

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

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	140160990022002		
District Name:	Cicero SD 99	School Name:	Cicero East Elem School
Superintendent:	Donna Adamic	Principal:	Linda Budrik
District Address:	5110 W 24th St	School Address:	2324 S 49th Ave
City/State/Zip:	Cicero, IL 60804 2948	City/State/Zip:	Cicero, IL 60804 2447
District Telephone#:	Label 7088634856 Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	7086529440 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 6

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	47.4		No	68.5		Yes	96.1	Yes		
White														
Black														
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	47.2	49.7	No	69.0		Yes	96.2			
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	38.0	41.1	No	64.5	64.5	Yes	96.4			
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	19.3	31.1	No	37.3	52.2	No	94.1			
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	46.9	48.4	Yes	68.7		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.

DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION

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 (%)	95.4	96.0	95.6	95.6	95.7	95.7	96.1	96.1
Truancy Rate (%)	6.5	1.3	8.6	2.4	5.7	4.5	4.1	1.4
Mobility Rate (%)	28.6	30.1	17.7	21.1	17.6	17.9	17.4	19.1
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	1,082	1,173	1,008	922	882	870	850	881
Low Income (%)	81.2	80.4	96.8	95.1	84.9	87.5	94.2	93.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	48.9	67.9	62.7	55.1	48.2	56.2	52.4	63.3
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	2.5	2.1	2.3	3.5	3.2	2.8	2.2	1.7
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.4	0.5	1.0	1.8	2.0	1.6	1.8	2.0
Hispanic (%)	96.9	97.1	96.5	94.5	94.6	95.4	96.0	95.8
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	-	0.2
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2

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 (%)
S C H O O L	2000	4.5	1.0	94.3	0.2	-	-
	2001	3.3	0.8	95.5	0.2	0.2	-
	2002	2.5	0.4	96.9	0.3	-	-
	2003	2.1	0.5	97.1	0.3	-	-
	2004	2.3	1.0	96.5	0.1	0.1	-
	2005	3.5	1.8	94.5	0.2	-	-
	2006	3.2	2.0	94.6	0.2	-	-
	2007	2.8	1.6	95.4	0.2	-	-
	2008	2.2	1.8	96.0	-	-	-
	2009	1.7	2.0	95.8	0.2	-	0.2
D I S T R I C T	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 (%)
S C H O O L	2000	41.0	74.0	92.8	95.5	27.0	90	8.6	-	-
	2001	31.9	72.6	94.6	95.5	30.5	92	8.2	-	-
	2002	48.9	81.2	70.0	95.4	28.6	68	6.5	-	-
	2003	67.9	80.4	97.0	96.0	30.1	15	1.3	-	-
	2004	62.7	96.8	100.0	95.6	17.7	85	8.6	-	-
	2005	55.1	95.1	100.0	95.6	21.1	22	2.4	-	-
	2006	48.2	84.9	100.0	95.7	17.6	49	5.7	-	-
	2007	56.2	87.5	100.0	95.7	17.9	39	4.5	-	-
	2008	52.4	94.2	100.0	96.1	17.4	35	4.1	-	-
	2009	63.3	93.4	99.0	96.1	19.1	13	1.4	-	-
D I S T R I C T	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	1,087	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,226	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	1,082	122	153	121	127	138	-
	2003	1,173	126	149	162	130	146	-
	2004	1,008	-	338	369	-	-	-
	2005	922	-	297	267	-	-	-
	2006	882	-	302	264	-	-	-
	2007	870	-	292	284	-	-	-
	2008	850	-	309	285	-	-	-
	2009	881	-	296	297	-	-	-
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
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	54.8	45.0	42.5	36.7	35.0	42.7	44.8	44.2	39.8	46.2
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.0	25.0	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20.0	-	-	-	-	-	50.0
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	56.6	45.0	42.8	36.1	36.4	46.9	47.8	45.2	39.8	45.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33.4	26.2	-	-	76.9	-	28.2	35.2
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.8	7.1	26.1	6.3	7.1	4.0	13.6	13.3	4.5	16.7
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53.0	44.8	40.0	36.5	35.5	42.4	42.6	45.6	39.5	45.2

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	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	-	-	41.0	44.9	51.5	60.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	30.0	60.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	41.4	44.3	51.8	60.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	33.3	40.8	43.7	51.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	9.4	9.4	20.0	24.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	40.4	43.3	51.6	59.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	73.7	76.0	62.7	65.6	57.0	61.0	65.0	73.9	63.1	66.6
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40.0	41.7	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40.0	-	-	-	-	-	58.3
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	74.6	76.8	62.3	66.4	58.4	64.4	68.3	75.4	63.1	66.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52.9	60.9	-	-	92.3	-	58.0	58.4
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51.8	28.5	43.5	37.5	14.3	11.5	40.9	56.7	31.8	33.3
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	72.2	75.5	60.7	65.3	55.6	59.9	67.0	74.4	63.4	67.0

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	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	-	-	66.4	69.3	72.9	74.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	60.0	50.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	67.2	70.2	74.2	73.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	63.7	64.8	71.1	72.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	34.4	43.7	50.0	36.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	65.9	69.1	73.0	74.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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 Cicero East School Report Card shows that our school did not make AYP in Reading or Math. We did not meet AYP standards over all due to the following subgroups: Hispanic (47.2), LEP (38.0), and Students with Disabilities (19.3). We did make AYP in Reading with our Low Income students through Safe Harbor (46.9). In Math our school also did not make AYP. However the only subgroup that was deficient was our Students with Disabilities at 37.3%. All other subgroups met AYP showing some growth.

In looking at our grade levels, it is interesting to note the growth from our 4th through 6th grade. In reading, our 4th grade scores for All were at 36.7%. By 5th grade the scores had increased to 46.2% , and finally by 6th grade, the scores were 60%. Although the 60% is still below the 70% required, we must still consider that five transitional classrooms still contained a considerable number of bilingual students or students who had recently transitioned to our 50/50 program. All of our subgroups showed the same growth pattern from 4th to 5th to 6th grade in reading.

Math showed a similar growth pattern in the grade levels for All students. Our 4th grade score for AYP in math was at 65.6% while 5th grade rose just slightly to 66.6%. There was a significant gain at 6th grade level to 74.2% All subgroups showed a similar pattern with slight growth from 4th to 5th grade level, but a 9% - 11% gain by the 6th grade in our Hispanic, LEP, and Low Income subgroups. However, our Students with Disabilities subgroup declined from 37.5% at 4th grade to 33.3% at 5th grade and only 36% at 6th grade.

Our Report Card also shows that our LEP population rose by 10.9% in 2009 and our mobility rate rose by 1.7% over the previous year. Overall, our truancy rate decreased by 22 children. On the whole, our scores are telling us that students at the intermediate grades are progressing and by the 6th grade level our students are beginning to show signs that language acquisition in English is taking place as more students are transitioned into the general education population. Our chronic truants decreased by 0.3%. We have shown a rise in enrollment increasing by 31 students over the previous year.

Overall, our scores show that our students are progressing through the intermediate grades as language acquisition takes place and our students transition from bilingual and transitional classrooms into the general education population. ISAT scores improve for those that have mastered the English language. However, special education has not improved at all which could be attributed to new teacher turnover.

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

A large number of our students taking the ISAT are identified as Limited English Proficient (63.3%) and Hispanic (95.8%). As English Language Learners the ISAT has proven to be taxing for these students who have not yet met exit levels on the ACCESS. ISAT is mandated for all students and one can see from the trend data that our school made steady progress from (2003-2007). With the advent of ISAT for all students our scores took a steep decline in students meeting and exceeding standards. Even with the accommodations that are given, students at Cicero East have not yet acquired the reading stamina and vocabulary needed as second language learners. In 2008 our overall reading scores were at 43.8% and by 2009 we had risen to 47.4%. Even after three years of Reading First in grades 1-3, our students entering our fourth grade have not yet achieved enough of a transfer to the English language to successfully meet/exceed standards on the ISAT test. As students achieve proficiency, our scores continually rise. We will continue to monitor math even though we meet/exceeds standards through safe harbor. In some subgroups we will not make AYP this year if we do not continue to strengthen instructional strategies in math. Teachers have noted a need for math interventions in our district to help with flexible grouping. It is also important to note that our ISAT test also involves a significant amount of reading which also can contribute to the scores our students attain. Guided reading is taught to our Hispanic/LEP students as a push-in program in the general education setting for our ESL students. However, our ESL teachers are pulled from the classroom for ACCESS testing yearly for weeks at a time. This causes a change in the schedule of guided reading for these students during this testing window. Services are interrupted for an extended period of time.

Our IEP group has shown no growth over time. This is also due to a combination of disability and an ELL population within this subgroup. Although our IEP subgroup has access to the general education curriculum, students are still well below levels in reading and math. This could be attributed to bilingual factors. Our ESL and special education resource teachers do help to support general education teachers in the general education classroom with our resource children. Unfortunately, the needs are greater than the time these teachers have to help support the general education classroom teacher. However, there does seem to be a gap with our self-contained cross categorical classrooms. All self-contained cross categorical classrooms are taught in English with bilingual support provided by Spanish speaking program assistants. Delivery of guided reading for our cross categorical students is given by the program assistant who is not trained in guided reading. Although math scores for this subgroup is higher than the reading, they are still significantly below AYP scores. We have also noted a dip in scores in 2009 from the 2008 scores. Teacher training and preparation may be a factor in the self-contained classrooms. Both my 4th and 5th grade cross-cat teachers were new to the district and one was new to teaching. Behavior management was also compounding problems in the instructional setting. In addition, our special education teachers need training in how to differentiate not only the core curriculum but additional training on how to target and remediate the specific disabilities of the children within their classrooms.

Our class sizes are rising especially in the general education classrooms, and therefore movement out of our transitional classrooms into general education is often impossible due to class size. Our enrollment rose by 31 students and a full classroom needed to be placed at another elementary building in our district. Placements using ACCESS scores that are from the previous year are not in the best interest of our children since many must remain in the transitional classrooms who have met criteria for English proficiency. In addition, our LEP population has risen by 10.9% which is a significant increase. The rising increases have caused changes in the programs in our school from year to year. As stated before, language acquisition for these students takes five to seven years to reach proficiency levels. For our students, the ISAT test even with accommodations requires stamina and grade level vocabulary.

External factors which have an impact on our scores are limited English speaking parents as reflected in home language surveys. Student absenteeism which often affects our most at risk students as reflected in school attendance and PBIS data. Student low coping skills due to social pressures often manifests itself as acting out behaviors in the classroom as evidenced in PBIS data. Extended vacations by families to Mexico, evidenced in school attendance logs, cause interruptions and gaps in learning. Teacher turnover impacts staff development. It is difficult to tier staff development to meet the needs of training in guided reading and math to meet the proficiency levels of our teachers.

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

In analyzing our 2009 ISAT scores, our reading scores in most subgroups will need continual monitoring. Our ISAT results show a steady increase in reading skills from the fourth through sixth grade as students language proficiency grows. Students are now showing signs they are mastering English and applying these skills. We have expanded RTI in reading to include both the fifth and sixth grade level with our students who are given interventions in the content area of social studies. Students who are most in need of interventions in this additional reading period are targeted and taught by our literacy support teachers. Yellow tiered students' skill deficits are targeted and differentiated by classroom teachers. Our transitional English classrooms need a stronger core curriculum to help enhance the acquisition of English language skills and a focus on differentiated instruction addresses this factor.

The IEP subgroup performance has shown little growth over time. We will continue to offer interventions using S.P.I.R.E. and Read 180 where appropriate. Progress monitoring will continue with this subgroup using ISEL. MAP testing will be used to target skill deficits and create goals toward IEP goal setting. Both teachers and program assistants need training in guided reading as well as additional training in specific strategies in remediating the disability.

Our parent meetings will be more focused with assistance from the district parent liaison to target strategies that parents can use in the home to help support their children. Other information that will be discussed are community resources available to help families in crisis.

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 Northwest Evaluation Association Measure of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP) test of reading and math has been administered to Cicero East's fourth through sixth grades and is used as our local assessment piece. MAP is used to assess our general education population as well as our transitional students who have attained a composite score of 3.0 or higher. English Language Learners who are enrolled in the bilingual programs take the MAP mathematics test with audio support in Spanish. The LEP population who score lower than 3.0 on ACCESS are given the ISEL which is new for this year. In the 2008-2009 school year our LEP population used the Supera which gave us a fall score, but did not give us the ability to progress monitor our students throughout the year. With the ISEL's introduction, we will now be able to assess our LMS population's fluency and comprehension. ISEL in English will also be used for progress monitoring our red tier students in RTI. MAP is administered three times a year with a timely turnover of results to teachers, students, and parents. Adaptive tests give teachers the data required to best align instruction to meet the students' needs.

MAP reading measures skills in word analysis/vocabulary, reading strategies and comprehension, literature and literary works. In Cicero East's RTI team meetings, MAP scores are one variable that is used to target our students for interventions. Those in the lowest 25% are selected as our red tier students. Students who rank at 26%-50% qualify for our yellow tier group and those students whose scores are above 50% remain in the green tier.

Our sixth grade decreased in reading level in word analysis from Fall, 2008 to Spring, 2009 in the number of students below level in the RIT bands. The overall strength through the year was literature with no significant gains shown in the other areas. Our Fall, 2009 scores are showing literary works (96 of 287 students at/above grade level) and reading strategies/comprehension (131 of 287 students at/above grade level) as that grade level's weaknesses. Word analysis is slightly better (139 out of 287 students). Literature is the strength with half (145 out of 297 students) at grade level. Fifty percent of our transitional students made their projected growth target from Fall, 2008 through Fall, 2009.

Our fifth grade RIT band comparisons from Fall, 2008 to Spring, 2009 showed decreases in scores in some of the areas. The area of strength in Fall, 2008 was literary works with 95 out of 256 students at or above grade level. The Fall, 2008 weakness was word analysis with only 68 students at or above grade level. Our Spring, 2009 scores showed a decrease as the median level for the end of the year rose in numbers. Our fifth grade showed a decrease of 15 students at or above grade level in word analysis (55 out of 256 students at or above grade level). Reading strategies increased with a gain of 27 students. In reading strategies 107 out of 256 were at or above grade level. The Fall, 2009 RIT bands show a strength in reading strategies with 100 students out of 279 at or above grade level. Literature (94/279) and Literary Works (91/279) were not significantly lower in the amount of students at or above grade level. The weakness was word analysis with 76 students out of 279 who are functioning at or above grade level. An average of 60.5% of our transitional students reached their projected growth target from the Fall, 2008 to Fall, 2009.

The fourth grade comparisons using our RIT bands from Fall, 2008 to Spring, 2009 showed no significant gains. The tests were given to all students so they must be viewed with

1/27/2010 2:33:10 PM

caution. Our bilingual classrooms were interested in how well our bilingual students would do on the English test mainly to assess English language skills. Our strengths were in Literature and Literary Works with 55 out of 241 students at or above grade level. The fourth grade weakness was word analysis with only 35 of 241 students scoring at or above grade level. This is still very distressing, but Supera scores were far more indicative of our bilingual population's achievement. When we disaggregate our general education population we found that students made a 23.5% gain in reading growth from Fall, 2008 to Spring, 2009. However, as students are beginning to transition we saw our students making large gains in word analysis skills. Students rose from 40 to 78 (out of 241) at or above level on the test. Our Fall, 2009 show huge deficits in word analysis (43/290 at or above grade level) and reading strategies (43/290 at or above grade level). This year no child with an ACCESS score below 3.0 took the MAP test. All of these children were given the ISEL for fluency and comprehension.

Our self contained special education students overall did show growth in reading when compared from Fall, 2008 to Fall, 2009. Thirty-three per cent of our fifth grade students met their growth target in reading while thirty percent of our sixth grade students met their growth target on MAP. No data was available for our fourth grade students since this group was not tested on MAP at the third grade in our feeder school. It must still be remembered though that most of these students are still at warning or below standards levels.

Cicero East's reading overview shows that overall 10.4% of our students are above proficiency level (grade level) but below the growth index, median level of RIT ranges between Fall to Spring; 30.5% of our students are above both the proficiency and growth index. Currently, 34.9% are below proficiency and above the growth index, and finally 24.1 % are below proficiency and growth. We must target the 35% who are below proficiency but show large potential for growth in reading. In addition , over 10% of our student body are not being challenged to move forward. They have the potential, but are not growing.

MAP mathematics tests our students in number sense, algebra, geometry, measurement, and data analysis and probability. MAP scores are used for flexible grouping in math, looking at tiers in much the same way they are used for reading. The lowest 20% are red tier, 21-50% are yellow tier and 50% and above are green tier students.

In the Fall, 2009 testing for our sixth grade, 176 of the 269 children tested show an average of 86% proficiency probability. This is an increase of 3% over Fall, 2008. As teachers analyzed their scores they found the strength to be measurement, algebra and data analysis. An average of thirty-seven per cent of our transitional students met their growth target from the Fall, 2008 test to Fall, 2009.

In the fifth grade, 125 of the 270 students tested show an average 81 % proficiency probability. This is approximately the same as the Fall, 2008 scores. In looking at the local data, our fifth grade students show weaknesses in measurement and geometry while our strengths are number sense and algebra. An average of twenty-six per cent of our transitional students met their growth target from the Fall, 2008 to Fall, 2009 testing.

In the fourth grade, 71 of 298 students tested show an average of 67% proficiency probability. This is a 13.6 % increase over the Fall, 2008 score. The data shows that the fourth grade students' strengths are number sense and algebra and the weaknesses are measurement and geometry.

1/27/2010 2:33:10 PM

Our self contained special education students show very little projected growth. Given their current RIT scores, students at fourth through the sixth grade will score below standards or academic warning. At this time they are showing no gains or growth.

Cicero East's mathematics overview shows that 23% of our students are above proficiency but below their growth index. Another 36.1% are below in both proficiency and growth; 29.4% are below proficiency but above the growth index; 11.5% are below proficiency but above the growth index. These scores must be carefully analyzed by classroom teachers in targeting differentiation in the classroom.

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 have contributed to these scores are lack of core curriculum in the English portion of our transitional classrooms which will be addressed in differentiating instruction for students. Teachers are constantly seeking materials to meet the varying needs of their students. The program provided often does not meet the instructional needs of the children, especially those that have reached proficiency level but are remaining in transitional classrooms due to lack of space in the general education classes. Teachers are also frustrated by the wide range of student abilities (gifted and slow learners) in overcrowded classrooms. Behavior concerns and social/emotional issues often interfere with learning by taking away instructional time. Limited vocabulary and background knowledge are barriers to learning for our ELL students. Reading stamina for these children often become frustrating, often leaving them unmotivated. The increase in transitional programs as our LEP population has risen has also had an impact on our scores and levels of our children. The constant turnover of staff has produced a great impact on providing professional development to get new teachers up to par with expectations for reading and math instruction.

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

Our next steps in school improvement planning will be a concerted effort to provide teachers with the tools to effectively differentiate in the classrooms. Professional development will focus on the work of Carol Ann Tomlinson through book talks, discussion, implementation in the classroom and peer observations of specific skills and strategies to reach students of varying abilities in the classroom. Math needs to be reviewed on a constant basis. Revisiting work stations for math will help to address review of concepts for various ability groupings of the students. Continued implementation of PBIS expectations will be revisited throughout the year through "Cool Tools" to address the multitude of social/emotional issues in the classroom. Parent Nights and 21st Century Learning Center will continue to work with our parents to strengthen their skills in working with their children academically.

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?

Cicero East has many attributes to be proud of which helps to describe our school. We have a collaborative and supportive staff who work within their learning teams to support student learning. With teamwork they provide one another with help, suggestions, strategies, and interventions to promote best practices for the academic and social/emotional support our students need. Teachers receive guided reading support from our literacy support teachers, ESL staff and special education resource. Most classrooms have one push-in teacher for guided reading several times per week. New teachers are given support through mentors assigned in the building as well as their grade level teams. We have many teachers who are currently working on a Master's in Reading and several more working on endorsements in ESL to help provide better knowledge of the skills their children need. This year the fourth grade received computer pods in the classroom to enhance technology in the classroom. Now our entire building has computer support for our children at a more accessible level. A computer lab has been added this year to help with the integration of technology in the classroom. In addition, whole classes can now test for MAP at once. MAP and ISEL testing is now used as our local assessments with immediate feedback on the progress of students. This allows teachers the ability to group their children in math and reading more readily with hard data. PBIS was implemented this year which allows for consistency in discipline. With this implementation we now have a full RTI model in place with more information readily available to us for interventions. We also have several tutors available to us through Northeastern Illinois University. They volunteer their time one to two hours a day, three times a week. In addition, we have more parent volunteers in our classrooms to help teachers. Our Assembly of Parents has seen an increase in attendance with approximately 25-30 parents attending our meetings to discuss programs and activities. Finally our school has after school activities for the students to join voluntarily. We currently have a Reading Club, Student Run Bookstore, Science Club, Drum Circle, Recorder Club, Guitar Club and Homework Clubs at the grade level daily. Book-it and the Six Flags Great America reading program are offered to our students.

As one of the district's RTI pilot schools, we had the opportunity to work with the district model and provide interventions in reading during our Power Hour. We focused on the fifth grade and saw many students gain skills through interventions which were given in English or Spanish. Teachers began to provide differentiated instruction at our yellow tier to struggling students while those children in the red tier received intensive intervention from reading specialists. With this implementation, we saw fewer special education referrals and gains in reading skills.

Our district also involves our children in many opportunities that promote progress and growth. The G.R.E.A.T. program is delivered through our police department to warn of the dangers of gangs which are a large factor in our schools. 21st Century Learning Centers has an after school program for 150 of our students who are in need of academic assistance in reading and math. RIF is offered three times a year so that our children may receive a free book of their choice. Free health exams are offered as well as vision and dental services are given to enable our children wellness checks. Corazon in conjunction with the Town of Cicero has trained parents as Parent Patrol volunteers to help ensure the safety of our children before and after school. District 99 has just revived a district band program for our fourth through sixth grade.

Challenges continue to impede on the progress of our children. Our school is not air conditioned with temperatures often reaching into the high 90 degree area. With the heat and no air circulation, many children become ill, have difficulty attending to instruction by afternoon, often become short tempered leading to office referrals. Teachers are less patient. Transitional teachers who teach the English half of the program feel the core curriculum does not meet the needs of the children. Class sizes are now near 30 students in the general education population, and teachers feel they cannot give the individual/group attention that many of our students need. More supplemental reading materials are needed in bilingual and transitional classrooms, especially for guided reading and interventions. We need lower level materials. LMS students who could be placed in the general education classrooms cannot be moved out of transitional due to large class sizes after the beginning of the school year. ACCESS test scores are a year behind our school projections. Special education teachers need more training through the department to accomodate the needs of the students. Training in strategies and interventions both behaviorally and academically would lead to greater support of our I.E.P. subgroup. More time is spend on the technology of writing the I.E.P. than on best practices for these teachers. Many new initiatives have been instituted in the district with very little time for teachers to implement what they have learned. Full implementation will not take place without time for the adult learner to practice what they have learned in professional development. Over my six year tenure in this district, many staff changes have taken place. I currently have four teachers in this building who were here when I entered. Trying to tier professional development becomes a challenge. This year I have five new teachers out of thirty-seven homerooms. In addition, this school had a new assistant principal with no building experience brought in one week before the opening of the school year. This was done after many hours of planning with my former assistant principal on the roll-out of the RTI model for 2009-2010. The school has also lost the school secretary one month into the year due to retirement. The added burden of training a new assistant principal and secretary has taken time away from faculty needs. The time needed for work on SIS takes away administrative time from classroom observations and walk throughs. Parent involvement continues to be a challenge. Parents' limited English often makes assisting their children challenging and they frequesntly ask the school for help. The economy has made it increasingly difficult for parents to support the their children's education.

Community safety issues often make it difficult for parents to allow their children to play outside. Gang involvement and crime are on an increase and recruitment is often happening before and after school. SES programs are often not available to our students due to transportation issues within the family. Many of our mothers must walk their children to various night functions which often are not safe, but to present a day program is not feasible becuae of space issues.

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

The increase in capacity of technology has afforded Cicero East wonderful outcomes. With the advantage of pods in all classrooms and the addition of a computer lab, teachers now have the ability to use the website for instruction in the classroom. With the addition of the lab, whole classrooms can test more quickly without losing instructional time that occurred with only one computer in a classroom. Technology has also given us the opportunity to to have timely data through MAP and ISEL in which to group our children for differentiated instruction rather than waiting months for results. This information allows teachers to discuss strategies in a more timely manner in the grade level meetings. Analysis of data takes place earlier in the year so that pertinent data helps focus our school professional development to meet the needs of the children.

Implementation of PBIS has helped delineate classroom management from office referrals. It has also helped develop consistency building wide on behavioral expectations for 80%

of our children. Teachers and students know the expectations which have helped to reduce workplace stress through consistency. Data has clearly shown times, locations, and students who are continual referrals. Reteaching takes place when needed.

With the piloting of RTI, teachers were excited by the results and gains our students had made in reading. Our staff needs assessment indicated they would like to focus on differentiated instruction at the building level for professional development. Implementation of staff development is difficult to tier in the buildings due to time constraints and personnel. Differentiation training is our building focus, but new teachers need additional training in guided reading, learning the curriculum and supplemental materials, frameworks and pacing guides. Although they are given a mentor, it still takes far too long to get them up to speed with all the expectations and demands of the profession.

After school programs such as homework clubs, 21st Century Learning Centers and SES programs have helped enhance learning for our most at risk students. Growth is happening, but not at the rate we need it to be.

Our class sizes continue to hamper teacher time with individuals who are struggling. Behaviors and motivation also factor into the equation as more and more students and their families are in crisis. Social/emotional issues have become a large factor and only one social worker is not enough to meet the needs of the children and their families. Often outside agencies have waiting lists that are months long.

Special education teachers need more training in not only differentiation, but strategies in which to remediate the disability. Special education teachers do not have the background in all the disability disciplines to effectively remediate the needs of many of our children placed in cross categorical classrooms. Less time in IEP+ training and more professional development in reading and math may help to move our special education population forward.

Parent groups have become more active in safety around the school. However, more parents need to become involved in the academic component of their children's day. We have taken baby steps with our parents as more have become involved. We need to focus the training for parents so they become more involved in their child's academic life.

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

Differentiation is the focus for our school improvement this year. Teachers have asked for more clarity on how to differentiate in the classroom. We will focus on the works of Carol Ann Tomlinson throughout the year with a focus on three strategies for differentiation that can be used for reading or math.

PBIS implementation will hopefully help to reduce the amount of children losing instructional time do to office referrals. Waiting to be seen by an administrator is a loss of classroom instructional time. Hopefully more classroom managed behaviors will come under control with our new school wide expectations for behavior. Consistency from one environment to another will be the same.

Materials for reading that are aligned with the core curriculum will help with reading strategies and skills in the transitional classrooms. The skills and strategies need to be the same as those presented in the general education and bilingual part of the day in the classroom.

Parent groups need to focus on strategies that help their children become successful readers. The Parent Patrol is a wonderful start in helping with safety in the community. However, parents also need to take part in the children's academic life.

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?

Educator data from the School Report Card gives us data at the district level. We are a young staff with an average years of experience at ten years which is below the State average. Our average salary is also below the state average. When compared to the state Cicero has a higher percentage of teachers with Bachelor's degrees and a lower percentage of teachers with Master's degrees. In addition, our pupil to teacher ratio is also higher than the state average (22 students vs. 18 students). We also have a higher percentage of classrooms taught by Not Highly Qualified teachers (3% vs. 1%) and Provisional certificates (3% vs 1%). In 2008-2009, one classroom at Cicero East employed a Not Highly Qualified teacher. Three teachers were gone on FMLA due to maternity leaves and students were taught by substitutes. One left in October, one in March and one in April.

At Cicero East data has been collected on both classroom teachers and special area/support staff. Cicero East has thirty-seven classroom teachers. Of the thirty-seven, twelve have Bachelor's degrees and twenty-five have Master's degrees. Twenty-seven are white and ten are Hispanic. The greatest number of years of experience is 6-10 years (17 teachers) with 1-5 years close behind (12 teachers). Cicero East has three teachers with 11-15 years experience and five teachers with 16+ years of teaching experience. We currently have two teachers working on advanced degrees in reading, one working on a degree in curriculum and instruction, one is receiving an advanced degree in bilingual education and one teacher is working on a Ph.D. in Bilingual Linguistics. Eight teachers are currently working on ESL endorsements and one is working on a reading endorsement. Two teachers are working on Master's degrees in the BTT/Elementary Education program through Northern Illinois University offered as a cohort through our district. We have sixteen support staff or special area teachers. Of these teachers, six have Bachelor's degrees and ten have Master's degrees. Within the ranks of this group of staff members, eight have less than ten years experience and eight are eleven years and above. Three teachers are currently working on advanced degrees. One is seeking a Master's in special education, one a degree in bilingual education, and one is working on a Type 75.

Our current LEP population has risen to 63.3% which is higher than the District (55.5%) and the State (8.0%), and our Hispanic population is also higher (95.8 %) than the District (95.1%) and State (20.8%). Teachers at Cicero East are encouraged early in their career to get endorsements in ESL or work on advanced degrees in bilingual education. Many have done so and the data shows that others are currently involved in coursework that will advance their knowledge in working with our ELL population.

Our Mobility rate (19.1%) was higher than the District (14.3%) and State (13.5%). Our Attendance (96.1%) was higher than the District (95.7%) and State (93.7%). Mobility rates are sources of frustration as movement of children in and out weekly are cause for new assessment to determine levels of children. Although our attendance percentage is good, staff time and energy is spent on monitoring the attendance of children who exhibit attendance problems. The number of truants and chronic truants has dropped due to teacher monitoring, parent phone calls and conferences, and incentive programs. However, instructional planning time is also lost due to the monitoring that must be done continually.

Our White population has decreased (1.7%) and is lower than the District (2.6%) and State (53.3%) while our Black population (2.0%) is lower than the District (2.1%) and State (19.1%). At Cicero East we have seen a steady rise in this population over the last three years and staff has asked for staff development on working with this subgroup as behavioral problems rise from these children. Cultural sensitivity training is desired by staff.

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

One contributing factor that has impacted student performance at Cicero East is teacher qualifications for our ELL population. Although many of our teachers have Master's degrees, we currently have two teachers that are in the BTT (Bilingual Transition to Teaching) program and several more that finished the program last year. Therefore, our ELL students are often taught by teachers who are not fully certified as teachers. One classroom was taught by a Not Highly Qualified teacher who dropped out of the program and was dismissed at the end of the year. Twelve teachers are non-tenured and five are new to teaching. One teacher has been moved to sixth grade general education after more than eleven years experience as a departmentalized junior high science teacher with no training in guided reading. Fewer teachers are seeking advanced degrees in administration and more are seeking advanced degrees and endorsements in ESL, bilingual education and reading.

Retention of teachers in special education, general education and bilingual education is imperative. This year Cicero East has five new teachers. The constant loss of trained teachers to other districts once they receive advanced degrees is detrimental to our school. Lower salaries and high demands are often reasons for this loss.

The high mobility rate has impact on the scores as students move in and out of Cicero East. Continuity of instruction is interrupted as teachers try to get our students up to

speed in curriculum and instruction. The rising pupil/teacher ratio make it difficult to work with smaller groups of children on a daily basis to meet the goals for their instructional deficits.

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

We can conclude from this data that retention of staff is crucial to continuity of professional development delivered to the staff. We must continue to provide opportunities for our staff to receive advanced degrees and endorsements so that they may have the latest knowledge of best practices that work with our students in our failing subgroup populations.

We must continue our efforts at the school level to monitor attendance and absenteeism to continue to reduce the number of truants and chronic truants. We must find ways to reduce time spent by classroom teachers in contacting parents about absence concerns. Use of other personnel in the building such as the nurse, social worker and building administrators can also be used to conference with parents concerning absenteeism.

The District recognizes the rising pupil/teacher ratio and is beginning to look at long range planning on building more capacity for classrooms. Mobility rates are rising. Many of children move within the district for various reasons. The district has added frameworks and pacing guides to try to meet this challenge for continuity of instruction and curriculum. However, many of our children move throughout the year between Chicago and Cicero and Mexico and Cicero which is difficult to address. Often this is due to family stresses such as loss of jobs, loss of home, family divorce and separation. Our social worker works with the families as much as she can to try to reduce some of these factors, but the need for additional social service workers is becoming more evident.

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

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

Cicero East Report Card data shows a 99% parent involvement rate. This school has many activities available to parents throughout the year. These activities include Open House, Parent/Teacher conferences, Family Activity Nights, the Assembly of Parents group, Coffee with the Principal, Parent Patrol, 21st Century celebrations, book clubs and computer classes, ESL classes through Morton college, PEP (Parents as Educational Partners) at Cicero West, SIP team, Parent Advisory Council and individual parent conferences held throughout the year with teachers. In addition, monthly Newsletters are sent home in both languages explaining what is happening in the classroom and the objectives being

1/27/2010 2:33:10 PM

taught in each academic area; a quarterly Newsletter is sent home to parents by building administrators explaining school wide goals and tips for parents. Through parent involvement activities we hope to help support parents in the academic achievement of their children.

Last year Cicero East provided parents with several family activity nights. In targeting reading, one of our reading nights involved read alouds and shared reading where strategies were modeled and taught to parents in both Spanish and English in November. In April a reading laser light show presented in Spanish and English was made available with a focus on vocabulary. This was particularly enjoyed by our parents. Our May Assembly of Parents meeting explained the reading calendar that was given to all students to maintain reading skills during the summer break. Our math nights focused on problem solving strategies in October and math make and take games and manipulatives in March. Our most largely attended parent nights are attended in December for a holiday movie night and May for our talent show and academic fair. Here teachers display the various projects and writing samples the classrooms have accomplished throughout the year. Parents are allowed to view these artifacts one hour prior to the talent show. The show involves many of our children who are involved in drum circle, recorder clubs, guitar club, and dance club in the school. In addition, students may present their talents to a group of judges in an audition process to also be part of the show. In December we also present our holiday music show conducted by our music teachers throughout the day. Parents attend the show presented for their child's grade level. January involved our students in presenting a small science fair with our fifth grade and members of the science club.

21st Century offers a book club to parents which met weekly. They also offer assistance in our computer lab (last year at Cicero West, this year in our building) for parents. Twice a year a celebration is offered to families of students enrolled in the program. The first celebration offered a Mexican folk music group, puppetry, dinner and activities. The second celebration had activities for children and parents, dinner and a display of the projects the students completed throughout the year.

Our Assembly of Parents meets monthly with our building and district parent liaisons. These meetings give parents an opportunity to hear speakers on community updates, share concerns, problem solve, to become volunteers in the school, and partnership with the town. It was through these meetings and partnership with the Town of Cicero that the first Parent Patrol was formed in the district which was fully implemented last year. Parents are out helping to patrol our school grounds before and after school. Their presence has helped to reduce the number of conflicts that occur and reduce tardiness in the morning.

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

We have seen an increase in parent support over time as more options are given to parents in which to become involved in the school and community. Academic achievement for children increases with parent involvement and support. We try to offer as many options to our parents as possible. With movie nights, parents who have never become involved in the school are now attending with their children. This is a small step, but a step none the less. A smaller group of parents have always been actively involved in the more academic activity nights. As parents become more confident in our schools, many are starting to emerge as parent leaders. Parents are voicing the direction they would like to see as topics for speakers and discussion. As they learn about the school and curriculum, they can offer more support to their children by understanding their learning needs.

Safety has been an issue for quite some time and has always been noted as one of the school challenges. With community partnership and training, parents moved forward to help

1/27/2010 2:33:10 PM

school administrators make our school perimeters a safer place for our students. A group of parents saw the need, stopped complaining and found the support to form a very much appreciated group in our Parent Patrol. Conflict has been reduced before school, students are crossing at crosswalks, parents are reporting gang recruiting, they are spotting children leaving school grounds to cut school, and they are working with the local store to move students out in a timely manner to avoid tardiness.

Our Assembly of Parents group has grown yearly. Parents have found an avenue in which to share concerns and focus on topics that concern their children and families. One concern has continually been the issue of the heat in the school due to no air conditioning. After many discussions, parents were informed that this was beyond building administrators ability to make happen. It was also explained that life safety work must be done for this to happen at the district level. Parents took control of the meeting and explained the process that must happen. A petition was started and taken to our state senator's office. Last spring, this administrator was called asking about this complaint and the conditions in the school during fall an spring. In October, our district was presented with a check to air condition Cicero East and another district school. Our parents have found their voices and used the democratic process appropriately to make things happen in the school. One of our challenges will now be addressed.

21st Century has targeted the parents of our at risk and struggling students. Although the book club is small (12 parents) they are modeling strategies and skills for our parents in their reading. Hopefully they will transfer these skills when working with their children. The computer labs give our parents the opportunity to use and learn computer skills while offering appropriate websites that can be accessed for their children that will boost literacy skills. Finally, many more parents attend the celebrations, but we are still pleased that they are taking the time to show their children they support their learning.

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

At Cicero East we have seen an increase in parent involvement with our children as availability of programs has expanded within the school and the district. We will continue to support the programs in place through monthly activities and newsletters. Parents have become actively involved in programs that involve safety issues and the physical plant of the building. They have become more focused in their needs for support and instruction on how to support their children academically. We now recognize core families that are actively involved. The key is how to use those parents who are more confident in the schools. They will be the impetus we need to get out parents who may still feel somewhat intimidated or inadequate in participating in parent involvement. Cicero East will continue to support parent initiatives that increase parent involvement that helps support children academically and social/emotionally.

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?

- Continue reading and math interventions using the district RTI model
- Provide professional development in guided reading to special education teachers and their program assistants
- Provide professional development in differentiation using Tomlinson's model, strategies, and books
- **School wide implementation of PBIS as the behavior component of the RTI model**
- Resources for materials that mirror the core curriculum in the transitional English classrooms
- Resources for high interest, low vocabulary materials that are aligned with core curriculum for special education students
- Retention of staff at the building
- Monitor absenteeism
- Continue to support parent programs and workshops

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	While our current achievement in reading for all grades is 47.4% in meets/exceeds categories, our 4th, 5th and 6th grades will make AYP of 77.5 % or Safe Harbor in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.	1,2,3,4,
2	While our achievement in math for our Students with Disabilities subgroup is 37.3% meets/exceeds standards for ISAT, the Students with Disabilities subgroup will make AYP of 77.5% for 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.	5,

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. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 4. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 5. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

While our current achievement in reading for all grades is 47.4% in meets/exceeds categories, our 4th, 5th and 6th grades will make AYP of 77.5 % or Safe Harbor in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

Objective 1 Description

Student focus: 1. Differentiated instruction using tiered assignments & rubrics, QAR, and RAFT strategies 2. Focused interventions, both academic and/or behavioral (PBIS), for reading improvement under auspices of RTI.

Professional Development: 1. Book talks on Carol Ann Tomlinson's Differentiated Instruction, viewing DVD series by Tomlinson at grade level meetings. Implementation in classrooms with peer observations. 2. Analyzing grade level PBIS data compiled from instructional time data to develop "Cool Tools" to use to reduce behavior, and analyzing MAP data to form flexible groups for targeting reading deficits.

Parent Involvement: 1. Reading specialists will present differentiated reading strategies that parents can implement in the home which will be presented three times in the year. 2. PBIS will be introduced to parents at Open House along with copies of the matrix. Newsletters will be sent home quarterly updating parents on progress of students academically and behaviorally.

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. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 4. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓔ 5. 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 all grades is 47.4% in meets/exceeds categories, our 4th, 5th and 6th grades will make AYP of 77.5 % or Safe Harbor in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All students will participate in focused interventions for reading improvement and behavior under the auspices of RTI and PBIS with	08/26/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title I	1,500

	particular attention to the LEP, Hispanic and IEP subgroups.					
2	All students will be introduced to tiered instruction, QAR and RAFT strategies within the classroom structure with emphasis on the LEP, IEP, and Hispanic subgroups.	08/26/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title I	1,000
3				Before School	Title I	

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

While our current achievement in reading for all grades is 47.4% in meets/exceeds categories, our 4th, 5th and 6th grades will make AYP of 77.5 % or Safe Harbor in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Grade level meetings will consist of book talks using Carol Ann Tomlinson's Differentiated Instruction. Teachers will implement strategies (tiered assignments, QAR, RAFT) in the classroom and complete peer observations.	08/26/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title I	1,500
2	PBIS core team will roll out behavioral data with emphasis on impact on instructional time. Cool tools and behavior interventions will be implemented.	08/26/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title I	500

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

While our current achievement in reading for all grades is 47.4% in meets/exceeds categories, our 4th, 5th and 6th grades will make AYP of 77.5 % or Safe Harbor in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Reading Specialists will present differentiated literacy strategies to parents two times a year to implement at home.	08/26/2009	06/04/2010	After School	Title I	700

2	PBIS will be introduced by the core team at Open House with strategies that can be applied at home. Quarterly newsletters will be sent home updating parents with data and additional strategies.	08/26/2009	06/04/2010	After School	Title I	100
---	---	------------	------------	--------------	---------	-----

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

While our current achievement in reading for all grades is 47.4% in meets/exceeds categories, our 4th, 5th and 6th grades will make AYP of 77.5 % or Safe Harbor in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

Monitoring will be a group effort. PBIS data will be utilized to monitor the implementation of PBIS. The Core Team, Universal Team, along with the external and internal coaches will collect and analyze PBIS data. The RTI team will monitor students that are in our Red Tier and receiving interventions through on-going assessment using the ISEL for progress monitoring and MAP three times a year. Yellow Tier students receiving differentiated instruction in the classroom will be monitored by the classroom teacher using tiered assignments for progress monitoring and end of unit assessments. Teacher monitoring will be done through a quick observation form that will be turned into administrators. Administrators will do observations and walk throughs of teacher instruction. Weekly grade level sign in sheets will monitor attendance of teachers at grade level meetings. A Jigsaw will be used for the Book Talk with presentations done by teachers of the chapters as well as discussion questions. Parent surveys/evaluations will be used to assess their understanding of strategies and receipt of newsletters.

Name	Title
1 Linda Budrik	Principal
2 Susan Kosmoski	Assistant Principal
3 Christine Michalik	Literacy Support Teacher
4 Kathy Koppe	Literacy Support Teacher
5 Shannan Cassel	PBIS Core Team / Social Worker

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

While our achievement in math for our Students with Disabilities subgroup is 37.3% meets/exceeds standards for ISAT, the Students with Disabilities subgroup will make AYP of 77.5% for 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

Objective 2 Description

Student Strategies & Activities : 1. Students will participate in focused math interventions for math improvement under the auspices of RTI and PBIS with a focus on core curriculum math concepts at their grade level. 2. Students will be introduced to math problem solving strategies, extended response, and the spiral curriculum within the classroom structure using calculators for computation.

Professional Development: Teachers will receive professional development on strategies for problem solving, extended response and spiral curriculum into the classroom structure using core curriculum outcomes. Teachers will also collaborate during grade level meetings on using tiered assignments for differentiation. 2. Teachers will receive professional development on differentiation using Book Talk and DVD addressing differentiation in math.

Parent Involvement: 1. Teachers will present differentiated math strategies to parents on Family Math Night two times during the year that can be used at home following classroom instruction. 2. Parents will receive monthly newsletters updating them on the core curriculum concepts being taught in the classroom setting along with progress monitoring data on their child from MAP scores and unit assessments.

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. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 4. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓕ 5. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

While our achievement in math for our Students with Disabilities subgroup is 37.3% meets/exceeds standards for ISAT, the Students with Disabilities subgroup will make AYP of 77.5% for 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
Students will participate in focused math interventions for math					

1	improvement under the auspices of RTI and PBIS with a focus on core curriculum math concepts at their grade level.	08/27/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title I	500
2	Students will be introduced to math problem solving strategies, extended response, and the spiral curriculum within the classroom structure using calculators for computation.	08/27/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title I	0

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

While our achievement in math for our Students with Disabilities subgroup is 37.3% meets/exceeds standards for ISAT, the Students with Disabilities subgroup will make AYP of 77.5% for 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will receive professional development on strategies for differentiation for problem solving, extended response and the spiral curriculum into the classroom structure using core curriculum outcomes.	08/27/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title I	100
2	Teachers will receive professional development on differentiation using Book Talk and DVDs addressing tiered assignments.	08/27/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title I	500

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

While our achievement in math for our Students with Disabilities subgroup is 37.3% meets/exceeds standards for ISAT, the Students with Disabilities subgroup will make AYP of 77.5% for 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will present differentiated math strategies to parents on Family Math Nights two times per year that can be used at home following the classroom instruction.	08/27/2009	06/04/2010	After School	Title I	200

2	Parents will receive monthly newsletters updating them on the core curriculum concepts being taught in the classroom setting along with progress monitoring data on their child from MAP scores and unit assessments.	08/27/2009	06/04/2010	After School	Title I	100
---	---	------------	------------	--------------	---------	-----

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

While our achievement in math for our Students with Disabilities subgroup is 37.3% meets/exceeds standards for ISAT, the Students with Disabilities subgroup will make AYP of 77.5% for 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

Monitoring of parent involvement activities will be conducted by the building administrators. Self-contained and special education resource teachers will turn in their monthly data and newsletters to be mailed to parents. Sign in sheets will be used with evaluation on Family Math Nights. Students whose parents attend will receive bonus PBIS incentives. Teachers will turn in weekly Extended Response and problem solving activities to building administrators. Sign in sheets, peer observation, and evaluations will be turned into building administrators after professional development implementation in the classroom.

	Name	Title
1	Linda Budrik	Principal
2	Susan Kosmoski	Assistant Principal
3	Shannan Cassel	PBIS Core Team Member

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 Cicero East 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 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	Linda Budrik	Principal
2	Susan Kosmoski	Assistant Principal
3	Brad Randmark	District Director of Technology & Assessment
4	Jaime Martinez	Parent
5	Rachel Esposito	Teacher 6th Grade-General Education
6	Christine Michalik	Literacy Support Teacher
7	Kathy Koppe	Literacy Support Teacher
8	Karen Adent	Special Education Resource Teacher
9	Nora Resendez	Teacher 4th Grade Transitional
10	Kim Haehnel	Teacher 4th Grade Transitional
11	Maria Cardona	Teacher 5th Grade Transitional
12	Linda Parsinen	Teacher 6th Grade General Education
13	Shannan Cassel	Social Worker
14	Luis Baena	Teacher ESL
15	Valerie Kissack	Teacher 5th Grade General Education

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's Director of School Improvement, a representative from West 40 RESPRO, an appointed co-facilitator from the District and 2 additional individuals from each building- the Assistant Principal and an appointed lead teacher agreed upon by the schools' SIP team. The Peer Review Team is then divided into teams of two individuals who then review one plan.

Responsibilities of the Peer Review Team

The primary responsibility of the SIP Peer Review Team is to provide feedback specific to the components on the state SIP rubric. This feedback will assist each school's SIP team with meaningful advice for further refinement of their plan. Feedback is given to the building representatives at the conclusion of the Peer Review cycle.

Peer Review Process

The 2009-2011 Peer Review was facilitated by our District's RESPRO representative and consisted of a two day session on October 27 and 28. *Day 1 consisted of 1/2 day general overview of the SIP template and rubric review using one SIP with all teams to calibrate scores. This was followed by using the rest of the day to read plans and

1/27/2010 2:33:10 PM

provide feedback specific to each of the District's schools in status. *Day 2 consisted of a 1/2 day for each team to meet with and provide their findings to that school's team. Names of the reviewers are not made known to the buildings following the procedure set by ISBE when they review plans.

The feedback that is provided by the reviewers 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.

Meaningful Insights from the Peer Review Team

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

*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
- 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

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.

- 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).

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

- é Reopening the school as a public charter school, consistent with Article 27A of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/Art. 27A.);
- é Replacing all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school's inability to make AYP;
- é 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;
- é Implementing any other major restructuring of the school's governance that makes fundamental reform in:
 - é governance and management, and/or
 - é financing and material resources, and/or
 - é 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 Representative
2	Jennifer Aldred-Berrt	West 40 Representative
3	Susan Schultz	West 40 Representative

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]

Yes No 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?

Yes No

Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]

MONITORING

Yes No

Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]

Yes 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

Yes No 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

Yes No

Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]

Yes 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

The plan needs to identify the specifics of the peer review. Who was involved? When was the review conducted? How was the review accomplished?

