

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?	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	45.2		No	71.4		Yes	95.3	Yes		
White														
Black														
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	45.1	57.3	No	72.0		Yes	95.4			
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	31.1	43.7	No	63.7	69.8	No	96.0			
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes										
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	44.9	56.9	No	72.4		Yes	95.5			

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 (%)	93.8	95.0	95.1	94.6	94.5	94.4	94.3	95.3
Truancy Rate (%)	0.4	0.3	-	-	1.5	4.5	13.0	4.2
Mobility Rate (%)	24.5	30.8	16.6	22.9	14.8	23.1	20.8	13.2
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	1,486	1,528	1,014	975	994	1,048	1,055	1,034
Low Income (%)	64.3	76.5	78.8	78.2	77.3	71.9	80.3	85.6
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	51.2	42.1	48.9	46.6	42.5	44.9	40.7	50.6
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	4.6	4.3	2.9	3.4	3.9	3.3	2.4	2.7
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.6	0.9	0.6	0.3	1.0	1.3	1.7	1.9
Hispanic (%)	94.3	94.5	96.4	95.8	94.9	94.7	94.9	94.5
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.3
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	0.2	0.2
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	0.5	0.4

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	7.0	0.4	92.1	0.5	-	-
	2001	5.1	0.2	94.1	0.5	0.1	-
	2002	4.6	0.6	94.3	0.5	-	-
	2003	4.3	0.9	94.5	0.3	0.1	-
	2004	2.9	0.6	96.4	0.2	-	-
	2005	3.4	0.3	95.8	0.5	-	-
	2006	3.9	1.0	94.9	0.2	-	-
	2007	3.3	1.3	94.7	0.4	-	0.3
	2008	2.4	1.7	94.9	0.4	0.2	0.5
	2009	2.7	1.9	94.5	0.3	0.2	0.4
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	38.8	78.9	93.0	94.5	24.9	6	0.5	-	-
	2001	64.6	65.9	78.0	94.3	33.8	2	0.1	-	-
	2002	51.2	64.3	87.0	93.8	24.5	6	0.4	-	-
	2003	42.1	76.5	91.0	95.0	30.8	4	0.3	-	-
	2004	48.9	78.8	94.5	95.1	16.6	-	-	-	-
	2005	46.6	78.2	96.5	94.6	22.9	-	-	-	-
	2006	42.5	77.3	97.5	94.5	14.8	14	1.5	-	-
	2007	44.9	71.9	98.5	94.4	23.1	42	4.5	-	-
	2008	40.7	80.3	99.2	94.3	20.8	129	13.0	-	-
	2009	50.6	85.6	100.0	95.3	13.2	43	4.2	-	-
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	1,278	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,366	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	1,486	203	158	145	286	261	-
	2003	1,528	177	168	123	323	286	-
	2004	1,014	228	98	171	-	-	-
	2005	975	226	220	89	-	-	-
	2006	994	220	247	78	-	-	-
	2007	1,048	186	227	94	-	-	-
	2008	1,055	173	199	114	-	-	-
	2009	1,034	138	190	202	-	-	-
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	34.2	31.3	53.7	44.1	38.6	44.8	-	-	48.9	48.5	44.8	44.7	28.3	51.8	65.6	57.2	34.5	43.8
White	-	41.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30.0	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	33.8	30.5	53.2	46.9	38.8	44.5	-	-	49.4	50.0	45.5	44.8	27.9	54.8	63.3	57.8	32.0	43.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	21.1	26.2	-	-	-	-	32.4	27.1	-	-	-	-	6.3	35.1
Students with Disabilities	9.1	-	-	-	15.4	-	-	-	30.0	27.3	8.3	15.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	29.0	33.3	53.2	40.7	36.6	42.6	-	-	47.6	48.3	44.1	44.7	28.9	54.5	52.2	59.0	34.1	42.5

Columbus West Elementary School
School Improvement Plan 2009

	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	-	-	39.6	45.3	74.2	50.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	41.3	43.5	74.5	50.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	22.2	32.5	75.0	22.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	27.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	37.9	44.6	74.9	53.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
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	50.0	42.7	74.5	66.2	63.9	81.8	-	-	56.7	75.2	75.6	68.0	37.7	39.3	68.7	73.4	52.7	70.9
White	-	58.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20.0	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	49.3	41.4	76.0	68.7	63.9	84.2	-	-	57.9	75.5	76.3	68.9	41.9	41.5	66.6	73.3	52.0	71.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	53.9	80.6	-	-	-	-	76.0	62.2	-	-	-	-	31.7	66.1
Students with Disabilities	25.0	40.0	10.0	-	23.1	-	-	-	27.3	36.4	41.6	41.6	10.0	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	45.8	46.3	76.0	64.5	63.4	83.6	-	-	57.5	74.1	73.7	68.7	39.5	40.9	60.8	74.4	52.7	70.2

Columbus West Elementary School
School Improvement Plan 2009

	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	-	-	49.5	71.9	79.1	67.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	49.4	71.0	80.8	67.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	31.1	69.9	84.2	50.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	44.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	49.3	69.4	79.7	71.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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?*

Columbus West Elementary School's summative data demonstrates that students have not met AYP as a whole. Overall, 45.2% of students met or exceeded State Standards in reading which did not meet the 70% AYP target. The Hispanic, LEP, and economically disadvantaged subgroups did not meet AYP in reading. The areas of weakness in reading were vocabulary and reading comprehension. The area of strength was reading strategies. 71.4% of students met or exceeded State Standards in Mathematics; however in the LEP subgroup only 63.7% met in mathematics, slightly below the 70% AYP target. The area of weakness was number sense; the areas of strength were geometry and algebra.

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

There are several factors which account for Columbus West's low achievement in **reading**. The LEP subgroup makes up one-third of Columbus West's testing population. In addition, several other students have a home language other than English. Second language learners do not bring a well-developed, rich vocabulary to text, making reading comprehension difficult to achieve. Furthermore, because 73% of the student population at Columbus West is low income, this prevents our students from being exposed to rich cultural experiences which build the schema needed for connecting to literature.

Performance in **math** was strong in all areas, with our LEP subgroup slightly below AYP. One possible factor for the LEP subgroup not making AYP is that a large portion of the math test involves reading. Also, math in bilingual and transitional classes is taught in Spanish. It is difficult for mono-lingual students to transition to an all English math test.

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

Based on these factors, Columbus West will focus on implementing a sound balanced literacy program in all classrooms. Guided Reading, Shared Reading, Read Alouds and Independent Reading will become the cornerstone of the Core curriculum in all classrooms. Students will be exposed to content area vocabulary, making use of their vocabulary notebook. Comprehension strategies will be reinforced using the content area textbooks. These steps will address the deficiencies in reading comprehension and vocabulary. To address the school wide weakness in number sense, teachers will implement the use of math manipulatives, which allow students to visually understand the relationship between numbers. Teachers will continue to discuss monthly math assessments in Professional Learning teams. Concepts that are not understood by students will be repeated. In the intermediate grades, instruction in the use of the calculator will be stressed. Teachers of LEP students will continue to teach math in Spanish, but will begin to introduce math vocabulary and math explanations in English. This will make the transition to the English test easier.

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?*

Beginning in the fall of 2009, Columbus West School began implementing a new local assessment, the Illinois Snapshot of Early Literacy (ISEL). At this time, ISEL has been given to all of our kindergarten through second grade students. Also, third through sixth grade students who participate in our Transitional Bilingual program were given a grade level ISEL assessment in Spanish.

Results from these assessments show us that comprehension is an area of weakness for many of our students. In our English first grade classrooms, 52% of all students fell below the 50th percentile in Passage Reading, which incorporates oral accuracy and reading comprehension. In second grade English classrooms, 65% of all students fell below the 50th percentile in comprehension while second grade Bilingual students performed slightly better with only 41% of the students falling below the 50th percentile in comprehension.

Analysis of the grade level ISEL assessments in Spanish shows that there are a good number of students who are still struggling with comprehension in their native language at their grade level. Students read a grade level passage in Spanish and then were asked comprehension questions regarding the passage. The following reflects the percentage of

1/27/2010 2:58:15 PM

students who were unable to answer at least two comprehension questions correctly after reading the passage: third grade, 32%; fourth grade, 40%; fifth grade, 45%; sixth grade, 30%.

The NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) is an assessment in math and reading given to all students in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6. There is an exception on the reading portion exempting students scoring below 3.0 on the Access test. These students did not take the reading portion of the test, but only the math. They were assessed in reading using the ISEL in Spanish. It is important to note that this test was new for our 3rd and 4th graders as it has been given to 4th, 5th, and 6th in the past. This year we added 3rd grade and their inexperience with the computer made it difficult for some this first testing session.

Results from these assessments show us overall that comprehension and vocabulary are major areas of weakness for our students across grade levels. The RIT scores and goal descriptors were generally low (33%) to low average (33%-66%) which is below level. Number sense and computation were areas of weakness in math but overall the student's performance in math showed higher RIT scores than reading indicating more students in the average range. In addition to ISEL and MAP assessments, teachers at all grade levels have developed unit math and reading assessments. These will continue to be discussed at PLT meetings, so that areas of deficiency can be addressed and monitored

We expect to see an improvement when we assess again in January. The teachers are working on differentiation and collaboration in their PLT's and have set goals to work on improving these areas of weakness.

Throughout the year, classroom teachers will also be giving unit assessments in math and reading. As the teachers give these classroom based assessments, the SIP team will analyze the results to see if these measures support the activities we are implementing.

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

The past three years have been spent implementing Reading First initiatives in our kindergarten through third grade classrooms. While we saw gains in assessments used previous to this year (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills, Indicadores Dinámicos del Exito en la Lectura, Inventario de Lectura en Español de Tejas LEE), these gains do not seem to have transferred to comprehension of real text as shown by our ISEL data.

Also, while Guided Reading has been much improved in our school, the other areas of balanced literacy such as Read Aloud, Shared Reading, and Independent Reading have not received as much professional development and attention. Read Aloud and Shared Reading are areas where comprehension and vocabulary can be taught and developed and then practiced by the student in Independent Reading.

1/27/2010 2:58:15 PM

The MAP test is new to our 3rd and 4th graders this year. In the past we have found that the first time students take this they score considerably lower than their performance in class per their teachers. It seems the test takes some time getting used to. It is on the computer and this is a new concept for them. For second language learners they can use headphones for math that presents the questions orally in Spanish yet they still must look at the computer and read it in English. Also the calculator is something foreign to many of our third graders since it is not introduced until 4th grade. Because this is not a paper and pencil test, students may have attempted to solve the problems mentally, rather than working them out on paper. This could account for a high percentage of errors. Students need to be told to work problems out with paper and pencil and then give their answer on the MAP test.

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

More professional development is needed in the area of balanced literacy and in how to improve comprehension and vocabulary instruction. The home-school connection has to be improved with easy to do math and literacy activities that can be done both in English and Spanish.

Specifically, we need to provide coffees or parent nights where these activities can be explained to parents. In reading, simple activities such as including a list of comprehension questions for fiction/non-fiction can be placed in the assignment notebook. These questions will enhance student reading logs. To address math, activities that involve common math manipulative such as playing cards, dice, rulers, and tape measurers need to be taught to parents so that they can reinforce math concepts at home.

Looking at MAP math scores indicates a need to focus on number sense. Teachers will hopefully see an improvement in scores after January assessment as students become more comfortable with the assessment tool and Professional Learning Teams (PLT) focus on increasing comprehension in the areas of number sense.

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?*

Columbus West is definitely heading in the right direction. Our mission statement states: "The mission of Columbus West School is to provide a quality education that promotes academic excellence so that each child will become a lifelong learner, a socially responsible citizen and a productive member of our culturally diverse world. To achieve this mission, students, families, teachers and administrators, support staff and the community will work together to create a positive learning environment designed to meet each

1/27/2010 2:58:15 PM

child's needs." We feel that we are creating the foundation on which to build that mission. Instructionally, Columbus West has many attributes. We have strengthened our guided reading program and enhanced work stations at all grade levels. This was done by providing training and professional development for all staff members in these areas. Professional Learning Teams (PLT) of grade level teachers were created this year. Individual PLT have already collaborated on grade level goals for math and reading. Common math and literacy visual aides are displayed at each grade level. Our media specialist applied for and received a grant of \$5000.00 from Dollar General to purchase read aloud material targeted for our LEP population. This has added new titles to our collection of books written in Spanish. Third through sixth grade teachers are becoming more familiar with the MAP assessment and have already used their beginning of the year data to set goals for their students.

Several clubs are available for our students to join at Columbus West School to improve motivation as well as to help our students become more well-rounded individuals. We offer guitar club, chess club, and choir to our intermediate students. Our student council is an attribute that bridges parent/school/community ties. Along with special days and activities, the council has helped with community career day, the town toy drive, award assemblies, and building fundraisers. This student group builds morale, responsibility and community within the building.

Our students also have the opportunity to attend programs outside of the school. This year many of our students applied to attend free tutoring sessions through Supplemental Educational Services (SES) providers. Fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students at Columbus West School have the opportunity to attend the Viva program which works to improve students reading fluency and comprehension. The director of this program, Alicia Gamboa, also serves as a member on our SIP team so there is cohesion among what students are learning at Viva with what they are learning here at Columbus West.

We have increased parental involvement by offering various opportunities such as: volunteering in classrooms, workshops, reading/curriculum nights, family nights, chaperoning field trips, and parent coffees. Over a hundred and fifty parents and/or family members volunteered in our school last year.

A final attribute is that Columbus West has become a part of the Language Minorities Services (LMS) pilot transitional program. This means that all bilingual students in grades 3-6 will be placed in a transitional class (half day Spanish, half day English) as opposed to being placed in an all English class or placed in a bilingual class (all day Spanish). This design has many advantages. Since students are not pushed into English at an early age, students are taught a half day in their native language which promotes long-term development of native language reading. Likewise, students have the opportunity to have native language teachers in each language, which is a very powerful model.

We still have challenges both instructionally and within the school/community. One challenge we still face is the district wide budget cuts. Less funds have been allocated in the Title 1 grant causing us to lose one literacy support teacher. This means less staff to assist classroom teachers with instruction as well as to provide interventions to our most struggling students. Another challenge involves our after school reading program. The Sherlock Extended Day program, which served students reading two or more grades below grade level, has been cut. Truancy continues to be a challenge. Even though students are rewarded for good attendance, our attendance rate only increased by .002%. Some

1/27/2010 2:58:15 PM

overall community challenges which affect our school population include: Among people 25 years or older

" No high school diploma 51.8%

" High school graduates total 25.7%

" Median household income \$38, 044 (below the U.S. average)

" % students free/reduced lunch 76.6%

" % of homes where only Spanish is spoken 70.2%

The above statistics were obtained from www.zipskinny.com & the U.S. census report.

Perhaps the biggest challenge we face is that ISAT reading is an all English test. This makes it very difficult for our LEP students. ISAT math can be taken using a linguistically modified test or a side-by-side test. The two unfamiliar formats are difficult for 3rd and 4th graders to maneuver.

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

Our students' attributes and challenges have contributed to their performance results. The educational level of the parents directly affects the parents' abilities to productively assist their children with their homework and/or their reading and writing deficiencies. In addition, with approximately 73% of our students qualifying for reduced/free lunch, homes find it difficult to provide a print rich environment. Furthermore, in many of students' homes English is not spoken, which impacts their verbal and written expression in English. Therefore, our students' reading scores and writing skills are far below grade level. It is important that students are in school on a regular basis to learn and retain the strategies being taught.

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

Our focus must be on the factors over which we have influence. We offer adult education classes that focus on language skills, parent coffees to assist in reading, math and test taking skills, and family nights tied to core subject areas. Parental involvement has increased and we've seen that our parents are willing to help in the school. We now need to communicate to our parents the activities upon which we are focusing. We also need to teach them simple ways to help their children at home in both Spanish and English. Finally, we need to find ways to increase consistent student attendance. Direct conversation with the principal and parents of truant students needs to take place. Follow up truancy letters need to be sent on a consistent basis.

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?

During the 2009-10 school year, the Columbus West staff consists of 70 full-time certified staff members, 27 paraprofessionals, two building administrators, one district administrator for the cognitively delayed special education rooms, 3 clerical staff members, and 5 custodians. We also have a breakfast and lunch staff consisting of 16 additional personnel members. All staff is highly qualified to teach the grades and subjects to which they have been assigned. The largest changes in our data over the past two years regarding staff include an increase in the number of those with Masters degrees and the number of teachers that are tenured. Out of a staff of 70 certified staff, 54 have a Masters degree or higher. Only 14 teachers are non-tenured, indicating that ours is an experienced staff. Having an experienced, highly educated staff means that they are familiar with best educational practices, testing procedures, the Illinois Learning Standards, and the current District 99 frameworks. Additionally, only 8 teachers joined the staff in 2008. Six of the eight teachers are new to Columbus West or the District but not new to teaching. The remaining 2 teachers are first year. All new teachers are provided with a mentor who meets with them on a regular basis. Mentors observe new teachers, make suggestions for classroom improvement and answer any questions. Columbus West has 1 National Board Certified teacher, with 2 teachers currently working on National Board Certification. We have 11 faculty members serving on our SIP Team, all from different grade levels and all with differing areas of expertise. Our building has 3 LST's, 1 Bilingual Reading Interventionist and 3 ESL teachers that support staff as well as assist them in the reading process. Teachers are required to attend mandatory shared professional learning team meetings 3 times per month. Agendas, as well as minutes, are kept on file in the principal's office. During this time grade level teams collaborate with each other in the areas of literacy and math. Two of the meetings are focused on literacy and one on math. The principal and/or assistant principal attend the meeting; however, the grade level team shares the responsibility of facilitating, preparing an agenda, and taking the meeting notes. This is a new concept for teachers this year and the feedback has been positive when given ownership and responsibility for their areas of need. There has been an increase in days the District has planned for afternoon school improvement days. This additional professional development allows for staff to become more effective in the classroom. Opportunities are also available for professional development through outside conferences and workshops. Teachers share information at PLT meeting and building meetings. The Columbus West staff provides students with enrichment activities by volunteering for several after school programs. The activities not only provide cultural background knowledge for our students, but connect our students to school.

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

Our staff is a well qualified, tenured, dedicated staff which includes four reading support teachers. Our staff is stable with few teachers new new to the building. Workshops have been attended, professional development has been given, and after-school activities are provided for our students. However, adequate academic gains in math and reading, specifically within the LEP subgroup, have not been made.

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

The staff will continue to pursue advanced degrees and continue to volunteer to provide cultural after-school activities for our children. However, this is not enough. The staff needs to be given professional development focused on learning strategies for ELL students. Secondly, workshops addressing the needs of the LEP subgroup need to be attended. Administrators and teachers need to ensure that academic instructional minutes for math and reading are precisely followed. Finally, administrators and teachers need to be sure a complete balanced literacy framework is in place in all classrooms.

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

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

Our goal at Columbus West is to partner with parents in the education of their children. Several opportunities are offered for parents to become involved at Columbus West. We have a Parent Involvement Committee, which includes teachers and our school parent liaison (who works with parents, staff, and other District parent liaisons).

The Parent Involvement Committee is comprised of 15 teachers and a parent who is the program director of the VIVA After School program. Seventy of our students attend. The committee organizes many parent involvement activities. Family Reading Night was attended by over 192 students plus their families. Our fall Open House in 2009 was attended by 425 families. The parent committee meets 1-2 times per month.

In order to increase parental involvement we will be hosting events at the grade level, inviting parents and families to come and participate in what students are learning at school. In addition the kindergarten teachers are planning monthly meetings to guide parents in supporting their children's learning. We also invite parents to volunteer to assist with many school-related events and assist in the classrooms. This fall we are inviting parents to visit classrooms to read aloud to the students. We also provide a Family Resource Library open to parents and students two days per week. This resource has recently been expanded with materials in both Spanish and English, including a variety of materials to support home learning. Technology resources were added last spring as well. Programs planned for the school year include a Family Math Night and a Family Science Night. Parent coffees will be added in the morning to discuss homework support and math and reading at home.

The Parent Involvement Committee also works collaboratively with the VIVA After School program. In addition to having the VIVA director on our S.I.P. Committee, beginning this year our staff will visit the program and attend parent meetings. Staff will also lead parent meetings at the VIVA site, which are open to all of our Columbus West students' families. Topics to be covered include good study habits and providing parents with resources and strategies to help their children become more successful students. Staff from Columbus West and the VIVA program will participate in on-site visits to collaborate regarding ideas and teaching strategies.

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

The Parent Involvement Committee works actively in getting parents involved to encourage the students to be life long learners and provides parents with resources and ideas for stimulating home learning and connecting to student learning at school. As it plans for parental involvement activities, the committee keeps the work of Joyce L. Epstein's Six Types of Parental Involvement in mind: Parenting, Communicating, Volunteering, Learning at Home, Decision Making and Collaborating with the Community. While data on the effects of parent involvement is more qualitative than quantitative, teachers report that students who have parents who are more involved with the school are themselves more involved in their school work. Parent involvement increases the comfort level of parents in the school environment and enhances communication with teachers and staff. This also results in a higher level of accountability on the part of the students. However, in spite of all these efforts, there are other important factors that affect 1) the level of parent involvement and 2) the impact that parent involvement can have on student performance. These major factors include language, culture, poverty and parent education levels.

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

Parent involvement enhances the school environment and therefore, has a positive effect on student performance. Most, if not all, of what is presented to parents is presented in Spanish and English, however many of our parents have limited formal education in their native language which limits understanding of school communications. While we offer classes to teach English, many parents do not have the foundation of language in Spanish to benefit greatly from English instruction. Poverty also has an effect on parent involvement since many of our parents are working many hours and cannot miss work. In addition, for some, transportation is an issue. However, the best attended events have been those at the grade level that are tied directly to what the students are studying at school with materials in Spanish for our Language Minority Students and connected to our families' culture. Perhaps smaller scale activities, more directly targeted to the population involved, would engage them more and produce more involvement. This could lead to a greater comfort level among parents, and likewise lead to more parent involvement. We are actively planning parent coffees and topics to assist parents in understanding what goes on in their child's classroom. We are also planning ways to assist and involve them in the process and understand how they can help their children at home and feel more confident in their very important role in the educational process of their child.

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

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

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

- We can provide professional development sessions for LEP teachers focused on the 4 components of balanced literacy (guided reading, shared reading, read alouds, independent reading)
- We can provide professional development on the new materials used in conjunction with the Transitional Pilot Program
- We can provide professional development on SIP days & Institute days on the components of balanced literacy
- We can organize a professional library based on comprehension strategies
- We can ask transitional/bilingual teachers to incorporate more math vocabulary in English
- We can be sure teachers are differentiating and modifying curriculum in math and reading for at-risk students

- We can provide more family events which model activities parents can do with their children at home

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	While our current, overall achievement in reading is 45.2%, all subgroups will make AYP of 77.5 in 2010 and 82% in 2011 or safe harbor.	1,2,3,5,
2	While our current overall achievement in Math is 71.4% for all subgroups except the LEP group, all groups will reach 77.5% in 2010 and 82% in 2011 or safe harbor.	4,

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. LEP students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 5. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

While our current, overall achievement in reading is 45.2%, all subgroups will make AYP of 77.5 in 2010 and 82% in 2011 or safe harbor.

Objective 1 Description

Reading continues to be the focus for the 2009-2010 school year. District/professional development, progress monitoring, PLT meetings, informal observations by administrators during reading, and interactive parental involvement will allow all subgroups to meet the minimum state target. Particular attention will be given to providing specific literacy components: read alouds, shared reading, comprehension strategies, and content area vocabulary. These areas were the lowest areas across all grade levels.

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. LEP students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 5. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

While our current, overall achievement in reading is 45.2%, all subgroups will make AYP of 77.5 in 2010 and 82% in 2011 or safe harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will learn COMPREHENSION STRATEGIES modeled by teacher during Read Aloud, Guided Reading, Shared Reading with the expectation that all teachers are using the strategies throughout the entire school year with periodic walkthrough by Principal/AP K-6	09/02/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Title I	0
2	Students will learn grade level content area VOCABULARY identified on District Learner Outcomes Document. Word list, strategy to be used & assessment determined by grade level PLT. Student vocabulary folder	01/13/2010	05/28/2010	During School	Title I	50

to contain words and assessments. Folder housed in SAPPI

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

While our current, overall achievement in reading is 45.2%, all subgroups will make AYP of 77.5 in 2010 and 82% in 2011 or safe harbor.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	(a) Develop a reference library categorized by reading strategy, with strong emphasis on books for ELL learners (housed in LST room)	10/07/2009	01/29/2010	During School	Title I	1,000
2	(b) PD in-service with modeled Read Aloud given by LST's	09/02/2009	09/02/2009	After School	Title I	0
3	(c) Book talk highlighting Read Alouds targeting ELL learners given by media specialist. Books housed in school media. Bibliography provided.	09/16/2009	09/16/2009	After School	Title I	0
4	(d) Media Specialist opens building meetings with Read Aloud titles found in school media center	11/18/2009	05/28/2010	After School	Title I	0
5	(e) PD on Comprehension strategies provided by LSTs at PLT. For example, 3rd gr team wants "inferencing" modeled.	10/26/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Title I	0
6	(f) ELL teachers participate in PD sessions focused on Balanced Literacy (Read Alouds, Shared Reading, Guided Reading)	09/10/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Title I	0
7	(a) Discuss and determine number of words, assessment to be used for content area vocabulary at PLT	01/11/2010	02/01/2010	During School	Title I	0
8	(b) Strategies for teaching vocabulary shared at PLT meetings; focus on ELL learners	02/01/2010	05/28/2010	During School	Title I	0

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

While our current, overall achievement in reading is 45.2%, all subgroups will make AYP of 77.5 in 2010 and 82% in 2011 or safe harbor.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	(a) Read Alouds/Shared Reading samples modeled by teachers for parents at Parent Coffee	11/06/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Title I	100
2	(b) List of comprehension questions provided for parents in student planner to use in conjunction with student reading log. Questions modeled at parent coffee	11/06/2009	12/11/2009	During School	Title I	100
3	(c) Comprehension strategies reinforced at Family Reading Night	10/14/2009	10/14/2009	During School	Title I	100
4	(a) Vocabulary Flashcards and Make & Take games shared at Parent Coffees	01/16/2009	05/29/2009	During School	Title I	100
5	(b) Flashcards sent home with students to be practiced with parents	01/16/2009	05/29/2009	After School	Title I	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

While our current, overall achievement in reading is 45.2%, all subgroups will make AYP of 77.5 in 2010 and 82% in 2011 or safe harbor.

Reading progress will be monitored through the use BOY, MOY and EOY assessments done on ISEL and MAP. SMART goals will be set by teachers with regard to the BOY, MOY and EOY and analysis of goals reached will be made. Progress monitoring will be done by teachers in the form of monthly math and reading assessments, discussed at PLT. Administrators will monitor the balanced literacy framework through the use of the 5 minute observation checklist. Activities reflect one year implementation to be reviewed in 2010.

	Name	Title
1	Denise Thul	Reading Interventionist
2	Suzanne Frost	Principal
3	Laurel Shea	Assistant Principal

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

While our current overall achievement in Math is 71.4% for all subgroups except the LEP group, all groups will reach 77.5% in 2010 and 82% in 2011 or safe harbor.

Objective 2 Description

Columbus West Math Scores continue to improve. Based on the 2009 ISAT scores, we have determined areas of weakness in the use of math manipulatives and calculators. In order to maintain this upward trend, we will increase the use of manipulatives and calculators in classrooms, and provide professional development through the sharing of manipulative centers at PLT and at building meetings. LEP students will be held to the same high standards so that their performance will continue to increase.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- ê 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ê 2. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ê 3. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ê 4. LEP students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ê 5. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

While our current overall achievement in Math is 71.4% for all subgroups except the LEP group, all groups will reach 77.5% in 2010 and 82% in 2011 or safe harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will use appropriate MATH MANIPULATIVES &/or CALCULATORS in lessons dealing with number sense with the expectation that all teachers will use calculators & manipulatives the entire year	09/07/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Title I	0

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

While our current overall achievement in Math is 71.4% for all subgroups except the LEP group, all groups will reach 77.5% in 2010 and 82% in 2011 or safe harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	(a) Math activities dealing with calculators, manipulatives & number sense presented at PLT and/or building meetings	09/14/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Title I	0
2	(b) All school math manipulative share at bldg meeting	12/09/2009	12/09/2009	After School	Title I	0

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

While our current overall achievement in Math is 71.4% for all subgroups except the LEP group, all groups will reach 77.5% in 2010 and 82% in 2011 or safe harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	(a) Math Night - parents rotate through math manipulative/calculator work stations focused on number sense; families receive manipulatives with at-home activities	01/27/2010	01/27/2010	After School	Title I	200

2	(b) Parent coffees demonstrate math manipulatives to use at home; ELL parents encouraged to attend	11/06/2009	05/29/2009	During School	Title I	100
---	--	------------	------------	---------------	---------	-----

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

While our current overall achievement in Math is 71.4% for all subgroups except the LEP group, all groups will reach 77.5% in 2010 and 82% in 2011 or safe harbor.

On a monthly basis, grade level teachers will design a math assessment which focuses on key mathematical concepts. Assessment will be administered to all students at a grade level and results discussed at PLT. Concepts not understood will be repeated the following month. Teachers will review extended math response samples and grade using student friendly rubric. LEP classrooms will be held to same procedures as regular division classrooms so as to elevate level of academic learning. Activites reflect one year implementation to be reviewed in 2010.

	Name	Title
1	Suzanne Frost	Principal
2	Laurel Shea	Assistant Principal
3	Gustave Avalos	4th grade trans. teacher, Math committee chair

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The stakeholders: parents and community, students, teachers and administrators will provide the school with feedback dealing with the School Improvement Plan through informal interviews and formal surveys about the school, its climate, educational programs, etc. Our school is eager for parents and community to provide feedback on the school and district initiatives using existing avenues for input. Parents and community receive newsletters from the school and district which include information dealing with the implementation of the School and District Improvement Plans. Regular updates on the newly redesigned district website: www.cicd99.edu 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 distributed to each student at the beginning of the year. 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	Denise Thul	LST
2	Julie Kowalski	teacher
3	Karen Monroy	teacher
4	Gustavo Avalos	teacher
5	Joanna Block	teacher
6	Rosemary Baroni	teacher
7	Alicia Gamboa	parent
8	Stacy LaMarca	Supervisor/ District Representative
9	Suzanne Frost	Principal
10	Laurel Shea	Assistant Principal
11	Ralene Hall	teacher
12	Karyn McKenna	teacher
13	Marianne O'Keefe	teacher
14	Brigid Peterson	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 2:58:15 PM

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 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

1/27/2010 2:58:15 PM

*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

1/27/2010 2:58:15 PM

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
- SIP Team (administrator, teacher, parents, community members)
- Engage in data driven decision making
- Share in the writing of the school improvement plan
- Provide a vital communication link to the stakeholders
- Share in the review and improvement of the school improvement plan
- Classroom teachers
- Collect necessary data to develop and monitor progress towards goals and activities
- Communicate the standards and activities in the plan to students and parents
- Communicate the progress toward achieving the goals

Community Level

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

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

- Share in the review and improvement of the school improvement plan

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

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

The Cicero School District 99 Induction and Mentoring Program was approved by the ISBE in January 2004. The mission of the program is to develop and retain quality educators by providing support and training through professional collaborative teams, thereby resulting in improved student academic achievement. The goals are 1) to establish a collaborative team of mentors responsible for providing assistance to, support for, and collegiality with new teachers; 2) to provide new teachers with meaningful opportunities to improve teaching performance by upgrading skills and knowledge in implementing research-based effective instructional practices; 3) to familiarize new teachers with the philosophy and expectations of the district and the local community; 4) to retain quality teachers within the district; 5) to integrate technology into the communication process; and 6) to satisfy Illinois mandated requirements for teacher induction, certification and professional development. The components of the program include new teacher orientation, mentor facilitated monthly support meetings for new teachers at each building to address needs and concerns, weekly personal contact between mentor and new teacher, peer observations of the new teacher's classroom practice by an experienced teacher, professional development opportunities including observation of experienced teachers and/or attendance at professional development workshops and seminars for the new teacher each semester, reflection by the new teacher on his or her teaching practices in relation to the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, and review and analysis of the new teacher's progress by the mentor. Teachers new to School District 99 are offered the opportunity to participate in this program during New Teacher Orientation in the fall. They record their decision and present it to their principal for approval. If they choose to fully participate in the program, they are paired with a trained mentor who will support them through two school years. They may prefer instead to attend the monthly support meetings at their buildings. Mentors must attend mentor training sessions provided by the ISBE and Strategies that Support Instruction for English Language Learners provided by School District 99 as a condition of their selection. Responsibility for coordination of the Induction and Mentoring Program is assigned to a Program Supervisor in the Language Minority Services Department. Responsibilities include program design and coordination, mentor selection, training, and matching to new teachers; coordinating professional development for program participants; documenting program completion requirements to ensure compliance with ISBE requirements; and coordinating program research and evaluation efforts. The program is reviewed annually and 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. 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 Personnel

-Director of School Improvement and Community Relations

-Director of Language Minority Services

-Director of Reading and Language Art

-Director of Math and Science

-Director of Social Studies, Fine Arts and Gifted

-Director of Special Education

-Director of Title I Programs

-Director of Assessment

-Director of Technology

-District Literacy Teachers

-Literacy Support Teachers

-Literacy Facilitators

-Building/District Resource Facilitators

-Building Administrators

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

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

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

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

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

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

Over the past several years, ISBE has provided support to Cicero District 99 in many ways. A new, comprehensive approach to increasing school improvement was recently developed and responds directly to the mandates of NCLB. ISBE developed a plan that would shift delivery of services from a centralized to a regionalized model. Regional Offices of Education act as primary providers of services, while Regional Service Providers (RESPROS) offer the district technical support. West 40 Intermediate Service Center assumes this supportive role for District 99. NCLB Section 1003: School Improvement states that 95% of the NCLB School Improvement money available each year must be used for activities connected to school improvement plans and are provided for through the RESPRO (West 40). The agency also acts as the External Partner for and monitors school improvement planning.

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

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

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 11/12/2009

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

OTHER DATA

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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