

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S

### School Improvement Plan 2007

|                                |                            |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Board Approval Date:           | 3/17/2008                  |
| Plan Submission Date & Ref No: | 3/20/2008 - SIP07 - 001787 |
| ISBE Monitoring Completed:     | 8/1/2008                   |

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**PRELIMINARY INFORMATION**

---

School & District Information

RCDTS Code Number : 190220990160001

District Name: CHSD 99

School Name : COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S

Superintendent: DR DAVID R EBLEN

Principal :MARIA WARD

District Address: 6301 SPRINGSIDE AVE

School Address : 4436 MAIN ST

City/State/Zip : DOWNERS GROVE, IL 60516 2489

City/State/Zip : DOWNERS GROVE, IL 60515 2844

District Phone : (630) 795-7100 X: 7101

School Phone : (630) 795-8400 X: 8401

District Email : deblen@csd99.org

School Email : mward@csd99.org

Is this for a Title I School? No

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data**

Item 1 - Adequate Yearly Progress Report for 2007

|   |    |   |                       |
|---|----|---|-----------------------|
| Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)? | No | Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act? | No                    |
| Is this School making AYP in Reading?                 | No | 2007-08 Federal Improvement Status  | Academic Watch Status |
| Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?             | No | 2007-08 State Improvement Status  |                       |

|                            | Percent Tested on State Tests |         |             |         | Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards |                    |         |             |                    |         | Other Indicators |         |                 |         |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|-------------|---------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|-------------|--------------------|---------|------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|
|                            | Reading                       |         | Mathematics |         | Reading                             |                    |         | Mathematics |                    |         | Attendance Rate  |         | Graduation Rate |         |
| Student Groups             | %                             | 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        |         | 55.0                                |                    |         | 55.0        |                    |         | 90.0             |         | 72.0            |         |
| All                        | 99.3                          | Yes     | 99.3        | Yes     | 69.2                                |                    | Yes     | 69.4        |                    | Yes     |                  |         | 96.0            | Yes     |
| White                      | 99.4                          | Yes     | 99.4        | Yes     | 72.2                                |                    | Yes     | 72.2        |                    | Yes     |                  |         |                 |         |
| Black                      |                               |         |             |         |                                     |                    |         |             |                    |         |                  |         |                 |         |
| Hispanic                   |                               |         |             |         |                                     |                    |         |             |                    |         |                  |         |                 |         |
| Asian/Pacific Islander     |                               |         |             |         |                                     |                    |         |             |                    |         |                  |         |                 |         |
| Native American            |                               |         |             |         |                                     |                    |         |             |                    |         |                  |         |                 |         |
| Multiracial Ethnic         |                               |         |             |         |                                     |                    |         |             |                    |         |                  |         |                 |         |
| LEP                        |                               |         |             |         |                                     |                    |         |             |                    |         |                  |         |                 |         |
| Students with Disabilities | 97.9                          | Yes     | 97.9        | Yes     | 27.3                                | 42.9               | No      | 28.4        | 41.4               | No      |                  |         | 85.3            |         |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 98.0                          | Yes     | 98.0        | Yes     |                                     |                    |         |             |                    |         |                  |         |                 |         |

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section I-A      Data & Analysis - Report Card Data**

---

Item 2 - Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives Report for 2007

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

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data**

Item 3 - School Information

| Basic Information  | 2001 - 2002 | 2002 - 2003 | 2003 - 2004 | 2004 - 2005 | 2005 - 2006 | 2006 - 2007 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Attendance Rate (%)  | 93.3        | 93.4        | 93.7        | 93.6        | 93.6        | 93.4        |
| Truancy rate (%)   | 1.3         | 1.4         | 1.0         | 1.9         | 1.7         | 1.6         |
| Mobility rate (%)  | 4.3         | 5.1         | 4.0         | 4.9         | 5.0         | 3.8         |
| Expulsion rate (%)   |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Retention rate, if applicable (%)  |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| HS graduation rate, if applicable (%)  | 88.7        | 92.3        | 92.1        | 88.8        | 93.1        | 96.0        |
| HS dropout rate, if applicable (%)   | 1.0         | 1.5         | 1.3         | 1.5         | 0.7         | 1.3         |
| Teachers working out-of-field (#)  |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Paraprofessionals in Title I funded programs and/or schools designated as school-wide with less than 2 years of training and/or education degree (#) |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| School Population (#)  | 2,106       | 2,141       | 2,211       | 2,282       | 2,296       | 2,323       |
| Economically disadvantaged (%)   | 3.9         | 5.7         | 6.2         | 7.3         | 6.6         | 8.4         |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) (%)   | 0.7         | 0.7         | 0.9         | 0.9         | 1.1         | 1.1         |
| Students with disabilities (%)   |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| White, non-Hispanic (%)  | 86.2        | 85.2        | 85.3        | 83.8        | 83.1        | 82.2        |
| Black, non-Hispanic (%)  | 3.4         | 3.8         | 3.9         | 4.9         | 4.6         | 4.7         |
| Hispanic (%)   | 3.8         | 4.6         | 4.5         | 4.8         | 4.9         | 5.5         |
| Native American or Alaskan Native (%)  | 0.2         | 0.1         | 0.2         | 0.3         | 0.2         | 0.2         |
| Asian/Pacific Islander (%)   | 6.4         | 6.3         | 6.2         | 5.7         | 5.8         | 5.5         |

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data**

Item 4 - Race/Ethnicity

|  | Year | White(%) | Black(%) | Hispanic(%) | Asian(%) | Native American(%) | Multiracial/Ethnic(%) |
|--|------|----------|----------|-------------|----------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>S<br/>C<br/>H<br/>O<br/>O<br/>L</b>             | 2001 | 85.1     | 3.6      | 4.0         | 7.0      | 0.3                | -                     |
|  | 2002 | 86.2     | 3.4      | 3.8         | 6.4      | 0.2                | -                     |
|  | 2003 | 85.2     | 3.8      | 4.6         | 6.3      | 0.1                | -                     |
|  | 2004 | 85.3     | 3.9      | 4.5         | 6.2      | 0.2                | -                     |
|  | 2005 | 83.8     | 4.9      | 4.8         | 5.7      | 0.3                | 0.6                   |
|  | 2006 | 83.1     | 4.6      | 4.9         | 5.8      | 0.2                | 1.3                   |
|  | 2007 | 82.2     | 4.7      | 5.5         | 5.5      | 0.2                | 1.9                   |
| <b>D<br/>I<br/>S<br/>T<br/>R<br/>I<br/>C<br/>T</b> | 2001 | 79.3     | 5.5      | 5.5         | 9.5      | 0.2                | -                     |
|  | 2002 | 79.3     | 5.5      | 5.4         | 9.6      | 0.2                | -                     |
|  | 2003 | 78.0     | 6.3      | 6.1         | 9.3      | 0.2                | -                     |
|  | 2004 | 78.3     | 6.5      | 5.9         | 9.0      | 0.3                | -                     |
|  | 2005 | 77.7     | 6.5      | 6.3         | 9.0      | 0.3                | 0.3                   |
|  | 2006 | 77.9     | 6.6      | 6.7         | 8.0      | 0.2                | 0.6                   |
|  | 2007 | 77.3     | 6.6      | 7.0         | 7.6      | 0.2                | 1.4                   |
| <b>S<br/>T<br/>A<br/>T<br/>E</b>                   | 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                   |

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**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 (%) |
|--|------|---------|---------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| <b>S<br/>C<br/>H<br/>O<br/>O<br/>L</b>             | 2001 | 0.7     | 3.3           | 99.6                     | 91.7           | 6.6          | 25.0                | 1.1                 | 2.1                | 91.9                   |
|  | 2002 | 0.7     | 3.9           | 99.5                     | 93.3           | 4.3          | 30.0                | 1.3                 | 1.0                | 88.7                   |
|  | 2003 | 0.7     | 5.7           | 84.3                     | 93.4           | 5.1          | 32.0                | 1.4                 | 1.5                | 92.3                   |
|  | 2004 | 0.9     | 6.2           | 84.3                     | 93.7           | 4.0          | 23.0                | 1.0                 | 1.3                | 92.1                   |
|  | 2005 | 0.9     | 7.3           | 92.2                     | 93.6           | 4.9          | 48.0                | 1.9                 | 1.5                | 88.8                   |
|  | 2006 | 1.1     | 6.6           | 89.5                     | 93.6           | 5.0          | 42.0                | 1.7                 | 0.7                | 93.1                   |
|  | 2007 | 1.1     | 8.4           | 84.4                     | 93.4           | 3.8          | 39.0                | 1.6                 | 1.3                | 96.0                   |
| <b>D<br/>I<br/>S<br/>T<br/>R<br/>I<br/>C<br/>T</b> | 2001 | 1.9     | 4.1           | 99.4                     | 91.7           | 6.8          | 43.0                | 0.7                 | 2.3                | 91.1                   |
|  | 2002 | 1.9     | 5.4           | 99.5                     | 93.3           | 4.9          | 65.0                | 1.2                 | 1.2                | 84.0                   |
|  | 2003 | 1.7     | 6.1           | 85.5                     | 93.5           | 5.0          | 68.0                | 1.2                 | 1.4                | 92.6                   |
|  | 2004 | 1.9     | 8.1           | 85.5                     | 93.8           | 5.3          | 61.0                | 1.0                 | 1.4                | 93.0                   |
|  | 2005 | 2.3     | 8.8           | 88.8                     | 93.5           | 5.0          | 117.0               | 2.0                 | 1.5                | 91.4                   |
|  | 2006 | 1.8     | 8.8           | 87.9                     | 93.5           | 4.8          | 137.0               | 2.3                 | 1.1                | 91.3                   |
|  | 2007 | 2.0     | 10.4          | 88.4                     | 93.3           | 4.3          | 127.0               | 2.1                 | 1.1                | 95.6                   |
| <b>S<br/>T<br/>A<br/>T<br/>E</b>                   | 2001 | 6.3     | 36.9          | 94.5                     | 93.7           | 17.2         | 42,813.0            | 2.2                 | 5.7                | 83.2                   |
|  | 2002 | 6.7     | 37.5          | 95.0                     | 94.0           | 16.5         | 39,225.0            | 2.0                 | 5.1                | 85.2                   |
|  | 2003 | 6.3     | 37.9          | 95.9                     | 94.0           | 16.4         | 37,525.0            | 1.9                 | 4.9                | 86.0                   |
|  | 2004 | 6.7     | 39.0          | 96.3                     | 94.2           | 16.8         | 40,764.0            | 2.1                 | 4.6                | 86.5                   |
|  | 2005 | 6.6     | 40.0          | 95.7                     | 93.9           | 16.1         | 43,152.0            | 2.2                 | 4.0                | 87.4                   |
|  | 2006 | 6.6     | 40.0          | 96.6                     | 94.0           | 16.0         | 44,836.0            | 2.2                 | 3.5                | 87.8                   |
|  | 2007 | 7.2     | 40.9          | 96.1                     | 93.7           | 15.2         | 49,056.0            | 2.5                 | 3.5                | 85.9                   |

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**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) |
|--|------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| <b>S<br/>C<br/>H<br/>O<br/>O<br/>L</b>             | 2001 | 2,197      | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -            |
|  | 2002 | 2,106      | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 517          |
|  | 2003 | 2,141      | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 554          |
|  | 2004 | 2,211      | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 525          |
|  | 2005 | 2,282      | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 543          |
|  | 2006 | 2,296      | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 588          |
|  | 2007 | 2,323      | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 592          |
| <b>D<br/>I<br/>S<br/>T<br/>R<br/>I<br/>C<br/>T</b> | 2001 | 5,329      | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 1,307        |
|  | 2002 | 5,201      | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 1,245        |
|  | 2003 | 5,248      | -           | -           | -           | -           | 1           | 1,352        |
|  | 2004 | 5,486      | -           | -           | -           | -           | 4           | 1,271        |
|  | 2005 | 5,504      | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 1,312        |
|  | 2006 | 5,559      | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 1,433        |
|  | 2007 | 5,590      | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 1,390        |
| <b>S<br/>T<br/>A<br/>T<br/>E</b>                   | 2001 | 2,007,170  | 164,791     | 161,546     | 162,001     | 151,270     | 148,194     | 123,816      |
|  | 2002 | 2,029,821  | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -            |
|  | 2003 | 2,044,539  | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -            |
|  | 2004 | 2,060,048  | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -            |
|  | 2005 | 2,062,912  | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -            |
|  | 2006 | 2,075,277  | 136,123     | 139,619     | 146,935     | 153,566     | 154,856     | -            |
|  | 2007 | 2,077,856  | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -            |

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data**

Item 7 - Educator Data

|  | Year        | Total Tchr FTE (N) | Avg. Tchr Exp.(Yrs) | Avg. Teacher Sal (\$) | Tchrs w/Bach.Deg (%) | Tchrs w/Mast.Deg (%) | Pupil-Tchr Ratio (EI) | Pupil-Tchr Ratio (HS) | Emgncy or Prvsl Creds(%) | Hi Qual Tchrs (%) |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>D<br/>I<br/>S<br/>T<br/>R<br/>I<br/>C<br/>T</b> | <b>2001</b> | 329.0              | 16.9                | 72,201                | 25.8                 | 74.2                 | -                     | 19.7                  | -                        | -                 |
|  | <b>2002</b> | 327.0              | 16.0                | 71,229                | 26.9                 | 73.1                 | -                     | 19.3                  | 0.3                      | -                 |
|  | <b>2003</b> | 324.0              | 16.1                | 74,098                | 24.1                 | 75.9                 | -                     | 19.9                  | 0.6                      | -                 |
|  | <b>2004</b> | 316.0              | 14.7                | 73,200                | 28.1                 | 71.9                 | -                     | 21.2                  | 0.9                      | -                 |
|  | <b>2005</b> | 326.0              | 14.0                | 75,474                | 29.1                 | 70.9                 | -                     | 20.2                  | 1.5                      | -                 |
|  | <b>2006</b> | 322.0              | 14.8                | 78,940                | 24.5                 | 75.5                 | -                     | 20.7                  | 0.3                      | -                 |
|  | <b>2007</b> | 326.0              | 15.2                | 81,358                | 20.1                 | 79.9                 | -                     | 20.7                  | 0.5                      | -                 |
| <b>S<br/>T<br/>A<br/>T<br/>E</b>                   | <b>2001</b> | 125,735.0          | 14.5                | 47,929                | 53.8                 | 46.0                 | 19.1                  | 18.0                  | -                        | -                 |
|  | <b>2002</b> | 126,544.0          | 14.2                | 49,702                | 53.9                 | 46.0                 | 19.1                  | 18.3                  | 2.4                      | 2.3               |
|  | <b>2003</b> | 129,068.0          | 13.9                | 51,672                | 53.9                 | 46.0                 | 18.4                  | 18.2                  | 2.5                      | 2.1               |
|  | <b>2004</b> | 125,702.0          | 13.8                | 54,446                | 51.3                 | 48.6                 | 19.4                  | 18.8                  | 1.7                      | 1.8               |
|  | <b>2005</b> | 128,079.0          | 13.6                | 55,558                | 50.1                 | 49.1                 | 18.9                  | 18.4                  | 1.9                      | 1.9               |
|  | <b>2006</b> | 127,010.0          | 13.0                | 56,685                | 49.3                 | 50.6                 | 19.1                  | 18.9                  | 1.6                      | 1.4               |
|  | <b>2007</b> | 127,010.0          | 12.9                | 58,275                | 47.6                 | 52.3                 | 18.8                  | 18.8                  | 1.5                      | 3.2               |

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

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data**

Item 8a - Assessment Data (Reading)

| <b>PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading - Grades 11</b> |         |         |         |         |         |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Groups  | 2002-03 | 2003-04 | 2004-05 | 2005-06 | 2006-07 |
| All   | 68.0    | 70.8    | 71.9    | 72.2    | 68.1    |
| White   | 69.8    | 72.6    | 73.7    | 75.5    | 71.6    |
| Black   | 31.6    | 45.0    | 48.0    | 39.1    | 21.3    |
| Hispanic  | 52.3    | 64.0    | 50.0    | 48.2    | 48.1    |
| Asian/Pacific Islander                                  | 71.0    | 66.6    | 80.5    | 70.6    | 78.5    |
| Native American   | -       | -       | -       | -       | -       |
| Multiracial/Ethnic                                      | -       | -       | -       | -       | -       |
| LEP   | -       | -       | -       | -       | -       |
| Students with Disabilities                              | 17.2    | 23.4    | 36.3    | 34.4    | 27.5    |
| Economically Disadvantaged                              | 30.8    | 29.2    | 31.0    | 37.9    | 36.2    |
|   |         |         |         |         |         |

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data**

Item 8b - Assessment Data (Mathematics)

| <b>PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics - Grades 11</b> |                |                |                |                |                |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Groups</b>   | <b>2002-03</b> | <b>2003-04</b> | <b>2004-05</b> | <b>2005-06</b> | <b>2006-07</b> |
| All   | 67.0           | 72.0           | 70.1           | 70.8           | 68.1           |
| White   | 69.4           | 73.4           | 72.8           | 73.6           | 71.8           |
| Black   | 31.6           | 50.0           | 34.6           | 26.1           | 21.3           |
| Hispanic  | 42.9           | 68.0           | 46.1           | 51.7           | 44.4           |
| Asian/Pacific Islander                                      | 71.0           | 70.3           | 77.8           | 79.4           | 82.1           |
| Native American   | -              | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| Multiracial/Ethnic  | -              | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| LEP   | -              | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| Students with Disabilities                                  | 15.6           | 30.0           | 25.7           | 34.4           | 27.5           |
| Economically Disadvantaged                                  | 23.1           | 29.2           | 26.6           | 44.8           | 40.5           |
|   |                |                |                |                |                |

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

### Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

---

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

Our School Report Card data for 2007 tell us that, on the Prairie State Achievement Exam for spring of 2007, the percent of juniors ("All" category) meeting the Illinois standards in Reading was 69.2%. The percent of North High juniors meeting the Illinois standards in Mathematics was 69.4%. The "All" category, therefore, made Adequate Yearly Progress in both Reading and Mathematics in 2007.

#### Major Area of Weakness:

The subgroup of Students with Disabilities did not meet Adequate Yearly Progress in Reading or Mathematics in 2007. The achievement of the Students with Disabilities subgroup was significantly below the 55% target, with only 27.3% of this subgroup meeting the standards in Reading and with 28.4% of this subgroup meeting the standards in Mathematics for 2007. Since the percentage of students with disabilities meeting standards decreased from the previous year, we did not meet the Safe Harbor criterion either.

#### Specific observations from report card data include:

- Consistent improvement in Reading for Students with Disabilities across three years, from 17.2% in 2003 to 36.3% in 2005, followed by a slight decline in 2006 at 34.4% (making AYP in reading in 2005 & 2006) and a greater decline in 2007 to 27.5%.
- The Students with Disabilities subgroup increased the percentage meeting in Math from 15.6% in 2003 to 30.0% in 2004, followed by a decrease to 25.7% in 2005, an increase in 2006 of 34.4% (meeting AYP through Safe Harbor), and a decrease in 2007 to 27.5%.
- The population of Students with Disabilities tested on PSAE has doubled from 2002 to 2007 (46 students tested in 2002 to 91 students tested in 2007).
- In 2007, Students with Disabilities outperformed Black students in terms of percentage of students meeting standards in both Reading (27% as compared to 21%) and Math (27% as compared to 21%).

#### Observations from disaggregated report card data include:

- IEP students meeting the cut score of 5 on the Work Keys Reading for Information Achievement test has remained relatively static from 2001 (28%) to 2007 (29%) with a significant increase (38%) only in 2006.
- IEP students meeting the cut score of 5 on the Work Keys Applied Math test has ranged from 37% in 2001 to 43% in 2006 and down to 34% in 2007.
- IEP students meeting the district cut score of 21 on the ACT Reading ranged from 20% in 2001 to 32% in 2006 and down to 21% in 2007.
- IEP students meeting the district cut score of 21 on the ACT Math ranged from 11% in 2001 to 24% in 2006 down to 17% in 2007.

#### Other Potential Areas of Concern:

Although the number of Black students in eleventh grade does not officially constitute a subgroup at North High, in regard to NCLB, we have identified this cohort as one in significant need of intervention, support, and acceleration in both Reading and Mathematics. The percentage of Black students who meet standards in math, for example, has significantly declined from 55% in 2001 to 21% in 2007. Similarly, although our Hispanic subgroup does not contain the numbers of students to be identified as a subgroup for NCLB either, the percentage of students who meet standards in math has fluctuated a bit since a high of 68% in math in the 2003-04 school year; since 2004, the percentage of Hispanic students meeting standards in math has remained at approximately 50%. While our action plan will not target specific interventions for these two subgroups, our interventions applied to the “all” should serve to support these students in their academic growth as well. Additionally, we will convene members of our respective school improvement-related teams to consider a variety of options to begin to address these areas of concern.

#### Additional observations from the data include:

- Our “All” has remained relatively “flat” since 2002-03 with only slight increases between 2003 and 2007 (68% in reading in 2003 as compared to 69% in reading in 2007; 66% in math in 2003 as compared to 69% in math in 2007).
- Our white subgroup performance has also remained relatively “flat” from 2003, although the subsequent four years each saw percentages that exceeded 71% (as compared to 69.4% in 2003). [Reading, 2003-2007: 69%, 73%, 74%, 75%, 72%; Math, 2003-2007: 69%, 74%, 72%, 74%, 72%]
- This performance data have been noted while the student population has increased from 2,106 in 2001-02 to 2323 in 2006-07, class size has increased by 1.0%, the pupil/teacher ratio has increased by 1 student, and the number of teachers has decreased slightly during the time period from 2001 to 2007.
- While the total percentage of Hispanic students who met standards in Reading and Math has declined slightly from 2005 to 2007 (Reading, 2005-07: 50%, 48%, 48%; Math, 2005-07: 46%, 52%, 45%), the percentage of students who exceeded standards has increased during that same time period (reading, 4%-15% from 2005-07; math, 8%-15% from 2005-07).
- No Black students exceeded standards in either 2005 or 2006 in Math; in Reading no Black students exceeded standards in 2006 but did exceed standards in 2005 and 2007.
- The trend for Black students is a declining percentage meeting state standards in Reading and Math.
- Asian students meeting standards in Math increased from 78% to 82% between 2005 and 2007. Asian students meeting standards in Reading decreased from 80% to 71% to 78% in 2005, 2006, and 2007, respectively.

North High School’s reading and mathematics achievement scores on the PSAE remain high compared to other “high school only” districts in DuPage County, but are relatively flat over the past several years and are lower than some area high schools within unit districts (K-12) in DuPage County. While the majority of our students met State Standards since the implementation of the PSAE, Students with Disabilities did not meet state standards in Reading and Math in 2007, although they did meet in 2006.

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

### Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

---

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

Factors - What factors are likely to have contributed to these results?

In reviewing the contributing factors in regard to IEP students in Reading, we believe:

- Until recently, the majority of our students with IEPs typically found themselves in either INLD (instructional LD) classes (contained within the Special Services Dept.), or, if enrolled in the “main stream,” were placed in our skills level classes. Neither provided adequate access to the core curriculum in English (reading).
- Students with disabilities did not have the benefit of co-teaching in “regular” level English core curriculum until the 2006-07 school year, and co-teaching was not implemented at the junior year until the current 2007-08 school year. Lack of access to core curriculum may have impacted IEP students’ not meeting standards.
- Students with disabilities did not have direct instruction in reading skill building via a “precision teaching” (or any other) model in the Learning Resource Center.
- Students with disabilities did not have practice and/or exposure to sample ACT and/or Work Keys tests.

In reviewing the contributing factors in regard to IEP students in Math, we believe:

- Until recently, the majority of our students with IEPs typically found themselves in either INLD (instructional LD) classes (contained within the Special Services Dept.), or, if enrolled in the “main stream,” were placed in our 200 level, or skills level classes. Neither provided adequate access to the core curriculum in math.
- Algebra 200 was not a placement option for freshmen until the 2006-07 school year; thus junior students with disabilities may not have had access to core math curriculum for three years in a row (that is recommended in order to meet standards).
- Co-taught Algebra 300 did not begin until the 2006-07 school year.
- Co-taught Geometry 300 began in the current 2007-08 school year.
- Co-taught Advanced Algebra will begin in the 2008-09 school year; consequently, IEP students most likely did not have access to Advanced Algebra core curriculum in 2007.
- The majority of IEP students did not have three years in a row of access to core curriculum in math, beginning with Algebra 300 and proceeding to Advanced Algebra 300.
- Students with disabilities did not have direct instruction in math skill building (precision teaching/skill building) in their LRC classes.
- Students with disabilities had minimal, if any, practice in ACT and/or Work Keys math sample tests.

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

### Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

---

#### **Conclusions - What conclusions for school improvement do you draw from the Report Card data?**

Conclusions - What conclusions for school improvement do you draw from the Report Card data?

Listed below are the conclusions for school improvement from the report card data:

- Precision teaching (direct instruction/skill building) in math and reading, in the Learning Resource Center, should improve the performance of IEP students on the PSAE.
- Practice testing on both ACT and Work Keys should improve the performance of IEP students on the PSAE.
- Access to core curriculum in both Math and Reading (English classes) is essential. IEP student enrollment for three years in co-taught core curriculum classes, if appropriate, should positively impact IEP student performance.
- In addition to core curriculum access in math and English, co-taught sections of social studies and science classes, currently available to IEP students, will enhance their ability to increase performance on the PSAE.
- By supporting as many of our students with disabilities in the “regular” core curriculum as possible, we are providing them with access to meet standards on the PSAE as well as providing them with access to the doors of opportunity that so many of our students enjoy upon graduation.
- Integrate the skills associated with level 5 on the Work Keys Reading and Math into the math and reading instructional programs for special education students at North High.
- Integrate the skills associated with 19-21 score band on the ACT into the math and reading instructional program for special education students at North High.
- Teachers’ writing and stating of clear learning objectives for each lesson will help our students, including special education students, meet the learning targets aligned with core curriculum.
- Spread literacy coaching to all content areas by including content area teachers who serve as liaisons between their content departments and the literacy coaches.
- Increased use of graphic organizers as part of instruction, an increased use of text marking in several reading-heavy content areas, and an increased use of summary frames will, we believe, begin to show results, over time, among our students in the area of reading across all curricular areas, including math.
- The development of unit plans in mathematics, and other content areas, should help to clarify those learning objectives common to each course. As teachers ensure that curriculum is aligned to state learning goals and ACT standards of transition, students’ ability to meet standards on the PSAE should increase.
- Implement appropriate cooperative learning structures on a regular basis in mathematics. Current experience has shown excellent results

in terms of student learning. As we continue this initiative, we believe students will increase their achievement of math content which will lead to increased performance on the PSAE.

- Direct instruction in applied reading and applied math must be increased for students to gain familiarity with passages and problems on the Work Keys Reading and Math tests. Specific practice test drill, such as Key Train will, we believe, benefit our students on the second day of the PSAE.

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data (Optional)**

---

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

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data (Optional)**

---

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

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data (Optional)**

---

**Conclusions - What conclusions for school improvement do you draw from the above local assessment data?**

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)**

---

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?**

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)**

---

Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

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

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)**

---

Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

**Conclusion - What analysis and conclusions for district improvement do you draw from the above answers?**

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

### Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)

---

#### 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?**

Data--For the 2006-2007 school year, North High School had one hundred sixty-seven (167) teachers all certified by the State of Illinois in their assigned curricular areas. All faculty members (100%) are highly qualified to teach their prescribed content area(s). Eighty-three per cent (83%) of the certified staff had at least a Master's Degree. The district offers many opportunities for professional growth in which over eighty-five per cent (85%) of the staff participated in at least one activity during this school year, not including the required institute days.

Additionally, 65% of North High staff members have been trained in CRISS strategies; 25% have been trained in Assessment Literacy, and 10% of staff members have been trained in Cooperative Learning, the newest initiative; within these percentages are some staff members who have taken one, two, or all three courses. 50% of co-teach teams have attended a workshop for co-teaching. Furthermore, 100% of staff members are working toward posting, articulating, referencing, and assessing learning objectives for their lessons each day.

Beginning next year, all teachers new to District 99 will be required to enroll in the District-Sponsored workshops [CRISS (CReating Independence through Student-owned Strategies), Assessment Literacy, and Cooperative Learning] within the first three years of their "tenure." An expectation and timeline will also be established for tenured teachers to enroll in any of the aforementioned workshops if they have not already done so. Ongoing training for incorporating lesson objectives will occur over the next several years.

COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)

---

Item 2 - Educator Qualifications

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

Factors - In what ways (if any) have educator qualifications contributed to student performance results?

The reality that our entire faculty is certified to teach in its respective curricular areas offers students the best opportunity to succeed. The fact that our faculty chooses to develop and hone their professional skills, annually, also positively impacts student performance. We firmly believe that our hiring practices benefit our students by bringing the best and most highly qualified faculty members to North High School. The impact of a school composed of high quality instructors is that students have an increased opportunity to succeed in all areas of the curriculum, especially in math and reading. We do attend job fairs and make every effort to recruit teachers who represent minority groups; obviously, however, we have room to grow in this area.

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)**

---

Item 2 - Educator Qualifications

**Conclusion - What analysis and conclusions for district improvement do you draw from the above answers?**

Conclusion - What analysis and conclusions for school improvement do you draw from the above answers?

Analysis and conclusions regarding the above include:

- Collective implementation of effective, researched-based strategies must occur in order to impact student achievement.
- Professional development must be ongoing to train and support teachers in their efforts to incorporate best practice, research-based instruction for all students, including IEP students.
- Our hiring practices must include strategic and aggressive ways to attract minority candidates to District 99.

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

### Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)

---

#### Item 3 - Parent Involvement

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

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

Data from the school report card indicate that parental involvement has declined from a high of 99.6% in 2001 to a low of 84.4% in 2007.

Parent involvement at North High includes but is not limited to:

- Parents' Club meets once a month during the school year with 7 meetings during the day and 2 evening meetings.
- Athletic Booster Parents meet once a month for 9 months, in the evenings.
- Music Booster Parents meet once a month for 9 months, in the evenings.
- IEP meetings -- 494 in 2006-07; 85 additional for incoming freshmen in 2006-07
- Project CRISS Parent Night, November 13, 2007 -- 38 parents in attendance, 4 of whom had students with IEPs; 1 Black parent; no Hispanic parent(s)
- Parent meeting to review school report card data and SIP process, Feb. 6, 2008; 12 parents in attendance.

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

### Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)

---

#### Item 3 - Parent Involvement

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

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

- Meeting with parents on a monthly basis provides valuable input into our educational process. We rely on honest dialogue, thoughtful reflections, probing questions, and a willingness to serve as partners as we seek to help all students achieve.
- Myriad volunteer efforts by parents help staff members continue to focus on student learning.
- Most significant is that parent organizations provide funding for student learning opportunities through scholarships for underclassmen, as well as scholarships for seniors.
- Parents' Club provides each department with monetary donations which may be used for learning tools and/or materials to impact instruction for students.

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

### Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)

---

#### Item 3 - Parent Involvement

#### **Conclusions - What analysis and conclusions for district improvement do you draw from the above answers?**

Conclusions - What analysis and conclusions for school improvement do you draw from the above answers?

- We will continue to support parent groups and continue to enlist their feedback and support to the school.
- We will also continue to seek ways for parents to be involved in new ways so students can benefit academically.
- We will seek to begin a new group of parents who represent underrepresented groups (IEP, Black, Hispanic) of students within our population. We desire to educate them regarding the PSAE data and solicit their support and involvement in instituting change.
- What appears to be a general decline in parent involvement from 2001 to 2007 can, in part, be attributed to recent (2006-07) on-line grade access for all parents to see their child's grades on-line, likely reducing the need, for at least some parents, to meet with teachers and/or call as frequently as they may have in the past, prior to this 24-7 access.

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

### Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

---

**Key Factors – From the preceding pages, identify key factors that are within the school’s capacity to change or control and which have contributed to low achievement, based on assessment and other relevant data.**

The key factors we are able to control that contributed to low achievement in mathematics and reading by the Students with Disabilities include the following:

- Access to core curriculum for all students, including IEP students (Math, English Science, and Social Studies) through expansion of co-teaching opportunities;
- Systematic training and monitoring of special education students’ self-assessment and monitoring of their progress;
- Exposure to ACT and Work Keys retired tests and/or KeyTrain;
- Writing and stating learning objectives at the beginning of each lesson;
- Systematic use of Precision Teaching Methodology and charting in Special Education LRCs, focusing on reading and math
- Access to additional curricular/academic support for special education students outside the school day.

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section II-Action Plan**

---

**The following areas of deficiency have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for your school:**

1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

### Section II-Action Plan

---

#### Part A. Objective 1

#### **Title : Increasing IEP Reading Proficiency on State Standards**

**Each objective should be written to identify the current achievement level and specific, measurable outcomes in terms of AYP to be achieved for each year of the two required years of the plan.**

By late April of 2010, North High School will increase the reading proficiency of all IEP students to at least 77.5% meeting the Illinois Learning Standards or attaining Safe Harbor status, as measured by the Prairie State Achievement Examination.

This objective covers the following areas of AYP deficiency (check all that apply):

1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets

If a school has met all the state-required performance targets identified in the School Report Card for only one year, it is still required to revise the School Improvement Plan while a school remains in status. The school should set forth other targets for improvement derived from and supported by data analysis to insure that the school continues to meet state targets.

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section II-Action Plan**

---

Part A. Objective 1

**Title : Increasing IEP Reading Proficiency on State Standards**

**This objective covers the following AYP deficiency areas.**

1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section II-Action Plan**

Part B. Student Strategies and Activities for Objective 1

**Title : Increasing IEP Reading Proficiency on State Standards**

**State the student strategies and activities to be implemented that logically support the objectives and respond to the key factors identified in Section III - Part B. Indicate whether the strategy or activity is during school hours, before school, after school, or during summer school.**

| Strategies & Activities  | Time Line  |          |               | Budget      |           |
|--|------------|----------|---------------|-------------|-----------|
|  | Start Date | End Date |               | Fund Source | Amount    |
| 1. Special education students will complete daily mastery drills in reading fluency and chart progress in a special education resource setting.  | 2008       | 2010     | During School | Local Funds | \$0       |
| 2. Special education students will participate in the Jamestown reading comprehension program, a program that includes five main skills: Recognizing Words in Context, Facts & Opinions, Sequencing, Inferences & Main Idea. In a special education resource setting, progress will be monitored monthly with and by students. | 2008       | 2010     | During School | Local Funds | \$0       |
| 3. Sophomore & Junior special education students will use various PSAE practice materials, including ACT prep software, along with Key Train software, in all LD LRC classes. Students will monitor their progress.  | 2008       | 2010     | During School | Local Funds | \$1500.00 |
| 4. Students will be taught self-assessment skills in order to take ownership of monitoring their learning progress in mastery drills, Jamestown reading, ACT Prep, Key Train, Learning Express Advantage, and in relation to the direct instruction they will receive in the LRC setting.                                      | 2008       | 2010     | During School | Local Funds | \$0       |

| Strategies & Activities  | Start Date | End Date |               | Fund Source | Amount      |
|--|------------|----------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| 5. Inasmuch as possible, students with IEPs will receive access to core curriculum through enrollment in co-taught, "regular" level English classes.   | 2008       | 2010     | During School | Local Funds | \$0         |
| 6. At-risk students, including special education students, will receive after-school tutoring in the STRIVE (Success Through Reaching Individual Expectations) program. Progress will be monitored by students in conjunction with the STRIVE coordinator. | 2008       | 2010     | After School  | Local Funds | \$10,000.00 |

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section II-Action Plan**

Part C. Professional Development Strategies and Activities for Objective 1

**Title : Increasing IEP Reading Proficiency on State Standards**

**State the professional development strategies and activities necessary to accomplish the objective. This component should directly address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified. In most cases, this professional training will focus on the teaching and learning process, such as increasing content knowledge, the use of scientifically based instructional strategies, and the alignment of classroom activities with academic content standards and assessments.**

| <b>Strategies &amp; Activities</b>  | <b>Time Line</b>  |                 |               | <b>Budget</b>      |               |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|
|   | <b>Start Date</b> | <b>End Date</b> |               | <b>Fund Source</b> | <b>Amount</b> |
| 1. All identified English & special education teachers will receive training in the use of Precision Teaching methodology, materials, and monitoring, along with appropriate, ongoing support.      | 2008              | 2009            | During School | Local Funds        | \$2,000.00    |
| 2. All co-teach teams and LRC teachers will receive training in Assessment Literacy, focusing on 2 of the 7 strategies that teach students to self-assess and monitor learning progress.            | 2008              | 2010            | During School | Title II           | \$2500.00     |
| 3. LRC teachers will receive training in the effective implementation of ACT and Key Train test preparation, along with how best to facilitate self-assessment and reflection among their students. | 2008              | 2010            | During School | Local Funds        | \$1,000.00    |

| Strategies & Activities  | Start Date | End Date |               | Fund Source | Amount   |
|--|------------|----------|---------------|-------------|----------|
| 4. Identified teachers of special education will engage in deeper investigation of data for students with disabilities, data related to: proportion of students with various disabilities; audit of IEPs for alignment with Illinois Assessment Frameworks/standards; instructional strategy use and impact in special education INLD (instructional LD), INED (instructional ED), and co-taught classes; positive impact of co-taught structure on performance of IEP students. | 2008       | 2010     | During School | Local Funds | \$500.00 |

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section II-Action Plan**

Part D. Parent Involvement Strategies and Activities for Objective 1

**Title : Increasing IEP Reading Proficiency on State Standards**

**State the parent involvement strategies and activities that will promote effective parental involvement for the objective. A parent involvement policy is required of all schools receiving Title I funds. The parental involvement strategies identified in the plan must be consistent with the schools parental involvement policy.**

| Strategies & Activities  | Time Line  |          |               | Budget      |          |
|--|------------|----------|---------------|-------------|----------|
|  | Start Date | End Date |               | Fund Source | Amount   |
| 1. Parents will have greater access to information related to their students' education through a Special Services Blackboard site.  | 2008       | 2010     | During School | Local Funds | \$0      |
| 2. Through eSchool administrative software, grade, attendance, and discipline information will be available to all parents.  | 2008       | 2010     | During School | Local Funds | \$0      |
| 3. A special fall Open House for parents of IEP students will be scheduled in order for parents to become acquainted with a variety of special education services, including but not limited to: skill-building in LRC, Project CRISS parent night, and assessment literacy, particularly as it pertains to their child's ability to self-assess and monitor progress. | 2008       | 2010     | After School  | Local Funds | \$300.00 |
| 4. In December, an Open House will be held for incoming freshman parents whose children have IEPs.   | 2008       | 2010     | After School  | Local Funds | \$300.00 |

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section II-Action Plan**

Part E - Monitoring Process for Objective 1

**Title : Increasing IEP Reading Proficiency on State Standards**

**1. Describe how school personnel will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities.**

Monitoring of Student Activities:

On a monthly basis, special education teachers will collect student data on precision teaching in LRCs. They will share this data with the Special Services Department Chair who will track data and trends and discuss possible adjustments to instructional strategies or interventions for the student with the teacher. The Special Services Department Chair will meet with the English and Communication Department Chair and Associate Principal for Instruction and/or Principal on a quarterly basis to review this data and actions that have occurred, as well as to discuss any changes that may be warranted. Additionally, at the end of each semester, the Special Services Department Chair will meet with the Associate Principal for Instruction and/or the Principal to review semester grades, along with final exam performance, of IEP students in co-taught English sections, making adjustments as warranted.

Monitoring of Parent Involvement:

Parent involvement in regard to parents of special education students will be monitored on a quarterly basis by the Special Services Department Chair and his staff. At the quarterly meetings with the Principal, he will report increases and/or results of parent involvement and discuss any changes that may be warranted.

Monitoring of Staff Development:

Staff development opportunities, support, and outcomes will be monitored by the Special Services and English and Communication Department Chairs in conjunction with the Associate Principal for Instruction and/or the Principal. They will meet on a quarterly basis to review the evaluation of staff development activities, consider any possible changes or additional needs for staff development.

**2. Designate the name and title of the person(s) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.**

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

Maria Ward

Principal

Pete Theis

Associate Principal

Linda Augustyn/Scott Wuggazer

English/Communication Dept. Chair/Special Services Dept. Chair

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section II-Action Plan**

---

Part A. Objective 2

**Title : Increasing IEP Mathematics Proficiency on State Standards**

**Each objective should be written to identify the current achievement level and specific, measurable outcomes in terms of AYP to be achieved for each year of the two required years of the plan.**

By late April of 2010, North High School will increase the math proficiency of all IEP students to at least 77.5% meeting the Illinois Learning Standards or attaining Safe Harbor status, as measured by the Prairie State Achievement Examination.

This objective covers the following areas of AYP deficiency (check all that apply):

1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Math Meets

If a school has met all the state-required performance targets identified in the School Report Card for only one year, it is still required to revise the School Improvement Plan while a school remains in status. The school should set forth other targets for improvement derived from and supported by data analysis to insure that the school continues to meet state targets.

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section II-Action Plan**

---

Part A. Objective 2

**Title : Increasing IEP Mathematics Proficiency on State Standards**

**This objective covers the following AYP deficiency areas.**

2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section II-Action Plan**

Part B. Student Strategies and Activities for Objective 2

**Title : Increasing IEP Mathematics Proficiency on State Standards**

**State the student strategies and activities to be implemented that logically support the objectives and respond to the key factors identified in Section III - Part B. Indicate whether the strategy or activity is during school hours, before school, after school, or during summer school.**

| Strategies & Activities   | Time Line  |          |               | Budget      |           |
|---|------------|----------|---------------|-------------|-----------|
|   | Start Date | End Date |               | Fund Source | Amount    |
| 1. Special education students in Algebra 200 & 300 will complete daily mastery drills and chart progress in a special education resource setting.   | 2008       | 2010     | Before School | Local Funds | \$1000.00 |
| 2. Special education students in Geometry 200 & 300 will complete daily mastery drills and chart progress in a special education resource setting.  | 2008       | 2010     | Before School | Local Funds | \$1000.00 |
| 3. Sophomore & Junior special education students will use various PSAE practice materials, including ACT prep software along with Key Train software, in all LD LRC classes. Students will monitor their progress.                                  | 2008       | 2010     | During School | Local Funds | \$500.00  |
| 4. Students will be taught self-assessment skills in order to take ownership of monitoring their learning progress in mastery drills, ACT Prep, Key Train, Learning Express Advantage, and direct instruction they will receive in the LRC setting. | 2008       | 2010     | During School | Local Funds | \$0       |
| 5. Inasmuch as possible, students with IEPs will receive access to core curriculum through enrollment in co-taught, "regular" level math classes.   | 2008       | 2010     | During School | Local Funds | \$0       |

| Strategies & Activities  | Start Date | End Date |              | Fund Source | Amount                                     |
|--|------------|----------|--------------|-------------|--|
| 6. At-risk students, including special education students, will receive after-school tutoring in the STRIVE (Success Through Reaching Individual Expectations) program. Progress will be monitored by students in conjunction with the STRIVE coordinator. | 2008       | 2010     | After School | Local Funds | Cost addressed in action plan for reading. |

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section II-Action Plan**

Part C. Professional Development Strategies and Activities for Objective 2

**Title : Increasing IEP Mathematics Proficiency on State Standards**

**State the professional development strategies and activities necessary to accomplish the objective. This component should directly address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified. In most cases, this professional training will focus on the teaching and learning process, such as increasing content knowledge, the use of scientifically based instructional strategies, and the alignment of classroom activities with academic content standards and assessments.**

| Strategies & Activities  | Time Line  |          |               | Budget      |           |
|--|------------|----------|---------------|-------------|-----------|
|  | Start Date | End Date |               | Fund Source | Amount    |
| 1. All identified math & special education teachers will receive training in the use of Precision Teaching methodology, materials, and monitoring, along with appropriate, ongoing support.  | 2008       | 2009     | During School | Local Funds | \$2000.00 |
| 2. All co-teach teams and LRC teachers will receive training in Assessment Literacy, focusing on 2 of the 7 strategies that teach students to self-assess and monitor learning progress.   | 2008       | 2010     | During School | Title II    | \$2500.00 |
| 3. LRC teachers will receive training in the effective implementation of ACT and Key Train test preparation, along with how best to facilitate self-assessment and reflection among their students.  | 2008       | 2010     | During School | Local Funds | \$1000.00 |
| 4. Identified teachers of special education will engage in deeper investigation of data for students with disabilities, data related to: proportion of students with various disabilities; audit of IEPs for alignment with Illinois Assessment Frameworks/standards; instructional strategy use and impact in special education INLD (instructional LD), INED (instructional ED), and co-taught classes; positive impact of co-taught structure on performance of IEP students. | 2008       | 2010     | During School | Local Funds | \$500.00  |

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section II-Action Plan**

Part D. Parent Involvement Strategies and Activities for Objective 2

**Title : Increasing IEP Mathematics Proficiency on State Standards**

**State the parent involvement strategies and activities that will promote effective parental involvement for the objective. A parent involvement policy is required of all schools receiving Title I funds. The parental involvement strategies identified in the plan must be consistent with the schools parental involvement policy.**

| Strategies & Activities  | Time Line     |               |               | Budget      |          |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|----------|
|  | Start Date    | End Date      |               | Fund Source | Amount   |
| 1. Parents will have greater access to information related to their students' education through a Special Services Blackboard site.  | 2008          | 2010          | During School | Local Funds | \$0      |
| 2. Through eSchool administrative software, grade, attendance, and discipline information will be available to all parents.  | 2008          | 2010          | During School | Local Funds | \$0      |
| 3. A special fall Open House for parents of IEP students will be scheduled in order for parents to become acquainted with a variety of special education services, including but not limited to: skill-building in LRC, Project CRISS parents' night, and assessment literacy, particularly as it pertains to their child's ability to self-assess and monitor progress. | Fall 2008     | Fall 2009     | After School  | Local Funds | \$300.00 |
| 4. In December, an Open House will be held for incoming freshman parents whose children have IEPs.   | December 2008 | December 2009 | After School  | Local Funds | \$300.00 |

# COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

## Section II-Action Plan

---

### Part E - Monitoring Process for Objective 2

#### Title : Increasing IEP Mathematics Proficiency on State Standards

##### 1. Describe how school personnel will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities.

###### Monitoring of student activities:

On a monthly basis, special education teachers will collect student data on precision teaching in LRCs. They will share this data with the Special Services Department Chair who will track data and trends of the data and discuss possible adjustments to instructional strategies or interventions for the student with the teacher. The Special Services Department Chair will meet with the Math Department Chair and Associate Principal for Instruction and/or Principal on a quarterly basis to review this data and actions that have occurred and discuss any changes that may be warranted. Additionally, at the end of each semester, the Special Services Department Chair will meet with the Associate Principal for Instruction and/or the Principal to review grades and final exam performance of IEP students in co-taught math sections, making adjustments as warranted.

###### Monitoring of Parent Involvement:

Parent involvement in regard to parents of special education students will be monitored on a quarterly basis by the Special Services Department Chair and his staff. At the quarterly meetings with the Principal, he will report increases and/or results of parent involvement and discuss any changes that may be warranted.

###### Monitoring of Staff Development:

Staff development opportunities, support, and outcomes will be monitored by the Special Services and Math Department Chairs in conjunction with the Associate Principal for Instruction and/or Principal. They will meet on a quarterly basis to review the evaluation of staff development activities, consider any possible changes or additional needs for staff development.

##### 2. Designate the name and title of the person(s) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

Maria Ward

Principal

Peter Theis

Associate Principal

Jonathan Heldmann/Scott Wuggazer

Math Dept. Chair/Special Services Dept. Chair

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

---

#### Part A - Parent Notification

**Describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand.**

- North High included information regarding AYP status on the front-page letter from the principal in the November 2007 parent newsletter that was mailed to all parents at the end of October; the letter was also posted on our North High website.
- The letter in the November 2007 newsletter, in addition to explaining AYP status, also invited interested parents to contact the principal if interested in serving on a committee to assist in the development and review of the SIP.
- The full school report card for 2007 is posted on the website and articulates the AYP status of the school.
- School improvement and school report card data were presented to Parents' Club on February 6, 2008, explaining the school report card information in detail, along with the implications of not making AYP. This meeting included parents who had contacted the school in regard to the invitation in the November newsletter. Twelve parents were in attendance at this particular meeting.

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

---

#### Part B - Stakeholder Involvement

**Describe specifically how stakeholders (including parents, school and district staff, and outside experts) have been consulted in the development of the plan.**

Our School Improvement Leadership Team was established in the spring of 2006 to assist in the development of our original school improvement plan. In the 2006-07 school year, the SI leadership team met several times to discuss progress in regard to school improvement efforts during the 2006-07 school year. In late spring of 2007, the SI team met to consider school-wide implementation of stated and posted daily learning objectives. Furthermore, the recommendation from the SI Team was to bring a consultant to North High to share expertise on the incorporation of learning objectives, graphic organizers, and summary frames with all staff. Dr. Bobb Darnell made a presentation to all North High staff on the May 2, 2007 Late Arrival day. On September 5 and November 14, 2007, the School Improvement Team, and other identified staff members, received additional professional development in the area of writing and implementing learning objectives and developing unit plans. SI team members are integral to school improvement work at North High.

A subgroup of the SI Team and School Administrative/Department Chair Team developed/wrote North's school improvement plan. Members of the subgroup include: Linda Augustyn, English/Communication Department Chair, Jonathan Heldmann, Math Department Chair, Scott Wuggazer, Special Services Department Chair, Melissa Hampton, Reading Teacher (Type 75 intern), Pete Theis, Associate Principal for Instruction, and Maria Ward, Principal. The full School Improvement Team reviewed the Action Plans for both Reading and Math on March 6, 2008.

Members of the School Improvement Leadership Team include:

Katie Baal, Science Department  
Jonathan Heldmann, Math Department Chair  
Stacey Villanueva, World Languages Department Chair  
Loukia Mastrodimos, Applied Arts and Technology Department Chair  
Lisa Lichtman, Applied Arts and Technology Teacher  
Scott Wuggazer, Special Services Department Chair  
Gary Mitchell, Social Studies Department Chair  
Tom Saam, Social Studies Teacher  
Allyson Passarelli, Math Teacher  
Amanda McDonald, Math Teacher  
Melissa Hampton, Reading Specialist

Jena Abrahamsen, English Teacher  
Marjorie Thomas, English Teacher  
Erin Enright, Science Teacher  
Beth Lee, World Languages Teacher  
Bill Miller, Music Teacher  
Marty Voelker, Art Teacher  
Sherri DeVore-Benitez, Assistant Principal  
Cyndi Karmik, Counselor  
Peter Theis, Associate Principal  
Maria Ward, Principal

Our school leaders -- the department chairs and building administrators -- members of one or more of the groups listed in this stakeholder section, have also been part of the planning and implementation of school improvement initiatives (past and present). The Administrative Council (department chairs and building administration) meets weekly, focusing on school improvement-related dialogue and decision-making. School improvement initiatives, action plans, monitoring and data collection plans are processed and “vetted” through the Administrative Council (building leadership team). The Administrative Council reviewed the Action Plans for both Reading and Math on February 26, 2008. Additionally, the Principal and the Associate Principal for Instruction are meeting with each department to review the Action Plans with their respective members.

School Improvement Administrative and Department Chair Members/Representatives are:

Loukia Mastrodimos, Applied Arts & Technology Teacher  
Katie Baal, Science Department Chair  
Jonathan Heldmann, Math Department Chair  
Linda Augustyn, English/Communication Department Chair  
Gary Mitchell, Social Studies Department Chair  
Stacey Villanueva, World Languages Department Chair  
Emily Mollet, PE/Health/DE Department Chair  
Scott Wuggazer, Special Services Department Chair  
Brayer Teague, Fine Arts Department Chair  
Rebecca Scott, Library Department Chair  
Sherri DeVore-Benitez, Assistant Principal  
Ken Sorensen, Assistant Principal  
Chuck Hiscock, Associate Principal  
Pete Theis, Associate Principal

Denise Kavanaugh, Athletic Director  
Maria Ward, Principal

We also held two Data Retreats – one focusing on math (January 18, 2008) and one focusing on reading (January 23, 2008). Consequently, we convened two different Data Teams, each of which was instrumental in analyzing data from our school report card by providing observations, developing hypotheses, and drawing conclusions based on the data, data which were used in the development of the School Improvement Plan.

Members of our two data teams include:

Math Data Team

Jonathan Heldmann, Math Department Chair  
Allyson Passarelli, Math Teacher  
Amanda McDonald, Math Teacher  
Tim McDonald, Math Teacher  
Scott Gollan, Math Teacher  
Bruce Thornquist, Math Teacher  
Marybeth Skooglund, Math Teacher  
Jodi Van Wetering, Math Teacher  
Katie Baal, Science Department Chair  
Erin Enright, Science Teacher  
Colleen Melie, Science Teacher  
Keith Dvorkin, Science Teacher  
Mike Szymanski, Science Teacher  
Tom Redig, Science Teacher  
Andy Klamm, Science Teacher  
Loukia Mastrodimos, Applied Arts and Technology Department Chair  
Scott Wuggazer, Special Services Department Chair  
Mary Frazier, Special Services Teacher  
Donna Frasor, Special Services Teacher  
Beth Housing, Special Services Teacher  
Brian Wardlow, Special Services Teacher  
Chuck Hiscock, Associate Principal  
Maria Ward, Principal

#### Reading Data Team

Linda Augustyn, English/Communication Department Chair

Vicki Everitt, English Teacher

Marjorie Thomas, English Teacher

Jena Abrahamsen, English Teacher

Elaine Simos, English Teacher

Kathy Smith, English and Reading Teacher

John Waite, English Teacher

Melissa Hampton, Reading Specialist

Sandra Smycz, English and Reading Teacher

Kelly Holquist, English Teacher

Gary Mitchell, Social Studies Department Chair

Tom Saam, Social Studies Teacher

Jill Rose, Social Studies Teacher

Melissa Kezios, Social Studies Teacher

Stacey Villanueva, World Languages Department Chair

Emily Mollet, PE/Health/DE Department Chair

Rebecca Scott, Library Department Chair

Scott Wuggazer, Special Services Department Chair

Robin Vesely, Special Services Teacher

Michele Geraghty, Special Services Teacher

Nancy Scanlan, Special Services Teacher

Dawn Pawlowski, Special Services Teacher

Jim Thomas, Special Services Teacher

Chuck Hiscock, Associate Principal

Pete Theis, Associate Principal

Maria Ward, Principal

The entire faculty, too, through a variety of meeting opportunities (late arrivals, early dismissals, before/after-school level and/or course meetings) continues to take part in Professional Learning Community dialogues at regularly scheduled sessions to analyze data, discuss implications of data, and determine implementation strategies for school improvement. Our Administrative Council has read **ON COMMON GROUND** and **GOOD TO GREAT**, and we have shared the tenets of both through departmental professional learning communities. Furthermore, as a school, we have worked with Dr. Bobb Darnell since last January, 2007, (an all-faculty presentation on May 2, 2007) in relation to the development of learning objectives, writing of unit plans, incorporation of advanced organizers into instruction, and implementation of summary frames.

Our Literacy Coaches and Literacy Liaisons, too, have been instrumental in providing professional development opportunities for staff members. Literacy Liaisons meet weekly with their respective literacy coach. As a large group, the literacy coaches convene workshops with literacy liaisons once per quarter. Additionally, literacy coaches and liaisons offer "Literacy Lunch" workshops to faculty six times per year on a variety of "reading in the content area" topics, such as "Activating Background Knowledge," "The Reading Process and Think Alouds," and "Content Area Vocabulary," to name three of the six.

Literacy Coaches are:

Melissa Hampton, English/Reading  
Kathy Smith, English/Reading/  
Sandra Smycz, English/Reading/Theater

Literacy Liaisons are:

Sharon Bolinger, Applied Arts and Technology Dept.  
Lisa Lichtman, Applied Arts and Technology Dept.  
Kelly Holquist, English and Communication Dept.  
Megan Kelly, Fine Arts Dept.  
Beth O'Riordan, Fine Arts Dept.  
Jodi Van Wetering, Math Dept.  
Amanda McDonald, Math Dept.  
Jackie McCormick, PE/Health/DE Dept.  
Lindsey Giannone, PE/Health/DE Dept.  
Colleen Melie, Science Dept.  
Steve Ruffolo, Science Dept.  
Melissa Kezios, Social Studies Dept.  
Jill Rose, Social Studies Dept.  
Toni Royster, Special Services Dept.  
Dawn Pawlowski, Special Services Dept.  
Madonna Smith, Library Services Dept.

Parents, too, were included in reviewing both Action Plans on March 7, 2008.  
Parents involved with review of the school improvement action plans include:

Gayle Besinger  
Sue Black  
Chris Colletti

Mary Dawes  
Peggy Gutzke  
Becky McKay  
Mary Rakowski  
Sandy Richards  
Linda Shranz

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

---

#### Part C - Peer Review

**Describe the district's peer review and approval process. Peer review teams should include teachers and administrators from schools and districts similar to the one in improvement, but significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students. As appropriate, peer reviewers may be teachers from other schools, personnel from other districts, Regional Office of**

The Peer Review Team is made up of educators from schools or districts similar to North High School, but they are significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students. The Peer Review team members have demonstrated effectiveness and have recognized expertise in school improvement. They are able to evaluate the plan's quality and the likelihood of its successful implementation, and they will make suggestions for revisions. The Peer Review Team used the ISBE monitoring prompt as they reviewed the plan. The DuPage RESPRO staff assisted North High in identifying possible Peer Review members; they suggested three schools.

One of the three schools, Highland Park High School in Highland Park, IL, District 113, offered a demographic situation more varied than our own but also offered promise in terms of significantly higher performance by the subgroups that were similar in size to ours – white and students with disabilities – while also presenting a picture of an “All” that outperformed our “All” by over 10 percentage points. We believe we can learn from their efforts.

We first contacted the interim principal at HPHS, John Scornavacco, who referred us to Mr. Tom Koulentes, Assistant Principal, the person who oversees HPHS's school improvement plan. Mr. Koulentes collaborated with Ms. Janell Cleland, Director of Learning at the District Office. After several e-mails with Mr. Koulentes in which North High's SI plan was forwarded, a conference call was arranged for Monday, March 10, 2008, at 3:00 p.m.. Suggestions from the Peer Review Team are listed below.

Suggestions from the Peer Review Team include:

- Reduce the numbers of strategies in each category of the action plans.
- Focus on narrowing the strategies with the intent on going deeply into them.
- Be prepared to collect data on each of the strategies, thus the recommendation to reduce the overall numbers.
- Consider including, as a strategy, providing training for students to self-assess and monitor their progress.
- Align student strategies with staff development strategies.
- Include the array of other initiatives that are underway, and will continue, in the narrative portion of the school improvement document.
- Distinguish between the collective work done by staff for the “All,” from the targeted interventions that will be implemented for the identified subgroup (students with disabilities).
- Leave blank the local assessment components (They stressed that we will collect and prepare local assessment data as we implement the plan.).

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

---

#### Part D - Teacher Mentoring Process

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

Mentoring Program in District 99:

Community High School District 99 has two established programs to ensure that essential information is shared and understood and that teachers new to the district experience a smooth transition from the academic world or other districts. New teachers are part of both the Mentor Program and the New Teacher Induction program.

The Mentor Program began in the 1991-1992 school year and has been nationally recognized. Members of the committee have made presentations at several local and national mentor conferences. Program participants have served as resources for other developing mentor programs. The program is dynamic, evolving, and successful at providing directed growth in District 99. Community High School District 99 was also the recipient of a three-year Federal Lighthouse Grant (2002-2005) in recognition of our mentor program. All teachers new to the district must participate in one year of the program and have the option of participating in a second year. New teachers are paired with successful, experienced teachers who share similar responsibilities. The highly structured mentor program consists of required and optional meetings for mentors and new teachers. Mentors spend at least 80 hours with their protégé during the year and visit their protégé in the protégé's classroom a total of five times while he/she is teaching. Two visits occur during the first quarter, and one each during the last three quarters. Mentors and protégés also attend three small liaison group meetings scheduled throughout the year.

The established agenda for the mentor-protégé meetings include:

- Orientation to the building and District
- Classroom Environment
- Scheduling
- Evaluation
- 1. Student
- 2. Teacher
- Parent Communication
- Teaching techniques
- Student Characteristics
- Special functions

- Professionalism

The New Teacher Induction program begins with a required week of meetings prior to the start of the school year and weekly meetings for the first three months of the school year. The program is overseen by an Associate Principal and employs a variety of staff members to make presentations on a variety of subjects. Topics covered during these meetings include:

- Preparing for Open House
- Teacher Appraisal
- Introduction to Library Services
- Instructional Technology
- Assessment Literacy
- Special Services
- Literacy Liaisons
- Student Assistance Training
- Preparing for Parent Conferences
- Assist
- Project CRISS
- Understanding by Design

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

---

#### Part E - District Responsibilities

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

District Responsibilities:

Community High School District 99 supports and will continue to support North High School in its efforts to improve student achievement in the following ways:

1. Provide additional teacher allocation to support lower class size in freshman and sophomore level core courses in which students will benefit from the smaller class size.
2. Continue to offer professional development in the areas of cooperative learning, Project CRISS, assessment literacy, and other areas as deemed necessary by the administration of North High.
3. Work with the Regional Office of Education and other agencies, as appropriate, to build a continuum of resources to provide consultative services, professional development and financial assistance in order to achieve the goals of North High.
4. Connect with the District 99 Professional Development Committee to provide additional district level professional development opportunities that complement the improvement programs at North High.
5. Continue to provide funding for the STRIVE (Success Through Reaching IndiVidual Expectations) after-school homework assistance program.
6. Ensure access to student performance data to support the work of North High staff in using data to identify appropriate and necessary changes in programming for students and staff.
7. Initiate working with a data study or retreat concept to provide data analysis training.

The District is working with North High School to support its efforts to institute and fully implement a new program for the special education LRCs. Furthermore, North High will incorporate learning objectives as part of beginning every lesson and continue to expand co-teaching. The growth of literacy coaching and affiliation with content liaisons will also bring beneficial reading/literacy instruction to classroom teachers, positively impacting all students and special education students, in particular. In doing so, the District agrees to provide appropriate professional development for all relevant staff, attests that the plan is based on scientifically-based research, and offers substantial promise of improving education achievement for low-achieving students, enabling the school to make AYP.

The various actions that will be undertaken in order to assist North High School include continuation of the supports listed above as well as:

1. Provide support and resources for expanded co-teaching of special education students, particularly in 300-level classes and for possible math and reading LRC support.
2. Provide for inclusion of North High students in the summer program for Algebra students who have failed second semester in order to help students stay on track with credits needed for graduation, successful completion of necessary course sequence, and mastery of required concepts.
3. Consider allowing for slots in a summer bridge program for at-risk, incoming freshman students from North that will assist the students in a successful transition from middle to high school, provide the opportunity to build background knowledge and skills needed for a successful high school experience, and provide a support network with other students and teachers.
4. Continue to support and direct core departments to identify, implement and assess their guaranteed and viable curriculum in the core content areas of math and reading.
5. Support the expansion of the literacy coaching program which provides content area teachers with the opportunity to learn with and from reading specialists regarding ways in which they can make their content materials more accessible to their students.
6. Increase the focus on assessment literacy in-service among staff and the broadening of the use of formative and summative assessments in evaluation of students, programs and instruction.
7. Expand the use of the newly adopted data analysis software program to permit easier and quicker access to data that will guide instruction.
8. Provide resources for a data “specialist” at each building.
9. Provide resources for professional development in the instructional practices articulated in Marzano’s CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION THAT WORKS.

10. Work with middle schools to understand the need to continue efforts to place students in the most rigorous math and English programs possible. In addition to providing course descriptions and placement criteria for the courses, provide to the middle schools achievement data that will include grades and data regarding key concepts with which their students seem to struggle once they arrive at North High. Solicit the support of the middle schools to bridge those gaps.

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

---

#### Part F - State Responsibilities

**Specify the services and resources that ISBE, RESPROS, and other service providers have provided the school during the development and review of this plan and other services that will be provided during the implementation of the plan. ISBE shall provide technical assistance to the school if district fails to do so.**

RESPRO has provided and will continue to provide technical assistance, data analysis, SI planning, reading material on research-based methodology, professional development opportunities in math and reading, sending administrators and teachers to conferences and workshops, all in an effort to support our learning of new ways to improve student achievement.

**COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99**

**Section III - Development, Review and Implementation**

---

Part G - School Support Team

**List the names and identify the roles (e.g., distinguished educator, district curriculum coordinator, university partner) of the School Support Team.**

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

1. Dr. Mary Biniewicz

Assistant Superintendent for Student Learning

2. Dr. Jack Hinterlong

RESPRO Consultant

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

### Section IV-A Local Board Action

---

DATE APPROVED by School Board : 3/17/2008

#### A. ASSURANCES

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

#### B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

By submitting this plan on behalf of the district, the district superintendent certifies to the Illinois State Board of Education that all the assurances and information provided in this plan are true and correct and that the improvement plan has been duly approved by the local school board.

---

Signature of LEA Superintendent

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

---

### ISBE Monitoring - Part I

#### ANALYSIS OF DATA

##### REPORT CARD DATA

Yes Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified?

Yes Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that clarifies the areas of weakness?

\* 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?

##### LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes \* 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?

##### OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes \* 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?

\* 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?

#### CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

Yes Has the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement?

Yes Do the objectives address all areas AYP deficiency?

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

---

### ISBE Monitoring - Part I

#### IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

#### ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

---

### ISBE Monitoring - Part I

#### **PART I - COMMENTS**

--August 1, 2008--School planners have identified weaknesses and trends over time, identified contributing factors clearly and comprehensively for IEP students in reading and math. The conclusions discussed are insightful and well-thought out. This is an aggressive plan to help students achieve success. Strategies and activities along with the monitoring process foster confidence that this plan will be implemented since expectations are clear.

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

---

### ISBE Monitoring - Part II

#### PLAN DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, AND IMPLEMENTATION

##### PARENT NOTIFICATION

Yes Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand?

##### STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

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

##### PEER REVIEW

Yes Has this plan been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have "the greatest likelihood" of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP?

##### TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS

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

##### DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes 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

Yes Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support (if any) is expected for its implementation?

##### SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM

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

## COMM H S DIST 99 - NORTH H S - CHSD 99

---

### ISBE Monitoring - Part II

#### APPROVAL DATE OF BOARD

Yes      The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.

#### PART II - COMMENTS

Note: This is a comprehensive plan to address the areas of deficiency. Best wishes as you implement this plan with the assistance of your area RESPRO. Carol Diedrichsen 217-524-4832 [cdiedric@isbe.net](mailto:cdiedric@isbe.net)