

Leyden CHSD 212

District Improvement Plan 2008

Local Board Approved	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	2/27/2009

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number	140162120160000		
District Name	LEYDEN CHSD 212	Superintendent	DR KATHRYN J ROBBINS
District Address	3400 ROSE ST	Telephone	8474513000
City/State/Zip	FRANKLIN PARK,IL,60131 2155	Extn:	0
Email	krobbins@leyden212.org		

Is this for a Title I District ? Yes

Is this for a Title III District that did not meet AMAO ? -

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2008 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	2007-08 Federal Improvement Status	corrective action year 1
Is this District making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2007-08 State Improvement Status	academic watch status year 2

	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	99.6	Yes	99.6	Yes	47.6		No	53.4		No			87.8	Yes
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	58.3		Yes	63.6		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic	99.4	Yes	99.4	Yes	36.3	46.7	No	41.9	48.3	No			92.7	
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities	98.0	Yes	98.0	Yes	22.9	33.0	No	11.5	27.8	No			88.5	
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	31.4	55.0	No	37.3	56.4	No			88.8	

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
		94.5	198	103	52

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		

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 (%)	92.9	93.4	90.7	89.5	88.5	93.9	91.5	92.2
Truancy Rate (%)	0.9	2.4	1.5	0.6	0.4	0.7	0.3	0.2
Mobility Rate (%)	9.2	10.6	12.8	12.4	13.7	15.9	9.6	11.2
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	81.9	81.7	90.8	93.0	92.1	92.9	82.5	87.8
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	6.2	4.9	3.4	3.6	3.2	3.3	4.3	3.1
District Population (#)	3312	3381	3477	3491	3497	3537	3501	3492
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	10.3	13.7	14.8	13.5	15.6	23.9	15.4	19.9
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	13.5	12.9	12.9	13.9	12.4	7.1	6.8	5.0
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	57.7	57.1	56.0	54.5	53.4	50.9	48.3	43.3
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.2	1.3
Hispanic (%)	36.5	37.2	38.3	40.3	41.5	43.5	46.0	50.0
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.4	3.0	2.7
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	-	0.6	1.3	2.5

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

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

	Year	White(%)	Black(%)	Hispanic(%)	Asian/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
D I S T R I C T	1999	60.9	1.6	33.2	4.0	0.3	-
	2000	58.7	1.7	35.0	4.1	0.5	-
	2001	57.7	1.3	36.5	3.9	0.5	-
	2002	57.1	1.3	37.2	3.9	0.4	-
	2003	56.0	1.4	38.3	3.8	0.5	-
	2004	54.5	1.2	40.3	3.7	0.3	-
	2005	53.4	1.4	41.5	3.5	0.2	-
	2006	50.9	1.4	43.5	3.4	0.2	0.6
	2007	48.3	1.2	46.0	3.0	0.3	1.3
	2008	43.3	1.3	50.0	2.7	0.2	2.5
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	12.8	5.4	100.0	92.3	10.6	85	2.8	5.3	81.1
	2000	13.2	8.1	100.0	92.7	13.9	30	1.0	5.6	86.0
	2001	13.5	10.3	100.0	92.9	9.2	30	0.9	6.2	81.9
	2002	12.9	13.7	100.0	93.4	10.6	81	2.4	4.9	81.7
	2003	12.9	14.8	100.0	90.7	12.8	50	1.5	3.4	90.8
	2004	13.9	13.5	100.0	89.5	12.4	22	0.6	3.6	93.0
	2005	12.4	15.6	100.0	88.5	13.7	14	0.4	3.2	92.1
	2006	7.1	23.9	100.0	93.9	15.9	25	0.7	3.3	92.9
	2007	6.8	15.4	100.0	91.5	9.6	12	0.3	4.3	82.5
	2008	5.0	19.9	100.0	92.2	11.2	8	0.2	3.1	87.8
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	3135	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	3222	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	3312	-	-	-	-	4	810
	2002	3381	-	-	-	-	-	826
	2003	3477	-	-	-	-	-	906
	2004	3491	-	-	-	-	-	834
	2005	3497	-	-	-	-	-	829
	2006	3537	-	-	-	-	-	887
	2007	3501	-	-	-	-	-	882
	2008	3492	-	-	-	-	-	847
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	155356	153480	154719	162594	159038	150475
	2008	2074167	155578	152895	153347	160039	161310	149710

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	190	15	67872	30	70	-	19	-	-
	2000	193	15	72029	28	72	-	19	-	-
	2001	203	14	74157	33	67	-	19	-	-
	2002	204	12	71097	35	65	-	19	1	-
	2003	208	13	75323	35	65	0.0	20	1	-
	2004	212	12	77624	40	60	0.0	20	2	-
	2005	223	11	78148	38	62	0.0	19	0	-
	2006	224	11	81350	40	60	0.0	19	2	1
	2007	221	10	79867	37	63	0.0	18	-	-
	2008	213	10	83499	32	68	-	18	-	1
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)**

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grade 11						
Groups	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	52.7	50.9	52.0	46.3	46.2	46.7
White	60.8	58.4	55.0	53.8	51.8	57.5
Black	-	-	20.0	38.5	-	-
Hispanic	38.9	40.1	46.5	35.8	36.5	35.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	65.5	51.7	77.4	55.2	72.3	45.5
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	40.0	50.0
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	15.6
Students with Disabilities	15.6	16.4	10.6	17.7	16.0	16.5
Economically Disadvantaged	43.1	39.7	40.9	34.9	37.1	30.9

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

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grade 11						
Groups	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	54.0	50.0	48.7	44.7	51.0	52.2
White	62.8	58.1	57.1	52.2	56.3	63.5
Black	-	-	6.7	23.1	-	-
Hispanic	39.1	35.3	36.0	33.8	42.0	40.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	72.4	75.9	74.2	62.0	83.4	72.7
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	60.0	45.0
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	21.9
Students with Disabilities	8.9	3.3	6.1	4.7	9.3	5.5
Economically Disadvantaged	52.9	48.6	31.2	49.4	46.3	36.3

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?

Our district report card tells us that the 'all' group and three subgroups (Hispanic students, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students) are under-performing in Reading and Mathematics.

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

Factors that likely contribute to the under-performance of students:

1. Students enter high school significantly lower than grade level in reading and mathematics.
2. Low-performing students often receive limited support from home for improving their academic performance.
3. Students may have limited awareness of the connections between test score performance and post-secondary goals and aspirations.
4. Faculty members may lack knowledge of the EPAS content and test sequencing, limiting their effectiveness in preparing students in their curricular areas for successful test performance in the state testing program.
5. Remedial reading and math curriculum within the district may lack specific skill building tied to individual students' needs.
6. Faculty members may lack instructional strategies that best address learning goals that are at the same time specific to their learning discipline and supportive of the scope and sequence of colleagues across the curriculum.
7. Inappropriate curricular choices within the mathematics curriculum may contribute to inadequate preparation for state testing in the junior year.
8. Targeted assistance may be needed for students whose achievement patterns and prior testing experience indicate an 'at-risk' status for meeting state standards.

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

We conclude that, in the interesting of coordinating and maximizing the district's effort to improve student achievement, we must (1) renew efforts to encourage parents to support their children at home toward increasing academic achievement, (2) increase student awareness of the importance of good performance on the EPAS series of tests, (3) increase faculty awareness of state test content and format, (4) analyze assessment data carefully to adjust and customize instructional delivery to address demonstrated needs of groups and individuals, (5) examine the enacted curriculum for appropriate scope and sequence, and (6) provide professional development for the faculty to obtain and practice discipline-specific best practices and at the same time coordinate this work to support colleagues across the curriculum.

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?

The district routinely examines the following data sets to analyze progress for groups and individuals: practice tests (PLAN, ACT); course grade distributions; course common assessments; course failure rates. Disaggregated reports tell us that student progress varies and is impacted by variables such as entry-level academic readiness, teacher expertise, clarity of learning objectives, support at home for participation and achievement, and individual social-emotional issues.

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

Factors that likely contribute to the under-performance of students:

1. Students enter high school significantly lower than grade level in reading and mathematics.
2. Low-performing students often receive limited support from home for improving their academic performance.
3. Students may have limited awareness of the connections between test score performance and post-secondary goals and aspirations.
4. Faculty members may lack knowledge of the EPAS content and test sequencing, limiting their effectiveness in preparing students in their curricular areas for successful test performance in the state testing program.
5. Remedial reading and math curriculum within the district may lack specific skill building tied to individual students' needs.
6. Faculty members may lack instructional strategies that best address learning goals that are at the same time specific to their learning discipline and supportive of the scope and sequence of colleagues across the curriculum.
7. Inappropriate curricular choices within the mathematics curriculum may contribute to inadequate preparation for state testing in the junior year.
8. Targeted assistance may be needed for students whose achievement patterns and prior testing experience indicate an 'at-risk' status for meeting state standards.

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

Our examination of local assessment data affirms the conclusions offered in Section I-A. Given both sets of data, we concluded that we can support overall district achievement by (1) renewing efforts to encourage parents to support their children at home toward increasing academic achievement, (2) increasing student awareness of the importance of good performance on the EPAS series of tests, (3) increasing faculty awareness of state test content and format, (4) analyzing assessment data carefully to adjust and customize instructional delivery to address demonstrated needs of groups and individuals, (5) examining the enacted curriculum for appropriate scope and sequence, and (6) providing professional development for the faculty to obtain and practice discipline-specific best practices and at the same time coordinate this work to support colleagues across the curriculum.

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?

Leyden students come from homes that lend a considerable amount of support to our teachers and the educational program that we offer. At the same time, aspirations of parents themselves have often not included formal post-secondary training. A school goal of establishing the link between high school academic performance, post-secondary preparation, and career success may be sometimes compromised by competing values systems.

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

Our schools are challenged to accommodate for and remediate gaps in learning that entering students often possess. Additionally, parents' limited experience with the American educational system remains a challenge in terms of support for school goals.

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

School improvement planning at Leyden should target not only academic goals but seek to educate parents on the urgency of strong performance in high school with an expectation for continuing education beyond the 12th grade.

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?

The Leyden High Schools employ faculty members who are highly qualified in their areas of instruction. 68% of all teachers hold a Master's Degree and the average number of years of experience is currently 10. Approximately 35% of the teaching force is now non-tenured. This data suggests that a large number of teachers are in the beginning stages of their careers, which implies the need for further growth and development as skillful classroom leaders who can offer the appropriate challenge levels for their students.

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

We would hypothesize that despite their academic readiness, teachers newer to the profession may have a more difficult time than seasoned veterans in pushing for higher levels of achievement on the part of their students.

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

Continued training of the professional staff will enhance teachers' skill within their own discipline and enable them to support learning across the curriculum.

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 supportive of the district's curricular and extra-curricular programs for their children. Teachers are in frequent contact with parents by telephone and email, and the district provides a number of services such as electronic access to grade progress and mailings on school events and opportunities for further development of students and their families. The data indicates that parents are in touch with their children as students.

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

A significant number of parents do not attend key school events, such as parent-teacher conferences. Commitments with their own jobs and lack of familiarity with the American education system and its expectations likely contribute to this pattern.

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

We believe that our schools must be proactive in establishing and maintaining solid relationships with parents.

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?

Key factors that are within the district's capacity to change and which have contributed to low achievement are as follows: (1) Students may have limited awareness of the connections between test score performance and post-secondary goals and aspirations, (2) Faculty members may lack knowledge of the EPAS content and test sequencing, limiting their effectiveness in preparing students in their curricular areas for successful test performance in the state testing program, (3) Remedial reading and math curriculum within the district may lack specific skill building tied to individual students’ needs, (4) Faculty members may lack instructional strategies that best address learning goals that are at the same time specific to their learning discipline and supportive of the scope and sequence of colleagues across the curriculum, (5) Targeted assistance may be needed for students whose achievement patterns and prior testing experience indicate an ‘at-risk’ status for meeting state standards.

Section II-Action Plan

Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed(AYP)	Deficiencies Addressed(AMAO)
1	The Leyden High School District will enhance post-secondary planning and services for special needs students as a means of reaching compliance with Indicator 13.	5,6,	
2	Improvement of Achievement in Reading for 'All' students and three sub-groups: Hispanic students, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students.	1,3,5,7,	
3	Improvement in Math Achievement for 'all' students and three subgroups: Hispanic students, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students.	2,4,6,8,	

The following areas of deficiency 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	Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
4	Hispanic students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
5	Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

6	Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
7	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
8	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

**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 :

The Leyden High School District will enhance post-secondary planning and services for special needs students as a means of reaching compliance with Indicator 13.

Objective 1 Description :

Only 74.92% of youth aged 16 and above had an IEP that included coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that would enable the student to meet their post-secondary goals during 2006-2007 this will be increased to 100% for the 2009-2010 school year. The focus of this objective is to review the policies, practices and procedures that impact post secondary planning and outcomes for all students at Leyden High Schools. An overview of this process includes collaboration, participation, and coordination between home, school and community members. Development of a framework which captures policy and practical alignment relative to other district initiatives will provide the structure for this process. Particular attention will be paid to the tertiary level of transition planning support with regard to students with disabilities and improving the district's compliance with Indicator 13. Targeted activities for this process include a focus on the use of the team planning tool for improving Transition Education and Services available through NSTTAC, web-based resources available through ISBE including the Indicator 13 Improvement Plan Checklist. A road map outlining the phases of this project pinpoints stakeholder participation, and the type of participation at checkpoints. Types of participation include information gathering, professional development, action planning, and focused monitoring.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency.

5	Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
6	Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

**No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO report.
This district is not accountable for AMAO for this year**

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 1 Title : The Leyden High School District will enhance post-secondary planning and services for special needs students as a means of reaching compliance with Indicator 13.

Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
Students who are 13.5 or older at the time of their high school intake staffing will participate in transition planning activities.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	State Funds	
Student will complete age appropriate formal and informal transition assessments and interest inventories as part of the high school counseling and course selection process.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	
Increase the number of student led IEP meetings by 50%	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title : The Leyden High School District will enhance post-secondary planning and services for special needs students as a means of reaching compliance with Indicator 13.

Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
Special Education faculty will participate in weekly transition activities based on the NSTTAC planning tool.	8/26/2008	6/3/2009	Before School	Local Funds	
Special education will use the Indicator 13 checklist to self monitor the content of IEP's.	1/5/2009	8/26/2009	During School	Local Funds	
Department Chairpersons and Technical Assistance Supervisors will review IEP content for compliance with Indicator 13	8/26/2008	8/26/2009	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title : The Leyden High School District will enhance post-secondary planning and services for special needs students as a means of reaching compliance with Indicator 13.

Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
Parents will receive information about the transition planning process via website, parent meetings, and targeted mailings.	11/12/2009	8/26/2010	After School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title : The Leyden High School District will enhance post-secondary planning and services for special needs students as a means of reaching compliance with Indicator 13.

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

We are in the the beginning stages of the process for changing mindsets and practices regarding transition. A road map of activities and check points has been developed to guide this process. At the starting point, baseline meetings were held with student services department chairpersons to identify current practices, barriers, and collect and review artifacts relative to transition planning. At this same stage, special education faculty completed a KWL about transition as a whole, received professional development by legal advisor Darcy Kriha, and then re-convened to apply what they had learned so far to their role as case manager by reviewing actual IEP samples. In the second phase, teams will now work on completing the NSTTAC tool focusing on each of the 4 areas on a weekly basis. Other departments are also reviewing segments of the tool including student services. As each of the 4 segments are completed team representatives from the departments will convene to analyze the data collected and synthesize the information into a plan that reveals current practices, extent implemented, and extent/quality of evidence from all sources. Plans will be developed from the information for systems change, targeted assistance to faculty, or no change. Progress toward completion of the NSTTAC tool is being monitored on a bi-weekly basis. Recommendations for needed district improvement activities will begin in the Spring of 2009. Agenda, Minutes, and artifacts will be kept to document progress.

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
Mindy McGuffin	Director of Special Education
Amy Ramsay	Department Chairperson Special Education
Joe Schimmel	Department Chairperson Special Education

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2 Title :

Improvement of Achievement in Reading for 'All' students and three sub-groups: Hispanic students, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

Objective 2 Description :

Our current reading achievement for 'all' students is 47.6% in meets and exceeds, this group will make AYP of 62.5% in 2008 and 70% in 2009, or reach Safe Harbor. Hispanic students currently score at 36.3% in meets and exceeds; this subgroup will make AYP of 62.5% in 2008 and 70% in 2009, or reach Safe

Harbor. Students with Disabilities currently score at 22.9% in meets and exceeds; this subgroup will make AYP of 62.5% in 2008 and 70% in 2009 or reach Safe Harbor. Finally, Economically Disadvantaged students score at 31.4% in meets and exceeds; this group will make AYP of 62.5% in 2008 and 70% in 2009, or reach Safe Harbor.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency.

1	District is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
3	Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
5	Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
7	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

**No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO report.
This district is not accountable for AMAO for this year**

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 2 Title : Improvement of Achievement in Reading for 'All' students and three sub-groups: Hispanic students, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
Sophomore and junior students who have earned failing grades in reading-based core classes will attend a mandatory daily supervised study tutorial period at the conclusion of their school day.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	After School	Local Funds	
Students placing 2 or more grade levels below their peers at freshman entry will receive computer assisted instruction in reading development during the required summer academy and the continuing English/Reading sequence for the following academic year.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	
Students demonstrating significant deficiencies in reading will participate in smaller class sections of differentiated curriculum in reading intensive subject areas: English, Science, and Social Studies.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Title I	
Students across the curriculum will participate in reading-based curricular activities aligned in core and elective classes in terms of content and format to state testing.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	
Students will routinely use one or more reading and thinking strategies across all disciplines.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	
Students will participate in lessons derived from the Reading for Information component of Key Train during the 9th grade required Computer Literacy class. Juniors and seniors will complete Key Train preparatory activities as part of Consumer Education, a graduation requirement.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title : Improvement of Achievement in Reading for 'All' students and three sub-groups: Hispanic students, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
Teachers will receive awareness training in disciplinary literacy and collaborate to create subject-area specific strategies to implement in departmental courses.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	Before School	Local Funds	
Teachers will employ questioning strategies advised by HEQ (Highly Effective Questioning) and the locally established critical thinking framework.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	
Teachers will participate in workshops outside the district to increase their effectiveness in delivering support for reading.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	After School	Local Funds	
Teachers will collaborate in academic teams to assess progress of students on local objectives and provide mid-course corrections with curriculum and instruction.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	
Teachers of core subject junior students write SMART goals related to areas of deficiency as associated with their students' performance during the previous spring's mirror testing.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	
Teachers will receive training in computer-assisted skill building for reading-deficient students (AutoSkill)	5/28/2009	5/28/2009	During School	Title I	

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

Objective 2 Title : Improvement of Achievement in Reading for 'All' students and three sub-groups: Hispanic students, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
Parents will receive information about the importance of student improvement from Explore to PLAN to ACT and the link between post-secondary training and career success (parent meetings, web site postings, targeted mailings).	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title : Improvement of Achievement in Reading for 'All' students and three sub-groups: Hispanic students, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

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

The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction monitors the activities of departments through the Department Chairs. He also approves conference attendance, text materials for courses, and staff participation in out-of-district professional development. He reviews assessment data that is collected and analyzed initially at the department level. He provides to department course teams disaggregated mirror testing data from sophomore testing that serves as the foundation for 3rd year infusion of needed content and formats into the core department instructional program.

The campus principals provide leadership by supporting effective teaching strategies across the curriculum -- these are reviewed and critiqued during the teacher evaluation cycle for all tenure and non-tenure staff members.

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. Jack Denny	Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction
Dr. Beth Concannon	Principal, East Leyden High School
Mr. Wil Wagner	Principal, West Leyden High School

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3 Title : Improvement in Math Achievement for 'all' students and three subgroups: Hispanic students, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

Objective 3 Description : Our current math achievement for 'all' students is 53.4% in meets and exceeds; this group will make AYP in 2008 and 2009 by achieving 62.5% and 70%, respectively, or by reaching Safe Harbor. The Hispanic subgroup is currently at 41.9% for meets and exceeds; this subgroup will make AYP of 62.5% in 2008 and 70% in 2009, or by reaching Safe Harbor. Students with Disabilities is currently scoring at 11.5% for meets and exceeds; this group will make AYP of 62.5% in 2008 and 70% in 2009, or by reaching Safe Harbor.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency.

2	District is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
4	Hispanic students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
6	Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
8	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

**No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO report.
This district is not accountable for AMAO for this year**

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 3 Title : Improvement in Math Achievement for 'all' students and three subgroups: Hispanic students, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
Sophomore and junior students who have earned failing grades in math courses will attend a mandatory daily supervised tutorial at the conclusion of their school day.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	After School	Local Funds	
Students enrolled in 3rd year math classes will participate in class activities based on the Applied Mathematics section of the WorkKeys exam.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	
Students demonstrating significant deficiencies in math skills will participate in smaller class-size sections of the mandatory summer academy as well as the follow-up academy classes during the regular school year.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Title I	
9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grade students will participate in math classroom activities aligned to ACT testing content and format.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	
Entering freshmen who are scoring 2 or more grade levels below their peers will receive computer assisted instructional support (AutoSkill) in summer academy classes and the follow up full-year sequential curriculum.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Title I	
Students will participate in lessons derived from the Applied Mathematics component of Key Train during their course work in Consumer Education, a requirement for graduation taken by 11th and 12th graders.			Before School	Title I	

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

Objective 3 Title : Improvement in Math Achievement for 'all' students and three subgroups: Hispanic students, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
Teachers will develop disciplinary literacy strategies and implement them in all math courses.	11/16/2009	8/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	
Teachers will participate in workshops outside the district that they identify as supportive in increasing their effectiveness of math instruction.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Title II	
Teachers will receive training on computer-assisted instructional supports for low-achieving math students.	5/29/2009	5/29/2009	During School	Title I	
Teachers will participate in departmental academic teams to assess progress of students on local objectives and provide mid-course corrections.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	
Teachers of junior math classes will write SMART goals that relate to specific deficiencies of those students as identified in the previous spring's mirror testing.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 3 Title : Improvement in Math Achievement for 'all' students and three subgroups: Hispanic students, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
Parents will receive information about the importance of student progress through the EPAS testing sequence -- meetings, emails, newsletters, special mailings.	8/26/2008	8/26/2010	Before School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 3 Title : Improvement in Math Achievement for 'all' students and three subgroups: Hispanic students, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

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

The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction monitors the activities of departments through the Department Chairs. He also approves conference attendance, text materials for courses, and staff participation in out-of-district professional development. He reviews assessment data that is collected and analyzed initially at the department level. He provides to department course teams disaggregated mirror testing data from sophomore testing that serves as the foundation for 3rd year infusion of needed content and formats into the core department instructional program.

The campus principals provide leadership by supporting effective teaching strategies across the curriculum -- these are reviewed and commented on during the teacher evaluation cycle for all tenure and non-tenure staff members.

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. Jack Denny	Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction
Dr. Beth Concannon	Principal, East Leyden High School
Mr. Wil Wagner	Principal, West Leyden High School

Section III - Plan 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.

Plan developers

Jack Denny- Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction #212

Mike McElherne-Director of Special Education Leyden Area Special Education Cooperative

Mindy McGuffin-Director of Special Education District #212/McKinney Vento Liaison

Dr. Fran Brady-Director of Careers District #212

Joe Schimmel- Special Education Department Chairperson District #212 (High incidence programs)

Amy Ramsay-Special Education Department Chairperson District #212 (Low incidence programs)

Melissa Kemp-LASEC Technical Assistance Supervisor for Leyden High Schools

Henry Ferraro- Transition Specialist LASEC

Cam Jackson-Student Services Department Chairperson

MK Leifker-Student Services Department Chairperson

Roger Reiner- Teacher Transition Program

Caryn Hart-Teacher Transition Program

Kathy Klaus-Teacher Transition Program

Leyden District School Improvement Team Teachers: Jeremy Babel, Michael Bodin, Fran Brady, Beth Concannon (Principal), Kelly Firkus, Barb Georges,

Johanna Heppeler, Jane Hyink, Cam Jackson, John Kmet, Sonja Kosanovic, Chris Lilly, MK Leifker, Mike Manderino, Liz O'Malley, Susan Peterson, Amy

Ramsay, Lisa Ripley, Joe Ruffolo, Chuck Skrabacz, Adrienne Subach, Beth Swanson, Wil Wagner (Principal), Lisa Baran.

Outside experts consulted include

West Suburban Transition Planning Council

Darcy Kriha, Attorney, Franczek Sullivan

Kathy Gould, Illinois Autism Training and Technical Assistance Project

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 development team is going to engage in activities based upon the NSTTAC Team Planning Tool for Improving Transition and Education Services, the Indicator 13 checklist, and the Illinois State Performance Plan Indicator 13 Checklist to meet SPP/APR requirements. We are working with the LASEC to ensure that there are checks and balances within the IEP process to ensure compliance with Indicator 13 including transmission of Indicator 13 data via FACTS. Professional development activities include peer coaching, bringing speakers into the District, sending staff outside the district to other districts and presentation, as well as information dissemination of web based resources.

Weekly inservice time provides a consistent format for data analysis, planning, implementing ideas, checking their effectiveness.

Other components of this plan receive direct funding support from both local funds and the federal title grants program.

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 district is currently beginning a relationship with the Illinois Autism Training and Technical Assistance Project. Projected week-long institute Summer 2009.

NCLB requires that ISBE take at least one of seven corrective actions. (See pages 48-50 of the "LEA and School Improvement: Non-Regulatory Guidance Revised July 21, 2006 at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guide/schoolimprovementguid.doc>). To that end, ISBE's work with districts in corrective action based on 2008 data will focus on curriculum and instruction, the second option provided in the law: "Instituting and fully implementing a new curriculum that is based on State and local academic content and achievement standards, including providing appropriate professional development based on scientifically based research for all relevant staff, that offers substantial promise of improving educational achievement for low-achieving students."

Essential requirements to be included in this district's plan and at the core of conversations and follow-up with the district will be:

1. Significant progress in guaranteeing a viable curriculum for all students
 1. focusing on Illinois Learning Standards
 2. equitable access for students
2. Classroom level impact and shared responsibility for learning
 1. clear expectations for lesson planning
 2. formative assessment
 3. standards aligned classrooms
3. ISBE coordination as possible:
 1. Title funding

2. communication with pertinent agency staff to support the district
3. involvement of the area RESPRO
4. tools and resources

District staff may choose to create an objective explaining the curriculum work and processes to be undertaken during the next two school years; district staff may also explain on-going work in the Section I attributes and challenges data pages and/or Section III District Responsibilities.

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

	Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified?
	Does the DIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness?
	Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students?
	Does the analysis, along with other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

	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?

OTHER DATA

	Do the other data 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?

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?

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

	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)?
	Has the DIP team stated <u>measurable objectives</u> that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan?
	Do the objectives address all areas of AYP and AMAO deficiency?
	Do the objectives address the areas of special education compliance?

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 strategies and activities for students?

	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?
	Do the parent involvement strategies and activities clearly align with the strategies and activities for students?
	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
	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?

MONITORING

	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

March 20, 2009

Note: phone call March 20, 2009

DIP and restructuring plan promised March 26, 2009; request to post submitting until April 18 I spoke with Jack Denney. He's concerned that stakeholders be involved: district is requesting additional time to communicate with stakeholders. (They could force this now and have it in but would rather delay this to get this right.) We will talk again after April 18. Carol Diedrichsen

February 27, 2009

I spoke with Jack Denney today about the district improvement plan and the restructuring plan. He told me that these plans are under development and scheduled for board approval in March. I am hoping to have a conference call with district staff to review restructuring for West Leyden. He will be working with the area RESPRO to submit the plans and schedule a conference call with me. Carol Diedrichsen cdiedric@isbe.net 217/524-1086

ISBE Monitoring - Part II

**METHODS OF PLAN DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, AND IMPLEMENTATION
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?
--	--

	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?
--	---

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the 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 LOCAL BOARD

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

Part II Comments**Illinois State Board of Education****Grants and Programs****Corrective Action Initial Conference - 2008****Date:** October 30, 2008**Time** 10:00 to 10:30 a.m.**Type:** Phone Conference

ISBE: Grants and Programs: Gina Hopper, Division Administrator
 Carol Diedrichsen, Principal Consultant
 Martha (Marti) Woelfle, Principal Consultant

Goal of Meeting:

Outline the Illinois State Board of Education's (ISBE) requirements regarding district *corrective action* as defined by federal law [NCLB Section 1116 (c) (10) (C)].

Overview of Meeting:

Carol Diedrichsen and Gina Hopper provided an overview of the NCLB requirements for those districts assigned *corrective action* due to their federal academic status and as defined by [Title I, Part A, Section 1116 \(c\) \(10\) \(C\), of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act \(ESEA\)](#). The law requires the State Board of Education to assign a *corrective action* and the conference discussion focused on defining the role of ISBE and an explanation of available state resources and technical assistance.

Based on the 2008 Report Card data, it was noted that thirteen districts are in Corrective Action Year One; and of these, four are single school districts. The law requires that the academic status and requirements which apply to the district and the school must be met.

According to NCLB, the *corrective action* options the state must take are to be selected from the following options:

1. Deferring programmatic funds or reducing administrative funds;
2. Instituting and fully implementing a new curriculum that is based on state and local academic content and achievement standards, including providing appropriate professional development based on scientifically based research for all relevant staff, that offers substantial promise of improving educational achievement for low-achieving students;
3. Replacing district personnel who are relevant to the inability of the district to make adequate yearly progress;
4. Removing individual schools from the jurisdiction of the district and establishing alternative arrangements for public governance and supervision of the schools;
5. Appointing a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district in place of the superintendent and school boards; and/or
6. Abolishing or restructuring the district.

The primary *corrective action* that ISBE has chosen for the districts in Corrective Action Year One is the second option, which is to require each district to provide a standards aligned viable curriculum and ensure access and equity for all students. Based on the state's experience with those districts assigned corrective action in 2007, this has been the most appropriate beginning action.

The district is required to inform ISBE as to how it is addressing the assigned *corrective action* by submitting its District Improvement Plan (DIP) at the Illinois Interactive Report Card (IIRC) site. The DIP must ensure that the district's students have access to a viable curriculum and there is equity for all students. To meet the requirements, the [2008 District Improvement Plan](#) must demonstrate that the district is implementing a standards-aligned curriculum in the classroom and the local assessments are aligned with the curriculum. District Improvement Plan resources, including the guide, monitoring prompt, and a template to facilitate the work of the plan developers are available on ISBE's website at <http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/district.htm>. This year, the plan must incorporate the corrective action expectations, as well as the Response to Intervention components; the completed plan is due on or before January 1, 2009. The ISBE web-based resources provide detailed explanations regarding these expectations. If the plan was previously submitted and incorporated strategies and activities through 2009, these expectations for curriculum must be added and submitted in the 2008 DIP template.

Carol and Marti are available to work with districts as they develop and revise the DIP to ensure each addresses the requirements. They can provide information related to the development of the DIP and implementation of a standards aligned curriculum, as well as address individual questions and concerns. Our division is also working in partnership with other ISBE divisions to provide assistance and help ensure that each district will be able to demonstrate progress. In addition, the [area RESPRO, ISBE's system of support](#), is responsible for providing technical assistance with meeting these requirements. Districts

that were previously assigned *corrective action* have made significant progress with support from their RESPROs.

Following the ISBE overview, questions were presented by the district representatives. The questions and ISBE's answers follow.

1. **Does the NCLB have status over a local district union contract?** We have teachers who are tenured and are not performing. Does the NCLB law provide a way to handle this situation?

ISBE: Work with your district attorney and union representatives and provide an explanation that there are ramifications for not addressing the law (see the other listed corrective actions.) You must follow your staff evaluation process, including a remediation plan that aligns to [105 ILCS 5/38-85 Removal for cause; Notice and hearing; Suspension](#) ISBE wants to partner with you and can provide direct information regarding the assignment of other corrective action options should the district fail to make adequate yearly progress. This assigned action requires that all students have access to the curriculum which will prepare them for the state assessment. For example: high school students must have Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry to be successful with the PSAE mathematics components.

2. **Is there a different DIP template for the corrective action for the district?**

No, the ISBE District Improvement Plan template on the IIRC meets the requirements. ISBE will place comments in the *ISBE Monitoring Prompt* section of the DIP, including the notes from today's session.

You are to include the objectives and strategies in your improvement plan. List any barriers and problems that must be resolved in Section I of the plan, and the list may include concerns with staff. Resolving the issues may be difficult at the onset but over time, the district's actions will be best for all students.

The Next Step:

ISBE will work in partnership with the district and provide assistance, including support from ISBE's curriculum and instruction, special education, career and technical education, English language learners, and other divisions. Carol Diedrichsen at cdiedric@isbe.net and Martha (Marti) Woelfle (mwoelfle@isbe.net) are available to address questions and facilitate requests for assistance. Gina Hopper, Division Administrator of the Grants and Program Division, email address ghopper@isbe.net, and Grants and Program Division staff can also be reached by calling 217-524-4832.

We will schedule a phone conference with you in late January or early February to discuss the plan.