

CRETE-MONEE MIDDLE SCHOOL

WORK PLAN FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

2018-2019 SCHOOL YEAR

IL-EMPOWER Whole Child, Whole School, Whole Community

Kokona Chrisos, Principal, chrisosk@cm201u.org

School Requested Planning Year: YES

I. Indicate current status of school performance against State-determined long term goals.

(Include: performance of subgroups, achievement gaps, and performance relative to indicators beyond academic achievement)

Our school designation was based on an underperforming student group in our school: Students with an IEP. Students with an IEP represent approximately 17% of the student population at CMMS. According to our data:

- Overall, our students were 29% proficient on the PARCC ELA section compared to 37% at the state.
- On PARCC Math, only 11% of our overall population were proficient compared to 32% at the state.
- Our school had 25.1% Eighth grade students passing Algebra I compared to 30.6% for the state. There are only two sections of Algebra I in eighth grade with less than 60 students populating those classes.
- Math is a relative weakness for all students (IEP and non-IEP students) on PARCC statewide; however, there is a much larger achievement gap between IEP and non-IEP students in ELA according to PARCC (31% gap in ELA vs 17% gap in Math)
- 2018 PARCC
 - IEP Students ELA/**NON-IEP Students ELA**
 - CMMS 8th grade: 0% met/**32% met**
 - CMMS 7th grade: 2% met/**39% met**
 - CMMS 6th grade: 5% met/**30% met**
 - IEP Students Math/**NON-IEP Students MATH**
 - CMMS 8th grade: 2% met/**15% met**
 - CMMS 7th grade: 0% met/**14% met**
 - CMMS 6th grade: 0% met/**9% met**
- On the PARCC ELA section, the Non-IEP group had a proficiency of 34% and IEP students had a proficiency of 2% representing an achievement gap of 32 percentage points between these two groups. Compare this with a state gap of 33 percentage points between both of the same identified groups (41% Non-IEP Proficiency to 8% IEP Proficiency).
- On the PARCC Math section, the Non-IEP group had a proficiency of 13% and IEP students had a proficiency of 1% representing an achievement gap of 12 percentage points between these two groups. Compare this with a statewide gap of 27 percentage points.

II. Summarize school findings based on IBAM Needs Assessment and/or other needs assessments conducted at the school.

After reviewing our rubric, we were *Emerging* in 9 areas, *Accomplished* in 13 areas, and *Exemplary* in 1.

- We have a clear vision, clear expectations, and work continually to create a culture where students feel safe and free to ask questions. Our curriculum is aligned to common core standards and the IB/MYP requirements.
- We utilize a variety of data (academic, behavioral, climate, etc.) in order to determine areas of need in our building, analyze the effectiveness of interventions put in place, and to make decisions about our programs and initiatives.
- We have building systems in place to address all areas, but see some of these areas as needing more focus and refinement, especially as it pertains to Response to Intervention and support services and methods.
- Our school provides students with social-emotional lessons and resources for support from grade-level counselors and social workers. This is new this year as we have purchased the Second Step curriculum and have committed to keep a daily Advisory time for all students.
- Staff members in our building generally feel valued and supported by administration. Staff members (certified) are provided with opportunities for professional development. This is an area that needs some additional attention as non-teaching staff do not feel as though PD opportunities are geared towards their particular needs.
- Teacher evaluation frameworks are strong and well developed both in our school and district wide.
- Many of these categories were marked as emerging because we either don't have it at the district level (such as a District Leadership Team) or we were unaware of the district implementing them. However, as a building we were accomplished for the same categories. There needs to be a more cohesive system in place so that the district to school comparison isn't so vastly different.

III. Identify any resource inequities, which may include budgeting, to be addressed through implementation of this improvement plan.

There are a variety of inequities that we believe need to be addressed:

- Our district is at 64% financial capacity to meet expectations. 70.5% of our students are considered low-income. This disparity alone is difficult to overcome without a more realistic funding system in place.

- There is a lack of physical space building wide and complex scheduling needs to be able to facilitate an IB/MYP Framework with fidelity. This has caused us to have to go to a complicated scheduling model that impacts our number of daily academic minutes. The only feasible solution to this would be to look at adding minutes to the academic day, and this is a contractual issue.
- Specific math interventions or courses that address particular levels of math. We have a wide variety of options in our literacy offerings but the same cannot be said for math. Other than honors level, general level, co-taught classes and instructional SPED classes. Looking into specific intervention programs for math, and building up our ability to group students with more flexibility would help. Also, we are on a textbook adoption cycle and are working on selecting a new series to anchor our math program. This will involve specific focus on training and implementation.
- Math Coach or Math Interventionist (Teacher Leader) who can provide PD to math department, especially SPED Co-Teachers and Instructional Teachers who are not necessarily trained to teach math. This interventionist could also work with teachers to plan for interventions, progress monitor student progress and group/regroup students as needed.
- More system wide interventions and common intervention/acceleration thresholds among all district schools. There are a multitude of strategies and interventions in place district wide, but the uniformity of this is not always evident. Students who come through our system need to be identified by a common set of thresholds and receive common interventions regardless of what building they come from. This also includes availability of targeted interventions district wide.
- Extended school day and summer intervention options are not always feasible for us due to budgetary constraints. We have made some inroads with this using Title I money and have incorporate some summer offerings and some after school intervention.
- Technology is being implemented quickly for students. We are moving to a 1:1 environment in the next year yet our classroom technology is aging, and our teachers are not all at the same level of proficiency with the instructional technology that is available to them.

IV. Detail activities, interventions, and strategies the school intends to implement to address needs identified earlier. Briefly describe how these strategies and interventions will address gaps in achievement and student inequities.

Our plan will include the following components:

- Systems self-assessment and action planning with CEC, our IL Empower Partner. This work will include an analysis of our current communication, collaboration and intervention systems building wide. In particular, we want to make certain that all of the work that we are doing in various departments aligns with our school-wide academic goals. This process will involve all stakeholder groups and allow for us to build on some of the strengths highlighted in the Illinois Quality Framework Rubric.. In particular we are going to focus on:
 - Structure and function of our School Leadership Team

- Structure and function of our in-house intervention time/RAMP
 - Structure and function of our departments, PLC's, Universal and Tier II teams, and grade level teams
 - Communication structures and their effectiveness in such a large building
 - Curriculum coverage and interdisciplinary connections/support
 - Stakeholder priorities and needs.
- Participation in the district Strategic Planning Process by CMMS stakeholders will be imperative in addressing some of the additional concerns regarding the functional connections between district and school.