

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

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	140160990022008		
District Name:	Cicero SD 99	School Name:	T Roosevelt Elem School
Superintendent:	Donna Adamic	Principal:	Claudia Jimenez
District Address:	5110 W 24th St	School Address:	1500 S 50th Ave
City/State/Zip:	Cicero,IL 60804 2948	City/State/Zip:	Cicero,IL 60804 1544
District Telephone#:	Label 7088634856 Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	7086527833 Extn: 224
District Email:	dadamic@cicd99.edu	School Email:	cjimenez@cicd99.edu
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	Restructuring Implementation
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2009-10 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status Year 6

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		70.0			70.0			90.0		78.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	47.2		No	77.1		Yes	96.7	Yes		
White														
Black														
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	47.3	53.9	No	78.0		Yes	96.8			
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American													
Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	40.0	47.9	No	73.4		Yes	97.0		
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	30.1	37.5	No	55.4	66.5	No	95.8		
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	47.5	53.5	No	77.0		Yes	96.7		

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress

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

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

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

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

DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

School Information								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	95.0	95.7	95.8	95.7	95.4	95.7	96.1	96.7
Truancy Rate (%)	0.7	0.1	5.0	8.1	2.9	2.3	7.6	2.1
Mobility Rate (%)	27.7	24.1	54.1	37.5	37.7	21.0	16.4	13.5
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	1,041	1,034	851	776	762	679	736	699
Low Income (%)	93.7	90.4	95.2	95.2	93.6	93.5	95.5	96.7
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	66.1	67.1	87.3	52.2	62.9	63.3	51.0	66.7
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	3.5	2.5	2.9	2.4	2.1	2.4	2.2	1.6
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	1.1	1.1	2.1	2.6	3.5	2.7	3.5	3.6
Hispanic (%)	95.5	96.4	94.6	95.0	94.1	94.7	94.0	94.1
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	-	0.2	-	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	0.1	-	0.1	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	0.1	0.6

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 4 - Student Race/Ethnicity

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	2000	4.2	0.9	94.8	-	0.1	-
	2001	3.4	1.3	95.3	-	-	-
	2002	3.5	1.1	95.5	-	-	-
	2003	2.5	1.1	96.4	-	-	-
	2004	2.9	2.1	94.6	0.2	0.1	-
	2005	2.4	2.6	95.0	-	-	-
	2006	2.1	3.5	94.1	0.1	0.1	-
	2007	2.4	2.7	94.7	0.1	-	0.1
	2008	2.2	3.5	94.0	0.1	-	0.1
	2009	1.6	3.6	94.1	0.1	-	0.6
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	61.0	74.2	100.0	95.0	32.0	-	-	-	-
	2001	70.2	82.7	96.3	94.7	10.7	8	0.8	-	-
	2002	66.1	93.7	100.0	95.0	27.7	7	0.7	-	-
	2003	67.1	90.4	100.0	95.7	24.1	1	0.1	-	-
	2004	87.3	95.2	100.0	95.8	54.1	43	5.0	-	-
	2005	52.2	95.2	80.0	95.7	37.5	63	8.1	-	-
	2006	62.9	93.6	100.0	95.4	37.7	22	2.9	-	-
	2007	63.3	93.5	99.3	95.7	21.0	16	2.3	-	-
	2008	51.0	95.5	99.5	96.1	16.4	55	7.6	-	-
	2009	66.7	96.7	99.0	96.7	13.5	15	2.1	-	-
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	985	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,029	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	1,041	137	146	166	-	-	-
	2003	1,034	163	158	151	-	-	-
	2004	851	126	244	226	-	-	-
	2005	776	106	233	233	-	-	-
	2006	762	86	226	229	-	-	-
	2007	679	89	193	207	-	-	-
	2008	736	135	181	195	-	-	-
	2009	699	115	231	167	-	-	-
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	37.3	20.8	43.2	62.3	44.5	36.8	-	-	37.7	49.3	42.8	48.0	37.1	32.2	42.6	30.3	39.5	39.8
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	38.6	21.7	45.0	59.6	42.6	36.4	-	-	39.4	51.7	43.1	47.7	41.4	37.5	45.4	30.3	39.1	40.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	37.8	26.9	-	-	-	-	30.8	43.9	-	-	-	-	32.9	30.6
Students with Disabilities	-	10.0	-	-	60.0	-	-	-	7.7	18.2	6.9	29.6	-	10.7	12.5	9.5	5.3	26.5
Low Income	34.8	16.7	39.5	62.8	43.5	37.3	-	-	36.3	49.2	43.1	47.4	36.5	35.1	43.1	27.9	39.0	39.7

	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	-	-	38.9	47.5	60.7	52.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	39.3	50.4	61.1	54.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	29.9	46.7	58.4	46.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	34.3	30.4	48.4	10.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	37.9	47.5	60.8	53.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	48.0	37.6	70.5	95.5	75.2	89.6	-	-	73.8	74.6	78.0	76.8	53.1	35.6	52.6	66.7	66.7	78.4
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	48.9	36.9	70.0	95.3	74.4	89.1	-	-	75.7	77.6	79.7	77.1	55.8	38.9	57.6	69.6	67.4	80.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	71.2	85.9	-	-	-	-	76.6	71.5	-	-	-	-	63.5	77.5
Students with Disabilities	-	30.0	-	-	50.0	-	-	-	60.0	45.5	55.2	66.7	-	21.4	16.7	38.1	42.1	50.0
Low Income	46.6	35.8	68.4	95.4	74.1	89.1	-	-	73.4	73.0	78.7	76.2	54.1	37.7	53.1	65.6	66.9	78.3

	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	-	-	58.7	72.6	79.6	67.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	61.3	76.3	80.4	69.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	54.6	78.7	81.2	64.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	48.6	39.1	78.2	31.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	57.8	72.2	80.0	68.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

Overall, we have 47.2% of our students meeting and exceeding standards in reading. The percentage of students meeting and exceeding standards within the different subgroups is consistent with the overall percentage of students that met and exceeded standards. Consequently, none of the subgroups of students are making AYP in reading. While this percentage has not had significant drops, we have not had any gains either. This is obviously our greatest concern. When analyzing our item analysis summary, there are some clear strengths and weaknesses. When comparing scores across the standards, there were no significant differences. However, a further analysis of the objectives did show some differences. Some of our strengths are in the area of identifying the author's purpose for third grade, characterization for fourth grade, and identifying and applying the main idea for fifth and sixth grades. However, we also found that in three different grade levels, third, fourth and sixth, there were weaknesses in making inferences. Another weakness found at all grade levels was in vocabulary development. This is quite common since a great percentage of our students have limited English proficiency.

In mathematics 77.1% of our students met or exceeded standards. However, our subgroup of students with disabilities did not meet AYP in mathematics. In 2006, there was a huge increase in mathematics scores. Since this time, scores have been consistently high. Mathematics has been our biggest strength and continues to be a strength for our students.

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

In general, Roosevelt School has a significantly higher percentage of students that have limited English proficiency (66.7%) when compared to the district (55.5%) and the state (8.0%). The same holds true with the percentage of students that are low income. At Roosevelt, 96.7% of our students are low-income, when compared to 84.7% for the district and 42.9% in the state. While these factors do not prevent students from learning, they are added obstacles that our staff needs to overcome in providing effective instruction to our students. Due to their backgrounds, many of our students come to school with limited background knowledge, which is an important factor for academic achievement. This is an additional challenge for teachers and students. In addition to these factors, we are also finding that there are some internal factors impacting the reading achievement of our students. For instance, despite the research-based practices that teachers have been exposed to through professional development, we still find that there are some practices occurring that may be antiquated. Some teachers may have limited knowledge/practice in research-based reading, mathematics and writing strategies and thus, feel averse to implementing evidence-based practices that they have been exposed to through professional development. There may also be a lack of knowledge as to how to integrate the curriculum across subject areas.

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

As a school, we will continue to implement the mathematics activities from previous action plans because they have proven to be successful in raising student achievement in the area of mathematics. More specifically, teachers will make anchor charts as they teach new concepts in mathematics. Students use the information on the anchor charts to make their own notes and include in their math toolkits. These two activities are especially beneficial for students with disabilities because they are visuals. This allows students to process the information both orally and visually. Many times, students are also actively involved in the creation of anchor charts. Additionally, Kagan cooperative learning structures will also help students with disabilities process the information being learned by increasing their level of engagement in all lessons.

As for reading, it will be necessary to determine which strategies have been successful. Another consideration may be to limit the number of comprehension strategies being used to only a few key strategies. Therefore, teachers will be able to implement these strategies with a greater level of integrity. Last year, our students began using reading response journals, which was very successful. This year, we would like to continue using reading response journals. However, we would like to have teachers focus on using specific reading strategies, and using stems that align with those reading strategies. These strategies will be outlined further in our action plan. Because such a large percentage of our students have limited English proficiency, it will be imperative that we provide them with an appropriate level of support and assistance from our ESL teachers. ESL teachers have looked at student ACCESS scores within the different language domains, and will provide services to students based on their level of proficiency within each domain (speaking, writing, reading and listening).

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?

Reading

Since we wanted to gain insight on literacy development for students in Transitional and General Education classrooms, the local assessment data that were used in this plan were taken from MacMillan Reading Assessment results. We also used the MAP Reading Results to further gauge reading development for students in General Education classrooms, since the test is administered only in English.

The MacMillan Reading Assessment results for Transitional classrooms are as follows:

3rd Grade

At or ^ 70%
79%

4th Grade

At or ^ 70%
60%

5th Grade

At or ^ 70%
N/A

6th Grade

At or ^ 70%
62%

The results for the MAP Reading Assessments were as follows:

* MAP Reading assessment was not available for 3rd Grade students.

4th Grade:

At or ^ Grade Level	-1 Grade Level	-2 > Grade Level
19%	32%	49%

5th Grade

At or ^ Grade Level	-1 Grade Level	-2 > Grade Level
46%	17%	37%

6th Grade

At or ^ Grade Level	-1 Grade Level	-2 > Grade Level
41%	20%	39%

4th Grade CC:

At or ^ Grade Level	-1 Grade Level	-2 > Grade Level
0%	0%	100%

5th Grade CC:

At or ^ Grade Level	-1 Grade Level	-2 > Grade Level
0%	0%	100%

6th Grade CC:

At or ^ Grade Level	-1 Grade Level	-2 > Grade Level
0%	0%	100%

What do these data tell you?

The data indicates that 35% of students in General Education classrooms (Grades 4-6) are reading at or above grade level; 23% of the students are reading one grade level below grade level; 42% of students are reading at least 2 or more grade levels below grade level. In regards to students in cross categorical classrooms (4-6), 100% of the students are reading at least 2 or more grade levels below grade level.

What areas of weakness are indicated by these data?

The data seem to provide contradictory results. For instance, according to MacMillan results, more than half of the student population is reading at or above grade level in grades 3-6. On the other hand, according to the MAP assessment, only 35% are reading at or above grade level. This can be attributed to the distinct nature of each of the assessments that were used to assess literacy development in both languages of instruction. It should be noted that a further analysis of MAP data shows that overall, student weaknesses are in the area of reading strategies and word analysis, which is consistent with our ISAT results in reading.

Mathematics

We give the Scott Foresman Diagnostic Math Assessment to all students. These data reveal an overall decline in mathematics scores from Spring of 2008 to Spring of 2009.

The students also are given an individualized test on the computer, the MAP (Measures of Academic Progress).

The MAP tests show that across all grade levels students score lowest in standard 6: Number Sense.

The MAP tests also show that across all grade levels students perform best in standard 8: Geometry.

According to Spring 2009 scores, 57% of fourth grade students, 48% of fifth grade students and 35% of sixth grade students were at or above grade level on the mathematics portion

of the MAP assessment. As the students go higher in grade level, their performance seems to decrease. This trend has also been found on their performance on the ISAT.

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

Reading

External factors that can contribute to these results can be related to student demographics such as low socio-economic status and limited literacy development prior to students entering kindergarten.

Internal factors that can contribute to these results are as follows: an absence of an assessment tool that can gauge a students' literacy development in both languages of instruction at any given point in time, limited literacy development training that is consistent across grade-levels and across the school-district, and an absence of a large selection of student materials correlated to students' stage of literacy development in both Spanish and English.

Mathematics

Factor contributing to low test scores include the MAP was a new test students and teachers were unfamiliar, transitional classes are taught mathematics in Spanish and had to take the test in English with Spanish audio and students were inundated with multiple end of the year tests/assessments.

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

Reading

First of all, a common assessment tool for both General Ed. and Transitional classrooms must be in place in order to gauge students' present stage of literacy development in both languages of instruction in order to allow for a point of comparison within and across the grade levels. Next, a common language of literacy pedagogy needs to be established among educators through professional development in order for this language to

transfer over to the student body consistently from one grade to the next. As a school, we will need to ensure that a literacy continuum is followed and often referred to when analyzing data in order to further improve instruction. Lastly, students must be frequently monitored through informal and formal assessments to ensure adequate literacy development.

Mathematics

Each grade level analyzed their own individualized student math data and decided on a grade level weakness in math. Then they developed a S.M.A.R.T. (Specific Measurable Attainable Realistic and Timely) Goal which is used to improve the math deficiency.

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?*

Attributes

Roosevelt School is a fifty-year-old facility that sits on a city lot in a densely populated neighborhood. The school, located on a busy street, shares its town block with small neighborhood businesses, two churches, and multiple family dwellings.

Roosevelt School is a Kagan Cooperative Learning School. This designation identifies the school as committed to a cooperative learning based curriculum built on the philosophy and research of Dr. Spencer Kagan. The four principles characteristic of all Kagan cooperative learning structures are: (1) positive interdependence, (2) individual accountability, (3) equal participation, and (4) simultaneous interaction. As stated earlier, a large percentage of our students (66.7%) have limited English proficiency, and the structures are a perfect fit for the needs of our students in language development. Additionally, the majority of our students (94.1%) are Hispanic. The Hispanic culture, which values and fosters cooperation and respect, is honored in this cooperative learning program.

Roosevelt School is a neighborhood school serving a majority of Hispanic students from grades three to six, most of whom are able to walk to school. A small portion of our special education students are bused from other areas of Cicero. The school offers limited before and after school activities in which the students can participate. Liberty School is our feeder school, where the students attend kindergarten to second or third grade. Liberty school also uses Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures, which creates familiarity and a smooth transition for the students coming to Roosevelt School.

Roosevelt School has 66.7% of students with limited English proficiency. We are currently piloting a Transitional Bilingual Education Program in grades 3rd through 6th. This program is a 50% English 50% Spanish program and allows for ESL to be taught through the content area of Science. Students will remain in this program until the end of the 6th grade allowing them to receive more instruction in their native language before exiting into an English only classroom.

The strategies teachers at Roosevelt School use to teach mathematics have been quite successful for the past four years. The mathematics scores on the ISAT have been consistently high. Continual assessment of the students on the monthly math focus has been one aspect that we feels leads to our success in math. Teachers administer a monthly math assessment to determine if students have learned the intended monthly objective. After administering the monthly math assessment, teachers calculate the percentage of students that answered each question correctly. They use this data to determine areas that need to be retaught or reviewed.

Our custodial staff keeps the school property clean and safe for our students. Repairs have been made and continue to be made to enhance a welcoming environment. The gymnasium and the stage offer opportunity for extra curricular activities. In 2008, a computer lab was designed and built. This provides the students with increased exposure to various computer programs and additional research modes.

Challenges

Roosevelt School's student population is 94.1% Hispanic. The majority of these students are second language learners (66.7%) and acquisition of English as a second language presents unique challenges to the school. As previously mentioned, 96.7% of our student population comes from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, which contributes to the challenges we encounter.

There is also a language barrier between many families and the school, which limits communication with the staff. Translators are always readily available to facilitate the communication between families and school staff. Economic restraints on the family require many long hours of work for many of our parents. This places an added burden on many of our students as they accept the role of caretakers for their younger siblings. The necessity to work long hours sometimes does not allow for time to academically support their children.

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

Attributes

The use of Kagan cooperative learning structures have improved the oral language as well as the higher level thinking skills of our students. These structures have translated into the ability to speak and write complete sentences. Students have displayed positive interdependence, individual accountability, equal participation, and increased simultaneous interaction while working in the classroom. Kagan has helped the special education students who are within some regular education classrooms. Kagan cooperative learning structures function as a school wide intervention for students having academic difficulties.

As previously mentioned we have a Transitional Bilingual Education program in grades third through sixth that services our students with limited English proficiency. The goal of this program is to increase student exposure to English language instruction at earlier grades while still preserving their native language. Ultimately, students would become bilingual and biliterate. An additional asset to this program is that ESL services are delivered through the content area of Science as opposed to having a pull out program.

Challenges

Because many of our parents have limited English proficiency, it is difficult for parents to assist their children with homework. As previously mentioned, the economic constraints on the family require many long hours of work leaving little time to address the academic needs of their children. As previously mentioned, a great percentage of our students have limited English proficiency and a majority of them come from low-income households. While these factors do not prevent students from learning, our teachers do not always have the background knowledge to effectively teach this unique student population.

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

In an attempt to foster relationships with our families, Roosevelt School will hold family curriculum nights throughout the year. The family curriculum night will be designed by teachers at each grade level. The curriculum nights will embed the grade level's focus in reading and mathematics. We will also provide families with Hispanic Heritage Celebration, Music Programs, and other family events, which we hope will help build relationships with our students' families. Additionally, we hope that these events will provide a platform where teachers can also become more familiar with the unique community which they are serving.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data
Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

Data - Briefly describe data on educator qualifications and data and/or information about staff capacity and professional development opportunities related to areas of weakness and strength. What do these data and information tell you?

Educator Qualifications

Average # of years Teaching Experience: 9 years

43% of teachers have 1-5 year's experience

22% of teachers have 6-10 years experience

13% of teachers have 11-15 years experience

22% of teachers have 16+ years experience

50% of the teachers have a bachelor's degree

50% of the teachers have a master's degree or higher

37% are currently pursuing an advanced degree

Professional Development

28% of the teachers have requested to attend a workshop or conference outside of the district

*Teachers meet in grade level meetings on a weekly basis covering reading and mathematics

*Building Curriculum Meetings: Reading Response Journals, reading strategies and Math Tool Kits

*School Improvement: Reading Extended Response and Reading Response Journals

*Building Meetings: Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures

*Structure a Month Club: New teachers to Roosevelt attend monthly SAM club meetings.

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

Teachers have had opportunities for professional development, which have led to an increase in student performance over the past four years. We also have more teachers than in the past have an advanced degree. For instance, despite the research-based practices that teachers have been exposed to through professional development, we still find that there are some practices occurring that may be antiquated. Some teachers may have limited knowledge/practice in research-based reading, mathematics and writing strategies and thus, feel averse to implementing evidence-based practices that they have been exposed to through professional development. There may also be a lack of knowledge as to how to integrate the curriculum across subject areas.

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

We feel that more professional development is needed so that teachers feel equipped to differentiate the curriculum to meet the needs of all their students. Part of this professional development may be in creating some authentic assessment measures for teachers to use. We also think that it might be necessary to provide teachers with more time to practice strategies after they have been introduced to them. Teachers need time to learn a strategy and then internalize it or make it their own. Perhaps some of these issues can be discussed during their grade level meetings.

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

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

Parent Involvement Report 2008-2009

Month: Sept-June

Submitted by: Elana Mosca

Building: _____

Family / Parent Resource Library Days Open: Monday/Friday Time: 3:00-3:30 Managed by: _____

Date	Activity	Type (1- 6)	Brief Description	# of Attendees
September 24 th , 2008	Open House	2	All parents are invited to Roosevelt School to hear about the programs that are offered. They are also given the opportunity to meet their child's teacher, to hear about curriculum, homework policies, and goals for the year.	314
September 30 th , 2008	PEP classes begin	2	Parents as Educational Partners begin. Classes are then held every Tuesday and Thursday from October 2 nd -December 18 th .	72
October 3 rd , 2008	Hispanic Heritage Movie Night	5	Families were invited to Roosevelt School to kick off the Hispanic Heritage celebration with a movie, Selena.	70
October 6 th , 2008	Coffee With the Principal	2/5	Families were invited to come have coffee and pan dulce with the principal to get to know one another and to ask for volunteers.	25

**T Roosevelt Elem School
School Improvement Plan 2009**

October 15 th , 2008	Hispanic Heritage Night	5	Classrooms studied a Latin American country and displayed their projects and artifacts that show the learning they had done.	275
November 4 th , 2008	Parent Teacher Conferences	2	Parents are invited to conference with the teacher one on one to be informed of their students' progress in the classroom.	
November 14 th , 2008	Honors Assembly	3	Parents are invited to the honors assemble to celebrate students successes on perfect attendance, golden honor roll, kagan coach, and first class citizen.	28
December 10 th	Holiday Celebration	5	Students prepared holiday show for parents.	350
January 27 th , 2009	PEP classes begin	2	Parents as Educational Partners begin. Classes are then held every Tuesday and Thursday.	75
February 3 rd , 2009	Computer Classes	2	Computer classes were offered to parents at Roosevelt school to be given on Tuesdays starting on February 3 rd , 2009 and ending March 31 st , 2009	
February 6 th , 2009	Honors Assembly	3	Parents are invited to the honors assemble to celebrate students successes on perfect attendance, golden honor roll, kagan coach, and first class citizen.	28
March 30 th , 2009	Family Math and Reading Night	5	Parents were invited to Roosevelt School to appreciate reading and math together. Books were read aloud that had to do with math skills. Students had prepared games that dealt with math and reading skills. Different stations were developed for parents to read and work on math as a family.	150
April 7 th , 2009	Parent Teacher Conferences	2	Parents are invited to conference with the teacher one on one to be informed of their students' progress in the classroom.	
May 1 st , 2009	Honors Assembly	3	Parents are invited to the honors assemble to celebrate students successes on perfect attendance, golden honor roll, kagan coach, and first class citizen.	28
May 20 th , 2009	Roosevelt's Talent Show	5	Roosevelt's families are invited to see the different acts that the students put together to show off their many talents.	350
June 4 th , 2009	Honors Assembly	3	Parents are invited to the honors assemble to celebrate students successes on perfect attendance, golden honor roll, kagan coach, and first class citizen.	30

Based on the number of families that are now attending Roosevelt's events, it is evident that student performance and success is important to both the students and the parents. However, in the parent events that are directly related to student's academic success we have lower parent involvement.

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

We feel that for the parent involvement to be successful in the events that are directly related to student's academic success, the parents should be part of a contextually focused school improvement process designed to create positive relationships that support students' total development. Parents should be involved at all levels of school life through general support of school's educational programs, active participation in daily activities, and in school planning and management. We also feel that our parents face challenges based on the fact that 96.7% of families are low income. Therefore, working long hours limits their involvement. We also noticed that our parents have a fear that the community is unsafe which then limits their socialization, interaction, and involvement.

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 continue to work on parent involvement in events that are directly related to student's academic success. Based on the analysis, we are on the road to parent involvement success. Incorporating the six types of parent involvement will benefit the entire school community. Five types of Epstein's parent involvement are present at Roosevelt School. We feel that we are strong in the three types, parenting, communicating, and volunteering. We need to focus on including families in all school-related activities at home, school-home communication, and parental attitude toward school to students' academic performance, attendance, and self-esteem, and in school planning and decision making. We need to continue to collaborate with the community.

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?

Based on the data analysis from the previous sections, the following are the key factors that we feel contribute to low achievement:

Student level factors:

1. Limited literacy development
2. Limited background/prior knowledge within the different content areas

Teacher level factors:

1. Limited knowledge/practice in research-based reading and mathematics strategies.
2. Not using authentic assessment to differentiate the curriculum.
3. Lack of knowledge on how to integrate the curriculum across subject areas.
4. Limited time to apply the professional development they have received.

Parent/Community level factors:

1. 96.7% of families are low-income. Therefore, there are the challenges of economic instability.
2. Parents having to work long hours may limit their level of involvement in school.
3. There is a language barrier, which may limit parents level of involvement in school.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	All students and subgroups will increase their achievement in reading on ISAT.	1,2,3,4,6,
2	Students with disabilities will increase their achievement in mathematics on ISAT.	5,

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

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

All students and subgroups will increase their achievement in reading on ISAT.

Objective 1 Description

While our current achievement in reading is 47.2% of all students, 47.3% of Hispanic students, 47.5% of low income students, 40.0% of LEP students and 30.1% of students with disabilities meet/exceed of ISAT, all groups will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor. Because the data shows that there is little differentiation between subgroups, the strategies in the action plan will address all students and subgroups.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- ⓑ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 2. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 3. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 4. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓐ 5. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 6. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

All students and subgroups will increase their achievement in reading on ISAT.

Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
Reading Response Journals: Each student will be given a notebook that will be used as their "reading response journal". The reading response journal will be used so that students have an opportunity to respond to all different types of text. The students' reading response journals will also be used so students can demonstrate their understanding and use of different reading strategies. Teachers will model the use of a reading strategy and then model a written response to a piece of text.					

1	All responses will be based on a stem that aligns with a specific reading strategy. The reading strategies that will be focused on throughout the year are schema, questioning, inferring, summarizing, synthesizing, and evaluating. The strategies are differentiated based on grade level. As students become more familiar with a reading strategy, it will become evident in their written responses. An assessment of the students responses in their reading response journal will be completed twice a quarter with the use of a rubric.	09/01/2009	05/31/2011	During School	Title I	750
2	Word Study: Teachers will introduce ten academic and ten non-academic tier two vocabulary words per month. They will use Marzano's six-step process for teaching vocabulary. At the end of the month, students will be assessed on their knowledge of the twenty vocabulary words.	09/01/2009	05/31/2011	During School	Title I	300

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

All students and subgroups will increase their achievement in reading on ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Literacy Presentations: Teachers will receive word study support and guidance on how to implement Reading Response Journals in their instruction from Literacy Support Teachers during building curriculum meetings, early-release SIP days, and individually as needed.	08/24/2009	05/31/2011	During School	Other	0
2	Grade Level Meetings: Two grade level meetings per month will focus on literacy and word study. Literacy Support Teachers will attend these meetings to share best-practice reading strategies and activities. Literacy Support Teachers will also introduce strategies for teaching new vocabulary words and games that allow students to review vocabulary terms.	08/24/2009	05/31/2011	During School	Other	0

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

All students and subgroups will increase their achievement in reading on ISAT.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Family Curriculum Nights: Families will be invited to Family Curriculum Nights throughout the year. Each grade level will host an event where they will be able to share with parents the different skills and strategies their children are learning. Students' reading response journals will be shared with parents during Family Curriculum Nights. Parents will learn about the word study activities being used in the classroom. Teachers will also share with parents different ways that they can support their children at home.	09/01/2009	05/31/2011	After School	Title I	2,100

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

All students and subgroups will increase their achievement in reading on ISAT.

The literacy support teachers created rubrics for the Reading Response Journals. The rubrics were created based on the stages of reading development from the Illinois StateBoard of Education. Twice during every quarter (for the progress report and again at the end of the quarter), teachers are assigned to assess their students' progress with regards to the reading response journal. The rubric also includes a section for vocabulary. Therefore, the teachers can assess the use of new vocabulary words by students. The assessment rubrics will be brought to literacy-focused grade level meetings atleast once per quarter to discuss and compare the implementation of the rubric and overall student progress by grade level. These rubrics will later be placed inside of the student's SAPPI.

	Name	Title
1	Claudia Jiménez	Principal
2	Raquel Jenke	Assistant Principal
3	Claudia Renteria	Bilingual Support Teacher
4	Sandy Brosinski	Literacy Support Teacher
5	Caryn Lesniak	Literacy Support Teacher

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

Students with disabilities will increase their achievement in mathematics on ISAT.

Objective 2 Description

While our current achievement in mathematics for students with disabilities is 55.4% meeting/exceeding for ISAT, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

Parent Strategies

Family Curriculum Nights: Families will be invited to Family Curriculum Nights throughout the year. Each grade level will host an event where they will be able to share with parents the different skills and strategies their children are learning. Teachers will also share with parents different ways that they can support their children at home.

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. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 5. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ê 6. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

Students with disabilities will increase their achievement in mathematics on ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Math Toolkits: Binders will be purchased for students where they will be able to keep math strategies, tools, and math facts regarding the different standards. Students will begin these binders in fourth grade and keep the same binder through sixth grade. As their level of understanding increases within different areas of mathematics, students are able to add to the different sections of their math toolkits. These binders are used to complete assignments, as a reference tool, and to review lessons learned.	09/01/2009	05/31/2011	During School	Title I	450
2	Anchor Charts: As teachers introduce and teach new mathematical concepts, they will make anchor charts with their students. Students participate in the creation of anchor charts. Students also copy information from the anchor charts so that they can include it in their math toolkits.	09/01/2009	05/31/2011	During School	Other	0

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

Students with disabilities will increase their achievement in mathematics on ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Grade Level Meetings: Two grade level meetings per month will focus on mathematics. Teachers will attend these meetings to share best-practice mathematics strategies and activities. Teachers will periodically review anchor charts that need to be made for specific	09/01/2009	05/31/2011	During School	Other	0

<p>lessons. They will also discuss and review information that should be placed in the students' math toolkits and how the information can be differentiated for students' different ability levels.</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Students with disabilities will increase their achievement in mathematics on ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	<p>Family Curriculum Nights: Families will be invited to Family Curriculum Nights throughout the year. Each grade level will host an event where they will be able to share with parents the different skills and strategies their children are learning. Students will create centers for parents that highlight the concepts they are covering in the classroom. Teachers will show examples of various anchor charts displayed in the room. Students' math toolkits will be shared with parents during Family Curriculum Nights. Teachers will also share with parents different ways that they can support their children at home.</p>	09/01/2009	05/31/2011	After School	Title I	2,100

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Students with disabilities will increase their achievement in mathematics on ISAT.

Monthly Math Assessments: Teachers will administer a monthly math assessment to determine if students have learned the intended monthly objective. After administering the monthly math assessment, teachers will calculate the percentage of students that answered each question correctly. They will use this data to determine areas that need to be retaught or reviewed.

	Name	Title
1	Claudia Jimenez	Principal
2	Raquel Jenke	Assistant Principal

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The stakeholders: parents and community, students, teachers and administrators will provide the school with feedback dealing with the School Improvement Plan through informal interviews and formal surveys about the school, its climate, educational programs, etc. Our school is eager for parents and community to provide feedback on the school and district initiatives using existing avenues for input. Parents and community receive newsletters from the school and district which include information dealing with the implementation of the School and District Improvement Plans.

Regular updates on the newly redesigned district website: www.cicd99.edu keep interested community and educational organizations informed as to our progress. The Action Plan from each school's School Improvement Plan is posted on the district's website as well as being available in the school office in English and Spanish. Copies of our school and district report cards are sent home with students and posted on the website as well.

Our district has a large number of Hispanic families so all communication is sent home in both English and Spanish, and accommodations are made for conferences and parent meetings to have an interpreter available to assist in communication. The frequent communication with parents allows classroom teachers to relate performance targets, strategies, and school and district improvement activities to parents and families.

Parents and community members are given numerous opportunities to become involved with the school improvement process. They are invited to participate in the development, implementation and review of the plan. Understanding that our parents and community are vital to the success of the School Improvement process, we offer many opportunities for their involvement. The district's parent involvement policy is included in the Student Handbook which is being revised to be distributed to each student.

Involvement with community organizations serves as forums for discussion on educational advances in the district. Through the schools, District 99 is involved with the community through a number of contacts. We work in partnerships with the Cicero Police Department, the Cicero Youth Task Force, the Cicero Educational Task Force, the Cicero Chamber of Commerce, the Cicero Fire Department, Interfaith Leadership Program and the GEAR UP Program through a grant from Northeastern University.

Our school and district administration continuously urges parents, staff, and community members to offer suggestions in order to make sure all stakeholders are invested in our school and district.

	Name	Title
1	Claudia Jiménez	Principal
2	Raquel Jenke	Assistant Principal
3	Miguel Fernandez	6th grade transitional
4	Christian Kalonji	5th grade transitional
5	Caryn Lesniak	Literacy Support Teacher
6	Nancy Leonard	4th grade cross-cat.
7	Melissa Matlak	5th grade
8	Cheryl Miceli	5th grade cross-cat.
9	Elana Mosca	4th grade transitional
10	Claudia Renteria	Bilingual Support Teacher
11	Salud Farfan	Parent
12	Lucina Roa	Parent
13	Magali Castro	Parent
14	Melissa Arjon	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.

Cicero School District 99 SIP Peer Review

A Process of Collaboration and Support

Composition of the Peer Review Team

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

Responsibilities of the Peer Review Team

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

Peer Review Process

The 2009-2011 Peer Review was facilitated by our District's RESPRO representative and consisted of a two day session on October 27 and 28.

1/27/2010 3:18:23 PM

*Day 1 consisted of 1/2 day general overview of the SIP template and rubric review using one SIP with all teams to calibrate scores. This was followed by using the rest of the day to read plans and provide feedback specific to each of the District's schools in status. *Day 2 consisted of a 1/2 day for each team to meet with and provide their findings to that school's team. Names of the reviewers are not made known to the buildings following the procedure set by ISBE when they review plans.

The feedback that is provided by the reviewers needs to be specific to each criterion within each component and focused on details specific to the criterion within the rubric.

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

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

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

The BIG Picture of School Improvement Planning

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

Director of School Improvement

Director of Title One

Director of Special Education

Director of Language Minority Services

Director of Reading/Language Arts

Director of Science and Math

Director of Social Studies

Director of Technology and Information Services

Assistant Superintendents

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

directly with a school team.

Building Level

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

- Administrator
- Provides leadership in facilitating the school improvement planning process and implementation of the plan
- Facilitate a process on ongoing evaluation and refinement toward achieving the goals
- SIP Team (administrator, teacher, parents, community members)
- Engage in data driven decision making
- Share in the writing of the school improvement plan
- Provide a vital communication link to the stakeholders
- Share in the review and improvement of the school improvement plan
- Classroom teachers
- Collect necessary data to develop and monitor progress towards goals and activities

- Provides leadership in facilitating the school improvement planning process and implementation of the plan
- Facilitate a process on ongoing evaluation and refinement toward achieving the goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

Instruction for English Language Learners provided by School District 99 as a condition of their selection.

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

Section IV-A Local Board Action

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

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

OTHER DATA

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yes No N/A

Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?

Yes No

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

MONITORING

Yes No

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

Yes No

Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers? [C]

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

Yes No N/A

Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only) [C]

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

PEER REVIEW

Yes No

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

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS

Yes No

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

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No

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

Yes No N/A

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

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No

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

SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM

Yes No N/A

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

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD

Yes No

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

PART II - COMMENTS