

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

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?	Yes	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	37.8		No	66.9		Yes	95.1	Yes		
White														
Black														
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	38.2	36.6	Yes	67.5		Yes	95.2			
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	30.2	29.4	Yes	62.9	57.5	Yes	95.6			
Students with Disabilities														
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	38.6	36.4	Yes	65.4		Yes	95.1			

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 (%)	94.5	95.1	94.9	94.7	94.2	94.6	94.3	95.1
Truancy Rate (%)	-	-	-	8.8	7.6	8.5	12.2	2.9
Mobility Rate (%)	35.5	63.8	70.2	75.5	22.2	18.8	23.6	20.0
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	1,315	1,400	1,179	1,112	1,101	1,089	1,063	1,100
Low Income (%)	82.2	81.6	70.1	71.8	66.8	78.1	77.5	81.8
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	51.4	46.3	60.2	60.1	58.3	56.9	44.2	68.5
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	6.2	3.4	2.8	2.2	2.4	1.9	2.2	1.6
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.6	0.5	1.2	2.1	1.7	1.5	1.7	2.2
Hispanic (%)	93.0	95.9	95.9	95.3	95.1	96.4	96.0	95.4
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.2	-	-
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.1	0.1	-	0.1	0.1	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	0.6	-	0.2	0.8

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	3.7	1.0	95.1	0.2	-	-
	2001	3.0	0.8	96.0	0.2	-	-
	2002	6.2	0.6	93.0	0.2	0.1	-
	2003	3.4	0.5	95.9	0.1	0.1	-
	2004	2.8	1.2	95.9	0.1	-	-
	2005	2.2	2.1	95.3	0.4	0.1	-
	2006	2.4	1.7	95.1	0.1	0.1	0.6
	2007	1.9	1.5	96.4	0.2	-	-
	2008	2.2	1.7	96.0	-	-	0.2
	2009	1.6	2.2	95.4	-	-	0.8
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	11.2	79.5	98.0	94.8	31.7	16	1.3	-	-
	2001	55.2	73.7	98.0	94.6	37.2	-	-	-	-
	2002	51.4	82.2	98.0	94.5	35.5	-	-	-	-
	2003	46.3	81.6	98.0	95.1	63.8	-	-	-	-
	2004	60.2	70.1	100.0	94.9	70.2	-	-	-	-
	2005	60.1	71.8	100.0	94.7	75.5	86	8.8	-	-
	2006	58.3	66.8	100.0	94.2	22.2	73	7.6	-	-
	2007	56.9	78.1	100.0	94.6	18.8	78	8.5	-	-
	2008	44.2	77.5	100.0	94.3	23.6	111	12.2	-	-
	2009	68.5	81.8	100.0	95.1	20.0	28	2.9	-	-
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	1,197	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,321	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	1,315	146	170	126	183	191	-
	2003	1,400	172	174	150	152	181	-
	2004	1,179	413	1	3	-	-	-
	2005	1,112	345	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	1,101	344	-	-	-	-	-
	2007	1,089	312	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	1,063	310	-	-	-	-	-
	2009	1,100	298	7	1	-	-	-
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	43.5	44.3	53.6	41.3	29.9	36.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	38.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	44.7	45.2	54.3	41.2	30.0	36.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	21.6	29.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	13.9	6.7	21.7	10.3	9.7	20.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	42.2	44.0	54.8	39.9	29.7	37.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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	72.2	66.5	79.3	73.0	56.5	65.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	53.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	74.0	67.4	79.3	75.5	57.1	66.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	51.6	61.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	37.1	36.7	56.5	68.9	35.5	44.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	71.8	66.4	79.2	71.3	56.6	64.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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 School Report Card data tell us that we have tested 100% of the students at the third grade level. This is the only grade tested in our school. We did not make AYP in reading and this is an area of weakness. Our LEP, Hispanic, and Low Income sub groups did achieve safe harbor, however their achievement over all 30.2, 38.2, 38.6 respectively is far from the percentage needed to make annual yearly progress. We did make AYP in mathematics. All three reporting subgroups, Hispanic, LEP, and Low Income did achieve Safe Harbor 67.5, 62.9, 65.4 respectively in mathematics.

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

2009 ACCESS data indicated that the percentage of children achieving a composite of less than 3.0 is decreasing over time.

Composite scores of less than 3.0

Kindergarten 97%

First Grade 74%

Second Grade 55%

Third Grade 17%

This year is the second year all students took the ISAT test. Of the 277 students tested, 187 of them (68%) are LEP. According to our ACCESS data the LEP students are acquiring academic English language, however many are not yet ready to transition to academic instruction in English and therefore struggled while taking the ISAT in English.

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

This factor implies that LEP students need more exposure to the English language. Academic English language needs to be integrated for longer periods of time using scientifically based instruction. Response to Intervention strategies need to be provided for our most needy readers red (tier 3), by reading specialists while classroom teachers will provide interventions to the students in the yellow (tier 2). The focus of our language arts, literacy curriculum, is balanced literacy.

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 local assessments that drive our action plan activities are the ISEL, and MAP. The ISEL test is given three times during the school year for all grade levels. The MAP is used at the third grade level. Regular division classes are tested in reading and mathematics. Bilingual students take the mathematics test using head phones that translate the language to Spanish. This benchmark data predict how successful students will be as they develop reading strategies. Students are progress monitored periodically using ISEL subtests. The data identify students who need support in phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension and fluency. Our LEP students take the MODEL when they enter school and the ACCESS test is administered annually to measure English language proficiency. Teachers also use Scott Foresman textbook assessments as well as teacher-made tests to measure performance in mathematics. Students and teachers apply the problem solving rubric to extended response in mathematics.

ISEL DATA

At the kindergarten level students take the following snapshot subtests:

General Education Classes

	Alphabet Recognition			Letter Sound Recognition			Developmental Spelling			Average %		
	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY
Benchmark	37%			33%			24.40%			37%		
Low Risk	25.60%			25.40%			24%			17%		

High Risk	37%	41%	52%	46%
-----------	-----	-----	-----	-----

Bilingual Classrooms

	Alphabet Recognition			Letter Sound Recognition			Developmental Spelling			Average %		
	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY
2010												
Benchmark	94%			80%			100.00%			100%		
Low Risk	6.00%			20.00%			0%			0%		
High Risk	0%			0%			0%			0%		

At the first grade level students take the following snapshot subtests:

General Education Classrooms

	Letter Sound Recognition			Developmental Spelling			Word Recognition		
	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY
2010									
Benchmark	41%			35%			34%		
Low Risk	31%			33%			25%		
High Risk	28%			32%			41%		

	Passage Reading			Average %		
	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY
Benchmark	32%			34%		
Low Risk	38.00%			29.00%		
High Risk	30%			34%		

Bilingual Classrooms

		Letter Sound Recognition			Developmental Spelling			Word Recognition		
2010	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	
Benchmark	79%			75%			75%			
Low Risk	20%			24%			19%			
High Risk	1%			1%			6%			
		Passage Reading			Average %					
	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY				
Benchmark	100%			91%						
Low Risk	0.00%			9.00%						
High Risk	0%			0%						

At the second grade level students take the following snapshot subtests:

General Education Classrooms

		Developmental Spelling			Word Recognition			Fluency		
2010	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	
Benchmark	22%			32%			20%			
Low Risk	12%			25%			21%			
High Risk	66%			43%			59%			
		Oral Accuracy			Comprehension			Average %		

	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY
Benchmark	30%			47%			31%		
Low Risk	20%			12%			17%		
High Risk	50%			91%			51%		

Bilingual Classrooms

	Developmental Spelling			Word Recognition			Fluency		
2010	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY
Benchmark	1%			92%			29%		
Low Risk	35%			1%			38%		
High Risk	64%			6%			33%		
	Oral Accuracy			Comprehension			Average %		
	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY
Benchmark	51%			46%			58%		
Low Risk	28%			20%			35%		
High Risk	21%			33%			8%		

All third grade bilingual students take the ISEL fluency snapshot subtests.

	Fluency		
2010	BOY	MOY	EOY
Benchmark	58%		
Low Risk	36%		
High Risk	6%		

Analysis of ISEL

1/27/2010 2:34:16 PM

The data tell us that the general education Kindergarten have just over one third of the students at benchmark with nearly half of our students designated as high risk. Our greatest weakness is in developmental spelling. As students increase their alphabet recognition and letter sound knowledge their developmental spelling skills should increase.

The bilingual kindergarten students appear to all be performing at benchmark. This data does not represent current classroom performance and is a reflection of the discrepancy between the norms used for the Spanish and English ISELS.

The data tell us that the general education first grade have an equal spread of students at benchmark, low risk and high risk in the tested areas.

The bilingual first grade students have over 90 % of the population achieving at benchmark. This data are not representative of student performance in the classroom again due to norms.

The data tell us that the second grade general education students appear to be at great risk. Only one third of our students over all are at benchmark with over half of the second grade at high risk. Developmental spelling and fluency are their weakest areas.

The second grade bilingual students' ISEL data tell us that 58 % of the students are at benchmark and 8 % of the students are at high risk. Developmental spelling is of greatest concern with only one percent of the students at benchmark.

The data tell us that third grade bilingual students have 58 % of students at benchmark for fluency. The entire general education third grade group does not take the ISEL. They are benchmarked using the Measure of Annual Progress (MAP) from the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA).

3rd Grade MAP Data

This includes all of our general education students and our transitional bilingual students who scored 3.0 or higher on the ACCESS.

Reading Composite

	BOY	MOY	EOY
Benchmark	14.16%		
Low Risk	38.36%		
High Risk	47.49%		

Math Composite

1/27/2010 2:34:16 PM

	BOY	MOY	EOY
Benchmark	14.14%		
Low Risk	60.94%		
High Risk	24.92%		

The Reading data tell us that 47.49% of the students are at high risk. This may be due to the fact that the transitional bilingual students took the reading test while only 14.16% achieved the benchmark.

The Math data tell us that 24.92% of the students are at high risk while only 14.14 % are at benchmark for math.

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

Students come to school with varying levels of experience. Some students have experienced gaps in their education. We have a large population of LEP students who are in the early stages of developing academic English language.

This is the first year that the ISEL test was given in our district. Therefore, teachers are learning how to give the test. This makes the validity of the data questionable. As the teachers become more proficient administering the test and using the data as a diagnostic tool, trend data will become more reliable.

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

Reading interventions need to be provided for students who are not reaching the target level in each of the five components of reading. Classrooms need to be rich in language to increase language development. Identifying the students who need interventions early and providing the support they need will increase the likelihood that students will be able to read by the end of third grade.

From the results of the ISEL scores, children needing interventions are identified. In looking at the data from this current year interventions need to be provided for many students. A plan needs to be in place that will provide more opportunities for this to occur.

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 West is a large urban pre-kindergarten through third grade elementary school located just outside Chicago. We currently house 1121 students. According to the 2000 U.S. Census report, more than 85,000 people live in Cicero making it one of the largest communities in the state. The residents take advantage of Chicago's amenities while at the same time enjoying suburban comforts. Surrounding this near western suburb are major expressways and other main roads as well as a wide variety of public transportation options that provide easy access to educational and cultural attractions in the area.

Population density, people per square mile, was 14,645 in 2000. Seventy-seven percent of the population is Hispanic; nineteen and six-tenths percent is white non-Hispanic. The remaining percentages are shared among black, non-Hispanic and Asian non-Hispanic residents. Overall, the population has increased from 1990 to 2000 by 26.96%.

In 2000, men out-numbered women representing 51.4% of the population. The average household size was 3.7 individuals with the average family size being reported as 4.18. Almost one-half of the residents have graduated from high school with 6% holding a bachelor degree or higher. Forty-four percent are foreign-born and 74% speak a language other than English at home. In 2000, the annual average household income was \$38,044. Thirteen percent of the families were living below the poverty level even with 58% of the individuals 16 or older in the labor force. As the 2010 Census report becomes available, these statistics are expected to show a significant change in data.

There are a number of positive attributes and challenges that face our school. For example, some of our challenges include large class sizes, number of students in special education programs, a high population of LEP (students with Limited English Proficiency), and various staffing trends.

During the writing of our plan we discovered that there is a lack of consistency in the academic language being used across grade levels. Kindergarten has the advantage of working closely together, communicating consistently and on a regular basis and collaborating due to their daily common plan. While Kindergarten schedules allow for that interaction, the other grade levels (1-3) do not have that luxury due to the size of the school and number of staff members on each team. Teachers are doing the best to carve out time in their day to meet together to discuss student needs and curricular issues.

While analyzing our ACCESS data over the last few years we noticed an increasing number of students becoming more proficient in academic English as they promote through our grade levels.

Cicero West has a large population of students with IEPs. We have two special education classrooms with 26 students in total, 5 students who receive LD resource, and 11 students with speech IEPs, totaling 46 students at the third grade level. In addition to our challenges with students with special needs, we struggle to address the needs of a large LEP population, 69% of our student body is identified as limited in their proficiency with English. This is a major challenge as all students take the ISAT in English. Another challenge is that as students become proficient in English, their parents are less able to provide adequate educational support in English at home.

On the other hand, Cicero West has many positive attributes that contribute to the academic gains of our students. For example, we have a high student attendance rate and several programs that support student literacy and academic improvement within and beyond the school day.

We have had the Reading First grant for the past three years. The grant provided us excellent staff development in the five components in reading. In addition to that, we were able to structure our day to incorporate 90 minute reading blocks at all grade levels. Beyond this time, 45 minutes have been allocated for each grade level and have been designated as reading intervention blocks for students not achieving benchmark standards. Interventions will be provided by the classroom teachers, sharing children with common needs. The neediest students will receive interventions provided by our literacy support teachers. The general education population will use 95% group, a continuum of strategies to develop literacy in all regular division K-3 grades. To monitor this students are progress monitored biweekly using PASI and PSI. Bilingual classrooms in k-1 are using Estrelita, a phonics program. They are progress monitored biweekly using the ISEL. Our second and third grade students are using the guided reading word list drills. They are progress monitored using ISEL and Rigby PM.

In other schools within our district, a blended 50% English/Spanish program has been incorporated for their bilingual students. This is getting good reviews and appears to be providing benefits for the students. Because of the high number of students struggling with vocabulary comprehension, we are now piloting this program at the third grade level in our school. "Literacy by Design" will be the focus to increase English-language vocabulary and comprehension.

Cicero West has many programs in place that produce a positive impact on our school community. First, we have a partnership with NICOR and Reading Is Fundamental (RIF). Three times a year a group of volunteers from NICOR visit our school to assist in the distribution of RIF books. We have collaborated on a reading incentive program with NICOR and consequently have the Super Reader Program. Perks of the program include annual visits from our super hero, Super Reader, a special recording sheet for student to document the books they have read, pictures with Super Reader and prizes awarded at special assemblies three times a year. In addition, NICOR provides two professional development opportunities for our teachers relating to co-teaching and literacy and they provide two educational workshops for parents that address literacy in the home.

Read to Me is a program which is utilized by our Kindergarten students. Daily children receive a backpack with a variety of books that can be read aloud at home. Activities are included in the backpacks as well. Backpacks are rotated on a weekly basis. This program helps to promote literacy in the home and is a great home-school connection.

The BLAST after school program, which is funded through the Department of Education's 21st Century grant and is run collaboratively by Northeastern University and a community organization, Corazon, is also housed at Cicero West. The program focuses on academics, fitness, the arts and team building. The goal is to engage students beyond the school day in constructive activities so that they are less likely to become involved in dangerous and/or unsupervised activities after school. Students are selected based on family need for afterschool care and homework assistance.

This year, Cicero West began the Before and After School Services (BASS) program. This school program is designed to improve the math, reading, ESL, and writing skills of students in grades one through three. The purpose of the program is to offer extended curricular opportunities for students to improve their math, reading, ESL, and writing skills. Teachers have identified that the best student achievement gains occur when they work with their own students. The teachers meet with small groups of their students two to three times per week for thirty to sixty minutes. Students are selected based on assessment data, classroom performance, and the criteria outlined here in the SIP. Teachers provide communication with parents and obtain ongoing assessment data to monitor the progress of students in the program.

The Rainbows program is also offered at Cicero West. Rainbows groups address the affective, social and emotional needs of children in crisis due to family stressors. This year, 75 students are being seen in Rainbows. Groups meet once weekly with one of the specially trained teachers from the school. The group provides a safe environment for the students to express their concerns, share feelings, ask questions, improve self-esteem, and develop coping skills and resilience during difficult times.

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

Our attributes specifically, our programs within our school, and those collaborations with community groups have created a true positive learning community. Parents are eager to pitch in and participate in programs. These programs create a strong sense of family which builds students, confidence and family relations. Our after school programs provide additional time to assist students who are not making benchmark in the core subject areas. Our school is a busy place both during and after school hours.

In looking at the home-language surveys filled out by each parent, when the student is registered in school the majority of families speak Spanish in the home even when their child may attend English only classes.

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

Teachers need to create language rich environment for their students. They need to provide experiences to build background to support vocabulary development. Progress monitoring and benchmark data need to be utilized to drive instruction. Based on data collected, teachers need to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.

As children become proficient in English and transition into English classrooms, their parents are sometimes unable to provide educational support in English. This affects the additional support that can be provided at home. It is important to focus on those students who need additional support which is not provided at home and encourage their participation in one of our after-school programs.

A review of the mobility rate indicates that, students enter our school at different times throughout the year. This makes differentiation of instruction a monumental task for the classroom teacher. Entry level assessments need to be administrated using ISEL and MAP to quickly determine the instructional level of new students. The Literacy Team may be used to collect this data.

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?*

Cicero West has a young faculty. Of the 64 certified staff, 30% have not attained tenure status. One areas of strength is that we have a staff who are eager to hone their skills. Thirty-six teachers hold master's degrees and are eager to participate in after school programs and Family Nights. Professional Learning team meetings are scheduled regularly, providing teachers with staff development in order to identify student performance levels and develop strategies to meet their needs.

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

New teachers require professional development on the instruction of the five components of reading as well as guided reading. Veteran teachers need to continually develop and perfect their reading instructional skills. Teachers become more proficient in their instruction over time with the support of reading specialists and veteran teachers. Veteran teachers improve their skills as they receive new in service support as well as review their knowledge while supporting new teacher skill development.

Teachers become more proficient in their mathematics instruction which supports the continued improvement in the number of students meeting and exceeding in this area. Teachers need to use manipulative models during instruction in order to build concrete number sense knowledge.

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

We must provide differentiated professional development to meet the needs of each of our teachers.

Reading specialists and support staff will provide assistance for our teachers in areas such as differentiating, demonstrating lessons and co-teaching in the areas of reading instruction.

Teachers need scaffolded professional develop on differentiating within the core program.

Our SIP team has provided professional development and developed instructional resources in the area of mathematics.

Teachers will be encouraged to utilized our ROE for professional development and share with their professional learning teams the new knowledge that was obtained.

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

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

Parent involvement is rapidly increasing. Parents' voice, presence and comfort level have increased at the school. Our Assembly of Parents (our school's parent organization) meets monthly. We have a group of parent leaders who have taken charge of planning the meetings, workshops, and informational presentations. Our average attendance at these meetings is about 125. We hold several workshops for parents throughout the year on the subject of reading. Parents learn how to help their children at home and receive books and other instructional materials. These workshops are well attended.

We have five PEP (Parent as Education Partners) classes that meet twice a week with 120 parents attending. PEP provides parents with English language skills needed to be a true partner in their child's education plan.

Our annual open house is well attended. Teachers meet about 80% of their students parents at this event each year.

Two parent teacher conference days are scheduled through out the year. Teachers report 90% attendance of scheduled appointments.

We have monthly family nights, most of which are curriculum based. These family nights encourage parent involvement in their child's education. The activities that make up our action plan are the core of each night's agenda. Our Family Night participation attendance ranges between 200 and 500 people.

We have a group of parent volunteers which varies through the year. On any given day 15 to 20 parents are here working with students and teachers providing additional support.

1/27/2010 2:34:16 PM

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

Current research has shown that parent involvement in a child's education increases performance in school. Epstein's 6 types of parental involvement (2002) states that as parents increase in all types of involvement in a school, their children's performance in all areas also increases.

Parents are eager to assist their children and want them to be successful. Their comfort level in and around the school continue to increase and the parents come to school to ask questions and clarify what is expected of their children and what they can do to provide support .

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

Staff needs to continue to foster open lines of communication with parents. The open communication provides ways for parents to support their child's education at home and at school. Surveys and activity evaluations need to be used to continually identify parent needs in order to provide workshops, speakers, and presentations that foster their involvement in school. Therefore, parent involvement must be an essential part of school improvement.

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?

Key factors which have contributed to low achievement are:

- *Limited academic English Language Proficiency
- *Poor reading performance
- *Limited academic vocabulary
- *Limited professional development on the topic of differentiation

The state data show our students are not making AYP in reading, our prediction is that local data will show our children are making good progress. We must continue to provide

students with academic language rich classrooms as well as specific English academic proficiency activities.

We will need to use a strong scientific research based core program (tier1) supported with early tier two and tier three interventions; use progress monitoring to assess progress and drive instruction.

We need to Differentiate instruction with in each classroom in the areas of language arts (reading, writing) and mathematics.

We need to provide targeted professional development in the area of differentiation.

We need to increase the percentage of instructional time the ELL students spend in English classrooms at the third grade level. This is being done through our pilot transitional bilingual program.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Make AYP of 77.5% or safe harbor in Reading.	1,

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

- 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Make AYP of 77.5% or safe harbor in Reading.

Objective 1 Description

Our current achievement in reading overall is 37.8%. Our students will make overall 77.5% or safe harbor in 2010.

While our current achievement in reading among the Hispanic population is 38.2%, our Hispanic population made safe harbor in 2009. The Hispanic population will make 77.5% or safe harbor in 2010.

While our current achievement in reading among the LEP population is 30.2%, our LEP population made safe harbor in 2009. The LEP population will make 77.5% or safe harbor in 2010.

While our current achievement in reading among or economically disadvantaged population is 38.6%, our economically disadvantaged population made safe harbor in 2009. The economically disadvantaged population will make 77.5% or safe harbor in 2010.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- B 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

Make AYP of 77.5% or safe harbor in Reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will use a selected series of graphic organizers (such as t-charts, Venn Diagrams, Semantic Webbing, Four Square, etc.) Across the content areas and grade levels. Organizers will be chosen to best support Marzano's nine comprehension strategies: Identifying similarities and differences, summarizing and note taking, homework and practice, Nonlinguistic representations (symbols,pictures), reinforcing effort and providing recognition, cooperative learning, setting objectives and providing feedback, generating and testing hypothesis, Cues, questions and advance organizers (exposure to background before learning).	08/31/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0
2	Students will engage in interactive activities using, "Working With Words", a resource compiled by district literacy support teachers. These activities use word walls in order to increase student automaticity with high frequency words.	08/31/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0
3	Students will employ the three cueing system (meaning, structure, and visual) during guided reading.	08/31/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0
4	Students will work towards mastery of the district created grade leveled learning outcomes.	08/31/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0

5	Students will engage in genuine writing activities across the content areas beyond the narrative, persuasive and expository writing.	08/31/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0
---	--	------------	------------	---------------	---------	---

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

Make AYP of 77.5% or safe harbor in Reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will engage in grade level meetings and vertical articulation to determine appropriate graphic organizers to support Marzano's nine comprehension strategies.	08/31/2009	06/11/2011	During School	Title I	0
2	Teachers will research and utilize selected Word Wall activities from "Working with Words" and share the ones that work well during grade level meetings.	08/31/2009	06/11/2011	During School	Title I	0
3	Teachers will participate in an initial guided reading workshop overview in order to determine their professional level. Based on that data the staff will be broken into groups based on professional need.	08/31/2009	06/11/2014	During School	Title I	200
4	Teachers will utilize the district created grade level learner outcomes to drive instruction.	08/31/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0
5	Teachers will provide multiple opportunities for students to engage in genuine writing activities.	08/31/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0

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

Make AYP of 77.5% or safe harbor in Reading.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	The parents of the most struggling kindergarten students will participate in weekly parent and child classes focusing on kindergarten outcomes. Child care is provided and the teachers share a literacy activity with the parents. The children are reunited with the parents and practice the activity together. The teachers offer assistance during the practice assuring the parents understand the procedure. The parents are given the activity to use at home with their child.	09/21/2009	05/23/2011	After School	Title I	500
2	The parents will be invited to curriculum night to gain familiarity with specific graphic organizers being used in their child's classroom.	09/28/2009	05/23/2011	After School	Title I	250
3	The parents will be invited to attend in-service workshops relating to district created grade level learning outcomes.	11/12/2009	04/13/2011	After School	Title I	500

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Make AYP of 77.5% or safe harbor in Reading.

Teachers will keep weekly running records at the first through third grade levels. Bench mark assessment using the ISEL at the beginning, the middle and the end of the year will be reported. The MAP will also be used with the third grade students. Periodic progress monitoring for students receiving interventions will be implemented on a weekly basis. The ACCESS test will be given in the January to all LEP students.

Progress monitoring will be on-going to evaluate the effectiveness of the kindergarten parent workshop activity program, and the reading interventions using the ISEL progress monitoring components. Teachers will meet bi-monthly with building administration and reading specialists to discuss student progress. Teachers will report reading levels to the principal at the beginning middle and end of the year.

	Name	Title
1	Jennifer O'Connor	Interventionist
2	Antonietta Garcia-Strain	Interventionist

3	Lara Medina-Beaver	Interventionist
4	Jennifer Evans Ferguson	Assistant Principal
5	Kimberly Pros	Principal

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

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

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

In accordance with the NCLB Act of 2001, states must provide notification to parents of students in districts/schools that are identified for improvement for failure to make adequate yearly progress. A letter that explains our district's status is sent to all District 99 parents in their native language in October of each year. A copy of the district's AYP Status Report is also disseminated to the parents at this time. This notification is distributed to all parents in all schools in the district as District 99 is a Title 1 school-wide district.

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

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	Kimberly Pros	Principal
2	Jennifer Ferguson	Assistant Principal
3	Antonietta Garcia-Strain	Interventionist
4	Sylvia Sandoval	Teacher
5	Norma Monsivias Diers	Teacher
6	Linda McInerney	Teacher
7	Kristina Roderer	Teacher
8	Rose Parisi	LDR Teacher
9	Kelly Zanena	Regional Supervisor for Special Education
10	Martha Vences	Teacher
11	Matthew Morano	Parent
12	Rosa Cisneros	Parent
13	Lara Medina	Literacy Support Teacher
14	Lucia Turk	Teacher
15	Jessica Mieczkowski	Teacher

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.

1/27/2010 2:34:16 PM

Composition of the Peer Review Team

The Peer Review Team consists of the District, "Director of School Improvement", an appointed co-facilitator and 12 additional individuals comprised of each buildings' Assistant Principal or an appointed lead teacher agreed upon by the school SIP team. The Peer Review Team is then divided into 6 teams of two individuals.

Responsibilities of the Peer Review Team

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

Timetable for the Peer Review Process

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

*Session 1 consists of 1/2 day overview using one SIP with all teams to calibrate scores. This is followed by using the rest of the day and the next, to provide peer review and feedback specific to one school's plan.

Meaningful Insights from the Peer Review Team

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

*Emphasize to the Peer Review Teams that Feedback needs to be specific to 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/Reading/Language Arts

Director of Language Minority Services

Director of Science and Math

1/27/2010 2:34:16 PM

Director of Social Studies
Director of Technology
Assistant Superintendents

Directors participate in a session of learning 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
- *Facilitates a process on on-going evaluation and refinement toward achieving the goals

SIP Team (administrator, teachers, parents, community members)

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

Classroom Teachers

- *Collect necessary data to develop and monitor progress towards goals and activities
- *Communicate the standards and activities in the plan to students and parents
- *Communicate the progress toward achieving the goals

Community Level

- *Stakeholders (community members, parents, school staff, students)
- *Engage in data driven decision making
- * Share in the writing of the school improvement plan
- * Provide a vital communication link to all stakeholders
- Share in the review and improvement of the school improvement plan

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

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

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 the 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 the 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 programs by the ISBE

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).

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

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

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

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

Part F. State Responsibilities

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

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	ROE System of Support
2	Susan Schultz	ROE System of Support
3	Jennifer Aldred Berry	ROE System of Support

Section IV-A Local Board Action

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

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

OTHER DATA

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

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

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

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

PEER REVIEW

Yes No

Is the peer review process described and is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have “the greatest likelihood” of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP? [C]

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS

Yes No

Is it clear how the school is ensuring that teachers are receiving the support needed for their professional growth and to retain them in the profession? [C]

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No

Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]

Yes No N/A

If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No

Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation? [C]

SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM

Yes No N/A

Have the names and titles of School Support Team members been listed in the plan? Does the team appear to have the expertise to support this school in regards to the school improvement plan? [C]

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD

Yes No

The plan indicates the approval date of this plan. [C]

PART II - COMMENTS