

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)?	Yes	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	Yes	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2009-10 State Improvement Status	

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	74.1		Yes	81.5		Yes	95.0	Yes		
White														
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION

The Differentiated Accountability classification for the school is:	-
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in reading?	-
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in math?	-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

School Information								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	94.5	95.4	94.9	94.3	94.0	94.2	92.5	95.0
Truancy Rate (%)	-	-	-	0.8	2.2	4.6	16.8	1.8
Mobility Rate (%)	35.9	35.6	44.0	57.5	46.4	33.8	25.1	15.7
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	365	350	349	361	389	305	340	347
Low Income (%)	58.1	61.1	56.2	47.9	37.5	57.7	60.9	71.2
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	52.1	48.0	54.7	44.6	39.6	43.6	47.9	54.2
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	5.8	5.7	6.3	4.4	2.1	3.0	2.9	3.2
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.8	1.4	1.1	-	1.8	0.7	0.3	0.9
Hispanic (%)	92.9	92.6	92.3	95.0	95.6	96.1	96.8	96.0
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.5	-	-	-
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	-

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	9.5	-	89.3	1.2	-	-
	2001	7.5	1.1	90.4	1.1	-	-
	2002	5.8	0.8	92.9	0.5	-	-
	2003	5.7	1.4	92.6	0.3	-	-
	2004	6.3	1.1	92.3	0.3	-	-
	2005	4.4	-	95.0	0.6	-	-
	2006	2.1	1.8	95.6	0.5	-	-
	2007	3.0	0.7	96.1	-	-	0.3
	2008	2.9	0.3	96.8	-	-	-
	2009	3.2	0.9	96.0	-	-	-
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	66.8	56.9	100.0	94.6	46.2	-	-	-	-
	2001	63.5	56.0	100.0	93.9	90.3	-	-	-	-
	2002	52.1	58.1	100.0	94.5	35.9	-	-	-	-
	2003	48.0	61.1	100.0	95.4	35.6	-	-	-	-
	2004	54.7	56.2	96.2	94.9	44.0	-	-	-	-
	2005	44.6	47.9	100.0	94.3	57.5	2	0.8	-	-
	2006	39.6	37.5	99.9	94.0	46.4	6	2.2	-	-
	2007	43.6	57.7	100.0	94.2	33.8	12	4.6	-	-
	2008	47.9	60.9	100.0	92.5	25.1	44	16.8	-	-
	2009	54.2	71.2	100.0	95.0	15.7	5	1.8	-	-
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	346	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	375	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	365	29	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	350	34	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	349	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	361	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	389	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2007	305	22	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	340	24	-	-	-	-	-
	2009	347	25	-	-	-	-	-
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	-	-	-	60.7	70.4	74.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	68.0	72.0	73.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	54.1	68.0	68.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	-	85.7	81.5	81.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	92.0	84.0	80.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	83.3	80.0	77.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

Sherlock School has 74.1 % of its students who have met AYP in reading. The areas of weakness were within vocabulary development and literary elements. Two overall areas of strength were reading strategies and comprehension.

Sherlock School has 81.5% of its students who have met AYP in math. The areas of weakness were within number sense, algebra, and data analysis. The areas of strength were probability, measurement, computation and geometry.

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

The weaknesses stated above in reading require higher level thinking and a working knowledge of affixes in isolation. Sherlock School has 54.2% LEP and 71.2% low income students. Many other unidentified students also have a home language other than English. These factors can influence higher level skills such as inference and vocabulary development. The amount of working vocabulary can vary greatly depending on the background knowledge of a 5 or 6 year old entering school. The strengths in reading strategies and comprehension have been attributed to Sherlock School's involvement with Reading First for three years. Concentration has centered on the 5 areas of balanced literacy which are phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary. Data from continuous progress monitoring was used to make decisions in instruction and intervention.

The weaknesses stated above in math require higher level thinking and the use of vocabulary in a variety of settings. Sherlock School has 54.2% LEP and 71.2% low income students. Many other unidentified students also have a home language other than English. These factors can influence higher level skills such as inference and vocabulary development in math too. The strengths in the math areas of probability, measurement, computation and geometry have been attributed to making them areas of concentration for improvement. Prior data was used to make decisions in the core curriculum, give a local math assessment 3 times a year, and use local item analysis to drive instruction.

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

Sherlock School will consider the contributing factors above in the next steps of school improvement. Instruction will continue to focus on the foundation of early reading instruction; phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension and fluency. This focused instruction will be part of a balanced approach to literacy that will further develop the vocabulary and higher level thinking abilities of our students needed to increase students' language and literacy proficiencies.

Math instruction will continue to focus on the areas of need identified in assessment results and build upon gains made due to prior results and areas of concentration. The core curriculum will be strengthened by identification and use of strategies and activities directly related to higher level skills as well as interventions for students at risk in math.

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data

Data - Briefly describe the relevant local assessment data used in this plan. What do these data tell you? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are apparent?

The 3rd grade students at Sherlock School completed the MAP (Measure of Academic Progress) assessment. MAP contains diagnostic, computerized adaptive assessments in reading and mathematics, specifically tailored to the needs of early learners. It is used to identify strengths and weaknesses of third grade students based on Illinois Learning Standards and Goals which enables teachers to individualize instruction according to these strengths and weaknesses. A RIT score is a unit that measures achievement. There is a normed RIT range for each grade level. The RIT norm for third grade students at the beginning of the year is 192. The average RIT score for the third grade students at Sherlock in Reading is 189.0 which is below the norm range of 192 – 199. Fifty percent of the students had RIT scores below grade level in Word Analysis and Vocabulary. Fifty-four percent scored below grade level in Comprehension and Reading Strategies.

All K-2 students at Sherlock School are assessed using designated snapshots of the ISEL (Illinois Snapshots of Early Literacy) and ISEL-S (Illinois Snapshot of Early Literacy-Spanish) assessment. The following are the snapshots for each grade level at the appropriate time of the year. Kindergarten snapshots include alphabet recognition, story listening, phonemic awareness, one-to-one matching, letter sounds, developmental spelling, word recognition, vocabulary, and passage reading which includes oral accuracy, comprehension and prosody. First grade snapshots include letter sounds, developmental spelling, word recognition, and passage reading which includes oral accuracy, comprehension and prosody. Second grade snapshots include, developmental spelling, word recognition, and passage reading which includes oral accuracy, comprehension and prosody. Scores are reported by percentiles (the 5th percentile being the lowest going up to the 100th percentile) the 50th percentile

represents the average raw score for students in the norming population. Students in the 20th percentile and below are determined to be at risk for making literacy progress.

Forty-nine percent of the 2nd grade students scored at the 'high' risk level in the *Comprehension* snapshot of this assessment. Sixty-six percent scored at the 'low risk' level in *Reading Accuracy*. Seventy-eight percent of the kindergarten students scored in the 'high' or 'some' risk range of the *Letter Sound* knowledge snapshot. While fifty-one percent of the first grade students scored in the 'high' or 'some' risk range of the *Letter Sound* knowledge snapshot.

Sherlock students in grades K-3 are assessed in math three times a year. The local assessments are taken from the Scott Foresman Math Program that is the series used in the core curriculum. A pre-test is used to determine the level of math knowledge a student has at the beginning of the year (BOY). A mid-year assessment (MOY) is used to monitor student progress after the first semester of math instruction. A final test at the end of the year (EOY) is used to determine student achievement for the year in math. The BOY and MOY math data are used formatively to drive instruction and plan intervention. The EOY data is summative and used for cross-grade level articulation and program evaluation.

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

Limited literacy levels in the home and the level of development at which students begin school affect learning. These are major factors that contribute to the amount of time needed to meet academic goals once children enter school. The weaknesses stated above may also be due to the change in the local assessment tools.

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

The conclusions that can be drawn from local assessment results are as follows: Instruction focusing on the foundations of early reading skills: phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency with a strong concentration on vocabulary and comprehension will continue to build the students' literacy skills. Ongoing progress monitoring will pinpoint specific strengths and weaknesses needed for reading intervention.

In math, the next steps in improvement planning will be determined by data and item analysis. The core program in math will be evaluated to meet the needs of students' strengths and weaknesses. The district framework and pacing guide will be adhered to for a scope and sequence of instruction that will further improve mathematical and analytical skills.

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?

Sherlock School is located in the Morton Park section of Cicero, Illinois. In District 99 terms it is considered a "small" school among the 16 that comprise the entire group of Cicero Elementary Schools. Sherlock is one of three schools that house less than 400 students and the remaining schools house between 500-2700 students each.

Sherlock is a "home school" that is walking distance for most students who attend. It houses approximately 337 students from Pre-kindergarten through 3rd grade. There are 2 sessions of pre-kindergarten, 4 sessions of kindergarten, 4 first grades, four second grades and 1 third grade.

Cicero is an "urban suburb" on the western border of Chicago with a current estimated population of over 83,000 within a radius of 6 square miles. It has ranked in the top ten U.S. cities with the most residents per square mile. Cicero has traditionally been a town with a large immigrant population and its current status is no exception. The current immigrant/ethnic population is Hispanic, largely from Mexico.

The low-income rate at Sherlock is 71.2% therefore qualifying for school-wide Title 1 services. Title 1 schools are required by law to report student achievement to the public. Sherlock fulfills this requirement by participating in Grade 3 state testing in ISAT. Low income status poses challenges to student achievement that include a lack of basic academic skills, planning skills, and learning goals.

Location and size are attributes for Sherlock School and its plan for improvement. Unity Junior High is just a few blocks away and provides the opportunity for partnerships with student groups and teachers to volunteer in our classrooms. Our families can also take advantage of special events and opportunities that take place there. Sherlock's small size provides a safe environment for primary students and a close-knit school community. The location of Sherlock provides a geographical "cushion" for students to attend a school close to home since we are between Wilson, a K-6 building to the west and Cicero West, a K-3 building to the east.

Class size at Sherlock fluctuates. Currently classroom sizes range from 12-30 students. Smaller class size and increased individual attention are beneficial especially for primary students. Class size is a variable that can not be controlled in District 99. Cicero Schools have experienced overcrowded conditions for many years although Cicero's population

has become increasingly stable which is a trend that is expected to continue.

The organization of kindergarten classes each year can be challenging. There is a system of pre-registration in the spring before each new kindergarten year begins. The process is also helpful in determining how many students will need language minority or special education services. The Pre-Kindergarten Program has increased over the past few years although it is not yet large enough to accommodate all those who could benefit from it.

The Hispanic population of Sherlock School is 96%. When students enroll, their initial placement is based on the results of a home language survey. The placement is later confirmed or adjusted according to the results of the WAPT ACCESS Screener. Currently 54.2% of Sherlock students are in full-time bilingual classes or receive ESL services as a result of this data analysis. It is a constant challenge to meet the dual academic needs of students to read at grade level in their native language, take the state test in English and eventually transition into a fulltime English classroom. The ACCESS test is administered to all LMS student and their progress in English is reported to the state and used for academic placement.

The teaching staff at Sherlock School is highly qualified. District-wide professional growth and development can be challenging for such a large group therefore, district opportunities are driven by the District Improvement Plan and individual schools use their School Improvement Plans as a guide. New teachers are provided with a 2-week orientation in August of every year before school starts. They are given an overview of the district, their individual school, the community and of course, the curriculum. Whether teachers are new to the profession or the district, this is an invaluable introduction to Cicero Public Schools and district expectations. All teachers then continue to develop professionally according to school and district improvement plan objectives. Sherlock School students benefit from a scientifically research-based curriculum that is delivered by highly qualified teachers.

Sherlock has physical plant attributes such as a gym, media center, and offices for ancillary staff. The gym and media center allow for a variety of student programs, an after-school program, parent workshops, family events, and some district professional development. Although physical plant constraints are improving throughout the district, Sherlock is one of the many older schools in the district with limited accessibility and infrastructure that is repaired, maintained and updated on a rotating basis according to need and budgetary allowances.

Finally, as one of Cicero District 99 Elementary Schools, Sherlock depends heavily on state and federal funding. Local funding only supports a small portion of total operating costs. This is an attribute when funding gives us the opportunity to support initiatives and more than a challenge when funds are cut and programs are dropped. We are a school, district, and community dedicated to the balance of our “variables” which change throughout the year and every year. Flexibility, tenacity, and creativity drive us toward one goal and that is to provide a quality education for our students based on their individual needs.

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

Student performance is enhanced at Sherlock School due to factors mentioned such as being a small, home school, having highly qualified teachers with solid professional development, a core curriculum based on data analysis and the goals of the school improvement plan, and a physical plant that can be used for parental involvement and additional student activities. Challenges to student performance may be caused by a high percentage of low-income and English language learners. Students may have limited access and therefore, exposure, to print, pre-literacy experiences, materials, and technology outside of school. As a result, many students may begin their school career significantly lacking necessary pre-literacy and early numerical skills. English language learners may be in early or middle stages of language acquisition in their second language. This affects their ability to read, write, and process English and significantly affects their ability to demonstrate academic progress on state and local assessments administered in their second language, English.

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

Factors outside of the school are not within our control. Within the school both students and staff work diligently to meet various challenges and promote and improve upon our attributes. On a school-wide level, we provide positive student motivation to become excellent readers and excel in math. Sherlock strives to expand support of students and parents of non-English backgrounds through various bilingual/ESL learning experiences and programs. This is accomplished by providing family and parent programs, workshops, the family library, and maintaining an open door policy for Sherlock parents.

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?*

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

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

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

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

Sherlock School has many involved parents. This is an attribute for our school due to the fact that parental involvement has been cited as a need in more than one study conducted in Cicero. Many parents cite education as an important goal for their children. The formal education of many parents is low, sometimes less than a high school degree. Parental involvement therefore, provides parents with the opportunity to acquire skills necessary to help their children be successful in school.

Parent workshops are offered at Sherlock School and other locations in Cicero which are planned by the Cicero Parent Liaison Group as well as a Parent University held at Unity Junior High School. The objectives of these opportunities are to teach parents about child development, appropriate activities for children, as well as other topics and agencies that may assist them in providing a safe and healthy learning environment for their children.

Sherlock School has an established Family Resource Library that is open after school hours and is run by Title 1 staff and parents. Students and their families can check out books, games, puzzles, and parent resources in the language and level that is most useful to them. The family library is well-attended and parents report satisfaction in the assistance they receive in selecting materials.

Opportunities for family involvement have increased according to the needs and suggestions of students and their parents. Family events are held monthly and are well-attended; Curriculum Night and Book Fair were held in September, Family Movie Night in October, Reading Night in November, Winter Saturday in December, Book and Blanket Night in January, Board Game Night in February, Family Math in March, Reading Night in April, and Curriculum Fair in May. We have added grade level parent workshops in the morning when parents bring students to school, three times a year per grade level.

Parents can take advantage of opportunities to volunteer in the classroom at Sherlock. Activities include reading to students, assisting small group activities, organizing materials, and participating in whole class activities. Time spent in the classroom exposes parents to activities that can be extended in the home. Everyone on the Sherlock staff is involved in promoting parental involvement. Activities, workshops and volunteering, also provide opportunities to communicate the objectives of the Sherlock School Improvement Plan and related Illinois State Standards.

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

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

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?

Sherlock has identified low literacy levels in the home as a factor that affects learning and the level of development at which students begin school. We can increase teacher knowledge of literacy and introduce strategies to close the low literacy gap with students and parents. ISAT results indicated weaknesses in distinguishing main ideas and supporting details in informational text. We can help students who are having a difficult time in these areas by increasing the time spent on guided reading, having books in a variety of genres, and exposing our students to reference material. ISAT results also indicated a weakness in extended math responses. We can provide professional development for our teachers in how to help their students increase their ability to solve the problems and how to write an explanation of the solution process.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Increase Student Achievement in Reading	
2	Increase Student Achievement in Math	

No deficiencies have been identified in the most recent AYP Report for your school

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Increase Student Achievement in Reading

Objective 1 Description

While our current achievement in Reading is 74.1% meeting and exceeding for ISAT, Sherlock school will make AYP of 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.

No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AYP Report.

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

Increase Student Achievement in Reading

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will develop vocabulary through Interactive Read Aloud lessons and engage independently with vocabulary activities during literacy work stations developed by teachers.	10/05/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Title I	0
2	Students will improve reading comprehension with the use of strategies from the district comprehension continuum and anchor charts. (predicting, inferring, visualizing, determining importance, questioning, synthesizing, making connections, schema)	10/05/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Title I	0
3	Students identified as at-risk through assessment will be instructed in small groups by classroom teacher, LST/ interventionist, bilingual interventionist, or team facilitator/interventionist.	08/31/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Title I	0
4	Students will read a minimum of fifteen minutes at home per day and complete a monthly reading log.	09/14/2009	05/16/2011	After School	Title I	4,500

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

Increase Student Achievement in Reading

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will align Interactive Read Alouds and independent literacy station activities with core curriculum in reading and best practices in vocabulary during Professional Learning Team Meetings.	09/15/2009	06/02/2011	During School	Title I	0
2	Teachers will use the Cicero D99 Comprehension Strategy Continuum to strengthen strategies that will improve comprehension at each grade	09/07/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Title I	0

	level.					
3	Teachers will participate in District 99 and Sherlock School professional development sessions for training in data analysis and reading intervention strategies.	08/24/2009	06/02/2011	During School	Title I	0

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

Increase Student Achievement in Reading

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will attend family reading nights to develop strategies for reading at home.	10/06/2009	05/10/2011	During School	Title I	1,800
2	Parents will attend kindergarten through third grade workshops that support vocabulary development.	10/02/2009	05/20/2011	During School	Title I	350
3	Parents will attend kindergarten through 3rd grade workshops that support reading interventions.	10/01/2009	05/26/2011	During School	Title I	350

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Increase Student Achievement in Reading

1. Weekly activities related to improvement of vocabulary and comprehension will be monitored by the classroom teacher and shared at Curriculum, SIP, and Professional Learning Team meetings. Progress will be monitored by teacher observation as well as formative and summative assessment.
2. Progress monitoring will be administered and analyzed every 4-6 weeks by an interventionist or classroom teacher. A reading intervention log will be maintained for each student receiving interventions.
3. Reading logs will be monitored and participation data will be shared as school, classroom and individually.

	Name	Title
1	Mirjana Dukic	Principal
2	Monique Abbate	Program Supervisor
3	Robin Dunda	Literacy Support Teacher

4	Marta De Miguel	Bilingual Interventionist
5	Irene Scanlon	Team Facilitator/Interventionist
6	Sherlock Staff	Teachers

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Increase Student Achievement in Math

Objective 2 Description

Sherlock School will exceed its current AYP in math of 81.5% therefore exceeding and respectively meeting state minimum requirements for 2010 AYP in Math of 77.5% and 85% in 2011. Student proficiency in math will improve in all grade levels (K-3) by implementing strategies and activities for student achievement, professional development for teachers, and involvement techniques for parents. Instruction will be data driven and strategies/activities that are developed for achievement will be aligned with national, state, and district standards.

No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AYP Report.

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

Increase Student Achievement in Math

Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
To support 3rd grade proficiency in short and extended responses in					

1	math, K-2 students will learn developmentally appropriate strategies to express math problems in writing. (in K-Think Aloud, 1st gr-Modeled/Shared Writing, 2nd gr-Guided Practice)	10/26/2009	05/06/2011	During School	Title I	0
2	Students will participate in math centers that provide activities that teach the use of manipulatives and appropriate tools to differentiate instruction in math.	09/07/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	4,560
3	Students will increase proficiency in ILS math goals and objectives (identified as weaknesses in assessment results) through specific lessons highlighted in the core curriculum (Scott Foresman, TIMS, ESL Science)and enriched with manipulatives, tools, graphic representation and vocabulary.	09/07/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	0

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

Increase Student Achievement in Math

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will research methods of instruction for developmentally appropriate lessons to express problem solving in writing during monthly Professional Learning Team and/or building meetings.	10/20/2009	05/26/2011	During School	Title I	0
2	Teachers will develop math centers at Professional Learning Team Meetings, to provide activities that teach the use of manipulatives and appropriate tools to differentiate instruction.	10/20/2009	05/26/2011	During School	Title I	0
3	Teachers will differentiate and enrich core curriculum to increase proficiency in lessons relevant to ILS goals and objectives in math identified as weaknesses through assessment results.	10/20/2009	05/26/2011	During School	Title I	0

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

Increase Student Achievement in Math

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will receive information regarding extended response in math (expressing problem solving in writing)at Family Nights, Parent/Teacher Conferences and Parent Workshops.	10/02/2009	05/20/2011	After School	Title I	550
2	Parents will volunteer in the classroom/school, and attend/participate in parent workshops and family activities that support the use of manipulatives and tools for demonstrating math skills.	10/05/2009	05/30/2011	During School	Title I	550
3	Parents will use the Scott Foresman Home-School Connection to reinforce math skills and sign off on those requested by the teacher.	09/07/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Title I	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Increase Student Achievement in Math

Expressing math problem solving in writing will be monitored by classroom teachers and shared at Math Professional Learning Team Meetings and/or dedicated portions of Building and SIP Meetings. Progress will be monitored by teacher observation, diagnostic checkpoints, and chapter tests. Assessment of problem solving occurs on a weekly basis and at the end of each chapter.

Math centers will be monitored by the classroom teachers and shared at Math Professional Learning Team Meetings and/or dedicated portions of Building and SIP Meetings. Progress will be monitored by teacher observation, assessment and checking student assignments. Assessment of centers will occur according to progress of the math framework. Activities and strategies related to identified weaknesses in math achievement will be monitored by classroom teachers. They will be identified, differentiated and enhanced during Math Professional Learning Team Meetings and/or dedicated portions of Building and SIP Meetings. Assessment of related activities occurs according to the progress of the math framework, SF assesment, MAP, and ISAT testing.

	Name	Title
1	Mirjana Dukic	Principal
2	Monique Abbate	Program Supervisor
3	Robin Dunda	Literacy Support Teacher

4	Denise Hamer	English as a Second Language Teacher
5	Marta De Miguel	Bilingual Interventionist
6	Irene Scanlon	Team Facilitator/Interventionst
7	Sherlock Staff	Teachers

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, notification must be provided to parents of student in districts/schools that are identified for improvement for failure to make adequate yearly progress. A letter that explained district status was sent to Cicero District 99 parents in English and Spanish. A copy of the district's current AYP Status Report was also disseminated to parents at this time. Notification of status was also sent to parents explaining options available to students by offering Choice and/or Supplemental Educational Services where mandated.

Sherlock School has provided parents with notification of its academic status publicly at the beginning of the school year. The AYP status of Sherlock School, the Sherlock School Improvement Goals and activities for students, teachers, and parents, and the Sherlock School Title 1 Parental Involvement Policy are all posted and presented in English and Spanish at the Sherlock School Open House/Curriculum Night held at the beginning of the school year. Throughout the year, these items are provided in writing and verbally in a specified area of the school, in newsletters and during parent and family events and workshops.

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, community members, students, teachers and administrators will provide Cicero District 99 schools with feedback regarding the School Improvement Plans through informal interviews, surveys, and evaluations. Parents and community members receive newsletters and notices from the schools and the district which include information dealing with the implementation of the school and district improvement plans. Regular updates on the district website keep interested community and educational organizations informed as to our progress. The Action Plan from each school's improvement plan is posted on the district's website as well as being available in each

school and the district central office.

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. Our parents and community are vital to the success of the school improvement process and the opportunities are also outlined in the district and school parental involvement policies. These policies are available in the student handbook and at each school and the district central office.

Cicero District 99 students and parents are predominantly Hispanic therefore, communication is provided in English and Spanish. Accommodations for language assistance are made in written documents that are distributed and posted and verbally through the use of interpreters at meetings, conferences, workshops and family events. All of the above are developed and communicated with the purpose of identifying, supporting and initiating the school improvement plan.

	Name	Title
1	Mirjana Dukic	Principal
2	Monique Abbate	District Program Supervisor
3	Robin Dunda	Literacy Support Teacher
4	Denise Hamer	English as a Second Language Teacher
5	Patricia Wolski	1st Grade Teacher

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part C. Peer Review Process

Peer Review - Describe the district's peer review and approval process. Peer review teams should include teachers and administrators from schools and districts similar to the one in improvement, but significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students. As appropriate, peer reviewers may be teachers from other schools, personnel from other districts, Regional Office of Education staff, Intermediate Service Center staff, RESPRO staff, university faculty, consultants, et al., or combinations thereof. RESPRO staff serving on a School Support Team should not serve on a peer review team in the same district. The peer review should precede the local board approval and must be completed within 45 days of receiving the school improvement plan. For further description of the peer review process see LEA and School Improvement: Non-Regulatory Guidance, July 21, 2006, at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

Description of peer review process including participants and date(s) of peer review.

1/27/2010 3:17:08 PM

Cicero Public 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 Director of School Improvement, an appointed co-facilitator, and additional individuals comprised of each building's Assistant Principal or an appointed lead teacher agreed upon by the schools' SIP team. **The Peer Review Team is then divided into nine 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 of rubric review using one SIP with all teams to calibrate scores. This is followed by using the rest of the day to provide peer review and feedback specific to one school's plan. Thus, 9 plans are reviewed during the first session.

Session 2 consists of one day for each team to provide peer review and feedback specific to one school's plan. Thus, 8 plans were reviewed during the second session for a total of 17 plans.

Protocol of the Peer Review Team

- It is extremely important to calibrate one SIP together prior to any team review.
- **Feedback regarding SIPs must 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.**
- **Refine feedback before submitting recommendations to the Director of School Improvement**
- **Submit all recommendations to the Director of School Improvement upon completion of SIP Peer Review**

Cicero District 99 School Improvement Planning Overview

At the district level, school improvement planning is the integration of a district-wide team effort. The School Improvement Team at this level consists of:

Assistant Superintendents

Director of School Improvement

Director of Special Education

Director of Language Minority Services

1/27/2010 3:17:08 PM

Director of Science and Math

Director of Social Studies

Director of Technology

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. District Directors and Program Supervisors work directly with school teams they are assigned to.

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

Principal and/or Assistant Principal who:

- Provides leadership in facilitating the school improvement planning process and implementation of the plan
- Facilitates a process of ongoing evaluation and refinement toward achieving the goals with the school SIP Team
- Engages in data driven decision making
- Revises the school improvement plan based on data, research and state and federal requirements
- Writes and submits the school improvement plan
- Provides communication to stakeholders

Teachers who:

- Collect and synthesize necessary data to develop and monitor progress towards goals and activities
- Assists in developing and revising the school improvement plan
- Communicates the standards and activities in the plan and the progress toward achieving the goals to students and parents

Community Members/Stakeholders who:

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

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

Part D. Teacher Mentoring Process

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

Part E. District Responsibilities

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

The Sherlock School Improvement Plan has as its foundation the 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 district positions that provide on-going professional development and support throughout the year.

- Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services
- Assistant Superintendent of Student Services
- Assistant Superintendent of Personnel
- Director of School Improvement and Community Relations
- Director of Language Minority Services
- Director of Special Education
- Director of Math, Science, Health, PE
- Director of Social Studies, Fine Arts, Gifted Education
- Director of Technology
- Program Supervisors
- Resource Teachers

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 SIP's, 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 SIP's
- 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 SIP's
- 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 administrators
- 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]

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

1/27/2010 3:17:08 PM

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