

Lemont-Bromberek CSD 113A

District Improvement Plan 2008

12/12/2008 11:49:01 AM

Page 1 of 44

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number	14016113A020000		
District Name	LEMONT-BROMBEREK CSD 113A	Superintendent	Tim Ricker, Ed.D.
District Address	16100 127TH ST	Telephone	6302572286
City/State/Zip	LEMONT,IL,60439 7462	Extn:	4605
Email	mgricus@sd113a.org		

Is this for a Title I District ? Yes

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

Lemont-Bromberek CSD 113A

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

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

	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		62.5			62.5			90.0		75.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	85.2		Yes	89.1		Yes	96.1	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	85.9		Yes	89.5		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	72.0		Yes	81.7		Yes				
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	57.9		Yes	78.5		Yes				
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	47.7	45.6	Yes	62.6		Yes				
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	63.6		Yes	73.9		Yes				

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress

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

2. At least 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. ***

3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.

4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 75% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2007. ** Safe Harbor Targets of 62.5% or above are not printed. *** Subgroups with fewer than 45 students are not reported. Safe Harbor only applies to subgroups of 45 or more. In order for Safe Harbor to apply, a subgroup must decrease by 10% the percentage of scores that did not meet state standards from the previous year plus meet the other indicators (attendance rate for non-high schools and graduation rate for high schools) for the subgroup. For subgroups that do not meet their Safe Harbor Targets, a 75% confidence interval is applied. Safe Harbor allows schools an alternate method to meet subgroup minimum targets on achievement.

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

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

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

ANNUAL MEASURABLE ACHIEVEMENT OBJECTIVES(AMAO) PERFORMANCE

Criterion 1: Attaining Proficiency			Criterion 2: Making Progress in English		
Total Number of Students Tested	Number Attaining Proficiency	Percent Attaining Proficiency	Total Number of Students Tested	Number Making Progress	Percent Making Progress
		98.1	131	99	75.6

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

Criterion 3: Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP for LEP Subgroup)

Percent Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards						Other Indicators (When Safe Harbor is Applied)	
Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate	Graduation Rate
%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target	Met AYP		
100	Yes	100	Yes	57.9		Yes	78.5		Yes		

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

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

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

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

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

Safe Harbor Targets of 55.0% or above are not printed

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

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

District Information								
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Attendance Rate (%)	95.7	96.1	96.2	97.1	96.0	96.1	95.8	96.1
Truancy Rate (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.0
Mobility Rate (%)	7.1	7.8	7.0	7.8	5.6	4.0	6.4	5.2
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
District Population (#)	2316.0	2355.0	2456.0	2532.0	2575.0	2591.0	2616.0	2625.0
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	3.2	2.8	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.4	4.3	5.0
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	1.0	0.6	1.1	2.1	3.0	5.1	5.4	5.9
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	94.1	94.6	94.9	94.8	91.7	90.8	89.8	88.8
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.6	1.2	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4
Hispanic (%)	3.6	2.8	3.5	3.4	4.6	5.1	5.9	6.0
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	1.3	1.0	1.3	1.2	1.7	1.9	2.1	3.0
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.0
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.8

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

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

	Year	White(%)	Black(%)	Hispanic(%)	Asian/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
D I S T R I C T	1999	95.7	0.4	2.7	1.2	0.1	-
	2000	96.2	0.6	2.5	0.5	0.2	-
	2001	94.1	0.6	3.6	1.3	0.3	-
	2002	94.6	1.2	2.8	1.0	0.3	-
	2003	94.9	0.4	3.5	1.3	0.0	-
	2004	94.8	0.6	3.4	1.2	0.1	-
	2005	91.7	0.5	4.6	1.7	0.2	1.4
	2006	90.8	0.5	5.1	1.9	0.1	1.6
	2007	89.8	0.4	5.9	2.1	0.3	1.5
	2008	88.8	0.4	6.0	3.0	0.0	1.8
S T A T E	1999	62.0	20.8	13.9	3.2	0.2	-
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7

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

Lemont-Bromberek CSD 113A

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

	Year	LEP(%)	Low Income(%)	Parental Involvement(%)	Attendance(%)	Mobility(%)	Chronic Truants(N)	Chronic Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
D I S T R I C T	1999	0.9	3.9	100.0	95.4	4.6	5	0.2	-	-
	2000	1.0	4.8	100.0	95.7	7.3	3	0.1	0.0	0.0
	2001	1.0	3.2	99.6	95.7	7.1	1	0.0	-	-
	2002	0.6	2.8	100.0	96.1	7.8	0.0	0.0	-	-
	2003	1.1	3.5	100.0	96.2	7.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2004	2.1	3.7	100.0	97.1	7.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2005	3.0	3.8	100.0	96.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2006	5.1	3.4	100.0	96.1	4.0	2	0.1	0.0	0.0
	2007	5.4	4.3	100.0	95.8	6.4	6	0.2	0.0	0.0
	2008	5.9	5.0	100.0	96.1	5.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
S T A T E	1999	6.4	36.1	96.1	93.6	18.1	43332	2.3	5.9	81.9
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.9	94.0	16.4	37525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40764	2.1	4.6	86.5
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49858	2.5	4.1	86.5

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

Lemont-Bromberek CSD 113A

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

	Year	School(N)	Grade 3(N)	Grade 4(N)	Grade 5(N)	Grade 7(N)	Grade 8(N)	Grade 11(N)
D I S T R I C T	1999	2203	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	2295	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2316	270	278	271	252	258	-
	2002	2355	245	270	284	274	268	0.0
	2003	2456	276	258	278	295	284	0.0
	2004	2532	279	308	278	320	291	0.0
	2005	2575	272	297	309	306	323	0.0
	2006	2591	280	281	308	304	319	0.0
	2007	2616	279	296	294	331	310	0.0
	2008	2625	-	-	-	-	-	-
S T A T E	1999	1962026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1983991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2007170	164791	161546	162001	151270	148194	123816
	2002	2029821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2044539	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	2060048	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	2062912	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	2075277	136123	139619	146935	153566	154856	-
	2007	2077856	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	2074167	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 7 - Educator Data, Staff Capacity and Professional Development**

	Year	Total Teacher FTE(N)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary(\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree(%)	Teachers with Master's Degree(%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials(%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers(%)
D I S T R I C T	1999	130	12	37254	53	47	20	-	-	-
	2000	128	12	37730	50	50	21	-	-	-
	2001	130	12	38921	49	51	21	-	-	-
	2002	135	12	39643	51	50	20	-	0.0	0.0
	2003	137	12	43396	55	45	21	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2004	144	11	45084	61	39	21	0.0	1	0.0
	2005	141	11	48410	58	43	21	0.0	1	0.0
	2006	144	11	51420	56	44	20	0.0	1	1
	2007	143	11	52206	37	63	20	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2008	138	11	54686	36	64	21	0.0	0.0	0.0
S T A T E	1999	119718	15	45337	53	47	20	18	-	-
	2000	122671	15	45766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125735	15	47929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126544	14	49702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129068	14	51672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125702	14	54446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128079	14	55558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127010	13	56685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127010	13	58275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131488	12	60871	47	53	18	18	1	1

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	80.9	79.6	78.5	84.5	86.0	81.1	-	-	-	85.4	80.9	83.3	71.8	68.5	69.6	76.9	78.7	80.3
White	80.8	79.5	77.7	85.5	85.7	81.3	-	-	-	85.1	81.4	83.6	73.2	69.7	69.3	77.0	78.6	83.0
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	69.2	81.8	78.5	80.0	72.7	-	-	-	85.7	73.3	80.0	-	27.3	63.6	80.0	77.8	58.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	72.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	71.4	-	53.3	-	-	-	95.2	-	52.7	-	-	-	76.2	-	13.3
Students with Disabilities	51.6	50.0	42.8	44.8	50.0	30.4	-	-	-	27.3	40.6	44.4	31.0	32.1	36.8	26.7	38.9	31.8
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	71.4	72.7	61.5	-	-	-	-	63.7	92.3	66.7	-	40.0	54.6	-	60.0	54.2
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	88.1	86.0	88.6	-	-	-	86.7	87.5	86.2	77.0	84.3	90.1	88.4	87.5	89.6
White	-	-	-	88.2	86.8	89.5	-	-	-	87.0	88.0	86.6	77.5	85.1	90.2	88.8	88.4	90.5
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	83.3	73.7	-	-	-	76.5	63.6	83.4	-	70.0	92.8	81.3	76.5	66.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69.2

Lemont-Bromberek CSD 113A

12/12/2008 11:49:01 AM

District Improvement Plan 2008

Page 12 of 44

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	46.7	41.2	56.5	-	-	-	27.3	42.8	47.6	19.4	36.8	40.0	45.5	31.8	56.3
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	80.0	61.1	-	-	-	72.7	68.8	76.9	-	57.2	70.0	-	70.0	64.3

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	93.5	92.3	90.7	91.1	95.9	88.6	-	-	-	91.2	89.6	92.8	84.3	81.3	82.5	84.5	90.4	84.4
White	94.0	93.0	90.7	92.4	95.5	88.8	-	-	-	91.5	90.0	93.1	85.9	82.1	83.2	84.3	90.4	85.3
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	84.6	100.0	85.7	100.0	90.9	-	-	-	92.8	80.0	93.3	-	54.6	54.5	100.0	88.9	75.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	91.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	90.5	-	68.8	-	-	-	100.0	-	78.9	-	-	-	85.7	-	60.0
Students with Disabilities	77.5	82.1	64.3	51.7	88.9	52.2	-	-	-	45.5	68.8	83.4	60.0	42.9	50.0	31.3	61.1	54.6
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	78.6	90.9	84.6	-	-	-	-	81.9	84.6	83.4	-	60.0	63.6	-	80.0	62.5
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	91.4	89.4	87.7	-	-	-	90.7	91.9	88.4	75.3	77.8	75.0	89.7	89.4	90.8
White	-	-	-	91.2	89.6	89.1	-	-	-	90.8	92.2	88.6	74.5	78.7	75.9	90.1	89.5	91.8
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	94.4	73.7	-	-	-	88.2	72.7	88.9	-	60.0	64.3	87.5	88.3	66.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61.5

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	60.0	47.1	47.8	-	-	-	45.4	71.4	52.4	16.1	15.8	15.0	45.5	28.6	70.5
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	80.0	72.3	-	-	-	81.8	68.8	100.0	-	50.0	50.0	-	-	64.3

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

Our analysis of the Report Card data from 2006, 2007 and 2008 revealed that District 113A students perform above the state average in Reading, Mathematics and Science in all grade levels tested. The total percentage of students who “met/exceeded” in all three content areas tested remained consistent for the three years analyzed.

Areas of Weakness:

In 2007, our subgroup of “students with disabilities” did not meet AYP in Reading. While this subgroup did meet AYP in Reading through the Safe Harbor provision in 2008, the performance of this subgroup remains a concern. Additionally, with the elimination of the IMAGE test in 2008, the performance of the LEP subgroup dropped from 76.1% meets/exceeds in 2007 to only 57.9% in 2008. Though our district’s low income rate is relatively low (5%), the performance for that subgroup of students also must be monitored to ensure that students in this subgroup continue to make adequate yearly progress.

While the total percentages of students in “meets/exceeds” are satisfactory, the percentages of students in the “exceeds” category are not as high as we would expect with our 96.1% attendance rate and relatively low mobility rate (5.2%). The percentages in the “exceeds” category range from 23% to 36%.

Areas of Strength:

For all but one grade level in one testing year (grade 6 in 2008), students’ performance in Mathematics is higher than their performance in Reading. We believe that our strong performance in Mathematics is the result of changes in our Mathematics curriculum that required increased rigor in the Illinois standards-aligned learning outcomes for all grade levels, K-8.

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

The factors that likely contributed to these results include both external and internal factors. One of the most significant factors relates to a growing population of LEP students, especially in the primary grades. In fact, the number of Polish-speaking students in our primary school has increased to a level that requires a Polish bilingual program. Classroom teachers need training to learn how to systematically and explicitly meet the needs of the English language learners who require more language support in learning how to read.

Another factor that contributed to these results is class size. For all grade levels, District 113A's class sizes are higher than the state average. With limited numbers of educational support staff (e.g., paraprofessionals, assistants) to support classroom instruction, it is a challenge for teachers to effectively differentiate instruction for all students, especially in reading and mathematics.

Additionally, while our percentage of students with disabilities reflects the national average (10%), the types of disabilities represented in that group have become more significant each year. For example, the number of students who are on the autism spectrum and who have cognitive impairments is much greater than the number of students with learning disabilities. It has been a challenge to provide sufficient staff training to meet the needs of this growing population of significantly impaired learners in the least restrictive environment.

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

Most of our students meet or exceed state standards in Reading and Math, but our local universal screening data indicate that more students than expected are struggling to be successful in the core reading curriculum. The district's literacy leadership team is in the process of revising the reading program for grades K-8 to better meet the range of reading abilities represented in our heterogeneous classrooms. Also, with the addition of more effective scientifically based instruction and Tier I, II and III interventions, a greater percentage of students will be successful in the core curriculum. The district is in the process of developing a menu of scientifically based interventions so that teachers and other implementers have a wide range of options to employ with students who need significant support to be successful in the core program.

Because a higher percentage of students demonstrate success with the core programs for the other content areas, we have not devoted as many resources to the development of intervention processes for those content areas. The district will analyze data from local assessments to determine needs for the other content areas, especially mathematics.

As we implement new scientifically based instructional strategies and Tier I, II and III interventions for reading and mathematics, staff training will be critical to our success. Our 3-year professional development plan includes specific training goals for all implementers of the RtI process: principals, classroom teachers, reading specialists, special educators, student service personnel, paraprofessionals and assistants.

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data

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

Analysis of the Terra Nova Test scores (a standardized achievement test given annually in grades 2-8) reveals that from 2001 through 2007 in grades two through eight, the Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) of 50 has been exceeded in all areas. An analysis of the 2007 data reveals that the greatest percentage of

students scored in the top two quartiles in all grades that the test was administered (2-8). In almost every subtest given district-wide, the smallest percentage of students scored in the bottom quartile.

While as a district the greatest percentage of students scored in the top two quartiles in all areas, math computation was a relative weakness for third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grades. The lowest achieving students scored substantially lower in computation in grades three, five, and six as compared to other content areas. Math was the lowest area for second grade, with 13% of the students scoring in the lowest quartile in math concepts and problem solving and 10% scoring in the lowest quartile in computation.

Reading Composite scores were consistently high in the 2007 Terra Nova administration ranging from 60.3% in the top two quartiles in grade five to 80% in the top two quartiles in second grade. Students scored higher in vocabulary than in comprehension at all grade levels except grades 3 and 8.

Currently the data is disaggregated into two subgroups: Limited English Proficiency (LEP) and students with disabilities. Overall, at least 80% of the students in the special education subgroups in all grade levels scored in the lower two quartiles. The LEP students also scored in the lower two quartiles for reading and language arts areas, but scores were higher in mathematics computation.

Currently Terra Nova testing results are used as an initial indicator for further screening. Students scoring below the 25th percentile on the Terra Nova and in the “does not meet” and “academic warning” for the ISAT are considered for further assessment. A relative weakness is that these tests are not intended to be used as universal screeners.

The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) is used in grades K-5 as a universal screener for reading; it is administered three times yearly. Although a majority of students are in the Established range in each grade level, current data indicate that a larger than expected number of students fall within the Emerging and Deficient ranges. Students who score within the Emerging or Deficient categories receive strategic and intensive interventions.

DIBELS data indicate that achievement gaps exist. In Kindergarten, teaching methods in letter naming and phoneme segmentation need to be examined. In 1st grade, Letter Naming and Nonsense Word Fluency were problematic. The 2nd grade Oral Reading Fluency data reveal that fluency is improving at an average rate, however, somewhat lower than desired; Nonsense Word Fluency is a significant problem (47% are Deficient or Emerging). In 3rd grade, Oral Reading Fluency is problematic, with over 30% identified as Deficient or Emerging.

In the area of literacy, AIMSweb is used as a progress monitoring tool. Evaluation of the effectiveness of this progress monitoring tool needs to take place. Additional assessments are given to students that score in the Deficient and Emerging ranges: Illinois Snapshots of Early Literacy (ISEL), Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) and the Basic Reading Inventory (BRI).

In the area of mathematics, district trimester tests are given in grades K-8. Data is collected on the percentage of students answering the questions correctly. However, scores are not disaggregated by subgroups at this time.

Demographic data indicate that 10% of the district's student population are identified as students with disabilities. Less than 6% of district students have been identified as LEP students. While students with disabilities and limited English proficient students can access tiered services, current data indicate that less than 5% of special education or LEP students receive such services.

Each school has a school-wide positive behavior program as well as individual plans for students, as needed. The middle school has initiated a formalized positive incentive program. Using the district's student data management system, all four schools systematically collect and track data about disciplinary infractions and disciplinary actions for behavior. Continued analysis of data is necessary to determine areas that need intervention. All schools currently have students in a form of tiered behavior programs. Individual behavior programs are developed as necessary. Gap analysis has not been completed concerning specific subgroups.

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

Several factors have contributed to the local results for District 113A. Spending less instructional time (minutes per day) in mathematics and language arts than the state average may have contributed to some students performing in the lower quartiles. The language delays that some students with disabilities and those with limited English proficiency possess may also impact the scores of those subgroups. Instructional time in science and social studies is close to the state average, and, based on the results of all students in all subgroups, appears to be sufficient.

Factors which contribute to the overall success of the students are high expectations with highly involved parents. All of the teachers of core subject areas are highly qualified according to No Child Left Behind requirements. The curriculum is standards based and utilizes best practices.

Some factors that inhibit overall success of students include the burgeoning ESL student population at the primary level. Additionally, classroom observations have revealed that inconsistent differentiation of instruction occurs across grade levels. The curriculum is also not uniformly implemented within all grade levels.

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

District 113A's RTI plan includes goals related to increasing achievement for all students. The literacy curriculum leadership team needs to investigate weaknesses in students' decoding and phonemic awareness skills so that they can recommend changes in instruction and materials. Additional professional development in differentiating instruction is needed. Scientifically based interventions for Tier II and III instruction will be evaluated and purchased. A more comprehensive analysis of behavior data will drive further school planning. The district will initiate a committee to review assessment programs that can be used as effective universal screeners for all grade levels and all content areas (e.g., NWEA's MAP).

In the area of mathematics, district grade level assessments are administered each trimester. The data is used primarily for curriculum monitoring and improvement. In order to effectively use the math assessment data for individual student diagnostics, we need to train teachers to analyze individual students' scores relative to the grade level's performance. Further, the District needs to provide training for teachers about all forms of assessment that are administered to students so that they can more effectively communicate about and discuss students' progress with parents.

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

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

Lemont-Bromberek Combined School District 113A is a relatively small district located in the southwest suburbs of Chicago. With a student enrollment of 2,625, our district has a low mobility rate of 5.2 %. Our attendance rate is 96.1%, which is above the state average. Parental contact is 100% via parent-teacher conferences which are held minimally twice a year. Parental support is generally perceived as being high, with an active P.T.A. and good parental attendance at school events. High parental involvement is accompanied by generally high parental expectations for student performance. Our schools also incorporate the expertise of support personnel, such as reading specialists, gifted education teachers, English as a Second Language teachers, bilingual teachers, speech therapists, special education teachers, and paraprofessionals. The above mentioned attributes contribute to students' academic and behavioral success and their desire to achieve in the classroom.

One of the challenges currently facing our district is that our district has a growing population of limited English proficient students (5.9%) with representation of 34 languages. Additionally, our pupil to teacher ratio is above the state average of 21:1, and our average class size is also above the state average at all grade levels, ranging from 22.6 in Kindergarten to 31.1 in eighth grade. This information tells us that teachers need training, materials and support to effectively differentiate instruction for a wide range of reading and language abilities with relatively high class sizes.

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

The above mentioned attributes are reflected in our students' success with local assessments, standardized achievement testing, and state assessment tests. On our district-created math assessment tests, at least 90% of the students in grades kindergarten through second answered a majority of the questions correctly. Gifted and Talented services are offered in grades three through eight; the majority of students in those programs demonstrated a high level of proficiency on the district math assessments. During the 2007-2008 school year, students in kindergarten through third grade were assessed using the DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) tests. At second grade, students' reading fluency scores at the Established level exceeded 73% in each trimester. Students in second through eighth grades also take the Terra Nova achievement test. From 2001 to 2007, grades three through eight exceeded the mean NCE (Normal Curve Equivalent) score of 50 in all tested content areas. Students in grades three through eight also take the ISAT tests per state mandate. From 2006 to 2008, 87% of the students met or exceeded in Reading, Math and Science compared to the state average of 73.8%.

We believe that our high test scores are a direct result of our strong, standards-based curriculum, highly-qualified staff and involved parents. For each curricular area, committees of teachers and administrators have aligned our learning outcomes with state standards and selected high quality materials to be used in the classroom. Committee work extends to the area of discipline and behavior. Behavioral expectations and discipline guidelines were reviewed and revised within the last year.

With our growing LEP population we have seen an increase in complications with home/school communication due to language barriers. In addition, large class

sizes and higher than average pupil to teacher and administrator ratios can negatively impact student behavior and achievement. District-wide, students identified as Economically Disadvantaged scored lower than their peers on the ISAT tests. ISAT data at grades three through five indicates that our LEP population achieves at a significantly lower rate than the general population. For example, ISAT reading scores for all 5th grade students show that 80.3% of students met or exceeded state reading standards in 2008. However, the LEP subgroup at fifth grade had 13.3% of students meet and exceed in reading. On the math test for fifth grade students, 84.4% of the grade level met or exceeded state standards while only 60% of the LEP students met or exceeded state standards in math.

We believe that steps can be taken to overcome many of the challenges facing our district. By addressing these challenges, we will have a positive impact on achievement for all students.

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

Currently, the four schools in our district are at different phases with RtI implementation. RtI implementation began in our primary building during the 2005-2006 school year. Over the next two years, the other buildings in our district began implementation. In the area of reading, universal screenings, assessments, interventions and progress monitoring systems have been selected and put in place. Qualifying criteria and research-based interventions have been determined for each tier. In the areas of behavior and math, we will continue to refine our assessments, interventions, and guidelines for implementation. Ongoing staff development will include district institutes, visits to other districts and attendance at professional conferences.

For future improvement planning, we will continue with our six year curriculum evaluation cycle. During the 2008-2009 school year, the literacy committee will analyze strengths and weaknesses in our current programs while considering needs for future programs. In the area of behavior and discipline, schools will continue to implement and refine building-level systems, including PBS (Positive Behavior Systems). Student support teams in each building will continue to be involved with creating and monitoring individual behavior plans within RtI Tier II and Tier III. To better serve students who are struggling with reading and/or math, Title I funds will be dedicated to support new Tier II and III services. Those services will be provided to students in our general population who meet the Title I eligibility requirements but will also support LEP students who qualify for services. The reading specialists and psychologists are in the process of designing fidelity checklists for Tier II and Tier III interventions so that we will be able to monitor the extent to which interventions are being administered with fidelity.

The District needs to enhance its ability to communicate about students' progress with parents who do not speak English or who speak English as a second language. Currently, the District's web site offers literal translation of the contents of the entire web site. However, we must explore resources for providing translation services so that teachers and specialists can inform non-English speaking parents about their children's progress in reading, math and behavior.

Section I—C. Data & Analysis – Other Data
Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

***Data** - Briefly describe data on educator qualifications and data and/or information about staff capacity and professional development opportunities related to areas of weakness and strength. What do these data tell you?*

All District 113A teachers of core academic subjects are highly qualified according to No Child Left Behind standards. Additionally, 64% of District 113A teachers have a master's degree or higher; 13% of our teaching staff hold a master's degree in reading.

We have conducted varied levels of training about the RtI process and scientifically based instruction and interventions for different groups of our professional staff. General training about a multi-tier early intervening services model and the district's implementation plan was provided to all staff during the 2007-2008 school year. Our reading specialists and a small number of certified staff have received extensive training on the RtI process, problem solving models and the use of scientifically based interventions via external providers, including Illinois Principals Association, ISBE, Southwest Cook County Cooperative for Special Education and I-ASPIRE. Also, although we have added one training session about the RtI process to our new teacher orientation/mentor program, it is imperative that we provide additional training so that ALL teachers can implement our core reading and math programs with fidelity during the 2009-2010 school year.

A 2007 survey of certified staff members indicated that from 42% to 51% of staff had limited understanding of the RtI process (42%, 42%, 45% and 51% for the four district schools). A follow-up survey will be administered in the spring of 2008 to ascertain the extent to which staff members have increased their knowledge base about RtI and scientifically based instructional strategies and interventions over the last year. Additional "check ins" will be conducted with staff in subsequent years via surveys, focus groups and staff meetings.

In another 2007 needs assessment related to professional development, teachers expressed strong interest in expanding their knowledge and skills about working with students who exhibit challenging behaviors. In response to that expressed need, our district has established a training plan whereby all District 113A staff who work directly with students will be trained in the Crisis Prevention Institute (CPI) methods by the end of the 2009-2010 school year. CPI teaches educators how to safely prevent and manage disruptive behavior. Participants learn proven methods for defusing explosive behavior and gain skills to handle many types of threatening or challenging situations with minimum anxiety and increased confidence. We believe that educators who practice CPI skills, especially for prevention, will be better able to provide a safe learning environment for all students. Additionally, while our schools have not adopted the PBIS system, many teachers have expressed interest in learning more about PBIS for classroom and whole school implementation. The district has conducted an introduction to PBIS for its leadership team and will continue to explore the PBIS system during the 2009-2010 school year with possible school or district-wide adoption to occur in the 2010-2011 school year.

These data tell us that staff capacity for implementing scientifically based instructional strategies and interventions is high. However, targeted and ongoing professional development related to scientifically based instruction and interventions for the core program as well as all intervention tiers is required. As part of our literacy program update and RtI plan, we intend to provide additional staff development about best practices for teaching reading at all grade levels, including the middle school.

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

District 113A teachers have a basic knowledge of instructional strategies for teaching reading, mathematics and other core academic subjects. However, with increased enrollment of LEP students, growing class sizes and more significantly impaired students participating in general education classrooms, teachers need advanced training in scientifically based instructional strategies and interventions to meet the wide range of abilities represented in our classes of 22 to 31 students. Over the last three years, professional development has been targeted to the personnel who have administered the universal screening instruments and interventions, and who supervise or implement progress monitoring. Limited resources of time and funding have presented challenges to implementing a robust training program that reflects the standards for effective professional development (i.e., results-driven, job-embedded, sustained, cumulative).

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

As classroom teachers assume more responsibility for the administration of universal screeners and expand their repertoire of scientifically based instructional strategies and Tier I interventions, the training needs will increase significantly. In order to effectively apply Tier I interventions for the greatest benefit of the students, teachers must have access to and be skilled with the analysis of student performance data. To that end, the assistant superintendent will conduct a training program for the building administrators so that they can use the new features of the IIRC database to inform their building level school improvement planning. In turn, the building administrators can train teachers how to use the data in the IIRC database to target instruction and interventions to the students' specific needs. Teachers will then have a stronger knowledge base about assessment and will be better able to explain assessment results in terms of individual students' progress, especially in reading and math.

Additionally, the Curriculum Leadership Teams will ensure that systematic and ongoing staff development is a priority in the implementation plan for updated core instructional programs that are adopted from this year forward. Finally, the District's Mentor Program will be expanded to include components that will ensure that new teachers have adequate training to implement the scientifically based instructional strategies and interventions that form the foundation of the core instructional program.

Section I-C. Data & Analysis – Other Data
Item 3 - Parent Involvement**Data** - *Briefly describe data on parent involvement. What do these data tell you?*

Parents are involved in Student Services Team meetings (SST minutes verify this), conferences with teachers about student progress and discussions about the results of progress monitoring. Teachers who have Tier 2 and Tier 3 students are required to share the progress monitoring information with parents. 100% of parents are contacted about students' progress throughout the year. Progress reports are sent home to parents via paper and electronic means on a regular schedule that has been determined by grade level (i.e., weekly, monthly, mid-trimester).

Although staff members do analyze data (local assessments, state assessments, etc.) and set goals for individual students and grade levels, the detailed assessment information is not consistently shared with parents.

All elementary schools have completed a parent and student satisfaction survey. The middle school will be conducting a parent survey as part of its National Middle School Association assessment. The survey results from the three elementary schools show a high level of satisfaction by parents and students.

A specific survey concerning RtI services will be designed and hand delivered to parents who have students in Tier II and Tier III. Results will drive training for staff and the development of information systems for parents and the community.

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

In order for parents to become informed consumers of what will be considered successful achievement, it is essential for families to become involved in the intervention process. This is currently a work-in-progress for District 113A. Parents need a great deal of information about their students' progress in order to understand and accept recommendations for improvement and to contribute to the students' achievement of academic and behavior goals. It is the school's responsibility to work hand-in-hand with parents to make sure that this takes place. However, these goals have not yet been fully realized. Currently, the schools share standardized achievement test and cognitive skills test data with all parents. Although the school district adequately communicates with parents about their students' classroom achievement via telephone, e-mail and face-to-face meetings, we do not provide detailed information about universal screening assessment and progress monitoring data. Additionally, we provide limited information about what parents can do at home to help their children succeed academically and behaviorally at school. It is our goal to conduct parent workshops, post resources on the district's website and increase regular and ongoing communication about individual students' progress between the classroom teacher and specialists and the home.

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

Parents need to be involved earlier in the Response to Intervention process. This means that the District will include parents in one-on-one and group meetings in which consensus regarding student progress, expectations and timelines will be determined.

The following procedures or activities will take place to help facilitate and communicate RtI:

- Parent participation on School Improvement teams
- Presentations on RTI process for parents
- Development of brochures and newsletters regarding RtI process
- RTI information and links posted on district web-page
- Increased staff-parent communication for students in Tiers II and III.

A survey for parents who have Tier II and III students will be conducted in the fall of 2008. The data will be collected and will drive the plans for staff development and parent workshops/presentations.

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

Section I-D - Key Factors – From the preceding screens (I-A, I-B, I-C-1, 2, 3), identify key factors that are within the district's capacity to change or control and which have contributed to low achievement. What conclusions about next steps have you reached from reviewing available data and information and about all the factors affecting student achievement?

I-A: Report Card Data

In 2007, our subgroup of "students with disabilities" did not meet AYP in Reading. While this subgroup did meet AYP in Reading through the Safe Harbor provision in 2008, the performance of this subgroup remains a concern. Additionally, with the elimination of the IMAGE test in 2008, the performance of the LEP subgroup dropped from 76.1% meets/exceeds in 2007 to only 57.9% in 2008.

While the total percentages of students in "meets/exceeds" are satisfactory, the percentages of students in the "exceeds" category are not as high as we would expect with our 96.1% attendance rate and relatively low mobility rate (5.2%). The percentages in the "exceeds" category range from 23% to 36%.

Compared to the state ratios our district is higher than the state in class size, pupil-teacher ratio and pupil-administrator ratio.

Our next steps to increase student achievement will be to continue to provide staff development and training to further enhance our students' academic performance, especially in reading and math. Areas of staff development might include, but are not limited to, differentiation, guided reading, and effective Tier I interventions.

I-B: Local Assessment Data

The local assessment data indicates that overall our students are doing very well, both academically and socially/emotionally. Current assessment data does indicate that phonemic awareness and reading fluency are two areas of relative weakness. An additional educational paraprofessional was hired this year to work with kindergarten students on phonemic awareness skills. This additional support and early intervention should show increased numbers of students in the Established range in DIBELS (meeting benchmark goals), which should ultimately enhance reading fluency. Additionally, discipline data is being collected in each building and PBS strategies and supports are being incorporated into daily building operations to ensure a safe, engaging learning environment.

I-C Item 1: Attributes and Challenges of the School and Community that Have Affected Student Learning

District-wide, our performance on the ISAT tests indicates that our economically disadvantaged students and our LEP students do not perform as well as their peers. Schools will continue implementation of RtI in the area of reading. Title I funds will be used to procure additional supports for our Tier II and Tier III reading and/or math students (District 113A was notified of its Title I status in October, 2008; therefore, programming is still in development). Further development is necessary to uniformly implement the RtI process in the areas of math, behavior and the other content areas. Ongoing staff development will include district institutes, visits to exemplary districts, and attendance at professional conferences. By continuing district committee work within our curriculum review cycle, the district will reevaluate and improve our core curriculum and selected materials for classroom use. With the continued support of building-level student support teams, classroom teachers will be able to better meet the academic and behavioral needs of all students.

I-C Item 2: Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development Data and Information

All teachers of core academic subjects and paraprofessionals are highly qualified. In the area of staff capacity, our professional development plan

includes additional professional development and training with Tier I interventions for general education teachers. Likewise, in spring of 2009, a committee comprised of building administrators, reading specialists, classroom teachers and school service personnel will review research-based Tier II and Tier III intervention materials for possible purchase. Training related to newly purchased interventions will be provided to a greater number of staff members than in the past. The staff development related to interventions will be integrated with training about scientifically based instructional strategies for the core reading program to ensure that all students experience strong and effective core instruction and intervention, as needed.

I-C Item 3: Parent Involvement Data

A survey regarding RtI services will be designed and distributed to parents who have students receiving Tier II and Tier III support. Survey results will drive training for school employees and development of communication/information systems for parents. Various procedures and/or activities will take place to help facilitate and communicate about RtI to our staff and parents, including, but not limited to, parent participation on school improvement teams, staff presentations to parents on the RTI process, brochures and newsletters regarding the RTI process, postings on the district's web-page, and increased communication between parents and school for students in Tiers II and III.

Section II-Action Plan

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

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

This district is not accountable for AMAO for this year

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1 Title :

Support implementation of a multi-tier early intervening services model for academics and behavior.

Objective 1 Description :

Our district believes that the key to successful implementation of our plan is the creation of a representative district leadership team comprised of staff members and parents that will guide the assessment of current systems and practices as well as the development of implementation strategies for needed improvements. The leadership team will make recommendations and decisions about: training related to scientifically based instruction and interventions; review and purchase of scientifically based interventions; identification of students potentially at risk for failure; delivery model for multi-tiered services; priority and long range staff development goals; and the components of the special education eligibility process for specific learning disabilities. The district leadership team will be responsible for establishing processes for educating the staff, parents and the wider community about the problem solving/multi-tiered intervention model (RtI). Members of the team will provide implementation guidance and support to all four of our schools. At the school level, the leadership team members will build the service delivery system in collaboration with the School Improvement Teams and the Curriculum Leadership Teams. This collaboration will strengthen the capacity of grade level teams to deliver high quality, scientifically based instruction and ensure that our Student

Services Teams can reach identified goals in a timely and efficacious manner.

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 1 Title : Support implementation of a multi-tier early intervening services model for academics and behavior.

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Assemble a discipline committee consisting of students, parents and staff to research and develop a district-wide code of conduct that will be shared with all students and families.	1/5/2008	10/1/2008	After School	Local Funds	7000
Teach and review student code of conduct three times per year (fall, winter and spring) with all students; code of conduct will raise awareness of district's policies and procedures related to student behavior; staff and parents will be responsible for teaching and implementing the code of conduct and students will be responsible for upholding the code; discipline data will be reviewed through the year and annually to ensure that targets are met.	9/1/2008	6/5/2009	During School	Local Funds	0
Organize building-based discipline committees to customize the code of conduct for each school; students, parents and staff will develop specific expectations and consequences for the grade levels which are served in the building; each building will investigate the possibility of adopting the PBIS or similar system.	9/1/2008	6/5/2009	After School	Local Funds	0
District leadership team will issue a statement about district's adoption of a multi-tiered, early intervening services and SLD identification model to students, parents and staff.	8/30/2007	6/5/2009	After School	Local Funds	0
District leadership team will identify and commit funds to support implementation of RtI service model.	1/12/2009	6/5/2009	After School	Local Funds	0
Research and review options for collecting intervention data to determine the need for and selection of additional interventions; effectiveness of data collection tools will be assessed through annual staff surveys and student achievement data.	9/1/2008	6/6/2010	Before School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 1 Title : Support implementation of a multi-tier early intervening services model for academics and behavior.

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Administer a staff survey as a follow-up to a pre-implementation survey about staff's knowledge about RtI, the problem solving model and criteria for the determination of SLD that was conducted in fall of 2007.	4/4/2009	5/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	0

Lemont-Bromberek CSD 113A

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Analyze data gathered from staff surveys related to knowledge of the RtI process and determine the need for development of staff guidance documents and training; use survey results to determine staff professional development needs for the next two years.	4/4/2009	6/30/2009	During School	Local Funds	0
Conduct information sessions about RtI and the problem solving model during grade level collaboration and middle school team meetings.	12/1/2008	3/5/2009	During School	Local Funds	0
Engage in ongoing discussions about scientifically based instructional strategies, interventions and student assessment data during grade level collaboration and middle school team meetings.	12/1/2008	6/6/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
Building level SST teams will review all components of the RtI plan and implementation timeline with their school's staff.	12/1/2008	4/30/2009	Before School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 1 Title : Support implementation of a multi-tier early intervening services model for academics and behavior.

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Research strategies used by neighboring school districts to educate parents about and involve parents in the RtI process; strategies will be chosen, implemented and assessed through annual parent surveys.	9/5/2008	6/5/2009	During School	Local Funds	0
Administer RtI parent survey and analyze data from survey to determine training and information needs of parents; staff will obtain useful data for development of parent information component of RtI.	11/20/2008	5/5/2009	During School	Local Funds	0
Analyze data gathered from parent surveys related to knowledge of the RtI process; survey results will be used to identify parent information and communication needs for the next two years.	3/3/2009	6/6/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
Using the results from the RtI parent survey, develop materials to increase parents' knowledge about and understanding of RtI; distribute materials via brochures, district's web site and personal contacts.	1/5/2009	6/6/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
Increase involvement of parents in problem solving and leadership team work and discussions.	10/28/2008	6/6/2010	After School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title : Support implementation of a multi-tier early intervening services model for academics and behavior.

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

Effectiveness of strategies and activities will be monitored through:

- Collaboration meeting minutes gathered every school day during grade level, team, facilitator, specialists', and administrator meetings
- Student Services Team discussion notes, file reviews, information gathering, assessments and research
- Information gathered through student, parent and teacher surveys developed specifically for the RtI process.
- Recorded number of "hits" on the RtI information page found on the district's website.

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

Name	Title
Mary T. Gricus	Assistant Superintendent
Mary Ellen Schaffer	Director of Student Services
Cathy Slee	Principal, Oakwood School
Joanne Policht	Assistant Principal, Oakwood School
Debby Lynch	Principal, River Valley School
Gina Rodewald	Principal, Central School
Dawn Pechukas	Principal, Old Quarry Middle School
Jan Collins	Assistant Principal, Old Quarry Middle School
Tracy Simon	Instructional Technology Coordinator

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2 Title :

Build a scientifically based assessment system that includes universal screening, individual student assessments and progress monitoring for academics and behavior.

Objective 2 Description :

The District will expand its use of Curriculum-Based Measurements (CBM), scientifically based universal screening tools and progress monitoring tools in all grade levels to identify candidates for multi-tiered interventions and to ensure that students are benefitting from the interventions provided. In addition, CBM will form the basis for special education IEP goals and a student's response to intervention will be used to determine SLD entitlement. School Improvement Teams and the Curriculum Leadership Teams will examine grade level data to evaluate the effects of core and intervention curricula. For behavior and social-emotional development, the district will use the student data management system (SDS) to record and analyze behavior patterns. This objective will require ongoing and robust professional development as well as specific methods and vehicles for communicating data and their interpretation to parents.

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 2 Title : Build a scientifically based assessment system that includes universal screening, individual student assessments and progress monitoring for academics and behavior.

Strategies/Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
District leadership team will evaluate and choose tools for universal screening and progress monitoring based on the standards provided by the National Center on Student Progress Monitoring and District leadership team will specify universal screening criteria for Tier II and III interventions.	1/5/2009	5/30/2009	After School	Local Funds	0
By fall 2009, a CBM universal screening for Tier 1 and progress monitoring system for Tiers II and III will be in place for all grade levels K-8; students will be screened 3 times per year with the tool selected.	9/8/2008	5/1/2009	After School	Local Funds	0
By fall 2010, IEP goals will be written and monitored using scientifically based progress monitoring tools (CBM).	9/1/2008	9/1/2010	Before School	Local Funds	0
By fall 2010, all behavioral IEP goals will be written and monitored with specific, measurable, observable and reliable data collection techniques.	9/1/2008	5/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
By winter 2010, based on universal screening data, the district will identify students at risk and provide them with scientifically based interventions for reading and math.	9/1/2008	3/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
Starting in fall 2009, all students receiving Tier II and Tier III interventions will be progress monitored with appropriate frequency.	9/1/2008	9/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	0

Lemont-Bromberek CSD 113A

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
In fall 2009 and annually thereafter, the district leadership team and curriculum leadership teams will evaluate all relevant data (e.g., ISAT, Terra Nova, universal screening) to determine if the core curriculum is meeting the needs of most students.	11/15/2009	1/6/2010	Before School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 2 Title : Build a scientifically based assessment system that includes universal screening, individual student assessments and progress monitoring for academics and behavior.

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
By winter 2010, appropriate staff will be trained to collect, organize and interpret universal screening data to make instructional decisions for students.	1/10/2009	4/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
By winter 2010, appropriate staff will be trained to collect and interpret progress monitoring data to evaluate the effectiveness of an intervention.	2/1/2009	4/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
By winter 2010, appropriate staff will be trained to use progress monitoring data to write measurable and observable scientifically based goals and objectives for students in Tier II, Tier III and those with IEPs.	4/1/2009	4/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
Training about the three-tier intervention model and problem solving system will be incorporated into new staff training via the Mentor Program.	8/1/2009	5/1/2010	Before School	Local Funds	600
By spring 2010, teachers will be trained in the administration of a universal screening and the interpretation of data from same.	8/30/2009	6/1/2010	Before School	Local Funds	10000
Review and purchase universal screening tools for all grade levels, K-8; screeners will be used to identify students in need of Tier II and Tier III interventions.	1/5/2009	9/1/2009	Before School	Local Funds	120000

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

Objective 2 Title : Build a scientifically based assessment system that includes universal screening, individual student assessments and progress monitoring for academics and behavior.

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
By spring 2009, District will develop an information brochure about the RtI process/Three-Tier Model of Service Delivery; brochure will be posted on the District's website and distributed to parents in hard copy.	12/1/2008	4/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	500
By spring 2009, District will create an RtI link on the District's web page that includes information and resources about the RtI process.	12/1/2008	5/30/2009	Before School	Local Funds	0

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Starting with our first universal screening assessment, data will be shared with parents three times a year, along with information about the interpretation of the data and recommendations for home activities.	9/1/2009	6/6/2010	After School	Local Funds	0
Information about the universal screening system and data will be presented at School Board meetings and open parent meetings.	9/1/2009	6/6/2010	After School	Local Funds	0
Provide regular data updates to parents of students who are progress monitored.	9/1/2008	6/6/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
Teachers will include discussion of universal screening data and progress monitoring data (if relevant) during parent-teacher conferences.	11/15/2009	4/1/2010	After School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title : Build a scientifically based assessment system that includes universal screening, individual student assessments and progress monitoring for academics and behavior.

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

Effectiveness of strategies and activities will be monitored through:

- Data collection (progress monitoring, universal screening results, student data system holdings, charts, graphs, behavior plans).
- Collaboration meeting minutes gathered every school day during grade level, team, facilitator, specialists', and administrator meetings.
- Student Services Team discussion notes, file reviews, information gathering, assessments and research.
- Data gathered through student, parent and teacher surveys developed specifically for the RtI process.
- Recorded number of "hits" on the RtI information page found on the district's website.

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

Name	Title
Mary T. Gricus	Assistant Superintendent
Mary Ellen Schaffer	Director of Student Services
Jan Collins	Assistant Principal, Old Quarry Middle School
Dawn Pechukas	Principal, Old Quarry Middle School
Debby Lynch	Principal, River Valley School
Gina Rodewald	Principal, Central School
Joanne Policht	Assistant Principal, Oakwood School
Cathy Slee	Principal, Oakwood School

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3 Title :

Ensure the use of scientifically based instructional practices and interventions at all three tiers in reading, mathematics and behavior for all grade levels, K-8.

Objective 3 Description :

The District will identify and implement scientifically based instructions and interventions to ensure that the curriculum meets the needs of most students. At the elementary and middle school levels, this includes building proactive and preventative systems of intervention (Tier I) for academics (reading/language arts, math) and behavior.

For students who need more of what is presented in the core curriculum or who need the most intensive support the District can offer, District 113A will provide scientifically based instructional strategies and/or interventions of increasing intensity and/or duration. Training in and supervision of instructional strategies for the core program and supplemental interventions will ensure implementation integrity at all tiers.

Teachers, paraprofessionals and assistants will be trained on best practices for instructional strategies and interventions for reading and mathematics.

Social-emotional needs will be addressed through a hierarchy of behavioral supports.

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 3 Title : Ensure the use of scientifically based instructional practices and interventions at all three tiers in reading, mathematics and behavior for all grade levels, K-8.

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Continue to implement Tier I interventions(basal series,intervention readers,leveled readers, small groups,re-teaching, pre-teaching) within the general curriculum. Universal screening will take place three times a year(fall, winter, spring).	9/1/2008	6/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	12000
Continue to implement Tier II interventions (for example; additional time,re-teaching,pre-teaching,manupulatives, Reading A-Z, Language!) within a small group setting with a Reading Specialist or other staff in addition to general education reading instruction. Students receiving Tier II interventions will be progress monitored on a regular basis.	9/1/2008	6/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	20000
Continue to implement Tier III interventions (for example; Tune into Reading, Earobics, Making Words) within a small group setting with a Reading Specialist or other staff in addition to general education instruction.Students receiving Tier III interventions will be progress monitored on a regular basis.	9/1/2008	6/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	20000
Implement interventions for Tier II and Tier III in the area of math. The list generated will be shared with staff implementors.	9/1/2009	6/1/2011	During School	Local Funds	20000
The District Leadership Team will review the results and establish a district intervention hierarchy for pre-kindergarten through 8th grades that uses scientifically based interventions and instructional practices.	9/1/2009	6/1/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
The District Leadership Team will establish policies for the delivery of Tier II services at the elementary level.	8/1/2009	6/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 3 Title : Ensure the use of scientifically based instructional practices and interventions at all three tiers in reading, mathematics and behavior for all grade levels, K-8.

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
All elementary administrators and staff will be given instruction on best practices in the teaching and supervision of reading	1/5/2009	6/1/2011	During School	Local Funds	5000

Lemont-Bromberek CSD 113A

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Research and determine menu of scientifically based interventions to be utilized in reading, math, and behavior. Intervention menus will be developed for each grade level span served by the four schools.	9/1/2009	6/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	5000
Provide weekly collaboration between and among staff member,specialists and support personnel to review,explain, and train staff in all scientifically based Tier interventions that appear on the District's menu. Assess the success of collaboration through collaboration meeting minutes and staff survey responses.	9/2/2007	6/1/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
Routinely schedule professional trainings on all scientifically based Tier interventions for specialists who will become trainers for additional district staff. Effectiveness of such professional development will be determined by the success and effectiveness of district trainers evidenced by increased student achievement.	9/7/2008	6/1/2011	During School	Local Funds	11000
Regularly conduct in-house trainings using district trainers on scientifically based interventions for all implementers(classroom teachers,specialists,and paraprofessionals). Effectiveness of such trainings will be determined by the success and effectiveness of district trainers evidenced by increased student achievement.	9/1/2007	9/1/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
Create for and administer to staff an annual needs assessment to determine additional training needs for all staff and the need for additions to the adopted interventions menu. Survey results will be used to determine professional development for the next school year.	9/1/2007	6/1/2011	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 3 Title : Ensure the use of scientifically based instructional practices and interventions at all three tiers in reading, mathematics and behavior for all grade levels, K-8.

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
District will develop a Three-Tier Model of Service Delivery brochure and send home to all parents. This will include information regarding Tier II and Tier III literacy interventions.	1/5/2009	6/5/2009	During School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 3 Title : Ensure the use of scientifically based instructional practices and interventions at all three tiers in reading, mathematics and behavior for all grade levels, K-8.

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

Effectiveness of strategies and activities will be monitored through:

- Data collection (progress monitoring, universal screening results, student data system holdings, charts, graphs, behavior plans).
- Fidelity and integrity checklists routinely kept by staff members participating in interventions.
- Collaboration meeting minutes gathered every school day during grade level, team, facilitator, specialists', and administrator meetings.
- Student Services Team discussion notes, file reviews, information gathering, assessments and research.
- RtI plan goal sheets developed for individual students receiving Tier II and Tier III interventions.
- Behavior plans developed for individual students receiving Tier II and Tier III interventions.
- Information gathered through student, parent and teacher surveys developed specifically for the RtI process.
- Analysis of discipline data collected by the building administrators in the student database.

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

Name	Title
Mary T. Gricus	Assistant Superintendent
Gina Rodewald	Principal, Central School
Cathy Slee	Principal, Oakwood School
Debby Lynch	Principal, River Valley School
Dawn Pechukas	Principal, Old Quarry Middle School
Mary Ellen Schaffer	Director of Student Services
Jan Collins	Assistant Principal, Old Quarry Middle School
Joanne Policht	Assistant Principal, Oakwood School

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 4 Title :

Define how the RtI entitlement process will inform eligibility decisions for SLD determination.

Objective 4 Description :

Our district is committed to RtI as an entitlement process and we will no longer require an ability-achievement discrepancy or processing deficit for identification of an SLD. We believe we will have a greater positive impact on the achievement of at-risk students and that we will reduce the number of referrals for SLD when we are successful in the following: 1) expanding the range of scientifically based instructional strategies consistently employed within the core instructional program; 2) engaging in early intervention with powerful Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading and mathematics interventions; and 3) increasing the consistency of implementation of positive behavior supports within individual classrooms and throughout the schools.

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 4 Title : Define how the RtI entitlement process will inform eligibility decisions for SLD determination.

Strategies/Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
District leaders identify specific learning disabilities identification practices, including what is and what is not included in the assessment process.	1/1/2009	6/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	0
The district leadership team will continue to ensure that the core reading curriculum is scientifically based, is aligned to the Illinois Learning Standards and includes the essential components of reading instruction (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension).	9/1/2007	6/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
The district leadership team will ensure that the core math curriculum is scientifically based, is aligned to the Illinois Learning Standards and addresses the "5 big areas of math" (conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, strategic competence, adaptive reasoning and productive response).	9/1/2009	6/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 4 Title : Define how the RtI entitlement process will inform eligibility decisions for SLD determination.

Strategies/Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
The district will have documentation that the core reading curriculum is effective (e.g., state assessment data, local district-wide assessment data, local universal screening/benchmarks)	9/1/2010	6/1/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
The district will have documentation that the core math curriculum is effective (e.g., state assessment data, local district-wide assessment data, local universal screening/benchmarks)	9/1/2010	6/1/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
The IEP team will provide evidence that the core curriculum is effective for most of the subgroups of students identified as LEP to rule out LEP as a determinant factor.	9/1/2010	6/1/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
The district will define type of evidence (e.g., review of health records, behavior screening data) to rule out additional exclusionary factors (e.g., visual, motor or hearing disabilities, cognitive disability, emotional disability, cultural factors, environmental factors or economic disadvantage) for specific learning disability determination.	9/1/2009	6/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
The district will define types of evidence to determine rate of educational progress across the tiers using repeated assessments of achievement at reasonable intervals, reflecting formal assessment of student progress during instruction.	9/1/2009	6/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
The district will define types of evidence from multiple data sources indicating a significant discrepancy between student and typical peers or standard.	9/1/2009	6/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
The district will define practices to ensure integrity of scientifically based research interventions across the multi-tiered model.	9/1/2008	6/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
District will define evidence to evaluate when instructional needs are beyond what can be provided with general education resources alone.	9/1/2008	6/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 4 Title : Define how the RtI entitlement process will inform eligibility decisions for SLD determination.

Strategies/Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
District will determine policies and procedures related to parent involvement across multi-tiered model, communication of progress monitoring data to parents and parental consent for an evaluation.	1/1/2009	6/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 4 Title : Define how the Rtl entitlement process will inform eligibility decisions for SLD determination.

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

Effectiveness of strategies and activities will be monitored through:

- Data collection (progress monitoring, universal screening results, student data system holdings, charts, graphs, behavior plans)
- Student Services Team information gathering, file reviews, assessment and research
- Information gathered through student, parent and teacher surveys developed specifically for the Rtl process.

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

Name	Title
Mary T. Gricus	Assistant Superintendent
Mary Ellen Schaffer	Director of Student Services
Kristen Hilburger	Psychologist
Cathy Slee	Principal, Oakwood School
Joanne Policht	Assistant Principal, Oakwood School
Debby Lynch	Principal, River Valley School
Gina Rodewald	Principal, Central School
Dawn Pechukas	Principal, Old Quarry Middle School
Jan Collins	Assistant Principal, Old Quarry Middle School

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

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

Before the 2007-2008 school year, the primary participants in Rtl planning were the building principals and the Student Service Teams. At the end of the 2007-2008 school year, the need to involve other members of the community and school became apparent. The following members have been included in

creating the RtI plan described herein: Principals, assistant principals, reading specialists, psychologists, special education teachers, ESL teachers, general education teachers, parents, union representatives, paraprofessionals, technology coordinator, director of student services (director of special education) and assistant superintendent.

The principals and members of the SST teams conducted Power Point presentations about RtI and the district's preliminary implementation timeline in all schools during the 2007-2008 school year. The presentations provided an orientation to the process of RtI and an explanation of the components and vocabulary related to RtI. The outside experts that were consulted via training sessions included Alan Coulter, Mark Shinn and the state agencies noted in Section III C.

Names and Titles of District 113A RtI Plan Team Members:

Melissa Brewe, Reading Specialist	Michelle Nevin, Middle School Teacher/Union Pres.
Kathy Burke, Paraprofessional/Parent	Dawn Pechukas, Principal
Maggie Burkhardt, Psychologist	Joanne Policht, Assistant Principal
Renee Christ, Reading Specialist	Gina Rodewald, Principal
Jan Collins, Assistant Principal	Mary Ellen Schaffer, Director of Student Services
Maureen Consola, Reading Specialist	Janet Schatz, Parent
Eileen Covert, Special Education Teacher	Sue Sharko, ESL Teacher
Bridget Esposito, Intermediate Teacher	Tracy Simon, Instructional Technology/Parent
Mary Gricus, Assistant Superintendent	Cathy Slee, Principal/Parent
Kristen Hilburger, Psychologist	Stacey VanderHeide, Reading Specialist
Judy Kilinskis, Middle School Teacher	Ann Walker, Reading Specialist
Lindsay Laitar, Psychologist Intern	
Debby Lynch, Principal	
Angela McKenna, Psychologist	
Colleen McNaughton, Reading Specialist	

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation

B. District Responsibilities

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

Data analysis is completed every year for individual students, grade levels and buildings. School Improvement Plans are developed and implemented.

Previous to 2007-2008, SST teams had the primary responsibility for learning about the RtI process. Many staff members attended RtI training with external agencies and shared information with the school SST team. In the beginning of the 2007-2008 school year, building administrators for the K-5 schools met with teachers who were directly affected by RtI since they had students receiving Tier II and Tier III services in their classes. Teachers in turn met with the parents of Tier II and Tier III students to explain the service delivery model to them. Letters also went home to inform parents of the process. Workshops took place in each building in 2008 to explain RtI to the staff and Board of Education.

Following are tasks that are currently underway:

- Post RtI plans and information on the website
- Make the RtI Plan and information readily available in the offices of each school
- Include parents throughout the problem solving process
- Use external experts to help facilitate the process, as needed
- Explore the need to orient outside providers that serve our students (psychologists, private therapists, etc.) about RtI
- Continue to provide release time to staff members during the work day so that they can participate in ongoing development of the RtI Plan.

District 113A is committed to providing scientifically based materials and assessments for the core instructional program in reading and math as well as scientifically based interventions and progress monitoring tools for use with students in Tiers I, II and III. Staff development and training for building administrators, teachers, resource personnel and paraprofessionals will be a priority in the district's short and long range professional development plans. The FY09 and FY10 budgets will include specific line items related to the acquisition of materials and the fees and stipends for training.

In October, 2008, ISBE confirmed that our district will receive Title I funding for FY09. The district is currently engaged in conducting needs assessments to determine how best to use those funds to address the needs of students who have not met rigorous state performance standards for reading and mathematics. Per the technical assistance from the ISBE grants division, District 113A will ensure that FY09 Title 1 funds will not supplant any projects or activities that are currently in place for students. Additionally, Title 1 funds will only be used to serve students who have been targeted for Tier II or Tier III services via the RtI process (i.e., Title I funds will not support activities that occur in Tier I). Furthermore, District 113A's Title I Comparability Report has been submitted to and approved by ISBE.

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation C. State Responsibilities

State Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that ISBE, RESPROS, and other service providers have provided the district during the development and review of this plan and other services that will be provided during the implementation of the plan. This may include ISBE technical assistance projects such as Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS), Children Have Opportunities to Inclusive Community Environments and Schools (CHOICES), Illinois Autism Training and Technical Assistance Project (IATTAP), Parent Educator Partnership (PEP), Illinois Service Resource Center (ISRC), and Transition Outreach Training for Adult Living (TOTAL). ISBE shall provide technical assistance to the district, if requested, to develop and implement the district plan and work with schools needing improvement. Such technical assistance shall be supported by effective methods and instructional strategies based on scientifically based research. Such technical assistance shall address problems, if any, implementing the parental involvement activities described in NCLB, Section 1118, and the professional development activities described in NCLB, Section 1119. [NCLB, Section 1116(c)(9)(B)].

The following training resources have been accessed by our district during the development of the RtI Plan and will continue to be accessed by District plan developers and implementers, as needs arise:

- Illinois Autism Training and Technical Assistance Project (IATTAP)

- Illinois Service Resource Center (ISRC)
- Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS) consultation and training
- Technical support from ISBE special education and curriculum/instruction divisions via e-mail communications
- ISBE webinars about the Rtl process and Rtl Plan.

District 113A also received technical assistance from the ISBE grants division regarding the interaction of Title 1 and Rtl Plans. ISBE staff members have informed District 113A that Title 1 funds may not supplant any projects or activities that are currently in place for students. Additionally, Title 1 funds may only be used to serve students who have been targeted for Tier II or Tier III services via the Rtl process.

Section IV-A Local Board Action

Date Approved by Local Board: 12/17/2008

A. Assurances

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

B. Superintendent's Certification

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

ISBE Monitoring - Part I

ANALYSIS OF DATA

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

Part I Comments

ISBE Monitoring - Part II

PLAN DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, AND IMPLEMENTATION

	STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT Does the DIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes?
	DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of this plan? If applicable, is it clear what corrective action the district is taking with this school?
	STATE RESPONSIBILITIES Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support (if any) is expected for its implementation?

APPROVAL DATE OF BOARD

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

Part II Comments