

District Improvement Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	10/08/2009
District Plan Submitted	10/20/2009
District Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE District Improvement Plan Monitoring Completed	12/21/2009

Additional Compliance Submissions by District	
RtI Compliance Submission	
Special Education Compliance Submission	
Title III Compliance Submission	

 District Information

RCDT Number:	140160990020000		
District Name:	Cicero SD 99	Superintendent:	Donna Adamic
District Address:	5110 W 24th St	Telephone:	7088634856
City/State/Zip:	Cicero,IL 60804 2948	Extn:	0
Email:	dadamic@cicd99.edu		
Is this for a Title I district ?		<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No
Is this for a Title III district that did not meet AMAO?		<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No

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

Is this District making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this district been identified for District Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this District making AYP in Reading?	No	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	Corrective Action Year 3
Is this District making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2009-10 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status Year 3

	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
Student Groups	%	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	54.1		No	69.3		Yes	95.7			
White	99.6	Yes	99.6	Yes	57.1	57.3	Yes	64.9		Yes	93.7			
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	42.3	56.0	No	48.3	52.7	No	93.2			
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	54.1	58.5	No	69.7		Yes	95.9			
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American														
Multiracial / Ethnic														
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	44.1	48.7	No	65.6	67.2	No	96.2			
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	24.2	31.7	No	42.7	51.6	No	94.3			
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	53.4	57.8	No	69.2		Yes	95.8			

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
<p>* 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.</p>

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

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

Is this district meeting Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO) ? **No**

English Proficiency Test Type : ACCESS for ELLs

Minimum Target :

Attaining English Language Proficiency Target	Making Progress in English Target	Criterion 3: AYP-LEP Subgroup						Is this district meeting English Proficiency target?	Yes
		AYP-Participation Rate		AYP-Percent Meeting/Exceeding		AYP-Other Indicators percent			
		Reading	Mathematics	Reading	Mathematics	Attendance	Graduations	Is this district meeting Progress in English Target?	Yes
10.0	85.0	95.0	95.0	70.0	70.0	90.0	78.0	Is this district meeting AYP for LEP Subgroup target?	No

ANNUAL MEASURABLE ACHIEVEMENT OBJECTIVES(AMAO) PERFORMANCE					
Criterion 1: Attaining Proficiency			Criterion 2: Making Progress in English		
Total Number of Students Tested	Number Attaining Proficiency	Percent Attaining Proficiency	Total Number of Students Tested	Number Making Progress	Percent Making Progress
6491	1669	25.7	4960	4518	91.1

There are no AMAO Status determinations for AMAO-Attaining Proficiency (Criterion 1) and AMAO-Progress (Criterion 2) if there are less than 30 students tested. A 95% confidence interval was applied to calculations of Criteria 1 and 2.

Criterion 3: Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP for LEP Subgroup)											
Percent Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards						Other Indicators (When Safe Harbor is Applied)	
Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate	Graduation Rate
%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target	Met AYP		
100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	44.1	49	No	65.6	67	No	96.2	

Three Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for LEP Subgroup

1. At least 95.0% tested in Reading and Mathematics for the LEP Subgroup. If the current year's participation rates are less than 95%, the participation rate for AYP will be considered sufficient if the average of the current year and the preceding year is at least 95%, or if the average of the current year and the two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% but 'Met AYP' is 'Yes', it means the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 62.5% Meeting/Exceeding Standards for Reading and Mathematics for the LEP subgroup. For LEP subgroup under the 62.5% Meeting/Exceeding requirement, a 95% confidence interval has been applied; or meet Safe Harbor requirements.
3. At least 90.0% Attendance Rate for elementary school districts or at least 75.0% Graduation Rate for high school districts. Unit districts must meet both criteria.

AYP for LEP subgroup includes only students enrolled as of 5/1/07.

Safe Harbor Targets of 62.5% or above are not printed.

LEP Subgroups with fewer than 45 students are not reported. Safe harbor only applies to subgroups. 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 school districts, graduation rate for high school districts, and attendance and graduation rates for unit school districts) for the subgroup. Safe harbor allows school districts an alternate method to meet subgroup minimum targets on achievement.

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

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

District Information								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	94.8	95.4	95.3	95.1	95.0	95.1	94.9	95.7
Truancy Rate (%)	1.2	0.6	3.9	3.3	3.7	5.4	9.7	2.5
Mobility Rate (%)	30.4	37.6	33.2	28.3	23.0	21.7	22.8	14.3
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
District Population (#)	12,972	13,276	13,479	13,624	13,528	13,458	13,552	13,713
Low Income (%)	71.8	75.4	76.4	78.7	75.0	77.7	82.6	84.7
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	48.7	48.8	46.3	44.2	45.8	44.6	38.6	55.5
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	6.6	4.8	4.6	4.0	2.9	2.5	2.4	2.6
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.6	0.7	1.1	1.2	1.6	1.7	2.1	2.1
Hispanic (%)	92.4	94.2	94.0	94.5	95.1	95.4	95.1	94.6
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	0.2	0.1	0.2	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 (%)
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
S T A T E	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-
	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 (%)
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	-	-	
S T A T E	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	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)
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	-	
S T A T E	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	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**

	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	24	-	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	18	-	17	1
	2006	785	9	51,891	63	37	20	-	14	1
	2007	734	10	54,358	64	36	21	-	8	4
	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	14	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	2	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	12	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					
Groups	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	47.4	43.0	50.0	52.8	44.4	45.1	-	-	51.1	49.9	47.6	46.8	39.3	47.0	48.8	48.4	43.0	48.4
White	47.1	50.9	36.8	53.9	58.3	67.9	-	-	43.2	45.7	39.5	55.3	34.9	34.0	40.0	42.9	42.5	52.4
Black	26.4	20.0	44.0	38.4	39.4	42.4	-	-	29.6	34.5	44.0	30.2	26.6	20.0	25.0	35.7	44.4	48.3
Hispanic	48.1	43.0	50.8	53.2	44.1	44.5	-	-	52.4	50.8	47.7	47.1	39.8	48.7	50.3	48.7	42.7	48.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	50.0	-	-	-	31.3	31.6	-	-	73.9	64.3	35.1	35.6	-	47.7	77.9	66.2	28.7	37.5
Students with Disabilities	16.3	16.8	15.3	16.7	16.3	20.5	-	-	14.8	13.0	16.0	16.0	9.9	13.1	11.9	9.0	7.7	18.7
Low Income	45.0	41.3	48.3	51.2	43.4	44.8	-	-	50.4	48.2	46.1	45.7	39.2	46.1	47.4	48.6	42.1	47.2

Groups	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	-	-	46.8	51.7	59.8	58.9	-	-	48.2	51.0	62.4	55.8	43.7	47.3	58.6	64.7	64.1	70.0
White	-	-	42.1	47.6	60.5	51.3	-	-	60.5	44.4	52.2	64.9	52.2	63.1	71.4	65.9	66.7	66.6
Black	-	-	32.1	35.0	61.5	42.9	-	-	23.5	40.6	50.0	40.0	41.2	-	25.0	57.2	71.9	57.6
Hispanic	-	-	47.3	52.0	59.5	59.4	-	-	48.0	51.3	63.0	55.6	43.0	46.7	58.5	64.8	63.7	70.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	36.8	47.7	51.1	46.4	-	-	29.1	41.9	56.1	46.7	-	18.8	38.0	58.4	53.0	65.0
Students with Disabilities	-	-	16.3	14.1	24.5	16.7	-	-	23.2	18.6	19.0	18.9	8.2	19.1	27.6	12.6	23.5	27.1
Low Income	-	-	46.0	50.4	59.4	58.1	-	-	47.1	50.6	62.4	54.9	43.6	46.0	57.2	64.4	62.8	69.8

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					
Groups	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	67.2	62.9	74.8	77.7	70.3	74.8	-	-	70.4	74.3	70.5	71.9	54.4	54.0	61.9	72.0	64.6	70.4
White	74.6	73.6	69.3	71.8	69.4	82.1	-	-	68.1	68.5	68.5	66.6	42.2	44.0	52.2	77.1	60.0	64.2
Black	47.4	45.0	64.0	56.0	59.0	57.6	-	-	59.2	55.1	64.0	62.3	37.6	25.0	41.7	50.0	63.0	55.2
Hispanic	66.9	62.5	75.4	78.9	70.6	74.9	-	-	71.0	75.3	70.5	72.3	55.8	55.5	63.5	72.2	64.7	70.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	80.0	-	-	-	62.7	70.4	-	-	88.9	85.7	65.3	67.1	-	47.6	85.6	77.9	56.3	65.1
Students with Disabilities	40.0	37.8	43.5	56.8	46.3	53.2	-	-	45.7	38.9	44.2	48.4	14.3	21.4	25.4	44.2	45.8	39.2
Low Income	65.8	62.5	74.0	76.4	69.6	74.0	-	-	70.0	73.3	69.6	71.3	54.8	53.7	62.0	72.0	63.9	70.0

Groups	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	-	-	63.7	69.8	73.3	69.4	-	-	54.4	60.1	64.0	66.9	32.4	24.0	56.2	59.0	59.2	58.9
White	-	-	63.2	54.7	73.7	71.8	-	-	48.9	55.6	56.5	70.3	40.5	33.8	50.0	53.2	58.3	51.1
Black	-	-	17.9	45.0	53.8	39.3	-	-	16.7	37.5	36.6	33.3	23.5	18.2	25.0	39.3	37.5	42.4
Hispanic	-	-	64.9	70.8	73.6	70.0	-	-	54.9	60.9	65.1	67.5	31.8	23.4	56.8	59.8	59.8	59.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	57.2	73.0	70.6	61.9	-	-	37.7	56.1	64.5	63.5	-	6.9	47.2	53.1	53.9	60.1
Students with Disabilities	-	-	37.5	37.2	51.0	30.4	-	-	24.8	27.6	29.2	29.4	4.1	8.1	25.0	21.4	28.1	28.8
Low Income	-	-	62.5	69.9	73.5	69.3	-	-	53.5	59.5	64.3	67.2	31.7	23.1	55.5	58.7	58.3	59.3

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 your District Report Card data tell you about student performance in your district? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are indicated?

Achievement in Reading : Overall scores increased slightly from 53.9% meeting and exceeding standards to 54.1% meeting standards in 2009. A significant number of students in the testing pool are still acquiring English as a second language. The slight increase in test scores from 2008 may be due to new response accommodations for the reading extended response items for students identified as LEP. This year, LEP students were given the option to respond to the reading and mathematics extended response items in either Spanish or English. Given this new option, LEP students, who are developing literacy both in their native language and in their second language, may have had a better chance of responding correctly to these items than they did in their first year of taking the standard ISAT assessment in 2008. More LEP students are demonstrating English proficiency on the ACCESS measure. Of the LEP subgroup, 25.2% reached proficiency in English, yet 44.1 % of this subgroup met and exceeded standards. The 2009 LEP subgroup data begins to suggest that native language literacy instruction in our bilingual education programs may lead to meaningful literacy learning that is transferable to English literacy learning over time. Despite this slight increase from 43% meeting standards in 2008, 16.7% more of the LEP subgroup met or exceeded standards in 2007 before these students were required to

take ISAT. The percentage of students in the LEP subgroup meeting and exceeding standards in reading could increase significantly if LEP students were offered questions using the same format as presented in the math assessment. The percentage of the Black subgroup meeting and exceeding standards in 2009 dipped to 42.3% from the previous year of 51.1%. The IEP subgroup meeting and exceeding standards remained basically the same from last year, 24.1%, to 24.2% meeting standards in 2009. Increasing achievement in reading for all students in the district continues as a main goal.

Achievement in Mathematics:

District 99 report card data demonstrate that most students made AYP in mathematics including the White, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. The overall trend was a slight increase in scores from 68.1 percent in 2008 to 69.3 percent meeting standards in 2009. None of the subgroups were able to meet AYP through “safe harbor”. The black subgroup was at 47.7% which was a slight gain over 2008 when only 47.4% were able to meet standards in mathematics. This was a gain of 0.3%. The IEP subgroup was at 42.5% meeting or exceeding standards and in 2008, 46.2% met standards. The overall loss for the IEP subgroup was -3.7%. The LEP populations’ scores increased slightly from 63.6% in 2008 to 65.6% in 2009. Given our student population with 52% of the students identified as Limited English Proficient, ability to read the test and understand the questions may interfere with performance in mathematics. Noted areas of weakness were due to students’ lack of ability to convert units of measure, to understand and convert numbers, and to estimate accurately. Increasing achievement in mathematics remains a goal for the district as AYP targets continue to increase in the coming years under NCLB.

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

A significant number of students (52.6%) of the students in the district taking ISAT were identified English Language Learners. The ISAT reading test is mandated for all students, except the 1% taking IAA. The assessment format requires reading stamina which many of these students have not yet developed in their second language. Within the IEP student population, 35% are also ELL. While the district continues to develop and improve its curriculum and strategies, the state of Illinois chose to again change the assessment system for ELLs.

The poverty rate in Cicero has increased over time from 71.8% in 2002 to 84.7% in 2009. Educational research suggests that poverty is a factor which affects student achievement.

Increases in student population (2002- 12,972 and 2009 - 13,713) may also be affecting our student achievement. The increase in population is 741 students in the past seven years. This has led to an increase in the average class size in elementary schools primarily. In summary, the significant ELL population, increased poverty rate and student populations are external factors impacting our schools.

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

From analysis of 2009 data, individual subgroups will need attention in the areas of reading and mathematics. Results from ISAT, when disaggregated, demonstrate steady growth in reading from sixth through eighth grade. It is taking our students time to learn the English language and to apply their skills. ACCESS data demonstrates growth in English proficiency since 2006 when the test was first administered. In 2009, 25.2% of our LEP students tested to be proficient on ACCESS.

Although still not meeting AYP, the Black subgroup is making slight gains in both reading and mathematics. This may be due to a recent focus on formative assessment and differentiation taking place in the classrooms across the district.

The performance of the IEP subgroup in reading has remained fairly constant and is below the state average. Through the guidance of the Curriculum Department, District 99 as a whole will implement the Response to Intervention Strategies (RtI) as they pertain to the progression from general education instruction to special education in all schools. Screening assessments- ISEL- will be implemented in all K-2 classrooms, benchmark assessments -MAP-for reading and math will be implemented in grades 3-8. Progress Monitoring- ISEL- will be implemented for progress monitoring in reading in grades 3-8.

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?**

During the past three years under the Reading First grant, early elementary students in grades kindergarten through three were assessed using DIBELS, IDEL, and Tejas-LEA through a district-wide subscription to Wireless Generation and the Reading First grant. Electronic test administration and reporting is important to Cicero District 99 because of the large number of students tested -approximately 6200 in grades K-3. District summary data for DIBELS at the end of the year demonstrated fewer students in the Intensive category for the 2009-2010 school year than in the 2008-2009 school year. For 2007-2008, the Intensive category was 62% for Kindergarten, 46% for first grade, 60% for second grade, and 42% for third grade. For 2008-2009, the Intensive category was 49% for Kindergarten, 40% for first grade, 54% for second grade, and 38% for third grade. Each grade level made improvement in only a one year period. DIBELS and IDEL yielded results that indicated that most students lacked listening comprehension, phonemic awareness and phonics skills. Reading fluency measures on Spanish speaking students appeared to be appropriate yet comprehension was weak. Fluency assessments did not measure comprehension, therefore the district will implement ISEL which focuses on fluency and comprehension. This will be implemented for the '09-'10 school year as the district is no longer a Reading First district.

Students in grades four through eight will continue to take the Northwest Evaluation Association Measure of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP) test of reading, and mathematics which we initiated as a pilot last year. English language learners from a Spanish language background who are enrolled in the bilingual program will take the NWEA MAP test of mathematics with Spanish audio support and for the first time this year and the ISEL test of reading. Cicero District 99 migrated from a district wide implementation of the CTB McGraw-Hill Terra Nova (English language administration) and Supera (Spanish language administration) to the NWEA MAP and CTB McGraw-Hill in 2007 to achieve three goals: to provide teachers and parents with more timely data; to align local assessment data to the Illinois State Assessment Framework; and to test students with an adaptive test to

achieve more accurate performance data on students performing significantly above or below their assigned grade level. The NWEA MAP data include a graphic representation of the results for the RtI team. Results are graphed including longitudinal data for each student as well as a trend line for the district data and the national normative data.

Data for the NWEA MAP are reported in four performance categories, but they come from a different perspective than ISAT or ISEL. NWEA classifies students at either above or below expected proficiency rather than the four categories for ISAT or the three categories for ISEL. We are now in our 2nd year of implementation of the MAP, in which we will assess third grade students in addition to students in grades 4-8.

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

Early elementary students demonstrated improvement on the DIBELS assessment from 2006 to 2008 with a decline in the percentage requiring intensive support for all grades Kindergarten to third. One main factor in these results is the experience level of the teachers. In 2006, the DIBELS assessment and associated services were new to District 99. By 2008, teachers had multiple professional development sessions and gained experience with the program. An additional factor was the increased attention to diagnosis and monitoring. Students were diagnosed earlier and were monitored more regularly in 2008 than they were before 2006. It is not an unreasonable assumption that this increased attention has resulted in more efficient delivery of the reading curriculum. DIBELS is an early reading assessment and through discussion the RtI committee felt we needed a tool that was consistent K-8 for measuring student performance in reading. In a district where 52% of the students are ELL, an assessment that measures native language literacy is also important. We believe that the factors indicated above will continue to impact instruction, and the new ISEL which is offered in both English and Spanish for students reading up to a fifth grade level, will provide information on skills which correlate to our Literacy Learner Outcomes and Literacy Framework.

Elementary and Junior High students taking the NWEA MAP assessment are more likely to show growth as their use of the assessment increases. A positive trend appears to be forming and causality will become clearer as District 99 continues to gather MAP data. According to MAP data, 60% of students were at or above projected performance and growth in Math. In Reading, 49.4% of students were at or above projected performance in Reading.

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

Early elementary students benefit from frequent monitoring and continuous attention to their reading development as defined by the National Reading Panel. Pragmatic assessment tools that offer detailed results in a timely manner make it possible to monitor individual students in a district of 13,800 students.

Just as early elementary students benefitted from more frequent monitoring, elementary and junior high students will demonstrate stronger growth with the MAP test administered three times per year. Use of the ISEL for progress monitoring for reading fluency will be implemented through grade 8 for students reading at or below the 5th grade reading level. Many of our computers and servers are outdated and do not possess enough memory to handle the web-based assessments. The district will need to take steps to strengthen the technology infrastructure as we move forward with RtI.

Teachers with more data and more specific data are better able to differentiate instruction in the classroom. Differentiation in the classroom combined with earlier intervention improves students' chances for success.

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

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

Students entering our schools are affected by a variety of community factors. Some of these factors include, but are not limited to: limited English proficiency and education at home, low-income households and crime. According to the 2000 Census, 77.4% of people living in Cicero are Hispanic or Latino, 43.6% of the population is foreign born and 31.8% are not citizens of the United States. Since such a large percentage of the population of Cicero is Hispanic, Spanish-speaking households are very common. The census indicates that 70.2% of the population's language spoken at home is Spanish, and 40.2% speak English less than well. The adults on the average also have limited education. 31% aged 25 and older have less than a ninth grade education, 20.7% have a ninth grade to 12th grade education with no diploma, and only 25% of the population has a high school degree. Income levels range from 13% of traditional families, 25.2% of families with female householder, no husband and 15.5% of individuals are below the poverty line. The major job industry in Cicero is manufacturing, with more than 50 manufacturing companies located within the city; 30% of the labor force works in a manufacturing position and 35.5% work in production, transportation or material moving occupations. Another unfortunate factor that directly affects the educational as well as social and emotional welfare of the students involves the high crime rates in town. According to the Chicago Tribune, in 2004 the murder rate for Cicero was 14 murders although current data under new leadership indicates gang-related shootings in Cicero are down 60%, and in 2008 the town has recorded its lowest incidence of homicide this decade. Aside from the murder rate, street gang activity is present throughout the community. The junior high children (ages 12-14) are prime targets for gang members to recruit due to their vulnerability. Members misrepresent the true roles of a gang and pretend that it is a club or family of brothers. This information can be enticing to children who come from low income families and cannot afford certain luxuries, as well as children who do not have a great deal of adult involvement in their life.

In review of the 2006-2008 District Improvement Plan, ISBE special education consultants provided a review of their focused monitoring visit which included concerns regarding the low state assessment scores for students with disabilities, possibly due to a lack of access to the general education curriculum. In addition, the examined educational environment data reflected that a large percentage of students with disabilities received their special education services outside of the general education classroom. Beginning in January of 2009, the Director of Special Education contacted and met with a consultant, Mr. Dan Hurd, former director of SASSED, to develop a plan to respond to the above concerns. A major component of the response plan was to provide information, staff development and infrastructure to regionalize the larger District into five distinct geographic regions with a certified, special education coordinator put into place to supervise each region. Special education regionalization would allow special education coordinators to coordinate placements within a region, allow for more hands-on support to building principals, school staff and parents ensuring that LRE guidelines are followed and to allow and plan for specific and individualized professional development in each region. There were a number of areas of support identified to give teachers the background and knowledge base necessary to successfully implement the regionalization. These areas included: providing staff training about inclusionary practices, through Project Choices; increasing disability awareness for all staff; providing professional development on RtI and collaborative problem solving and professional development and specialized training in the areas of Assistive Technology and Autism.

The LEP subgroup is in the process of acquiring English as a Second Language and they comprise approximately 52% of the total testing pool. It is likely that this is a key factor that is challenging our students' ability to meet and exceed standards. Nevertheless their test performance suggests that are benefiting from the bilingual program services that they are receiving. Several schools are entering year three of a pilot 50/50 transitional bilingual education program that is designed to promote bilingualism and biliteracy. The pilot program offers native language literacy instruction and second language literacy instruction in English. Current ACCESS data suggest that the LEP subgroup is continuing to reach proficiency on ACCESS. In 2009, the LEP subgroup was given the opportunity to demonstrate their bilingual learning skills by reading the ISAT items in English and then writing a meaningful responses in English or Spanish. The ISAT test connection to their daily native literacy instruction is likely to improve their overall test performance. LEP students in the pilot program are afforded time (from grades 3 to 8) to learn the reading and mathematics curriculum in the language that they understand while they are acquiring both academic and social English.

Teachers will participate in professional learning teams each week. These meetings will provide opportunities for teachers to study student achievement gaps and identify causes and/or strategies to narrow the gaps. Teachers will commit to learn with their team and implement what they have learned in their lessons. Of course, teachers will monitor progress to ascertain the efficacy of strategies identified in the action plan.

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

These factors have a direct impact on the achievement of our students. Many students are either second language learners, or their primary language is English but Spanish is the only language spoken in the home. Research (Collier and Thomas, 2008) tells us that children who are acquiring a second language need five to seven years to develop academic proficiency in that language. This creates difficulties for students in verbal and written expression in English which are skills measured on the Illinois assessments. Given that Cicero is a largely Hispanic community with most communication available in Spanish, students do not often have ample opportunities to practice their English language skills, hence their proficiency in English progresses slowly. Therefore reading scores are far below grade level and their writing skills are weak. The correlation between family and community demographic information and the student performance presents a challenge. Parents lack the ability to accurately help students with their homework when it is presented in English which is compounded by their limited experience with formal education. The relationship between low-income households and student success is defined in the roles of the student versus the educational needs. Since 86% of our students come from low income families, to help the family situation, these students' main priority when they arrive home from school involves babysitting and caring for younger siblings and/or family members such as cousins. Students are not able to spend an adequate amount of time practicing their schoolwork to advance to the next level. Therefore, their grades are lower, their performance declines and their path to success becomes more challenging.

In light of the consultants' review of the district organization, it has been determined that the educational environment data reflected that a large percentage of students with disabilities received their special education services outside of the general education classroom and were not placed in LRE (least restrictive environment). This factor will be addressed by the reorganization of Special Ed students and services.

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

Our focus must be on the factors we have influence over. Although we cannot change the home language of our students we can offer opportunities for extended day programs, summer schools and adult education classes that focus on ESL skills . We also can continue to offer training session for parents on how to assist their children in academic areas. Although we cannot change the effect of violence in the community alone, we must offer safe learning environments for our students as well as safe and non confrontational venues for them to come to each day. Afterschool opportunities must be offered for as many students as possible (SES and 21st CCLC). Working with community agencies, our goal must be to do whatever is necessary to reduce and ultimately eliminate gang presence in the neighborhoods and make our community a safe place for our children. A District committee was created to explore the benefits of PBIS as a district wide behavior intervention. It appears that addressing a defined behavior curriculum, an acknowledgement system, an on-going evaluation system and tiered behavior intervention supports the needs of all our students, expectations and reinforcements.

The district plans to create a technology life cycle plan that keeps computers in the classroom functional and able to handle both web-based assessments and interventions.

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 tell you?**

In Cicero District 99 we have a young staff, the average years of teaching experience is ten years. This is a strength and weakness for our district. We are getting teachers with the latest training in teaching but they are also not experienced to teach a high poverty, ELL population. Another area of strength is more of our teachers are going on to obtain their masters degree. We offer many opportunities to our teachers for professional development through new teacher orientation, mentoring, cohort classes to obtain Bilingual, ESL, Reading and Administrative endorsements. We have added certified bilingual teachers to the reading teams at each school to offer interventions in the native language. We have also reassigned trained Title I program assistants to work with Special Ed resource teachers - serving students who are LD resource.

Along with our strengths we have many challenges. We have the greatest need to recruit and employ certified highly qualified Bilingual Spanish teachers.

Many of our bilingual teachers are in the Bilingual Transition to Teaching (BTTT) program through the Illinois State Board of Education. These teachers are not fully certified and are taking graduate classes to become certified as they teach. As compared to the state, we have a high teacher to pupil ratio, class size and lower average teacher salary which creates barriers for employment when trying to be competitive in the job market for teachers.

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

The greatest contributing factor to our performance results are educator qualifications. A significant number of our ELL staff are being hired through alternative programs. They are not becoming fully certified until after their first or second year of teaching and are getting on the job training to become a teacher. Our teacher to pupil ratio is also a factor when dealing with high poverty, ELL populations, however we do not have the funding to hire more teachers or space for additional classrooms to reduce class sizes.

A yearlong Teacher Evaluation Committee worked to create a new comprehensive evaluation tool based on the Charlotte Danielson model - Framework for Understanding. Administrators and teachers will be trained on this new evaluation instrument and it will be used as a pilot to evaluate tenured teachers for the 2009-2010 school year.

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

Conclusions we can draw from these data would be; we need to recruit and employ and retain teachers that are fully certified and highly qualified to teach bilingual, special and regular education. We need to continue to offer graduate coursework leading to endorsements which will enable our teachers to work effectively with our community of learners.

The new teacher evaluation instrument will provide a framework for teachers to begin conversations with administrators about their teaching and what areas are needed for professional development.

**Section I-C. Data & Analysis - Other Data
Item 3 - Parent Involvement****Data - Briefly describe data on parent involvement. What do these data tell you?**

Research shows that parental involvement and support helps promote academic success in students. District 99's goal is to strengthen the partnership with our parents and our community in order to achieve a higher level of parent involvement. (Epstein & Dauber, 1991) In order to strengthen our partnerships, District 99 has adapted Joyce Epstein's Keys to Successful Family, and Community Partnerships framework. This model outlines the Six Types of Parent Involvement and helps create a partnership with our parents and our community. The main reason to create such partnerships is to help all youngsters succeed in school and in later life. (Epstein 2002). The following briefly describes each type, activity and data.

Type 1 Parenting: District 99 assists parents with parenting and child rearing skills with 2-3 workshops each month. These workshops help parents understand the development of their child and our district to understand our families.

Type 2 Communicating: District 99 sends home communication to our families in Spanish and English in order to establish effective home to school communications.

Type 3 Volunteering: District 99 offers many ways for parents to help and support their child's school. Schools provide a volunteer program to help teachers, administrators,

students and other parents. They also schedule activities in the evening to make it possible for parents to attend and support their child and the school. Parents are volunteering in many facets throughout or district in the classroom, on field trips and helping out at school events. A monthly Parental Involvement Calendar is distributed to families with information about the different activities that are occurring at each school.

Type 4 Learning at Home: District 99 holds family reading and math nights to provide the families to include them in their child's learning activities. Some schools also hold workshops to provide parents with strategies to enhance what our students are learning at school. Our PEP Program (Parents as Educational Partners) provides an opportunity for our parents to learn how to support their child in school and English at the same time. It is currently held at seven school sites. Currently there are over 500 parents enrolled. Each school has a Parent Resource library full of educational material for the parents to use at home. These libraries provide the parents with additional resources to help their children with their learning activities at home.

Type 5 Decision Making: Our district involves parents in making school decisions and advocacy through our Parent Advisory Council (PAC), SIP Teams and PTO's. Our PAC membership includes two representatives from each of our 16 schools.

Type 6 Collaborating with the Community: District 99 is active member of the Cicero Youth Task Force, a community organization that enables us to bring services to our parents. Several schools have established partnerships with businesses to promote academic programs at their school. District 99's goal is to include parents in a variety of ways. Our parental involvement data shows that our partnership with parents is increasing each year. Parents are to be included in the planning and implementation of RtI and the problem solving process. **Parents will be informed and invited to participate in the three tier process as soon as their child begins tiered support. Parents will also be informed of their rights to request a special evaluation to determine Special Education and/or Gifted at any time during the RtI process.** Through Open House, Parent Teacher Conferences, PAC meetings, district website and online surveys, we will include parents in all planning and stages of implementation of the RtI process.

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

Parental involvement has contributed to an increase in student achievement and performance because parents are supporting their child's school. The school is becoming part of the community and parents are integrating themselves into the educational process. As a school district, we will continue to create partnerships with our parents, community and families for the benefit our students' success. Parent's participation in their child's education improves achievement because of the following factors: Parents are confident about parenting because they understand their child's learning needs, and development.

Parents are aware of what is going on at school and can support their child's progress. They are participating in a two-way communication, home to school and school to home. Parents understand the job of the school and the teacher. They also gain skills and confidence to work at school and with children. Parents learn about the curriculum and see themselves as stakeholders in their child's education. They carry out discussions with their child about schoolwork, class work and future plans. Parents become aware of the policies that affect their child's education. They share experiences with other parents and thereby make connections and friendships. Parents become aware of the local resources and the skills to obtain services for the family.

There is limited availability of parents for participation in school improvement planning although there has been an increased interest in parent involvement on these teams the past several years. Our data have indicated that strong collaboration between parents and teachers has positively affected student performance.

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

District 99 acknowledges that parental involvement and student achievement has increased over the past several years. From the aforementioned conclusions, District 99 will continue to use Joyce Epstein's Keys to Successful Family, and Community Partnerships Framework. It will continue to build upon the partnerships and to increase the collaboration with the community to provide services for our families.

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

Section I-D - Key Factors - From the preceding screens (I-A, I-B, I-C), identify key factors that are within the district'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?

*identify early in the year the students who are at risk of not succeeding by assessing all with appropriate assessments, monitor progress midyear, and chart progress through spring as part of the general program of instruction in Tier I.

*address resources of time and materials needed to implement Tier II and Tier III interventions

*help parents become informed stakeholders in their students' education by providing support and training

*initiate the beginning steps in the district RtI model

*examine PBIS as the behavior component to RtI and explore the implementation of the program in the district

*invite participation of the stakeholders to continue collaboration on the RtI planning committee

*share RtI PD and progress with staff, Board of Education and parent organizations

Section II-Action Plan

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed	
		AYP	AMAO
1	Students in all subgroups will make AYP of 77.5% or safe harbor in 2010 and 85% or safe harbor in 2011 in reading on ISAT. Focus will be on the IEP, LEP and Black subgroups.		
2	Students with Disabilities, LEP and the Black Subgroup will meet AYP of 77.5% or Safe Harbor in Math in 2010, and 85% or Safe Harbor in 2011.		
3	The District will implement in all 16 schools, an RtI model that includes collaborative efforts from all district staff.		

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

1 District is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2 Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
3 Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
4 Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
5 LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
6 LEP students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
7 Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
8 Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
9 Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

The following deficiencies have been identified from the most recent AMAO Report for your district.

1 District is not meeting AYP for LEP
2 District is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
3 District is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives**Objective 1 Title :**

Students in all subgroups will make AYP of 77.5% or safe harbor in 2010 and 85% or safe harbor in 2011 in reading on ISAT. Focus will be on the IEP, LEP and Black subgroups.

Objective 1 Description :

Since all subgroups except the White subgroup (that did meet Safe Harbor) did not meet AYP, our district focus will target all students to meet AYP of 77% or Safe Harbor in 2010 and 85% or Safe Harbor in 2011. Strategies and activities presented to each subgroup will focus on the deficiencies determined by the analysis of data.

Special attention will be given to the IEP, LEP and Black subgroups. Strategies, activities and interventions based on student ability levels will be researched and determined appropriate for students within the subgroup as they reflect the core curriculum. In addition, educational environment data reflected that a large percentage of students with disabilities (IEP) received their special education services outside of the general education classroom for more than 60% of the time. This practice was examined and appropriate action is being implemented.

This Objective does not address any AYP deficiency.

This Objective does not address any AMAO deficiency.

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students in all subgroups will make AYP of 77.5% or safe harbor in 2010 and 85% or safe harbor in 2011 in reading on ISAT. Focus will be on the IEP, LEP and Black subgroups.

	Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	A 50/50 Program Model for bilingual services will be implemented in 15 schools across the district in Grades 3-6. Students will receive half of the instruction in the core subject areas in English and half in Spanish. English instruction includes Reading, Language Arts, and Science. Support for English literacy will be provided by certified ESL staff.	09/01/2009	09/01/2010	During School	Title III	25000
2	Screening, benchmark, and progress monitoring assessments will be utilized with students. Assessments such as MAP, ISEL, and core specific CBMs are in Tier I. DRA/EDL and phonetic screeners are in place as part of Tier II.	09/01/2009	09/01/2010	During School	Title I	50000
3	Reading Support - the district is implementing reading interventions based on the RtI model for struggling students. Supplemental reading sessions will be provided to these students in addition to the 90 minute reading block. Services will be provided by certified bilingual teachers or those who are enrolled in a Masters' Reading program or who have a Reading Masters. . The sessions will focus on vocabulary, phonemic awareness, phonics, comprehension, and fluency.	09/01/2009	09/01/2010	During School	Title I	50000
4	Students, upon initial referral to Special Education, will be considered for LRE (least restrictive environment) placements. One "region" includes Liberty, Roosevelt, Cicero East, Cicero West (all schools in Restructuring status) and Woodbine will be piloting a more targeted approach to LRE for all Special Ed students.	09/01/2009	09/01/2010	During School	Other	0
5	All students will be given access to the general education curriculum with accommodations and interventions as necessary.	09/01/2009	06/11/2010	During School	Title I	25000

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students in all subgroups will make AYP of 77.5% or safe harbor in 2010 and 85% or safe harbor in 2011 in reading on ISAT. Focus will be on the IEP, LEP and Black subgroups.

	Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	50/50 Program Model - Teachers will review the schedule and effective program implementation. Demonstration sites will be selected. Teachers from grades 3-6 will be trained on a modified guided reading approach to meet the language needs of ELLs	09/01/2009	06/14/2010	During School	Title III	74000
2	Teachers will be trained to administer and analyze data to modify classroom instruction. Assessment data will also be used for determining appropriate interventions.	09/01/2009	06/14/2010	During School	Title II	5000
3	Reading Support - staff working in the program will receive training on interventions that are appropriate to students' language needs. Materials will be selected and Progress Monitoring will be part of this training.	09/01/2009	06/14/2010	After School	Title I	10000
4	Administrators responsible for each region within the district will be provided PD training provided by Project Choices.	09/01/2009	08/27/2010	During School	Other	2500

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students in all subgroups will make AYP of 77.5% or safe harbor in 2010 and 85% or safe harbor in 2011 in reading on ISAT. Focus will be on the IEP, LEP and Black subgroups.

	Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will be informed when students begin tiered support and they will be invited to workshops where they will be instructed on how they are able to continue support at home.	09/01/2009	06/11/2010	During School	Title I	4000
2	The district will investigate appropriate ways to inform parents of their right to request a special education evaluation during the Rtl process.	09/01/2009	06/11/2010	During School	Other	0
3	Parents will be informed about the 50/50 Program Model for bilingual					

	students at the Parent Advisory Council meetings. Further information will be disseminated site-based during parent teacher conferences, parent nights, parent coffees, and curriculum nights.	09/21/2009	05/28/2010	After School	Title III	4000
4	A Summer Activities Calendar based on the strategies in the Comprehension Continuum will be available to students in the IEP subgroup in May to begin before the school year ends. Upon completion of the activities and submission of a completed activity packet in Sept, these students will receive a book of their choice.	05/03/2010	08/27/2010	Summer School	Title I	7000
5				Before School	Title I	
6				Before School	Title I	
7				Before School	Title I	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Students in all subgroups will make AYP of 77.5% or safe harbor in 2010 and 85% or safe harbor in 2011 in reading on ISAT. Focus will be on the IEP, LEP and Black subgroups.

Monitoring - Include the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities for the objective and identify the person(s) responsible for overseeing the work. Describe the process and measures of success for this objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

Appropriate interventions for our community of learners will be selected by the District RtI Committee. Training was provided during the summer of 2009 on Reading Recovery Strategies through National Louis University. Additional training on selected interventions such as those offered by Fountas and Pinell, American Institute of Research, Illinois Resource Center, etc. will be provided. A system of continuous progress monitoring will be put into place to verify implementation of interventions and insure they are implemented with fidelity. Literacy staff and school administrators will monitor implementation of interventions across the tiers. Monitoring of interventions will take place through classroom observations, walk-throughs, and through review of data from progress monitoring assessments.

Professional development will be presented at the district level through the use of experts in the fields of literacy and special education. Plans for implementation of strategies will be developed for use in programs across the district. Building administrators will monitor the fidelity of the instructional strategies through observations of classroom instruction and formative assessments.

"Project Choices" will monitor progress toward successful implementation of strategies presented to staff.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

Name	Title
------	-------

1	Karen Mulattieri	Assistant Superintendent for Student Services
2	Jane Montes	Director of LMS
3	Dr. Peter DiFrancesca	Director of Special Education

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2 Title :

Students with Disabilities, LEP and the Black Subgroup will meet AYP of 77.5% or Safe Harbor in Math in 2010, and 85% or Safe Harbor in 2011.

Objective 2 Description :

Although there has been continued academic growth in several subgroups, our focus in math will be to assist the IEP, LEP and the Black subgroup to work towards meeting the AYP target of 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 .

This Objective does not address any AYP deficiency.

This Objective does not address any AMAO deficiency.

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

Objective 2 Title :

Students with Disabilities, LEP and the Black Subgroup will meet AYP of 77.5% or Safe Harbor in Math in 2010, and 85% or Safe Harbor in 2011.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will be instructed based on lessons generated with access to Learner Outcomes which are aligned to the ILS and curriculum assessment framework.	09/01/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Other	0
2	Students will be given MAP assessment 3x a year as a Progress Monitoring tool to measure growth in number sense and problem solving.	09/01/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Local Funds	10000

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

Objective 2 Title :

Students with Disabilities, LEP and the Black Subgroup will meet AYP of 77.5% or Safe Harbor in Math in 2010, and 85% or Safe Harbor in 2011.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will be provided PD during grade level meetings to understand Learner Outcomes and MAP assessment.	09/01/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Teachers will be provided sufficient time to participate in PD as determined by analysis of student data focusing on students with IEPs, LEPs and the Black subgroup.	09/01/2009	06/11/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Teachers will assist in identification/selection of effective interventions and progress monitoring tools to improve instruction in math	09/01/2009	07/29/2011	Before School	Other	0

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

Objective 2 Title :

Students with Disabilities, LEP and the Black Subgroup will meet AYP of 77.5% or Safe Harbor in Math in 2010, and 85% or Safe Harbor in 2011.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Strategies implemented in the classroom will be shared with parents and demonstrated for them to reinforce at home. This is done at PAC (PArnts Advisory Council) and Parent University(sponsored by the district) and at the building level.	09/01/2009	06/10/2011	After School	Title I	20000
2	Parents will be invited to assist in identification of math interventions that can be adapted for home use.	09/01/2009	06/10/2011	After School	Title I	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

Students with Disabilities, LEP and the Black Subgroup will meet AYP of 77.5% or Safe Harbor in Math in 2010, and 85% or Safe Harbor in 2011.

Monitoring - Include the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities for the objective and identify the person(s) responsible for overseeing the work. Describe the process and measures of success for this objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

An analysis of the MAP data for Students with Disabilities (IEP), LEP and the Black subgroup will be performed to determine if there is an improvement in number sense and problem solving and other areas of deficiency. MAP will be administered 3 times a year. Teachers will analyze the data, share at grade level meetings to create additional lessons needed and then share with parents. This process will be overseen by the principals, and shared with Director of Math and Science and Director of Student Information Services.

Surveys will be distributed to obtain feedback from teachers regarding the effectiveness of strategies used and recommendations for revisions if necessary.

Parents will be invited to participate in meetings for sharing and discussing results of student growth. Their suggestions and ideas will be used in the creation of additional family involvement activities.

This process will be overseen by the principals, and shared with Director of Math and Science, Director of Special Education, Parent Coordinator and Director of Student Information Services.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	Name	Title
1	Karen Mulattieri	Assistant Superintendent for Student Services
2	Elsa Berrios	Director for Math and Science
3	Dr. Peter DiFrancesca	Director of Special Education
4	Jane Montes	Director of LMS

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives**Objective 3 Title :**

The District will implement in all 16 schools, an RtI model that includes collaborative efforts from all district staff.

Objective 3 Description :

An RtI model, (including PBIS in 6 schools), will be created that contains the three essential components: a three tier model of school supports, utilization of a problem-solving method of decision-making and having an integrated data system that informs instruction. Screening and benchmark assessments will be given in K-8 three times per year. Interventions that are recommended for use with English language learners will be researched and implemented on a trial basis using an action research method to determine effectiveness. Intervention strategies and materials will then be made available to all schools depending on the grade level spans served in the site.

Students will be assessed three times per year utilizing ISEL and MAP for reading and mathematics

Students in need of additional support will be identified and discussed at monthly RTI meetings conducted at the schools.

Students in need of support will be offered Tier two instruction outside of the Tier One core instruction.

Student progress will be monitored every two weeks.

Training will be conducted at the district level of all staff. Teachers delivering interventions will be trained by National Louis University and other consultants. Ongoing training will be offered monthly to RTI team members, interventionists working in Spanish and program assistants working to tutor at-risk students.

Parents will be an integral part of the problem solving process by providing information to the team on external factors affecting achievement. Through our Parent Advisory Council and parent University we will offer strategies for working with students at home. Parents will be notified when their child is recommended for Tier Two interventions for reading or mathematics.

This Objective does not address any AYP deficiency.

This Objective does not address any AMAO deficiency.

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

Objective 3 Title :

The District will implement in all 16 schools, an RtI model that includes collaborative efforts from all district staff.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students' academic and behavioral needs will be identified and monitored continuously with documented student performance data used to make instructional decisions.	09/01/2009	06/11/2010	Before School	Title I	0
2	Summer school programs will be offered to junior high students struggling with reading, mathematics or ESL.	06/15/2010	07/16/2010	Before School	Title I	35000

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

Objective 3 Title :

The District will implement in all 16 schools, an RtI model that includes collaborative efforts from all district staff.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Staff will be involved in the process for gathering information regarding current resources and practices, problem-solving, scientific, research based instruction	09/01/2009	06/11/2010	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 3 Title :

The District will implement in all 16 schools, an RtI model that includes collaborative efforts from all district staff.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parent and community members will be educated on RtI and the					

	process. Members of this group will be invited to participate in the development of the district model. This will implemented at PAC (Parent Advisory Council) Meetings and at classes during the annual district sponsored Parent University.	09/01/2009	06/11/2010	During School	Title I	20000
2	Building level meetings will be held to explain the district RtI model to all parents.	09/01/2009	10/30/2009	After School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 3 Title :

The District will implement in all 16 schools, an RtI model that includes collaborative efforts from all district staff.

Monitoring - *Include the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities for the objective and identify the person(s) responsible for overseeing the work. Describe the process and measures of success for this objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)*

Monitoring the development of RtI will continue to be done throughout the year. Using the data from the RtI Self-Assessment and the components of the District Improvement Plan, a model and process was created and shared with staff at each building . For the past three years the district has convened a steering committee involving teachers and administrators to plan and discuss RTI as a framework for continuous improvement. Ideas from the committee are then shared with the various sites during institute days, Wednesday building meetings, and early release days.

Feedback and participation of district stakeholders will be monitored and evaluated for inclusion in the process. District leadership will continue to be involved in professional development based upon needs and will be expected to begin implementation and sustain what has been initiated in the schools that have already begun implementation according to their Restructuring Plan. Monitoring tools will be used by each RtI team and specific frequencies to measure the effectiveness of RtI will be shared. By initiating these tools and benchmark checkpoints, monitoring the success of RtI throughout the district will be measured. This will be overseen by the Assistant Superintendent by visits to the buildings and meetings with the teams and building principals.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	Name	Title
1	Karen Mulattieri	Assistant Superintendent for Student Services
2	Michael Dziallo	Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

A. 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 district improvement team or plan developers are identified here.

The revision of the 2009-2011 District Improvement Plan began with data analysis of the 2009 district assessment data with District Administration. The administrative group looked at the three year trends with ISAT and local data. Reflection and review of individual school and district trends began during the summer. Questions arose from this initial review.

Were there still areas of need district wide? Are there areas where targeted professional development activities are needed in order to implement the strategies planned? Is there a need to examine assessments and interventions needed to implement strategies to increase student achievement ?

To better answer these questions and involve most stakeholders, individual SIP teams reviewed data and the academic growth of their students. This assisted in determining areas of focus in the academic areas of reading and mathematics in grade level teams. This was accomplished by teams looking at ISAT together with the Illinois Assessment Frameworks and performance descriptors. Central Office staff who are members of the school SIP teams relayed that information for reading and mathematics from their particular building to be included in the district plan.

In addition to the data analysis activities in each school, each administrator will be asked to again this year reflect on his/her professional goal/accomplishment that would support the needs of students and be linked to the overall District Improvement Plan. District Committees that were formed last year (including administrators, teachers and community members) will continue planning and work in the areas of professional development and "Response to Intervention."

We have been meeting with parents and continue to include them in all areas of the districts DIP and RtI plans. Parents continue to offer suggestions on special education programs and delivery, afterschool tutoring, and parental notification letters and have become integral members of our academic community. Members of the Parent Advisory Council have become knowledgeable on RTI and have had input into the design of the model and the general areas of student need across the district in K-8. The District will continue to offer parents the necessary support and training to become informed stakeholders in their children's education.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

B. 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 responsibilities include providing technical assistance to the schools including data analysis, identification of the district'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 district's budget to ensure that funds provided under Title I and Title III supplement, not supplant, non federal funds, and that services provided with these funds are comparable with the services in schools that are not receiving funds under Title I (NCLB, Section 1116 and 1120A).

The District Improvement Plan established its foundation in the comprehensive school reform model initiated by ISBE intervention. This plan 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. Although the Director of Assessment's title and position has been re-established to include additional responsibilities which includes oversight of the Technology Dept., (Director of Student Information Systems) the schools in the district continue to be 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 Resources • 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 Student Information Systems • District Literacy Teachers • Literacy Support Teachers • Literacy Facilitators • Building Administrators

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation C. State Responsibilities

State Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that ISBE, RESPROS, and other service providers have provided the district 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 district, if requested, to develop and implement the district plan and work with schools needing improvement. Such technical assistance shall be supported by effective methods and instructional strategies based on scientifically based research. The technical assistance shall address problems, if any, implementing the parental involvement activities described in NCLB, Section 1118, and the professional development activities described in NCLB, Section 1119. [NCLB, Section 1116(c)(9)(B)].

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

- Assisting schools in developing and monitoring SIPs, as well as providing support and training in data collection and analysis
- Providing professional development opportunities designed for activities specifically in School Improvement Plans
- Facilitating collaboration of parents and community members in the design, implementation and monitoring of School Improvement Plans
- Providing models for development of district activities for parental involvement.
- Providing 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 administrators.
- 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 IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 10/8/2009

A.Assurances

1. 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).
2. Technical assistance provided by the district serving its school is founded on scientifically based research (NCLB, Section 1116(b)(4)(C)) as defined in NCLB, Section 9101(37).
3. The plan includes strategies and activities that support the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards and ensures alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with the Illinois Learning Standards.
4. The district will spend at least 10 percent of the funds made available under Title I, Part A, subpart 2 of NCLB, for the purpose of providing high-quality professional development. (Title I districts only.)

B.Superintendent's Certification

By submitting the plan on behalf of the district, 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 plan completion from the **Submit Your Plan** page the plan shall be deemed to be executed by the superintendent on behalf of the district.

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

Note: The items marked with a [C] are compliance items the ISBE readers will review for those district improvement plans that are required to be submitted based on the district's academic status as reported in the 2009 Report Card. These district improvement plans are to span a two year period: 2009-2011.

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 DIP 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 data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?[C]

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

 Yes No

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

 Yes No

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

OTHER DATA

 Yes No

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

 Yes No

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 DIP team stated measurable objectives that promote continuous and substantial progress to ensure that students in each subgroup meet the State's target (e.g., in delivering tiered services or differentiated instruction)?

 Yes No
Has the DIP 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 and AMAO deficiency?[C]

 Yes No N/A

Do the objectives address the areas of special education compliance?

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?

 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 special education non-compliance?

 Yes No N/A

Do the parent involvement strategies and activities 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

December 21, 2009

I recommend the plan for implementation. Your strategies and activities provide sufficiently clear expectations for who is expected to accomplish the strategies and activities. Since the key audience for the plan is the plan user, such clarity is for their benefit and for the benefit of those monitoring the plan. Also, I would recommend establishing clear benchmarks for success in your monitoring process. (This provides plan users guidance to know "that" they have accomplished the plan and "how well.") Best wishes during implementation of this plan.

Carol Diedrichsen ISBE Innovation and Improvement

cdiedric@isbe.net

217-524-1086

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

METHODS OF PLAN DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, AND IMPLEMENTATION

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

Yes No

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

Yes No

Does the DIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that best effect necessary changes?[C]

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?[C]
STATE RESPONSIBILITIES	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 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]
APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.[C]
PART II - COMMENTS	