

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
Lori Zaimi	Principal	lzaimi@cps.edu
Sam Lee	AP	swlee@cps.edu
Kristen Munoz	AP	kmmunoz2@cps.edu
Kim Lebovitz	Curriculum & Instruction Lead	kclebovitz@cps.edu
Anne Park	Postsecondary Lead	apark1@cps.edu
Nana Adu	Postsecondary Lead	naadu@cps.edu
Shelton Jackson	Connectedness & Wellbeing Lead	sjackson143@cps.edu
Liv Fonte	Connectedness & Wellbeing Lead	ljfonte@cps.edu
Tiffany Brugman, Jinny Gerhardt & Athanasia Kolontouros	Inclusive & Supportive Learning Lead	tmking@cps.edu, jlcrawford@cps.edu, atkolontouro@cps.edu
Mathieu Kouame	LSC Member	kouamem@gmail.com
Bianca Jimenez, Josh Lerner	Partnerships & Engagement Lead	biancaramirez@gmail.com, jdlerner@cps.edu
REP will identify 1 member	Partnerships & Engagement Lead	reppeirce@gmail.com

Initial Development Schedule

Outline your schedule for developing each component of the CIWP.

CIWP Components	Planned Start Date	Planned Completion Date
Team & Schedule	5/19/23	5/19/23
Reflection: Curriculum & Instruction (Instructional Core)	5/26/23	6/1/23
Reflection: Inclusive & Supportive Learning (Instructional Core)	5/26/23	6/1/23
Reflection: Connectedness & Wellbeing	5/26/23	6/1/23
Reflection: Postsecondary Success	5/26/23	6/1/23
Reflection: Partnerships & Engagement	5/26/23	6/1/23
Priorities	6/1/23	6/5/23
Root Cause	6/5/23	6/13/23
Theory of Acton	6/13/23	6/30/23
Implementation Plans	6/30/23	7/31/23
Goals	7/31/23	8/31/23
Fund Compliance	8/31/23	9/10/23
Parent & Family Plan	8/31/23	9/10/23
Approval	9/1/23	9/17/23

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

	10/11/2023
Quarter 1	Changed to October 24, 2023 due to HS Admissions test on Oct 11
Quarter 2	December 6, 2023
Quarter 3	March 6, 2024
Quarter 4	May 22, 2024

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>Key data from state assessments: </p> <p>K-2 Reading, 75% of students are performing on/above grade level according to iReady K-2 Math, 60% of students are performing on/above grade level according to iReady 3-8 Reading, 64% of students are at/above benchmark according to STAR Reading 3-8 Math, 62% of students are at/above benchmark according to STAR Math</p> <p>3-8 IAR data shows that 35% of students met/exceeded standards on IAR Reading 3-8 IAR data shows that 30% of students met/exceeded standards on IAR Math</p> <p>Through state assessments (above) and the IB evaluation we understand there are many areas to celebrate regarding instruction. The IB report states that "teachers remove barriers to learning to enable every student to develop, pursue and achieve challenging personal goals".</p>	<p>IAR (Math)</p> <p>IAR (English)</p> <p>Rigor Walk Data (School Level Data)</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>Coming out of the pandemic, students re-entered school at varying places academically. While some students engaged completely during remote learning, other students did not. Gaps in learning varied among students. Peirce along with Chicago Public Schools emphasized the importance of Social Emotional Learning while also affirming student identities. Teachers worked on building positive relationships with and among students in order to develop a sense of community. Cultivate survey data from EOY23 indicated that Affirming Identities was our highest rated component. With recent efforts to embed SEL, rigor differs across grade levels and over 50% of our students are not making expected growth on interim benchmark assessments (STAR).</p> <p>During the SY20-SY23 CIWP cycle, teachers reviewed, revised and developed IB Units of Study with a focus on the inner core (identity, community, and relationships). Curriculum revisions included the incorporation of the Learning for Justice Standards along with an alignment of all state standards, next steps are to monitor implementation and progress towards mastering standards as well as greater emphasis on differentiated instruction that is rigorous and standards aligned.</p>	<p>PSAT (EBRW)</p> <p>PSAT (Math)</p> <p>STAR (Reading)</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>The Instructional Leadership Team identified Curriculum and Instruction as an area of focus after reviewing data (iReady, STAR, IAR, Grades, Behavior, Attendance, Cultivate, My Voice My School). The ILT completed the CIWP process for this foundation and will be seeking additional feedback from teachers during opening week PD. The school leadership team along with members of the CIWP committee will hold several focus groups for the school community to seek additional feedback on this foundation. During summer 23 programming, families of children attending the program were invited in for brief focus groups. Families were asked about student performance and student academic goals. Feedback from those groups indicated that students generally understand their child's performance, but cannot recall the exact level of performance. </p>	<p>STAR (Math)</p> <p>iReady (Reading)</p> <p>iReady (Math)</p>
Partially	<p>The ILT leads instructional improvement through distributed leadership.</p> <p>Continuum of ILT Effectiveness</p> <p>Distributed Leadership</p>		<p>Cultivate</p> <p>Grades</p> <p>ACCESS</p>
Partially	<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>Students were asked about their classroom experiences and they mentioned that teachers should provide opportunities for critical thinking. Students also mentioned that positive teacher-student relationships empower students to be better students; they also expressed that real world connections should directly tie to students' lived experiences.</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>The CIWP cycle for SY20-23 allowed for teachers to review, revise and redevelop IB Units of study with a focus on equity, cultural relevance, cultural accuracy. Teachers anchored their review in the Learning for Justice Social Justice Standards, incorporating these standards into their IB Units of study. During the pandemic, school leaders visited classrooms virtually using an equity rubric to support teacher feedback. Post pandemic, school leaders visit classrooms formally through the REACH teacher evaluation process and informally through periodic pop in visits. There is an opportunity to increase quick pop in visits with feedback to support teacher development. </p>	
<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.</p>		<p>During SY23, teachers engaged in a year long professional learning cycle, using Dylan Williams Handbook for Embedded Formative Assessment. Professional Learning took place on Professional Development Days along with Grade Level Team Meetings, providing opportunity for teachers to learn, reflect and apply formative assessment practices in the classroom. The Instructional Leadership Team was formally created in SY23, supported financially by Chicago Public Schools with extended day pay and training for team members. The ILT focused on peer observation cycles and getting teachers comfortable observing and providing feedback to their peers. Peer observations focused on developing trust among staff members while also creating space for teachers to share practices that advance student learning. With support from the Illinois State Board of Educations empowerment funds </p>	


There is a difference in student performance on IAR, STAR and iREADY. Many students are not meeting grade level standards and may be having different experiences in how tier 1 instruction is delivered in and across classrooms. Student assessment data has not been consistently used to develop tier 1 instruction along with differentiating instruction. Based on the IB Evaluation report - students are not consistently experiencing inquiry in the classroom.

The Illinois State Board of Education's empowerment funds, co-teaching teams engaged in professional learning that was created and led by teacher leaders who have demonstrated strong co-teaching practices in order to support best practices in co-teaching across the school.

As Peirce works to advance equity - we find it helpful to work in partnership with outside organizations to help push our thinking as a school. Peirce has partnered with several organizations that serve as thought partners along with professional development providers. These partners include the Gust Foundation and Developing Capacity Coaching. Gust partnered and provided professional development with our 2nd grade team to promote inclusive practices.

[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
Partially	MTSS Integrity Memo MTSS Continuum Roots Survey	<p>Peirce has a functioning MTSS team that includes school administrators, case manager, interventionists and Bilingual Lead Teacher. The current MTSS structure focuses mostly on tier 3 interventions and there needs to be more thinking around supporting teachers with implementing tier 2 interventions and monitoring student progress. We have a strong structure and system for implementing and monitoring Tier 3 interventions in Kinder through 4th grades. At the end of SY23 Peirce had 299 students with an IEP or 504 plan, 92% of students with IEPs receive services in LRE 1. We do not currently have a pulse on the quality of IEPs and think this could be helpful to come back to. Implementation of Tier 3 in grades 5-8 is another area of growth, as there is a need to identify research-based interventions for these grade levels and ensure that they are being implemented with fidelity. Branching Minds is a new platform that teachers are becoming familiar with as they identify and track interventions.</p>	<p>Unit/Lesson Inventory for Language Objectives (School Level Data)</p> <p>MTSS Continuum</p> <p>Roots Survey</p> <p>ACCESS</p> <p>MTSS Academic Tier Movement</p> <p>Annual Evaluation of Compliance (ODLSS)</p> <p>Quality Indicators of Specially Designed Curriculum</p>
Partially	MTSS Integrity Memo	<p>Through SY23 Peirce had 1 case manager who was responsible for coordinating 299 IEP and 504 meetings. This led to some IEP and 504 meetings not being held in a timely manner. The quality of IEPs is called into question along with proper implementation. The Peirce LSC approved the hiring of a 2nd Case Manager for SY24 which should alleviate many of these challenges.</p>	<p>EL Program Review Tool</p>
Yes	LRE Dashboard Page	<p>Students who receive tier 3 interventions from an interventionist have made significant progress, many exiting interventions as they move to tier 1 or 2. The role of interventionists have supported a more cohesive referral process for students who have not made adequate progress after receiving interventions.</p>	
Partially	IDEA Procedural Manual	<p>There is opportunity to improve the implementation of tier 2 interventions along with further supporting teachers with the use of Branching Minds. Students who are enrolled in the bilingual program are generally programmed with a teacher who holds the appropriate Bilingual or ESL endorsement. There is a need to increase the number of teachers in middle school who have an ESL or Bilingual Spanish Endorsement. Training for teachers on the use of language objectives has been helpful, but there is opportunity to further expand on this training.</p>	
Yes	EL Placement Recommendation Tool ES EL Placement Recommendation Tool HS	<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>Data shows a difference in longitudinal success in reading after exiting Tier 3 for English Language Learners in particular. Interventionists did continue Tier 3 with a number of students enrolled in the Bilingual Program, students whose data suggested a move to Tier 2, with positive results based on end of year data. This points to expanding this effort by the MTSS to consider a more equitable approach to determining criteria for exiting English Language Learners (i.e. continuing Tier 3 until they reach closer to the 50th percentile vs. 24th). Peirce has received support from the Gust Foundation since SY17, which provides training for staff on inclusive practices. Co-Teaching Professional Learning Communities are in place to support teachers and staff in developing co-teaching practices. The Bilingual Lead Teacher has supported ongoing training and development of teachers.</p>	
No	<p>There are language objectives (that demonstrate HOW students will use language) across the content.</p>		
<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.</p> <p>Students in PK through 8th grades are not consistently receiving tier 2 interventions in reading and math. </p> <p>Students in 5th through 8th grades are not consistently receiving tier 3 interventions in reading and math.</p> <p>English Language Learners who have exited tier 3 interventions often re-enter tier 3 once those interventions are no longer provided.</p>			

[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
Yes	BHT Key Component Assessment SEL Teaming Structure	<p>Peirce has an established Behavioral Health Team (BHT) that meets weekly. The team has members that represent various departments including school Counselors, Social Worker, Restorative Practice Coach, Case Manager, Psychologist and school administrators. In previous CIWP cycles, Peirce focused on the development of a PK-8th grade Social Emotional Learning Scope and Sequence that embeds learning from Second Step, Talking Circles, and a focus on the IB Learning Profile. Previous efforts included training for all teachers on Restorative practices, RP training for all new hires to the school and the creation of a Restorative Practices Position. The attendance team has focused on creating individual plans for students who have chronic absenteeism. Peirce rarely uses out of school suspension as a disciplinary practice, and only uses this if there is a threat to student/community safety that would require the creation of a safety plan prior to having students re-enter. While the school has shifted discipline practices to be restorative and not punitive and while teachers have engaged in several years of training on RP, Equity and healing centered practices, student</p>	<p>% of Students receiving Tier 2/3 interventions meeting targets</p> <p>Reduction in OSS per 100</p> <p>Reduction in repeated disruptive behaviors (4-6 SCC)</p> <p>Access to OST</p>

Yes	Student experience Tier 1 Healing Centered supports, including SEL curricula, Skyline integrated SEL instruction, and restorative practices.	discipline data still shows an over-referral of students of color, male identifying students and students who have an IEP. The school has created a Responding to Bias Based Harm Guide and provided training for teachers and students as one way to intervene when we see bias based behaviors having a negative impact on our school community.	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) Enrichment Program Participation: Enrollment & Attendance Student Voice Infrastructure Reduction in number of students with dropout codes at EOY
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.	<p>What is the feedback from your stakeholders?</p> Teachers have requested that the school provide ongoing training for veteran staff on Restorative Practices, the school provides training for newly onboarded staff currently. There is concern that we are still seeing an over-referral of students of color and students with IEPs, requesting administrative support even though we have engaged heavily in a review of our discipline practices, provided training for teachers on equity, bias and the importance of fostering relationships with students.	
Yes	Students with extended absences or chronic absenteeism re-enter school with an intentional re-entry plan that facilitates attendance and continued enrollment.		
<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.</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>	
Students of color, male identifying students and students with IEPs are referred at a higher rate than any other student group. 17% of students were considered chronically absent (decrease from 20% SY22)- while there are attendance plans in place, we have not been able to get to the root cause of chronic absenteeism.		Peirce staff members have engaged in training on equity based practices in partnership with Gust Foundation, Northwestern, Developing Capacity, Facing History and district professional learning. There is a need to continue this training, not losing sight of our work with equity. Given staff turnover rates, there is also opportunity to revisit Restorative Practices Training and to consider having teachers be trained as RP coaches - an effort that was made in previous years. During SY23 through our partnership with Northwestern, affinity spaces were piloted for students who identify as black. We look to expand affinity spaces in SY24 and beyond.	

[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
Partially	College and Career Competency Curriculum (C4)	6th-8th grade students have a 50-60 minute Learning Community/SEL block of time each day of the week. 2 of those days are dedicated to SEL instruction which includes Postsecondary Success lessons while the other 3 days are dedicated towards differentiated learning. Success bound lessons are new and included in the SEL advisory calendar. Staff still require training in order to implement them. There is opportunity for increased collaboration between school counselor and MYP coordinator to strengthen postsecondary success. Students in 6th-8th grades participate in a career fair. The Peirce-Senn partnership has allowed for teachers to collaborate across grade levels, aligning IB practices and observing instruction in the middle and high school. Students at Peirce have visited Senn High School for tours, performances and service learning projects.	Graduation Rate Program Inquiry: Programs/participation/attainment rates of % of ECCC 3 - 8 On Track Learn, Plan, Succeed % of KPIs Completed (12th Grade) College Enrollment and Persistence Rate 9th and 10th Grade On Track
Partially	Individualized Learning Plans		Cultivate (Relevance to the Future) Freshmen Connection Programs Offered (School Level Data)
Partially	Work Based Learning Toolkit	<p>What is the feedback from your stakeholders?</p> Even though there is time built within our schedule for SEL and Learning Communities, teachers still feel that we do not have enough time in the school year to cover everything. Need to think creatively about ways to expand opportunities for postsecondary success.	
N/A			
N/A	ECCE Certification List		
N/A	PLT Assessment Rubric	<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>	

N/A	<p>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).</p> <p>Alumni Support Initiative One Pager</p>	<p>We currently do not use a college and career program for MYP. There is a Success Bound and School Links program available through CPS, but the challenge is when that would fit during school instruction time. We would like to increase career options for students to attend during Career Day along with looking for school-business partnerships. Students career interests are not always available and those students were not engaged when placed in the next available career presentation slot. PYP does not currently participate in a career day event, other than what each individual teacher is able to coordinate.</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 consistently receiving instruction that focuses on post-secondary success.

[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	<p>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.</p> <p>Spectrum of Inclusive Partnerships</p>	<p>5 Essentials survey shows strong parent-community-staff engagement and partnership. We have lots of involvement among parents/families in terms of participation and volunteers. Many families report hearing from their children's teachers through a variety of channels. However, more can be done to increase the representation among all kids' families across race and class status, increase language access, and diversity the networks of communication we use. A look at the resources provided in the CIWP template, especially the student voice rubric, show that we have a lot of area for improvement in terms of establishing student voice across all systems in the school.</p>	<p>Cultivate</p> <p>5 Essentials Parent Participation Rate</p> <p>5E: Involved Families</p>
Partially	<p>Staff fosters two-way communication with families and community members by regularly offering creative ways for stakeholders to participate.</p> <p>Reimagining With Community Toolkit</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 ODLSS Family Advisory Board (School Level Data)</p>
Partially	<p>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).</p> <p>Student Voice Infrastructure Rubric</p>	<p>What is the feedback from your stakeholders?</p> <p>There is interest in further developing student voice in class and school decision making while making sure that the approach is differentiated to allow for engagement of early learners in PK-2nd especially. There is some question as to what this will look like in the classroom and further support will be needed to establish a vision and guidance for teams. There is also interest in making sure that all students are engaged, regardless of individual identities and a need to make sure that we are explicitly engaging students of color.</p>	<p>Formal and informal family and community feedback received locally. (School Level Data)</p>
<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.</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>It's possible that students of color and multilingual learners are negatively affected by seeing their white peers' families participating in school events and having easier access to participate in the classroom environment than their own due to structural/school patterns.</p> <p>If a student's leadership capacities are not being fully developed and leveraged, their full sense of self is not able to be present and honored in the classroom and the school environment. As a result, the young person might feel less invested academically or actually "shut down" or "check out" from school. Opportunities can be missed in terms of learning, community building, and student leadership.</p>		<p>Student council shifted to being grade band aligned (3-4, 5-6, 7-8) and SC meetings take place during lunch (instead of after school), which theoretically increases access to participation for students. All Student Council members are now elected by their peers, instead of nominated by their teachers (previous practice). The changes to student council were created after seeking input from students on how to expand student voice opportunities school wide.</p> <p>Some piloting of identity-based affinity groups has taken place (student voice) and will continue into SY24.</p>	
		<p>BAC efforts have increased the number of Spanish-speaking volunteers at BAC events as well as at coordinated events organized across community/parent groups.</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.
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.
Partially	Evidence-based assessment for learning practices are enacted daily in every classroom.

What are the takeaways after the review of metrics?

Key data from state assessments:
 K-2 Reading, 75% of students are performing on/above grade level according to iReady
 K-2 Math, 60% of students are performing on/above grade level according to iReady
 3-8 Reading, 64% of students are at/above benchmark according to STAR Reading
 3-8 Math, 62% of students are at/above benchmark according to STAR Math

3-8 IAR data shows that 35% of students met/exceeded standards on IAR Reading
 3-8 IAR data shows that 30% of students met/exceeded standards on IAR Math

Through state assessments (above) and the IB evaluation we understand there are many areas to celebrate regarding instruction. The IB report states that "teachers remove barriers to learning to enable every student to develop, pursue and achieve challenging personal goals".

Coming out of the pandemic, students re-entered school at varying places academically. While some students engaged completely during remote learning, other students did not. Gaps in learning varied among students. Peirce along with Chicago Public Schools emphasized the importance of Social Emotional Learning while also affirming student identities. Teachers worked on building positive relationships with and among students in order to develop a sense of community. Cultivate survey data from EOY23 indicated that Affirming Identities was our highest rated component. With recent efforts to embed SEL, rigor differs across grade levels and over 50% of our students are not making expected growth on interim benchmark assessments (STAR).

During the SY20-SY23 CIWP cycle, teachers reviewed, revised and developed IB Units of Study with a focus on the inner core (identity, community, and relationships). Curriculum revisions included the incorporation of the Learning for Justice Standards along with an alignment of all state standards, next steps are to monitor implementation and progress towards mastering standards as well as greater emphasis on differentiated instruction that is rigorous and standards aligned.

What is the feedback from your stakeholders?

The Instructional Leadership Team identified Curriculum and Instruction as an area of focus after reviewing data (iReady, STAR, IAR, Grades, Behavior, Attendance, Cultivate, My Voice My School). The ILT completed the CIWP process for this foundation and will be seeking additional feedback from teachers during opening week PD. The school leadership team along with members of the CIWP committee will hold several focus groups for the school community to seek additional feedback on this foundation. During summer 23 programming, families of children attending the program were invited in for brief focus groups. Families were asked about student performance and student academic goals. Feedback from those groups indicated that students generally understand their child's performance, but cannot recall the exact level of performance.

Students were asked about their classroom experiences and they mentioned that teachers should provide opportunities for critical thinking. Students also mentioned that positive teacher-student relationships empower students to be better students; they also expressed that real world connections should directly tie to students' lived experiences.

What student-centered problems have surfaced during this reflection?

There is a difference in student performance on IAR, STAR and iREADY. Many students are not meeting grade level standards and may be having different experiences in how tier 1 instruction is delivered in and across classrooms. Student assessment data has not been consistently used to develop tier 1 instruction along with differentiating instruction. Based on the IB Evaluation report - students are not consistently experiencing inquiry in the classroom.

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?

The CIWP cycle for SY20-23 allowed for teachers to review, revise and redevelop IB Units of study with a focus on equity, cultural relevance, cultural accuracy. Teachers anchored their review in the Learning for Justice Social Justice Standards, incorporating these standards into their IB Units of study. During the pandemic, school leaders visited classrooms virtually using an equity rubric to support teacher feedback. Post pandemic, school leaders visit classrooms formally through the REACH teacher evaluation process and informally through periodic pop in visits. There is an opportunity to increase quick pop in visits with feedback to support teacher development.

During SY23, teachers engaged in a year long professional learning cycle, using Dylan Williams Handbook for Embedded Formative Assessment. Professional Learning took place on Professional Development Days along with Grade Level Team Meetings, providing opportunity for teachers to learn, reflect and apply formative assessment practices in the classroom. The Instructional Leadership Team was formally created in SY23, supported financially by Chicago Public Schools with extended day pay and training for team members. The ILT focused on peer observation cycles and getting teachers comfortable observing and providing feedback to their peers. Peer observations focused on developing trust among staff members while also creating space for teachers to share practices that advance student learning. With support from the Illinois State Board of Educations empowerment funds, co-teaching teams engaged in professional learning that was created and led by teacher leaders who have demonstrated strong co-teaching practices in order to support best practices in co-teaching across the school.

As Peirce works to advance equity - we find it helpful to work in partnership with outside organizations to help push our thinking as a school. Peirce has partnered with several organizations that serve as thought partners along with professional development providers. These partners include the Gust Foundation and Developing Capacity Coaching. Gust partnered and provided professional development with our 2nd grade team to promote inclusive practices.

Return to Top

Determine Priorities

Resources:

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

Students...

Students are not making expected growth on current assessment systems - some students start on grade level and end off grade level while others start off grade level and stay off grade level.

[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...

Need to develop common understanding and expectations on standards aligned, rigorous differentiated tasks



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....
create standards aligned, rigorous differentiated tasks

then we see....
all students accessing grade level content

which leads to...
tier 1 instruction that meets the needs of all students

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

Instructional Leadership Team (ILT)

Dates for Progress Monitoring Check Ins

Q1	10/11/2023 Changed to October 24, 2023 due to HS Admissions test on Oct 11	Q3	March 6, 2024
Q2	December 6,	Q4	May 22, 2024

SY24 Implementation Milestones & Action Steps

Who

By When

Progress Monitoring

	SY24 Implementation Milestones & Action Steps	Who	By When	Progress Monitoring
Implementation Milestone 1	All teachers will engage in PD on how to create standards aligned, rigorous and differentiated student tasks	Teachers	May 2024	In Progress
Action Step 1	Teachers will have common understanding of differentiation and rigor	Teachers	October 2023	In Progress
Action Step 2	Review standards alignment by content and grade, revise as necessary	Staff	August 2023	Completed
Action Step 3	Provide PD on Blooms Taxonomy and Depths Of Knowledge Framework	Teachers	January 2024	In Progress
Action Step 4	Analyze tasks using Blooms taxonomy, Depths Of Knowledge Framework and state standards	Teachers	February 2024	In Progress
Action Step 5	Content teams have dedicated time to create, implement and analyze standards aligned, rigorous and differentiated tasks	Teachers	May 2024	Select Status
Action Step 6				Select Status
Action Step 7				Select Status
Implementation Milestone 2	All teachers are using rigorous differentiated tasks to deliver instruction	Teachers	June 2025	Select Status
Action Step 1	Modify rigor walk rubric to include differentiated tasks	ILT Members	September 2024	Select Status
Action Step 2	ILT members conduct rigorwalks to observe, collect data, provide coaching and feedback to staff on rigorous differentiated tasks	ILT Members	May 2025	Select Status
Action Step 3	Use rigor walk rubric to gather data on BOY/MOY/EOY	Teachers	Quarterly in SY25	Select Status
Action Step 4	Teachers will use benchmark data to determine the effectiveness of instruction	Teachers	Every 5 weeks SY24	Select Status
Action Step 5	Teachers will analyze student performance on rigorous differentiated tasks monthly	Teachers	Quarterly in SY25	Select Status
Action Step 6				Select Status
Action Step 7				Select Status
Implementation Milestone 3	100% of teachers with students that are EL are providing Tier 1 instruction using characteristics of high quality EL teaching	Teachers	SY26	In Progress
Action Step 1	Complete the EL Placement Recommendation Tool to maximize the bilingual/ESL services provided in classrooms and limit gaps in services	ELPT / Teachers	Annually	In Progress
Action Step 2	BOY PD on Tier 1 EL student supports based on OLCE PD modules and responsive to trends seen around the school	ELPT / Teachers	Annually	Select Status
Action Step 3	GLT team work time with ELPT to implement identified strategies for that teachers/grade level	ELPT / Teachers	Ongoing	Select Status

Action Step 4	Observe teachers EL instruction using a lookfor tool that is informed by EL addendum	ELPT	Ongoing	Select Status
Action Step 5	Check in with GLTs using data to lead actions (informed by EL addendum domain 3) / next steps every 5 weeks during data days	ELPT / Teachers	November SY25	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	Class walkthroughs show that 70% of classrooms are implementing standards aligned, rigorous, differentiated tasks.	
SY26 Anticipated Milestones	Class walkthroughs show that 100% of classrooms are implementing standards aligned, rigorous, differentiated tasks.	

[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 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
Increase the percent of students moving up or staying at/above benchmark	Yes	STAR (Reading)	Overall	64%	70%	76%	80%
			English Learners	59%	64%	69%	74%
Increase the percent of students moving up or staying at/above benchmark	Yes	STAR (Math)	Overall	62%	68%	74%	78%
			English Learners	60%	65%	70%	75%

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:4 The ILT leads instructional improvement through distributed leadership.	ILT will develop a 3 year PD scope and sequence to engage all teachers on providing standards aligned, rigorous and differentiated tasks and begin implementation	Content teams have dedicated time to create, implement and analyze standards aligned, rigorous and differentiated tasks	100% of returning teachers have engaged in PD on standards aligned, rigorous and differentiated student tasks
C&I:2 Students experience grade-level, standards-aligned instruction.	Use rigor walk rubric to gather data on BOY of the three year data capture	Teachers will analyze student performance and ILT members will conduct rigorwalks	100% of returning teachers are using rigorous differentiated tasks to deliver instruction
C&I:2 Students experience grade-level, standards-aligned instruction.	BOY PD on Tier 1 EL student supports based on OLCE PD modules and responsive to trends seen around the school	GLT team work time with ELPT to implement identified strategies for that teachers/grade level	100% of returning teachers with students that are EL are providing Tier 1 instruction using characteristics of high quality EL teaching

[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
Increase the percent of students moving up or staying at/above benchmark	STAR (Reading)	Overall	64%	70%	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
		English Learners	59%	64%	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
Increase the percent of students moving up or staying at/above benchmark	STAR (Math)	Overall	62%	68%	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
		English Learners	60%	65%	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:4 The ILT leads instructional improvement through distributed leadership.	ILT will develop a 3 year PD scope and sequence to engage all teachers on providing standards aligned, rigorous and differentiated tasks and begin implementation	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
C&I:2 Students experience grade-level, standards-aligned instruction.	Use rigor walk rubric to gather data on BOY of the three year data capture	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
C&I:2 Students experience grade-level, standards-aligned instruction.	BOY PD on Tier 1 EL student supports based on OLCE PD modules and responsive to trends seen around the school	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status

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.
Yes	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.
Yes	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?

Peirce has a functioning MTSS team that includes school administrators, case manager, interventionists and Bilingual Lead Teacher. The current MTSS structure focuses mostly on tier 3 interventions and there needs to be more thinking around supporting teachers with implementing tier 2 interventions and monitoring student progress. We have a strong structure and system for implementing and monitoring Tier 3 interventions in Kinder through 4th grades. At the end of SY23 Peirce had 299 students with an IEP or 504 plan, 92% of students with IEPs receive services in LRE 1. We do not currently have a pulse on the quality of IEPs and think this could be helpful to come back to. Implementation of Tier 3 in grades 5-8 is another area of growth, as there is a need to identify research-based interventions for these grade levels and ensure that they are being implemented with fidelity. Branching Minds is a new platform that teachers are becoming familiar with as they identify and track interventions.

What is the feedback from your stakeholders?

Through SY23 Peirce had 1 case manager who was responsible for coordinating 299 IEP and 504 meetings. This led to some IEP and 504 meetings not being held in a timely manner. The quality of IEPs is called into question along with proper implementation. The Peirce LSC approved the hiring of a 2nd Case Manager for SY24 which should alleviate many of these challenges.

Students who receive tier 3 interventions from an interventionist have made significant progress, many exiting interventions as they move to tier 1 or 2. The role of interventionists have supported a more cohesive referral process for students who have not made adequate progress after receiving interventions.

There is opportunity to improve the implementation of tier 2 interventions along with further supporting teachers with the use of Branching Minds. Students who are enrolled in the bilingual program are generally programmed with a teacher who holds the appropriate Bilingual or ESL endorsement. There is a need to increase the number of teachers in middle school who have an ESL or Bilingual Spanish Endorsement. Training for teachers on the use of language objectives has been helpful, but there is opportunity to further expand on this training.

What student-centered problems have surfaced during this reflection?

Students in PK through 8th grades are not consistently receiving tier 2 interventions in reading and math.
 Students in 5th through 8th grades are not consistently receiving tier 3 interventions in reading and math.
 English Language Learners who have exited tier 3 interventions often re-enter tier 3 once those interventions are no longer provided.

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?

Data shows a difference in longitudinal success in reading after exiting Tier 3 for English Language Learners in particular. Interventionists did continue Tier 3 with a number of students enrolled in the Bilingual Program, students whose data suggested a move to Tier 2, with positive results based on end of year data. This points to expanding this effort by the MTSS to consider a more equitable approach to determining criteria for exiting English Language Learners (i.e. continuing Tier 3 until they reach closer to the 50th percentile vs. 24th). Peirce has received support from the Gust Foundation since SY17, which provides training for staff on inclusive practices. Co-Teaching Professional Learning Communities are in place to support teachers and staff in developing co-teaching practices. The Bilingual Lead Teacher has supported ongoing training and development of teachers.

[Return to Top](#)

Determine Priorities

Resources:

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

Students...

After reviewing MTSS Data, we saw that many English Language Learners make progress after receiving tier 2/3 interventions, but once those interventions are removed, students regress on benchmark assessments.

[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...

Need to develop MTSS monitoring process that continues through 8th grade along with establishing clear expectations and support systems for teachers in 5th-8th grades around tier 2/3 interventions and guidance for PK-4 teachers on tier 2 interventions.



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

Resources:

What is your Theory of Action?

If we....

develop an MTSS Committee that creates a system to support the training and development of teachers on the use of tiered interventions



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)"

then we see....

tiered interventions implemented consistently across classrooms



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

which leads to...

an increase of students scoring on grade level via benchmark assessments



[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

Dates for Progress Monitoring Check Ins

Q1 10/11/2023 Changed to October 24, 2023 due to HS Admissions test on Oct 11
 Q2 December 6,
 Q3 March 6, 2024
 Q4 May 22, 2024

SY24 Implementation Milestones & Action Steps

Who

By When

Progress Monitoring

Implementation Milestone 1	MTSS team will be FULLY OPERATIONAL in systems and infrastructure.	MTSS Team	June 2024	In Progress
Action Step 1	MTSS Team will meet weekly	MTSS Team	September 2023	In Progress
Action Step 2	MTSS team will create a structure/protocol for determining when students need tier 2 or tier 3 interventions	MTSS Team	September 2023	Completed
Action Step 3	MTSS team will create a 2 way communication system between teachers and the MTSS committee	MTSS Team	October 2023	In Progress
Action Step 4	MTSS team will train teachers on creating targeted goals	MTSS Team/Teacher Teams	October 2023	In Progress
Action Step 5	Teachers will create intervention schedule and groups and share with	Teacher Teams	September 2023	In Progress
Implementation Milestone 2	MTSS team and Staff will be FULLY OPERATIONAL in the use Branching Minds to document interventions	MTSS Team	June 2025	In Progress
Action Step 1	MTSS team and staff analyze assessment data to determine students who need Tier 2 and Tier 3 services	MTSS Team	September 2023	In Progress
Action Step 2	MTSS team and staff will use the problem solving process to determine student needs	MTSS Team/Teacher Teams	Ongoing	Select Status
Action Step 3	MTSS team and staff will create Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups in Branching minds and will create targeted goals/provide training for teachers on how to create targeted goals	MTSS Team/Teacher Teams	September 2023	In Progress
Action Step 4	MTSS team and staff will progress monitor and track student progress in branching minds	MTSS Team/Teacher Teams	Ongoing	In Progress
Action Step 5				Select Status
Implementation Milestone 3	All staff will be trained on how to use the request for referral form	MTSS Team	November 2023	Select Status
Action Step 1	Determine data that needs to be collected	MTSS Team	September 2023	Completed
Action Step 2	Create guidelines for completing request for review	MTSS Team	September 2023	Completed
Action Step 3	Create a google form for staff to complete	MTSS Team	October 2023	Completed
Action Step 4	Determine the frequency of reviews and how next steps will be communicated with staff	MTSS Team	October 2023	Completed
Action Step 5	Train staff on how to use the form during GLs	MTSS Team/Teacher Teams	November 2023	Select Status
Implementation Milestone 4	Teachers will engage in ongoing training related to inclusive practices with a focus on equity	ILT	Ongoing	Select Status
Action Step 1	Send cohorts of teachers to annual inclusive practices training with Gust Foundation	Admin Team	October 2023 annually	In Progress
Action Step 2	Provide PD for teachers on behavioral supports and refreshers on Restorative Practices	RP Coach/Gust	August 2023	Completed
Action Step 3	Teacher teams will review student behavior data on a quarterly basis disaggregated by IEP, Race, Gender, EL	ILT/RP Coach	Quarterly starting August 2023	In Progress
Action Step 4	Teachers and school leadership team will engage in professional learning with Facing History	ILT	Quarterly starting August 2023	In Progress
Action Step 5	Staff take an annual belief survey to measure shifts in practice	ILT	August 2024	Select Status

SY25-SY26 Implementation Milestones

SY25 Anticipated Milestones	MTSS team will be FULLY OPERATIONAL in systems and infrastructure. Teachers will create intervention schedule and groups and share with the MTSS team MTSS Team will be DEVELOPED in the use of Branching Minds to document and progress monitor interventions	
SY26 Anticipated Milestones	MTSS team and Staff will be FULLY OPERATIONAL in the use Branching Minds to document interventions	

[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 an 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
Increase in the percentage of students who are meeting Tier 2/3 intervention goals in reading and/or math	Yes	% of Students receiving Tier 2/3 interventions meeting targets	Students in Tiers 2/3	57%	60%	75%	90%
			Select Group or Overall				
Increase in the percentage of students performing in intervention or urgent intervention according to BOY STAR will have positive tier movement according to the EOY STAR Benchmark report	Yes	MTSS Academic Tier Movement	Students in Tier 2/3 Math	33%	53%	63%	70%
			Students in Tier 2/3 Reading	28%	38%	48%	60%

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: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 EOY ratings fall in developed or higher in at least 6 out of 8 categories of the MTSS Continuum	The MTSS leadership team rates EOY ratings fall in developed or higher in at least 7 out of 8 categories of the MTSS Continuum	The MTSS leadership team rates EOY ratings fall in developed or higher in at least 8 out of 8 categories of the MTSS Continuum
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.	School personnel utilize universal screening data to develop and implement student plans with identified goals in branching minds	School personnel utilize universal screening data to develop and implement student plans with identified goals and tiered interventions in Branching Minds	School personnel utilize universal screening data to collaboratively review support plans and progress on interventions across content areas and grade level classroom/teas within Branching minds Platform
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.	Teacher teams will review student behavior data on a quarterly basis disaggregated by IEP, Race, Gender, EL	Teacher teams will review student behavior data on a quarterly basis disaggregated by IEP, Race, Gender, EL	Teacher teams will review student behavior data on a quarterly basis disaggregated by IEP, Race, Gender, EL

[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
Increase in the percentage of students who are meeting Tier 2/3 intervention goals in reading and/or math	% of Students receiving Tier 2/3 interventions meeting targets	Students in Tiers 2/3	57%	60%	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
		Select Group or Overall			Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
Increase in the percentage of students performing in intervention or urgent intervention according to BOY STAR will have positive tier movement according to the EOY STAR Benchmark report	MTSS Academic Tier Movement	Students in Tier 2/3 Math	33%	53%	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
		Students in Tier 2/3 Reading	28%	38%	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: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 EOY ratings fall in developed or higher in at least 6 out of 8 categories of the MTSS Continuum	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status

[Jump to...](#)
[Priority](#)
[TOA](#)
[Goal Setting](#)
[Progress](#)

[Reflection](#)
[Root Cause](#)
[Implementation Plan](#)
[Monitoring](#)

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

Inclusive & Supportive Learning Environment

<p>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.</p>	<p>School personnel utilize universal screening data to develop and implement student plans with identified goals in branching minds</p>	<p>Select Status</p>	<p>Select Status</p>	<p>Select Status</p>	<p>Select Status</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Teacher teams will review student behavior data on a quarterly basis disaggregated by IEP, Race, Gender, EL</p>	<p>Select Status</p>	<p>Select Status</p>	<p>Select Status</p>	<p>Select Status</p>

Reflection on Foundation

Using the associated documents, is this practice consistently implemented?

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.
Partially	Staff fosters two-way communication with families and community members by regularly offering creative ways for stakeholders to participate.
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).

What are the takeaways after the review of metrics?

5 Essentials survey shows strong parent-community-staff engagement and partnership. We have lots of involvement among parents/families in terms of participation and volunteers. Many families report hearing from their children's teachers through a variety of channels. However, more can be done to increase the representation among all kids' families across race and class status, increase language access, and diversity the networks of communication we use. A look at the resources provided in the CIWP template, especially the student voice rubric, show that we have a lot of area for improvement in terms of establishing student voice across all systems in the school.

What is the feedback from your stakeholders?

There is interest in further developing student voice in class and school decision making while making sure that the approach is differentiated to allow for engagement of early learners in PK-2nd especially. There is some question as to what this will look like in the classroom and further support will be needed to establish a vision and guidance for teams. There is also interest in making sure that all students are engaged, regardless of individual identities and a need to make sure that we are explicitly engaging students of color.

What student-centered problems have surfaced during this reflection?

It's possible that students of color and multilingual learners are negatively affected by seeing their white peers' families participating in school events and having easier access to participate in the classroom environment than their own due to structural/school patterns.

If a student's leadership capacities are not being fully developed and leveraged, their full sense of self is not able to be present and honored in the classroom and the school environment. As a result, the young person might feel less invested academically or actually "shut down" or "check out" from school. Opportunities can be missed in terms of learning, community building, and student leadership.

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?

Student council shifted to being grade band aligned (3-4, 5-6, 7-8) and SC meetings take place during lunch (instead of after school), which theoretically increases access to participation for students. All Student Council members are now elected by their peers, instead of nominated by their teachers (previous practice). The changes to student council were created after seeking input from students on how to expand student voice opportunities school wide.

Some piloting of identity-based affinity groups has taken place (student voice) and will continue into SY24.

BAC efforts have increased the number of Spanish-speaking volunteers at BAC events as well as at coordinated events organized across community/parent groups.

Return to Top Determine Priorities

Resources:

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

Students...

Young people at Peirce are not fully engaged in class and school wide decision making.

Stemming from component:
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).

[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...

Lack of common vision, language, training, expectations related to engaging students in class and school decision making.

[5 Whys 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....

create a student voice steering committee that supports the development of a common vision, language, training, expectations related to engaging students in class and school decision making

then we see....

classroom and school wide structures that are intentionally planned to include and develop student voice and leadership.

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.

which leads to...
 an increase of student voice and agency in class and school decision making 

[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 

Student Voice Steering Committee

Dates for Progress Monitoring Check Ins




Q1	10/11/2023 Changed to October 24, 2023 due to HS Admissions test on Oct 11	Q3	March 6, 2024
Q2	December 6,	Q4	May 22, 2024

SY24 Implementation Milestones & Action Steps 

Who 

By When 

Progress Monitoring

	SY24 Implementation Milestones & Action Steps 	Who 	By When 	Progress Monitoring
Implementation Milestone 1	The "Listening" Domain of the Student Voice Infrastructure Rubric scores in the "Meeting" Range	Student Voice Steering Committee	June 7, 2024	Select Status
Action Step 1	Develop Student Voice Steering Committee, identify staff members to participate and create meeting schedule, review MVMS and Cultivate Data, Student Voice Rubric and develop committee goals	Admin	November 29, 2023	Select Status
Action Step 2	Teacher teams listening structures are established and fully leveraged	SV Steering Committee	March 29, 2024	Select Status
Action Step 3	Identify current classroom and school practices along with practices that teachers, students and school leaders would like to develop	SV Steering Committee	January 31, 2024	Select Status
Action Step 4	Review Student Voice Rubric and score BOY, MOY, EOY	SV Steering Committee	November 30, 2023	Select Status
Action Step 5	School leadership teams seek out and collect perspectives of	SV Steering Committee	November 30, 2023	Select Status
Action Step 6	Create opportunities for students to participate in affinity spaces	AP Lee & Josiah Rosario	November 30, 2023	In Progress
Implementation Milestone 2	The "Collaborate" Domain of the Student Voice Infrastructure Rubric scores in the "Meeting" Range	SV Steering Committee	June 6, 2025	Select Status
Action Step 1	School wide leadership teams create space for students to co-create ideas and suggestions for improvement of targeted priority areas	SV Steering Committee	October 31, 2025	Select Status
Action Step 2	Teacher teams/teachers work collaboratively with students to elicit student ideas and suggestions for improvement during teacher-driven learning cycles	Teacher Teams	October 31, 2025	Select Status
Action Step 3	Staff consistently consider ways they can work with with students in decision-making, problem-solving, events, or initiatives	Teacher Teams	October 31, 2025	Select Status
Action Step 4	Hold focus groups with students who have discipline referrals to learn more about their experience with school and overall connectedness to the school	SV Steering Committee	Annually beginning in March 2024	Select Status
Action Step 5	Measure the number of students overall and by aspects of identity that are engaged in schoolwide student voice	SV Steering Committee	Annually beginning SY25	Select Status
Implementation Milestone 3	The "Lead" Domain of the Student Voice Infrastructure Rubric scores in the "Meeting" Range	SV Steering Committee	June 6, 2026	Select Status
Action Step 1	Students in leadership and decision-making roles represent the diversity of the student body, and ensure varied perspectives	SV Steering Committee	November 30, 2023	Select Status
Action Step 2	The CIWP team has a student-leadership team with a decision-making role that is either: a) a part of the CIWP process; or b) In charge of evaluating and planning for a priority area (e.g. the Student Voice Committee has a leadership role in developing actions for the schools prioritized Cultivate condition).	SV Steering Committee	November 30, 2025	Select Status
Action Step 3	Teacher teams (department or grade level teams) have a student advisory committee that they meet with regularly (e.g. Social Science Student Advisory Team; Literacy Department Student Taskforce).	Teacher Teams	November 30, 2025	Select Status
Action Step 4	Student Representatives (LSC reps, Student Government, SVCs) have responsibilities that help them represent the student body's interests (e.g. providing student-interest updates to the LSC; presenting findings and suggestions to staff during regularly scheduled staff meetings).	SV Steering Committee	November 30, 2025	Select Status
Action Step 5	Student groups have leadership and decision-making roles. This might look like; students identifying priority areas they believe should be a focus after reviewing school data students are assigned a priority area to lead: design strategies, presents to staff, etc. students hold student-facing meetings to share updates on the plans, goals, and get feedback from other students student groups take the lead on collecting student feedback from the rest of the student body.	SV Steering Committee	June 5, 2026	Select Status
Action Step 6	Identify resources needed to support Student Voice Committee	SV Steering Committee	March 2024	Select Status
Action Step 7				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	100% of teams have opportunities for students to collaborate with them on classroom and school decision making as noted in the Collaborate Domain of the Student Voice Infrastructure Rubric.	
SY26 Anticipated Milestones	Students take on leadership with the development of the SY27-29 CIWP as noted in the Lead Domain of the Student Voice Infrastructure Rubric.	

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 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
Student Voice Domain of the Cultivate Survey has a rating of 76	Yes	Cultivate	Overall	61	66	71	76
			NA				
Decrease the percentage of students with an IEP and students of color who are referred for discipline	Yes	Other	Students with an IEP	44	34	24	14
			Other [Student of Color]	78	68	58	48

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
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).	Students create PK-8 survey or tool to monitor current state and future state goals	Students create PK-8 survey or tool to monitor current state and future state goals	Students create PK-8 survey or tool to monitor current state and future state goals
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).	Student Voice Steering Committee meets on a monthly basis at minimum and creates a plan for developing student voice school wide	Teacher teams listening structures are established and fully leveraged	CIWP team includes student participation
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).	School leadership teams seek out and collect perspectives of students most impacted by their solutions to problems they are trying to solve (targeted universalism)	School leadership teams seek out and collect perspectives of students most impacted by their solutions to problems they are trying to solve (targeted universalism)	School leadership teams seek out and collect perspectives of students most impacted by their solutions to problems they are trying to solve (targeted universalism)

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
Student Voice Domain of the Cultivate	Cultivate	Overall	61	66	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status

[Jump to...](#)
 [Priority](#)
 [TOA](#)
 [Goal Setting](#)
 [Progress Monitoring](#)

Survey has a rating of 76		NA			
Decrease the percentage of students with an IEP and students of color who are referred for discipline	Other	Students with an IEP	44	34	
		Other [Student of Color]	78	68	

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

Partnership & Engagement

Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status
Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status

Practice Goals

Progress Monitoring

Identified Practices	SY24	Progress Monitoring			
		Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
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).	Students create PK-8 survey or tool to monitor current state and future state goals	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).	Student Voice Steering Committee meets on a monthly basis at minimum and creates a plan for developing student voice school wide	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).	School leadership teams seek out and collect perspectives of students most impacted by their solutions to problems they are trying to solve (targeted universalism)	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status	Select Status

If Checked:
Complete
IL-Empower
Section below

Our school receives school improvement funding through Title I, Part A, 1003 (IL-Empower)

This CIWP serves as your School Improvement Plan, which is required for schools in school improvement status (comprehensive or targeted) as identified by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE). The following section, "IL-Empower," addresses grant requirements, assurances, and alignment across your CIWP, grant budget, and state designation.

If Checked:
No action needed

**Our school DOES NOT receive school improvement funding through Title I, Part A, 1003 (IL-Empower).
(Continue to Parent & Family Plan)**



<input type="text" value="Select a Goal"/>					
<input type="text" value="Select a Goal"/>					
<input type="text" value="Select a Goal"/>					

This CIWP serves as your School Improvement Plan, which is required for schools in school improvement status (comprehensive or targeted) as identified by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE). The following section, "IL-Empower," addresses grant requirements, assurances, and alignment across your CIWP, grant budget, and state designation.

Parent and Family Plan

If Checked:

Complete School & Family Engagement Policy, School & Family Compact, and Parent & Family Engagement Budget sections

Our school is a Title I school operating a Schoolwide Program

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.

If Checked:

No action needed

Our school is a non-Title I school that does not receive any Title I funds. (Continue to Approval)

