

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| RCDT Number | 090101160220000 | | |
| District Name | URBANA SD 116 | Superintendent | Dr. PRESTON WILLIAMS |
| District Address | PO BOX 3039 | Telephone | 2173843600 |
| City/State/Zip | URBANA,IL,61803 | Extn: | 0 |
| Email | pwilliams@usd116.org | | |

Is this for a Title I District ? Yes

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

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

| | | | |
|---|-----|---|-------------------------------|
| Is this District making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)? | 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? | Yes | 2007-08 Federal Improvement Status | district improvement year |
| Is this District making AYP in Mathematics? | No | 2007-08 State Improvement Status | academic early warning year 1 |

| | Percentage Tested on State Tests | | | | Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards* | | | | | | Other Indicators | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------|-------------|---------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---------|-------------|----------------------|---------|------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|
| | Reading | | Mathematics | | Reading | | | Mathematics | | | Attendance Rate | | Graduation Rate | |
| | % | Met AYP | % | Met AYP | % | Safe** Harbor Target | Met AYP | % | Safe** Harbor Target | Met AYP | % | Met AYP | % | Met AYP |
| State AYP Minimum Target | 95.0 | | 95.0 | | 62.5 | | | 62.5 | | | 90.0 | | 75.0 | |
| All | 99.8 | Yes | 99.8 | Yes | 71.9 | | Yes | 75.3 | | Yes | 93.8 | Yes | 92.0 | Yes |
| White | 99.6 | Yes | 99.6 | Yes | 82.0 | | Yes | 84.8 | | Yes | | | | |
| Black | 99.9 | Yes | 99.9 | Yes | 58.9 | 57.1 | Yes | 59.5 | | Yes | | | | |
| Hispanic | 100.0 | Yes | 100.0 | Yes | 60.9 | | Yes | 79.1 | | Yes | | | | |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 100.0 | Yes | 100.0 | Yes | 82.6 | | Yes | 87.0 | | Yes | | | | |
| Native American | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multiracial /Ethnic | 100.0 | Yes | 100.0 | Yes | 74.6 | | Yes | 79.5 | | Yes | | | | |
| LEP | 100.0 | Yes | 100.0 | Yes | 65.0 | | Yes | 80.3 | | Yes | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 99.7 | Yes | 99.7 | Yes | 37.9 | 39.8 | Yes | 45.8 | 49.2 | No | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 99.7 | Yes | 99.7 | Yes | 62.0 | | Yes | 65.9 | | 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 | | Is this district meeting Progress in English Target? | Yes |
| | | Reading | Mathematics | Reading | Mathematics | Attendance | Graduations | 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 |
| | | 97.7 | 296 | 178 | 60.1 |

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

| Criterion 3: Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP for LEP Subgroup) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|-------------|---------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|-------------|--------------------|---------|--|-----------------|
| Percent Tested on State Tests | | | | Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards | | | | | | Other Indicators (When Safe Harbor is Applied) | |
| Reading | | Mathematics | | Reading | | | Mathematics | | | Attendance Rate | Graduation Rate |
| % | Met AYP | % | Met AYP | % | Safe Harbor Target | Met AYP | % | Safe Harbor Target | Met AYP | | |
| 100 | Yes | 100 | Yes | 65 | | Yes | 80.3 | | 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 (%) | 93.0 | 93.1 | 93.1 | 92.4 | 93.0 | 92.7 | 92.7 | 93.8 |
| Truancy Rate (%) | 1.5 | 4.2 | 2.8 | 4.3 | 5.6 | 5.9 | 6.3 | 2.2 |
| Mobility Rate (%) | 21.9 | 21.8 | 27.1 | 28.3 | 21.6 | 24.9 | 22.9 | 20.7 |
| HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%) | 92.4 | 79.7 | 81.0 | 97.8 | 85.6 | 86.9 | 85.1 | 92.0 |
| HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%) | 4.6 | 6.1 | 3.8 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 4.2 | 2.2 | 2.0 |
| District Population (#) | 4410.0 | 4424.0 | 4369.0 | 4309.0 | 4264.0 | 4128.0 | 4054.0 | 3752.0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged (%) | 40.1 | 40.4 | 43.7 | 47.2 | 51.6 | 55.3 | 58.9 | 60.3 |
| Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%) | 5.6 | 4.9 | 6.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 7.3 | 8.5 | 9.2 |
| Students with Disabilities (%) | | | | | | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic (%) | 59.3 | 56.8 | 55.4 | 52.4 | 50.1 | 49.6 | 48.1 | 45.4 |
| Black, non-Hispanic (%) | 30.7 | 32.7 | 33.3 | 36.5 | 33.3 | 33.6 | 35.1 | 33.8 |
| Hispanic (%) | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 5.6 | 6.3 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander (%) | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.9 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 6.2 |
| Native American or Alaskan Native(%) | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| Multiracial/Ethnic (%) | - | - | - | - | 6.0 | 6.3 | 5.3 | 7.9 |

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 | 62.2 | 28.2 | 2.2 | 7.2 | 0.3 | - |
| | 2000 | 59.9 | 29.6 | 2.5 | 7.6 | 0.3 | - |
| | 2001 | 59.3 | 30.7 | 2.5 | 7.3 | 0.3 | - |
| | 2002 | 56.8 | 32.7 | 3.0 | 7.3 | 0.2 | - |
| | 2003 | 55.4 | 33.3 | 3.2 | 7.9 | 0.2 | - |
| | 2004 | 52.4 | 36.5 | 4.3 | 6.6 | 0.2 | - |
| | 2005 | 50.1 | 33.3 | 4.3 | 6.1 | 0.2 | 6.0 |
| | 2006 | 49.6 | 33.6 | 4.5 | 5.7 | 0.3 | 6.3 |
| | 2007 | 48.1 | 35.1 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 0.3 | 5.3 |
| | 2008 | 45.4 | 33.8 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 0.4 | 7.9 |
| 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 | 6.2 | 41.2 | 97.0 | 93.4 | 25.5 | 59 | 1.4 | 5.5 | 89.2 |
| | 2000 | 6.2 | 40.7 | 92.5 | 93.1 | 22.7 | 107 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 92.2 |
| | 2001 | 5.6 | 40.1 | 100.0 | 93.0 | 21.9 | 68 | 1.5 | 4.6 | 92.4 |
| | 2002 | 4.9 | 40.4 | 99.9 | 93.1 | 21.8 | 185 | 4.2 | 6.1 | 79.7 |
| | 2003 | 6.5 | 43.7 | 100.0 | 93.1 | 27.1 | 120 | 2.8 | 3.8 | 81.0 |
| | 2004 | 5.5 | 47.2 | 99.8 | 92.4 | 28.3 | 184 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 97.8 |
| | 2005 | 5.5 | 51.6 | 99.7 | 93.0 | 21.6 | 234 | 5.6 | 2.4 | 85.6 |
| | 2006 | 7.3 | 55.3 | 100.0 | 92.7 | 24.9 | 237 | 5.9 | 4.2 | 86.9 |
| | 2007 | 8.5 | 58.9 | 100.0 | 92.7 | 22.9 | 251 | 6.3 | 2.2 | 85.1 |
| | 2008 | 9.2 | 60.3 | 100.0 | 93.8 | 20.7 | 84 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 92.0 |
| S T A T E | 1999 | 6.4 | 36.1 | 96.1 | 93.6 | 18.1 | 43332 | 2.3 | 5.9 | 81.9 |
| | 2000 | 6.1 | 36.7 | 97.2 | 93.9 | 17.5 | 45109 | 2.4 | 5.8 | 82.6 |
| | 2001 | 6.3 | 36.9 | 94.5 | 93.7 | 17.2 | 42813 | 2.2 | 5.7 | 83.2 |
| | 2002 | 6.7 | 37.5 | 95.0 | 94.0 | 16.5 | 39225 | 2.0 | 5.1 | 85.2 |
| | 2003 | 6.3 | 37.9 | 95.9 | 94.0 | 16.4 | 37525 | 1.9 | 4.9 | 86.0 |
| | 2004 | 6.7 | 39.0 | 96.3 | 94.2 | 16.8 | 40764 | 2.1 | 4.6 | 86.5 |
| | 2005 | 6.6 | 40.0 | 95.7 | 93.9 | 16.1 | 43152 | 2.2 | 4.0 | 87.4 |
| | 2006 | 6.6 | 40.0 | 96.6 | 94.0 | 16.0 | 44836 | 2.2 | 3.5 | 87.8 |
| | 2007 | 7.2 | 40.9 | 96.1 | 93.7 | 15.2 | 49056 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 85.9 |
| | 2008 | 7.5 | 41.1 | 96.8 | 93.3 | 14.9 | 49858 | 2.5 | 4.1 | 86.5 |

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

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

| | Year | School(N) | Grade 3(N) | Grade 4(N) | Grade 5(N) | Grade 7(N) | Grade 8(N) | Grade 11(N) |
|--|------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| D I S T R I C T | 1999 | 4371 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 2000 | 4551 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 2001 | 4410 | 348 | 335 | 368 | 379 | 339 | 327 |
| | 2002 | 4424 | 361 | 344 | 324 | 328 | 361 | 339 |
| | 2003 | 4369 | 343 | 351 | 340 | 344 | 321 | 317 |
| | 2004 | 4309 | 324 | 332 | 345 | 328 | 357 | 324 |
| | 2005 | 4264 | 313 | 319 | 322 | 328 | 341 | 286 |
| | 2006 | 4128 | 313 | 292 | 305 | 355 | 322 | 248 |
| | 2007 | 4054 | 322 | 313 | 293 | 315 | 330 | 274 |
| | 2008 | 3752 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 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 | 355 | 14 | 39591 | 37 | 63 | 16 | 16 | - | - |
| | 2000 | 359 | 15 | 40364 | 38 | 62 | 16 | 18 | - | - |
| | 2001 | 366 | 14 | 40868 | 40 | 60 | 15 | 18 | - | - |
| | 2002 | 359 | 15 | 44308 | 38 | 62 | 16 | 18 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | 2003 | 356 | 15 | 46348 | 39 | 62 | 16 | 18 | 0 | 0.0 |
| | 2004 | 330 | 16 | 49719 | 35 | 65 | 17 | 19 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | 2005 | 317 | 16 | 50858 | 38 | 63 | 17 | 20 | 1 | 0.0 |
| | 2006 | 329 | 16 | 51684 | 40 | 60 | 16 | 18 | 1 | 0.0 |
| | 2007 | 326 | 15 | 53545 | 42 | 58 | 15 | 18 | 3 | 0.0 |
| | 2008 | 337 | 14 | 52350 | 44 | 56 | 14 | 16 | 2 | 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 | 60.8 | 61.4 | 65.6 | 62.3 | 60.9 | 73.9 | - | - | - | 73.1 | 74.5 | 68.5 | 60.4 | 53.6 | 63.0 | 62.2 | 62.1 | 77.4 |
| White | 75.2 | 79.7 | 78.0 | 77.4 | 73.5 | 81.4 | - | - | - | 85.7 | 83.2 | 77.8 | 73.5 | 69.0 | 78.7 | 80.9 | 75.2 | 87.7 |
| Black | 35.4 | 36.9 | 44.5 | 37.2 | 43.1 | 57.5 | - | - | - | 52.1 | 62.6 | 57.0 | 35.0 | 27.7 | 45.2 | 34.7 | 41.2 | 67.0 |
| Hispanic | - | - | - | 60.0 | - | 69.2 | - | - | - | - | - | 69.5 | - | 72.8 | - | 80.0 | - | 60.9 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 95.3 | 100.0 | 90.0 | - | 90.9 | 87.5 | - | - | - | - | - | 66.7 | 88.2 | 83.3 | 81.3 | 91.7 | - | - |
| Native American | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Multiracial/Ethnic | - | 48.0 | 72.0 | 77.3 | 70.0 | 81.5 | - | - | - | 80.9 | 81.9 | 71.4 | - | 37.5 | 50.0 | 60.0 | 65.2 | 82.6 |
| LEP | 97.1 | 94.2 | - | - | - | 67.7 | - | - | - | - | - | 69.0 | 78.2 | 82.6 | - | - | - | 58.4 |
| Students with Disabilities | 30.4 | 30.2 | 32.8 | 25.0 | 30.8 | 34.1 | - | - | - | 47.7 | 33.9 | 39.0 | 33.3 | 15.8 | 32.2 | 24.6 | 29.4 | 40.4 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 47.7 | 43.6 | 49.4 | 45.5 | 48.4 | 64.3 | - | - | - | 57.0 | 63.3 | 62.3 | 42.7 | 35.4 | 48.2 | 46.4 | 44.6 | 68.1 |
| | 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 | - | - | - | 69.0 | 63.6 | 69.2 | - | - | - | 61.1 | 68.2 | 73.0 | 60.3 | 70.0 | 63.5 | 67.6 | 76.0 | 74.8 |
| White | - | - | - | 83.1 | 79.2 | 83.6 | - | - | - | 69.5 | 80.5 | 91.4 | 71.4 | 81.5 | 78.7 | 79.1 | 82.5 | 80.2 |
| Black | - | - | - | 54.6 | 46.3 | 52.6 | - | - | - | 41.9 | 51.6 | 62.1 | 35.6 | 44.5 | 39.1 | 46.2 | 62.9 | 66.3 |
| Hispanic | - | - | - | - | 64.7 | 71.5 | - | - | - | - | - | 60.7 | - | - | 66.7 | - | - | 64.2 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | - | - | - | 88.2 | 91.0 | 53.9 | - | - | - | 100.0 | 100.0 | 78.6 | 73.4 | 88.2 | 82.3 | 90.9 | 100.0 | 94.2 |
| Native American | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Multiracial/Ethnic | - | - | - | 42.1 | 53.3 | 70.9 | - | - | - | 59.1 | 55.5 | 56.3 | - | 80.0 | 63.1 | 85.0 | 70.5 | 81.0 |
| LEP | - | - | - | - | - | 41.7 | - | - | - | - | - | 45.5 | 75.0 | 92.0 | - | - | - | - |

Urbana SD 116

District Improvement Plan 2008

| Students with Disabilities | - | - | - | 25.0 | 18.5 | 22.8 | - | - | - | 24.0 | 24.5 | 42.0 | 16.7 | 27.3 | 23.8 | 33.3 | 30.6 | 31.4 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|---|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Economically Disadvantaged | - | - | - | 55.8 | 50.9 | 55.4 | - | - | - | 47.5 | 57.2 | 63.5 | 48.5 | 51.3 | 50.6 | 53.6 | 66.5 | 67.2 |
| 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 | 53.9 | 66.5 | 66.0 | 59.8 | 52.2 | 54.6 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | 66.9 | 80.5 | 77.7 | 76.3 | 64.7 | 72.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Black | 28.3 | 39.0 | 31.9 | 17.7 | 22.2 | 25.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 40.0 | 57.9 | 55.6 | 75.0 | 60.0 | 57.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Native American | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multiracial/Ethnic | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LEP | 53.6 | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 5.9 | 10.7 | 18.7 | 18.5 | 9.7 | 27.8 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 27.3 | 38.6 | 41.6 | 35.0 | 31.3 | 34.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**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 | 72.5 | 72.9 | 76.1 | 80.5 | 73.7 | 81.8 | - | - | - | 80.2 | 85.3 | 82.8 | 63.8 | 64.7 | 65.9 | 69.7 | 75.3 | 82.5 |
| White | 86.7 | 89.2 | 91.7 | 91.2 | 79.7 | 88.5 | - | - | - | 91.3 | 90.1 | 86.8 | 79.2 | 77.2 | 76.4 | 85.0 | 90.8 | 90.3 |
| Black | 50.0 | 50.4 | 54.4 | 63.8 | 63.8 | 68.8 | - | - | - | 64.6 | 77.1 | 75.7 | 37.8 | 42.0 | 53.3 | 47.5 | 52.9 | 72.5 |
| Hispanic | - | - | - | 70.0 | - | 66.7 | - | - | - | - | - | 82.6 | - | 90.9 | - | 90.0 | - | 83.3 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 95.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | 95.8 | - | - | - | - | - | 88.9 | 88.3 | 91.7 | 93.8 | 91.6 | - | - |
| Native American | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Multiracial/Ethnic | - | 65.3 | 72.0 | 90.9 | 85.0 | 88.9 | - | - | - | 76.2 | 90.9 | 95.2 | - | 50.0 | 52.2 | 65.0 | 78.3 | 82.6 |
| LEP | 94.1 | 100.0 | - | - | - | 78.8 | - | - | - | - | - | 85.7 | 78.2 | 95.7 | - | - | - | 84.0 |
| Students with Disabilities | 51.4 | 55.4 | 58.2 | 57.3 | 53.8 | 52.2 | - | - | - | 65.7 | 67.3 | 63.8 | 34.8 | 28.4 | 33.9 | 42.1 | 50.7 | 53.8 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 59.8 | 58.5 | 61.4 | 68.9 | 65.7 | 75.3 | - | - | - | 67.2 | 78.2 | 80.1 | 45.9 | 51.1 | 54.9 | 56.8 | 60.0 | 74.3 |
| | 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 | - | - | - | 76.3 | 68.2 | 73.8 | - | - | - | 68.7 | 72.5 | 69.5 | 43.7 | 47.2 | 48.4 | 68.4 | 71.4 | 71.9 |
| White | - | - | - | 87.5 | 82.1 | 90.1 | - | - | - | 75.8 | 86.5 | 78.8 | 58.7 | 62.3 | 64.0 | 81.8 | 81.0 | 83.0 |
| Black | - | - | - | 62.5 | 51.0 | 53.5 | - | - | - | 55.9 | 56.2 | 56.1 | 13.6 | 17.6 | 21.0 | 50.0 | 55.3 | 56.4 |
| Hispanic | - | - | - | - | 76.4 | 81.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 78.6 | - | - | 44.4 | - | - | 85.7 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | - | - | - | 94.1 | 100.0 | 77.0 | - | - | - | 90.9 | 93.3 | 92.8 | 73.3 | 82.4 | 88.9 | 81.8 | 90.0 | 94.1 |
| Native American | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Multiracial/Ethnic | - | - | - | 65.0 | 60.0 | 66.7 | - | - | - | 54.6 | 57.9 | 68.8 | - | 20.0 | 38.9 | 70.0 | 58.8 | 61.9 |
| LEP | - | - | - | - | - | 66.7 | - | - | - | - | - | 72.7 | 64.3 | 60.0 | - | - | - | - |

| Students with Disabilities | - | - | - | 40.3 | 33.4 | 36.8 | - | - | - | 20.0 | 27.5 | 36.7 | 10.8 | 19.7 | 11.3 | 35.2 | 18.0 | 22.4 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|---|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Economically Disadvantaged | - | - | - | 66.0 | 55.7 | 60.4 | - | - | - | 60.0 | 61.7 | 60.4 | 25.4 | 26.9 | 28.0 | 55.0 | 59.7 | 61.1 |
| 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 | 46.5 | 58.5 | 57.3 | 55.0 | 44.1 | 56.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | 61.7 | 72.8 | 65.5 | 69.5 | 54.2 | 73.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Black | 11.7 | 23.4 | 21.3 | 17.7 | 15.9 | 22.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 46.6 | 78.9 | 83.3 | 75.0 | 80.0 | 73.6 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Native American | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multiracial/Ethnic | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LEP | 57.2 | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 8.8 | 7.1 | 12.5 | 15.8 | 7.3 | 22.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 20.0 | 27.2 | 30.0 | 31.3 | 25.3 | 30.8 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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?

District report card data reveals several trends in student performance as measured by ISAT/PSAE in math and reading. It also reveals several trends related to attendance and graduation rates that are also indicators of student performance.

Reading:

The percent of students meeting or exceeding on the ISAT has increased for all grades 3-8, except grades 4 and 8. The percent of students meeting or exceeding on the Reading ISAT dropped for grade 4 between 2007 and 2008, however the 2008 fourth graders showed growth in every subgroup when compared to the 3rd grade 2007 cohort scores. For example, the overall percentage in 2007 for 3rd grade was 60.9%, and the overall percentage in 2008 for 4th grade was 68.5%. Figure 1 shows subgroup comparisons for the 2007-2008 Gr 3-Gr 4 cohort.

Figure 1:

| READING Gr 3-Gr 4 Cohort | 2007 | 2008 |
|--------------------------|------|------|
| Black | 43.1 | 57.0 |
| Multiracial | 70.0 | 71.4 |
| Students w/ Disabilities | 30.8 | 39.0 |
| Econ. Disadvantaged | 48.4 | 62.3 |

At the 8th grade level, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding in Reading was very similar between 2007 and 2008. The only subgroup that showed marked improvement between 2007 and 2008 (non-cohort) was Multiracial. When viewed as a Gr 7-Gr 8 cohort between 2007 and 2008, there is substantial gain (see Figure 2). The only subgroup cohort that did not show substantial gains from Gr 7 (2007) to Gr 8 (2008) was White students, who went from 80.5% meets and exceeds in 2007 to 80.2% in 2008.

Figure 2:

| READING Gr 7- Gr 8 Cohort | 2007 | 2008 |
|----------------------------|------|------|
| Black | 51.6 | 66.3 |
| Multiracial | 55.5 | 81.0 |
| Students with Disabilities | 24.5 | 31.4 |
| Econ. Disadvantaged | 57.2 | 67.2 |

At the high school level, there were small increased in reading in all subgroups except Asian/Pacific Islander, which dropped from 60% meeting and exceeding on the PSAE Reading in 2007 to 57.9% meeting or exceeding in 2008.

Math:

The percentage of students meeting or exceeding on the Math ISAT in grades 3-5 increased or stayed relatively level for the past three years. Grades 3 and 5 showed increases for all subgroups, while grade 4 remained level for almost all subgroups. The achievement gap has narrowed for Black/White students and low income/non-low income students in grades 3-5 over the past three years. The gap has dropped from the 40 point range into the 20 point range for those comparison groups. The achievement gap between special education and non-special education students has remained high (ranging between 40 and 50 points).

At the secondary level, the math scores have remained fairly constant, but they have increased for some subgroups. The Hispanic subgroup showed significant increases and had over 80% of students meeting or exceeding standards. The multiracial subgroup had slight increases over the past three years and the economically disadvantaged subgroup has continued to increase and now has close to 60% meeting or exceeding in grades 6-8. The special education subgroup has improved, however still has the widest achievement gap of any group.

On the PSAE, all subgroups made AYP in math. However the special education, Black, and low socioeconomic subgroups made AYP through the "Safe Harbor" provision, which means that they had gains of more than 10% from 2007 to 2008.

On the District Report Card, the only subject/subgroup that did not make AYP was Special Education students in math.

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

External Factors:

There are several population shifts that may have an impact on the results:

The percent of low socioeconomic students increased from 40.4% (2002) to 60.3% (2008).

The percent of LEP students increased from 4.9% (2002) to 9.2% (2008).

The district enrollment dropped from 4424 (2002) to 3752 (2008).

The mobility rate for the district has been between 20% and 28% between 2002 and 2008. However the mobility rate for individual buildings ranges between 61.1% (King, 2003) to 25% (King, 2008).

Other external factors:

The reauthorization of IDEA (2004) that provided support for Response to Intervention (RtI).

Internal Factors:

Adoption of new reading and math series at the elementary level.

Ongoing professional development for math and literacy.

Restructuring of English and reading courses at the high school level.

Restructured reading courses at the middle school.

Implemented ThinkLink Assessments for reading and math grades 3-11.

Implementation of RtI at K-5 during the 06-07 and 07-08 school years.

District lacks central database for student achievement data that can be used to correlate state mandated assessments to local data points (e.g. ThinkLink, DIBELS, attendance, discipline, grades).

During the 2007-08 school year, the district has aligned the Specific Learning Disability (SLD) criteria to include data from RtI problem solving.

With the adoption of new LD criteria and RtI problem solving, the number of SLD identified students at K-5 has dropped between 2005-2008.

With the changing criteria, only the student who fail to respond to interventions and are achieving at or below the 10th percentile are being identified as LD; therefore, students who were high achieving LD students in the past, will no longer be eligible.

Extended learning opportunities (after school, Saturday school, Summer school) academic programs in reading and math (funded by grants and local funds).

Implementation of co-taught special education classes at the high school level.

Students with disabilities IEP goals may not be aligned to the state assessments.

Insufficient monitoring of progress toward curriculum goals in both core curriculum and support services for SpEd students.

In some buildings the service delivery model is based on resource for regular classroom work rather than providing interventions that will help SpEd students become independently successful.

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

Schools and district need to provide opportunities for **all** students to learn core content that is aligned with the Illinois Learning Standards, national content standards, and the Illinois Assessment Framework.

Through the Rtl process, schools and district need to monitor the fidelity of implementation of core and intervention programs.

Schools and district need to examine and analyze multiple sources of data (e.g. summative and formative assessment; attendance; discipline) in order to make decisions about instruction, student learning, and progress.

District needs to identify and implement universal screening tools in math and Social Emotional Learning, as well as progress monitoring tools in these areas PK-12.

Schools and district need to ensure that core curriculum and interventions are supported through professional development and monitoring of implementation. Service delivery models for students with disabilities need to be refined in order to better meet the educational needs of our students.

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?*

Local Assessment Data:

The local assessment data used in this plan consist of the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), and the ThinkLink (TL) online assessment in reading and math from Discovery Education Assessment. The DIBELS are given to every student in grades K-5, and use AIMSweb prompts as a curriculum-based-measure for progress monitoring targeted students in grades 6-8. In grades K-5 the DIBELS are given to all students three times a year as universal screeners in literacy. The TL assessment is given to all students in reading and math in grades 3-10. It is also administered three times per year. (Grades 9 and 10 of TL are considered alignment pilot tests by the company.) Beginning with the 08-09 school year, the high school administers the Explore to 9th graders and the Plan to 10th graders.

At the elementary and middle school level, Rtl problem solving teams use DIBELS and TL assessment data to help make instructional decisions and determine specific interventions at the Tier II and Tier III levels. At the high school level, department and leadership teams use Plan, Explore, and TL data to make curricular decisions as well as placement decisions.

Analysis of Local Data:

DIBELS. The local DIBELS assessment data for the Fall 2008 benchmark shows that students' Oral Reading Fluency in grades 2-5 is either emerging or established for between 70 % to 75% of students district wide.

ThinkLink Reading. In grades 3-5, the TL scores for reading were between 62% and 77% of the students overall meeting or exceeding benchmarks. In grades

6-8, the TL scores for reading were between 58% (6th grade) and 81% (8th grade) of students overall meeting or exceeding benchmarks.

ThinkLink Math. In grades 3-5, the TL scores for math were between 80% and 90% of the students across the district meeting or exceeding benchmarks. In grades 6-8, the TL scores for math were between 83% and 90% meeting and exceeding benchmarks.

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

External Factors:

There are several population shifts that may have an impact on the results:

The percent of low socioeconomic students increased from 40.4% (2002) to 60.3% (2008).

The percent of LEP students increased from 4.9% (2002) to 9.2% (2008).

The district enrollment dropped from 4424 (2002) to 3752 (2008).

The mobility rate for the district has been between 20% and 28% between 2002 and 2008. However the mobility rate for individual buildings ranges between 20% and 61.1% (2003).

Other external factors:

The reauthorization of IDEA (2004) that provided support for Response to Intervention (Rtl).

Internal Factors:

Adoption of new reading and math series at the elementary level.

Ongoing professional development for math and literacy.

Restructuring of English and reading courses at the high school level.

Restructured reading courses at the middle school.

Implemented ThinkLink Assessments for reading and math grades 3-11.

Implementation of Rtl at K-5 during the 06-07 and 07-08 school years.

District lacks central database for student achievement data that can be used to correlate state mandated assessments to local data points (e.g. ThinkLink, DIBELS, attendance, discipline, grades).

During the 2007-08 school year, the district has aligned the Specific Learning Disability (SLD) criteria to include data from Rtl problem solving.

With the adoption of new LD criteria and Rtl problem solving, the number of SLD identified students at K-5 has dropped between 2005-2008.

With the changing criteria, only the student who fail to respond to interventions and are achieving at or below the 10th percentile are being identified as LD; therefore, students who were high achieving LD students in the past, will no longer be eligible.

Extended learning opportunities (after school, Saturday school, Summer school) academic programs in reading and math (funded by grants and local funds).

Implementation of co-taught special education classes at the high school level.

Students with disabilities IEP goals may not be aligned to the state assessments.

Insufficient monitoring of progress toward curriculum goals in both core curriculum and support services for SpEd students. In some buildings the service delivery model is based on resource for regular classroom work rather than providing interventions that will help SpEd students become independently successful.

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

Schools and district need to provide opportunities for **all** students to learn core content that is aligned with the Illinois Learning Standards, national content standards, and the Illinois Assessment Framework.

Through the Rtl process, schools and district need to monitor the fidelity of implementation of core and intervention programs.

Schools and district need to examine and analyze multiple sources of data (e.g. summative and formative assessment; attendance; discipline) in order to make decisions about instruction, student learning, and progress.

District needs to identify and implement universal screening tools in math and Social Emotional Learning, as well as progress monitoring tools in these areas PK-12.

Schools and district need to ensure that core curriculum and interventions are supported through professional development and monitoring of implementation. Service delivery models for students with disabilities need to be refined in order to better meet the educational needs of our students.

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?*

Student Attributes/Challenges:

The percentage of low socioeconomic students in the district has increased from 40% in 2000 to 60% in 2008. The percentage of students who are at risk now outnumbers those who are not based on economic indicators.

The mobility rate for the district is 20%, which is higher than the state average. Highly mobile student populations limit the effectiveness of curricular programs.

District Attributes/Challenges:

The calculation of the percentage of students in poverty as defined by the U.S. Census caused Title I funds to be cut by nearly \$150,000 for the 2008-2009 school year. This means that the district has less money to meet the increasing needs of the student population.

The IDEA (2004) re-authorization requires an implementation of Response to Intervention (Rtl). This paradigm shift has meant that the district has had to reallocate resources, responsibilities, and change procedures.

The district began the implementation of Rtl according to the table below.

| 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 |
|--|--|--|--|
| Rtl implementation at K-2 in early literacy Planning year and professional development | Rtl implementation at K-5 in early literacy Planning year and professional development | Rtl implementation at K-5 in literacy and piloting assessment in math Change of LD criteria Planning year for PBIS at K-5 in SEL and Rtl blend | Rtl implementation in K-5 literacy. Planning year for K-5 Math. Differentiated implementation of PBIS/SEL/Rtl blend at K-5 Planning year for 6-12. |

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

The increase in the percentage of low socioeconomic students has increased the number of subgroups in each of our elementary schools. This population shift, and the high mobility rate has stretched the district's limited resources in order to serve a larger number of at risk students. The new criteria for Specific Learning Disabilities means that the IEP students who are taking the ISAT/PSAE may be lower-achieving than in previous years.

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

Schools and district need to provide opportunities for **all** students to learn core content that is aligned with the Illinois Learning Standards, national content standards, and the Illinois Assessment Framework.
 Schools and district need to examine and analyze multiple sources of data (e.g. summative and formative assessment; attendance; discipline) in order to make decisions about instruction, student learning, and progress.
 District needs to identify and implement universal screening tools in math and behaviors.
 Schools and district need to ensure that core curriculum and interventions are supported through professional development and monitoring of implementation.
 Service delivery models for students with disabilities need to be refined in order to better meet the educational needs of our students.

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?*

Highly Qualified Teachers

The percent of teachers in the district with emergency or provisional credentials is 1.6%

Staff Capacity in Terms of New Teachers

Out of 53 teachers hired for the 2006/2007 school year, 13 resigned and 2 were RIF'd before the start of the next school year. Another 6 resigned and 1 was RIF'd before the start of the 2008/2009 school year. So, out of 53 teachers hired for the 2006/2007 school year, only 31 (59%) were still teaching in Urbana School District two years later.

In the 2007/2008 school year, 41 of 69 new teachers (59%) participated in the New Teacher Mentoring Program. In the 2008/2009 school year, 38 of 48 new teachers (79%) participated in the New Teacher Mentoring Program.

Professional Development Opportunities

The 2008/2009 school year calendar allows for professional development time during the regular school day. There are two full days of district inservice time: one in August and one in January. There are two full days and five half days of building inservice time for all elementary schools, as well as UMS and UHS. In addition to that, UMS and UHS have early release Wednesdays that account for an additional 35 hours of professional development during the regular work day throughout the course of the school year. Elementary schools have four extra mornings of district inservice that result in 16 additional hours of professional development.

In the 2008/2009 school year, elementary teachers have 32 hours of district inservice time and 36 hours of building inservice time. UMS and UHS teachers have 16 hours of district inservice time and 71 hours of building inservice time. These times do not count regular meeting times that are negotiated in the contract.

New teachers in Urbana also have opportunities for professional growth during the school day through Urbana New Teacher Mentoring and Induction Program. Teachers new to the district are encouraged to sign up for a mentor who will work with them throughout the school year.

Urbana teachers have professional development opportunities outside of the regular school day as well. Urbana teachers regularly attend professional development offerings that are part of partnerships with University of Illinois organizations, including the Center for Education in Small Urban Communities. The Center for Education in Small Urban Communities provides opportunities for teachers to work during the school day with University of Illinois teacher collaborators, as well as professional development opportunities outside of the normal school day. Other organizations offer workshops and institutes for teachers as well, including ROE Schoolworks, Urbana Adult Education, Champaign County Forest Preserve District, The Urbana Free Library, and the Urbana Park District.

Teachers in Urbana also have a wide variety of optional professional development opportunities sponsored by the school district. These include activities for new teachers, book study groups, after-school trainings, and Saturday workshops. Topics include best practices in literacy instruction, differentiation, instructional technology, using primary sources to engage students in history, math and science strategies, and improving students' content area reading comprehension through student-owned strategies. Approximately 25% of Urbana's teachers participate in at least one workshop, training, study group, or other professional growth activity each semester. Most of the participating teachers attend more than one activity each semester. There were 13 professional development activities in Summer 2007, 18 activities in Fall 2007, 23 activities in Spring 2008, 17 activities in Summer 2008, and 25 activities in Fall 2008.

Twenty professional development activities sponsored by Urbana School District are planned for Spring 2009. All professional development activities are funded through categorical and competitive grants.

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

The district attempts to minimize the number of teachers who are teaching with emergency or provisional certificates. No classes are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified.

Professional development in areas of literacy and math instructional strategies, and assessment strengthens instructions and provides a common language for staff across all levels.

Problem solving models, like Rtl (K-5) and Professional Learning Communities (9-12) help focus teacher discussion on student achievement and instructional practices.

The district mentoring program provides supports for new teachers as well as inducts them into the culture of the district.

The addition of professional development time (early release time at 6-12 and full day inservice days at K-5) has provided more opportunities for collaboration.

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

Schools and district need to provide opportunities for **all** students to learn core content that is aligned with the Illinois Learning Standards, national content standards, and the Illinois Assessment Framework.

Schools and district need to examine and analyze multiple sources of data (e.g. summative and formative assessment; attendance; discipline) in order to make decisions about instruction, student learning, and progress.

District needs to identify and implement universal screening tools in math and behaviors.

Schools and district need to ensure that core curriculum and interventions are supported through professional development and monitoring of implementation.

Service delivery models for students with disabilities need to be refined in order to better meet the educational needs of our students.

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

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

The district surveyed parents in November of 2008. The majority of parents perceived themselves as being "Very Involved" in all aspects of their child's education. The data from the survey regarding parent involvement:

| | 1 - not at all involved | 2 - not very involved | 3 - somewhat involved | 4 - fairly involved | 5 - very involved | 6 - don't know / no response | Response Count |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Your child's day-to-day school work | 0.5% (1) | 2.2% (4) | 6.5% (12) | 24.9% (46) | 64.9% (120) | 1.1% (2) | 185 |
| Parent/teacher conferences | 1.1% (2) | 3.8% (7) | 4.3% (8) | 14.7% (27) | 75.0% (138) | 1.1% (2) | 184 |
| Selection of your child's courses | 7.7% (14) | 3.3% (6) | 8.3% (15) | 18.2% (33) | 35.4% (64) | 27.1% (49) | 181 |
| Extra-curricular activities (e.g., sports, arts, etc.) | 3.3% (6) | 2.7% (5) | 5.5% (10) | 21.3% (39) | 60.1% (110) | 7.1% (13) | 183 |
| Post-school planning | 1.1% (2) | 0.6% (1) | 2.2% (4) | 15.6% (28) | 63.9% (115) | 16.7% (30) | 180 |
| | | | | | | | 186 |

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

Parent involvement has helped student performance throughout the district. We attribute parent involvement with increased attendance rates (93.8% - the highest rate since 1999) and decreased drop out and truancy rates (2.2% - the lowest rate since 2001). All six of the elementary schools have made AYP and are off state and federal status. The high school made AYP for the first time in 2008. Of the 64 testing "hurdles" the the individual buildings and the district were required to clear in 2008, the students as whole and in subgroups cleared 60 of the "hurdles," which is 93.75%.

Teachers notify parents when students are struggling, and the parents are invited to participate in problem solving meetings when the student needs intensive interventions.

Families are notified in writing when students' schedules are modified to provide intervention services.

Starting with the 2007-2008 school year, parents have access to their students' attendance, grades, and progress reports via a secure web interface with the district's student data management system. At the secondary level, parents have the ability to view teacher gradebooks for their children, and can be notified by email of missing assignments or low grades.

The district has two full time positions to act as liaisons among the community, families, and the schools. The district also has outreach workers, and community volunteer coordinators who support the positive relationships among community, families and the schools.

The Center for Education in Small Urban Communities at the University of Illinois is developing a proposal to create a family academy that will connect families with community resources.

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

The district has a commitment to strong home-school partnerships, and welcomes parental and family involvement in all parts of school and district improvement plans.

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?*

The key factors that are within the district's capacity to change or control that have contributed to low achievement are:

- District lacks central database for student achievement data that can be used to correlate state mandated assessments to local data points (e.g. ThinkLink, DIBELS, attendance, discipline, grades).
- With the changing criteria, only the student who fail to respond to interventions and are achieving at or below the 10th percentile are being identified as LD; therefore, students who were high achieving LD students in the past, will no longer be eligible.
- Students with disabilities IEP goals may not be aligned to the state assessments.
- Insufficient monitoring of progress toward curriculum goals in both core curriculum and support services for SpEd students.
- In some buildings the service delivery model is based on resource for regular classroom work rather than providing interventions that will help SpEd students become independently successful.

The conclusions that will drive the next steps are:

- Schools and district need to provide opportunities for **all** students to learn core content that is aligned with the Illinois Learning Standards, national content standards, and the Illinois Assessment Framework.
Schools and district need to examine and analyze multiple sources of data (e.g. summative and formative assessment; attendance; discipline) in order to make decisions about instruction, student learning, and progress.
- District needs to identify and implement universal screening tools in math and behaviors.
- Schools and district need to ensure that core curriculum and interventions are supported through professional development and monitoring of implementation.
- Service delivery models for students with disabilities need to be refined in order to better meet the educational needs of our students.
- The district has a commitment to strong home-school partnerships, and welcomes parental and family involvement in all parts of school and district improvement plans.

Section II-Action Plan

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

1 Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

This district is not accountable for AMAO for this year

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1 Title :

Improve academic achievement of special education students.

Objective 1 Description :

While the achievement gap between IEP and Non-IEP students at the elementary level has been dropping in reading and math over the past three years, the district is still not making AYP for the special education student subgroup in math with only 45.8% of the IEP subgroup meeting or exceeding. Special education students did make AYP through safe harbor in reading, but only 37.8% of IEP students met or exceeded in reading.

The objective is to increase the percentage of special education students meeting or exceeding state standards in math and reading by at least 10 percentage points per year.

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 1 Title : Improve academic achievement of special education students.

| Strategies/Activities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------------|------------|--------|
| The district implemented Rtl at the elementary school in reading/literacy in 2006-2007. Expand Rtl in reading, math and social emotional learning in grades K-12. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Title I | |
| At the middle school level, two Reading Dimensions as well as Reading and Math Connections classes were added to meet the needs of struggling students in reading and math. | 8/25/2006 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Title I | |

| StrategiesActivities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------------|------------|--------|
| Additional direct instruction and academic support in the areas of reading and math are provided for students at elementary, middle and high school levels after school. Students are identified by state and local assessments as well as grades. Funded by Teen REACH and 21st Century Learning Centers grants. | 8/25/2006 | 6/10/2009 | After School | Other | 240000 |
| Additional direct instruction and academic support in the areas of reading and math are provided for students at elementary, middle and high school levels during summer school. Students are identified by state and local assessments as well as grades. Funded by Summer Bridges, Teen REACH and 21st Century Learning Centers grants. | 6/10/2009 | 8/20/2009 | Summer School | Other | 200000 |
| Students who are identified as LD in at the primary level will receive high quality researched based intervention through the Read Well series. Students who are identified as LD at the intermediate, middle and high school levels will receive high quality research based intervention through the Language! series. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Other | 20000 |
| Students in self-contained classrooms (cross categorical and EBD) will receive high quality research-based reading and math curricula. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | Before School | Other | 2000 |
| At the middle school level, special education teachers will use the AIMSWeb to monitor math and reading progress and make adjustments and accomodations as needed. | 8/25/2007 | 6/10/2010 | Before School | Other | |
| At the high school level, a pyramid of supports has been created that identifies the type and process of interventions to be utilized when students are not being successful. Interventions include student advocates, study support classes, and social work services. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | Before School | Other | 2000 |

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

Objective 1 Title : Improve academic achievement of special education students.

| StrategiesActivities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------------|-------------|--------|
| EC-12 staff development will include training on Differentiated Instruction (DI) with a specific emphasis on serving special education students in the regular classroom. | 8/8/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Other | |
| EC-12 staff development will include components on collecting and analyzing student data to make instructional and programatic decisions. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Local Funds | |
| All new teachers receive training and support in a variety of instructional strategies. Funded by New Teacher Mentoring and Title IIA. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Title II | 50000 |
| At the middle school and high school level, special education teachers are trained on new intervention materials, and are trained in problem solving and progress monitoring. | 8/25/2007 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Other | |
| Creating Independence Through Student-owned Strategies (CRISS) - all new teachers are trained in Project CRISS. Approximately 70% of all District 116 teachers have been trained in CRISS. | 8/20/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Title II | 6000 |

| StrategiesActivities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------------|------------|--------|
| Provide training and follow up for elementary, middle, and high school LD teachers in Language! intervention materials. | 8/20/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Other | 1000 |
| Teachers in self-contained classrooms (cross categorical and EBD) will receive training and implement high quality research-based reading and math curricula. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Other | 2000 |

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

Objective 1 Title : Improve academic achievement of special education students.

| StrategiesActivities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------------|-------------|--------|
| The district will continue to train parents about Rtl and Special Education criteria. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | After School | Other | |
| Title I collects and analyzes a parents needs survey annually. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Title I | |
| The district provides a variety of community, volunteer and parent liaison positions across the district. Funded by both Title I and local funding. These positions are in all buildings and high needs schools have additional positions. | 8/25/2006 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Local Funds | |
| District Parent Involvement Advisory committee meets three times per year. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | After School | Title I | |
| District PBIS/SEL/Rtl Leadership Committee will seek parent representation starting in the Spring of 2009. | 1/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | After School | Other | |
| District designates a District Homeless Liaison and a District Homeless teacher (for UMS and UHS). | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Title I | |
| The district is partnering with the University of Illinois' Center for Education in Small Urban Communities to research the possibility of creating a Family Academy to provide support and community outreach to families. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Other | |

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title : Improve academic achievement of 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?)

The district will monitor the success of this objective by analyzing the academic and behavioral data of special needs students across the district. The Assistant Superintendent for Special Services will support building principals and building level School Improvement Teams in the gathering and analysis of data. Special Education and building administrators will ensure that the reading and math core and intervention programs are implemented with fidelity by all teachers including LD, Cross Categorical, and EBD teachers at the elementary and middle school and high school levels. Success will be measured using both state tests, local assessments, and other measures of academic success (e.g. attendance, progress monitoring, discipline data).

The District Monitoring Team is made up of the Superintendent, the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, the Assistant Superintendent for Special Services, the high school principal, the middle school principal, an elementary principal, and two representatives of the University of Illinois College of Education. The District Monitoring Team's task is to review and monitor district and school improvement efforts, and the committee also is in the process of creating (2008-2009) a district-wide evaluation plan that will be employed to provide formative assessments of improvement initiatives.

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 |
|---------------------|---|
| Susan Baker-Ory | Assistant Superintendent for Special Services |
| Ria Merriman | Assistant Director for Special Education |
| Building Principals | |
| Donald Owen | Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction |

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2 Title :

Continued Implementation of Response to Intervention in areas of Reading, Math, and Social Emotional Learning

Objective 2 Description :

The district has implemented Response to Intervention (Rtl) in the area of reading and literacy in grades K-5. Rtl will be expanded over the next two years to include the areas of math and social emotional learning. The district will also begin implementation of Rtl at the middle school and high school level over the next two years.

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 2 Title : Continued Implementation of Response to Intervention in areas of Reading, Math, and Social Emotional Learning

| StrategiesActivities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------------|------------|--------|
| Continue implementation plan for Rtl to include math and social emotional learning at elementary level. Define and implement tiered levels of support for academics and behavior across all grade levels. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Other | 50000 |

| StrategiesActivities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------------|-------------|--------|
| Continue implementation plan for RtI to include math and social emotional learning at elementary level. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Other | |
| Start implementation of RtI at the middle school and high school level. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Local Funds | 200000 |
| Continue research and implementation about Social Emotional Learning Standards at K-8 levels. Funded through SEL Implementation grant. | 8/25/2007 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Other | 30000 |
| Additional direct instruction and instructional support in the areas of reading and math is provided for students at elementary, middle and high school levels after school and during Saturday school. Funded through TEEN Reach and 21st Century Learning Centers grants. | 8/25/2004 | 6/10/2009 | After School | Other | 244000 |
| Additional direct instruction in the areas of reading and math is provided for students at elementary, middle and high school levels during summer school. These programs include programs for some IEP students, some students who are identified through local assessments, and some students who have failed courses. The funding sources include both grants and local funding sources. | 6/10/2009 | 8/15/2009 | Summer School | Other | 100000 |
| At the middle school level, two Reading Dimensions classes were added to meet the needs of struggling readers. Reading and math connections classes are implemented to support students in team classes. | 8/26/2006 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Local Funds | 110000 |
| At the middle school level, restructure service delivery model for special needs students. Planning will start during the second semester of the 2008-2009 school year. | 1/10/2009 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Local Funds | |
| At the high school level a pyramid of supports has been created that identifies the type and process of interventions to be utilized when students are not being successful. This systematic approach to support is geared mostly to 9th and 10th grade students, however upperclassmen are identified through the process as well. Interventions include study support classes, student advocates, social work services, team supports. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Local Funds | |

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

Objective 2 Title : Continued Implementation of Response to Intervention in areas of Reading, Math, and Social Emotional Learning

| StrategiesActivities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------------|------------|--------|
| The District PBIS/RtI/SEL Leadership Team will create a 3 year implementation and professional development plan for a blended approach for prevention and tiered interventions in reading, math, and social emotional learning. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Other | |
| All K-5 staff attended at least an overview of the PBIS/RtI/SEL blended approach to prevention and intervention. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2009 | During School | Other | 5000 |
| At the upper elementary and middle school levels, Special Education teachers are trained in the Language! intervention materials. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2009 | During School | Other | 10000 |

| StrategiesActivities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------------|------------|--------|
| All elementary schools are participating in PBIS training to incorporate positive supports and interventions for behaviors. Funded by SEL, Mental Health grants and local funds. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2008 | During School | Other | 10000 |

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

Objective 2 Title : Continued Implementation of Response to Intervention in areas of Reading, Math, and Social Emotional Learning

| StrategiesActivities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------------|-------------|--------|
| District PBIS/Rtl/SEL Leadership Team is actively seeking parent input through surveys and in parental membership on district committees. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2008 | During School | Other | |
| District surveyed all parents about curriculum, climate, and facilities. | 10/1/2008 | 1/1/2009 | During School | Local Funds | 1000 |
| District Parent Involvement Advisory Committee meets three times per year. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Title I | |
| Title I will collect and analyze a parents' needs survey annually. | 8/25/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Title I | |
| The district is partnering with the University of Illinois' Center for Education in Small Urban Communities to research the possibility of creating a Family Academy to provide support and community outreach to families. | 10/1/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Other | |

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title : Continued Implementation of Response to Intervention in areas of Reading, Math, and Social Emotional Learning

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 process for monitoring the success of the implementation of a Rtl model in reading, math, and SEL will be handled in large part by the District PBIS/Rtl/SEL Leadership Team. This team will consist of program coordinators, principals, teachers, social workers, the Director of Title I, the Assistant Director of Special Education, and the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction. During the 2008-2009 school year, parent representatives will be recruited to be part of this leadership team.

The District Monitoring Team is made up of the Superintendent, the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, the Assistant Superintendent for Special Services, the high school principal, the middle school principal, an elementary principal, and two representatives of the University of Illinois College of Education. The District Monitoring Team's task is to review and monitor district and school improvement efforts, and the committee also is in the process of creating (2008-2009) a district-wide evaluation plan that will be employed to provide formative assessments of improvement initiatives.

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 |
|-------------------|---|
| Jennifer Frerichs | Director of Title I |
| Linda Gibbens | Coordinator of Safe and Drug Free Schools |
| Maggie Whicker | Coordinator of Mental Health and SEL Grants |

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3 Title :

Timely Transition from Early Intervention to Early Childhood Spec. Ed. Services

Objective 3 Description :

Currently 88.9% of the students transitioning from Early Intervention to Early Childhood found eligible to receive services have IEPs developed and implemented by their 3rd birthday. This will increase to 100% of the transitioning students found eligible for services during the 2007 through 2009 school years.

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 3 Title : Timely Transition from Early Intervention to Early Childhood Spec. Ed. Services

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

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

Objective 3 Title : Timely Transition from Early Intervention to Early Childhood Spec. Ed. Services

| Strategies/Activities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------------|-------------|--------|
| Attend ISBE and local trainings regarding EI to EC transition regulations. Review current transition process on a quarterly basis and make changes in the calendar as necessary to ensure students' needs are planned for and met in a timely manner | 8/25/2007 | 6/10/2010 | During School | State Funds | |

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

Objective 3 Title : Timely Transition from Early Intervention to Early Childhood Spec. Ed. Services

| Strategies/Activities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------------|-------------|--------|
| Meet with parents and EI team on a monthly basis to transition, plan for, and develop IEPs as needed. | 11/1/2007 | 6/10/2010 | During School | State Funds | |
| Work with local agencies, such as Head Start, area schools, Champaign County Resource Center, and area daycares to locate families who do not attend transition meetings. | 11/1/2007 | 6/10/2010 | During School | State Funds | |
| Inform families of our open-door policy and invite them to team meetings. | 11/1/2007 | 6/10/2010 | During School | State Funds | |
| Use family coordinators to bring welcome packets and visit home of students transitioning to our program | 11/1/2007 | 6/10/2010 | During School | State Funds | |
| To ensure family attendance and participation, we will work with Early Intervention to set meetings at a time convenient for families. | 11/1/2007 | 6/10/2010 | During School | State Funds | |

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 3 Title : Timely Transition from Early Intervention to Early Childhood Spec. Ed. Services

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

Document contacts with local agencies; and document transition and planning meetings with parents and EI staff. Document quarterly meetings to review data and effectiveness. Document number of family visits to the school and parent coordinator home visits.

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 |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| Ruth Myers-Dunnum | WEC Social Worker |
| Crystal Vowels | WEC Principal |

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 4 Title :

Enter accurate IEP transition data into FACTS files for transmission to ISBE.

Objective 4 Description :

By the end of the 2009-2010 school year, all of the IEP transition plan data for IEP students who are 14 years-old will be entered into appropriate FACTS files for transmission to ISBE.

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 4 Title : Enter accurate IEP transition data into FACTS files for transmission to ISBE.

| StrategiesActivities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|----------------------|---------------|---------|----------|------------|--------|
| | Before School | Title I | | | |

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

Objective 4 Title : Enter accurate IEP transition data into FACTS files for transmission to ISBE.

| StrategiesActivities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------------|------------|--------|
| Special Education administrators and Administrative Assistant will review how the transition data from the transition checklist will be entered into iePoint. | 9/1/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Other | |
| The Administrative Assistant will use the FACTS Instructional Manual for Entry of Indicator 13 | 9/1/2008 | 6/10/2010 | During School | Other | |

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

Objective 4 Title : Enter accurate IEP transition data into FACTS files for transmission to ISBE.

| StrategiesActivities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|----------------------|---------------|---------|----------|------------|--------|
| | Before School | Title I | | | |

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 4 Title : Enter accurate IEP transition data into FACTS files for transmission to ISBE.

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

Administrative Assistant for Special Services will run iePoint checks to verify that the required transition information is recorded in the FACTS program. This report will be reviewed prior to required FACTS submission dates by special education administrators. Teachers will be informed of data indicating that incorrect plans were filed and will be required to correct plans and hold an IEP meeting to inform parents.

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 |
|-----------------|---|
| Rebecca Dawkins | Administrative Assistant for Special Services |
| Ria Merriman | Assistant Director of Special Education |
| Susan Baker-Ory | Assistant Superintendent of Special Services |

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 5 Title :

Improving IDEA-compliant transition goals for students leaving public schools.

Objective 5 Description :

By the end of the 2008-2009 school year, 100% of the transition goals for students leaving public schools will meet IDEA standards. Teachers will write IDEA-compliant transition goals and services into transition plans for students with IEPs. Plans will include goals for employment, education, training, and

independent living.

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 5 Title : Improving IDEA-compliant transition goals for students leaving public schools.

| StrategiesActivities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|----------------------|---------------|---------|----------|------------|--------|
| | Before School | Title I | | | |

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

Objective 5 Title : Improving IDEA-compliant transition goals for students leaving public schools.

| StrategiesActivities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------------|-------------|--------|
| Special Education administrator attended workshops by Susan Walter at the State Special Education Directors Conference. | 7/31/2008 | 8/1/2008 | Summer School | Local Funds | 400 |
| Sue Walters' information, power-point presentation, recommended ISBE websites and resources were presented to secondary special education teachers. Sample form completed during presentation. | 8/25/2008 | 8/25/2008 | During School | Local Funds | 100 |
| Paper copies of the Example Secondary Transition Plan - examples and non-examples were shared with secondary teachers | 9/4/2008 | 9/4/2008 | During School | Local Funds | |
| Email to secondary teachers reminding or correct transition plans and attachment of links to websites. | 9/4/2008 | 9/4/2008 | During School | Local Funds | |
| Follow up training on correct plans provided | 1/20/2009 | 1/20/2009 | During School | Local Funds | |
| The high school transition planning team will review need for additional inservice activities. | 1/20/2009 | 1/20/2009 | During School | Local Funds | |

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

Objective 5 Title : Improving IDEA-compliant transition goals for students leaving public schools.

| StrategiesActivities | StartDate | EndDate | TimeLine | FundSource | Amount |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|----------|------------|--------|
|----------------------|-----------|---------|----------|------------|--------|

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 5 Title : Improving IDEA-compliant transition goals for students leaving public schools.

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

Ria Merriman will provide and oversee all training. Teachers will learn how to use the transition form checklist to ensure all components are included in their transition plans. Teachers will correct missing or deficient components to ensure correct plans. Throughout the school year, special education administrators will review a sample of each secondary teacher’s transition plans for completeness by comparing them to samples provided by Susan Walters. Plans will also be reviewed during IEP meetings by special education administrators. Teachers will be required to correct deficient transition plans and reconvene IEP meeting in order to inform parents.

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 |
|-----------------|---|
| Ria Merriman | Assistant Director of Special Education |
| Susan Baker-Ory | Assistant Superintendent for Special Services |

**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.

The District Improvement Plan writers include:

- Todd Taylor, School District Lead Psychologist
- Susan Baker-Ory, Assistant Superintendent for Special Services
- Donald Owen, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction
- Jennifer Frerichs, Director of Title I
- Katherine Barbour, Director of Staff Development
- Jean Korder, Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
- Linda Gibbens, Coordinator of Safe and Drug Free Schools

Stakeholders are involved in this process in several ways. At least once per year, district administration presents parts or all of the District Improvement Plan to the Board of Education. The plan is also reviewed once per year by building principals at one of their scheduled meetings. The plan is also shared with the District Monitoring Team which includes University of Illinois experts.

Parts or all of the plan are shared with the Title I Parent District Advisory Committee as well as building level School Improvement Teams who have teacher, support staff, and parent representatives.

The District Improvement Plan along with all individual building School Improvement Plans are posted on the district website at:

<http://www.usd116.org/home/schools/improvement.html>

This webpage contains a feedback link to provide an opportunity for members of the community to provide input and feedback to school and district improvement plans.

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation B. District Responsibilities

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

The district is providing funds, expertise, and other resources to revise and implement this plan. The district provides technical assistance to building principals in the form of data analysis, goal setting, and planning professional development. The district also conducts continual needs assessment through a variety of means including analyzing state and local assessment data, surveying principals and teachers, students and parents, and continuing to conduct reviews and revisions of district curriculum. The district actively pursues competitive grants to support students (Teen Reach, 21st Century). The district uses Title I, Title IIA Title IID, Title IV and Title V, Special Education grant funds, as well as funds from competitive grants (Mental Health, SEL Implementation, Teaching American History Grant) to support the professional development and district inservice activities.

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation

C. State Responsibilities

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

The Regional Office of Education (#09) has provided technical assistance in the creation of RESPRO plans and spending of RESPRO funds at the middle school and high school level. The district works with the principals of the middle and high schools to ensure alignment of district and school improvement plans.

The district also utilizes regional support assistance from the PBIS support network to provide professional development and leadership in PBIS/RtI/SEL implementation.

The Area IV Learning Technology Center provides technical assistance with the district Tech Plan writing.

The district also receives technical and professional development assistance from the University of Illinois' Center for Education in Small Urban Communities.

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

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

B. Superintendent's Certification

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

ISBE Monitoring - Part I

ANALYSIS OF DATA

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>REPORT CARD DATA 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