

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number	190220200020000		
District Name	KEENEYVILLE SD 20	Superintendent	DR CAROL AUER
District Address	5540 ARLINGTON DR E	Telephone	6308942250
City/State/Zip	HANOVER PARK,IL,60133 5569	Extn:	0
Email	cauer@esd20.org		

Is this for a Title I District ? Yes

Is this for a Title III District that did not meet AMAO ? No

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2008 AYP Report**

Is this District making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	Yes	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?	Yes	2007-08 Federal Improvement Status	district improvement year
Is this District making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2007-08 State Improvement Status	academic early warning year 1

	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		62.5			62.5			90.0		75.0	
All	99.8	Yes	99.8	Yes	76.8		Yes	80.4		Yes	95.8	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	85.6		Yes	87.4		Yes				
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	59.5		Yes	62.7		Yes				
Hispanic	99.3	Yes	99.3	Yes	62.9		Yes	72.1		Yes				
Asian/Pacific Islander	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	89.3		Yes	88.4		Yes				
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP	98.8	Yes	98.8	Yes	61.3		Yes	74.8		Yes				
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	51.3	43.9	Yes	56.1	56.8	Yes				
Economically Disadvantaged	99.5	Yes	99.5	Yes	60.9		Yes	68.7		Yes				

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.

2. At least 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 62.5% 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 62.5% 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 75% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2007. ** Safe Harbor Targets of 62.5% 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.

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2008 AMAO Report**

Is this district meeting Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO)?: Yes
 English Proficiency Test Type : ACCESS for ELLs
 Minimum Target :

Attaining English Language Proficiency Target	Making Progress in English Target	Criterion 3: AYP-LEP Subgroup						Is this district meeting English Proficiency target?	Yes
		AYP-Participation Rate		AYP-Percent Meeting/Exceeding		AYP-Other Indicators percent			
		Reading	Mathematics	Reading	Mathematics	Attendance	Graduations	Is this district meeting Progress in English Target?	Yes
								Is this district meeting AYP for LEP Subgroup target?	Yes

ANNUAL MEASURABLE ACHIEVEMENT OBJECTIVES(AMAO) PERFORMANCE					
Criterion 1: Attaining Proficiency			Criterion 2: Making Progress in English		
Total Number of Students Tested	Number Attaining Proficiency	Percent Attaining Proficiency	Total Number of Students Tested	Number Making Progress	Percent Making Progress
		100	167	62	37.1

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

Criterion 3: Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP for LEP Subgroup)											
Percent Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards						Other Indicators (When Safe Harbor is Applied)	
Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate	Graduation Rate
%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target	Met AYP		
98.8	Yes	98.8	Yes	61.3		Yes	74.8		Yes		

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

1. At least 95.0% tested for Reading and Mathematics for the LEP Subgroup. If the current year's participation rates are less than 95%, the participation rate for AYP will be considered sufficient if the average of the current year and the preceding year is at least 95%, or if the average of the current year and the two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% but 'Met AYP' is 'Yes', it means the 95% condition was met by averaging.

2. At least 55.0% Meeting/Exceeding Standards for Reading and Mathematics for the LEP subgroup. For LEP subgroup under the 55.0% Meeting/Exceeding requirement, a 95% confidence interval has been applied; or meet Safe Harbor requirements.

3. At least 90.0% Attendance Rate for elementary school districts or at least 72.0% Graduation Rate for high school districts. Unit districts must meet both criteria.

AYP for LEP subgroup includes only students enrolled as of 5/1/06.

Safe Harbor Targets of 55.0% or above are not printed

LEP Subgroups with fewer than 45 students are not reported. Safe harbor only applies to subgroups. In order for safe harbor to apply, a subgroup must decrease by 10% the percentage of scores that did not meet state standards from the previous year plus meet the other indicators (attendance rate for non-high school districts, graduation rate for high school districts, and attendance and graduation rates for unit school districts) for the subgroup. Safe harbor allows school districts an alternate method to meet subgroup minimum targets on achievement.

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

District Information								
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Attendance Rate (%)	95.8	96.1	96.0	95.8	95.7	96.2	95.2	95.8
Truancy Rate (%)	0.7	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.3
Mobility Rate (%)	15.5	11.7	10.0	12.0	13.1	14.7	10.6	12.6
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
District Population (#)	1675.0	1616.0	1619.0	1727.0	1713.0	1708.0	1699.0	1691.0
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	13.3	13.6	15.8	20.7	21.6	24.1	26.3	30.0
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	12.8	12.7	9.1	13.5	15.2	15.0	15.0	10.9
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	60.1	58.8	56.2	53.8	50.7	46.8	44.3	45.1
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	11.8	10.7	10.6	11.3	12.1	14.2	14.2	12.6
Hispanic (%)	15.3	16.9	19.0	21.2	22.9	24.2	27.3	25.4
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	12.7	13.4	13.8	13.4	14.1	14.0	12.9	14.1
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.8
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	0.1	0.4	1.1	2.0

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/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
D I S T R I C T	1999	66.2	9.6	11.9	12.2	0.1	-
	2000	63.4	10.0	14.1	12.3	0.2	-
	2001	60.1	11.8	15.3	12.7	0.2	-
	2002	58.8	10.7	16.9	13.4	0.2	-
	2003	56.2	10.6	19.0	13.8	0.4	-
	2004	53.8	11.3	21.2	13.4	0.3	-
	2005	50.7	12.1	22.9	14.1	0.2	0.1
	2006	46.8	14.2	24.2	14.0	0.4	0.4
	2007	44.3	14.2	27.3	12.9	0.3	1.1
	2008	45.1	12.6	25.4	14.1	0.8	2.0
S T A T E	1999	62.0	20.8	13.9	3.2	0.2	-
	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

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 Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
D I S T R I C T	1999	12.6	9.9	98.1	95.5	11.7	29	1.8	-	-
	2000	12.3	12.4	100.0	95.7	16.5	14	0.9	0.0	0.0
	2001	12.8	13.3	100.0	95.8	15.5	11	0.7	-	-
	2002	12.7	13.6	100.0	96.1	11.7	4	0.3	-	-
	2003	9.1	15.8	100.0	96.0	10.0	1	0.1	0.0	0.0
	2004	13.5	20.7	99.7	95.8	12.0	3	0.2	0.0	0.0
	2005	15.2	21.6	100.0	95.7	13.1	1	0.1	0.0	0.0
	2006	15.0	24.1	100.0	96.2	14.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2007	15.0	26.3	100.0	95.2	10.6	3	0.2	0.0	0.0
	2008	10.9	30.0	100.0	95.8	12.6	5	0.3	0.0	0.0
S T A T E	1999	6.4	36.1	96.1	93.6	18.1	43332	2.3	5.9	81.9
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.9	94.0	16.4	37525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40764	2.1	4.6	86.5
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49858	2.5	4.1	86.5

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

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

	Year	School(N)	Grade 3(N)	Grade 4(N)	Grade 5(N)	Grade 7(N)	Grade 8(N)	Grade 11(N)
D I S T R I C T	1999	1681	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1695	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1675	169	210	197	199	176	-
	2002	1616	173	157	198	168	193	3
	2003	1619	192	178	161	202	168	1
	2004	1727	164	204	189	215	210	1
	2005	1713	194	173	201	170	207	2
	2006	1708	168	185	180	195	175	0.0
	2007	1699	184	175	164	193	196	0.0
	2008	1691	-	-	-	-	-	-
S T A T E	1999	1962026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1983991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2007170	164791	161546	162001	151270	148194	123816
	2002	2029821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2044539	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	2060048	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	2062912	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	2075277	136123	139619	146935	153566	154856	-
	2007	2077856	-	-	-	-	-	-
2008	2074167	-	-	-	-	-	-	

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, Staff Capacity and Professional Development**

	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	1999	110	15	45335	55	46	18	-	-	-
	2000	110	14	43307	59	41	19	-	-	-
	2001	111	14	45981	61	39	18	-	-	-
	2002	114	15	48185	58	42	17	-	1	0.0
	2003	114	15	49751	59	41	17	0.0	1	0.0
	2004	111	14	50570	52	48	19	0.0	1	0.0
	2005	110	14	52373	39	61	18	0.0	1	0.0
	2006	110	13	54372	45	56	18	0.0	1	0.0
	2007	109	13	56908	39	61	18	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2008	111	13	58379	41	59	18	0.0	0.0	0.0
S T A T E	1999	119718	15	45337	53	47	20	18	-	-
	2000	122671	15	45766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125735	15	47929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126544	14	49702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129068	14	51672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125702	14	54446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128079	14	55558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127010	13	56685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127010	13	58275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131488	12	60871	47	53	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, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	57.6	66.9	56.1	67.8	68.3	69.9	-	-	-	73.0	71.1	71.9	70.8	66.5	58.7	69.9	75.5	79.1
White	60.8	76.7	60.5	78.1	75.0	80.9	-	-	-	78.5	77.9	88.6	70.0	70.2	69.3	80.0	82.1	87.0
Black	42.9	33.3	33.3	44.1	47.8	47.8	-	-	-	35.0	50.0	53.8	69.3	64.2	43.4	38.7	45.0	72.4
Hispanic	52.0	72.3	64.2	66.7	44.0	58.5	-	-	-	81.5	75.0	42.3	62.5	56.0	48.6	66.7	82.2	71.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	64.3	57.1	50.0	72.2	88.4	80.0	-	-	-	77.7	83.4	92.3	87.6	65.4	54.6	79.0	68.8	83.3
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	52.7	-	-	-	-	-	61.4	-	-	-	-	-	73.7
Students with Disabilities	24.1	26.3	34.6	35.7	30.3	46.4	-	-	-	17.4	28.2	56.4	27.8	16.0	23.1	33.3	23.8	55.0
Economically Disadvantaged	60.7	45.1	51.2	41.7	46.3	60.7	-	-	-	50.0	51.5	50.0	57.7	57.9	51.4	39.4	50.0	68.2
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	68.1	71.3	80.7	-	-	-	70.1	70.9	74.9	69.4	68.2	70.7	78.3	83.2	77.6
White	-	-	-	73.0	82.7	87.4	-	-	-	79.3	71.6	86.5	78.4	71.4	76.3	82.9	86.5	83.1
Black	-	-	-	51.5	34.4	55.0	-	-	-	52.5	56.7	56.7	37.5	53.8	54.2	52.9	75.0	54.5
Hispanic	-	-	-	70.6	59.3	74.5	-	-	-	60.0	72.2	57.5	57.7	65.4	51.6	76.9	84.2	72.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	68.9	90.0	88.2	-	-	-	81.8	81.5	83.3	70.8	69.5	88.5	76.5	84.2	96.1
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Keeneyville SD 20

12/12/2008 2:21:55 PM

District Improvement Plan 2008

Page 12 of 31

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	40.5	42.9	46.6	-	-	-	22.2	34.4	37.9	23.1	37.5	36.0	39.1	38.5	43.2
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	56.5	40.5	72.8	-	-	-	55.1	61.0	55.8	48.1	57.9	46.4	42.5	77.1	61.2

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	74.9	86.0	76.2	78.3	81.0	88.1	-	-	-	82.9	84.0	80.2	77.2	78.2	77.4	80.9	86.0	80.2
White	72.6	91.9	79.2	83.6	89.2	95.2	-	-	-	85.7	88.3	95.5	83.0	84.1	76.9	89.6	89.3	85.8
Black	71.4	54.2	76.2	53.0	65.2	78.3	-	-	-	65.0	61.3	53.9	46.2	57.2	67.7	51.6	70.0	65.5
Hispanic	76.0	94.5	75.0	83.4	56.0	83.0	-	-	-	85.2	95.0	61.6	66.7	73.0	74.3	85.8	89.3	76.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	85.7	92.9	68.2	100.0	92.3	85.0	-	-	-	83.3	94.5	92.3	87.6	84.6	90.9	84.2	87.6	94.4
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	80.0	-	-	-	-	-	70.1	-	-	-	-	-	86.8
Students with Disabilities	37.9	57.9	65.3	57.1	60.6	78.6	-	-	-	43.4	68.8	71.8	38.9	36.0	42.5	58.3	61.9	62.5
Economically Disadvantaged	78.6	64.5	75.7	61.2	61.0	83.6	-	-	-	70.0	66.7	65.1	57.6	55.3	72.2	54.5	73.3	71.2
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	71.3	78.2	78.3	-	-	-	70.2	77.5	77.6	51.6	50.7	52.8	84.4	82.6	74.9
White	-	-	-	74.1	86.4	83.7	-	-	-	83.9	79.6	90.1	58.4	53.8	55.7	88.9	91.0	75.0
Black	-	-	-	54.3	44.8	55.0	-	-	-	45.0	70.0	50.0	31.3	15.4	20.9	53.0	63.9	66.6
Hispanic	-	-	-	61.7	77.8	74.5	-	-	-	54.3	66.7	67.5	26.9	38.4	39.4	80.7	79.0	70.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	93.1	90.0	82.3	-	-	-	86.3	92.6	83.4	66.7	86.9	88.5	94.1	89.5	92.3
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	40.5	28.6	40.0	-	-	-	29.6	50.0	34.4	15.3	16.6	11.5	52.2	42.3	32.4
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	63.0	59.5	71.2	-	-	-	46.9	65.9	59.0	25.9	34.2	21.5	57.5	66.7	63.0

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

--

The FY08 data from the District Report Card tell us that students in our district are meeting standards in all areas and all subgroups. However, we do find gaps in achievement for several subgroups. While 85.6% and 87.4% White students meet/exceed in Reading/Math respectively, the Blacks, Hispanics, LEPs, IEPs, and Economically Disadvantaged students score significantly below those percentages.

	Reading	Math
White	85.6	87.4
Blacks	59.5	62.7
Hispanics	62.9	72.1
LEP	61.3	74.8
Students with Disabilities	51.3	56.1
Economically Disadvantaged	60.9	68.7

Further study of the report card data revealed that the number of students in LEP, IEP, and Low Income (Title I) programs is not proportional to the Rtl triangle proportions of 80% - 15% - 5%. District 20 data are 53.3% - 46.7%, with no differentiation for Tier III in the 46.7% group.

LEP tested in program	169
IEP tested in programs	214
Low Income (386 identified)	143 (Title I and Reading Improvement)
Total tested in programs GR3-8	526
Total tested in GR3-8	1124
Total in programs Tier II and Tier III	46.7%

District 20 has made AMAO for the past three years, so while there is an achievement gap for LEP students, the progress they are making is within the range of continuous improvement.

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

External Factors:

Diversity in community, both ethnicity and income related demographics

High language needs of community

Many students come to our district with Special Education requirements. Sometimes those students need opportunity to learn rather than special education services.

Internal Factors:

Core curriculum or instructional practices may not be meeting the diverse range of learners; they may need more support in reading and math.

Curriculum implementation for students in LEP, IEP, and Title I programs may be mismatched.

Professional development specific for the needs of the students in these subgroups may not have been sufficient to meet the needs of all of our learners.

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

While we are meeting AYP as a district in all areas, all subgroups, in order to move forward with the Rtl Model, we need to verify that the core curriculum is being implemented with fidelity. We also will need to score and post with consistency the common unit assessments that are being developed.

We need to collect data from the various intervention programs that are in place related to the subgroups and monitor progress of students involved in the program.

We need to disaggregate the percentage of students in the 46.7% group who are receiving more intense services in each of the programs.

We need to investigate universal screening measures in Reading and Math and data management systems that may be able to provide another data source for inclusion in the Rtl Model.

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 indicated?*

At this point, the local data that could be used in the future comes from the standards-based report card and the common assessments. As both of these are implemented, consistency of use and reporting will improve thus allowing us to be able to make better use of this data. The November Standards-based Report Card report to the District 20 Board of Education indicated that the average standard score for reading and math was 2.96 and 2.99 respectively. The Fall 2008 Kindergarten screening data tells us that 52% of our students entered our system with literacy skills below standard, i.e., phonemic awareness, letter names and sounds, and print concepts. These students were identified as they began their kindergarten year and are now participating in Title I or Reading Improvement programs.

Each January, the Kindergarten ISEL, ISEL1, ISEL2, and QRI-3 are administered to provide us information about the growth that students in the Title I and Reading Improvement programs are making. These same tests are given to students with disabilities each year in preparation for their annual reviews. ELL

students also are given the tests if they are at Levels 3, 4, or 5 because at that point, we believe they know enough English to begin charting what they know and are able to do. The data collected from these assessments tells us that students make progress at varying rates. That is, for some students, growth occurs quickly and for others it takes place steadily over time. We have the data for each students but we have not disaggregated it by subgroups or by tiers using local criteria.

We are currently developing common assessments in reading/Language Arts that are aligned to the Illinois Assessment Framework. The intent of these assessments is to provide us with information about what students know and are able to do as a result of scientifically based instruction and directly related to the core curriculum aligned with the Illinois Learning Standards.

According to the RtI Needs Assessment, we do not have universal screenings in place. However, we do currently use ISAT, Kindergarten Screening, ISEL, and QRI-3 data to make decisions about students needing interventions. We also have a process in place, called START, where problem solving about students takes place. Data from the assessments cited above are used for this process. Specific progress monitoring for students as a result of this data needs to be developed for more effective interventions. We want to continue to use these measures in FY10 while we investigate other data measures and data management systems.

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

External factors:

Kindergarten students often do not have pre-school experiences or other literacy experiences. Thus, these student and others new to our system from the various subgroups often enter our system with background experiences that do not match the academic background knowledge needed for school success.

Internal factors:

Using the ISEL and QRI-3 allows us to test students, one-on-one, to identify their reading needs and then plan instruction accordingly. Testing in January provides time for instruction during the fall and then time again for data-driven instruction through the spring to the end of the year.

Making the change to use common assessments and scoring them according to standards has meant a paradigm shift for staff. Using the data from these assessments is another area that will help us in the future to meet the needs of our students.

We have moved to a standards-based grading and common assessment system that is intended to identify strengths and weaknesses of our students and that could be used as a part of a multi-tier intervention system. Since our efforts have been in this area, we have not pursued the use of a computerized standard testing system to date.

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

We need to disaggregate data collected from all assessments used at this time for all students for all subgroups to find out how what we have in place can help us in a multi-tier intervention system and whether there is a need for other data instruments.

We need to know more about intervening for learning, assessing *for* learning and assessing *of* learning in order to increase the number of students in Tier 1.

We need to look at our system and use formative and progress monitoring measures in this process to help to increase the number of students in Tier 1.

We need to use the information obtained from these data to guide instruction and evaluate the strength of our curriculum.

We will investigate universal screeners and data management systems in Reading and Math, in the event that these tools may have to be added to the system we currently have in plac.

**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?

District Attributes

- o Staff, administration, and Board of Education committed to improving student performance. The scores have been going up over the past four years.
- o District 20 has a good attendance rate with an average of 95% over the past four years.
- o District 20 has experienced an increasing diversity within its school community with the percentage of ELL students growing from 25.4% in 2004 to 65.1% in 2007. This attribute offers us the opportunity to celebrate our differences.
- o The pupil-teacher ratio in 2007 was 17.9 in District 20, compared to 18.8 in the state.
- o The average class size in the district was 22.0 in 2007.
- o District 20 parents are involved in parent teacher conferences, Reading Nights, band boosters, PTOs, African American Read-Ins, RIF Program, Bilingual Advisory Committee, and Read Across America.
- o District 20 offers after school programs for ELL students at Greenbrook and after school homework sessions for middle school students two nights a week. Transportation is provided for both the elementary and middle school students supported by both federal and district funds.
- o District 20 has excellent facilities for students and staff. The buildings are well-kept, bright and cheerful. They are secure from outsiders.
- o District 20 has excellent technology resources for students and staff. Each classroom has 4 computers and each building has at least 1 cart of laptops that can be used in addition to the 4 computers already in the rooms.
- o District 20 libraries are updated annually. Each library is staffed with a librarian and an aide.
- o District 20 has recently implemented PBIS to enhance the learning climate in each of the buildings.
- o District 20 has a standards-based curriculum. The development of common assessments is in its second year. Students' academic progress is reported to parent online in terms of standards as well as overall grade.

- o District 20 has adopted a balanced literacy format in reading; uses NSF (National Science Foundation) developed math programs at the elementary and the middle school; uses science kits at the elementary level; has recently adopted social studies materials that include leveled biographies and historical event readers; adopted 6+1 Writing Traits program for writing.
- o District 20 pays for a summer school program each year. Approximately 300 students are invited to attend this summer program with over 150 students actually attending for 16 days, 4 hours per day. The district provides free transportation to attend this program.
- o Lapsits are provided two times each month for parents and young children, birth to age 5, to promote language development.
- o Parents As Teachers is another district program that encourages social interaction with other children and families, providing opportunities to practice social skills in all areas of development.
- o District 20 employs a parent liaison for the Hispanic community. We also sponsor Mi Casa, Su Casa which is a parent program that explains the American education system to Hispanic parents. We offer adult ESL classes free of charge to parents in our district.

Community Attributes

- o Within the community, District 20 enjoys good working relationships with the fire and police departments. We work closely with the mayors of both villages, Roselle and Hanover Park. The public libraries provide shelf space for our textbooks thus making curriculum materials available to students and parents outside of the school buildings.
- o Also within the community, District 20 partners with the College of DuPage offering academic opportunities for students during the school year and during the summer. District 20 hosts GED classes taught through COD for adults in the area seeking to advance their education.
- o District 20 supports the Hanover Park Resource Center sponsored by the DuPage County Partners Program (DuCaP) which holds tutoring sessions for students on Saturday mornings. DuCaP also provides daily after school services for Greenbrook and Spring Wood students.
- o District 20 schools participate in the AIMS (Adults Involved in Mentoring Students) program.
- o 31% of the adults in the District 20 school community hold BA degrees or higher.
- o The Bloomingdale Library offers free tutoring for students.
- o DuPage County Literacy Volunteers provides no-cost one to one tutoring for adults who do not speak English.
- o The Polish community holds a Saturday school for Polish speaking students.

- o A new organization from the community is working with District 20 students called WAYS.
- o Lake Park High School tutors come to SpringWoodMiddle School twice a week to work with students who are struggling.
- o Roselle Park District sponsors Club Kids that is housed at WaterburyElementary School.
- o Basketball activities sponsored by the Roselle Park District and Hanover Park Park District use District 20 facilities.
- o Both Cub Scouts and Boy Scouts use District 20 facilities making these programs easily accessible for students.

The data and information listed in this section tells us that District 20, while changing demographically and economically, is still rich with resources and strong community relationships. Civic organizations readily support academic learning. District 20 has partnerships with libraries, police and fire protection, and park districts. We are multi-lingual in nature providing a variety of experiences that can enrich the life of the school community. The difference in income reflects shifts in the use of resources and family life patterns. Often some parents are working two jobs or both parents are working, leaving school-age children with other adults, siblings, or unattended. Cultural aspects and differences impact parental experiences, student performance, and communication between school and home. Frequently students come to us with complicated social and emotional issues. There are students with behavior issues and/or with medical conditions that affect their learning and the learning environment.

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

These attributes and challenges contribute to student performance results in the following ways:

Attributes

- o Common assessments clearly define what learning looks like in District 20.
- o PBIS creates a positive and safe learning environment.
- o The math curriculum focuses on problem solving and thinking and as a result, ISAT Math scores are improving.
- o A balanced literacy program has been implemented throughout the district.
- o Students have up-to-date access to technology for learning.

Challenges

- o Limited background knowledge limits the students' ability to make connections to academic curriculum.

- o Parents not able to help due to lack of time and/or education
- o Parents and students may make choices at home that do not support school work
- o Some parents are apprehensive about being involved in school related activities because of a lack of education or poor education experiences themselves. They may not know about the high expectations and their reference point for expectations may be a result of their own experiences or culture.
- o Cultural differences affect student learning in terms of who is responsible for a child's education, e.g., the home or the school.
- o Meeting the needs of diverse groups of students is a challenge given the time constraints of the school day.
- o Using data that we currently have to meet the instructional needs of students
 Within the district, we have resources available for students. We have adopted researched-based curriculum materials. Our staff are always searching for ways to meet the needs of our students. We have developed a variety of formats to communicate student progress to parents. We have parent groups at each building that support district learning programs. We strive to maintain positive learning environments throughout the district. The school buildings are safe for students and staff.
 To date, District 20 has not undertaken the implementation of a multi-tier intervening services model as described by the recent Rtl paper published by the Illinois State Board of Education. Rather, District 20 does have a START process that supports staff as they plan for diverse learning needs of students. It is a problem solving process that was developed out of the Regular Education Initiative and continues to evolve. Title I, Reading Improvement, and ELL programs are interventions at the Tier 2 level with special education in line with the Tier 2 and Tier 3 levels.

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

Because we are committed to improving our achievement outcomes for all students, we want to improve the system that we have in order to bring it into alignment with the current Rtl model.

We want to investigate universal screeners for Reading in FY2010 and Math in FY2011 along with data managements systems in order to identify other measures of student achievement besides what we are already working on in the district.

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?*

All District 20 staff meet the highly qualified requirements for the subject areas they teach.

District 20 employs four reading specialists, one each at Waterbury and Spring Wood Middle School; two specialists at Greenbrook. District 20 employs special education teachers for each grade level to meet the needs of special education students. There are three special education teachers at WB (K-5); six at Greenbrook (K-5); and seven at Spring Wood (6-8).

Staff have participated in professional development focusing on poverty issues, ethnic issues, autism, ADHD/ADD, ELL teaching strategies, classroom management, differentiation, technology, standards and assessments, and standards-based grading.

Staff are using standards-based grading programs and have participated in standards-based grading workshops.

We have a number of new staff who will need staff training on how to implement the core reading and math programs with fidelity.

All staff members have received training with PBIS, Tier 1. We intend to move into Tier 2 training during the FY09 school year.

District 20 has an educated staff with 58.7% of the staff holding a Masters degree or higher.

District 20 staff has on average 12.7 years teaching experience which is 0.3 years more than the state average of 12.4 years.

District 20 administrative personnel have been consistent stable for the last 6 years. The current superintendent has been with the district for the last 5 years; one of the building principals has been serving the district for 14 years.

The District Rtl committee members indicated on the Rtl Needs Assessment that in all the areas listed for ongoing professional development for effective Rtl, the indicators were not present, e.g, use of data for instructional purposes, tools for screening and progress monitoring, reasearch-based intervention strategies, training in collaborating with and involving parents, sufficient time for professional development activities related to Rtl, application of data analysis skills, and finally, key district and school staff have not been identified for enchanced training in specific components of Rtl to build school capacity and ensure sustainability of Rtl.

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

While staff have participated in the professional development experiences, follow up and implementation may not have been done in a timely or consistent manner.

Possibly the manner of delivering professional development meant that not all staff learned and/or used what was learned consistently to affect student results in a large way, i.e., across a grade level or school.

New staff enter the organization and may have to deal with complex leaarning issues without the benefit of the deep initial training that usually takes place when district initiatives are implemented.

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

We need to develop a cohesive, coordinated staff development plan that supports the Rtl model taking into account what staff already know and use successfully. The district is committed to ensuring that all teachers have access to and training in all the elements of Rtl. According to our **Rtl Needs**

Assessment, this was the only area in Professional Development that committee members felt was present as an indicator.

We need professional development and on-going coaching support to encourage role changes for support staff. We need professional development that helps staff in the area of co-teaching, data analysis, problem solving team work, and assessment.

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

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

Parent Satisfaction Surveys indicate that parents want more communication from the school

Attendance at Parent-Teacher Conferences, Curriculum Nights

Number of parents attending school functions is stable from year to year with some events drawing more parents than others

Attendance at problem solving meetings is good meaning that for the most part, parents come to special meetings that focus on their child.

Parent participation on current school wide committees or leadership teams varies among the buildings. Sometimes parents who do serve are often employees of the district. The Bilingual Advisory Committee always has between 4 and 5 parents serving at any one time.

PTO/PTA sponsor field trips that expand education experiences for our students.

Parents participate in field day activities.

The number of parent hits on Webgrader, electronic grading system, has increased almost three times from last year when it was first introduced.

District 20 parents are involved in parent teacher conferences, Reading Nights, band boosters, PTOs, African American Read-Ins, RIF Program, Bilingual Advisory Committee, and Read Across America.

Results of **Rtl Needs Assessment** indicate that strong district leadership and principal support for systemic change through collaboration is known and implementation planning has begun.

The results also indicate that a collaborative model facilitating discussion among district stakeholders is also known and implementation planning has begun.

District stakeholders are included in plan development, implementation and fidelity monitoring as the plan is implemented is also known and has begun.

Three other areas: a comprehensive plan to provide information about Rtl practices; parents included in planning and implementation of Rtl; and, integration of the Rtl plan with other initiatives are **not** present.

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

PTO provides materials and assembly for schools, thus expanding learning opportunities for students.

Classroom volunteers and tutors help students who might need a little more practice or assistance with academic work.

Parents contribute to school climate with a high demand for excellence.

Webgrader information has increased understanding and dialogue between parents and staff.

At least one parent on district and school leadership can contribute to a clearer understanding of 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).

Need for more parents involved in planning and dissemination of information regarding Rtl.

Identify structure to communicate Rtl information to parents (e.g., open house, parent/teacher conferences, website, written communication, progress

monitoring graphs) on ongoing basis.

We will more clearly define the Rtl plan that will be implemented in the next two years for parents

We will develop procedures to involve parents in the planning, implementation, and sustainability of Rtl.

We need to develop and communicate ways for parents to participate in Rtl if their child is identified for Tier 2 and/or Tier 3.

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

Section I-D - Key Factors – From the preceding screens (I-A, I-B, I-C-1, 2, 3), 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?

Build a stronger, more efficient and effective assessment and intervention system based upon core curriculum in Reading and Math and aligned with Illinois Learning Standards and the Illinois Assessment Framework.

Building stronger grade level/department teams to ensure that the assessment and intervention systems and problem solving activities are working at their maximum capacities.

Need for on-going professional development in the Rtl Model and coaching support to encourage and problem solve with staff.

Need for more consistent parent involvement in the planning, implementation and participation in the Rtl Model.

Section II-Action Plan

No Deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AYP report.

No Deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO report.

This district is not accountable for AMAO for this year

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1 Title :

Response to Intervention Model: Plan for Implementation

Objective 1 Description :

District 20 is committed to improving the achievement gap for all students. Key to reaching that goal, a district team representing each of the buildings and

including parents has been created to ensure that decisions about what is already in place and what needs to be built through leadership and staff development are made thoughtfully and with appropriate awareness of the change process.

The district team will focus its efforts around issues related to which interventions will be used, how multi-tiered services will be delivered, how students will be identified for each tier and move between tiers, and what will and will not be part of the special education eligibility process for specific learning disabilities.

The district team will provide implementation guidance and support for each of the schools.

At the school level, the district team will build a strong rapport with each school improvement team, strengthening the capacity for grade-level teams, and ensuring that a problem solving team works in a timely and effective manner.

The Rtl Implementation Plan is coordinated with the SIPs from all three buildings in District 20. All buildings have targeted meeting the needs of specific subgroups as goals for the coming years. They have cited the implementation of Rtl in their plans.

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 1 Title : Response to Intervention Model: Plan for Implementation

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Students in GR3-8 will be identified using ISAT scores from FY09; K students will participate in the Kindergarten Screening Assessment. Students currently in Title I, Reading Improvement, and ELL classes will participate in ISEL and QRI-3 testing. All students will participate in common classroom assessments.	8/15/2009	6/10/2010	During School	Other	
All Students in Kindergarten will be screened using the D20 Kindergarten Screening Measure in the fall and spring of each year.	8/15/2009	6/15/2010	During School	Other	
Students in Title I, Reading Improvement, ELL, and Special Education programs will participate in progress monitoring based upon results of local tests.	8/15/2009	6/10/2010	During School	Other	
Students in each school will be placed at appropriate tiers based upon local assessment results.	8/15/2009	6/10/2010	During School	Other	
By March 15, 2009, program to be piloted for universal screener and data management will be decided.			After School	Title I	
Students in the pilot program will be assessed at least times according to the data management system's requirements and the district's determination of appropriateness for Rtl plan.	8/15/2009	6/10/2010	During School	Other	
By March 15, 2010, program to be used for universal screening and data management will be recommended to the Board of Education.			Before School	Title I	

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

Objective 1 Title : Response to Intervention Model: Plan for Implementation

Strategies/Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
District Team will develop a cohesive and coordinated staff development focusing on the Rtl Model components using data from staff about what is known and what needs to be learned.	1/1/2009	6/10/2009	During School	Title I	
District Team will identify staff development needs regarding assessment and data-based decision making.	1/1/2009	6/10/2009	After School	Title I	
District Team will identify staff development needs regarding reading and math interventions for both elementary and middle school	1/1/2009	6/10/2009	After School	Title I	
Each school in the district will organize a team at each of the tiers in the Rtl Model using written functions/roles for each team developed by District Rtl team.	1/1/2009	6/10/2009	After School	Title I	
Each team will participate in professional development activities using data to make instructional decisions.	8/15/2009	6/10/2011	During School	Local Funds	
Using grade level/department meeting times, teacher institute days, all staff will receive training in the use of local data for instructional decisions and matching research-based interventions to student needs.	8/15/2009	6/10/2011	During School	Local Funds	
Using grade level/department meeting times, teacher institute days, all staff will receive training in the team problem-solving process, including parent collaboration at each tier of the Rtl Model.	8/15/2009	6/10/2011	During School	Local Funds	
The District will establish an Rtl Committee comprised of administrators, faculty, and parents which will meet at least four times each year to ensure on-going support and integration with other district initiatives.	4/15/2008	6/10/2011	After School	Title I	
Members of District Rtl team will visit other places where Rtl is established and working.	1/1/2009	3/15/2009	During School	Title I	
Professional Development for piloting staff members will be provided.	5/1/2009	6/10/2010	After School	Title I	

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

Objective 1 Title : Response to Intervention Model: Plan for Implementation

Strategies/Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Overview of Rtl to parent groups during the fall and spring of each year. Information about how they can participate and support their students will be presented.	8/15/2009	6/10/2011	After School	Local Funds	
Parent information sessions/coffees	8/15/2009	6/10/2011	After School	Title I	
Development of parent information groups	8/15/2009	6/10/2011	After School	Title I	

Strategies/Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Development of parent brochures explaining RtI and the tier system.	1/1/2009	8/15/2009	After School	Title I	
Increased involvement in problem solving meeting i.e., more parents on existing committees	1/1/2009	6/15/2011	After School	Title I	
Involve parents in planning and leadership discussions	1/1/2009	6/15/2011	After School	Title I	
District Team will update staff, parents regarding FY11 implementation of RtI process	1/1/2009	6/15/2011	During School	Local Funds	
Each school will develop and implement written procedures for how parents are informed and invited to participate in the RtI Model as soon as their child is identified for Tier 2 or Tier 3 support.	1/1/2009	8/15/2010	After School	Title I	
Parents will be invited to participate at each individual student problem-solving meeting held for their child.	1/1/2009	6/10/2011	After School	Title I	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title : Response to Intervention Model: Plan for Implementation

Monitoring - Describe the process and measures of success for the identified objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

Local assessment data will be analyzed three times each year by departments and grade level to determine the percentages of students currently meeting targets in Reading and Math. Also, an analysis of the various subgroups of students at risk will be conducted during those times.

Progress monitoring data will be reviewed for students currently involved with Title I, Reading Improvement, Special Education, and ELL programs on a monthly basis. Those students receiving more intense services in any of these programs, will be progress monitored on a weekly schedule.

Minutes of grade level and department meetings to analyze data and develop plans for interventions will be maintained by each team and shared with the principal of each building.

The RtI Committee will collect and review inservice evaluation ratings and comments for activities related to the RtI Model.

Annual parent surveys will include items about parent participation in the RtI process so that district administrators receive parent feedback.

Monitoring Persons - List the individuals and designate the role of each person(e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

Name	Title
Dr. Dorothy J. Dirks	Asst. Superintendent
Ms. Mary Iwema	Director of Special Education
Mr. Tod Tecktiel	Principal, Greenbrook Elementary School
Ms. Beth Carow	Principal, Waterbury Elementary School
Mr. Craig Barringer	Principal, Spring Wood Middle School
Ms. Kim Trehy	GR3 Teacher, Greenbrook
Ms. Donna Caputo	Reading Teacher, Greenbrook
Ms. Cindy Stirmell	Community Member, Teaching Assistant, Greenbrook
Ms. Cathy Henry	GR1 Teacher, Waterbury
Ms. Karen Sabados	GR3 Teacher, Waterbury
Ms. Marilyn Barnum	Community Member, Teaching Assistant, Waterbury
Ms. Sandy Haglund	Parent, Waterbury, Spring Wood
Ms. Michelle Madeck	GR7 Math Teacher, Spring Wood
Ms. Marisa Struyk	GR8 Math Teacher, Spring Wood

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation

A. Stakeholder Involvement

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

Parents and school staff, including teacher, support staff, and administrators began work on this plan in March 2008. The team met monthly until the end of the school year and then in July 2008. Each member of the team completed the Rtl Needs Assessment individually and then the information was compiled to represent the entire team's perceptions of District 20's need regarding Rtl.

During the summer meeting, a tentative timeline of activities was laid out beginning with a subgroup of team members planning to attend a Vendor Showcase sponsored by the Regional Office of Education. The purpose of attending the showcase was to educate the committee regarding the variety of resources available for districts as they implement Rtl.

Further, a writing subgroup has met more frequently during the Fall 2008 organizing the information for inclusion in the District Improvement Plan. The work done by this small group was always reviewed by the entire Rtl team before the final report was delivered to the Board of Education on December 18, 2008 for approval. It will then be posted on the official on the *iirc* website.

The District Rtl committee has agreed on dates for the remainder of the FY09 school year. The committee will decide upon rules for rotation of members as the process of implementation proceeds.

Section III - Plan 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 schools technical assistance that must include 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. Districts are also responsible for revising 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 assistance from the central office in the writing of the plan. The district will continue to provide technical assistance where and when it is needed in terms of data management systems. The district will also arrange for assistance for data analysis, monitoring of the challenges faced when providing appropriate professional development, and supporting the changes in instruction that will inevitably take place. The district will provide financial support through federal grants and re-prioritizing local dollars when appropriate to meet the evolving needs of implementing a multi-tiered system. The federal grants will not supplant non-federal funds and the services provided by the federal funds will be comparable with the services in schools that are not receiving Title I funds.

Section III - Plan 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. This may include ISBE technical assistance projects such as Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS), Children Have Opportunities to Inclusive Community Environments and Schools (CHOICES), Illinois Autism Training and Technical Assistance Project (IATTAP), Parent Educator Partnership (PEP), Illinois Service Resource Center (ISRC), and Transition Outreach Training for Adult Living (TOTAL). 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. Such 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 Regional Office of Education has provided support by alerting our district to the posting of sample plans on the ISBE website and offering consultative services when requested. Marjorie Cave and Lenore Johnson have been most helpful in answering questions and supporting our endeavors to thoughtfully plan for the RtI implementation that will take place by Fall 2010.

Section IV-A Local Board Action**Date Approved by Local Board:****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.

ISBE Monitoring - Part I

ANALYSIS OF DATA

	<p>REPORT CARD DATA</p> <p>Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified?</p>
	<p>Does the DIP include analysis of report card data that clarifies the areas of weakness?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it clear that the area of weakness is broad or narrow and whether this affects many or few students? • Does the analysis along with other optional data provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?
	<p>LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If included, is there evidence that the DIP team analyzed optional data to clarify the areas of weakness? • Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data? • Does the analysis along with the other data provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?
	<p>OTHER DATA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If included, has the DIP team analyzed other available optional data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities? • If included, do the other data provide clear direction for the selection of strategies and activities? • Does the analysis along with the other data provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

	Has the DIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement?
	Do the objectives address all areas of deficiency on the AYP sheet?

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

	Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance?
	Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control?

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

	Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?
	Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement?
	Are the strategies and activities measurable?
	Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified?
	Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear?
	Is professional development aligned with the objectives?
	Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status?
	Do the parent involvement strategies and activities clearly align with the objectives?
	Will these parent activities positively affect the factors contributing to low achievement?
	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?
	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?
	Will the collection of strategies and activities along with the monitoring process provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?

Part I Comments

ISBE Monitoring - Part II

PLAN DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, AND IMPLEMENTATION

	STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT Does the DIP 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?
	DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of this plan? If applicable, is it clear what corrective action the district is taking with this school?
	STATE RESPONSIBILITIES Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support (if any) is expected for its implementation?

APPROVAL DATE OF BOARD

	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.
--	--

Part II Comments