

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	11/12/2009
Submitted	11/23/2009
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

## PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	140160990022001		
District Name:	Cicero SD 99	School Name:	Daniel Burnham Elem School
Superintendent:	Donna Adamic	Principal:	Carol H Anderson
District Address:	5110 W 24th St	School Address:	1630 S 59th Ave
City/State/Zip:	Cicero,IL 60804 2948	City/State/Zip:	Cicero,IL 60804 1742
District Telephone#:	Label 7088634856                      Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	7086529577                      Extn: 0
District Email:	dadamic@cicd99.edu	School Email:	
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 1 - 2009 AYP Report

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	Restructuring Implementation
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2009-10 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status Year 7

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		70.0			70.0			90.0		78.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	48.5		No	73.3		Yes	96.0	Yes		
White														
Black														
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	48.4	51.2	No	73.9		Yes	96.0			
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American													
Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	37.3	36.7	Yes	70.8		Yes	96.2		
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	17.5	25.4	No	47.6	53.7	No	95.5		
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	47.8	49.8	Yes	72.2		Yes	96.1		

**Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress**

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 70% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 70% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. \*\*\*
3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 70% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 78% graduation rate for high schools.

\* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2008.

\*\* Safe Harbor Targets of 70% or above are not printed.

\*\*\* Subgroups with fewer than 45 students are not reported. Safe Harbor only applies to subgroups of 45 or more. In order for Safe Harbor to apply, a subgroup must decrease by 10% the percentage of scores that did not meet state standards from the previous year plus meet the other indicators (attendance rate for non-high schools and graduation rate for high schools) for the subgroup. For subgroups that do not meet their Safe Harbor Targets, a 75% confidence interval is applied. Safe Harbor allows schools an alternate method to meet subgroup minimum targets on achievement.

<b>DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION</b>
---

The Differentiated Accountability classification for the school is:	Comprehensive
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in reading?	No
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in math?	Yes

In 2008, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) was one of 6 states to be chosen by the US Department of Education to participate on the Differentiated Accountability Pilot Program. The Differentiated Accountability classification applies only to schools in federal improvement status.

The classification is a descriptor (i.e., focused or comprehensive) that is added to a school's improvement status. Current Title I requirements do not change.

The classification will assist in distinguishing between schools that need focused supports versus more comprehensive interventions.

Focused-School does not make AYP overall, but does make AYP in the "ALL" students subgroup in both reading and math.

Comprehensive-School does not make AYP overall and does not make AYP in the "ALL" students subgroup in either reading or math.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 2 - 2009 AMAO Report

Schools are not accountable for AMAO. This is a district level requirement only.

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 3 - School Information**

School Information								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	95.5	96.1	96.0	95.1	95.8	95.3	95.4	96.0
Truancy Rate (%)	1.9	1.9	5.1	7.2	3.3	6.1	7.8	1.6
Mobility Rate (%)	24.0	24.3	19.2	17.4	23.5	26.7	21.3	12.6
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	1,540	1,493	1,250	1,263	1,227	1,215	1,133	1,106
Low Income (%)	83.8	81.4	76.6	76.9	72.7	80.2	83.8	86.6
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	47.1	43.5	48.7	49.7	51.5	52.9	35.5	60.8
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	4.7	3.8	3.7	2.5	1.6	1.8	1.8	1.9
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	1.4	1.3	1.6	0.6	1.2	1.2	1.8	1.7
Hispanic (%)	93.6	94.6	94.2	96.4	96.1	96.0	95.5	95.3
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.5
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	0.7	0.7	0.4	0.6

Note: Hyphens in the table indicate that data is not relevant for your plan.

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data**  
**Item 4 - Student Race/Ethnicity**

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	2000	7.5	1.1	90.4	0.7	0.2	-
	2001	6.6	1.5	91.3	0.6	0.1	-
	2002	4.7	1.4	93.6	0.3	-	-
	2003	3.8	1.3	94.6	0.3	0.1	-
	2004	3.7	1.6	94.2	0.5	-	-
	2005	2.5	0.6	96.4	0.4	-	-
	2006	1.6	1.2	96.1	0.3	-	0.7
	2007	1.8	1.2	96.0	0.4	-	0.7
	2008	1.8	1.8	95.5	0.5	-	0.4
	2009	1.9	1.7	95.3	0.5	-	0.6
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	2000	8.0	0.6	90.8	0.5	0.1	-
	2001	6.3	0.7	92.3	0.7	-	-
	2002	6.6	0.6	92.4	0.4	-	-
	2003	4.8	0.7	94.2	0.3	-	-
	2004	4.6	1.1	94.0	0.3	-	-
	2005	4.0	1.2	94.5	0.3	-	-
	2006	2.9	1.6	95.1	0.2	-	0.2
	2007	2.5	1.7	95.4	0.2	-	0.1
	2008	2.4	2.1	95.1	0.2	-	0.2
	2009	2.6	2.1	94.6	0.2	-	0.4
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

S T A T E	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5

Note: Hyphens in the table indicate that data is not relevant for your plan.

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data**  
**Item 5 - Educational Environment**

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	2000	49.8	70.6	100.0	95.6	25.9	32	2.5	-	-
	2001	56.0	82.4	96.2	95.2	22.4	30	2.2	-	-
	2002	47.1	83.8	96.7	95.5	24.0	28	1.9	-	-
	2003	43.5	81.4	100.0	96.1	24.3	25	1.9	-	-
	2004	48.7	76.6	100.0	96.0	19.2	60	5.1	-	-
	2005	49.7	76.9	99.0	95.1	17.4	85	7.2	-	-
	2006	51.5	72.7	99.9	95.8	23.5	37	3.3	-	-
	2007	52.9	80.2	99.0	95.3	26.7	68	6.1	-	-
	2008	35.5	83.8	98.0	95.4	21.3	82	7.8	-	-
	2009	60.8	86.6	98.0	96.0	12.6	18	1.6	-	-
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	2000	41.1	67.7	100.0	94.9	31.9	196	1.7	-	-
	2001	48.2	69.9	95.6	94.6	32.6	146	1.2	-	-
	2002	48.7	71.8	94.8	94.8	30.4	146	1.2	-	-
	2003	48.8	75.4	98.1	95.4	37.6	66	0.6	-	-
	2004	46.3	76.4	98.2	95.3	33.2	488	3.9	-	-
	2005	44.2	78.7	97.5	95.1	28.3	419	3.3	-	-
	2006	45.8	75.0	99.1	95.0	23.0	467	3.7	-	-
	2007	44.6	77.7	98.8	95.1	21.7	663	5.4	-	-
	2008	38.6	82.6	98.7	94.9	22.8	1,198	9.7	-	-
	2009	55.5	84.7	97.4	95.7	14.3	330	2.5	-	-
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6

S T A T E	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
	2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1

Note: Hyphens in the table indicate that data is not relevant for your plan.

Section I A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 6 - Enrollment Trends

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	1,355	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,432	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	1,540	249	287	299	-	-	-
	2003	1,493	176	336	259	-	-	-
	2004	1,250	226	259	278	-	-	-
	2005	1,263	253	328	132	-	-	-
	2006	1,227	237	316	111	-	-	-
	2007	1,215	226	304	148	-	-	-
	2008	1,133	202	304	92	-	-	-
	2009	1,106	208	215	118	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	11,917	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	12,577	1,500	1,488	1,377	1,226	1,125	-
	2002	12,972	1,507	1,473	1,431	1,282	1,199	-
	2003	13,276	1,531	1,497	1,430	1,336	1,261	-
	2004	13,479	1,490	1,514	1,463	1,415	1,315	-
	2005	13,624	1,561	1,485	1,458	1,383	1,403	-
	2006	13,528	1,474	1,516	1,434	1,385	1,348	-
	2007	13,458	1,507	1,440	1,444	1,302	1,353	-
	2008	13,552	1,533	1,482	1,410	1,332	1,296	-
	2009	13,713	1,521	1,515	1,475	1,392	1,325	-
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816

S T A T E	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2,044,539	164,413	157,570	159,499	160,924	156,451	138,559
	2004	2,060,048	161,329	160,246	158,367	162,933	160,271	139,504
	2005	2,062,912	156,370	158,622	160,365	162,047	162,192	142,828
	2006	2,075,277	155,155	154,372	158,822	160,362	160,911	147,500
	2007	2,077,856	155,356	153,480	154,719	162,594	159,038	150,475
	2008	2,074,167	155,578	152,895	153,347	160,039	161,310	149,710
	2009	2,070,125	156,512	152,736	152,820	155,433	158,700	144,822

Note: Hyphens in the table indicate that data is not relevant for your plan.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 7 - Educator Data

\*\*Educator Data is available only for district level\*\*

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	608	11	37,131	66	34	23	-	-	-
	2001	617	11	38,271	68	32	24	-	-	-
	2002	619	11	39,521	67	33	25	-	14	1
	2003	675	10	42,548	63	37	23	-	16	3
	2004	751	10	47,037	64	36	21	-	16	1
	2005	820	9	48,677	66	34	19	-	17	1
	2006	785	9	51,891	63	37	20	-	15	1
	2007	734	10	54,358	64	36	21	-	8	5
	2008	740	10	55,817	58	42	21	-	4	3
2009	740	10	56,975	57	43	22	-	3	3	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1

---

	2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1
--	------	---------	----	--------	----	----	----	----	---	---

Note: Hyphens in the table indicate that data is not relevant for your plan.

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data**  
**Item 8a - Assessment Data (Reading)**

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>
All	58.8	46.6	43.5	52.5	35.9	45.6	-	-	49.2	48.7	46.7	40.4	45.8	52.8	49.4	53.7	60.6	46.6
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40.0	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	60.4	47.7	46.7	53.8	34.9	44.4	-	-	50.3	50.4	46.7	40.6	45.7	52.5	48.8	56.3	61.4	46.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	23.9	40.0	-	-	75.1	-	34.6	30.6	-	-	76.2	80.0	23.1	42.9
Students with Disabilities	28.5	20.0	5.6	6.7	4.8	15.8	-	-	13.0	4.2	20.0	12.5	8.8	21.7	-	7.1	-	16.7
Low Income	58.6	41.2	40.8	52.8	34.8	46.2	-	-	47.0	45.6	45.3	39.9	46.2	51.9	50.6	56.3	57.3	46.5

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	70.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	72.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	33.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	69.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: Hyphens in the table indicate that data is not relevant for your plan.

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data**  
**Item 8b - Assessment Data (Mathematics)**

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>
All	76.7	63.6	77.1	67.0	61.6	73.2	-	-	70.6	72.3	70.2	70.6	52.7	64.3	60.9	75.8	78.7	66.1
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40.0	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	58.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	77.2	63.3	78.9	68.8	63.1	72.8	-	-	70.9	74.8	70.6	72.1	53.0	63.8	60.1	78.1	78.4	66.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	52.9	71.4	-	-	81.3	-	66.0	66.9	-	-	90.5	86.7	46.2	71.4
Students with Disabilities	46.7	26.7	50.0	33.4	47.7	57.9	-	-	56.5	16.7	48.6	37.5	5.9	39.1	7.7	57.1	46.7	50.0
Low Income	76.1	59.8	74.7	64.9	60.5	72.7	-	-	68.9	70.1	69.6	69.4	53.1	63.3	62.0	75.1	76.8	65.8

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	20.0	-	-	75.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	25.0	-	-	77.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	33.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	20.0	-	-	21.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	21.4	-	-	73.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: Hyphens in the table indicate that data is not relevant for your plan.

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data**

**Data** - What do the School Report Card data tell you about student performance in your school? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are indicated?

The Burnham School report card tells us that the Hispanic subgroup is failing in the area of reading (48.4) and Special Education subgroup is failing in both reading (17.5) and math (47.6). Both groups did not meet safe harbor although the Hispanic group was very close missing safe harbor by 2.8% in Reading. Most of the Special Education students were low in all areas of reading and mathematics. There were a small percentage of the students that met state standards. Most of those students are receiving Learning Disability Resource.

The subgroups of LEP and Low Income met the state AYP minimum target using Safe Harbor for Reading. The LEP and Low Income met the AYP minimum target in Mathematics. The Hispanic (73.9) and low income (72.2) subgroups are much stronger in Mathematics than Reading.

In delving a little more into the reading information about Burnham School, we find in the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade that only 3 Bilingual students passed the ISAT test, while 43 Transitional passed and 50 regular education students passed. In 4<sup>th</sup> grade Bilingual 2 students passed, while 40 students passed in transitional, and 38 in the regular division passed. Zero special education students passed. In 5<sup>th</sup> grade, we found 32 students in the regular division passed while 23 in the transitional class passed in reading. In 6<sup>th</sup> grade 67 students in regular education passed reading.

In 3rd grade reading, we find that vocabulary is .1 higher than the district but we are .1 below the district in strategies, comprehension, and literature. We find that females (41.3) are a little below males (49.5) in reading. The IEP (15.8) group is below the non IEP (48.5) group, and that LEP (40.0) group is below the non LEP (55.0) group. The extended response shows that most students scored a 2 or 1 which is below standards.

In fourth grade, we find that in every area of reading we scored below the state and district. The males (76.8) and females (69.2) were about even in the meets/exceeds area. The LEP (30.6) and IEP (12.5) were below the Non LEP (54.8) and Non IEP (44.0) subgroups.

In the fifth grade, we are above the district but below the state in vocabulary. In the areas of reading strategies, they were below the district and state while comprehension and literature was the same as the district but below the state. The IEP (16.7) scored substantially below the Non IEP (52.0). The females (49.1) scored a little higher than the males (44.3). The LEP (42.9) is below the Non LEP (52.1). Fifth graders were below the district and state in extended response.

The sixth graders were above the district in all areas of reading and below the state in vocabulary development, reading, comprehension, and literature. They were equal to the state in reading strategies. The females (87.8) were much higher than the males (57.4). The Non LEP (75.9) group outscored the LEP group (33.3), and the Non IEP (82.7) was substantially higher than the IEP (0).

1/27/2010 2:55:16 PM

---

Looking at the mathematics portion of the ISAT, in the regular division third grade 61 passed, while 60 in transitional and 27 in Bilingual classes. In 4<sup>th</sup> grade Bilingual 3 passed 72 in transitional and 61 in regular division. In 5<sup>th</sup> grade regular division 39 passed while transitional had 33 pass. In special education 4<sup>th</sup> grade 6 passed the math part. In 6<sup>th</sup> grade 72 met the ISAT standards in mathematics.

Looking at the 3rd grade mathematics from ISAT, we notice that 3rd grade was below the district and state in number sense, measurement, algebra, geometry, and data analysis, statistics, and probability. The males (76.8) outscored the females (69.2). The IEP subgroup (57.9) was lower than the Non IEP subgroup (74.6). Short response was below the state and district along with extended response.

In the fourth grade, Burnham was below the district and state in all areas of mathematics. The male/females were about equal. The Non IEP (75.0) group outscored the IEP (37.5) and the Non LEP (76.2) was higher than the LEP (66.9). Burnham was below the district and state in short response. The extended response showed higher scores, we did better than the district but not as well as the state. Fifth graders were below the state and district in all areas of mathematics. The gap between the Non IEP (69.0) and the IEP (50) is shrinking. The LEP (71.4) surpassed the Non LEP (58.3). We were below the district and state in short response but many more students were scoring 2. Fifth graders scored below the district and state in extended response. The sixth graders scored above the district in all areas of mathematics but below the state. The females (87.8) outscored the males (66.7). The non LEP (81.9) outscored the LEP (33.3) and the Non IEP (85.2) were much higher than the IEP (21.4).

As we look at the students in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade on the ACCESS test, we notice most students composite score is at the developing stage. Reading and Comprehension is at the bridging stage while speaking and writing are developing. Oral language is between the expanding and bridging stage.

In fourth grade, the composite score shows us that most students are at the developing level. The speaking level shows us that students are the highest at the entering level and next, most students fall in the beginning or reaching levels. Reading has an abundance of students at the bridging level while comprehension is at the bridging level. The scores indicate that writing and oral language are mainly at the developing level.

In fifth grade most students fell in the composite level of developing. Oral language and speaking were expanding while writing, reading, and comprehension were developing.

Overall, the data from the ISAT tells us that students in the regular division and transitional classes do well on the ISAT reading portion. However, students in the Bilingual classes do not do well. In Mathematics, Bilingual classes do much better in mathematics than reading. The special education subgroup is way below state standards in Reading and Mathematics.

**Factors** - *What factors are likely to have contributed to these results? Consider both external and internal factors to the school.*

The external factors that have likely contributed to these results are due to the fact that the Students with Disabilities subgroup are not all housed at Burnham School. Many of these students are housed at schools throughout the district. Students are consistently moved from one school to another school yearly. All special education scores are part of their home school. We have no control as a school where these students are housed. The Special Education Department does not train the teachers appropriately. The rooms are Cross Categorical and there are a significant amount of different needs in the classrooms in which the teachers need training to facilitate learning of all the students. Students are bussed which causes transportation difficulties for many of the parents to become involved in their children's educational process because they cannot get to the school. The make-up of the school changes from year to year in the number of LMS classes housed. There is a significant increase in the number of LMS students. There are not enough ESL teachers to facilitate all the students in need of help. The curriculum in the English portion of the transitional classrooms lack good Core materials that would facilitate Reading in the English language.

Some other external factors that contribute to these results are that there are a number of families that take extended vacations during the school year. Additionally, language issues affect parents' ability to help their children with the homework. Parents are involved in school activities but not necessarily in the academic areas due to work schedules and children that are not of school age. Parents are interested in their children and academics but cannot necessarily help their children. Another external factor is that ESL teachers are pulled from the classrooms in which they service to help with ACCESS testing within the school year. This upsets the schedule of guided reading and students get much less guided reading during this time because homeroom teachers need to adjust their schedules and accommodate more students for guided reading.

The internal factors contributing to these results are that the Students with Disabilities subgroup is that the ability of the special education students is far below grade level, yet the materials in Reading and Mathematics are at grade level rather than their own instructional level. Special Education teachers have not been trained specifically for the needs of all the students they are servicing in their classrooms and how to differentiate the planning and classroom activities. Special Education aides have not been effectively trained to contribute to the education of the students. They are not included in any Teacher Institutes where training takes place yet they are expected to facilitate groups in Reading and Mathematics. Staff development needs to be continual in the areas of Reading and Guided Reading for new teachers. It is extremely hard for the individual schools to train all staff at the levels of development where each teacher is currently because of the staff turnovers throughout the school years. There has been an increase in LMS classes in grades 3-5. Teachers have changed grade levels and had to learn a new curriculum.

*What do these factors imply for next steps in improvement planning? These conclusions will be carried forward to Part D (Key Factors).*

The conclusions drawn from the report card data are that Students with Disabilities and Hispanic Subgroup are the main contributing factors to Burnham School failing to meet expectations in Reading. The Students with Disabilities are a main contributing factor to Burnham School failing to meet expectations in Mathematics. Teachers and aides need to be trained in differentiation skills of reading and mathematics for the types of disabilities that are placed in their classroom. The transitional 4th, 5th, and 6th grade need a Core curriculum for reading that facilitates the teaching of strategies and skills that can be reinforced through guided reading. Reading strategies need to be reinforced throughout the day in all subject areas. There has been an increase in LMS classes in grades 3-5. Teachers have changed grade levels and had to learn a new curriculum.

### Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data

**Data** - Briefly describe the relevant local assessment data used in this plan. What do these data tell you? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are apparent?

The SIP team was responsible for looking at data provided by DIBELS, IDEL, MAP, and classroom data. DIBELS and IDEL were used for local data for 3<sup>rd</sup> grade reading. The data available is for three years since we were part of Reading First. There are three tiers which include the red being at risk, yellow at some risk, and green at level. Looking at the data in two separate categories of English and Spanish gives us a better perspective of the skills students are lacking in reading. Looking at the regular self contained classroom beginning in 2006-07 we saw a 13 point drop in the red group and a 10 point gain in the yellow. In 2007-08, we saw a 9 point drop in the red and a 5 point gain in the green. In 2008-09, we saw a 1 point drop in green, a 4 point gain in yellow and no increase in green. We saw the largest gain in 2007-08. The transitional classroom which is 1/2 day in English and 1/2 day in Spanish showed some great gains. In 2006-07, there was a decrease of red students by 4 and an increase of green by 12. In 2007-08, there was a decrease of red by 17 and an increase of green by 11. Finally in 2008-09, there was a decrease of red by 3 and an increase of green by 17. The Bilingual classes that are taught in Spanish and take the IDEL saw an increase in red and yellow and a decrease in green in 2006-07. In 2007-08, they saw a decrease in red and green and an increase in yellow. In 2008-09, there was a decrease in red and an increase in the yellow and green which showed growth. The data shows the biggest improvement is in transitional over the past three years. Those are students that are transferring their reading Spanish skills to English skills. The Bilingual red group made significant improvement in 2008-09 while the regular education third grade showed the most improvement in 2007-08.

MAP testing is our local assessment for fourth, fifth, and sixth grade for Reading and Mathematics. The reading portion looks at the areas of word analysis, reading comprehension,

1/27/2010 2:55:16 PM

literature and literary works. We look at the scores in terms of red being the lowest 25%, yellow being 50%, and green being at level. The sixth grade showed a decrease of 2 students reading at level. The strength of 6<sup>th</sup> graders in reading is literature and word analysis while the weakness is reading strategies.

The fifth grade regular division showed a decrease of 1 student (19-18) at level in the spring. In the fifth grade regular division, the students remained about the same. There were no significant gains. The strength was literacy works and the weakness was word analysis. The Special Education (5<sup>th</sup>) showed no increase in the number making it in reading although all students progressed in reading. The 5<sup>th</sup> grade special education class had significant gains in the areas of literacy works, literature, and word analysis. The weakness is word analysis although they did gain in that area.

The transitional class showed an increase of 3 students (6-9) at level in the spring. In the 5<sup>th</sup> grade transitional classes, there were significant gains in reading. The area of strength was literacy works while the weakness was word analysis. In the 4<sup>th</sup> grade regular division there were 3 less students at level in the spring. In the 4<sup>th</sup> grade regular division there were more students at level and more students below level at the end of the school year. The strength is literacy works and the weakness is reading strategies. The transitional rooms had 4 (11-15) more students at level at the end of the year. The strength in the transitional room was Literary works and the weaknesses were reading strategies and word analysis. The Bilingual room was weak in all areas due to reading being taught in Spanish. The fourth grade special education class had no one at level at the beginning or end of the year. Their strength was literacy works and the weaknesses were strategies and word analysis in reading.

MAP testing in Mathematics consists of the areas of algebra, data analysis and probability, geometry, measurement, and number sense. In looking at the data, we divide the data into scores. The scores of those students that make benchmark are green, those that are below but not in the lower 25% are yellow, and the lowest 25% are red.

The sixth grade showed an increase of 5 students at level in the spring (24-29). In sixth grade, all areas in the red went down except for data analysis. All areas of green went up in the spring. The strength of sixth graders is algebra, geometry, measurement and number sense while the weakness is data analysis/probability.

The fifth grade regular education class showed an increase of 5 (11-16) students at level from the fall to the spring. In fifth grade regular division, all the areas in red went down except for algebra while the green areas went up except in data analysis and measurement. The strength was geometry and weakness measurement. The 5<sup>th</sup> grade special education class had 1 student at level at the end of the year. In the 5<sup>th</sup> grade special education class all areas went up except for data analysis. All green areas went up except for number sense. The strength is measurement and number sense and the weakness is data analysis. The 5<sup>th</sup> grade transitional class had an increase of 8 (3-11) at level in the spring. In the 5<sup>th</sup> transitional, all areas of math went up except for geometry. All areas went up in the green area. The strength is geometry and the weakness is number sense and measurement.

The fourth grade regular division had an increase of one (15-16) at level at the end of the year. There were more red in all the areas of mathematics except number sense which was equal to the fall scores. Their strength was geometry and weakness number sense. The 4<sup>th</sup> grade transition group had an increase of 7 (20-27) at level in the spring. In fourth grade transitional all the scores went down in the red except for measurement which went up one. In the green area, all the scores went down. The yellow areas went up

substantially. The strength was geometry and the weakness was data analysis/probability. Their strength is geometry and weakness data analysis/probability. The Bilingual 4<sup>th</sup> grade class remained the same with 0 at level. In the fourth grade Bilingual class all the red went down. The yellow area went up while all areas in the green went down except for geometry. Geometry was the strength while algebra and number sense were the weaknesses in the Bilingual. There were less green except in geometry. The 4<sup>th</sup> grade special education had an increase of 1 in the spring. In fourth grade special education all areas in the red went down while the green areas went up except for number sense. Geometry was the strength and number sense the weakness.

As we look at the students in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade on the ACCESS test, we notice most students' composite score is at the developing stage. Reading and Comprehension is at the bridging stage while speaking and writing are developing. Oral language is between the expanding and bridging stage.

In fourth grade, the composite score shows us that most students are at the developing level. The speaking level shows us that students are the highest at the entering level and next, most students fall in the beginning or reaching levels. Reading has an abundance of students at the bridging level while comprehension is at the bridging level. The scores indicate that writing and oral language are mainly at the developing level.

In fifth grade most students fell in the composite level of developing. Oral language and speaking were expanding while writing, reading, and comprehension were developing.

Overall, at Burnham School, we see the strength in reading being literary works in grades 4 and 5 and literature and word analysis in grade 6. The weakness is word analysis in transitional 4th and all of 5th grade. Reading strategies were weak in fourth and sixth grade. In the areas of mathematics, Burnham finds geometry as its strength and data analysis and number sense as the weakness. The Bilingual classes do well in their native language but not with the transfer of information from Spanish to English on testing in Reading and Mathematics. The ACCESS shows us that many students have not developed the proficient stage of language acquisition.

**Factors** - *What factors are likely to have contributed to these results? Consider both external and internal factors to the school.*

The factors that most likely contributed to these results are that students are coming into the special education rooms below level. The special education students are moved throughout the district yearly. The aides and teachers have not been provided with staff development of guided reading and differentiation from the special education department for the different types of students they are receiving in the cross categorical classrooms. The English part of the transitional classes are lacking a core program in English teaching the strategies and skills. There has been an increase in the number of Bilingual/Transitional classrooms in grades three, four, and five. There has been a change of teachers in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 some having no experience as a teacher and some changing to a grade level never taught before.

**Conclusions** - *What do these factors imply for next steps in improvement planning? These conclusions will be carried forward to Part D (Key Factors).*

The conclusions for school improvement that we draw from the local assessment data is that differentiated instruction needs to take place to assist each student to reach his/her potential. Time needs to be spent in reading focusing on strategies and skills to help the students reach their potential. Skills/strategies need to be reinforced throughout the school day in all areas of the curriculum. Math skills need to be reviewed on a continual basis throughout the year. Spiral reviews need to be completed with integrity throughout the year focusing on reviewing skills taught. Posters need to be up in the room to help facilitate the learning so students can refer to them.

### Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

**Data** - *Briefly describe attributes and challenges of the school and community that have affected student performance. What do these data and/or information tell you?*

Some of the attributes of Burnham School, district and community that have affected student performance are that there is a caring and supportive staff which allows for much more staff collaboration and teamwork among teachers. In the sharing of ideas and materials, teachers share ideas that help promote best practices amongst their peers. Every teacher is given help with guided reading by a teacher working on their masters or having their masters in reading. There is a positive energy among staff and students. Students are enthusiastic about school. There has been more consistency among staff and curriculum the past year. Many teachers are in advance degree programs promoted by the district. Computer PODs are in most classrooms which helps integration of technology into the classroom. PBIS has been implemented along with RTI into the school to help all children achieve. MAP/DIBELS/ISEL testing has helped teachers to use data to identify the needs of the students. MAP testing is done in a computer lab which allows all students to take the test at one time rather than one at a time. Catholic Charities supplies tutors for 20 of our students three days per week. Tutors are Cicero residents from the high

1/27/2010 2:55:16 PM

---

school, college and parents.

Some of the attributes supplied at the district level include PEP which allows and helps parents feel comfortable participating in their child's education by attending classes within the school two times a week. G.R.E.A.T. (Gang Resistance Education and Training), Safety Town, and Officer Friendly are community activities which help to keep the students safe. SES allows students to get extra help by signing up with programs that are designed by outside agencies throughout the district. 21st Century is offered to students from 3rd-6th grade to help students academically in reading and mathematics. Outside sources have donated their time to give health exams, dental exams, and eye exams to make sure our children are healthy. Book It and Six Flags allow the promotion of reading to all students within the school for prizes. Partners in Reading is done throughout the year in which students are rewarded for reading. In partnership with Cicero Public library, Burnham participated in the summer reading program as well as Burnham's own school summer reading program. RIF affords the students books three times a year.

The school information area of the report card shows some positive changes in truancy and mobility. These areas has significant decreases in numbers over the past year. The areas of attendance and low income have remained constant. Burnham has remained stable in the make up of ethnicity of students and the number of students has decreased since 2004. The enrollment trends have significantly fluctuated in grades 3, 4 and 5 from 2002-2009. In 2009, there was an increase in grades 3 and 5 while 4 went down. Hopefully this is a positive change and more students are remaining at Burnham through sixth grade rather than moving schools three times through grade school.

Some of the challenges encountered by the school, district and community affecting student performance are time for special teachers (LDR, ESL, Reading, Art, Music, P.E.) to meet together because of the lack of collaborative planning times. Bilingual and Transitional teachers are in need of good materials for supplemental reading time in social studies. Transitional teachers do not have a core curriculum in reading in English. Class sizes are large in both primary and intermediate grades. There are many technical difficulties which cause the computers to be down along with MAP testing so testing is not done in a timely fashion. LMS students are not always accurately placed due to testing results coming out after classrooms are put together and numbers do not allow for those students to be moved appropriately. LD resource teachers are not always trained appropriately by the special education department. They are in need of more support, training, and resources to accommodate their students. The copy machine and risograph are not large enough to accommodate the number of teachers and therefore materials needed for a lesson are not always supplied in a timely manner. There is a lack of involvement in academics due to the fact that many parents have varying work schedules. Many parents have limited academic education. Spanish speaking parents of students in English classrooms have expressed feelings of inadequacy toward helping their children in English academics.

Other challenges faced within the community are safety issues. There is an increase in gang activity and crime within the area. Parents do not allow their children to be outside unless accompanied by an adult. Parents do not have time to meet their children's friends due to work schedules. Therefore, they have no familiarity with the family and friends of their children. Transportation is another problem for many of our families. Most families have one car and need to walk to most functions with their families. Community events and activities sponsored by the town are not located close enough to the school for the children to get there unless they are transported.

**Factors** - *In what ways, if any, have these attributes and challenges contributed to student performance results?*

The attributes and challenges that have contributed to student performance result in an increased awareness of reading and math strengths and weaknesses provided through additional testing and progress monitoring. Specific areas of strengths and weaknesses were provided through DIBELS, IDEL, and MAP testing. Besides saving time, the guesswork has been eliminated giving teachers the opportunity to address student needs. Grade level meetings have helped the teachers to focus on the needs of the students by sharing information and having the opportunity to get input from others in their grade level and reading specialists. Programs afterschool and before school have helped give students some support that they need to grow in reading.

New staff members create difficulty with staff development and how to catch them up. New teachers are overburdened in the expectations that take place during their first several years. Materials in the transitional rooms need to focus on the strategies and skills that are used in all other classrooms. Additional materials need to be in place to supplement those programs so the students can focus on specific strategies and skills in guided reading.

**Conclusions** - *What do these factors imply for next steps in improvement planning? These conclusions will be carried forward to Part D (Key Factors).*

For school improvement planning the focus needs to be on reading differentiation with a focus on strategies and skills that students are lacking in their reading. Materials need to be supplemented in transitional rooms that are of high interest, low ability with a focus on specific skills and strategies that are learned in the regular division and bilingual rooms. There needs to be a process that is a step program to catch teachers up with professional development in reading and math.

All teachers need professional development on differentiation and how to specifically do it to meet all the needs of their students in the classroom. They need to continually focus on skills in mathematics throughout the school year to keep concepts in the minds of their students.

## Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data

### Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

**Data** - *Briefly describe data on educator qualifications and data and/or information about staff capacity and professional development opportunities related to areas of weakness and strength. What do these data and information tell you?*

1/27/2010 2:55:16 PM

The Cicero District is below the state in average teacher experience, average teacher salary, and teachers with master's degrees. They are above in the areas of teachers with Bachelor's degree, pupil-teacher ratio, teachers with emergency or provisional credits, and classes not taught by highly qualified teachers.

Looking at Burnham school, we find that the average Bilingual teacher has less experience than the English teachers. In Kindergarten the average Bilingual teacher has 4 years experience while the English teacher has 35 years. In first grade the Bilingual teacher has 3 years experience and English 28. In second grade the Bilingual teachers have an average of 3 years experience while English have 15. In third grade the Bilingual teachers have an average of 6, English 8, and Transitional 12. In fourth grade Bilingual 22, English 5, Transitional 19, and Special Education teacher has 3 years experience. In fifth grade, the English have 28, Transitional 7, and Special Education has 19. Finally in sixth grade the English has 5 and the Transitional has 10. Fourth and sixth grade English teachers have the least amount of experience. The average class sizes range from 14 to 30. The Special Education classes are 14 and 15 respectively. The English Kindergarten and English 5th grade class are at 30. The English first and fourth are higher than the Bilingual and Transitional in those grades. The average classroom is at 25 students or more within Burnham School.

At Burnham School 28 teachers have their masters degree while 15 have their bachelors and one has a provisional. There are currently 5 regular education teachers working on their masters. As we look at the teachers in special areas such as art, music, reading, esl, we find that 11 have masters degrees, 6 are working on their masters, and 2 have bachelors degrees. Two teachers are currently working on becoming qualified for the area in which they are teaching.

Professional development has been continual throughout the school year in reading. Professional development is done during PTL's and during curriculum and district meetings. Most of the professional development has been done in the area of reading throughout the school year. The LST's spend time modeling in classrooms and also have teachers visit other classrooms that are strong in reading. The staff development included story cubes, using data to drive instruction, QAR with data, Comprehensive Literacy and Fluency presentation, Oral language, Comoprehension, Phonics/Word Analysis, Guided Reading/Workstations, RTI and interventions, Reading and Math Response using a rubric, Math Games and uses of Manipulative to increase learning, Closed Word Sort, RAFT using Bloom's Taxonomy for differentiation in Social Studies, MAP testing and how to use information for the benefit of grouping students, Phonics Continuum for English and Spanish, Syllable Types, and Explicit Instruction, Anecdotal Records, THIEVES graphic organizer and PBIS.

This year we will be working on QAR to increase comprehension along with responses in reading. We found that we need to concentrate on one concept while incorporating new ideas into reading as a whole school.

**Factors** - In what ways, if any, have educator qualifications, staff capacity, and professional development contributed to student performance results?

Educator qualifications have contributed to student performance in two ways: one is that many more teachers are getting master's degrees in the area of reading, Bilingual Education, and ESL. The second way is that there are many teachers that are working on their masters degree. There have been many teachers that are new to the profession that need to be updated in staff development. There have also been many teachers that are in their first four years that have changed grade levels and need to be trained in their new grade level. In some cases, the teachers need to become accostummed to the new curriculum and a new country.

Staff development has been ongoing for several years at Burnham School. The school has always been divided into two parts which consist of primary and intermediate. Therefore, we are looking at focusing on QAR so that all grade levels will be on the same page. The variance of difficulty within the grade levels will vary. However, the entire school will focus on QAR in some degree. Math Spiral review will also be a focus. We have noticed that students do the best when the information is presented right before the test. Spiral Review being done throughout the school year will help keep students focused on the different areas of mathematics.

**Conclusions** - *What do these factors imply for next steps in improvement planning? These conclusions will be carried forward to Part D (Key Factors).*

We need meaningful staggered staff development to help teachers that are new to the profession and those that change grade levels. We need to try and keep teachers that are new in the same grade level so that they can become familiar with the curriculum and more proficient. We need to offer help and observe those teachers often throughout the school year. Staff development needs to be focused on the individual school and remain constant so that teachers can achieve and get proficient. Burnham needs to focus on the same strategy throughout the school level in all grade levels. This will help move everyone forward from kindergarten to sixth grade.

### Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data Item 3 - Parent Involvement

**Data** - *Briefly describe data on parent involvement. What do these data tell you?*

Burnham holds many activities that involve students and parents throughout the school year. Last year Burnham held presentations on reading giving parents ideas to help their children at home. Strategies were presented using materials that students would have available at home. Presentations were made in January (Flip books-Comprehension), March (Storyteller), and May (reading calendar and how to use them). The presentations were made in both the Spanish and English language. The turn out was very small compared to the number of students that we have in our building. The presentations were made at separate times for the primary and intermediate grades.

Burnham Ornament Night in December brings about 300 families. Parents and children read directions and complete the making of ornaments together. Parents are very comfortable attending this activity and enjoy being with their families. Children of all ages are welcome to attend this activity. It makes it easier for parents to attend knowing they do not need to find babysitters.

The Burnham Valentine's Dance is one of the favorite activities held. It is enjoyed by parents, teachers, and students alike. Over 250 people attend this activity. Students are required to bring an adult with them to attend. Parents and students and sometimes teachers dance to the music of a DJ.

Burnham had a bilingual storyteller this year in the evening. There were not a lot of people in attendance. The storyteller told a story and talked about how she became a storyteller. Reading strategies were presented and both students and parents wove a story in groups each person adding to what the last person said. It was great watching the parent and student involvement.

Bingo night is attended by about 300 students and parents. Each person is given one BINGO card and everyone plays. Prizes are awarded for those people that get BINGO. Burnham had MATH WEEK and MATH EXTENDED RESPONSE week. During the designated week each classroom invited the parents to come to school. Each grade level made games to help with mathematics and enforce what they had learned in class. During the math game week, parents came to the classroom and the students taught the parents how to play the games. Students had to be able to explain the details about the games. During Math Extended Response week, the students were given a problem to solve. They needed

1/27/2010 2:55:16 PM

to teach their parents how to solve the problem and the steps in solving the problem. It was fun and parents realized how hard it was to explain in words the steps that were taken to solve the problem.

At the end of the year, Burnham invites families to a Fine Art Fair which consists of student performances and an art showcase. There are many participants that really enjoy this opportunity.

During the course of the year, individual classrooms invite parents in for plays and activities taking place in their room. We find that more parents attend activities in grades K-3 than 4-6.

Twenty First Century offers a book club for parents and also the use of the computers. The book club meets once a week. There are about 10 adults that attend on a regular basis. Twenty First Century also has an evening each year that shows off what they have accomplished during the year. They serve dinner to the parents and children that attend.

PEP (Parents as Educational Partners) is offered twice a year. PEP involves a curriculum that enables parents to communicate with the school and feel comfortable. It also helps parents to acquire the English language.

PATT (Parents and Teachers Together) is an organization that gets parent volunteers to help teachers out in a variety of ways. Parents volunteer in classrooms to help with reading, prepare materials for the teacher, help with centers, work with individual students, work the Book Exchange and help prepare for activities taking place in classrooms. They are greatly appreciated.

**Factors** - *In what ways, if any, has parent involvement contributed to student performance results?*

Parent involvement is an important role in student performance. Parents being involved in their child's education gives the impression that school is important. Students, teachers, and parents working together get the best results. Students whose parents are involved in school become more a part of the school community which allows communication to open up between the school and community. Student performance has been enhanced through parent involvement.

**Conclusions** - *What do these factors imply for next steps in improvement planning? These conclusions will be carried forward to Part D (Key Factors).*

Parents continue to want to be involved in their children's educational process. We need to continue to find ways that parents can be supportive of the academic side of their children's education. We will continue to incorporate activities that will help build the confidence and knowledge of the parents to help their children. More activities within the classroom seem to attract parents to the school. Children teaching their parents how to do an activity helps the child as much as it helps the parent to become involved in the school curriculum.

### Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

*From the factor pages (I-A, I-B, and I-C), identify key factors that are within the school's capacity to change or control and which have contributed to low achievement. What conclusions about next steps have you reached from reviewing available data and information and about all the factors affecting student achievement?*

The key factors that are within the school's capacity to change or control are:

*We can have teachers reinforce the skills/strategies learned in reading and incorporate them into other areas of the curriculum.*

*We can purchase guided reading books for transitional classes in English to focus on strategies and skills of the Core curriculum in Spanish.*

*In reading and math , we can have the teachers focus on differentiation.*

*We can make sure spiral review takes place in mathematics and on a continual basis.*

*We can have teachers make posters for the areas of curriculum in reading and mathematics so that students can refer to them on a continual basis throughout the year.*

*We can try to keep teachers at the same grade level when possible.*

*We can have more activities within the classroom for parent awareness of the curriculum.*



## Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	<a href="#">While we are targeting the students with disabilities subgroup all students will participate in the math activities and will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 or Safe Harbor.</a>	4,
2	<a href="#">While our current achievement in reading for the hispanic subgroup is 48.4% and the students with disabilities is 17.5% meeting/exceeding for ISAT, all students will participate in the activities to make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.</a>	1,2,3,

The following deficiencies have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for your school.

- 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 2. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 3. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 4. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

## Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

## Objective 1

While we are targeting the students with disabilities subgroup all students will participate in the math activities and will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 or Safe Harbor.

## Objective 1 Description

Spiral review will be reinforced from the curriculum throughout the school year. Posters referring to the different areas of mathematics will be placed on the walls so students can refer to those posters. Staff will be given the opportunity to discuss areas of concern with others during PTL's and how specific concepts are taught. Hands on materials will be used when possible to help the students understand new concepts taught. Parents will be invited in the classroom on a regular basis to participate and learn from their children the concepts learned in the classroom.

**This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:**

- e 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- e 2. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- e 3. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- b 4. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

**Section II-B Action Plan - Strategies and Activities for Students**

While we are targeting the students with disabilities subgroup all students will participate in the math activities and will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 or Safe Harbor.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will complete math spiral exercises from their math books and review the spiral reviews once a month.	10/30/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	400
2	Students will prepare and present math activities to their parents at their grade level.	11/16/2009	11/20/2009	During School	Title I	0
3	Students will prepare a math extended response to teach their parents at their grade level.	01/25/2010	01/29/2010	During School	Title I	

### Section II-C Action Plan - Professional Development Strategies and Activities

While we are targeting the students with disabilities subgroup all students will participate in the math activities and will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	PTL's will be spent discussing the performance of concepts taught in mathematics and new ways those skills can be presented to help students progress along with materials that can be used.	10/23/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	0
2	PTL's will spend time explaining and showing how a math game works for their grade level.	11/09/2009	11/13/2009	During School	Title I	20

### Section II-D Action Plan - Parent Involvement Strategies and Activities

While we are targeting the students with disabilities subgroup all students will participate in the math activities and will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will have the opportunity to share in mathematical and extended response activities at each grade level with their children in their classroom. Parents will become familiar with how the concepts work to promote skills in mathematics.	11/16/2009	01/25/2010	During School	Title I	0

### Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

While we are targeting the students with disabilities subgroup all students will participate in the math activities and will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 or Safe Harbor.

The teachers will review the mathematic concepts taught through the use of the spiral review provided with the mathematics series at the end of each month. The teachers will use materials that are provided to teach the concepts so that the students will learn the process that takes place to complete the problems. At PTL's, the teachers will discuss concepts that they feel they need help in presenting due to students lack of accomplishment. Program Assistants in the special education rooms will take small groups to reinforce the material learned. Posters will be hung in the room in which students can refer to the mathematic concept to complete the problems. The principal and assistant principal will do walk throughs at the end of the month during math time to monitor the process is taking place. The principal and assistant principal will look at math spiral notebooks to check off the math concepts that have been taught and retaught at the end of the month. MAP testing will be checked for scores in the winter and at the end of the school year for progress. Activities that are not extended to 2011 will be reviewed and changed as needed after the first year.

	Name	Title
1	Carol Anderson	Principal
2	Linda Giovingo	Assistant Principal

### Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

#### Objective 2

While our current achievement in reading for the hispanic subgroup is 48.4% and the students with disabilities is 17.5% meeting/exceeding for ISAT, all students will participate in the activities to make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

#### Objective 2 Description

Burnham will introduce through PLT's the QAR strategies. During PLT's, the teachers will discuss the chapter or part of the chapter of the book and talk about how they can implement the information into their own classroom. The teachers will model the strategy within the classroom structure. The students will then practice the strategy as a classroom and then implement the strategy on their own. Teachers will make peer observations to see the strategy being implemented into other classrooms. Discussions will take place during PLT's about what worked and what they need more help with and any other questions. The parents will be invited into the classroom during implementation 3 times a year to learn the strategy with their children so that they can use it at home. We would like documentation that the strategy is being practiced at home.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- ⓑ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 2. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 3. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓐ 4. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

**Section II-B Action Plan - Strategies and Activities for Students**

While our current achievement in reading for the hispanic subgroup is 48.4% and the students with disabilities is 17.5% meeting/exceeding for ISAT, all students will participate in the activities to make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will be introduced and practice QAR strategies within the classroom structure.	09/21/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	600
2	RTI will be implemented across the grade levels. Students will be placed in tiers from data instruments. Students will focus on the core curriculum and be taught using differentiated instruction that is researched based. Interventions will also be implemented using social studies materials. Progress monitoring will be done every two weeks with the lowest students.	10/26/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	0
3	Students will participate in B.A.S.S. before and after school to increase skills needed in reading. This will take place twice a week in the morning and afternoon.	11/09/2009	05/28/2010	Before School	Other	0
4	PBIS will be implemented across the grade levels. Students will be placed in tiers from using data instruments. The PBIS team will look at student behaviors, time and place behaviors happen and interventions	11/02/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Title I	3,000

	to change the behavior in a positive way to increase learning.				
5				Before School	Title I
6				Before School	Title I
7				Before School	Title I

**Section II-C Action Plan - Professional Development Strategies and Activities**

While our current achievement in reading for the hispanic subgroup is 48.4% and the students with disabilities is 17.5% meeting/exceeding for ISAT, all students will participate in the activities to make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	PTL's will model QAR strategies using best practices.	10/05/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	0
2	Progress monitoring will be demonstrated and introduced to teachers using ISEL.	09/23/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	0
3	RTI Core team will spend time interpreting data from (MAP, ISEL, PSI/PASI/TPRI/IDEL/Tejas Lee/DRA/EDL/ACCESS, Curriculum Placement Tests, Teacher observations/anecdotal records and ILP to place stiudents in tiers for interventions.	11/02/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	0
4	PBIS team will be trained using data instruments to place students in tiers.	08/20/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	0

**Section II-D Action Plan - Parent Involvement Strategies and Activities**

While our current achievement in reading for the hispanic subgroup is 48.4% and the students with disabilities is 17.5% meeting/exceeding for ISAT, all students will participate in the activities to make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)

1	Grade levels will present QAR strategies throughout the school year with students teaching their parents the strategies 3 times a year.	12/14/2009	12/18/2009	During School	Title I	0
2	A reading night will be scheduled with a storyteller promoting QAR strategies.	03/31/2010	03/31/2010	After School	Title I	500
3	An introduction to PBIS and RTI will be done by the teachers in their individual classrooms Curriculum Night.	09/30/2009	09/30/2009	After School	Title I	0
4				Before School	Title I	
5				Before School	Title I	

**Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring**

While our current achievement in reading for the hispanic subgroup is 48.4% and the students with disabilities is 17.5% meeting/exceeding for ISAT, all students will participate in the activities to make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

The principal/assistant principal will be making observations/walk throughs during reading time throughout the school year. The assistant principal will be attending grade level meetings observing the conversation that takes place about QAR. The RTI/PBIS team will be looking at data (charts with behaviors/MAP testing/Progress monitoring/ISEL) for improvement. Sign in sheets for parent involvement will be collected. B.A.S.S. will be monitored through progress monitoring, anecdotal records, DRA/EDL, and running records records. The activities that do not run for a 2 year plan will be reviewed and changed as needed afther the first year.

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
1	Carol Anderson	Principal
2	Linda Giovingo	Assistant Principal

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part A. Parent Notification\*

*This section describes how the plan has been developed and reviewed and identifies the support in place to ensure implementation.*

**Parent Notification** - Describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand. (*\*Requirement for Title I Schools only.*)

In accordance with the NCLB Act of 2001, states must provide notification to parents of students in districts/schools that are identified for improvement for failure to make adequate yearly progress. A letter that explained our district's status was sent to all District 99 parents in their native language in October 2009. A copy of the district's 2009 AYP Status Report was also disseminated to the parents at that time. This notification was distributed to all parents in all schools in the district as District 99 is a Title I school-wide district.

Individual schools provided written notification in August, to the parents of their students that explained the academic status of their school. That letter explained options available to the students by offering Choice and/or Supplemental Educational Services where mandated.

All Title I Schools, have provided written notice about the school's academic status to the parents of each student in a variety of ways. Due to the high percentage of parents who speak Spanish, all documents are translated and sent home both in English and with a back-to-back version in Spanish.

Examples of situations in which the schools' academic status are identified include but are not limited to the following:

- Dissemination of the Parent/Family Involvement Policy
- Open House General Session Power Point
- Open House Orientation with Classroom Teacher
- Parent-Student-Teacher Compact
- Recipients of Services: Supplemental Educational Services; Individual Learning Plan (ILP); 21st Century Community Learning Century Program; Extended Day Program; Individual Education Plan (IEP)
- Parent Reading and Math Nights per Grade Level Professional Learning Team
- Parent-Teacher Conferences

-- Sharing School-Wide Expectations for Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports (PBIS)

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part B. Stakeholder Involvement

**Stakeholder Involvement** - Describe specifically how stakeholders (including parents, school staff, and outside experts) have been consulted in the development of the plan. The names and titles of the school improvement team or plan developers must be identified here.

The stakeholders: parents and community, students, teachers and administrators will provide the school with feedback dealing with the School Improvement Plan through informal interviews and formal surveys about the school, its climate, educational programs, etc. Our school is eager for parents and community to provide feedback on the school and district initiatives using existing avenues for input. Parents and community receive newsletters from the school and district which include information dealing with the implementation of the School and District Improvement Plans.

Regular updates on the newly redesigned district website: [www.cicd99.edu](http://www.cicd99.edu) keep interested community and educational organizations informed as to our progress. The Action Plan from each school's School Improvement Plan is posted on the district's website as well as being available in the school office in English and Spanish. Copies of our school and district report cards are sent home with students and posted on the website as well.

Our district has a large number of Hispanic families so all communication is sent home in both English and Spanish, and accommodations are made for conferences and parent meetings to have an interpreter available to assist in communication. The frequent communication with parents allows classroom teachers to relate performance targets, strategies, and school and district improvement activities to parents and families.

Parents and community members are given numerous opportunities to become involved with the school improvement process. They are invited to participate in the development, implementation and review of the plan. Understanding that our parents and community are vital to the success of the School Improvement process, we

offer many opportunities for their involvement. The district's parent involvement policy is included in the Student Handbook which is being revised to be distributed to each student.

Involvement with community organizations serves as forums for discussion on educational advances in the district. Through the schools, District 99 is involved with the community through a number of contacts. We work in partnerships with the Cicero Police Department, the Cicero Youth Task Force, the Cicero Educational Task Force, the Cicero Chamber of Commerce, the Cicero Fire Department, Interfaith Leadership Program and the GEAR UP Program through a grant from Northeastern University.

Our school and district administration continuously urges parents, staff, and community members to offer suggestions in order to make sure all stakeholders are invested in our school and district.

	Name	Title
1	Carol Anderson	Principal
2	Linda Giovingo	Assistant Principal
3	Dianna Aguado	District Personnel
4	Anastasia Escamilla	2nd Grade Teacher
5	Gabriela Small	2nd Grade Bilingual Teacher
6	Kristy Heinzl	4th Grade Teacher
7	Luis Valdovinos	4th Grade Bilingual Teacher
8	Nicole Edmeier	Self Contained Special Education Teacher
9	Pedro Sanchez	6th Grade Transitional Teacher
10	Andrea Woldeit	LD Resource Teacher
11	Bethany Schneider	Literacy Support Teacher
12	Angela Hawkins	Art Teacher
13	Joy Nielsen	ESL Teacher
14	Angela Lara	Parent
15	Dorothy Carter	Community Member

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part C. Peer Review Process

**Peer Review** - Describe the district's peer review and approval process. Peer review teams should include teachers and administrators from schools and districts similar to the one in improvement, but significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students. As appropriate, peer reviewers may be teachers from other schools, personnel from other districts, Regional Office of Education staff, Intermediate Service Center staff, RESPRO staff, university faculty, consultants, et al., or combinations thereof. RESPRO staff serving on a School Support Team should not serve on a peer review team in the same district. The peer review should precede the local board approval and must be completed within 45 days of receiving the school improvement plan. For further description of the peer review process see LEA and School Improvement: Non-Regulatory Guidance, July 21, 2006, at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

Description of peer review process including participants and date(s) of peer review.

#### Cicero School District 99 SIP Peer Review

A Process of Collaboration and Support

#### Composition of the Peer Review Team

The peer Review Team consists of the District Director of School Improvement, a representative from West 40 an appointed co-facilitator and 6 additional individuals comprised of each building's Assistant Principal and an appointed lead teacher agreed upon by the schools' SIP team. The Peer Review Team is then divided into 6 teams of two individuals.

#### Responsibilities of the Peer Review Team

The primary responsibility of the SIP Peer Review Team is to provide feedback specific to the state SIP rubric. This feedback will assist each school's SIP team with meaningful advice for further refinement of their plan.

#### Timetable for the Peer Review Process

The timetable for the 2009-2011 Peer Review consists of two sessions.

\*Session 1 consists of 1/2 day of rubric review using one SIP with all teams to calibrate scores. This is followed by using the rest of the day to provide peer review and feedback specific to one specific plan from a school in status.\*Session 2 consists of 1/2 day for each team to provide peer review and feedback specific to one school's plan.

#### Meaningful Insights from the Peer Review Team

\*It is extremely important to calibrate one SIP together prior to any team review.

1/27/2010 2:55:16 PM

\*Emphasize to the Peer Review Teams that feedback needs to be specific to each criterion within each component and focused on details specific to the criterion within the rubric.

\*Focus feedback on big ideas contained within the rubric that will move the plan toward an implementation score. In contrast, cosmetic feedback (word choices, formatting and spelling) is an expectation of the building SIP team.

\*Peer Review teams should proofread their feedback before submitting their recommendations to the Director of School Improvement.

\*All recommendations must be submitted to the Director of School Improvement when the team has completed their review.

### The BIG Picture of School Improvement Planning

District Level School Improvement planning is the integration of a district team effort. The School Improvement Team at the district level consists of :

Director of School Improvement

Director of Title One

Director of Special Education

Director of Language Minority Services

Director of Reading/Language Arts

Director of Science and Math

Director of Social Studies

Director of Technology and Information Services

Assistant Superintendents

Directors participate in a session of learning the rubric and reflecting on how they can assist School Improvement Teams in the development of their plans. Each Director works directly with a school team.

### Building Level

School Improvement planning is the integration of a building team effort. The School Improvement Team at the building level consists of:

- Administrator
- Provides leadership in facilitating the school improvement planning process and implementation of the plan
- Facilitate a process on ongoing evaluation and refinement toward achieving the goals
- SIP Team (administrator, teacher, parents, community members)
- Engage in data driven decision making
- Share in the writing of the school improvement plan
- Provide a vital communication link to the stakeholders

- Share in the review and improvement of the school improvement plan
- Classroom teachers
- Collect necessary data to develop and monitor progress towards goals and activities
- Communicate the standards and activities in the plan to students and parents
- Communicate the progress toward achieving the goals

#### Community Level

Stakeholders (community members, parents, school staff, students)

- Engage in data driven decision making
- Share in the writing of the school improvement plan
- Provide a vital communication link to all stakeholders
- Share in the review and improvement of the school improvement plan

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part D. Teacher Mentoring Process

**Teacher Mentoring Process** - Describe the teacher mentoring program. Mentoring programs pair novice teachers with more experienced professionals who serve as role models and provide practical support and encouragement. Schools have complete discretion in deciding what else the teacher mentoring program should provide.

The Cicero School District 99 Induction and Mentoring Program was approved by the ISBE in January 2004. The mission of the program is to develop and retain quality educators by providing support and training through professional collaborative teams, thereby resulting in improved student academic achievement.

The goals are 1) to establish a collaborative team of mentors responsible for providing assistance to, support for, and collegiality with new teachers; 2) to provide new teachers with meaningful opportunities to improve teaching performance by upgrading skills and knowledge in implementing research-based effective instructional practices; 3) to familiarize

new teachers with the philosophy and expectations of the district and the local community; 4) to retain quality teachers within the district; 5) to integrate technology into the communication process; and 6) to satisfy Illinois mandated requirements for teacher induction, certification and professional development.

The components of the program include new teacher orientation, mentor facilitated monthly support meetings for new teachers at each building to address needs and concerns, weekly personal contact between mentor and new teacher, peer observations of the new teacher's classroom practice by an experienced teacher, professional development opportunities including observation of experienced teachers and/or attendance at professional development workshops and seminars for the new teacher each semester, reflection by the new teacher on his or her teaching practices in relation to the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, and review and analysis of the new teacher's progress by the mentor.

Teachers new to School District 99 are offered the opportunity to participate in this program during New Teacher Orientation in the fall. They record their decision and present it to their principal for approval. If they choose to fully participate in the program, they are paired with a trained mentor who will support them through two school years. They may prefer instead to attend the monthly support meetings at their buildings. Mentors must attend mentor training sessions provided by the ISBE and Strategies that Support Instruction for English Language Learners provided by School District 99 as a condition of their selection.

Responsibility for coordination of the Induction and Mentoring Program is assigned to a Program Supervisor in the Language Minority Services Department. Responsibilities include program design and coordination, mentor selection, training, and matching to new teachers; coordinating professional development for program participants; documenting program completion requirements to ensure compliance with ISBE requirements; and coordinating program research and evaluation efforts. The program is reviewed annually and the mentor.

Teachers new to School District 99 are offered the opportunity to participate in this program during New Teacher Orientation in the fall. They record their decision and present

it to their principal for approval. If they choose to fully participate in the program, they are paired with a trained mentor who will support them through two school years. They may prefer instead to attend the monthly support meetings at their buildings. Mentors must attend mentor training sessions provided by the ISBE and Strategies that Support Instruction for English Language Learners provided by School District 99 as a condition of their selection.

Responsibility for coordination of the Induction and Mentoring Program is assigned to a Program Supervisor in the Language Minority Services Department. Responsibilities include program design and coordination, mentor selection, training, and matching to new teachers; coordinating professional development for program participants; documenting program completion requirements to ensure compliance with ISBE requirements; and coordinating program research and evaluation efforts. The program is reviewed annually and revised according to participant evaluation responses, district needs, and data indicators required of induction and mentoring.

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part E. District Responsibilities

***District Responsibilities*** - Specify the services and resources that the district has provided to revise the plan and other services that the district will provide toward implementation of strategies and activities. District technical assistance should include data analysis, identification of the school's challenges in implementing professional development requirements, the resulting need-related technical assistance and professional development to effect changes in instruction, and analysis and revision of the school's budget (NCLB, Section 1116). If applicable, identify corrective actions or restructuring options taken by the district.

This School Improvement Plan has as its foundation the district's Comprehensive District Plan/Comprehensive School Reform model. This includes district professional development, a standards aligned curriculum, instructional resources, and support personnel as confirmation of a supportive district structure where leadership and responsibility are shared. Professional development is well supported by Cicero District 99 through internal and external sources funded by local, state and federal resources.

The schools in the district are supported by the following positions that provide on-going professional development and support throughout the year.

1/27/2010 2:55:16 PM

- Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services
- Assistant Superintendent for Student Services
- Assistant Superintendent for Human Resource
- Director of School Improvement
- Director of Language Minority Services
- Director of Math and Science
- Director of Social Studies, Fine Arts and Gifted
- Director of Special Education
- Director of Technology and Information Services
- Literacy Support Teachers/Interventionists
- Literacy Facilitators
- Building/District Resource Facilitators
- Building Administrators

**Corrective Actions** taken by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress for a fourth annual calculation (Corrective Action Status) should be aligned with the strategies and activities of this plan. The district must take one or more of the following actions in such a school per NCLB, Section 1116(b)(7)(C)(iv).

- Require implementation of a new research-based curriculum of instructional program;
- Extension of the school year or school day;
- Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance;
- Significant decrease in management authority at the school level;
- Replacement of the principal;
- Restructuring the internal organization of the school;
- Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school.

**Restructuring Options** (allowed in Illinois) selected by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress for a fifth annual calculation (Restructuring Status) should be aligned with the strategies and activities of this plan. The district must take one or more of the following options in such a school.

- Ⓔ Reopening the school as a public charter school, consistent with Article 27A of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/Art. 27A.);
- Ⓔ Replacing all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school's inability to make AYP;
- Ⓔ Entering into a contract with a private entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the school as a public school;
- Ⓔ Implementing any other major restructuring of the school's governance that makes fundamental reform in:
  - Ⓔ governance and management, and/or
  - Ⓔ financing and material resources, and/or
  - Ⓔ staffing.

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part F. State Responsibilities

**State Responsibilities** - Specify the services and resources that ISBE, RESPROS, and other service providers have provided the school during the development and review of this plan and other services that will be provided during the implementation of the plan. ISBE shall provide technical assistance to the school if district fails to do so.

Over the past several years, ISBE has provided support to Cicero District 99 in many ways. A new, comprehensive approach to increasing school improvement was recently developed and responds directly to the mandates of NCLB. ISBE developed a plan that would shift delivery of services from a centralized to a regionalized model. Regional Offices of Education act as primary providers of services, while

Regional Service Providers (RESPROS) offer the district technical support. West 40 Intermediate Service Center assumes this supportive role for District 99. NCLB Section 1003: School Improvement states that 95% of the NCLB School Improvement money available each year must be used for activities connected to school improvement plans and are provided for through the RESPRO (West 40). The agency also acts as the External Partner for the district's Comprehensive School Reform model and monitors school improvement planning.

Other West 40 (RESPRO) services to the district include but are not limited to:

- Assisting schools in development of SIPs, reviewing and analyzing all facets of school operation
- Providing support and training in data collection and analysis
- Providing professional development opportunities designed for activities specifically in SIPs
- Providing support in alignment of curriculum with ILS/Benchmarks/Performance Descriptors
- Facilitating collaboration of parents and community members in the design, implementation and monitoring of SIPs
- Facilitating the collaboration of and provide models for development of district and school policy on parental involvement.
- Facilitating the collaboration of and provide models for the development of school-parent compacts
- Providing training required of districts and schools in developing state approved mentoring and induction programs
- Providing Administrator Academies to support building level adm.
- Using SIP, identify personnel concerns and provide models for identifying outstanding school personnel.
- Developing written reports that analyze the organization and implementation of the school's improvement plan.

- Providing support teams to schools undergoing Restructuring or Corrective Action, Supplemental Educational Services and Choice

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation  
Part G. School Support Team

	Name	Title
1	Kay Poyner Brown	West 40
2	Jennifer Aldred-Berry	West 40
3	Susan Schultz	West 40

---

**Section IV-A Local Board Action**

**DATE APPROVED** by Local Board:                    **11/12/2009**

**A. ASSURANCES**

1. The district has provided written notice in a timely manner about the improvement identification to parents of each student enrolled in the school, in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand (NCLB, Section 1116(c)(6)).
2. Strategies and activities have been founded in scientifically based research as required by NCLB, Section 1116(b)(3)(A)(i) and as defined in NCLB, Section 9101(37).
3. Technical assistance provided by the district serving the school is founded on scientifically based research (NCLB, Section 1116(b)(4)(C)) as defined in NCLB, Section 9101 (37).
4. The plan includes strategies and activities that support the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards and ensures alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessments with the Illinois Learning Standards.
5. The school will spend at least 10 percent of the funds made available under Section 1113 of NCLB for the purpose of providing teachers and the principal high-quality professional development. (Title I schools only.)

**B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION**

By submitting the plan on behalf of the school the district superintendent certifies to ISBE that all the assurances and information provided in the plan are true and correct and that the improvement plan has been duly approved by the local school board. By sending e-mail notification of the plan completion from the **Submit Your Plan** page (Section IV-C) the plan shall be deemed to be executed by the superintendent on behalf of the school.

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes  No

Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified? [C]

Yes  No

Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness? [C]

Yes  No

Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students? [C]

Yes  No

Does the analysis, along with other optional data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities? [C]

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Yes  No  N/A

If included, is there evidence that the SIP team analyzed optional data to clarify the areas of weakness?

Yes  No  N/A

Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?

Yes  No  N/A

Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

OTHER DATA

Yes  No  N/A

If included, has the SIP team analyzed other available data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities?

Yes  No  N/A

Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?

Yes  No  N/A

Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

**IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS**

Yes  No Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance? [C]

Yes  No Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control? [C]

**CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES**

Yes  No Has the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan? [C]

Yes  No  N/A Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency? [C]

**ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES**

Yes  No Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?

Yes  No Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement? [C]

Yes  No Are the strategies and activities measurable? [C]

Yes  No Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified? [C]

Yes  No Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear? [C]

Yes  No  N/A Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students? [C]

Yes  No  N/A Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status or in special education non-compliance?

Yes  No  N/A Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities? for students? [C]

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]
<b>MONITORING</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers? [C]

**PART I - COMMENTS**

**PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN**

**PARENT NOTIFICATION**

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only) [C]
---	---

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the SIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes? [C]

**PEER REVIEW**

Yes  No      Is the peer review process described and is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have “the greatest likelihood” of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP? [C]

**TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS**

Yes  No      Is it clear how the school is ensuring that teachers are receiving the support needed for their professional growth and to retain them in the profession? [C]

**DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES**

Yes  No      Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]

Yes  No  N/A      If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]

**STATE RESPONSIBILITIES**

Yes  No      Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation? [C]

**SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM**

Yes  No  N/A      Have the names and titles of School Support Team members been listed in the plan? Does the team appear to have the expertise to support this school in regards to the school improvement plan? [C]

**APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD**

Yes  No      The plan indicates the approval date of this plan. [C]

**PART II - COMMENTS**