

Oswego CUSD 308

District Improvement Plan 2008

Board Approval Date	1/26/2009
Plan Submission Date	12/30/2008
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number	240473080260000		
District Name	OSWEGO CUSD 308	Superintendent	DAVID L BEHLOW
District Address	4175 RTE 71	Telephone	6306363080
City/State/Zip	OSWEGO,IL,60543 9781	Extn:	0
Email	mhgolden@oswego308.org		

Is this for a Title I District ? Yes

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

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

Is this District making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this district been identified for District Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this District making AYP in Reading?	No	2007-08 Federal Improvement Status	district improvement year 1
Is this District making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2007-08 State Improvement Status	academic early warning year 1

	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		62.5			62.5			90.0		75.0	
All	99.6	Yes	99.6	Yes	83.1		Yes	86.3		Yes	95.3	Yes	96.2	Yes
White	99.8	Yes	99.8	Yes	87.1		Yes	89.7		Yes				
Black	98.3	Yes	98.3	Yes	70.1		Yes	70.3		Yes				
Hispanic	99.4	Yes	99.4	Yes	72.0		Yes	79.3		Yes				
Asian/Pacific Islander	99.7	Yes	99.7	Yes	89.3		Yes	92.2		Yes				
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	81.3		Yes	82.3		Yes				
LEP	98.1	Yes	98.1	Yes	54.1		No	71.3		Yes				
Students with Disabilities	99.3	Yes	99.3	Yes	43.9	45.8	No	55.0	56.0	Yes	95.1		91.5	
Economically Disadvantaged	99.1	Yes	99.1	Yes	67.0		Yes	72.8		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)?: No
 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?	No

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
		98.2	572	351	61.4

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

Criterion 3: Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP for LEP Subgroup)											
Percent Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards						Other Indicators (When Safe Harbor is Applied)	
Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate	Graduation Rate
%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target	Met AYP		
98.1	Yes	98.1	Yes	54.1		No	71.3		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 (%)	94.7	95.0	95.2	95.2	94.7	94.9	94.9	95.3
Truancy Rate (%)	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.7
Mobility Rate (%)	15.0	15.7	14.7	18.1	15.7	12.7	11.2	8.3
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	92.4	89.4	89.5	93.8	92.8	89.2	95.4	96.2
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	2.8	2.9	2.5	3.1	1.5	1.5	2.2	1.8
District Population (#)	6846	7739	8679	9771	11114	12599	13789	14347
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	5.4	6.1	6.7	7.9	8.1	8.6	9.0	10.9
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	1.3	1.2	1.5	1.5	1.9	2.1	3.5	3.8
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	83.8	81.2	77.8	74.6	71.1	68.1	66.3	64.8
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	3.7	4.5	5.7	6.6	7.4	7.4	7.5	8.1
Hispanic (%)	9.7	11.0	12.6	14.5	16.3	17.0	17.5	17.2
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	2.2	2.8	3.4	3.9	4.4	4.9	5.0	5.2
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.2
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	0.2	2.3	3.4	4.3

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	87.9	2.4	7.7	1.4	0.6	-
	2000	85.9	3.2	8.5	1.7	0.6	-
	2001	83.8	3.7	9.7	2.2	0.6	-
	2002	81.2	4.5	11.0	2.8	0.5	-
	2003	77.8	5.7	12.6	3.4	0.5	-
	2004	74.6	6.6	14.5	3.9	0.5	-
	2005	71.1	7.4	16.3	4.4	0.5	0.2
	2006	68.1	7.4	17.0	4.9	0.4	2.3
	2007	66.3	7.5	17.5	5.0	0.4	3.4
	2008	64.8	8.1	17.2	5.2	0.2	4.3
S T A T E	1999	62.0	20.8	13.9	3.2	0.2	-
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7

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

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

	Year	LEP(%)	Low Income(%)	Parental Involvement(%)	Attendance(%)	Mobility(%)	Chronic Truants(N)	Chronic Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
D I S T R I C T	1999	0.8	6.4	91.2	95.0	11.8	10	0.2	2.8	87.9
	2000	0.7	6.0	93.3	94.8	12.1	44	0.7	2.6	91.3
	2001	1.3	5.4	90.1	94.7	15.0	38	0.6	2.8	92.4
	2002	1.2	6.1	96.5	95.0	15.7	42	0.5	2.9	89.4
	2003	1.5	6.7	97.8	95.2	14.7	52	0.6	2.5	89.5
	2004	1.5	7.9	97.7	95.2	18.1	60	0.6	3.1	93.8
	2005	1.9	8.1	98.0	94.7	15.7	64	0.6	1.5	92.8
	2006	2.1	8.6	94.7	94.9	12.7	68	0.6	1.5	89.2
	2007	3.5	9.0	94.7	94.9	11.2	88	0.6	2.2	95.4
	2008	3.8	10.9	95.8	95.3	8.3	103	0.7	1.8	96.2
S T A T E	1999	6.4	36.1	96.1	93.6	18.1	43332	2.3	5.9	81.9
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.9	94.0	16.4	37525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40764	2.1	4.6	86.5
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49858	2.5	4.1	86.5

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

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

	Year	School(N)	Grade 3(N)	Grade 4(N)	Grade 5(N)	Grade 7(N)	Grade 8(N)	Grade 11(N)
D I S T R I C T	1999	5728	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	6188	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	6846	582	555	537	581	526	438
	2002	7739	581	617	596	604	615	477
	2003	8679	745	650	682	648	638	514
	2004	9771	870	818	712	723	695	578
	2005	11114	926	961	879	824	781	649
	2006	12599	1055	997	1067	868	900	706
	2007	13789	1108	1117	1059	1009	915	835
	2008	14347	1266	1147	1163	1171	1050	826
S T A T E	1999	1962026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1983991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2007170	164791	161546	162001	151270	148194	123816
	2002	2029821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2044539	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	2060048	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	2062912	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	2075277	136123	139619	146935	153566	154856	-
	2007	2077856	155356	153480	154719	162594	159038	150475
	2008	2074167	155578	152895	153347	160039	161310	149710

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

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

	Year	Total Teacher FTE(N)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary(\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree(%)	Teachers with Master's Degree(%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials(%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers(%)
D I S T R I C T	1999	293	14	43355	43	57	22	20	-	-
	2000	319	13	44073	43	56	21	20	-	-
	2001	358	12	43932	51	48	21	20	-	-
	2002	409	11	44589	54	45	21	20	1	-
	2003	476	10	46245	55	45	20	20	1	0
	2004	493	11	50888	51	49	22	22	1	1
	2005	550	10	51639	50	50	22	19	2	1
	2006	659	9	52343	48	52	21	19	2	-
	2007	717	9	53153	52	48	21	18	2	1
	2008	780	8	54522	50	50	21	18	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	76.6	77.4	74.2	81.6	82.1	83.5	-	-	-	80.4	82.1	86.2	74.0	73.9	74.3	80.9	78.7	84.8
White	78.5	82.4	78.5	85.8	85.9	88.1	-	-	-	83.4	85.7	91.6	78.2	77.6	77.5	86.0	83.4	89.7
Black	63.8	63.8	54.7	64.5	64.3	73.1	-	-	-	67.6	60.0	70.4	69.0	56.0	59.2	53.4	58.2	71.6
Hispanic	65.0	56.0	59.0	70.1	70.3	71.8	-	-	-	72.3	78.1	74.5	51.6	64.7	63.0	71.4	72.0	73.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	90.0	88.5	91.2	92.4	91.7	85.1	-	-	-	86.8	92.9	93.3	72.8	69.6	90.0	93.1	78.3	91.4
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	69.6	82.2	74.5	-	-	-	82.6	65.8	79.3	-	-	-	84.2	66.7	79.1
LEP	-	-	-	73.7	63.3	38.8	-	-	-	-	85.3	54.5	-	-	-	80.0	50.0	47.0
Students with Disabilities	40.7	44.9	34.4	45.2	41.1	38.9	-	-	-	48.5	39.6	53.3	28.4	37.8	30.8	37.0	41.6	45.6
Economically Disadvantaged	61.2	53.7	51.1	69.3	59.7	63.1	-	-	-	65.7	68.4	68.3	44.5	53.4	62.6	64.4	60.2	69.1
	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	-	-	-	80.8	82.6	85.3	-	-	-	78.2	82.9	83.8	69.3	72.8	77.0	82.6	83.9	86.4
White	-	-	-	84.5	87.8	88.3	-	-	-	81.6	86.5	89.9	74.1	75.9	82.3	86.3	86.6	89.1
Black	-	-	-	67.0	61.5	70.4	-	-	-	61.3	70.7	62.3	52.5	67.4	56.1	71.9	77.5	75.8
Hispanic	-	-	-	70.7	71.1	80.9	-	-	-	73.3	72.4	72.5	47.2	61.8	59.2	73.9	77.6	79.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	91.4	95.8	88.6	-	-	-	84.9	97.2	96.2	75.0	65.0	86.7	88.9	82.1	97.5
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	75.0	88.0	84.8	-	-	-	-	88.9	85.7	-	-	-	63.6	100.0	92.9
LEP	-	-	-	30.0	51.9	66.7	-	-	-	-	28.6	37.1	-	-	-	-	50.1	26.7

Oswego CUSD 308

District Improvement Plan 2008

2/2/2009 10:31:54 AM

Page 13 of 37

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	38.6	34.6	50.8	-	-	-	37.2	37.4	34.8	16.0	30.8	29.4	49.0	41.5	39.8
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	64.3	65.7	68.8	-	-	-	61.5	70.4	59.8	57.1	57.2	55.8	66.0	67.7	70.9
PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grade 11																		
Groups	2003		2004		2005		2006		2007		2008							
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0		40.0		47.5		47.5		55.0		62.5							
All	69.3		72.8		77.0		82.6		83.9		86.4							
White	74.1		75.9		82.3		86.3		86.6		89.1							
Black	52.5		67.4		56.1		71.9		77.5		75.8							
Hispanic	47.2		61.8		59.2		73.9		77.6		79.5							
Asian/Pacific Islander	75.0		65.0		86.7		88.9		82.1		97.5							
Native American	-		-		-		-		-		-							
Multiracial/Ethnic	-		-		-		63.6		100.0		92.9							
LEP	-		-		-		-		50.1		26.7							
Students with Disabilities	16.0		30.8		29.4		49.0		41.5		39.8							
Economically Disadvantaged	57.1		57.2		55.8		66.0		67.7		70.9							

**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	88.1	88.0	82.7	89.7	92.9	93.2	-	-	-	88.7	92.1	91.8	77.4	82.7	82.1	85.1	91.8	89.2
White	90.0	91.1	86.0	93.3	95.5	96.4	-	-	-	91.6	95.8	96.1	80.6	85.5	85.4	88.8	93.7	93.5
Black	68.1	68.9	61.5	72.4	79.3	83.7	-	-	-	74.3	72.9	75.5	64.2	70.0	61.8	62.3	79.1	67.4
Hispanic	81.6	79.2	74.3	82.9	88.6	86.8	-	-	-	81.9	87.8	84.8	64.2	75.2	73.7	79.4	89.5	83.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	100.0	96.1	91.4	94.3	94.5	94.6	-	-	-	100.0	94.6	96.0	81.8	82.6	100.0	95.4	100.0	94.8
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	70.8	91.1	85.4	-	-	-	78.3	82.9	84.5	-	-	-	89.5	87.5	86.1
LEP	-	-	-	94.7	86.7	70.6	-	-	-	-	91.1	69.1	-	-	-	100.0	87.5	64.8
Students with Disabilities	62.9	66.4	57.9	66.9	71.0	74.4	-	-	-	67.2	61.8	68.5	35.3	52.4	38.9	50.4	64.4	58.6
Economically Disadvantaged	77.6	74.6	55.8	76.2	79.0	79.2	-	-	-	73.9	83.1	79.1	55.6	63.0	74.4	71.2	82.9	75.3
	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	-	-	-	87.8	86.9	88.0	-	-	-	82.2	86.4	86.3	62.4	60.4	60.0	81.9	82.3	85.8
White	-	-	-	90.9	90.7	90.0	-	-	-	85.9	89.7	91.1	69.8	65.9	65.6	85.8	87.6	90.1
Black	-	-	-	73.5	62.5	68.4	-	-	-	67.1	72.6	66.6	30.0	38.0	32.1	65.9	59.5	71.6
Hispanic	-	-	-	80.3	81.9	87.5	-	-	-	76.5	79.4	79.1	35.6	40.4	41.7	74.6	76.5	78.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	97.1	100.0	100.0	-	-	-	81.8	100.0	92.6	75.0	70.0	73.4	91.7	82.0	97.5
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	91.7	92.0	87.9	-	-	-	-	83.4	89.3	-	-	-	63.7	80.0	75.0
LEP	-	-	-	60.0	66.7	87.9	-	-	-	-	64.2	52.8	-	-	-	-	56.3	33.3

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	48.7	44.8	51.8	-	-	-	45.9	33.0	42.0	10.0	21.6	17.9	46.0	40.7	38.1
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	76.5	70.0	71.8	-	-	-	62.8	74.2	66.1	50.0	40.0	37.8	64.9	62.2	67.8
PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grade 11																		
Groups	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008												
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5												
All	62.4	60.4	60.0	81.9	82.3	85.8												
White	69.8	65.9	65.6	85.8	87.6	90.1												
Black	30.0	38.0	32.1	65.9	59.5	71.6												
Hispanic	35.6	40.4	41.7	74.6	76.5	78.0												
Asian/Pacific Islander	75.0	70.0	73.4	91.7	82.0	97.5												
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-												
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	63.7	80.0	75.0												
LEP	-	-	-	-	56.3	33.3												
Students with Disabilities	10.0	21.6	17.9	46.0	40.7	38.1												
Economically Disadvantaged	50.0	40.0	37.8	64.9	62.2	67.8												

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?

There is continual improvement in reading and math.

All subgroups show growth except LEP and Special Education did not meet their growth targets. Therefore, the district did not meet AYP and is in academic early warning year one.

The weaknesses are in our level of reading support and our limited interventions for LEP and special education populations. Also, we are below in Illinois Alternative Assessment performance (only 38 students of our special education population take IAA).

Our strengths involve our continued improvements in both areas and the fact that we are above the state target (approximately 9% above) in overall results for

all students.

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

- This is the first year that LEP students have taken the ISAT instead of IMAGE.
- We are increasing in enrollment and diversity (LEP , free and reduced lunch, low income, homeless, mobility).
- We operate at well below state level in funding.
- We have high percentages of non-tenured teachers (73% in one building alone).
- We are below the state average in teacher and administrator salaries.
- We have had 3 different administrators leading the LEP program in 3 years.

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

We need to continue our commitment to closing the achievement gap of these groups of students through staff development and curriculum renewal processes and purchases.

We need to align all professional development across the district, including those that directly instruct our targeted at-risk populations.

Eighty percent of our students are at/above state requirements. Therefore, our core curricula are meeting the needs of a large majority of our students.

As a district we are looking at how we can address the needs of a diverse population (recently added as an integral part of the District Strategic Plan).

We need to continue to provide increased training to new teachers on the core curriculum.

Our curriculum is standard aligned and we need to ensure that our renewal processes retain this requirement as we face budget cuts, etc.

We have a new (2008-09) Director of ELL who will be involved in more District Improvement Planning so the ELL voice is heard as an important focus area.

We have a new full time elementary reading coordinator who is involved in writing this Rtl plan and who will be involved in more District Improvement Planning.

Our Director of Student Services, who is the lead administrator for Special Education, will become more involved in District Improvement Planning.

We have written five additional grants to fund reading initiatives which can support our LEP and Special Education students. (Rtl, two Reading Recovery, Title I,

and Reading Improvement), but we need to continue to seek additional funding for ELL and Special Education interventions.

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data

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

The relevant local assessment instruments are as follows: AimsWeb, R-CBM benchmarking, NWEA MAP (2-9th), ISEL, Observation Survey, Gates.

Weaknesses:

Growth for the LEP and Special Education populations in reading is not as strong as other populations. We need to identify a universal screening at Kindergarten and secondary level.

Strengths:

We have researched best practices and training for teachers in all areas. We have reallocated funding to be aligned directly with classroom interventions. Our intervention programs are researched based and we use the F-Star process to determine validity and reliability in our local assessments. Our scores on the NWEA and AimsWeb show increases from last year.

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

- We have a Train the Trainer model for reading interventions.
- We have added additional professional development for our teachers/
- We have added more reading specialists to our Title I buildings.
- We have added more reading interventions to match to the students identified in need.
- A consultant from Houghton-Mifflin provided reading intervention professional development to address LD and ELL students.
- A consultant from Scholastic provided reading intervention professional development to address LD and ELL students.
- We increased in population and diversity.
- We added Full Day Kindergarten this year.
- We added the first ELL Full Day Kindergarten this year.

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

We need to develop protocols for data monitoring.

We need to add a universal screening for Kindergarten and 1st grade.

We need to investigate a Pre-enrollment kindergarten screening tool and determine the impact of it.

We need to increase our articulation between Early Learning Center (PreK program) and The Kendall County Special Education Cooperative, especially in terms of the shared data.

We need to enhance resource information for parents of entering Kindergarten students.

We need to increase universal screening at the secondary level.

We need to assess the effectiveness of our alignment of Special Education and ELL curriculum with District Core Curriculum (understanding of what various levels are for students).

We need to continue with our 6-12 Curriculum Renewal Alignment which has provided resources and staff development in areas of critical need.

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?*

OswegoCommunityUnitSchool District 308 is located in one of the fastest growing regions in the state of Illinois as well as in the entire country, according to the U.S. Census Bureau (2006). As a result of this growth, District 308 is one of the fastest growing school districts in the state. District wide, the population has jumped from 6,865 in 2001 to 14,860 in the 2007-08 school year. The district's area covers 68.6 square miles and services students residing in all or parts of Oswego, Montgomery, Aurora, Plainfield, and Joliet.

Oswego routinely hires approximately 100 new teachers annually. Oswego was chosen to be one of 50 pilot programs in Illinois to provide research-based Mentor and Induction programming for new teachers annually for the next three years.

Many of our schools have a high percentage of new/non-tenured teachers. At OswegoEastHigh School, which houses the high school ELL program and did not make AYP, approximately 73% of the teachers are new/non-tenured.

Our student growth has also seen an interest and requirement in expansion of our Dual Language program, and our ELL program.

In efforts to retain a balanced budget, the district has made the difficult decision of increasing class sizes and student-to-teacher ratios.

Within a high growth district, the mobility factors can be categorized into two ways: internal and external. Internal factors are attendance boundary changes and adjustments to our feeder systems. External factors are our overall growth of the district and our changing demographics.

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

- Resources are given towards developing new teachers which immediately impacts resources available to support curriculum and student interventions.
- Accelerated growth means that teacher/student relationships are constantly in a state of accelerated growth.
- Students coming into district have varying levels of pre-requisite skills.
- We have a large population of non-tenured teachers who are at beginning levels of proficiency of their craft.
- We have expanded the Dual Language program and staff, along with moving the program's location.
- Tight staffing ratios cause difficulty in creating and staffing intervention programs in a creative and flexible manner.
- Within a high growth district, the mobility factors can be categorized into two ways: internal and external. Internal factors are attendance boundary changes and adjustments to our feeder systems. External factors are our overall growth of the district and our changing demographics.

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

We need to continue to align pyramids of intervention with staff development.

We need to continue to support our new teachers through grants and district professional development and training programs already in place.

We need to develop leadership capacity within the organization to address the needs of our district/students, especially in the critical focus areas of special

education and LEP programs.

We should evaluate our hiring practices, which would address non-tenured teachers and tight staffing ratios and actively recruit a more diversified staff.

We are trying to accelerate our course selection process at the secondary level to be sure the hiring process includes/maintains a consistent student-to-staff ratio and gains the best staff members.

We need to maintain a consistent feeder system as it is evaluated by the Growth Committee. A consistent feeder system will make resources and support system more stable.

Fidelity of implementation of core curriculum and interventions needs to continue to be a requirement of all teachers across the district.

We need to use a universal screener to identify the strengths and weaknesses of students who come into our district from other districts. These students' needs must be identified as soon as possible via instruments such as the NWEA screeners.

We need to create an entry assessment process/data collection process for new students that looks at reading and math skills and possible LEP issues.

We need to increase users of an integrated data system.

We need to increase the use of learning style inventories across the district and within our data system.

We need to do more research and analysis into instances where student placement is inappropriate, especially where language and disability are a factor.

We need to identify alterative resource/strategies/programs/models/program delivery to support intervention programs for students at all levels.

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?

- Percentage of highly qualified staff : 99.6%
- Percent of staff that have advanced degrees: 49.5%
- Number of reading teachers/specialists: 31 at Elementary level, 8 at Jr. High level and 2 at high school level.
- Number of ELL/Dual Lang teachers: 33
- Number of National Board Certified teachers: 8

- Ratio of Special Ed teachers/Special Ed student (new state appointment class size ratios)
- 19 of 33 ELL teachers have less than four years teaching experience

This information tells us that we have a highly qualified staff and we are building our staff capacity to provide multiple levels of intervention for our students. However, we do have some staffing areas that are in need of attention. Close analysis of the recruitment process will assist us in these areas.

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

- BEST Mentoring and induction program provides strong support for new teachers.
- Oswego University Courses (on-site staff development) provide targeted professional development based on building and district improvement goals.
- Curriculum Mapping supports new teachers in developing and planning for instruction. It also provides a warehouse of best practices and instructional tools that can be used by all staff.

Oswego has the ability to attract a wide pool of candidates for teaching positions.

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

Implications are time and resources need to be spent training new staff.

Reauthorization of IDEA guidelines will affect student class size ratios and delivery systems.

Professional development for all staff, utilizing a differentiation model, must remain an integral element in our District Strategic Plan. This will entail sharing with the members of the Steering Committee our staffing data and helping them to understand how the professional development has a direct link to student achievement.

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

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

- ELL/Dual Language Parent Council – The council consists of five-member parent board and the Director of ELL Services which meets five times a year.
- District Advisory Parent Council to the Superintendent meets monthly with representation from all school buildings.

- District-wide Strategic plan was developed with 33 members, with representation from the community, parents, school district, board members, special education cooperative and staff.
- Each of the buildings has an active home and school.
- In developing our Rtl systems, parents served on all committees to develop pyramids of intervention.
- The OCUSD #308 has received the What Parents Want Award over multiple, consecutive years.
- Home Access is an electronic system in which parents can monitor their students' academic and attendance information.
- Parent contact is 95.8% as reported in the 2008 Illinois State Report Card.
- Oswego School District Parents are proactively included in curriculum renewal process; and other district procedures and decision making processes including, but not limited to the following: boundaries, growth, strategic planning, rights and responsibilities; and other district initiatives.

This information tells us that we are doing an effective job of inviting parents to share in the decision-making for the school community, and on multiple levels. However, certainly not all parents are involved to the level of being on these committees. We need to provide additional vehicles of communication which focus on our minority and special education parents.

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

- Parents contribute in multiple ways
- Shared accountability for our students being high achievers
- Helped create the 97% meet or exceed target
- Supported and passed referenda (largest one in the State of IL in 2006) for educational programs and new buildings
- Community expects high achievement
- Parents attend reading and math nights regularly
- 96.8% Conference/visits show support of the district and shared accountability
- Won award for "What Parents Want" over multiple consecutive years
- Home access/parent connect keeps parents informed of educational issues
- Reading newsletters keeps parents informed regarding testing and other academic issues
- Pass multiple referenda (3 consecutive) which has provided us with resources to grow our curriculum and facilities
- Translated documents assist parents of minority students with becoming more involved in their students' educations

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

We need to explore ways to get more [special education/minority] parents involved in their child's education. Parent involvement has contributed greatly to our educational success as a school district, but our focus groups need to be at that same level of success. This will only happen when we increase the involvement and knowledge base of our special education and minority parents. We also need to make these parents feel welcome in our district buildings. It is not enough to simply provide the vehicles of communication; we need to provide the welcome feeling as well or they will not communicate regardless of how

many vehicles we choose to use. We are doing a good job of working toward this, but we have a ways to go.

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?

- We need to increase universal screening at K, 1, and 9-12.
- We need to put progress monitoring tools in place at the 6-12 grade levels
- We operate at well below state level in funding.
- We have high percentages of non-tenured teachers (73% in one building alone).
- We are below the state average in teacher and administrator salaries.
- We have had 3 different administrators leading the LEP program in 3 years.

We are doing a good job at increasing student achievement, but we need to do an even better job, especially where the focus groups are concerned. Some of the things that are within our control can be easily addressed once we share the data and get all of our stakeholders on board. The next steps will involve sharing our findings with our stakeholders and coming up with a board-approved plan for addressing increased screening and progress monitoring, and assessing our hiring practices. We also hope to retain our current ELL director who is doing an effective job.

Section II-Action Plan

Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed(AYP)	Deficiencies Addressed(AMAO)
1	The Oswego school district was found to need intervention for Indicator 13 because 47.8% of the youth aged 16 and above had an IEP that did not include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals or transition services that would enable the student to meet his/her post secondary goals. Our objective is to be at 100% compliance thus remedying the above concern and meeting the state’s measurable and rigorous target.	1,2,	
2	Oswego School District 308 is utilizing technical assistance resources provided by the Illinois State Board of Education.		
3	Increase reading achievement, targeting LEP and Special Education students	1,2,	

The following areas of deficiency have been identified from the most recent AYP report for your district.

1	LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2	Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

The following areas of deficiency have been identified from the most recent AMAO report for your district.

1	District is not meeting AYP for LEP
2	District is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1 Title :

The Oswego school district was found to need intervention for Indicator 13 because 47.8% of the youth aged 16 and above had an IEP that did not include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals or transition services that would enable the student to meet his/her post secondary goals. Our objective is to be at 100% compliance thus remedying the above concern and meeting the state's measurable and rigorous target.

Objective 1 Description :

Make safe harbor target for the 2009-2010 school year in the area of Students with Disabilities.
Increase students (special education and LEP) meeting and exceeding State Standards by 5% in the 2009-2010 school year.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency.

1	LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2	Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

This objective does not address any AMAO deficiency.

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 1 Title : The Oswego school district was found to need intervention for Indicator 13 because 47.8% of the youth aged 16 and above had an IEP that did not include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals or transition services that would enable the student to meet his/her post secondary goals. Our objective is to be at 100% compliance thus remedying the above concern and meeting the state's measurable and rigorous target.

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
1. The district will access the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) information and evidence based transition practices to implement student strategies.	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	After School	Local Funds	0

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
2. The district will use information and resources from NSTTAC age appropriate transition assessment guide	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	After School	Local Funds	0
3. The district will provide the Illinois Indicator 13 checklist for all IEP meetings where transition planning is required with a protocol for completion and handing off to the staff responsible for inputting the Indicator 13 data.	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	0
4. The district will have students participate in interest surveys (i.e. Career Cruising), to determine where the student's vision for the future will guide the education process.	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	0
5. All students in 10th grade will take the PLAN state assessment	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	0
6. The district will provide a transition fair for students to access information regarding services available post graduation, including adult services	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	After School	Local Funds	0
7. The district will provide to students the Kendall County Transition Guide and Service Directory which includes agencies and resources that are available in the community and throughout the state.	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 1 Title : The Oswego school district was found to need intervention for Indicator 13 because 47.8% of the youth aged 16 and above had an IEP that did not include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals or transition services that would enable the student to meet his/her post secondary goals. Our objective is to be at 100% compliance thus remedying the above concern and meeting the state's measurable and rigorous target.

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
1. The district will develop a transition guide to provide support to staff for developing transition focused IEPs.	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	After School	Local Funds	0
2. The district will provide in service training for developing transition focused IEPs, including KCSEC Transition Plan Guide and ISBE Indicator 13 tools and resources information.	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	After School	Local Funds	0
3. The District will provide access and training to resources such as Career Cruising and PLAN; to help develop transition focused IEPs	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	After School	Local Funds	0
4. The district will provide to the staff a Kendall County Transition guide.	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	After School	Local Funds	0
5. The district will access the FACTS instructions for Indicator 13 input, the Illinois Indicator 13 checklist and the Harrisburg resources to provide training for district staff responsible for inputting the FACTS data.	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 1 Title : The Oswego school district was found to need intervention for Indicator 13 because 47.8% of the youth aged 16 and above had an IEP that did not include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals or transition services that would enable the student to meet his/her post secondary goals. Our objective is to be at 100% compliance thus remedying the above concern and meeting the state’s measurable and rigorous target.

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
1. The district will encourage parental attendance at transition focused IEPs	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	0
2. The district will provide parents the Kendall County Transition Guide and Service Directory which includes information on agencies and resources that are available in the community and throughout the state.	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	0
3. The district will provide a transition fair for parents to access information regarding services available post graduation.	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title : The Oswego school district was found to need intervention for Indicator 13 because 47.8% of the youth aged 16 and above had an IEP that did not include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals or transition services that would enable the student to meet his/her post secondary goals. Our objective is to be at 100% compliance thus remedying the above concern and meeting the state’s measurable and rigorous target.

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

The District and KCSEC Administration and staff will yearly review the Indicator 13 data gathered in lePoint to determine if students are meeting their transition goals.

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

Name	Title
Dr. David L. Behlow	Superintendent
Mrs. Lynda Shanks	Special Education Director
Ms. Linda McKee/Mr. Bill Boyter	Special Education Coordinators

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2 Title :

Oswego School District 308 is utilizing technical assistance resources provided by the Illinois State Board of Education.

Objective 2 Description :

As a result of Indicator 13, the Oswego School District 308 has utilized technical assistance resources provided by ISBE. The district has implemented numerous forms of staff development, and resources for students and parents. Staff development options include; providing a transition guide to support staff in developing transition focused IEPs, providing access and training resources (Career Cruising) for transition focused IEPs, being provided with the Kendall County Transition Guide and Service Directory to staff, and providing FACTS instructions and training to necessary staff. The district staff will also be able to utilize the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center for transition practices to implement student strategies. Staff members have participated in the most recent Transition Conference in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Parental involvement has been encouraged by: providing parents with the Kendall County Transitions Guide and Service Directory for information on agencies and resources available throughout the community and state, by hosting a transition fair for parents to access post graduation services, and by encouraging parents to attend transition focused IEPs. Student resources and responsibilities are; taking part in student interest surveys and their own transition IEP meeting, taking the PLAN state assessment test, being able to access the transition fair to gain knowledge on post graduation and adult services, and being provided with the Kendall County Transition Guide and Service Directory.

This objective does not address any AYP deficiency.

This objective does not address any AMAO deficiency.

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 2 Title : Oswego School District 308 is utilizing technical assistance resources provided by the Illinois State Board of Education.

Strategies/Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
			Before School	Title I	

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

Objective 2 Title : Oswego School District 308 is utilizing technical assistance resources provided by the Illinois State Board of Education.

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
			Before School	Title I	

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

Objective 2 Title : Oswego School District 308 is utilizing technical assistance resources provided by the Illinois State Board of Education.

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
			Before School	Title I	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title : Oswego School District 308 is utilizing technical assistance resources provided by the Illinois State Board of Education.

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

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3 Title :

Increase reading achievement, targeting LEP and Special Education students

Objective 3 Description :

Make safe harbor target for the 2009-2010 school year in the area of Students with Disabilities.

Increase students (special education and LEP) meeting and exceeding State Standards by 5% in the 2009-2010 school year.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency.

1	LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2	Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

This objective does not address any AMAO deficiency.

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 3 Title : Increase reading achievement, targeting LEP and Special Education students

Strategies/Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Special Education students will have increased access to technology	8/1/2008	8/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	396000
Special Education students will have a newly adopted curriculum in grades 6-12.	8/1/2008	8/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	171000
9th grade students will take the NWEA assessment	8/1/2010	8/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
Progress monitoring will occur for students receiving LEP interventions	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	
Progress monitoring will occur for students receiving special education interventions	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	
LEP program increased access to student technology through the Read About, Read 180, System 44, Lexia, additional computers in the classroom	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	During School	Title III	18800
Testing/accommodation center for special education students at the high school (Oswego East) level	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	
Post high school education opportunities for Special Education students	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 3 Title : Increase reading achievement, targeting LEP and Special Education students

Strategies/Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Professional Development in the reading interventions and literacy for ELL Sheltered Teachers	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	During School	Title III	2000
Professional Development in the READ180 Program for High School Teachers	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	During School	Title I	2000
Professional Development in the Read Naturally Program for ELL teachers			Before School	Title I	
Professional Development in the Wilson Phonics Program for Special Education Teachers	8/1/2008	8/1/2010	During School	Title I	8150
Professional Development in the Lexia Web-Based Phonics program for the ELL and Special Education Teachers	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	During School	Title III	3100
Professional Development in Read About, Read 180, and System44 for ELL teachers.	8/1/2008	8/1/2009	During School	Title III	2000
Universal screening and progress monitoring will be determined and implemented at the K, 1, 6-12.	8/1/2009	8/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 3 Title : Increase reading achievement, targeting LEP and Special Education students

Strategies/Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
ELL Parent Council identifying events the upcoming 2009-2010 for parent of LEP student.	8/1/2008	8/1/2010	After School	Title III	2000
Each school building has targeted parent activities in their School Improvement Plan in involve parents in the school process.	8/1/2008	8/1/2010	After School	Local Funds	
Each elementary and Jr. High hosts a Reading Night to educate parent in reading best practices.	8/1/2008	8/1/2010	After School	Local Funds	
The district will encourage parental attendance at transition focused IEPs.	8/1/2008	8/1/2010	After School	Local Funds	
The district will provide parents the Kendall County Transition Guide and Service Directory which includes information on agencies and resources that are available in the community and throughout the state.	8/1/2008	8/1/2010	After School	Local Funds	
The district will provide a transition fair for parents to access information regarding services available post graduation.	8/1/2008	8/1/2010	After School	Local Funds	
develop strategies to increase parent involvement.	8/1/2008	8/1/2010	After School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 3 Title : Increase reading achievement, targeting LEP and Special Education students

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

NSSE climate surveys (students, parents, staff, community)

Local Assessment data – content specific (formative based on content specificity)

MAP – 3 time a year

ACCESS assessment for all ELL students – once a year

State Assessment data – once a year

Internal teacher surveys – periodically, at least annually

Mentoring program evaluations

Review of school improvement plans - annually

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
Marti Neahrng	Director of Student Services
Dr. Marsha Hollis Golden	Assistant Superintendent for Teaching & Learning
Rafael Segarra	Director of ELL and Dual Language
Cathi Mundsinger	Director of Teaching and Learning Elementary
Dr. Carla Johnson	Director of Teaching and Learning Secondary
Building Principals	Elementary, Junior High and High School
Lynda Shanks	Director of Kendall County Special Education Coop

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

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

Stakeholders listed below met at various meeting in November and December to review achievement data and district practices and procedures to develop this action plan.

Dr. Marsha Hollis-Golden, Asst. Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction

Dr. Carla Johnson, Director of Teaching and Learning, Secondary

Cathi Mundsinger, Director of Teaching and Learning, Elementary

Rafael Segarra, Director of ELL and Dual Language

Christine Laughlin, Elementary Principal

Patti Decker, Elementary Principal

Julie Kreitzer, Reading Coordinator

Shannon Ford, Asst. Jr. High Principal

Colleen Moran, Special Education Department Chair

Dale Eschbach, High School Psychologist

Sonya Leto, parent of secondary student

Kim Katzen, parent of elementary student

Sue Green, school psychologist

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).

District has contracted with an external evaluator of the ELL/Dual Language Program.

District has provided with all school in the training on how to interpret local assessment data and State mandated tests.

District has met funded multiple professional development initiatives

District budgets are in compliance with State and Federal guidelines for Title 1.

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)].

We have not had additional assistance.

Section IV-A Local Board Action

Date Approved by Local Board: 1/26/2009

A. Assurances

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

B. Superintendent's Certification

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

ISBE Monitoring - Part I

ANALYSIS OF DATA

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

	Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?
	Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

OTHER DATA

	Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?
	Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

	Has the DIP team stated measurable objectives that promote continuous and substantial progress to ensure that students in each subgroup meet the State's target (e.g., in delivering tiered services or differentiated instruction)?
	Has the DIP team stated <u>measurable objectives</u> that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan?
	Do the objectives address all areas of AYP and AMAO deficiency?
	Do the objectives address the areas of special education compliance?

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

	Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?
	Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement?
	Are the strategies and activities measurable?
	Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified?
	Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear?
	Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students?

	Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status or special education non-compliance?
	Do the parent involvement strategies and activities clearly align with the strategies and activities for students?
	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?
	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?
	Will the collection of strategies and activities along with the monitoring process provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?

MONITORING

	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?
	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?

Part I Comments

ISBE Monitoring - Part II

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

	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?
	Does the DIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that best effect necessary changes?

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?
	If applicable, is it clear what corrective action the district is taking with this school?

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

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

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD

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

Part II Comments