CIWP Team & Schedules

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).

Resources 🚀

CIWP Team Guidance

Name ✍	Role ✍	Email ✍
Marissa Lat	Teacher Leader	mcdejesus@cps.edu
Connie Moreno	Partnerships & Engagement Lead	ccmoreno@cps.edu
Aery Ko	Teacher Leader	bkko@cps.edu
Patricia Diaz	Curriculum & Instruction Lead	pmoreno@cps.edu
Katherine Kerivan	Curriculum & Instruction Lead	kekerivan@cps.edu
Karen VanZytveld	Teacher Leader	kavanzytveld@cps.edu
Robyn Katz	Teacher Leader	rkatz@cps.edu
Heleina Conejos	Inclusive & Supportive Learning Lead	hmconejos@cps.edu
Colleen Crotty	Inclusive & Supportive Learning Lead	chgavin@cps.edu
Nikhil Bhatia	LSC Member	nikhil.m.bhatia@gmail.com
Didi Swartz	AP	cmswartz@cps.edu
Meredith Bawden	Principal	mabawden@cps.edu

Initial Development Schedule

Outline your schedule for developing each component of the CIWP.

CIWP Components	Planned Start Date ✍	Planned Completion Date ✍
Team & Schedule	5/1/23	5/15/23
Reflection: Curriculum & Instruction (Instructional Core)	5/18/23	5/18/23
Reflection: Inclusive & Supportive Learning (Instructional Core)	6/1/23	6/1
Reflection: Connectedness & Wellbeing	6/23/23	6/23/23
Reflection: Postsecondary Success	6/23/23	6/23/23
Reflection: Partnerships & Engagement	6/23/23	6/23/23
Priorities	6/28/23	6/28/23
Root Cause	6/28/23	6/28/23
Theory of Acton	6/29/23	6/29/23
Implementation Plans	7/12/23	7/12/23
Goals	7/13/23	7/13/23
Fund Compliance	8/16/23	9/13/23
Parent & Family Plan	8/16/23	9/13/23
Approval	5/1/23	9/13/23

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	10/23/23
Quarter 2	12/18/23
Quarter 3	3/18/24
Quarter 4	6/3/24

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

Curriculum & Instruction

Return to Top

Using the associated references, is this practice consistently implemented?		References
Partially	All teachers, PK-12, have access to high quality curricular materials, including foundational skills materials, that are standards-aligned and culturally responsive.	CPS High Quality Curriculum Rubrics
Partially	Students experience grade-level, standards-aligned instruction.	Rigor Walk Rubric Teacher Team Learning Cycle Protocols Quality Indicators Of Specially Designed 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.	Powerful Practices Rubric Learning Conditions
Yes	The ILT leads instructional improvement through distributed leadership.	Continuum of ILT Effectiveness Distributed Leadership
Partially	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.	Customized Balanced Assessment Plan ES Assessment Plan Development Guide HS Assessment Plan Development
Yes	Evidence-based assessment for learning practices are enacted daily in every classroom.	Assessment for Learning Reference Document

What are the takeaways after the review of metrics? ✏️

- Students overall lower math scores this year, despite good growth, indicate that implementation of our high quality curriculum is not consistent or being implemented in ways to maximally engage students in learning (tier 1).
- K-3 units use F&P but have been strenthened with Fundations; teacher created units that are thematic and embed formative and summative assessments; HOWEVER, units do not currently meet the rubric expectations for ELA curriculum K-8 using the district rubric.
- Gaps: writing in response to reading requires a lot of supplement and teacher-creation. Also assessment is largely teacher-created.
- Culturally relevant teaching practices and curriculum can be improved - not alignment in all alreas here.
- Only 42% of students are at or above grade level in ELA and 30% in Math in grades 3-8 on the IAR
- 64% of K-2 students are at or above grade level in reading and 43% at or above grade level in math.
- ILT members facilitating meetings more wholistically is a goal next year
- We need an aligned vocabulary curriculum
- Focus on "inner Core" is needed as evidenced by Cultivate data (indicates teacher care needs attention - scale score of 24 EOY). Notions of care need to be explored
- Focus on learning enviro at beginning of year but need to ensure year round
- Social studies curricula work w alignment of the curriculum (noted as high quality) and ELA curricula which needs strengthening according to CPS rubric

What is the feedback from your stakeholders? ✏️

Parent feedback suggests that increased rigor and extension oppportunites for students who are higher achieving is needed.

Aligned homework systems and communication re: assessments would be helpful, particulary in upper grades

Additional extension opportunites for after school or summer programming would be beneficial.

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? ✏️

Fundations helpful for K-2, moving to 3rd grade in SY23-24

Consideration of piloting Skyline ELA across K-8 to better understand components of this comprehensive curriculum

After school homework help or tutoring opportunites may be need to be more targeted and more robust

Metrics

IAR (Math)

IAR (English)

Rigor Walk Data (School Level Data)

PSAT (EBRW)

PSAT (Math)

STAR (Reading)

STAR (Math)

iReady (Reading)

iReady (Math)

Cultivate

Grades

ACCESS

TS Gold

Interim Assessment Data

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. ✏️

- Only 42% of students are at or above grade level in ELA and 30% in Math in grades 3-8 on the IAR
- 64% of K-2 students are at or above grade level in reading and 43% at or above grade level in math.
- Focus on "inner Core" is needed as evidenced by Cultivate data (indicates teacher care needs attention - scale score of 17). Notions of care need to be explored.
- K-2 students scores in reading indicate gaps in comprehension and vocabulary, and student scores in mathmatics indicate gaps in measurement and data and geometry.
- Social studies and ELA curricula either not aligned or not considered high quality according to EdReports, the districts measure this year, and may be contributing to lower levels of achievement (tier 1)
- Students overall lower math scores this year, despite very strong growth, indicate that implementation of our high quality curriculum is not consistent or being implemented in ways to maximally engage students in learning (tier 1).
- Academic Personalism was the lowest 5Essentials area-the only area scoring Weak with a score of 32. Supportive Environment overall was Neutral
- Approx 20% of students reported Disagree or Strongly Disagree within the 5Essentials for measures of Academic Personalism (e.g. teacher notices when I'm struggling, provides extra support, explains things differently...etc).

Inclusive & Supportive Learning Environment

Return to Top

Using the associated references, is this practice consistently implemented?	References	What are the takeaways after the review of metrics?	Metrics

| Partially | 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. | MTSS Integrity Memo

MTSS Continuum

Roots Survey |
Partially	School teams create, implement, and progress monitor academic intervention plans in the Branching Minds platform consistent with the expectations of the MTSS Integrity Memo.	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.	LRE Dashboard Page
Yes	Staff ensures students are receiving timely, high quality IEPs, which are developed by the team and implemented with fidelity.	IDEA Procedural Manual
Partially	English Learners are placed with the appropriate and available EL endorsed teacher to maximize required Tier I instructional services.	EL Placement Recommendation Tool ES

EL Placement Recommendation Tool HS |
| Partially | There are language objectives (that demonstrate HOW students will use language) across the content. | |

- Branching Minds is still an area we can improve on; learning year (which puts us at the top of network data on usage and clsoing out cycles for students) and ready to dive in
- MTSS processes have improved this year but with more work it could be quite powerful
- 8.6% of students recieving documented academic interventions in SY22-23 and 3.4% SEL interventions
- MTSS team has been meeting regularly
- Access % of students reaching proficiency: 10% (9 students)
- 2% of students in EL program meeting in ELA and 5% in Math on IAR
- 67% (61 kids) in LRE 1 and 32% (29 kids) in LRE 2
- 5% DL students met expectations in ELA and 2% in Math on IAR
- Coteaching implemtation and training needed help students get better access to curr in LRE
- Student voice is needed to ensure supports feel supportive

What is the feedback from your stakeholders?

- Students at highest levels of achievmenet need extension or research activities (i.e. Math circles, science competitions, project based learning)
- Parents seeking additional clarity around student learning progress and upcoming mastery deadlines

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?

- Focus on MTSS structures and systems has been beneficial and continued focus will continue to help target specific student groups
- Small group instruction focus can continue within this priority as a way to support coteaching as well as interventions

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.

EL IAR: 2% meeting in ELA and 5% in Math
EL iReady: 40% in reading at 27% in Math
DL IAR: 5% in ELA and 2% in Math
DL iReady: 32% in reading and 15% in Math
Black students: 25% in ELA and 16% in Math
Student progress montiring in tier 2 and 3 is not yet informing next cycles of intervnetion
-Academic Personalsm was the lowest 5Essentials area-the only area scoring Weak with a score of 32. Supportive Environment overall was Neutral
-Approx 20% of students reported Disagree or Strongly Disagree within the 5Essentials for measures of Academic Personalsm (e.g. teacher notices when I'm struggling, provides extra support, explains things differently...etc).

Unit/Lesson Inventory for Language Objectives (School Level Data)

MTSS Continuum

Roots Survey

ACCESS

MTSS Academic Tier Movement

Annual Evaluation of Compliance (ODLSS)

Quality Indicators of Specially Designed Curriculum

EL Program Review Tool

Connectedness & Wellbeing

Using the associated references, is this practice consistently implemented?		References
Partially	Universal teaming structures are in place to support student connectedness and wellbeing, including a Behavioral Health Team and Climate and Culture Team.	BHT Key Component Assessment

SEL Teaming Structure |
| Partially | Student experience Tier 1 Healing Centered supports, including SEL curricula, Skyline integrated SEL instruction, and restorative practices. | |
| Partially | 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. | |

What are the takeaways after the review of metrics?

- BHT team as after school w classroom teachers is a challenge. Think through structures needed for regular cadence of meetings with service providers and other non classroom teachers
- Multiple committees that make up school culture - better as one committee? What is the most efficient structures for divergent and convergent work?
- Tier 1 SEL curricula is in place in all rooms but needs greater consistency in implementation (Paths in K-3, Second Step in 4-8). Focus on advisory time within inner core (relationships, identity, community)
- Discipline can be more restorative in conversations w staff after incidents (not just students). Additional follow up would be benefiical for accountablity for all
- Cultivate data indicates teacher care needs attention (scale score of 24 EOY). - Decrease in student fights this school year; coding of physsical conflict 3 v 4 v 5
- Continued tier 2 and 3 attendance support from clerk and building into larger MTSS structure with BHT supporting this work next year as well

What is the feedback from your stakeholders?

Though this did not emerge as a high priorty for parents on the end of year survey, we know that SEL and restorative responses are important for individual students and our larger school culture.

After school programs, variety and duration (now doing two separate sessions) is a strength we want to continue to build on

Metrics

% of Students receiving Tier 2/3 interventions meeting targets

Reduction in OSS per 100

Reduction in repeated disruptive behaviors (4-6 SCC)

Access to OST

Increase Average Daily Attendance

Increased Attendance for Chronically Absent Students

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)

| Yes | 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.

- Cultivate data indicates that "teacher care" is scored at 17, our lowest scored category. "This teacher builds one on one relationships with students" was the lowest. Student voice emerges as a need from cultivate survey as well as students feeling they are recieving actionable feedback on their work.
- Students need additional tier 2 and 3 SEL supports; not enough BHT structures are in place to avoid all support landing on counselor.
-Academic Personalism was the lowest 5Essentials area-the only area scoring Weak with a score of 32. Supportive Environment overall was Neutral
-Approx 20% of students reported Disagree or Strongly Disagree within the 5Essentials for measures of Academic Personalism (e.g. teacher notices when I'm struggling, provides extra support, explains things differently...etc).

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?

Tier 1 SEL curriculum; additional tier 2 or 3 focused supports (i.e. BAM, WOW) ✍

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 — 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).	College and Career Competency Curriculum (C4)	Strong Naviance Implemtation in 6-8 for College and Career Competency curriculum. Can still work on other opportunites to ensure students are internalizing their college and career explorations. ✍ ILP's at 100% implentation; how can we think through adviosry use w this as tool for students internalizing and investing in their plans a bit more? WBL toolkit in use - additional career fair in 4th gr this year; sustain and build on this. Opportunites for virtual parent career fairs by classroom, leaning into parent community? Campus visits, monthly college day (teachers supporting gear and sharing college experiences)	Freshmen Connection Programs Offered (School Level Data)
Yes — Structures for supporting the completion of postsecondary Individualized Learning Plans (ILPs) are embedded into student experiences and staff planning times (6th-12th).	Individualized Learning Plans		
Yes — 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).	Work Based Learning Toolkit	**What is the feedback from your stakeholders?** Additional support for HS process has been helpful and more still needed ✍	
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 — Industry Recognized Certification Attainment is backward mapped from students' career pathway goals (9th-12th).	ECCE Certification List		
N/A — 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).	PLT Assessment Rubric	**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?** Transition from Naviance underway ✍	
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		

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.

NA - not chosing as priority ✍

Partnership & Engagement

Using the associated references, is this practice consistently implemented?		References	What are the takeaways after the review of metrics?	Metrics
Yes	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	"- Parent involvement opporutnities via committees (BAC, LSC, FOG), but could improve on getting input on parent education - There is a small number of dedicated parents who take leadership of most of the activities. How do we expand this, while also being cognizant of working parents. - Let's bring back parent book club and find an invested parent to lead it - Options of virtual meetings/conferences very helpful - Let's have virtual parent career days! - Parents report strong responses of involved families on 5 Essentials Survey - Active Student Voice Committee as part of after school program - providing input on exisitng structures (i.e. Starbucks and out of uniform days). Goal is to move to additional feedback on curriculum and school culture in coming years and to have voice in development of ideas and systems rather than only feedback.	Cultivate 5 Essentials Parent Participation Rate 5E: Involved Families 5E: Supportive Environment Level of parent/community group engagement (LSC, PAC, BAC, PTA, etc.) (School Level Data) Level of parent engagement in the ODLSS Family Advisory Board (School Level Data) Formal and informal family and community feedback received locally. (School Level Data)
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	**What is the feedback from your stakeholders?** - Parents and students appreciate and want to continue additional arts and other partnerships during and after school - Need for clearer communication in departmentalized grades - parent survey feedback indicated stronger communication in K-3 than 4-8 - Parents have differing views on levels of student voice as a priority	

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.

NA - not selecing as priority at this time.

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?

SVC ongoing - want to ensure additional opportunites during day (i.e. lunch recess) are available so all kids who would like to join are able to

Select the Priority Foundation to pull over your Reflections here =>

Inclusive & Supportive Learning Environment

Reflection on Foundation

Using the associated documents, is this practice consistently implemented?

Partially	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.
Partially	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.
Yes	Staff ensures students are receiving timely, high quality IEPs, which are developed by the team and implemented with fidelity.
Partially	English Learners are placed with the appropriate and available EL endorsed teacher to maximize required Tier I instructional services.
Partially	There are language objectives (that demonstrate HOW students will use language) across the content.

What are the takeaways after the review of metrics?

- Branching Minds is still an area we can improve on; learning year (which puts us at the top of network data on usage and clsoing out cycles for students) and ready to dive in
- MTSS processes have improved this year but with more work it could be quite powerful
- 8.6% of students recieving documented academic interventions in SY22-23 and 3.4% SEL interventions
- MTSS team has been meeting regularly
- Access % of students reaching proficiency: 10% (9 students)
- 2% of students in EL program meeting in ELA and 5% in Math on IAR
- 67% (61 kids) in LRE 1 and 32% (29 kids) in LRE 2
- 5% DL students met expectations in ELA and 2% in Math on IAR
- Coteaching implemtation and training needed help students get better access to curr in LRE
- Student voice is needed to ensure supports feel supportive

What is the feedback from your stakeholders?

- Students at highest levels of achievmenet need extension or research activities (i.e. Math circles, science competitions, project based learning)
- Parents seeking additional clarity around student learning progress and upcoming mastery deadlines

What student-centered problems have surfaced during this reflection?

EL IAR: 2% meeting in ELA and 5% in Math
EL iReady: 40% in reading at 27% in Math
DL IAR: 5% in ELA and 2% in Math
DL iReady: 32% in reading and 15% in Math
Black students: 25% in ELA and 16% in Math
Student progress montiring in tier 2 and 3 is not yet informing next cycles of intervnetion
-Academic Personalism was the lowest 5Essentials area-the only area scoring Weak with a score of 32. Supportive Environment overall was Neutral
-Approx 20% of students reported Disagree or Strongly Disagree within the 5Essentials for measures of Academic Personalism (e.g. teacher notices when I'm struggling, provides extra support, explains things differently...etc).

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?

- Focus on MTSS structures and systems has been beneficial and continued focus will continue to help target specific student groups
- Small group instruction focus can continue within this priority as a way to support coteaching as well as interventions

Determine Priorities

Return to Top

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

Students...

Students in our EL program are experiencing lower growth and attainment in reading and math than other students

Majority of our DL students are recieving support in LRE1 and LRE2 settings which best practice indicates are best served through coteaching models; however, students do not experience consistent opportunities for maximized support to access curriculum in these contexts

Not all students in tier 2 and 3 are recieving documented interventions in Branching Minds

Few higher achieving students are scoring in the 5 range of IAR

Resources: 🚀

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.

Root Cause

Return to Top

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

As adults in the building, we...

As a staff have had training on ESL strategies but we don't see wide spread adoption or consistency with these strategies. This may be because there has not been enough examples provided or time to develop the scaffolds.

We are lacking wide spread and consistent models of coteaching and other best practice supports for DL students for all staff members. This may be because expectations aren't clear and gened teachers/DL teachers/SECAs don't have as well defined roles as we could have and sharing best practices with all teachers who teach students who may be struggling to access a given curriculum.

We have focused much time and attention on students who are lower achieving coming out of the pandemic; we need to continue this push while ensuring our curriculum and pedagogy are providing additional opportunites for our highest achieving students.

Resources: 🚀

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.

Theory of Action

Return to Top

What is your Theory of Action?

If we....

provide ongoing professional learning opportunities for all staff, using full data cycles of learning, with a focus on our EL students, DL students, and all students in the MTSS process

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....

teachers utilizing data to inform instruction and an increased implementation of co-teaching models and ESL strategies as well as data-informed intervention cycles of support ✍

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...

Increased student achievement for all students who are below or just below grade level standards, particularly our EL and DL students, as well as increased outcomes for our highest achieving 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 ✍

ILT, Admin, ELPT, MTSS team

Dates for Progress Monitoring Check Ins

Q1	10/23/23	Q3	3/18/24
Q2	12/18/23	Q4	6/3/24

SY24 Implementation Milestones & Action Steps ✍	Who ✍	By When ✍	Progress Monitoring
Implementation Milestone 1 Structures, training and planning artifacts for: co-teaching, EL strategies, MTSS implementation		October 20 (end of Q1)	In Progress
Action Step 1 Articulate expectations for co-teaching models (e.g. weekly planning tool, meeting cadence), EL Instructional strategies (see document), MTSS implementation/cycles (e.g. use of EOY/BOY data for in-class grouping/advisory sessions, Branching Minds entry)	All teachers--admin team	Aug 18	Completed
Action Step 2 Provide initial PD Expectations (co-teaching-- station teaching and parallel teaching), EL instructional strategies in practice, Branching Minds and BOY data analysis BOY data analysis to create MTSS and small groups to allow for MTSS intervention execution by Sept 5	ILT/grade level leads	August 18	Completed
Action Step 3 Quarter 1 team meetings on deepening understanding of co-teaching, EL strategies, MTSS structures and ensuring tier 2 supports being provided by wk 3; extension and independent learning activities brainstormed and stations planned for - MTSS/BHT combined committee for referral for their 2 and 3 supports with librarian providing additional tier 3 supports	ILT/admin	Sept 20	Completed
Action Step 4 Create and define EL and co-teaching look-for tool that pushes accountablity and improvement across multiple domains (e.g. planning artifacts, instructional practice, student work)	ILT/Admin team	Sept 22	In Progress
Action Step 5 Create after school tutoring and extension supports that provide additional tier 2 and 3 opportunities Collect data on progress of implementation to determine next cycle of learning steps	Teachers/ILT	Sept 25	Completed
Action Step 6 End of MTSS cycle 1 --re-evaluate goal/skill based on progress monitoring	Teachers/SECAs	Oct 20	Completed
Action Step 7 End of MTSS cycle 2--re-evaluate goal/skill based on progress monitoring	Teachers/SECAs	Nov 17	Select Status
Implementation Milestone 2 Evidence of 100% of teachers engaged in planning and implementation of Q1 PD (practice shifts evident)	Teachers/Staff/Admin	Dec 22 (End of Q2)	Select Status
Action Step 1 Conduct baseline observations aligned to newly created look-for tool	ILT	Oct 20	Select Status
Action Step 2 Determine model classrooms (across all 3 instructional priorities) and film examples (in addition to other network 6 schools who display strong practice in DL, EL, and MTSS models)	ILT	Oct 20	Select Status
Action Step 3 Grade-level led planning on improvement strategies aligned to look-for data, model class videos	ILT leads	Oct 27	Select Status
Action Step 4 Continued safe practice and observation of model classrooms	Teachers/SECAs	Thru Dec 21	Select Status
Action Step 5 Revision of unit plans stage 3, co-teaching planning docs to reflect grade-level determined needs/actions (unit internalization templates for those implementing Skylinie) Solicit student feedback on curriculum and tier 2 and 3 MTSS supports	Teachers/SECAs	Dec 21	Select Status
Action Step 6 End of MTSS cycle 3--re-evaluate goal/skill based on progress monitoring	Teachers/SECAs	Jan 19	Select Status
Action Step 7 End of MTSS cycle 4--re-evaluate goal/skill based on progress monitoring		Feb 23	Select Status
Implementation Milestone 3 All classrooms will have evidence of some level of implementation of co-teaching models, ESL strategies, and tier 2 MTSS interventions during whole class instruction.		June 7 (End of Q4)	Select Status
Action Step 1 Additional coteaching model trainings in grade level meeting and additional cycle of learning	ILT	March 22 (end of Q3)	Select Status
Action Step 2 The following EL strategies observed in action in 80% of classrooms: step sheets/directions chunking, writing brainstorming-partner planning, sentence starters, comprehension checks/retelling	ILT/teacher teams/SECAs	March 22 (end of Q3)	Select Status
Action Step 3 MTSS team provides additional PD on progress monitoring tools and determinations of tier placements (including BHT interventions)	MTSS team	Q3 and Q4	Select Status
Action Step 4 All teachers start new MTSS groupings with new students (as applicable, or move from reading to math in k-3), new goals, interventions, progress monitoring. All new groups entered in Branching Minds	All teachers		Select Status

Action Step 5	End of MTSS cycle 5--re-evaluate goal/skill based on progress monitoring	Teachers/SECAs	April 5	Select Status
Action Step 6	End of MTSS cycle 6--re-evaluate goal/skill based on progress monitoring	Teachers/SECAs	May 10	Select Status
Action Step 7				Select Status
Implementation Milestone 4	Summer revision and work plan for SY24-25			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
Action Step 6				Select Status
Action Step 7				Select Status

SY25-SY26 Implementation Milestones

SY25 Anticipated Milestones	Increase number of model classrooms; increased fidelity across other content areas ✍️
SY26 Anticipated Milestones	Increase number of model classrooms; increased fidelity across other content areas ✍️

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 ✍️	SY24	SY25	SY26
Decrease the percent of students in urgent intervention on screener assessments (approx 60 out of 530 scored 10th %tile or below in reading, math or both on STAR or iReady)	Yes	MTSS Academic Tier Movement	English Learners	11%	9%	7%	6%%
			Students with an IEP				
The percentage of students at or above grade level on IAR and iReady will increase by 10%	No	IAR (Math)	Overall	IAR: 30% iReady: 42%	IAR: 33% iReady: 46%	IAR: 37% iReady: 50%	IAR: 41% iReady: 54%
			Select Group or Overall				

(Numerical Targets [Optional] ✍️)

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.	By the end of SY23-24, we will have 60% of coteacher partners particpate in structured planning meetings with outputs that weekly plannning for teaching By the end of SY23-24, we will have conducted professional learning related to 2 additional coteaching models and see evidence of these practices in at least 60% of classrooms		
C&I:2 Students experience grade-level, standards-aligned instruction.	All students needing interventions are serviced with appropriate interventions, monitored within Branching Minds		
I&S:7 There are language objectives (that demonstrate HOW students will use language) across the content.	By the end of SY23-24 we will be implementing EL strategies in all classrooms and scoring at 70% or higher on the Look For tool		

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
Decrease the percent of students in urgent intervention on screener assessments (approx 60 out of 530 scored 10th %tile or below in reading, math or both on STAR or iReady)	MTSS Academic Tier Movement	English Learners	11%	9%	*Select Status*	*Select Status*	*Select Status*	*Select Status*
		Students with an IEP			*Select Status*	*Select Status*	*Select Status*	*Select Status*
The percentage of students at or above grade level on IAR and iReady will increase by 10%	IAR (Math)	Overall	IAR: 30% iReady: 42%	IAR: 33% iReady: 46%	*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.	By the end of SY23-24, we will have 60% of coteacher partners particpate in structured planning meetings with outputs that weekly plannning for teaching By the end of SY23-24, we will have conducted professional learning related to 2 additional coteaching models and see evidence of these practices in at least 60% of classrooms	*Select Status*	*Select Status*	*Select Status*	*Select Status*
C&I:2 Students experience grade-level, standards-aligned instruction.	All students needing interventions are serviced with appropriate interventions, monitored within Branching Minds	*Select Status*	*Select Status*	*Select Status*	*Select Status*
I&S:7 There are language objectives (that demonstrate HOW students will use language) across the content.	By the end of SY23-24 we will be implementing EL strategies in all classrooms and scoring at 70% or higher on the Look For tool	*Select Status*	*Select Status*	*Select Status*	*Select Status*

Curriculum & Instruction

Reflection on Foundation

Using the associated documents, is this practice consistently implemented?

Partially	All teachers, PK-12, have access to high quality curricular materials, including foundational skills materials, that are standards-aligned and culturally responsive.
Partially	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.
Yes	The ILT leads instructional improvement through distributed leadership.
Partially	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.
Yes	Evidence-based assessment for learning practices are enacted daily in every classroom.

What are the takeaways after the review of metrics?

- Students overall lower math scores this year, despite good growth, indicate that implementation of our high quality curriculum is not consistent or being implemented in ways to maximally engage students in learning (tier 1).
- K-3 units use F&P but have been strenthened with Fundations; teacher created units that are thematic and embed formative and summative assessments; HOWEVER, units do not currently meet the rubric expectations for ELA curriculum K-8 using the district rubric.
- Gaps: writing in response to reading requires a lot of supplement and teacher-creation. Also assessment is largely teacher-created.
- Culturally relevant teaching practices and curriculum can be improved - not alignment in all areas here.
- Only 42% of students are at or above grade level in ELA and 30% in Math in grades 3-8 on the IAR
- 64% of K-2 students are at or above grade level in reading and 43% at or above grade level in math.
- ILT members facilitating meetings more wholistically is a goal next year
- We need an aligned vocabulary curriculum
- Focus on "inner Core" is needed as evidenced by Cultivate data (indicates teacher care needs attention - scale score of 24 EOY). Notions of care need to be explored
- Focus on learning enviro at beginning of year but need to ensure year round
- Social studies curricula work w alignment of the curriculum (noted as high quality) and ELA curricula which needs strengthening according to CPS rubric

What is the feedback from your stakeholders?

Parent feedback suggests that increased rigor and extension oppportunites for students who are higher achieving is needed.

Aligned homework systems and communication re: assessments would be helpful, particulary in upper grades

Additional extension opportunites for after school or summer programming would be beneficial.

What student-centered problems have surfaced during this reflection?

- Only 42% of students are at or above grade level in ELA and 30% in Math in grades 3-8 on the IAR
- 64% of K-2 students are at or above grade level in reading and 43% at or above grade level in math.
- Focus on "inner Core" is needed as evidenced by Cultivate data (indicates teacher care needs attention - scale score of 17). Notions of care need to be explored.
- K-2 students scores in reading indicate gaps in comprehension and vocabulary, and student scores in mathmatics indicate gaps in measurement and data and geometry.
- Social studies and ELA curricula either not aligned or not considered high quality according to EdReports, the districts measure this year, and may be contributing to lower levels of achievement (tier 1)
- Students overall lower math scores this year, despite very strong growth, indicate that implementation of our high quality curriculum is not consistent or being implemented in ways to maximally engage students in learning (tier 1).
- Academic Personalism was the lowest 5Essentials area-the only area scoring Weak with a score of 32. Supportive Environment overall was Neutral
- Approx 20% of students reported Disagree or Strongly Disagree within the 5Essentials for measures of Academic Personalism (e.g. teacher notices when I'm struggling, provides extra support, explains things differently...etc).

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?

Fundations helpful for K-2, moving to 3rd grade in SY23-24

Consideration of piloting Skyline ELA across K-8 to better understand components of this comprehensive curriculum

After school homework help or tutoring opportunites may be need to be more targeted and more robust

Determine Priorities

Return to Top

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

Students...

- Students report they are feeling a lack of connection and support in the learning environment ("teacher care" and "teacher builds one on one relationships with students were lowest rated categories). Students report feeling puniative systems and incentive systems geared to mtoivate some are actually demotivating to many.
- Students are not exerincing vertically aligned vocabulary and writing instruction
- Student math growth and attainment remain lower, suggesting need for improved pedogigcal approaches
- Lower levels of students exceeding on IAR in both ELA (6%) and math (4%)

Resources: 🚀

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.

Root Cause

Return to Top

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

As adults in the building, we...

...use ELA curricular materials that support some aspects of comprehensive curriculum but leave gaps in others
...have comprehensive math curriculum, but inconsistent instructional choices lead to some students experiencing the full rigor and others not
...have competing priorities during advisory and morning meeting time and inconsistent implentation of SEL curriculum
...have a harder time building deep connections with larger classes and departmentalized model

Resources: 🚀

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.

Theory of Action

Return to Top

What is your Theory of Action?

If we....

Adopt a comprehensive ELA curriculum, incorporate problem-centered math instruction, and center relationship building in all courses to ensure we are prioritizing Tier 1 SEL

Resources: 🚀

Indicators of a Quality CIWP: Theory of Action

practices

then we see....

teachers consistently implmenting a rigorouos, standards-aligned curriculum that prioritizes ✍ caring relationships with students

which leads to...

an increase in students feeling affirmations at school which will impact their ability to ✍ engage and learn, resulting in higher achievement levels on outcome measures like IAR and greater feelings of connection on measures like the 5Es or Cultivate

| 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. |

Implementation Plan

Return to Top

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 ✍

CIWP team

Dates for Progress Monitoring Check Ins

Q1	10/23/23	Q3	3/18/24
Q2	12/18/23	Q4	6/3/24

SY24 Implementation Milestones & Action Steps ✍	Who ✍	By When ✍	Progress Monitoring
Implementation Milestone 1 — 100% of teachers (as relevant) will receive training on Skyline ELA, math launch-explore-discuss and advisory/morning meeting expecations			Select Status
Action Step 1 — Articulate expectations for C&I, connectedness: -K-3 teachers implementing Fundations -k-8 ELA teachers implementing 1 unit of Skyline ELA by EOY -4-5 ELA teachers implementing Skyline Word Study -K-8 math: implementation of launch-explore-discuss at least weekly -Quarterly advisory calendar with weekly team building and Second Step	Admin/ILT	Aug 18	Completed
Action Step 2 — Provide PD on Skyline ELA, math launch-explore-discuss cycle	ILT	Aug 18	Completed
Action Step 3 — 4-8 new student induction program: parent meeting, mentor staff check-in/out, peer mentor weekly lunches	Counselor/BHT	Aug 18	In Progress
Action Step 4 — Quarter 1 team meetings to focus on subsequent week's lesson plans: Fundations, Skyline ELA, math launch-explore-discuss implementation, advisory	Teachers	Sept 15	In Progress
Action Step 5 — Complete Skyline unit internalization tool to ensure planning for Skyline pilot is made with a teacher's particular students in mind	Teachers	Oct 1	Select Status
Action Step 6 — Adapt existing N6 look for tool to account for focus on Skyline ELA pilot and math launch-explore-discuss	ILT	Oct 20	Select Status
Action Step 7 — design a comprehensive advisory calendar			Select Status
Implementation Milestone 2 — Evidence of 100% of teachers engaged in planning and implementation of Q1 PD expectations	Teachers/ILT/admin	Mar 22	Select Status
Action Step 1 — Conduct baseline observations aligned to look-for tool		Jan 19	Select Status
Action Step 2 — Continued safe practice and observation of model classrooms		Feb 23	Select Status
Action Step 3 — Revision of unit plans stage 3, co-teaching planning docs to reflect grade-level determined needs/actions		Feb 23	Select Status
Action Step 4 —			Select Status
Action Step 5 —			Select Status
Implementation Milestone 3 — All ELA teachers will have piloted and reflected on implementation of Skyline ELA. Math teachers will have piloted and reflected on launch-explore-discuss		June 7	Select Status
Action Step 1 — Deepen understanding of math instructional shifts through peer observation		March 22	Select Status
Action Step 2 — Implement chosen Skyline ELA unit k-8		March 22	Select Status
Action Step 3 — Reflect on Skyline implementation and math problem-first implementation		June 10	Select Status
Action Step 4 — Deepen student connectedness through opportunites for older kids and younger kids (utilizing advisory time) and peer mediation training for students and adults		Feb - June	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	Fully implement Skyline ELA or other comprehensive curriculum Regular use of launch-explore discuss and another student-led math instructional strategy (e.g. math talk, 3 Act math)	✍

SY26 Anticipated Milestones	100% of teachers implementing standards-aligned curriculum in all content areas with fidelity ✏️

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 ✏️	SY24	SY25	SY26
Increase the score on Cultivate of teacher care from 26 to 40	No	Cultivate	Overall	26	40	45	55
			African American Male	2%	3%	4%	6%
Increase of students meeting or exceeding IAR math by 15% (growth from SY22 to SY23 = 22% to 30%, pre-Covid = 45%)	No	IAR (Math)	Overall	30%	34%	40%	46%
Increase of students meeting or exceeding IAR ELA by 10% (growth from SY22 to SY23 = 37% to 42%, pre-Covid = 53%)			English Learners	5%	6%	7%	8%

(Numerical Targets [Optional] ✏️ spans SY24, SY25, SY26)

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:1 All teachers, PK-12, have access to high quality curricular materials, including foundational skills materials, that are standards-aligned and culturally responsive.	100% of teachers will have piloted ELA skyline curriculum (either unit or full scope and sequnce) in K-8 and be at 100% implentation w Skyline in K-8 Science and K-2 Social Studies. ILT will have developed an evaluation tool, in alignment with EdReports rubrics, to determine all content curriculum for SY24-25.		
C&I:3 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.	We will have supportive structures and feedback systems to ensure full implentation of K-8 SEL tier 1 curriculum with 80% fidelity		
P&E:3 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).	We will have created systems for student feedback and input on academic and SEL curriculum.		

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
Increase the score on Cultivate of teacher care from 26 to 40	Cultivate	Overall	26	40	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
		African American Male	2%	3%	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
Increase of students meeting or exceeding IAR math by 15% (growth from SY22 to SY23 = 22% to 30%, pre-Covid = 45%)	IAR (Math)	Overall	30%	34%	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
Increase of students meeting or exceeding IAR ELA by 10% (growth from SY22 to SY23 = 37% to 42%, pre-Covid = 53%)		English Learners	5%	6%	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:1 All teachers, PK-12, have access to high quality curricular materials, including foundational skills materials, that are standards-aligned and culturally responsive.	100% of teachers will have piloted ELA skyline curriculum (either unit or full scope and sequnce) in K-8 and be at 100% implentation w Skyline in K-8 Science and K-2 Social Studies. ILT will have developed an evaluation tool, in alignment with EdReports rubrics, to determine all content curriculum for SY24-25.	*Select Status*	*Select Status*	*Select Status*	*Select Status*
C&I:3 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.	We will have supportive structures and feedback systems to ensure full implentation of K-8 SEL tier 1 curriculum with 80% fidelity	*Select Status*	*Select Status*	*Select Status*	*Select Status*
P&E:3 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).	We will have created systems for student feedback and input on academic and SEL curriculum.	*Select Status*	*Select Status*	*Select Status*	*Select Status*