerships	Per 5E data for Involved Families, we received a rating of weak (performance indicator score 39). Teachers reported that parental involvement in school is very weak (indicator score is 19), teacher-parent trust is neutral (indicator score 40), and parent influence on decision making in schools is neutral (indicator score 58). This data suggests that teachers do not see parents as partners in helping students learn. Per the 5E data for Supportive Environment, we received a rating of weak (performance indicator score 27). Students reported that student-teacher trust is very weak (indicator score 19), academic personalism is weak (indicator score 32), and peer support for academic work is neutral (indicator score 48). We have a full and functioning Local School Council. We have a functioning Parent Advisory Council, however, the only members of the PAC are those who hold a title. Parents, who also work within the school community do not participate in PAC events. We have a partnership with the Greater Auburn Gresham Development Corporation (GAGDC). They contribute to the learning experience by providing enrichment academic afterschool programs for students (dance, arts, music, etc...). We have a partnership with Gentlemen of Distinction (G.O.D.). Through this partnership, parents engage in dance workshops and financial literacy classes during afterschool hours. Through our partnership with Illinois State University, we are able to provide future educators with the pedagogical tools and experience necessary to connect practice and theory, while still providing high quality learning experiences to our students. We have a partnership with TEAM Englewood and the Parent Mentor Program which provides parent the opportunities to volunteer in the classroom, providing services to students (small group/one-to-one supports) while earning money. 	<p>Cultivate</p> <p>5 Essentials Parent Participation Rate</p> <p>5E: Involved Families</p> <p>5E: Supportive Environment</p> <p>Level of parent/community group engagement (LSC, PAC, BAC, PTA, etc.) (School Level Data)</p> <p>Level of parent engagement in the ODLS Family Advisory Board (School Level Data)</p> <p>Formal and informal family and community feedback received locally. (School Level Data)</p>
Partially	Staff fosters two-way communication with families and community members by regularly offering creative ways for stakeholders to participate. Reimagining With Community Toolkit		
Partially	School teams have a student voice infrastructure that builds youth-adult partnerships in decision making and centers student perspective and leadership at all levels and efforts of continuous improvement (Learning Cycles & CIWP). Student Voice Infrastructure Rubric	<p>What is the feedback from your stakeholders?</p> <p>Per data from our Family/Parent Engagement Survey, parents have would like to have more opportunities to volunteer in the classroom and with various school activities. Parents have also provided input on communication methods voicing that email, text messaging and/or phone/robocalls are the preferred methods of communication. Parents believe that there should be more social-emotional after school programs. Parents have also voiced concerns about not being kept in the loop about everyday activities and issues (teacher leaves, new hires, etc...) that may impact their children (this information should be distributed school wide vs just on a class by class basis. The school should be flexible and consider parents' work and school schedules and consider having events at different times (mornings, evenings, weekends, etc...). Parents request more communication about their childrens' academic progress (aside from progress reports and parent-teacher conferences. Parents request more communication from teachers about positive behavior (not just when their children are misbehaving). More academic programs need to be provided for students as afterschool programs. </p>	
	<p>What student-centered problems have surfaced during this reflection?</p> <p>If this Foundation is later chosen as a priority, these are problems the school may address in this CIWP.</p> <p>Students' academic goals are not regularly communicated with families which impacts how families are able to support their childrens academic goals at home and through resources provided by the community. </p>	<p>What, if any, related improvement efforts are in progress? What is the impact? Do any of your efforts address barriers/obstacles for our student groups furthest from opportunity?</p> <p>Related improvement efforts include: developing and implementing a Family & Community Engagement Plan that will allow us to build strong, trusting relationships between teachers, families, and the community. Continue to survey parents and seek other ways for their input to be inclusive with school events. Invite parents/guardians to share information about family cultures and traditions and to share knowledge about their students' lives, interests, hopes and struggles. </p>	

Reflection on Foundation

Using the associated documents, is this practice consistently implemented?

Yes	All teachers, PK-12, have access to high quality curricular materials, including foundational skills materials, that are standards-aligned and culturally responsive.
Yes	Students experience grade-level, standards-aligned instruction.
Partially	Schools and classrooms are focused on the Inner Core (identity, community, and relationships) and leverage research-based, culturally responsive powerful practices to ensure the learning environment meets the conditions that are needed for students to learn.
Partially	The ILT leads instructional improvement through distributed leadership.
Yes	School teams implement balanced assessment systems that measure the depth and breadth of student learning in relation to grade-level standards, provide actionable evidence to inform decision-making, and monitor progress towards end of year goals.
Partially	Evidence-based assessment for learning practices are enacted daily in every classroom.

What are the takeaways after the review of metrics?

IAR: 38% of students in 3rd-8th grade did not meet expectations for IAR ELA; 48% of students in 3rd-8th grade did not meet expectations for IAR in Math. These numbers were higher in SY22 (56% for ELA; 55% for Math). 3rd Grade students had the highest percentage of students who did not meet expectations in ELA (73%) and Math (58%). Subclaim Performance for Math is as follows: 78% did not meet or partially met expectations for Additional & Supporting Content, 82% did not meet or partially met expectations for Major Content, 77% did not meet or partially met expectations for Mathematical Reasoning, and 83% did not meet or partially met expectations for Modeling Application. Subclaim Performance for Reading is as follows: 65% did not meet or partially met expectations for Informational Text, 66% did not meet or partially met expectations for Literary Text, and 57% did not meet or partially met expectations for vocabulary. Subclaim Performance for Writing is as follows: 80% did not meet or partially met expectations for Language Conventions and 83% did not meet or partially met expectations for Written Expressions. iReady: 9% of K-2 students are two or more grade levels below in math. Compared to BOY, this is an 18% decrease. 48% of K-2 students are one grade level below, 21% are early on grade level and 22% are mid or above grade level. Kindergarten has the highest percentage of students mid or above grade level for math at 48%. 8% of K-2 students are two or more grade levels below in reading. Compared to BOY, this is a 14% decrease. 43% of students are one grade level below, 19% of students are early on grade level, and 29% of students are mid or above grade level. Kindergarten has the highest percentage of students mid or above grade level for reading at 53%. A higher percentage of male students are two or more grade levels below than female students (43%:25%). ACCESS: For the past three years, 100% of students who are eligible to participate in ACCESS testing are not reaching proficiency. Cultivate Survey: Based on Cultivate Survey Data from MOY, students in grades 5th -8th reported not having a learning environment that meets the conditions that are needed to learn. Per the survey data, our lowest Mindset and Strategies for all students were Growth Mindset, Academic Risk Taking and Belonging. Curriculum: High quality curriculums were implemented for all content subjects (My View/Perspective, EnVision, Skyline & Amplify). Grades: We ended SY23 with an on-track rate of 29%. 32% of students were almost on-track, 9% of students were near on-track, 14% of students were far from on-track and 16% of students were off-track. Students in 7th grade had the lowest on-track rate with 21% and students in 3rd and 8th grades had the highest off-track rate with 19%. Students in 4th grade had the highest on-track rate with 42% and the lowest off-track rate with 8%.

What is the feedback from your stakeholders?

Although we implemented a high quality curriculum with fidelity, teachers felt that the curriculum did not address the needs of students for ELA. In diving deep into the curriculum, it was noted that there were no opportunities for differentiated instruction aligned to student assessment data and often times the learning targets did not fully address or align the Common Core State Standards. No opportunities were embedded for the modeling of a skill/strategy and the units in the curriculum did not have a good balance of literature and informational text. Per teachers, we did not balance the learning/professional development opportunities for ELA and Math (there was more focus on ELA through the PLC). There was no intense development around providing small group instruction and progress monitoring.

What student-centered problems have surfaced during this reflection?

Students are not experiencing high-quality, grade-level instruction.

What, if any, related improvement efforts are in progress? What is the impact? Do any of our efforts address barriers/obstacles for our student groups furthest from opportunity?

Based on feedback from teachers, we have decided to adopt the Skyline Curriculum for ELA for SY24. The impact will be that students will still have access to a high quality curriculum where learning targets are aligned to the Common Core State Standards. Instructional resources are embedded within Skyline (powerpoints, handouts, novels, etc...) that will provide a blueprint for what teachers need to explicitly model. The Interventionist will begin pulling groups Day 1 to provide Tier 3 supports based on student assessment data from SY23. iReady will be implemented for K-8 for more aligned universal assessments and personalized instruction tailored to the needs of each individual student. Year-long professional development around Skyline will be provided for teachers via CoLabs.

Return to Top Determine Priorities

Resources:

What is the Student-Centered Problem that your school will address in this Priority?

[Determine Priorities Protocol](#)

Students...

Students are not experiencing high-quality, grade-level instruction.

Indicators of a Quality CIWP: Determine Priorities
 Schools determine a minimum of 2 Foundations to prioritize, with at least one being within the Instructional Core.
 Priorities are informed by findings from previous and current analysis of data (qualitative and quantitative).
 For each priority, schools specify a student-centered problem (within the school's control) that becomes evident through each associated Reflection on Foundation.
 Priorities are determined by impact on students' daily experiences.

Return to Top Root Cause

Resources:

What is the Root Cause of the identified Student-Centered Problem?

[5 Why's Root Cause Protocol](#)

As adults in the building, we...

we need opportunities to unpack/internalize the curriculum, receive professional development and implement high-quality grade level instruction with fidelity.

Indicators of a Quality CIWP: Root Cause Analysis
 Each root cause analysis engages students, teachers, and other stakeholders closest to each priority, if they are not already represented by members of the CIWP team.
 The root cause is based on evidence found when examining the student-centered problem.
 Root causes are specific statements about adult practice.
 Root causes are within the school's control.

Return to Top Theory of Action

What is your Theory of Action?

If we....
 unpack/internalize high quality, grade level curricula across all subject areas and grade levels, provide professional development and provide coaching and feedback supports

then we see....
 teachers delivering high quality grade-level instruction to all students which includes: use of high quality curriculum with fidelity, standards-based curricula, teaching practices and learning environments, engaging learning environments, differentiated and culturally responsive instruction and data driven small group instruction

which leads to...
 students meeting/exceeding their growth targets and an increase in the number of students who are close to/at attainment

Resources:

Indicators of a Quality CIWP: Theory of Action

Theory of Action is grounded in research or evidence based practices.

Theory of Action is an impactful strategy that counters the associated root cause.

Theories of action explicitly aim to improve the experiences of student groups, identified in the Goals section, in order to achieve the goals for selected metrics.

Theory of Action is written as an "If we... (x, y, and/or z strategy), then we see... (desired staff/student practices), which results in... (goals)"

All major resources necessary for implementation (people, time, money, materials) are considered to write a feasible Theory of Action.

[Return to Top](#) **Implementation Plan**

Resources:

Indicators of a Quality CIWP: Implementation Planning

Implementation Plan Milestones, collectively, are comprehensive to implementing their respective Theories of Action and are written as SMART goals. The number of milestones and action steps per milestone should be impactful and feasible.

Implementation Plan identifies team/person responsible for implementation management, monitoring frequency, scheduled progress checks with CIWP Team, and data used to report progress of implementation.

Implementation Plan development engages the stakeholders closest to the priority, even if they are not already represented by members of the CIWP team.

Action steps reflect a comprehensive set of specific actions which are relevant to the strategy for at least 1 year out.

Action steps are inclusive of stakeholder groups and priority student groups.

Action steps have relevant owners identified and achievable timelines.

Team/Individual Responsible for Implementation Plan	Dates for Progress Monitoring Check Ins
Instructional Leadership Team	Q1 <input type="text"/> Q3 <input type="text"/>
	Q2 <input type="text"/> Q4 <input type="text"/>

	SY24 Implementation Milestones & Action Steps	Who	By When	Progress Monitoring
Implementation Milestone 1	Provide Professional Development	Teachers	August 2023	In Progress
Action Step 1	Teachers will attend District Provided PD for Skyline and Envision	Teachers	Ongoing	In Progress
Action Step 2	Teacher will attend Network Provided PD for Skyline and Envision	Teachers	Ongoing	In Progress
Action Step 3	Teachers will attend Monthly Content PLCs	Teachers	Ongoing	In Progress
Action Step 4	Teachers will attend schoolwide PD around unpacking/internalizing the Skyline and Envision Curricula	Teachers	Ongoing	In Progress
Action Step 5				Select Status
Implementation Milestone 2	Unpack and Internalize Units and Lessons	Teachers	August 2023	Select Status
Action Step 1	Create schoolwide expectations for annotating unit/lesson plans	Administration and Instructional Leadership Team	8/14/2013	Completed
Action Step 2	During Grade Level Team Meetings, teachers will engage in the Curriculum Co-Labs (Learning Cycles) in which teachers internalize unit content, engage in lesson studies, and engage in data collection and reflection	Instructional Leadership Team	Ongoing	Select Status
Action Step 3	During Grade Level Team Meetings, teachers will receive tiered supports around lesson internalization and annotation	Instructional Leadership Team	Ongoing	Select Status
Action Step 4	Create an observation schedule to monitor the implementation of learning and student experience with the curriculum based on lesson annotations	Administration and Instructional Leadership Team	Ongoing	Select Status
Action Step 5				Select Status
Implementation Milestone 3	Coaching and Feedback Supports	Administration and Instructional Coach	8/28/2023	Select Status
Action Step 1	The Principal, Assistant Principal and Coach will create a coaching schedule for all teachers by grade-level	Administration and Instructional Coach	Ongoing	Select Status
Action Step 2	Provide general coaching supports and feedback around annotating the TFG, unit and lesson plans	Administration and Instructional Coach	Ongoing	Select Status
Action Step 3	Provide differentiated coaching supports and feedback around annotating the TFG, unit and lesson plans	Administration and Instructional Coach	Ongoing	Select Status
Action Step 4				Select Status
Action Step 5				Select Status
Implementation Milestone 4				Select Status
Action Step 1				Select Status
Action Step 2				Select Status
Action Step 3				Select Status
Action Step 4				Select Status
Action Step 5				Select Status

SY25-SY26 Implementation Milestones

SY25 Anticipated Milestones	80% of teachers will be delivering high-quality, grade-level instruction to all students.	
SY26 Anticipated Milestones	100% of teachers will be delivering high-quality, grade-level instruction to all students.	

[Return to Top](#) **Goal Setting**

Indicators of a Quality CIWP: Goal Setting
 Each priority has both Practice Goals & Performance Goals reflecting end-of-year outcomes (numerical targets are optional and based on on applicable baselines and trend data).
 Practice Goals, and at least 1 Performance Goal per priority, can be frequently monitored (reported 3X/year or more).
 Goals seek to address priorities and opportunity gaps by embracing the principles of [Targeted Universalism](#).
 There is consensus across the team(s) responsible for meeting the goals that the goals are ambitious and attainable based on anticipated strategies and unique school contexts.
 Goals are reviewed and adjusted with most-current data sources, including MOY and EOY.
 Schools designated as Comprehensive or Targeted Support by ISBE meet specified IL-EMPOWER goal requirements.

Resources:

IL-EMPOWER Goal Requirements
 For CIWP goals to fulfill IL-EMPOWER requirements, please ensure the following:
 -The CIWP includes a reading Performance goal
 -The CIWP includes a math Performance goal
 -The goals within the reading, math, and any other IL-EMPOWER goals include numerical targets
 -Schools designated as Targeted Support identify the student groups named in the designation within the goals above and any other IL-EMPOWER goals

Performance Goals

Specify the Goal	Can this metric be frequently monitored?	Metric	Student Groups (Select 1-2)	Baseline	Numerical Targets [Optional]		
					SY24	SY25	SY26
75 % of students in Kindergarten - 8th Grade meeting or exceeding growth Targets as indicated by iReady Reading by the end of SY24	Yes	iReady (Reading)	Overall	Baseline will be provided after BOY Testing	75	78	80
			Select Group or Overall				
75 of students in Kindergarten - 8th Grade meeting or exceeding growth Targets as indicated by iReady Math by the end of SY24	Yes	iReady (Math)	Overall	Baseline will be provided after BOY Testing	75	78	80
			Select Group or Overall				

Practice Goals

Identify the Foundations Practice(s) most aligned to your practice goals.	Specify your practice goal and identify how you will measure progress towards this goal.		
	SY24	SY25	SY26
C&I:2 Students experience grade-level, standards-aligned instruction.	80% of teachers are observed as effectively delivering high-quality, grade-level instruction which includes: standards-based curricula, teaching practices, and learning environments, engaging learning environments, differentiated instruction, culturally responsive instruction and data-driven small group instruction.	90% of teachers are observed as effectively delivering high-quality, grade-level instruction which includes: standards-based curricula, teaching practices, and learning environments, engaging learning environments, differentiated instruction, culturally responsive instruction and data-driven small group instruction.	100% of teachers are observed as effectively delivering high-quality, grade-level instruction which includes: standards-based curricula, teaching practices, and learning environments, engaging learning environments, differentiated instruction, culturally responsive instruction and data-driven small group instruction.
Select a Practice			
Select a Practice			

[Return to Top](#) **SY24 Progress Monitoring**

Resources:

Below are the goals for this Theory of Action that were created above. CIWP Teams will use this section to progress monitor the goals on a quarterly basis.

Performance Goals

Specify the Metric	Metric	Student Groups (Select 1-2)	Baseline	SY24	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
75 % of students in Kindergarten - 8th Grade meeting or exceeding growth Targets as indicated by iReady Reading by the end of SY24	iReady (Reading)	Overall	Baseline will be provided after BOY Testing	75	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
		Select Group or Overall			Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
75 of students in Kindergarten - 8th Grade meeting or exceeding growth Targets as indicated by iReady Math by the end of SY24	iReady (Math)	Overall	Baseline will be provided after BOY Testing	75	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
		Select Group or Overall			Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status

Practice Goals

Progress Monitoring

Identified Practices

SY24

Quarter 1

Quarter 2

Quarter 3

Quarter 4

C&I:2 Students experience grade-level, standards-aligned instruction.	80% of teachers are observed as effectively delivering high-quality, grade-level instruction which includes: standards-based curricula, teaching practices, and learning environments, engaging learning environments, differentiated instruction, culturally responsive instruction and data-driven small group instruction.	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
Select a Practice		Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
Select a Practice		Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status

Reflection on Foundation

Using the associated documents, is this practice consistently implemented?

No	School teams implement an equity-based MTSS framework that includes strong teaming, systems and structures, and implementation of the problem solving process to inform student and family engagement consistent with the expectations of the MTSS Integrity Memo.
No	School teams create, implement, and progress monitor academic intervention plans in the Branching Minds platform consistent with the expectations of the MTSS Integrity Memo.
Partially	Students receive instruction in their Least Restrictive Environment. Staff is continually improving access to support Diverse Learners in the least restrictive environment as indicated by their IEP.
Partially	Staff ensures students are receiving timely, high quality IEPs, which are developed by the team and implemented with fidelity.
No	English Learners are placed with the appropriate and available EL endorsed teacher to maximize required Tier I instructional services.
No	There are language objectives (that demonstrate HOW students will use language) across the content.

What are the takeaways after the review of metrics?

An MTSS Team and lead has been identified, however; MTSS meetings do not occur on a consistent basis, a model/plan for full implementation of Branching Minds has not yet been identified and training to gain understanding of how to use universal screening data has been minimal. Protocols have not yet been established for identifying and analyzing student data for students identified for tiered intensive supports within the Branching Minds Platform. Research-based core curriculum is used to provide tier-1 instruction for academics and behavior/SEL, teachers utilize instructional materials to intentionally plan and implement standards-based tier-1 instruction (it is not used to adjust instruction). Universal screening plans for ELA and Math are identified and embedded into the assessment plans and student support plans are developed for students to receive tiered supports by the Tutors and the interventionist. These plans are developed within and are documented. We were not proactive in prioritizing EL Learners due to blooming enrollment.

What is the feedback from your stakeholders?

DL students are not fully supported as often times DL teachers have to be used to serve as substitutes in other classrooms. This impacts the amount of instruction that students can receive in their Least Restrictive Environment. Per survey data, students have expressed concern about not having student choice as it pertains to what they learn in class and how they showcase their learning. The focus is more on teacher and formal instruction vs the learning that should be taking place. Students have reported not having a sense of belonging in the classroom as their interests, preferences, and learning styles are not always considered by their teachers. More training needs to be provided on how to create, implement, and progress monitor academic intervention plans in the Branching Minds platform. Teachers don't have access to all of the interventions and strategies that have been curated in the Branching Minds Platform as some of them require a paid subscription. If Branching Minds is the district mandated platform for MTSS, teachers should have access to all interventions and strategies without the school having to pay for them. No reports can be generated via Branching Minds, which makes it difficult to share data with stakeholders.

What student-centered problems have surfaced during this reflection?

All students and groups do not consistently have access to personalized tiered support with interventions.

What, if any, related improvement efforts are in progress? What is the impact? Do any of our efforts address barriers/obstacles for our student groups furthest from opportunity?

Related improvement efforts that are in progress include: identifying an MTSS lead and team and providing ongoing Professional Development and supports focused on implementing an equity MTSS framework that is consistent with the expectations of the MTSS Integrity Memo. Our goal is to develop a model/plan for full implementation of Branching Minds and the Problem Solving Process by November of SY24 and have protocols established for identifying and analyzing student data for students identified for tiered intensive supports within the Branching Minds Platform.

[Return to Top](#) **Determine Priorities**

Resources:

What is the Student-Centered Problem that your school will address in this Priority?

Students...
All students and groups do not consistently have access to personalized tiered support with interventions.

[Determine Priorities Protocol](#)

Indicators of a Quality CIWP: Determine Priorities
Schools determine a minimum of 2 Foundations to prioritize, with at least one being within the Instructional Core.
Priorities are informed by findings from previous and current analysis of data (qualitative and quantitative).
For each priority, schools specify a student-centered problem (within the school's control) that becomes evident through each associated Reflection on Foundation.
Priorities are determined by impact on students' daily experiences.

[Return to Top](#) **Root Cause**

Resources:

What is the Root Cause of the identified Student-Centered Problem?

As adults in the building, we...
do not have identified systems and structures in place for effective implementation of MTSS and we are not planning for intentional interventions/small group instruction based on student assessment data.

[5 Why's Root Cause Protocol](#)

Indicators of a Quality CIWP: Root Cause Analysis
Each root cause analysis engages students, teachers, and other stakeholders closest to each priority, if they are not already represented by members of the CIWP team.
The root cause is based on evidence found when examining the student-centered problem.
Root causes are specific statements about adult practice.
Root causes are within the school's control.

[Return to Top](#) **Theory of Action**

What is your Theory of Action?

If we...
implement research-based structures and systems that support enrichment and intervention for both academic and SEL.

Resources:

Indicators of a Quality CIWP: Theory of Action
Theory of Action is grounded in research or evidence based practices.
Theory of Action is an impactful strategy that counters the associated root cause.

then we see...
effective problem-solving protocols applied to student achievement and behavioral efforts being implemented with fidelity.

Theories of action explicitly aim to improve the experiences of student groups, identified in the Goals section, in order to achieve the goals for selected metrics.
Theory of Action is written as an "If we... (x, y, and/or z strategy), then we see... (desired staff/student practices), which results in... (goals)"

All major resources necessary for implementation (people, time, money, materials) are considered to write a feasible Theory of Action.

which leads to...
academic and behavior improvement for targeted students.



[Return to Top](#)

Implementation Plan

Resources:

Indicators of a Quality CIWP: Implementation Planning
 Implementation Plan Milestones, collectively, are comprehensive to implementing their respective Theories of Action and are written as SMART goals. The number of milestones and action steps per milestone should be impactful and feasible.
 Implementation Plan identifies team/person responsible for implementation management, monitoring frequency, scheduled progress checks with CIWP Team, and data used to report progress of implementation.
 Implementation Plan development engages the stakeholders closest to the priority, even if they are not already represented by members of the CIWP team.
 Action steps reflect a comprehensive set of specific actions which are relevant to the strategy for at least 1 year out.
 Action steps are inclusive of stakeholder groups and priority student groups.
 Action steps have relevant owners identified and achievable timelines.

Team/Individual Responsible for Implementation Plan

MTSS Team, Teachers, Interventionist & Tutors

Dates for Progress Monitoring Check Ins

Q1 Q3
 Q2 Q4

	SY24 Implementation Milestones & Action Steps	Who	By When	Progress Monitoring
Implementation Milestone 1	Provide professional development	Teachers	August 2023	In Progress
Action Step 1	Interventionist will attend District Provided PD for Branching Minds & MTSS	Interventionist	Ongoing	Select Status
Action Step 2	Interventionist will attend Network Provided PD for Branching Minds & MTSS	Interventionist	Ongoing	Select Status
Action Step 3	Teachers will attend schoolwide PD around Branching Minds & MTSS for academic and SEL	Teachers	Ongoing	Select Status
Action Step 4	Create schoolwide protocol for effective implementation of MTSS	Administration, Interventionist, & MTSS Team	August 2023	Select Status
Action Step 5				Select Status
Implementation Milestone 2	Data Driven Small Group Instruction	Teachers	October 2023	Select Status
Action Step 1	Create schoolwide expectations for Tier II instruction	Administration, Instructional Coach & Interventionist	September 2023	Select Status
Action Step 2	Create schoolwide expectations for Tier III instruction	Administration, Instructional Coach & Interventionist	September 2023	Select Status
Action Step 3	During Planning Parties, teachers will engage in learning around how to use the iReady Platform to plan for and implement data informed small group instructions and intervention	Instructional Leadership Team	Ongoing	Select Status
Action Step 4	Create an observation schedule to monitor the implementation of learning and student experience within small group instruction using the iReady platform	Administration, Instructional Coach & Interventionist	September 2023	Select Status
Action Step 5	Deliver Tier II and Tier III data driven small group instruction	Teachers	October 2023	Select Status
Implementation Milestone 3	Use of the Branching Minds Platform with Fidelity	Teachers	September 2023	Select Status
Action Step 1	Teachers will attend any District and Network Provided PD around the use of the Branching Minds Platform	Teachers	Ongoing	Select Status
Action Step 2	Teachers, Interventionist, & Tutors will enter interventions into Branching Minds every 5 weeks	Teachers, Interventionist, & Tutors	Ongoing	Select Status
Action Step 3	MTSS Team will review and analyze Branching Minds Data quarterly to identify Tier III students who may need to be targeted for more support	Interventionist & MTSS Team	Ongoing	Select Status
Action Step 4	Teacher will receive constant support with the use and implementation of Branching Minds	Administration, Instructional Coach, & Interventionist	Ongoing	Select Status
Action Step 5				Select Status
Implementation Milestone 4				Select Status
Action Step 1				Select Status
Action Step 2				Select Status
Action Step 3				Select Status
Action Step 4				Select Status
Action Step 5				Select Status

SY25-SY26 Implementation Milestones

SY25 Anticipated Milestones	60% of teachers will be using the iReady Platform to plan for and implement data informed small group instruction and interventions, and using the Branching Minds Platform with fidelity.	
SY26 Anticipated Milestones	100% of teachers will be using the iReady Platform to plan for and implement data informed small group instruction and interventions, and using the Branching Minds Platform with fidelity.	

[Return to Top](#)

Goal Setting

Indicators of a Quality CIWP: Goal Setting

Each priority has both Practice Goals & Performance Goals reflecting end-of-year outcomes (numerical targets are optional and based on on applicable baselines and trend data).
 Practice Goals, and at least 1 Performance Goal per priority, can be frequently monitored (reported 3X/year or more).
 Goals seek to address priorities and opportunity gaps by embracing the principles of [Targeted Universalism](#).
 There is consensus across the team(s) responsible for meeting the goals that the goals are ambitious and attainable based on anticipated strategies and unique school contexts.
 Goals are reviewed and adjusted with most-current data sources, including MOY and EOY.
 Schools designated as Comprehensive or Targeted Support by ISBE meet specified IL-EMPOWER goal requirements.

Resources:

IL-EMPOWER Goal Requirements
For CIWP goals to fulfill IL-EMPOWER requirements, please ensure the following: -The CIWP includes a reading Performance goal -The CIWP includes a math Performance goal -The goals within the reading, math, and any other IL-EMPOWER goals include numerical targets -Schools designated as Targeted Support identify the student groups named in the designation within the goals above and any other IL-EMPOWER goals

Performance Goals

Specify the Goal	Can this metric be frequently monitored?	Metric	Student Groups (Select 1-2)	Baseline	Numerical Targets [Optional]		
					SY24	SY25	SY26
By the end of SY24, 75% of students of students who are receiving Tier II and Tier III supports will meet or exceed their growth Targets as established by iReady	Yes	% of Students receiving Tier 2/3 interventions meeting targets	Students who are identified as Tier II or Tier III per Branching Minds	50	75	78	80
			Select Group or Overall				
By the end of SY24, 60% of students in grades 3-8 will be classified as on On-Track	Yes	3 - 8 On Track	Overall	30	60	70	80
			Select Group or Overall				

Practice Goals

Identify the Foundations Practice(s) most aligned to your practice goals.	Specify your practice goal and identify how you will measure progress towards this goal.		
	SY24	SY25	SY26
I&S:2 School teams create, implement, and progress monitor academic intervention plans in the Branching Minds platform consistent with the expectations of the MTSS Integrity Memo.	All teachers are creating and implementing interventions in the Branching Minds platform.	MTSS Team and 60% of teachers are progress monitoring interventions using multiple data points.	MTSS Team and 100% of teachers are interpreting data, progress monitoring, and adjusting instruction based on interventions and multiple data points.
I&S:1 School teams implement an equity-based MTSS framework that includes strong teaming, systems and structures, and implementation of the problem solving process to inform student and family engagement consistent with the expectations of the MTSS Integrity Memo.	The MTSS Leadership Team rates as "Developed" or higher in the "high quality well-documenet student support and support plans" and "Foundational" in the "supplemental intervention: progress monitoring" components as measured by the MTSS Continuum.	The MTSS Leadership Team rates as "Developed" or higher in most components as measured by the MTSS Continuum.	The MTSS Leadership Team rates as "Operational" in most components as measured by the MTSS Continuum.
Select a Practice			

[Return to Top](#)

SY24 Progress Monitoring

Resources:

Below are the goals for this Theory of Action that were created above. CIWP Teams will use this section to progress monitor the goals on a quarterly basis.

Performance Goals

Specify the Metric	Metric	Student Groups (Select 1-2)	Baseline	SY24	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
By the end of SY24, 75% of students of students who are receiving Tier II and Tier III supports will meet or exceed their growth Targets as established by iReady	% of Students receiving Tier 2/3 interventions meeting targets	Students who are identified as Tier II or Tier III per Branching Minds	50	75	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
		Select Group or Overall			Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
By the end of SY24, 60% of students in grades 3-8 will be classified as on On-Track	3 - 8 On Track	Overall	30	60	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
		Select Group or Overall			Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status

Practice Goals

Progress Monitoring

Identified Practices	SY24	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
I&S:2 School teams create, implement, and progress monitor academic intervention plans in the Branching Minds platform consistent with the expectations of the MTSS Integrity Memo.	All teachers are creating and implementing interventions in the Branching Minds platform.	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
I&S:1 School teams implement an equity-based MTSS framework that includes strong teaming, systems and structures, and implementation of the problem solving process to inform student and family engagement consistent with the expectations of the MTSS Integrity Memo.	The MTSS Leadership Team rates as "Developed" or higher in the "high quality well-documenet student support and support plans" and "Foundational" in the "supplemental intervention: progress monitoring" components as measured by the MTSS Continuum.	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
Select a Practice		Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status

Parent and Family Plan

<p>If Checked:</p> <p>Complete School & Family Engagement Policy, School & Family Compact, and Parent & Family Engagement Budget sections</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Our school is a Title I school operating a Schoolwide Program</p> <p>This CIWP serves as your comprehensive Title I plan, which is a federal requirement for every Title I school operating a schoolwide program. As outlined in the federal legislation, this plan must be reviewed on at least an annual basis, and it must be made available to the district, parents, and the public. The following section, "Title I Schoolwide Programs and Parent Involvement," addresses the federal Title I requirements around meaningful parent and family involvement in developing and implementing Title I schoolwide programs.</p>
<p>If Checked:</p> <p>No action needed</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Our school is a non-Title I school that does not receive any Title I funds. (Continue to Approval)</p>

SCHOOL & FAMILY ENGAGEMENT POLICY

ESSA, Title I, Part A law requires schools to develop a parent and family policy that reflects their commitment to develop best engagement practices and maximizes meaningful consultation. Checking the boxes below indicates that your school understands and complies with each requirement listed.

- The school will hold an annual meeting at a time convenient to parents and families during the first month of school to inform them of the school's participation in ESSA, Title I programs and to explain the Title I requirements and their right to be involved in the Title I programs. The school will also hold an annual Title I PAC Organizational meeting at which 4 PAC officers are elected and monthly meeting dates are identified. The school will also offer parental and family engagement meetings, including monthly school PAC meetings, at different times and will invite all parents and key family members of children participating in the ESSA, Title I program to these meetings, and encourage them to attend.
- At the request of parents, schools will provide opportunities for regular meetings, including the School Parent Advisory Council meetings, for parents and family members to formulate suggestions and to participate, as appropriate, in decisions about the education of their children.
- Schools will provide parents a report of their child's performance on the State assessment in at least math, language arts and reading.
- Schools will provide parents timely notice when their child has been assigned to, or taught by, a teacher who is not "highly qualified," as defined in the Title I Final Regulations, for at least four (4) consecutive weeks.
- Schools will assist parents of participating ESSA Title I children in understanding: the state's academic content standards; the state's student academic achievement standards; the state and local academic assessments, including alternate assessments; the requirements of Title I, Part A; how to monitor their child's progress; and how to work with educators.
- Schools will provide information, resources, materials and training, including literacy training and technology, as appropriate, to assist parents and family members in working with their children to improve their academic achievement, and to encourage increased parental involvement.
- Schools will educate all staff in the value and utility of contributions by parents and family and in how to reach out to, communicate, and work with parents and family as equal partners in the education of their children and in how to implement and coordinate parent and family programs and build ties with parents and family members.
- Schools will, to the extent feasible and appropriate, coordinate and integrate parent involvement programs and activities with other federal, state, and local programs, including public preschool programs, and conduct other activities, such as parent resource centers, that encourage and support parents in more fully participating in the education of their children.
- Schools will ensure that information related to the school and parent and family programs, meetings, and other activities is sent to parents in understandable and uniform formats, including language.


SCHOOL & FAMILY COMPACT

Your school shall jointly develop, with parents, a school-parent compact that outlines how parents, the entire school staff, and students will share the responsibility for improved student academic achievement. Checking off the statements below indicates your school will develop a compact that complies with each requirement. Compact statements will be housed at the school and shared with all parents.

- The school will provide high-quality curriculum and instruction in a supportive and effective learning environment that enables the participating student to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.
- The school will hold parent-teacher conferences.
- The school will provide parents with frequent reports on their children's progress.
- The school will provide parents reasonable access to staff.
- The school will provide parents, as appropriate, opportunities to engage in and volunteer with school activities.
- The parents will support their children's learning.
- The students will share the responsibility for improved student academic achievement by engaging in behaviors such as good attendance, positive attitude, and class preparation, among others.

PARENT & FAMILY ENGAGEMENT BUDGET

The overarching goal for Title I Parent & Family Engagement funds is to increase student academic achievement through parental and family engagement and supporting skills development. In the box below, identify the academic priority areas around which your parent engagement & skills development will be aligned. As a reminder, use of your funds must occur in consultation with parents.

Parent engagement and skills development will align with priority 1 of our CIWP, curriculum and instruction. The academic priorities areas will focus on reading and some. Some activities which will occur are parent curriculum nights centered on the two content areas of focus, monthly family engagement events and parent after school programming. 

In order to maintain compliance with the use of Title I Parent & Family Engagement funds, please review and check each box below to indicate that your school understands and complies with the requirements following. We will...

- Spend Parent & Family Engagement Funds in a timely manner (Average 10%/month)
- Collaborate with parents, prioritizing PAC officers, to decide on Title I expenditures
- Assure that funds impact the majority of parents or focus on parents with students most at academic risk
- Provide up to date monthly fund reports to PAC officers
- Maintain a binder with the original documents related to PAC meetings, presentations, fund expenditures and other evidence of collaboration
- Provide support to PAC officers including but not limited to consultation about fund usage, meeting set-up, information dissemination, and organizational support