

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	
Submitted	
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 Choice	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2009-10 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning Year 1

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	53.8		No	73.2		Yes	96.0	Yes		
White														
Black														
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	53.3	57.5	No	72.6		Yes	96.1			
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	40.0	47.3	No	64.7		Yes	96.4		
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes									
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	53.1	58.3	No	72.3		Yes	96.0		

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress

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

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

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

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

DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

School Information								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	94.9	95.7	95.5	95.0	95.3	95.4	95.2	96.0
Truancy Rate (%)	1.4	1.3	6.0	1.7	6.2	5.2	7.8	2.6
Mobility Rate (%)	23.9	55.3	72.2	25.2	18.6	18.6	29.6	27.7
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	1,191	1,103	1,023	790	850	813	821	829
Low Income (%)	63.7	75.2	69.5	74.3	88.2	76.5	82.3	77.1
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	48.0	47.5	45.0	51.5	52.6	57.4	31.8	45.6
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	10.7	7.1	5.2	6.5	2.6	3.9	3.3	4.0
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.5	1.3	2.0	3.4	1.4
Hispanic (%)	88.5	91.8	94.1	92.5	94.8	93.6	92.7	93.1
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.6	0.8	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.6	0.7
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	0.6	-	-	0.7

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	13.5	0.2	85.1	1.1	-	-
	2001	12.3	0.2	86.5	0.9	0.1	-
	2002	10.7	0.3	88.5	0.6	-	-
	2003	7.1	0.3	91.8	0.8	-	-
	2004	5.2	0.3	94.1	0.4	-	-
	2005	6.5	0.5	92.5	0.5	-	-
	2006	2.6	1.3	94.8	0.7	-	0.6
	2007	3.9	2.0	93.6	0.5	-	-
	2008	3.3	3.4	92.7	0.6	-	-
	2009	4.0	1.4	93.1	0.7	-	0.7
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	13.0	58.2	100.0	94.7	35.6	13	1.3	-	-
	2001	5.4	60.3	100.0	94.3	23.8	6	0.6	-	-
	2002	48.0	63.7	100.0	94.9	23.9	16	1.4	-	-
	2003	47.5	75.2	100.0	95.7	55.3	13	1.3	-	-
	2004	45.0	69.5	100.0	95.5	72.2	55	6.0	-	-
	2005	51.5	74.3	100.0	95.0	25.2	13	1.7	-	-
	2006	52.6	88.2	100.0	95.3	18.6	48	6.2	-	-
	2007	57.4	76.5	100.0	95.4	18.6	37	5.2	-	-
	2008	31.8	82.3	100.0	95.2	29.6	57	7.8	-	-
	2009	45.6	77.1	97.0	96.0	27.7	20	2.6	-	-
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	1,056	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,029	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	1,191	116	102	205	162	130	-
	2003	1,103	126	102	194	152	146	-
	2004	1,023	64	140	94	-	-	-
	2005	790	105	109	172	-	-	-
	2006	850	120	99	111	-	-	-
	2007	813	125	141	92	-	-	-
	2008	821	90	137	140	-	-	-
	2009	829	114	98	122	-	-	-
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	53.7	46.5	50.8	50.9	53.2	51.7	-	-	56.6	58.3	46.0	49.0	40.5	53.8	64.5	59.6	40.6	47.4
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36.4	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	53.3	48.0	50.9	48.9	54.6	52.3	-	-	59.5	59.1	46.2	50.5	41.7	53.1	66.2	57.7	39.1	45.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	40.0	29.2	-	-	-	-	36.8	47.7	-	-	-	-	23.9	38.3
Students with Disabilities	15.4	-	6.7	30.0	-	-	-	-	25.0	7.7	16.7	-	21.1	13.3	11.8	-	5.9	23.1
Low Income	53.4	49.0	51.9	48.2	54.4	50.0	-	-	60.9	57.8	45.1	48.9	43.2	54.0	61.2	60.8	40.9	47.0

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	53.7	69.4	74.2	59.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	53.9	70.0	73.0	57.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	42.7	65.3	64.3	38.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	13.3	26.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	54.2	69.0	75.3	60.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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	80.6	67.3	68.2	68.9	82.6	74.8	-	-	81.2	80.6	63.4	71.7	55.7	70.2	69.6	86.5	65.0	67.6
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	45.5	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	78.3	66.0	69.4	69.6	83.7	75.0	-	-	80.8	81.9	62.1	71.3	56.7	70.8	73.2	86.6	64.7	68.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	90.0	56.8	-	-	-	-	64.3	72.1	-	-	-	-	57.7	65.6
Students with Disabilities	53.9	-	26.7	-	-	-	-	-	50.0	53.8	8.3	-	21.1	13.3	41.2	-	41.2	30.8
Low Income	81.1	67.3	68.6	66.1	81.0	71.7	-	-	82.6	79.7	63.3	70.8	59.7	70.1	70.2	84.7	62.8	67.0

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	69.7	80.6	76.3	71.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	70.7	81.1	76.4	70.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	60.0	92.3	76.2	58.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	40.0	40.0	-	12.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	68.2	81.0	77.5	70.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

The School Report Card data indicates that our students are performing very well in math overall. The reading scores are low, with a particular area of weakness in vocabulary. We have not lost or gained any ground between 2008 and 2009.

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

High Math Scores

--Monthly math assessments at each grade level

--School-wide concentrated effort in math extended response

--Math taught in primary language of students

Low Reading Scores, particularly in Vocabulary

--New Core Reading program implemented in English classrooms only

--Lack of correlation of Reading Core program between English and bilingual/transitional classes

--The high number of ELL learners and the time it takes to develop academic English and literacies in English

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

Increase parent involvement in reading as a family

--Ensure students are receiving reading instruction at their instructional level

--Increase vocabulary study in content areas

--Implement the same Core Reading Program in English and bilingual/transitional classrooms

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?

DIBELS data from K-3 indicates weaknesses in vocabulary and applying comprehension strategies and a strength in phonics

Tejas Lee data from K-1 indicates a weakness in syllable segmentation and blending of sounds and a strength in letter sound recognition

IDEL data from second grade indicates a weakness in vocabulary and applying comprehension strategies and a strength in phonics and decoding in isolation

MAP data for grades 3-6 indicates an overall weakness in vocabulary and a strength in literary works

ISEL Data will continue to be used to progress monitor students in Grades K-2 and those students scoring in the bottom 20% of MAPS for grades 3-6.

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

One factor contributing to our success in phonics is the strength of the phonics based core program in grades K-3. A factor contributing to grades 4-6 being strong in literary works is the time and emphasis spent on different types of literature in reading.

The overall weakness in vocabulary as indicated by ISAT and local assessments can be attributed to the high number of ELL learners and the time it takes to develop their academic English and literacies in English.

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

All students in grades K-6 will receive instruction in guided reading to support the vocabulary that corresponds to the core reading program. In addition all students will utilize the Marzano method for vocabulary study in the content areas and will be assessed quarterly through spiral reviews.

To further address the weakness in applying comprehension strategies Goodwin will have a school wide monthly comprehension skill that is taught, practiced, assessed, retaught, and reassessed.

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?*

Goodwin Elementary School is located at the intersection of Austin Boulevard and 26th Street. Although situated right up to the sidewalk, the school property includes a large playground with more than ample area for play. It is a well maintained facility in which all take pride. As a neighborhood school, we offer after school programs to enhance the student's life experiences.

Our number one challenge at Goodwin School is to reach the goal of academic success in literacy while developing appropriate language proficiency. The majority of our students in both the bilingual and English classes are second language learners. Our students enter kindergarten lacking academic background and skills which ensure success in school. It

is our responsibility while respecting the students' culture to expose the students to many life experiences and teach them successful academic coping skills in addition to curricular knowledge.

Goodwin continues to use Kagan in all grades everyday. By using Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures student interaction with oral academic language is built into the instructional day allowing students to further develop their language skills. Kagan also provides a structure for students to interact in a positive manner with their peers building community among the students. Kagan Structures require all students to equally participate and provides a forum for them to share their ideas and opinions in class.

This challenge is further complicated by difficulty with parent communication. We consider our parents partners in our students' education. Disconnected phones and frequent number changes impair our communication and this partnership with many families.

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

Attributes

- Neighborhood school provides stability
- Highly trained teachers offer quality education

Challenges

- Achieve academic success while developing language
- Parent communication complicated by frequent disconnects

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

As a neighborhood school with a highly trained staff, Goodwin School is able to focus on initiatives that ensure academic success for its students. The school-wide comprehension skill and monthly math focus will help students and families realize the importance of these skills throughout their entire education and that these skills continue to build over time.

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?*

Full Time Teachers (FTE)	44
Average Teacher Experience	12
Teachers with Bachelors Degree	33
Teachers with Masters Degree	67
Pupil/Teacher Ratio	18.3
Highly Qualified Teachers	42

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

Factors that may contribute positively to students performance:

- Balanced staff of new teachers (30% teaching < 5 years) and experienced teachers (33% teaching > 15 years)
- 67% of staff has a Masters Degree
- 24% of staff has Bilingual Endorsement
- 28% of staff has ESL Endorsement
- 30% of staff are Hispanic

Factors that may contribute negatively to students performance:

- Very low percentage of males (7%)

Goodwin is able to build on the new teachers previously acquired skills because of their prior experience.

Professional development has contributed to student performance results because of the school wide focus and consistency of expectations for all action plan activities has increased the academic success of students.

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

A diverse faculty offers many opportunities for collaboration which enhance the curriculum. Ninety three percent of the students at Goodwin School are Hispanic and most are second language learners. These students require specialized instruction. The staff who are Hispanic in ethnicity offer an insight into the students' culture. In addition, the staff with an ESL endorsement provide expertise in language acquisition. The highly educated staff engage in quality collaboration and reflection which are valuable tools for professional development. The most valuable professional development is collaborative, continual and based on teacher input. The process of professional development has been well established and we will continue to use the model of teach, assess, reteach, and reassess. These on-going assessments provides opportunities for staff to continue to develop professionally through differentiated 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?*

About 25% of our parents participate in our monthly family nights. We have a core of group parents who attend on a regular basis. We have 40 parents that are on our volunteer list and are involved in the classroom and after school activities. In addition, we have two families involved on the SIP team, who are actively involved in the writing and implementation of the SIP plan.

New to 2009 is our Parents in Action group. This is a group of 5 parents/grandparents that meet on a weekly basis with administration and plan fun activities to get students and families into the building on a regular basis. They have set the goal of one fun activity per month, in addition to our regularly scheduled monthly Family Nights. They are also conducting some fund raising activities to help provide money for field trips. These parents also serve as a liason between parents and administration to further our problem solving.

This data tells us that parents are very intersted in their children's education. Through our Parents in Action we are seeing more parents volunteering and a large turn outs for events.

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

Parent volunteers in the classroom working with small groups of students has directly contributed to student performance. The culture we have developed in which parents are respected as partners in their children's education has created open communication and understanding of the values and goals of the school.

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

We need to expand the pool of parent volunteers in the classrooms and for our fun activities. In November 2009, we will hold our first Parent Informational meeting hosted by our Parents in Action group. This meeting is designed to be a forum for an exchange of information between parents and staff, such as testing data, Kagan cooperative learning, and social issues (bullying). Based on the information gathered we will strive to develop programs and activities that will meet the needs of our families and enhance our students education.

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors





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

Continue as a school to develop student vocabulary and analyze our assessment data to drive instruction. A system of differentiation and interventions will be developed to meet the needs of all students.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	In 2009, 53.8 % of students met or exceeded state standards in Reading. Our goal is that by 2010, 77% will meet or exceed and by 2011, 83% will meet or exceed standards as measured by ISAT.	1,2,3,4,
2	In 2009 73.2 percent of students met or exceeded standards in math. Our goal is that by 2010, 78% will meet or exceed and by 2011 83% of students will meet or exceed state standards as measured by ISAT.	

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. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

In 2009, 53.8 % of students met or exceeded state standards in Reading. Our goal is that by 2010, 77% will meet or exceed and by 2011, 83% will meet or exceed standards as measured by ISAT.

Objective 1 Description

Guided Reading and Centers will be differentiated to allow students to receive instruction at their instructional level. Students will be regularly assessed and reassigned to appropriate guided reading groups.

School wide comprehension skills will be taught, assessed, retaught, and reassessed based on sprial review.

Teachers will receive differentiated professional development in reading extended response, independent reading, and read alouds to meet their needs and better meet the needs of their students. Differentiation will be based on experience and expressed needs of the teachers.

Parents will be encouraged to attend informational meetings and read information sent home to better help their student achieve their reading goals.

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. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

In 2009, 53.8 % of students met or exceeded state standards in Reading. Our goal is that by 2010, 77% will meet or exceed and by 2011, 83% will meet or exceed standards as measured by ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students from K-6 will utilize the Gretchen Courtney method in Reading Extended Response with grade appropriate expectations as stated on the ISBE friendly rubric. Samples will be collected and analyzed in December, February, and May. Staff will refine teaching claendar as	10/07/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0

	needed.					
2	In order to strengthen our Core program students in K-6 will use the Marzano vocabulary process in a school wide vocabulary initiative based on the core reading program. The process will be reassessed in January by the staff and adjustments to the plan will be made as needed.	09/08/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0
3	Students in grades 3-6 will focus on monthly, school-wide comprehension skills in addition to district guidelines. The following skills will be emphasized throughout the content areas: inference, main idea, author's purpose, sequencing, summarizing, cause and effect, and fact and opinion.	09/08/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0
4	Students in K-6 will participate in on-going reading comprehension skill practice through differentiated instruction. Learning groups will be monitored and adjusted monthly to meet students' changing needs.	09/11/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0
5	All Professional Learning Teams will establish SMART goals for their grade level to ensure each student achieves reading success. SMART Goals will be revisited and revised yearly.	09/08/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0
6	Students in Grade 1 will receive tier 2 interventions daily for 45 minutes from the interventionist or LST.	10/05/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0

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

In 2009, 53.8 % of students met or exceeded state standards in Reading. Our goal is that by 2010, 77% will meet or exceed and by 2011, 83% will meet or exceed standards as measured by ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	On-going differentiated professional development will be provided to teachers for reading extended response. Professional development will be provided for K-2 teachers on how to support the process orally, for example, restate the question. PD for grade 3-4 and grade 5-6 teachers will be differentiated according to grade level needs and the	10/07/2009	06/10/2011	After School	Title I	500

	experience of the teachers.					
2	K-6 teachers will attend workshops on Read Alouds and Independent Reading to increase student exposure to vocabulary and background knowledge.	08/26/2009	06/10/2011	After School	Title I	200
3	All teachers and support staff will participate in professional learning team, building curriculum, SIP day, and institute meetings focusing on the implementation of research based strategies, reading extended response, vocabulary building, and comprehension.	08/25/2009	06/10/2011	After School	Title I	0
4	All special education teachers will participate in the same collaborative professional development as general education teachers.	08/25/2009	06/10/2011	After School	Title I	0

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

In 2009, 53.8 % of students met or exceeded state standards in Reading. Our goal is that by 2010, 77% will meet or exceed and by 2011, 83% will meet or exceed standards as measured by ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will participate in two Family Reading Nights per year to increase the home/school connection in the development of literacy.	10/14/2009	02/16/2011	After School	Title I	600
2	Parents will be trained by teachers to support literacy at home using 3-2-1 and Read, Cover, Remember, and Retell strategies.	10/14/2009	02/16/2011	After School	Title I	0
3	Parents will be trained by Literacy Support Team to support literacy endeavors by volunteering in the school.	10/14/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0
4	Parents will receive the quarterly Goodwin Gator Gazette which will contain the following information; quarterly vocabulary expectations, student reading strategies, comprehension skills and activities.	11/06/2009	06/10/2011	After School	Title I	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

In 2009, 53.8 % of students met or exceeded state standards in Reading. Our goal is that by 2010, 77% will meet or exceed and by 2011, 83% will meet or exceed standards as measured by ISAT.

1. Reading Extended Response samples will be collected in December, February, and May. These will be collaboratively analyzed by administration, the professional learning team, and the literacy team.
2. Spiral assessments are completed at each grade level for core vocabulary and collaboratively analyzed by grade level professional learning team and administration. The spiral assessment is to determine if students are retaining and using vocabulary over an extended period of time.
3. School wide reading comprehension skill is assessed monthly. The cycle of teaching, assessing, reteaching, and reassessing the comprehension skills is continued throughout the year. Based on monthly assessment, students are provided intervention or enrichment through differentiated instruction and then reassessed. The SIP Data Committee is responsible for overseeing this process.
4. Students in grades 3-6 will take MAP tests in September, January, and May. Teachers will conference individually with each student to set goals and determine what the student, teacher, and parent can do to help the student reach their goal. Students scoring in the bottom 20% on the MAP Test will be progress monitored using ISEL.
5. Students in grades K-2 will be assessed using ISEL in September, January, and May. Students scoring in the lower 20% will receive interventions and be progress monitored.
5. Students in Grade 1 receiving Tier 2 interventions will be progress monitored using ISEL and assessments from the Core reading program.

	Name	Title
1	Mary Catherine Wygonik	Principal
2	Colleen Arriola	Assistant Principal
3	Lonna Haley Hancock	LST, SIP Data Committee
4	Fran Rajske-Dzurayak	LST, SIP Data Committee
5	Jami McCallum	2nd grade Teacher, SIP Data Committee

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives**Objective 2**

In 2009 73.2 percent of students met or exceeded standards in math. Our goal is that by 2010, 78% will meet or exceed and by 2011 83% of students will meet or exceed state standards as measured by ISAT.

Objective 2 Description

Students are currently meeting the minimum state standards in math, but because continual improvement is important Goodwin has included a math objective in our plan.

1. Establish a Math Lead team to provide support and professional development to staff and students.
2. Students will further develop math extended response skills by revising their answers to make them the best that they can be.
3. Each grade has a grade level review focus and an instructional focus, for example second grade's review focus is addition and their instructional focus is subtraction. The goal is that each student leaves second grade with a strong understanding of these two concepts and is able to utilize these skills in many situations.
4. Students will receive instruction and enrichment at their level through differentiation.

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. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

In 2009 73.2 percent of students met or exceeded standards in math. Our goal is that by 2010, 78% will meet or exceed and by 2011 83% of students will meet or exceed state standards as measured by ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All students in K-6 will complete a math extended response problem once a week according to appropriate grade level expectations. Students will spend time correcting and revising their extended response to better understand the process.	09/08/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0
2	All students in grades K-6 will be assessed monthly on grade level focus as determined by the district pacing guide.	09/08/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0
3	All students in K-6 will receive instruction and practice on the grade level instructional focus. The grade level instructional foci are as follows: K-number sense, 1-addition, 2-subtraction, 3-multiplication, 4-division, 5-fractions, and 6-decimals	09/08/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0
4	Students in K-6 will participate in on going differentiated instruction for their grade level review focus. The grade level review foci are as follows: 1-number sense, 2-addition, 3-subtraction, 4-multiplication, 5-division, and 6-fractions	09/11/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	0

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

In 2009 73.2 percent of students met or exceeded standards in math. Our goal is that by 2010, 78% will meet or exceed and by 2011 83% of students will meet or exceed state standards as measured by ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
	All teachers will participate in Professional Learning Team meetings,					

1	building curriculum meetings and SIP days to focus on implementation of research based math strategies, extended response, and differentiated math centers.	08/26/2009	06/10/2011	After School	Title I	0
2	Math Lead Team will provide differentiated support through modeling, workshops, and classroom visits to help teachers with specific needs or requests.	10/07/2009	06/10/2011	After School	Title I	500
3	Teachers will participate in Using Math Manipulatives Workshop from U of I.	12/09/2009	12/09/2009	After School	Title I	300
4	All special education teachers will participate in the same collaborative professional development as general education teachers.	08/25/2009	06/10/2011	After School	Title I	0

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

In 2009 73.2 percent of students met or exceeded standards in math. Our goal is that by 2010, 78% will meet or exceed and by 2011 83% of students will meet or exceed state standards as measured by ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will participate in Family Math Night to strengthen the home/school connection in math.	12/09/2009	12/08/2010	After School	Title I	600
2	Parents will read monthly newsletter to learn activities that can be completed at home to support the grade level instructional and review foci.	11/06/2009	06/10/2011	After School	Title I	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

In 2009 73.2 percent of students met or exceeded standards in math. Our goal is that by 2010, 78% will meet or exceed and by 2011 83% of students will meet or exceed state standards as measured by ISAT.

1. Grade level focus is assessed monthly and collaboratively analyzed at Professional Learning Team meetings by the grade level and administration team. The cycle of teaching, assessing, reteaching, and reassessing the skill is continued throughout the year. Based on monthly assessments, students are provided intervention or enrichment through differentiated instruction and then reassessed. The SIP data committee is responsible for overseeing the process.
2. Grade level review focus is assessed weekly and students are provided intervention or enrichment through differentiated instruction and then reassessed.
3. Students in grades 3-6 will take the MAP test in September, January, and May. Teachers will conference individually with each student to set goals and determine what the student, teacher, and parents can do to help each student achieve their goal.

	Name	Title
1	Mary Catherine Wygonik	Principal
2	Colleen Arriola	Assistant Principal
3	Lonna Haley Hancock	LST, SIP Data Committee
4	Fran Rajski-Dzuryak	LST, SIP Data Committee
5	Jami McCallum	Second Grade Teacher, SIP Data Committee
6	Veronica Zamora	Third Grade Teacher, Math Lead Team

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.

Through monthly meetings the SIP committee and faculty has collaboratively analyzed ISAT results and local assessments to identify the needs of our students and develop SIP objectives. Once objectives were developed the activities, professional development, and parent involvement pieces of the action plan were developed to support our objectives.

	Name	Title
1	Mary Catherine Wygonik	Principal
2	Colleen Arriola	Assistant Principal
3	Milagros Castejon	Fifth Grade Transitional-Spanish Teacher
4	Julie Mensik	Fourth Grade Cross Cat Teacher
5	Lonna Haley Hancock	LST
6	Jose Posada	Third Grade Transitional Spanish Teacher
7	Fran Rajski-Dzuryak	LST
8	Alexa Galvan	Second Grade Bilingual Teacher
9	Jamie McCallum	Secind Grade English Teacher
10	Rosetta Lombardi	Art Teacher
11	Chrissy Seilheimer	Fourth Grade English Teacher
12	Elsa Barrios	Director of Math, Science, PE, and Health

13 Luis Borjas

Parent

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.

Composition of the Peer Review Team

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

Responsibilities of the Peer Review Team

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

Timetable for the Peer Review Process

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

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

Meaningful Insights from the Peer Review Team

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

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

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

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

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

The BIG Picture of School Improvement Planning

District Level

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

Director of School Improvement

Director of Title One/Reading/Language Arts

Director of Language Minority Services

Director of Science and Math

Director of Social Studies

Director of Technology

Assistant Superintendents

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

Building Level

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

Administrator:

*Provides leadership in facilitating the school improvement planning process and implementation of the plan

*Facilitates a process on on-going evaluation and refinement toward achieving the goals

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

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

Classroom Teachers

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

Community Level

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

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

Part D. Teacher Mentoring Process

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

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

The goals are 1) to establish a collaborative team of mentors responsible for providing assistance to, support for, and collegiality with new teachers; 2) to provide new teachers with meaningful opportunities to improve teaching performance by upgrading skills and knowledge in implementing research-based effective instructional practices; 3) to familiarize new teachers with the philosophy and expectations of the district and the local community; 4) to retain quality teachers within the district; 5) to integrate technology into the communication process; and 6) to satisfy Illinois mandated requirements for teacher induction, certification and professional development.

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

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

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

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

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

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

Part E. District Responsibilities

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Assisting schools in development of SIPs, reviewing and analyzing all facets of school operation
- Providing support and training in data collection and analysis
- Providing professional development opportunities designed for activities specifically in SIPs
- Providing support in alignment of curriculum with ILS/Benchmarks/Performance Descriptors

- Facilitating collaboration of parents and community members in the design, implementation and monitoring of SIPs
- Facilitating the collaboration of and provide models for development of district and school policy on parental involvement.
- Facilitating the collaboration of and provide models for the development of school-parent compacts
- Providing training required of districts and schools in developing state approved mentoring and induction programs
- Providing Administrator Academies to support building level adm.
- Using SIP, identify personnel concerns and provide models for identifying outstanding school personnel.
- Developing written reports that analyze the organization and implementation of the school's improvement plan.
- Providing support teams to schools undergoing Restructuring or Corrective Action, Supplemental Educational Services and Choice

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

	Name	Title
1		

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

OTHER DATA

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

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

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

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

PEER REVIEW

Yes No

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

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS

Yes No

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

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No

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

Yes No N/A

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

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No

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

SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM

Yes No N/A

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

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD

Yes No

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

PART II - COMMENTS