

Local Board Approved	10/01/2009
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

District Information

RCDT Number:	140162270170000		
District Name:	Rich Twp HSD 227	Superintendent:	Howard R Hunigan
District Address:	20000 Governors Dr	Telephone:	7086795800
City/State/Zip:	Olympia Fields,IL 60461 1034	Extn:	0
Email:	hhunigan@rich227.org		
Is this for a Title I district ?		<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No
Is this for a Title III district that did not meet AMAO?		<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No

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

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

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	98.6	Yes	98.6	Yes	48.3		No	41.3		No			91.8	
White														
Black	98.3	Yes	98.3	Yes	45.1	45.2	Yes	38.1	41.8	No			91.6	
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities	94.0	Yes	94.0	Yes										
Low Income	98.7	Yes	98.7	Yes	48.1	42.9	Yes	41.1	38.0	Yes			92.8	

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging. 2. At least 70% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 70% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. *** 3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 70% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision. 4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 78% graduation rate for high schools.
<p>* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2008. ** Safe Harbor Targets of 70% or above are not printed. *** Subgroups with fewer than 45 students are not reported. Safe Harbor only applies to subgroups of 45 or more. In order for Safe Harbor to apply, a subgroup must decrease by 10% the percentage of scores that did not meet state standards from the previous year plus meet the other indicators (attendance rate for non-high schools and graduation rate for high schools) for the subgroup. For subgroups that do not meet their Safe Harbor Targets, a 75% confidence interval is applied. Safe Harbor allows schools an alternate method to meet subgroup minimum targets on achievement.</p>

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

AMAO Reports for 2009 are not yet available for posting.

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

District Information								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	90.7	92.0	92.6	91.0	89.6	88.6	89.6	88.7
Truancy Rate (%)	1.4	1.5	2.2	4.0	2.0	2.2	5.3	4.9
Mobility Rate (%)	16.6	13.8	17.1	11.7	15.7	20.1	21.9	20.5
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	89.6	94.0	83.7	93.2	92.0	90.6	92.0	91.8
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	1.2	2.3	3.2	2.2	3.9	3.9	3.3	2.2
District Population (#)	3,343	3,365	3,461	3,626	3,886	4,190	4,287	4,167
Low Income (%)	37.9	40.4	46.9	52.8	59.9	51.5	56.8	59.3
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	0.1	0.1
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	21.1	17.4	14.7	11.3	8.1	6.2	4.9	4.7
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	75.4	78.4	80.6	83.8	86.8	88.5	89.2	89.2
Hispanic (%)	2.2	2.9	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.3	2.8	2.4
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.6
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.0
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	0.1	0.5	1.3	2.2	3.1

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	25.1	70.7	2.8	1.3	0.1	-
	2001	22.4	73.5	2.8	1.1	0.2	-
	2002	21.1	75.4	2.2	1.1	0.2	-
	2003	17.4	78.4	2.9	1.0	0.3	-
	2004	14.7	80.6	3.5	0.9	0.2	-
	2005	11.3	83.8	3.8	0.8	0.1	0.1
	2006	8.1	86.8	3.7	0.6	0.2	0.5
	2007	6.2	88.5	3.3	0.4	0.2	1.3
	2008	4.9	89.2	2.8	0.5	0.3	2.2
	2009	4.7	89.2	2.4	0.6	0	3.1
S T A T E	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 5 - Educational Environment

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truancy (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	-	30.0	100.0	90.7	12.0	38	1.2	2.5	85.8
	2001	0.1	33.2	94.7	90.0	18.8	79	2.4	1.2	90.2
	2002	-	37.9	99.5	90.7	16.6	46	1.4	1.2	89.6
	2003	-	40.4	98.6	92.0	13.8	52	1.5	2.3	94.0
	2004	-	46.9	98.5	92.6	17.1	78	2.2	3.2	83.7
	2005	-	52.8	100.0	91.0	11.7	142	4.0	2.2	93.2
	2006	-	59.9	100.0	89.6	15.7	78	2.0	3.9	92.0
	2007	0.1	51.5	100.0	88.6	20.1	92	2.2	3.9	90.6
	2008	0.1	56.8	100.0	89.6	21.9	220	5.3	3.3	92.0
	2009	0.1	59.3	100.0	88.7	20.5	201	4.9	2.2	91.8
S T A T E	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
	2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	-

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 6 - Enrollment Trends

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
D I S T R I C T	2000	3,137	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	3,283	-	-	-	-	-	716
	2002	3,343	-	-	-	-	-	864
	2003	3,365	-	-	-	-	-	850
	2004	3,461	-	-	-	-	-	845
	2005	3,626	-	-	-	-	-	859
	2006	3,886	-	-	-	-	-	957
	2007	4,190	-	-	-	-	-	1,027
	2008	4,287	-	-	-	-	-	1,187
	2009	4,167	-	-	-	-	-	560
S T A T E	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2,044,539	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	2,060,048	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	2,062,912	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	2,075,277	136,123	139,619	146,935	153,566	154,856	-
	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 7 - Educator Data

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials (%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	187	19	68,496	28	72	-	20	-	-
	2001	186	19	70,187	29	71	-	20	-	-
	2002	206	18	72,236	28	72	-	19	-	-
	2003	228	16	71,948	33	67	0	18	-	-
	2004	212	15	70,088	35	65	0	20	-	-
	2005	224	13	69,140	40	60	0	20	-	-
	2006	251	12	67,313	46	54	0	18	3	-
	2007	270	11	67,900	46	54	0	18	2	-
	2008	266	12	70,498	47	53	-	19	-	-
	2009	280	11	70,616	48	52	-	18	0	0
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	14	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	2	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1
	2009	133,017	12	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 8a - Assessment Data (Reading)**

[Note: for High Schools, High School Districts, or Unit Districts Only]

PSAE - % Meets & Exceeds Reading grade 11

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	47.0	47.1	45.8	36.6	40.4	46.2
White	65.9	63.8	71.0	52.6	61.5	76.5
Black	43.3	43.8	42.8	35.1	38.5	43.0
Hispanic	42.1	43.4	50.0	39.4	61.9	54.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	59.1
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	16.3	4.9	-	4.4	16.0	4.8
Low Income	36.7	33.5	37.7	31.6	36.3	45.8

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

[Note: for High Schools, High School Districts, or Unit Districts Only]

PSAE - % Meets & Exceeds Mathematics grade 11

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	33.6	30.3	29.2	26.1	36.4	38.5
White	53.9	53.8	58.0	57.9	61.5	64.7
Black	29.0	25.3	25.6	23.6	34.2	35.5
Hispanic	36.9	47.8	38.4	27.3	47.6	45.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	54.5
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	10.2	2.5	-	0.0	8.0	4.8
Low Income	24.5	23.4	20.6	19.4	30.9	38.8

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

Based on the Report Card data from 2004 to 2009, Rich Township High School District 227 faces a number of challenges in the area of student achievement. Students are not performing at the Benchmark levels as defined by the state in Mathematics or Reading. The district has seen a high score of 47.1% of students being successful in reading in 2005 to a low in reading of 36.6 in 2007. However, the District has seen an increase since 2007 from 36.6% to 46.2% for all students in reading. There is evidence that, although the numbers are small, the percentage of white students, 76.5%, being successful in Reading is significantly higher than black students, 43.0%. However, that data represents only a 4.7% of the population as white with 89.2% listed as black. Even with the small actual number, the percentages for white students performance has been significantly higher than black students in Reading since 2004.

In the area of mathematics, the district has seen its highest score since 2004 with 38.5% meeting state standards. That number has risen from a low of 26.1% in 2007. A similar phenomenon occurs in the mathematics area with white students and black students. Although the actual white student population is small, 64.7% of white students are meeting state standards in math in 2009, while only 35.5% of Black students, 54.5% of multiracial students and 45.4% of Hispanic students. Again, although the numbers of White, Hispanic and multiracial students is significantly smaller, those students continue to outperform Black students. This data speaks to the fact that with 89.2% of the population being comprised of Black students, the efforts of those students encompass the overall student achievement.

In addition to those subgroups, the district has seen an increase in the number of low income students over the past 10 years from 30% in 2000 to 59.3% in 2009. However, this population, as it has increased, has also increased their performance on the PSAE. The percentage of students in this subgroup meeting/exceeding state standards has grown from a low of 31.6% in 2007 to 45.8% in 2009 in the area of Reading and from a low of 19.4% in 2007 to 38.8% in 2009 in the area of Mathematics. With this growth, they are still not at the level of AYP, but are making significant progress.

Another subgroup within the district that has been struggling as well is students with disabilities. In the area of Reading, the percentage of students meeting state standards within this subgroup has been as low as 4.4% in 2007 to a high of 16.3% in 2004. The 2009 score was only 4.8% of these students meeting state standards. Although the actual number of students is small (40 district wide), this represents only 2 students meeting state standards and 38 of them not meeting in Reading.

In the area of Mathematics, the percentage of students meeting state standards within this subgroup has been as low as 0% in 2007 to a high of 10.2% in 2004. The 2009 score was only 4.8% of these students meeting state standards. Again, this represents only 2 students meeting state standards and 38 of them not meeting in Mathematics.

Areas of weakness identified are:

- 1 Black students in the area of mathematics
- 2 Black students in the area of reading
- 3 Low income students in the area of Reading
- 4 Low Income students in the area of mathematics
- 5 Students with disabilities students in the area of Reading
- 6 Students with disabilities students in the area of mathematics

Currently, all groups of students are performing below the state Benchmark for 2009 or 70% and significantly below the benchmarks for 2010 – 77.5% and 2011 – 85%.

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

Since 2004, there are a number of factors that have contributed to the low student performance:

1. Lack of data driven decision making
2. Lack of programs that are focused on specific subgroups to insure increased student achievement
3. Lack of significant transition in instructional practice to assure success for all students
4. Tracking of Mathematics and Language Arts courses until 2007 – 2008 that denied students opportunities
5. Lack of accountability based on assessment data on a consistent basis
6. Mobility of students (evidenced by a growth from 12% mobility in 2000 to 20.5% in 2009 versus 13.5% in the state)
7. Disconnect between ACT College Readiness Standards – as addressed on the ACT – and the Foundation Districts.
8. A lack of seamless articulation from grade 8 to 9

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

Based on the Report Card data, the District must have a plan that specifically addresses the needs of:

1. All students in the areas of math and reading
2. Black Students in the areas of math and reading
3. Low income students in the areas of math and reading
4. Students with disabilities in the areas of math and reading

The district must also have a plan to address the articulation between the high schools and the Foundation districts. Included in the planning must be concerted efforts to assure relevant data is collected in a timely and efficient manner for usage to in a formative fashion.

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?**

Academic

In order to gauge where students are entering in terms of College Readiness Standards as measured on the ACT during the PSAE testing, Rich Township High School District 227 uses the EPAS (Educational Planning and Assessment) System. This entails using the EXPLORE, PLAN and finally the ACT to determine College Readiness of our students.

The local assessments used are the EXPLORE and PLAN tests. This data gives us baseline for our incoming Freshmen as well as the data reflecting the rising Juniors.

Currently, the data for our students shows the following in terms of EXPLORE:

Class of 2013 (current freshmen)

average English score of 13.2 (benchmark of 13)

average Reading score of 13.3 (benchmark of 15)

average Math score of 14 (benchmark of 17)

average Science score of 15.6 (benchmark of 20)

average composite score of 14.1

Class of 2012 (current sophomores)

average English score of 13.1 (benchmark of 13)

average Reading score of 13.2 (benchmark of 15)

average Math score of 14.5 (benchmark of 17)

average Science score of 15.4 (benchmark of 20)

average composite score of 14.1

Class of 2011 (current juniors)

average English score of 13.5 (benchmark of 13)

average Reading score of 13.4 (benchmark of 15)

average Math score of 14.4 (benchmark of 17)

average Science score of 15.7 (benchmark of 20)

average composite score of 14.3

The PLAN results have been fairly consistent with the EXPLORE results in terms of growth as expected by ACT:

average English score of 16.7 (benchmark of 15)

average Reading score of 16.2 (benchmark of 17)

average Math score of 16.5 (benchmark of 19)

average Science score of 17.7 (benchmark of 21)

Similarly, the ACT scores continue to reflect a small amount of growth:

average English score of 18.3 (benchmark of 18)

average Reading score of 17.7 (benchmark of 21)

average Math score of 17.3 (benchmark of 22)

average Science score of 17.7 (benchmark of 24)

Based on this data, our students are entering at the benchmark for English, but below the benchmark for Reading, Mathematics and Science. They remain below the benchmark on each subsequent test. This indicates that the district must use the EXPLORE data to determine appropriate Responses to Intervention in the academic arena as students are entering as freshmen in the areas of Reading and Math in particular.

Behavioral-

The data available for Behavioral Assessment is indicated by pupil personnel service data, attendance data, suspension data, and discipline referrals. Currently this data is being collected at each campus; however the analysis of that data is neither universal nor serving as a consistent screening process.

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

Initial factors contributing to the results are:

Academic:

1. Articulation with our Foundation districts regarding College Readiness Standards versus Illinois Learning Standards/Assessment Framework for ISAT
2. A needed comprehensive benchmark assessment system for Reading and Mathematics providing information on the attainment of College Readiness Standards at short intervals of time
3. Teacher connection to the classroom of College Readiness Standards for all subject areas
4. Appropriate curriculum to address the needs and gaps for freshmen as they enter the district and matriculate through the system
5. Continued and consistent alignment to the College Readiness Standards in all courses from Freshmen through Senior Year.
6. Continued and consistent focus on instructional strategies related to reaching all learners.

Behavioral:

1. Articulation with our Foundation districts regarding behavioral screening and interventions prior to a student's arrival in the district.
2. A needed consistent behavioral system for students

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

Academic

Using the data derived from the EXPLORE, PLAN and ACT, there must be an emphasis on the College Readiness Standards and how they are used in all subject areas.

- * Articulation between the high school district and its foundation districts must ensure a Pre-K – 12 curriculum approach to address the needs of students through the entire system
- * Professional development must focus on differentiated instruction and reading across the curriculum to meet the needs of students and fill in gaps in learning
- * Common artifacts must be completed and implemented in all areas. Common assessments must be linked to College Readiness Standards and the ability to monitor progress from

these assessments

* Collaboration time for teachers to address the needs of students and determine appropriate interventions based on the collected data

* Technology needs to be in place to support these efforts.

Behavioral Data -

A system to collect and analyze the Behavioral data will be developed by May 2009. This system will include the analysis of pupil personnel data, attendance data, suspension data, and discipline referrals. Additionally, this system will develop interventions based on identified benchmarks within that data set.

The local assessments expose the weaknesses we experience in the areas of Reading and Math. Policies and procedures that comply with state regulations have not been defined regarding the use of RtI to determine special education eligibility. The development of the district RtI Plan will imply recognition of academic and behavioral deficiencies in addition addressing the use of district assessments for universal screening purposes. It is suggested that All School Testing move to earlier in the year in order to gather data early in the year for universal screening purposes.

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

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

The district has seen a consistent turnover in the average tenure of a teacher, thus bringing in newer teachers with fewer years of experience. Over 50% of the district's teaching staff is non-tenured. In addition, the district has also experienced a number of turnovers in the administrative staff, both at the district and building levels. The buildings have seen an increase in student population with the use of the same facilities. Students from neighboring feeder districts come to the district with varying backgrounds in academic experience.

The state mandate of ISAT testing for grades 3-8 does not measure the College Readiness needed at Grade 8 for the ACT in Grade 11.

Additionally, the district has seen an increase in students of poverty as well as homeless population. These demographics present different types of challenges for the staff. The number of gang related infractions has also increased indicating need for intervention for students interested in those types of activities.

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

The maintenance of a consistent Program with a changing staff challenges student performance.

The need to establish College Readiness Standards as part of the academic expectation prior to grade 9 contributes to the overall student performance.

The teacher/administrator turnover causes a disruption in the programming directed at affecting student achievement.

The early intervention and understanding by the overall school community regarding students with specific behavioral concerns.

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

Science – needs to update additional courses (Currently only College Prep Biology and Chemistry have Benchmark Exams written to the Illinois Learning Standards and College Readiness Standards as determined by ACT. Physics and Honors Science courses have common assessments – not Benchmark Exams.)

Math – needs to update higher levels of mathematics. Currently Benchmark Exams exist for College Prep Algebra and Geometry written to the Illinois Learning Standards and College Readiness Standards as determined by ACT. Common Assessments exist for remaining College Prep Math course. Honors courses need finalization of Common Assessments and completion of Benchmark Exams.

Social Studies – need to update and connect all courses to College Readiness Standards/State Standards

Behavior – need to address the issue of how to set up a meaningful system and fully implement and monitor positive behavior support system (Social Emotional Learning Standards) (tiered behavior support)

**Section I-C. Data & Analysis – Other Data
Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development****Data - Briefly describe data on educator qualifications and data and/or information about staff capacity and professional development opportunities related to areas of weakness and strength. What do these data tell you?**

Over the past 9 years, our District has seen a drastic reduction in the years of experience for teachers – from an average of 19 years in 2000 to 11 years in 2009. This newer, less experienced staff also has fewer teachers with advanced degrees – from 73% in 2000 to 52% in 2009. As the experience level and educational level have decreased, our student population as well as total teacher population has increased. In 2000 the district had a student population of 3,137 versus a student population of 4,167 in 2009. The teacher FTE has grown from 187 in 2000 with a pupil teacher ratio of 20 to 287 in 2009 with a pupil teacher ratio of 17. This data speaks to a newer teacher workforce as more seasoned, veteran teachers have chosen to retire. In addition, this echoes the increase in career changers choosing to come into the field of teaching adding less experienced staff members. Also, with an increasing student population, the decrease in class size speaks to concerted efforts to keep class sizes smaller in specific areas such as special education.

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

With new, more inexperienced staff coming into the buildings on a regular basis, maintaining the continuity of courses can contribute to student performance challenges. Based on the student performance data though, which has begun to increase over the past two years, the educator qualifications of lack of experience and advanced degrees is not having a direct impact on student performance.

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

Based on the data regarding the experience level and advanced educational level, the district has put several items into place to ensure there is no impact on student achievement:

- District based curriculum based on the College Readiness Standards as assessed by the ACT
- District based assessments to insure accountability for all teachers regardless of experience or additional educational background
- District Mentoring Program with mandatory support for year 1 and 2 teachers
- Assessment system for consistent data collection and analysis
- Leadership focused on equity, teaching and learning, assessment and curriculum
- Professional development targeted to differentiating instruction and reading across the curriculum for the success of all students

In order to continue to move student progress in a forward motion, the areas focus must be maintained from above with the following additions:

- Specific intervention requirements for teachers
- Writing skills across all curricular areas
- Professional development dealing with the diverse learner
- Classroom climate and support for teachers

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

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

Parents are involved in a host of school activities – parent-teacher conferences, Discipline Committee, Open House (low attendance due to conflict with feeder school schedule. School Improvement Committee and District Community Forum (attendance – 63 district wide), Honor Banquet (Academic and Athletic), access to PowerSchool.

Currently, only about 10% of our parents participate in the Parent, Teacher, Student Organization. There are one to two parents represented on various committees. Approximately 30% of the parents access PowerSchool online for their children's information. The majority of parent participation occurs with the Booster organizations for sports and band.

Some of the issues leading to lower parent participation are:

1. Lack of communication,
2. Lack of parental interests
3. Conflict with working schedule

Parents in the community care about increased students' achievement and are very involved with their own child's achievement but may not always involve school activities. Those items that are communicated timely, connect with parent interest, and are accommodating of their work schedules receive the highest participation.

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

In terms of the Response to Intervention (Rtl):

- Parents have not been informed and invited to participate in the three tier process
- Parents have not been informed of their right to request a special education evaluation at any time during the Rtl process.
- The numbers of parents involved with their student's academic/behavioral performance needs to increase with the use of Power School.

Our parent organizations want to increase student performance overall. A lack of continuity and low achievement have contributed to parent disconnect. In addition, the changing demographic of students is similarly reflected with parents. The increase in low socioeconomic families presents challenges that the district must accommodate.

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

As we inform parents of our process and procedures, their rights to request a Special Education Evaluation will be included in those conversations.

Conclusion:

The district needs to be flexible in scheduling activities to coincide with parents' schedules.

1. District needs to develop a system of incentives to increase parent involvement in school activities.
2. Increase training opportunity for parent to learn about the new school management system called PowerSchool.

3. Parent organization needs to be more aggressive in develop specific activities to support students' achievement.
4. All school buildings should establish after hour building usages for parent to access the electronic communication.

A parent has been involved in the formation of the Rtl team which will help develop the district/building plan.

Parental involvement within the format of the Rtl plan will include an initial campaign which educates parents on the various stages of the plan, including universal screening techniques, tiers and progress monitoring techniques. This campaign will include written materials, meetings, surveys and electronic communication.

Parental involvement with the Rtl process will result in a positive effect upon their children's academic performance by:

- increasing communication between school and home
- reducing unnecessary special education referrals
- increasing the number of academic and behavioral interventions made available to all students
- decreasing the number of student dropouts
- increasing graduation rates
- increased number of students at grade level

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

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

Key factors that are within the district's capability to change or control include:

- lack of knowledge in standardized test structure
- lack of understanding in instructional methodology

-lack of connect to the Illinois Assessment Framework

-lack of connections to the College Readiness Standards

-lack of curricular focus

-lack of continuity

-lack of sufficient outreach and providing of opportunities for parents with varying schedules

In order to positively affect student achievement, the district needs to:

- increase parental involvement
- continue to increase professional development
- increase support of the Teacher Mentoring Program in order to retain teachers
- increase support of the administrative team
- increase consistency of the administrative structure
- increase communication between and among parents, staff and students
- increase articulation with the feeder districts
- establish specific, easy to implement interventions

Section II-Action Plan

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies			
Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed	
		AYP	AMAO
1	We will increase the number of all students meeting/exceeding on the PSAE Reading to 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or safe harbor.	1,	
2	We will increase the number of all students and Black students meeting/exceeding on the PSAE Mathematics to 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or safe harbor.	2,3,	

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

1 District is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2 District is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
3 Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

2009 AMAO reports are not yet available for posting.

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1 Title :

We will increase the number of all students meeting/exceeding on the PSAE Reading to 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or safe harbor.

Objective 1 Description :

This objective is related to the need to increase the number of students who meet/exceed on the PSAE in Reading to at least 77.5% in April 2010 and 85% in April 2011. The strategies to achieve this goal will involve specific items for students, staff and parents. Students will be engaged in tutoring, specific courses designated for their reading needs as well as mentoring and specific intervention plans for reading skills. Staff will be involved in professional learning opportunities to support increased student achievement in Reading. Parents will be included in strategies that involve their participation and gives them information to support their children in increased student achievement in Reading.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

1 District is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
--

2009 AMAO reports are not yet available for posting.

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

Objective 1 Title :

We will increase the number of all students meeting/exceeding on the PSAE Reading to 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or safe harbor.

	Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Targeted student tutoring - Students falling below a C in their Language Arts and/or Social Studies Classes will be placed in a tutoring program during the school day for at least two weeks. The program will run during the advisory time for students.	09/21/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	40000
2	Supplemental Educational Services - Low income students will be given free tutoring in the area of Reading through outside tutoring services. These students will be given 30 hours of tutoring focused on the needed areas as identified by screening tools designed for the provider of services.	10/30/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Title I	140000
3	ACT/PSAE course for Junior students - This will provide all junior studnets with additional targeted support on the Reading skills needed for meeting state standards on the PSAE	08/18/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	336000
4	Common Artifacts will be used in all Language Arts classes connected to benchmarks as set by the College Readiness Standards	06/01/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
5	Reading I will be offered to all incoming Freshmen to fill in gaps as indicated by the Explore and Gates Mcginnitte assessments	08/20/2007	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	336000
6	Reading II will be offered to sophomore students who still need additional support in increasing their reading skills	08/18/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	150000
7	Read 180 Summer Program - Incoming freshmen students identified by Explore results will bea targeted to particpate in the Summer Read 180 program to increase their reading achievement	06/08/2009	07/22/2011	Summer School	Title I	40000

8	Read 180 - For those students who are entering school with significantly low reading levels, Read 180, a 90-minute individualized program to boost reading skills, will be incorporated into the schedule for the student.	01/11/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	50000
9	School within a School - This is an individualized program for assistance with reading skills. Students will work on an individual basis with a teacher and aid on coursework with support for reading in particular.	08/20/2007	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	210000
10	Targeted after school tutoring - Students falling below a C in their Language Arts and/or Social Studies classes will be placed in an after school tutoring program for at least two weeks.	01/19/2010	05/20/2011	After School	Title I	40000
11	Recovery Period - A recovery period will be offered after school for students for language arts as needed. This period will give students access to the content in a different instructional format.	09/16/2009	05/20/2010	After School	Local Funds	15000
12	Alternative School - Individual intervention plans will be developed for students in order to increase their success in reading. The campus problem solving teams will address the individual need of students and determine which alternative setting is best - School within a School or Evening School.	09/02/2009	05/26/2011	Before School	Local Funds	200000

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

Objective 1 Title :

We will increase the number of all students meeting/exceeding on the PSAE Reading to 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or safe harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Additional training on College Readiness Standards related to reading across multiple curricula.	08/20/2009	05/26/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Additional training for Differentiated Instruction as related to Reading	08/20/2009	05/26/2011	During School	Title II	2000
3	Training on the use of the Read 180 program and the strategies embedded in that program	04/12/2010	06/30/2011	After School	Title I	5000
4	Continue working with staff on setting SMART Goal action plans that identify the interventions for struggling students including the designated person, timeframe and expected outcome. These action plans are at the team level and connect teachers immediately to their responsibility in	08/13/2009	05/26/2011	During School	Local Funds	0

	the intervention process for students.					
5	Collaboration time to ensure continued alignment of curriculum, common artifacts and data analysis.	08/18/2009	05/26/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
6	Continued Reading Across the Curriculum Workshops for all teachers to develop them on the usage of a variety of readign strategies within their content areas.	09/02/2009	05/26/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
7	Writing across the Curriculum Workshops to increaset the connections between reading and writing for students in all curricular areas.	11/02/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
8	Specific training for Title I teachers before, during and after school on targeted strategies for Title I students in reading.	09/01/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Title I	50000
9	Benchmark Training - Language Arts and Social Studies to be trained on using a benchmark assessment for reading, analysis of the data and how to write benchmark questions as well	10/30/2009	05/07/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
10	After school workshops for Differentiated Instruction as related to Reading	09/01/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Title II	26000

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

Objective 1 Title :

We will increase the number of all students meeting/exceeding on the PSAE Reading to 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or safe harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Student information system – This system will allow parents, students, staff and administrators to access grades, schedules, attendance and up-to-date information in a timely fashion.	08/13/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	50000
2	Communicate in a variety of ways with parents regarding interventions available for their children in reading.	01/11/2010	06/30/2011	Before School	Local Funds	0
3	Parent Teacher Conferences – Direct contact with parents regarding student achievement in reading.	09/10/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Local Funds	0
4	Open House to share reading curriculum and strategies with parents	08/27/2009	09/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	0
5	Saturday Title I Parent information sessions to provide parents with avenues to support their students in reading	02/06/2010	05/27/2011	After School	Title I	2000
6	Parent resource centers at each campus with a focus on reading	01/11/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	0

7	8th grade night – Meet with incoming parents to review Reading scores and interventions to increase reading skills at the high school level.	01/19/2010	02/28/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
---	--	------------	------------	---------------	-------------	---

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

We will increase the number of all students meeting/exceeding on the PSAE Reading to 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or safe harbor.

The district personnel will work with the campuses to provide quarterly updates on:

EXPLORE scores and updates to address student need

PLAN scores and updates to address student need

Practice ACT scores and updates for students

Benchmark assessment data and updates to curriculum to address the needs of students

Data will be specific and targeted to assist based on need of the student

Data will be collected and used as a general screening process for all students and to determine effectiveness of core instructional practices.

- Individual academy teachers will collect and share academic and behavioral data with their teams in order to collaboratively disaggregate said data for intervention planning.
- Intervention strategies are implemented and monitored for a determined amount of time as determined by the team.
- A data review meeting is held to review effectiveness of the intervention strategies and determine the next steps.
- The team determines whether to continue the intervention(s) as developed, or alter strategies for an increased interval of time.

Data will be collected to determine the effectiveness of an intervention and determine if an instructional change is needed.

- Initial data is reviewed and continuously monitored

- A data review meeting is held to review effectiveness of the intervention strategies and determine the next steps.
- The team determines whether to continue the intervention(s) as developed, or alter strategies for an increased interval of time.
- Additional data will be collected for the "problem solving committee" to explore and implement individual interventions based upon all previously recorded information on students.

A data review meeting is held to determine if interventions will continue or if special education testing will occur.

	Name	Title
1	Howard Hunigan	Superintendent
2	Dr. Donna Simpson Leak	Assistant Superintendent for Student Learning and Accountability
3	Mace Rainey	Principal, Central Campus
4	Mark Kramer	Principal, East Campus
5	Cynthia Hudson	Principal, South Campus

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2 Title :

We will increase the number of all students and Black students meeting/exceeding on the PSAE Mathematics to 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or safe harbor.

Objective 2 Description :

This objective is related to the need to increase the number of students who meet/exceed on the PSAE in Mathematics to at least 77.5% in April 2010 and 85% in April 2011. The strategies to achieve this goal will involve specific items for studnets, staff and parents.

Students will be engaged in tutoring, specific courses designated for their mathematics needs as well as mentoring and specific intervention plans for math skills.

Staff will be involved in professional learning opportunities to support increased student achievement in mathematics.

Parents will be included in strategies that involve their participation and gives them information to support their children in increased student acheivement in mathematics.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

2 District is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
3 Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

2009 AMAO reports are not yet available for posting.

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

Objective 2 Title :

We will increase the number of all students and Black students meeting/exceeding on the PSAE Mathematics to 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or safe harbor.

	Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Continue Math Foundations course – Based on Explore scores, students who need additional support in terms of College Readiness will take this course to fill in the gaps.	08/27/2007	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	300000
2	ACT preparation class – All junior students are enrolled in a year long ACT preparation course to increase the math skills they need additional focus.	08/18/2008	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	300000
3	Targeted student tutoring - Students falling below a C in their Math Classes will be placed in a tutoring program during the school day for at least two weeks. The program will run during the advisory time for students.	08/31/2009	04/29/2011	During School	Title I	30000
4	Supplemental Educational Services - Low income students will be given free tutoring in the area of Mathematics through outside tutoring services. These students will be given 30 hours of tutoring focused on the needed areas as identified by screening tools designed for the provider of services.	10/23/2009	04/29/2011	After School	Title I	280000
5	Common Artifacts will be used in all Mathematics classes connected to benchmarks as set by the College Readiness Standards	08/18/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
6	School within a School - This is an individualized program for assistance with reading skills. Students will work on an individual basis with a teacher and aid on coursework with support for reading in particular.	08/18/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	350000
7	Targeted after school tutoring - Students falling below a C in their Mathematics classes will be placed in an after school tutoring program for at least two weeks.	09/18/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Title I	30000
8	Recovery Period - A recovery period will be offered after school for students for Mathematics as needed. This period will give students	01/12/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Local Funds	40000

	access to the content in a different instructional format.					
9	Alternative School - Individual intervention plans will be developed for students in order to increase their success in reading. The campus problem solving teams will address the individual need of students and determine which alternative setting is best - School within a School or Evening School.	09/01/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Local Funds	100000

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

Objective 2 Title :

We will increase the number of all students and Black students meeting/exceeding on the PSAE Mathematics to 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or safe harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Additional training on College Readiness Standards related to mathematics.	08/20/2009	05/26/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Additional training for Differentiated Instruction as related to mathematics	08/20/2009	05/26/2011	During School	Title II	4000
3	Continue working with staff on setting SMART Goal action plans that identify the interventions for struggling students including the designated person, timeframe and expected outcome. These action plans are at the team level and connect teachers immediately to their responsibility in the intervention process for students.	08/13/2009	05/26/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
4	Collaboration time to ensure continued alignment of curriculum, common artifacts and data analysis.	08/18/2009	05/26/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
5	Specific training for Title I teachers before, during and after school on targeted strategies for Title I students in mathematics	09/01/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Title I	25000
6	Benchmark Training – Math teachers to continue in the training on using a benchmark assessment for mathematics, analysis of the data and how to write benchmark questions as well	10/30/2009	05/06/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
7	After school workshops for Differentiated Instruction as related to Mathematics	09/01/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Title II	26000
8	Articulation with Foundation District mathematics teachers on a monthly basis	09/30/2008	05/20/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
9	Math consultants to coach Title I math teachers on instructional strategies in the classroom including lesson design	08/13/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Title I	40000

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

Objective 2 Title :

We will increase the number of all students and Black students meeting/exceeding on the PSAE Mathematics to 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or safe harbor.

	Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Student information system – This system will allow parents, students, staff and administrators to access grades, schedules, attendance and up-to-date information in a timely fashion.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	50000
2	Communicate in a variety of ways with parents regarding interventions available for their children in mathematics.	01/12/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Parent Teacher Conferences – Direct contact with parents regarding student achievement in mathematics.	09/10/2009	05/26/2011	After School	Local Funds	0
4	Open House to share mathematics curriculum and strategies with parents	08/26/2009	09/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	0
5	Saturday Title I Parent information sessions to provide parents with avenues to support their students in mathematics	02/06/2010	04/23/2011	After School	Title I	4000
6	Parent resource centers at each campus with a focus on mathematics	01/11/2010	05/26/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
7	8th grade night – Meet with incoming parents to review Reading scores and interventions to increase mathematics skills at the high school level.	01/20/2010	05/26/2011	After School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

We will increase the number of all students and Black students meeting/exceeding on the PSAE Mathematics to 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or safe harbor.

The district personnel will work with the campuses to provide quarterly updates on:

EXPLORE scores and updates to address student need

PLAN scores and updates to address student need

Practice ACT scores and updates for students

Benchmark assessment data and updates to curriculum to address the needs of students

Grades for students in all math courses.

Data will be specific and targeted to assist based on need of the student

Data is collected and used as a general screening process for all students and to determine effectiveness of core instructional practices.

- Individual academy teachers will collect and share academic data with their teams in order to collaboratively disaggregate said data for intervention planning.

- Intervention strategies are implemented and monitored for a determined amount of time as determined by the team.

- A data review meeting is held to review effectiveness of the intervention strategies and determine the next steps.

- The team determines whether to continue the intervention(s) as developed, or alter strategies for an increased interval of time.

Data is collected to determine the effectiveness of an intervention and determine if an instructional change is needed.

- Data continues to be monitored as additional interventions are designed and implemented.

- A data review meeting is held to review effectiveness of the intervention strategies and determine the next steps.

- The team determines whether to continue the intervention(s) as developed, or alter strategies for an increased interval of time.

	Name	Title
1	Howard Hunigan	Superintendent
2	Dr. Donna Simpson Leak	Assistant Superintendent for Student Learning and Accountability
3	Mace Rainey	Principal, Central Campus

4	Mark Kramer	Principal, East Campus
5	Cynthia Hudson	Principal, South Campus

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation A. Stakeholder Involvement

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

Administrators, counselors, social workers, teachers, staff, and parents have participated in various parts of the planning. We have worked with each of these groups as well as outside consultants to contribute to specific parts of the plan that were relevant to their areas.

Outside consultants:

Dr. Vanessa Kinder - ISC4
 Tony Monaco - ISC 4
 Dr. Timothy Kanold - Retired Superintendent District 125
 Jerry Cummins - Math Consultant
 Dr. Linda Fulmore - Math Consultant
 Dr. Gwen Zimmerman - Math and Science Division Chair, Adlai Stevenson High School

District Office

Howard Hunigan – Superintendent
 Ilandus Hampton – Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Operations
 Donna Simpson Leak – Assistant Superintendent for Student Learning and Accountability
 Selma McDonald – Director of Human Resources
 Marda Cotton-Ramey - Director of Special Education
 Celeste Nelson- Rtl Coordinator

Rich Central Campus

Maceo Rainey – Principal
 Xavier Owens – Associate Principal of Operations
 Jacalyn Bailey – Special Education Instructional Leader
 Sherry Stokes – Associate Principal of Teaching & Learning
 Viola Baecher – social worker
 Kim Groves –psychologist
 Bryan Craig – counselor
 Kina Thomas – counselor

Christopher Moore – dean
Rick Rapp – School Improvement Plan Chair person, English teacher
Audrey Smith – PBIS member and special education teacher
Oliver Speller – science teacher
Devon Westmoreland – social studies
Vivian Johnson – parent/classified
Charles Durley - Parent

Rich East Campus

Mark Kramer - Principal
Sherry Birts – Associate Principal of Operations
Iman Ellis- Bowen - Special Education Instructional Leader
Traci Toth - Associate Principal of Teaching & Learning
Bob Abrams – Science Instructional Leader
Kari Tomiak - teacher
Bob Kaufmann - math teacher
Bob Kehoe - teacher
Stacy Dunn - Math Teacher
Leah Roberts - teacher
Bonnie Alshire – community rep/classified
Jonnie Bass – dean
Vikkeda Bass – sped ed teacher
Erin Craven – science teacher
Bonnie Dickey – school psychologist
Kathy Gray – sped teacher
Eric Hampton - classified
Lydia Hernandez – parent/classified
Kameelha Jones – English teacher
Paul Jurges - counselor
Jeanine Seyfried – special education teacher
Sarah Smado – math teacher
Nancy Pawluk – counselor

Rich South Campus

Cynthia Hudson - Principal
Jennifer Bednarczyk - Associate Principal for teaching and Learning
Cynthia Levy – Instructional Leader
Dr. Bridget Imoukhuede – Associate Principal for Operations
LaRhonda Taylor – Instructional Leader
Mark Hopman – Assistant Principal for Athletics and Activities
Tracy Murray – Social Worker
Tracy Lett-Hill – Teacher and SIP Chairman
Juanita Southern – Social Studies Teacher

Brenna Moreland - Teacher
Toya Jarrett - Math Teacher
Will Chatman - Teacher
Rashad King - Teacher
Andre Varnardo – Social Studies Teacher
Arie Christian - Nurse
Elise Baranowski – Math Teacher
Sherri Mazzone – Science Teacher
Lisa Calgaro – Reading Specialist
Martha Rago – Science Teacher
Linda Knight - Teacher
Patricia Crowe - Teacher
Chris Pipikios – Science Teacher
Susan Douglass – school psychologist

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

B. District Responsibilities

District Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that the district has provided to revise the plan and other services that the district will provide toward implementation of strategies and activities. District responsibilities include providing technical assistance to the schools including data analysis, identification of the district's challenges in implementing professional development requirements, the resulting need-related technical assistance and professional development to effect changes in instruction, and analysis and revision of the district's budget to ensure that funds provided under Title I and Title III supplement, not supplant, non federal funds, and that services provided with these funds are comparable with the services in schools that are not receiving funds under Title I (NCLB, Section 1116 and 1120A).

The district has provided and will continue to provide:

1. Math Consultants
2. Differentiated Instruction training and consultants
3. Evans Newton Incorporated - Benchmark assessments completed for Math (Algebra, Geometry, Algebra 2 Trig) and Science (Biology and Chemistry). To be completed in 2010 for English (English 9 and 10) and Reading (Freshmen Social Studies and History of Western Civilization)
4. ACT Preparation for all students – Cambridge Education as a partner
5. Student Information System for the efficient retrieval of data

Corrective Action Items taken:

1. Detracking of Language Arts in 2006 – 2007
2. Detracking of Mathematics in 2007 – 2008
3. Implementation and Support of ACT/PSAE support
4. Outside consultants for Mathematics (Excellence and Equity (E2) in Mathematics)
5. Reading Specialist support at each campus

Restructuring Implementation at all three campuses including:

1. Changing of staff
2. Other Governance changes including:
 - a. Freshmen Academy
 - b. Advisory period embedded within the bell schedule

The District will continue to review and insure connection to the Corrective Action items listed, Campus Restructuring plans and the Title I e plan. The District will also continue to support the development and implementation of the campus based School Improvement Plans for each campus with alignment to the District Improvement Plan.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

C. State Responsibilities

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

The district is working closely with ISC 4 including the three assigned consultants:

Mr. Jerry Vrshek

Mr. Bill Wilson

Dr. Ken Freeman.

In addition, support has been obtained through Dr. Vanessa Kinder and Tony Monaco.

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 10/1/2009

A.Assurances

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

B.Superintendent's Certification

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

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

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN**ANALYSIS OF DATA**

- Yes No Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified?[C]
- Yes No Does the DIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness?[C]
- Yes No Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students?[C]
- Yes No Does the analysis, along with other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?[C]

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

- Yes No Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?
- Yes No Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

OTHER DATA

- Yes No Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?
- Yes No Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

- Yes No Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance?[C]
- Yes No Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control?[C]

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

Yes No

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

Yes No

Has the DIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan?[C]

Yes No N/A

Do the objectives address all areas of AYP and AMAO deficiency?[C]

Yes No N/A

Do the objectives address the areas of special education compliance?

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

Yes No

Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?

Yes No

Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement?[C]

Yes No

Are the strategies and activities measurable?[C]

Yes No

Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified?

Yes No

Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear?[C]

Yes No N/A

Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students?[C]

Yes No N/A

Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status or special education non-compliance?

Yes No N/A

Do the parent involvement strategies and activities clearly align with the strategies and activities for students?[C]

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No

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

MONITORING

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

METHODS OF PLAN DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, AND IMPLEMENTATION

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No

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

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD

Yes No

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

PART II - COMMENTS