

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

### District Improvement Plan

Board Approval Date:	6/12/2007
Plan Submission Date & Ref No:	7/30/2007 - DIP07 - 000088
ISBE Monitoring Completed:	8/14/2007

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**  
**PRELIMINARY INFORMATION**

---

District Information

**RCDT Code Number :** 3404906000000

**District Name:** WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

**Superintendent:** DR DONALDO R BATISTE

**District Address:** 1201 N SHERIDAN RD

**Telephone # :** 847-336-3100 X:

**City/State/Zip:** WAUKEGAN, IL 60085

**Email :**           dbatiste@waukeganschools.org

**Is this for a Title I district?**

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

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

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

Item 1 - Adequate Yearly Progress Report for 2006

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	-	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	-	2006-07 Federal Improvement Status	District Improvement
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	-	2006-07 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning

	Percent Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
Student Groups	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		47.5			47.5			89.0		69.0	
All	98.7		98.7		58.8			67.3			92.5		66.4	
White	97.9		97.9		72.4			79.6						
Black	98.0		98.0		48.2			57.2						
Hispanic	98.2		98.2		59.6			68.2						
Asian/Pacific Islander	98.9		98.9		79.3			91.1						
Native American														
Multiracial Ethnic	100.0		100.0											
LEP	99.1		99.1		61.7			66.6						
Students with Disabilities	97.7		97.7		22.8	28.5		38.5	35.2		92.0		57.3	
Economically Disadvantaged	98.4		98.4		56.3			65.8						

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

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

Item 2 - Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives Report for 2006

**Is this district meeting Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO)? Yes**

Is this district making English Proficiency Target?	Yes
Is this district meeting Progress in English target?	Yes
Is this district meeting AYP for LEP?	

English Proficiency Test Type:  
Minimum Target:

English Proficiency Targets	English Progress Targets	AYP Participation Rate	AYP-Percent Meeting/Exceeding		AYP-Other Indicators	
			Reading	Mathematics	Attendance	Graduation
10.0	85.0	95.0	47.5	47.5	89.0	69.0

	Criterion 1 - Proficiency			Criterion 2 - Progress		
	Total Number of Students Tested	Number Making Proficient	Percent Making Proficient	Total Number of Students Tested	Number making Progress	Percent Making Progress
AMAO Performance	4263	689	16.2	3246	2903	89.4

Criterion 3 - Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP for LEP Subgroup)											
Percent Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards						Other Indicators (When Safe Harbor Applied)	
Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics				
%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target	Met AYP	Attendance Rate	Graduation Rate
										94.5	

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

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

Item 3 - District Information

Basic Information	2000 - 2001	2001 - 2002	2002 - 2003	2003 - 2004	2004 - 2005	2005 - 2006
Attendance Rate (%)	92.1	91.9	92.3	92.7	92.4	92.5
Truancy rate (%)	14.3	10.9	10.4	8.6	11.4	12.6
Mobility rate (%)	19.6	20.4	17.3	18.2	17.0	18.6
Expulsion rate (%)						
Retention rate, if applicable (%)						
HS graduation rate, if applicable (%)	69.0	100.0	61.0	83.6	86.8	66.4
HS dropout rate, if applicable (%)	7.5	4.9	6.5	4.2	4.6	3.4
Teachers working out-of-field (#)						
Paraprofessionals in Title I funded programs and/or schools designated as school-wide with less than 2 years of training and/or education degree (#)						
School Population (#)	14,972	15,713	15,482	15,758	15,176	14,819
Economically disadvantaged (%)	56.6	54.8	54.0	58.1	62.2	71.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) (%)	24.4	23.9	25.9	23.4	23.9	23.3
Students with disabilities (%)						
White, non-Hispanic (%)	13.4	11.9	10.6	9.7	8.9	8.2
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	24.7	23.1	22.1	20.9	20.6	19.4
Hispanic (%)	59.4	62.6	64.9	67.1	68.0	69.5
Native American or Alaskan Native (%)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.0	2.1

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

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

Item 4 - Race/Ethnicity

	<b>Year</b>	<b>White(%)</b>	<b>Black(%)</b>	<b>Hispanic(%)</b>	<b>Asian(%)</b>	<b>Native American(%)</b>	<b>Multiracial./Ethnic(%)</b>
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	<b>2000</b>	15.0	26.2	56.3	2.4	0.1	-
	<b>2001</b>	13.4	24.7	59.4	2.4	0.1	-
	<b>2002</b>	11.9	23.1	62.6	2.3	0.1	-
	<b>2003</b>	10.6	22.1	64.9	2.3	0.1	-
	<b>2004</b>	9.7	20.9	67.1	2.2	0.1	-
	<b>2005</b>	8.9	20.6	68.0	2.0	0.1	0.3
	<b>2006</b>	8.2	19.4	69.5	2.1	0.1	0.8
<b>S T A T E</b>	<b>2000</b>	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-
	<b>2001</b>	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	<b>2002</b>	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	<b>2003</b>	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	<b>2004</b>	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	<b>2005</b>	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	<b>2006</b>	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8

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

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

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

---

Item 5 - Educational Environment(under construction)

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

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

Item 6 - Enrollment Trends

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	<b>2000</b>	14,391.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<b>2001</b>	14,972.0	1,338.0	1,289.0	1,269.0	1,119.0	1,044.0	705.0
	<b>2002</b>	15,713.0	1,383.0	1,375.0	1,342.0	1,144.0	1,094.0	852.0
	<b>2003</b>	15,482.0	1,434.0	1,328.0	1,269.0	1,207.0	1,094.0	811.0
	<b>2004</b>	15,758.0	1,418.0	1,376.0	1,320.0	1,226.0	1,157.0	857.0
	<b>2005</b>	15,176.0	1,358.0	1,385.0	1,354.0	1,184.0	1,198.0	863.0
	<b>2006</b>	14,819.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>S T A T E</b>	<b>2000</b>	1,983,991.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<b>2001</b>	2,007,170.0	164,791.0	161,546.0	162,001.0	151,270.0	148,194.0	123,816.0
	<b>2002</b>	2,029,821.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<b>2003</b>	2,044,539.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<b>2004</b>	2,060,048.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<b>2005</b>	2,062,912.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<b>2006</b>	2,075,277.0	136,123.0	139,619.0	146,935.0	153,566.0	154,856.0	-

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

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

Item 7 - Educator Data

	Year	Total Tchr FTE (N)	Avg. Tchr Exp.(Yrs)	Avg. Teacher Sal (\$)	Tchrs w/Bach.Deg (%)	Tchrs w/Mast.Deg (%)	Pupil-Tchr Ratio (EI)	Pupil-Tchr Ratio (HS)	Emgncy or Prvsl Creds(%)	Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	<b>2000</b>	845.0	12.0	42,324	57.7	42.3	22.1	21.2	-	-
	<b>2001</b>	890.0	11.6	44,578	57.2	42.6	22.0	20.7	-	-
	<b>2002</b>	855.0	11.9	45,805	57.7	42.2	23.7	21.8	7.5	5.7
	<b>2003</b>	844.0	11.7	46,591	57.4	42.4	23.3	22.4	7.7	13.6
	<b>2004</b>	874.0	11.6	48,737	56.9	42.9	22.2	23.6	8.8	8.4
	<b>2005</b>	903.0	11.3	49,607	60.6	39.3	21.5	22.2	6.5	8.8
	<b>2006</b>	916.0	10.8	50,765	57.4	42.5	20.4	21.8	5.1	1.6
<b>S T A T E</b>	<b>2000</b>	122,671.0	14.8	45,766	53.2	46.6	19.3	18.1	-	-
	<b>2001</b>	125,735.0	14.5	47,929	53.8	46.0	19.1	18.0	-	-
	<b>2002</b>	126,544.0	14.2	49,702	53.9	46.0	19.1	18.3	2.4	2.3
	<b>2003</b>	129,068.0	13.9	51,672	53.9	46.0	18.4	18.2	2.5	2.1
	<b>2004</b>	125,702.0	13.8	54,446	51.3	48.6	19.4	18.8	1.7	1.8
	<b>2005</b>	128,079.0	13.6	55,558	50.1	49.1	18.9	18.4	1.9	1.9
	<b>2006</b>	127,010.0	13.0	56,685	49.3	50.6	19.1	18.9	1.6	1.4

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

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

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

Item 8a - Assessment Data (Reading)

**ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading By Grades 3-5-8, 2002-2006**

Groups	Grade 3 - Reading				Grade 5 - Reading				Grade 8 - Reading			
	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06
<b>All</b>	47.5	52.4	53.8	55.9	38.8	39.8	49.5	57.4	42.0	40.9	48.1	61.3
<b>White</b>	72.9	58.9	72.3	67.7	60.6	61.8	74.7	72.1	65.7	69.3	78.2	75.6
<b>Black</b>	43.0	46.0	44.7	48.2	33.5	32.2	42.1	43.1	43.3	44.2	45.0	61.7
<b>Hispanic</b>	42.2	53.6	54.5	56.5	35.1	38.3	48.6	59.5	34.1	33.6	43.7	58.3
<b>Asian/Pacific Islander</b>	80.8	77.8	73.9	78.2	92.0	77.2	63.6	91.3	77.3	58.3	75.0	89.7
<b>Native American</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Multi-racial/EthnicLEP</b>	-	-	-	60.0	-	-	-	63.7	-	-	-	-
<b>LEP</b>	4.3	-	-	-	3.0	11.1	-	13.8	-	-	7.7	-
<b>Students w/Disabilites</b>	15.4	13.9	19.1	19.4	13.1	14.0	18.4	16.0	11.3	12.5	13.1	22.1
<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b>	41.9	49.0	48.2	51.6	31.3	34.5	46.0	53.6	35.0	32.4	41.7	57.2

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

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

Item 8a - Assessment Data (Reading)

<b>ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading all Grades 2006</b>						
Groups	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8
All	55.9	62.1	57.4	52.5	54.9	61.3
White	67.7	74.6	72.1	72.0	82.5	75.6
Black	48.2	47.9	43.1	51.2	47.5	61.7
Hispanic	56.5	65.8	59.5	50.1	54.1	58.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	78.2	91.7	91.3	75.0	68.1	89.7
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	60.0	52.6	63.7	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	13.8	6.6	-	-
Student with Disabilities	19.4	19.9	16.0	15.3	14.9	22.1
Economically Disadvantaged	51.6	58.7	53.6	49.4	51.0	57.2

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

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

#### Item 8a - Assessment Data (Reading)

<b>PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading - Grades 11</b>				
Groups	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
All	37.1	34.4	37.9	33.4
White	59.7	62.8	60.2	60.9
Black	29.4	32.5	34.4	27.2
Hispanic	30.9	26.0	33.1	28.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	34.8	37.0	41.6	47.7
Native American	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-
Student with Disabilities	15.1	1.8	10.6	6.0
Economically Disadvantaged	24.7	22.9	28.4	22.8

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

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

Item 8b - Assessment Data (Mathematics)

**ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics By Grades 3-5-8, 2002-2006**

Groups	Grade 3 - Mathematics				Grade 5 - Mathematics				Grade 8 - Mathematics			
	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06
<b>All</b>	72.2	74.9	75.6	82.0	55.3	65.5	67.3	79.8	31.2	32.4	34.3	60.1
<b>White</b>	86.5	77.8	87.9	89.7	74.8	90.4	79.3	90.4	56.6	59.0	68.5	76.1
<b>Black</b>	62.4	64.1	60.9	72.9	46.1	51.2	56.8	63.6	23.9	27.9	21.8	52.7
<b>Hispanic</b>	73.4	79.3	80.2	84.2	54.1	66.8	69.4	84.0	27.0	27.9	32.3	59.4
<b>Asian/Pacific Islander</b>	100.0	94.5	95.7	95.6	92.0	90.9	81.8	100.0	73.9	66.7	75.0	93.1
<b>Native American</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Multi-racial/EthnicLEP</b>	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	72.7	-	-	-	-
<b>LEP</b>	34.8	-	-	-	14.2	27.8	10.0	34.5	-	-	7.7	-
<b>Students w/Disabilites</b>	36.2	44.8	43.6	54.1	28.8	35.9	36.5	54.3	6.5	8.0	9.4	23.4
<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b>	69.1	72.3	72.5	80.0	50.5	60.4	63.7	76.7	24.2	26.1	27.9	57.9

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

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

Item 8b - Assessment Data (Mathematics)

<b>ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics all Grades 2006</b>						
Groups	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8
All	82.0	83.6	79.8	71.0	61.7	60.1
White	89.7	92.1	90.4	85.3	81.4	76.1
Black	72.9	68.3	63.6	59.0	50.5	52.7
Hispanic	84.2	88.7	84.0	73.0	62.9	59.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	95.6	95.8	100.0	95.0	81.8	93.1
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	100.0	84.2	72.7	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	34.5	44.6	9.1	-
Student with Disabilities	54.1	53.8	54.3	32.5	18.4	23.4
Economically Disadvantaged	80.0	80.7	76.7	68.4	58.4	57.9

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

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

**Item 8b - Assessment Data (Mathematics)**

<b>PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics - Grades 11</b>				
<b>Groups</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2003-04</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2005-06</b>
All	29.4	27.7	24.1	25.4
White	54.6	55.8	48.6	50.5
Black	21.0	21.7	13.8	16.2
Hispanic	20.7	19.8	21.3	22.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	56.5	48.1	41.7	47.6
Native American	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-
Student with Disabilities	3.8	1.8	5.3	2.4
Economically Disadvantaged	19.9	15.7	18.3	20.6

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

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

---

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

Report card data indicate that while the population has fluctuated around 15,200 students with an increase in the number of students of Hispanic origin we have seen increases in the percentage of students meeting standards in both reading (i.e., median slope for grades 3, 5, and 8, average increase in reading of 6.4% per year) and mathematics (i.e., median slope for grades 3, 5, and 8, average increase in reading of 7.7% per year) at the elementary and middle school levels. As the population of students of Hispanic origin in Waukegan has continued to grow, the rate of increase in the proficiency of these students has been greater than the district as a whole (i.e., median slope for grades 3, 5, and 8 of 8.3% per year versus 6.4 for the all group in reading and a median slope for grades 3, 5, and 8 of 9.2% per year versus 7.7 for the all group in math). At the same time, we have seen slight decreases in the percentage of students meeting and exceeding standards over time at the high school level (i.e., slope for the reading of -.9% per year and a slope of -1.6% per year in math).

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

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

---

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

The focus on scientifically – based reading and math curriculum materials and staff development at the elementary and middle school levels are likely contributing factors to the increases in the percentage of students meeting proficiency standards at these levels. The same increases in improvement in the areas of reading and math have continued to elude our students at the high school level with decreasing percentages of students reaching proficiency in reading and math. We are currently in the process of investigating this, with one theory being the lack of connection between the large student body and staff.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

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

---

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

Two primary conclusions can be drawn from the report card data with regards to student achievement. First, although we have seen reliable increases in the percentage of students meeting standards in reading and math, the rate of increase is not sufficient to free the district from district improvement status. In short, to get off the district improvement list, we will need to increase the percentage of students meeting standards at an even higher rate than what we have obtained over the past four years. Second, efforts to restructure the Waukegan high school must have a focus on improving student achievement.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

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

---

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

We began using Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) with the assistance of monies received from the Reading First Grant. We have expanded the use of DIBELS and Curriculum – Based Measurement through sixth grade and plan to expand to eight grade. Using these data we have been able to reliably identify which students were likely to require additional instructional assistance in order to meet state standards on both ISAT and IMAGE. Last year, we began to use these data to monitor student progress in the area of reading. From these data we have been able to document the problem, but we are still working on using the data for instructional decision-making.

At the high school level we have been using measures from the EPAS system (i.e., Explore, Plan and ACT) to attempt to address the needs of students. While we have been able to reliably predict which students would and would not meet standards on PSAE, we have not been successful in changing the predicted outcomes.

Although we have obtained greater increases in math scores than reading, as of this year we do not have a coordinated local assessment system to address issues in math.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

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

---

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

The results obtained from DIBELS measures are consistent with the research literature indicating that DIBELS measure a general outcome in reading. When we had Reading First monies we were able to bring in scientifically based reading curriculum materials and begin to train staff to use these materials as they were designed. The loss of Reading First funds has contributed to factors related to our capacity to address the needs of students who are at-risk of not meeting standards. We have been attempting to shift resources, to provide the resources and supports that were lost due to the elimination of Reading First funds.

With approximately 3800 students at the two campuses of Waukegan High school, we believe one contributing factor to low student achievement is the lack of connection between many students and staff members. In addition, although data are collected and reported to high school staff little by way of support for at-risk students has been offered in a coordinated fashion.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

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

---

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

We have the data to reliably predict student outcomes, we need to become more proficient with responding to the different needs of students in an efficient and effective manner.

At the high school level we have begun to plan for restructuring by bringing in new administration and developing a plan for Smaller Learning Communities.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

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

---

#### Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

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

The Waukegan Public Schools have a fairly stable population with a median size of 15329 over the past 5 years. Although the population has been stable we have seen an average increase of about 2% per year of students of Hispanic origin and an average increase in students who identified as economically disadvantaged of about 3% per year to our current level of 71%. In addition, although our student mobility levels have been decreasing at a rate of .4% per year, the level of transience remains high, 19%. Finally, the graduation rates of 76% must be addressed.

In the schools we have seen fairly stable levels of attendance and truancy with a slight increase of .1% per year in average attendance of about 92% and a commensurate slight drop in truancy of about -.2% per year to a rate of 11%.

The increases in students from economically disadvantaged homes indicate that meeting the challenges that students bring with them will increase for our staff. In order to meet these challenges staff will need to become more proficient with strategies for working with students from poverty, and working with students with high rates of mobility.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

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

---

#### Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

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

As student risk factors increase, challenges increase and unless the efforts to address the challenges are sufficient, scores decrease. Based on the triangulation of our data, our elementary and middle schools are seeing some success in meeting the challenges presented by the attributes of our district. So far, our efforts at the high school level have not been sufficient to address the needs of our population.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

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

---

#### Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

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

We have the data to reliably predict student outcomes; we need to become more proficient with responding to the different attributes of our changing population in an efficient and effective manner. As stated above, we have begun to plan for restructuring at the high school by bringing in new administration and developing a plan for Smaller Learning Communities.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

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

---

#### Item 2 - Educator Qualifications

**Data - Briefly describe data on educator qualifications. What do these data tell you?**

In the past 8 years, we have seen a .5% per year decrease in teachers with Masters Degrees, and a 1 % increase in teachers with provisional credentials, and classes taught by teachers who are not identified as highly qualified. At the same time FTE has increased by an average of 24% per year, and average salaries have risen by about \$1200 per year, which is less than the state average increase. At the same time, average class size has decreased about .5% per year for elementary classrooms to 20 students per teacher and at the high school by .25% to an average of 22 students per teacher, both greater than state averages.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

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

---

#### Item 2 - Educator Qualifications

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

It is hard to say that decreasing educator qualifications are related to increasing scores at the elementary and middle school levels or decreases at the high school level.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

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

---

#### Item 2 - Educator Qualifications

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

The relation between teacher characteristics that are collected by the state do not appear to be readily translated into student achievement outcomes.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

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

---

#### Item 3 - Parent Involvement

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

Reported parent involvement has decreased from 100% in 1999 to 99.7% in 2006. These data tell us that quantity of involvement are likely not as important as quality data would be in relation to student achievement.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

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

---

#### Item 3 - Parent Involvement

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

It is unlikely that the data being collected and reported for parent involvement are relevant to student achievement in a causal manner. In fact given the near 0 variability in both the state and district data it is unclear what these data could expected to tell.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

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

---

#### Item 3 - Parent Involvement

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

The primary factor that must be addressed based on our data is what happens in the classroom. We can not change our student population. Teacher quality, while it may be a concern, is not captured in the data collected in these reports. Parent participation as reported above should be sufficient, but quantitative data on parent participation is not likely to provide meaningful information.

We have a changing population, we have adopted scientifically based instructional programs. We need the resources to be able to support teachers to use the resources that have been provided and to improve their efforts to respond to the data they collect.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

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

---

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

Two primary conclusions can be drawn from the data presented above with regards to student achievement. First, although we have seen reliable increases in the percentage of students meeting standards in reading and math, the rate of increase is not sufficient to free the district from district improvement status. In short, to get off the district improvement list, we will need to increase the percentage of students meeting standards at an even higher rate than what we have obtained over the past four years. We have the data to reliably predict student outcomes; we need to become more proficient with responding to the different attributes of our changing population in an efficient and effective manner.

Second, efforts to restructure the Waukegan high school must have a focus on improving student achievement. As previously stated, we have begun to plan for restructuring at the high school by bringing in new administration and developing a plan for Smaller Learning Communities.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

### Section II-Action Plan

---

No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AYP Report.

If a district has met all the state-required performance targets identified in the School Report Card, the SIP should set forth other targets for improvement derived from and supported by data analysis.

No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO Report.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

### Section II-Action Plan

---

#### Part A. Objective 1

**Title : The percentage of students obtaining meets or exceeds in the area of reading will increase to meet AYP for the district's subgroups.**

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

19% of all Students with disabilities in the 3rd grade are currently meeting or exceeding standards, which will increase to 55% in 2007 and 62.5% in 2008 or safe harbor.

16% of all students with disabilities in the 5th grade are currently meeting or exceeding standards on the ISAT, which will increase to 55% in 2007 and 62.5% in 2008 or safe harbor.

23% of all students with disabilities in the 8th grade are currently meeting or exceeding standards on the ISAT, which will increase to 55% in 2007 and 62.5% in 2008 or safe harbor.

6% of all students with disabilities in the 11th grade are currently meeting or exceeding standards on the PSAE, which will increase to 55% in 2007 and 62.5% in 2008 or safe harbor.

Although in grades 3 and 5 54% are currently meeting or exceeding in math, in grades 8 and 11 the percentages decrease to 24% and 2%, therefore by 2007 for all grades students will meet or exceed standards to 55% and in 2008 to 62.5% or safe harbor.

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

**Section II-Action Plan**

---

Part A. Objective 1

**Title : The percentage of students obtaining meets or exceeds in the area of reading will increase to meet AYP for the district's subgroups.**  
**No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AYP Report.**

**No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO Report.**

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

**Section II-Action Plan**

Part B. Student Strategies and Activities for Objective 1

**Title : The percentage of students obtaining meets or exceeds in the area of reading will increase to meet AYP for the district's subgroups.**

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

Strategies & Activities	Time Line			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount
Implement Tier Two reading intervention programs that will be provided to Students with IEP's as well as other sub groups of targeted students not meeting AYP(Guided Instructional strategies- Fennema, Carpenter, & Franke,1992), who are being instructed in general education reading classroom in conjunction with Special Education services and Response to Intervention services provided through the Title One Intervention program. CORE teacher academy will support core curriculum and instruction SRA Open Court, Prentice Hall Reading core curriculum implementation for all subgroups not meeting AYP at school level, students with IEP at District level targeted. Scientifically Research Based Intervention programs that will be used to address targeted group: Voyager Reading Passport/ Passaporte supplemental program at primary grades in language of instruction, Read Naturally, Corrective Reading, Lexia, Earobics, Read 180 as supplemental/or alternative program, Read Well Rewards in Tier 2,	9/11/2007	06/04/2008	During School	Title I	\$ 500,000

Strategies & Activities	Time Line			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount
Corrective Reading may be used as the alternative curriculum in Tier3 will utilize mostly in self contained classroom. This will include support from the Waukegan Teacher Academy workshops for new teachers and our mentoring program.					
Provide Extended Day learning for students (time on task strategies-Slavin,2003) opportunities for students which will include: SES providers who include students with disabilities will offer after school tutoring to all students not meeting AYP using state approved SBR intervention programs that will include students with disabilities, as well as, school based SBR intervention programs before, after school and saturday programs and summer school: The Tier 2 and 3 programs will be used during these times.	10/16.2007	06/04/2008	After School	Title I	\$600,000
Provide Literacy Coaches for the High School students and staff who will provide instructional support to all Core content areas utilizing training, modeling, coaching the CRISS (Project CRISS – National Reading Panel,2000; Rand Report-Snow, 2002; Duffy,2002; Anderson & Roit,1993; Brown, Pressley, Van Meter & Shuder,1996)and reading across content area strategies for students.	09/11/07	06/04/2008	Before School	Title V	\$90,000
Provide Differentiated Instructional(Differentiated instruction-Tomlinson, 200& 2004; Moll, A.M. & Riley, D.P. ,2005) strategies/resources that	09/28/2007	02/15/2008	Before School	Title II	\$300,000

Strategies & Activities	Time Line			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount
support strategies which will be implemented to address individual learning needs of students not meeting AYP in reading.					
Progress monitor all Tier 2 students on a monthly basis, Tier 3 will be progress monitored on a weekly basis. (Formative assessment- Black & William ,1998)	9/11/2007	06/04/2008	During School	State Funds	\$50,000
Implement additional support with Academic Vocabulary strategies in reading and across content instrution(Building Background Knowledge. What Works in in Schools, Marzano,2003; Time on task strategies-Slavin,2003;Graphic Organizers-nonlinguistic representation strategies Walberg 1999, Hattie et al., 1996.)with focus on students with learning disabilities, Limited English Proficient and low income student sub group populations.	06/18/2007	06/04/2008	During School	State Funds	\$35,000

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

**Section II-Action Plan**

Part C. Professional Development Strategies and Activities for Objective 1

**Title : The percentage of students obtaining meets or exceeds in the area of reading will increase to meet AYP for the district’s subgroups.**

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

Strategies & Activities	Time Line			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount
Tier 1 PD workshop and ongoing coaching to support Open Court, Prentice Hall, Tier 2 PD Tier 3 PD, including follow up coaching and monitoring(Reform coaching to support full implementation –Coggins, Stoddard, Cutler, 2003). Also included is training through the Waukegan Teacher Academy for new teachers and our mentoring program.	08/16/2007	06/04/2008	Before School	Title II	\$38,000
Extended Day/ During the Day sub release training to support intervention curriculum programs same as above, but with teacher hired as extended day tutors.(Ongoing professional development/coaching- Guskey, 2000; Fullan , 1993)	10/15/2007	06/04/2008	After School	Title I	\$35,000
CRISS training will be tiered with intial training with coaches and deans of instruction, building leadership team members, with on-going training and support with classroom teachers to be scheduled throught out the year. Our RESPRO consultants will work with this program at the	06/18/2007	06/04/2008	Before School	State Funds	\$25,000

Strategies & Activities	Time Line			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount
high school level, as well as, middle school level(Reform coaching to support full implementation –Coggins, Stoddard, Cutler, 2003).					
Differentiation District Wide Conference through SDE: three part September Mini conference for all certified instructional staff, train the trainer model for school level support to coach and monitor implementation of strategies, February will be part two of the mini conference to provide next step training of DI strategies to support learning of all students with focus on those in identified target groups not meeting AYP-focus on students with disabilities(Reform coaching to support full implementation –Coggins, Stoddard, Cutler, 2003).	09/28/2007	02/15/2008	Before School	Title II	\$300,000
Training on Inclusion/ team teaching to better support the change in Special Education services for targeted inclusion teams(Inclusion strategies- Bucalos, A.B. & Lingo, A.S., 2005).	08/12/2007	06/04/2008	Before School	Title I	\$26,000
Professional development on response to intervention, problem solving, behavior management, data collection, Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions(Response to Intervention - Forte,I. & Schurr,S. (1993) National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc. Alexandria, VA, 2006).	08/12//2007	/0/04/2008	Before School	State Funds	\$40,000
Professional Development on intensive intervention programs: Language! Corrective	08/12/2007	06/04/2008	Before School	State Funds	\$50,000

Strategies & Activities	Time Line			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount
Reading, Read Well, Rewards(Ongoing professional development/coaching- Guskey 2000; Fullan , 1993).					

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

**Section II-Action Plan**

Part D. Parent Involvement Strategies and Activities for Objective 1

**Title : The percentage of students obtaining meets or exceeds in the area of reading will increase to meet AYP for the district's subgroups.**

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

Strategies & Activities	Time Line			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount
Provide SEPTAC parent organization, as well as BIPAC parents and parents at large with workshops on intervention strategies and progress being made, implementation support services plan (Parent involvement strategies- Walberg & Paik 1997 & Piak,2001).	09/11/2007	06/04/2009	After School	State Funds	20,000
Include School Improvement parent participants in planning, implementation and review process for each school plan (Parent involvement strategies-Walberg & Paik 1997 & Piak,2001).	02/05/2007	06/04/2009	After School	Title I	\$500
Provide Parents an opportunity to provide input as the Title One Intervention program planned, implemented and reviewed.(Parent as partner strategies- Epstein, J. , 2004)	05/10/2007	06/04/2009	After School	Title I	\$500
Include District Strategic Plan committee involvement in review of District Plan implementation/ review process(Parent as partner strategies- Epstein, J., 2004).	09/05/2006	06/04/2009	After School	Local Funds	\$10,000
Include Parent/ community participation on District Restructuring Oversight, and District	02/05/2007	06/04/2009	After School	Title I	\$500

Strategies & Activities	Time Line			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount
Epstein, J., 2004).					

# WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

## Section II-Action Plan

---

### Part E - Monitoring Process for Objective 1

**Title : The percentage of students obtaining meets or exceeds in the area of reading will increase to meet AYP for the district's subgroups.**

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

Implementation of this plan will be monitored at both district and school level utilizing student performance data, teacher performance data, central office performance data (qualitative and quantitative such as: local/benchmark student achievement data, student high stake test data, teacher survey/ checklist/ evaluations, administrator survey/ checklist/ evaluations, and walk-through observation data.

District leadership team will work with the RESPRO consultants in District Improvement Monitoring utilizing the tool prescribed by the Lake County RESPRO team. The District Oversight Committee will also be included in this monitoring process with reports, updates generated through this process. Revisions will be made, based on data as needed to ensure that progress is made toward the goals to meet AYP in reading by all sub-groups targeted either through the district AYP or school level AYP data.

District leadership team will also work with outside consultants from Urban Learning and Leadership Center (ULLC) in ongoing plan revisions, implementation and assistance with assessment of data.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

Dr. Mary Lamping

Chief Academic Officer

Mrs. Judith M. Green

Director of School Improvement

Dr. Julie Retzloff

RESPRO Director

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

### Section II-Action Plan

---

#### Part A. Objective 2

**Title : The percentage of students obtaining meets or exceeds in teh area of math increase at targeted schools to meet AYP.**

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

While as a whole the district did meet AYP, there are District schools that are not meeting AYP and (Waukegan High School only 26% overall meeting with: Black 18.5 %, Hispanics 22.9%, Students with Disabilities7.0%, Economically Disadvantaged 22% are making AYP. Abbott Middle School did not meet in percent tested. Benny Middle School 21.3% Students with Disabilities made AYP. Jefferson Middle School 25% of pecent students with disabilities made AYP. Webster Middle School 20% students with disabilities made AYP. With the bar raising to 62.5% in 2008 or safe harbor, this is a need that the district must address.

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

**Section II-Action Plan**

---

Part A. Objective 2

**Title : The percentage of students obtaining meets or exceeds in teh area of math increase at targeted schools to meet  
No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AYP Report.**

**No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO Report.**

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

**Section II-Action Plan**

Part B. Student Strategies and Activities for Objective 2

**Title : The percentage of students obtaining meets or exceeds in teh area of math increase at targeted schools to meet AYP.**

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

Strategies & Activities	Time Line			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount
Implement extended day intervention programs(Explicit instructional strategies Brophy, 1999; Waxman & Walberg,1999)for students not meeting AYP with focus on the students with disabilities, as well as students with limited english proficiency, and other targeted populations at individual schools. V-math, FASTT math, as well as other intervention programs yet to be determined will be used for extended day tutoring, summer school, before and after school programs, during the day intervention courses at high school level to replace study halls. SES tutoring also is part of the extended day learning opportunities made available to those students who meet the NCLB criteria.	08/27/2007	06/05/2009	After School	Title I	\$600,000
Provide differentiated instructional strategies(Differentiated instruction-Tomlinson 2001&2004; Moll, A.M. & Riley, D.P., 2005) / resources to better support mathematic skill/concept mastery for all students, but with particular attention to sub groups not meeting	08/27/2007	06/05/2009	During School	Title II	\$300,000

Strategies & Activities	Time Line			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount
<p>AYP at the school level. Tier 1 core intervention, Tier II interventions such as V-Math and FASTT Math. Tier 3 V-Math/ other alternative curriculum used in self contained,additional time(Time on task strategies-Slavin, 2003). This will include support from the Waukegan Teacher Academy workshops for new teachers and our mentoring program.</p>					
<p>Implement Academic Vocabulary strategies(Vocabulary Direct Instruction: Stahl and Fairbanks, 1986) particular to mathematics to strengthen student understanding of essential concepts with focus on sub-groups: students with disabilities,limited english proficient and low income sub groups.</p>	06/18/2007	06/04/2009	During School	State Funds	\$35,000
<p>Establish task force to articulate both horizontally and vertically our mathematic program with end result revising the High School Course offerings to provide higher level mathematic courses available to high school students at large, versus a very small slice of the student population.</p>	08/23/2007	05/02/2008	After School	Title V	\$16,000

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

**Section II-Action Plan**

Part C. Professional Development Strategies and Activities for Objective 2

**Title : The percentage of students obtaining meets or exceeds in teh area of math increase at targeted schools to meet AYP.**

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

Strategies & Activities	Time Line			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount
Provide professional development to teacher implementing SBR Curriculum programs for: Tier 1 ( Scott Foresman Math, Conneced Math, Glenco Algebra/Geometry) Tier 2 ( FASTT Math, V-Math, or Tier 3 alternative curriculum such as Nova Net intervention programs with focus on learning needs of targed sub groups not meeting AYP(Ongoing professional development/coaching- Guskey, 2000); Fullan, 1993).	06/13/2007	06/05/2009	Summer School	Title I	\$20,000
Provide Professional development on differentiated instructional strategies through SDE mini conference and train trainer model(Ongoing professional development/coaching- Guskey, 2000); Fullan, 1993).	09/28/2007	02/15/2009	Before School	Title II	\$300,000
Provide professional development on SBR CRISS strategies at secondary level and SBR Academic Vocabulary strategies at K-8 level. Implementation of the grade level/ subject area	08/24/2007	06/05/2009	Before School	Title I	\$20,000

Strategies & Activities	Time Line			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount
lists with focus on building understanding with targeted sub groups not meeting AYP at school level(Ongoing professional development/coaching- Guskey 2000); Fullan, 1993).					
Support mathematics skill articulation with both district leadership, RESPRO consultants and ULLC consultants.	08/23/2007	05/-2/2008	Before School	Title I	\$10,000

**WAUKEGAN CUSD 60**

**Section II-Action Plan**

Part D. Parent Involvement Strategies and Activities for Objective 2

**Title : The percentage of students obtaining meets or exceeds in teh area of math increase at targeted schools to meet AYP.**

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

Strategies & Activities	Time Line			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount
Provide SEPTAC parent group, BIPAC parent group and parents at large math workshops on the District Oversight committee an opportunity (home school connection strategies to help students at home with mathematic practice/learning targeting parents of sub-group student populations not meeting AYP(Parent involvement strategies-Walberg & Paik,1997 & Piak,2001).	09/11/2007	06/30/2009	After School	State Funds	\$10,000
Include school improvement parent participants in targeted school planning, implementation and review process for targeted schools not meeting AYP in mathematics(Parent involvement strategies-Walberg & Paik, 1997 & Piak,2001).	02/15/2007	06/04/2009	After School	Title I	\$500
Include parents/ community members on the Strategic Plan Committee the opportunity to participate in the District plan implementation/ review process of this plan. Members did have input prior to preparation for writing of this plan(Parent involvement strategies-Walberg & Paik,1997 & Piak,2001).	09/18/2007	06/04/2009	After School	Local Funds	\$20,000
Provide parents/ community members serving on	02/05/2007	06/04/2009	After School	Title I	\$3,000

Strategies & Activities	Time Line			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount
to participate in plan implementation/review process of the District Improvement plan. Members had opporutnity to give input(Parent as partner strategies- Epstein, J. 2004).					
Involve parents in development of mathematics K-12 scope and sequence and new high school course development.	09/17/2007	05/02/2008	After School	Title I	\$500

# WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

## Section II-Action Plan

---

### Part E - Monitoring Process for Objective 2

**Title : The percentage of students obtaining meets or exceeds in teh area of math increase at targeted schools to meet AYP.**

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

Implementation of this plan will be monitored at both district and school level utilizing student performance data, teacher performance data, central office performance data (qualitative and quantitative such as: local/benchmark student achievement data, student high stake test data, teacher survey/ checklist/ evaluations, administrator survey/ checklist/ evaluations, and walk-through observation data.

District leadership team will work with the RESPRO consultants in District Improvement Monitoring utilizing the tool prescribed the Lake County RESPRO team. The District Oversight Committee will also be included in this monitoring process with reports and updates generated through this process. Revision will be made, based on data as needed to ensure that progress is made toward the goals to meet AYP in mathematics by all sub-groups targeted either throught the district AYP or school level AYP data.

District leadership team will also work with outside consultants from Urban Learning and Leadership Center (ULLC) in ongoing plan revisions, implementation and assistance with assessment of data.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

Dr. Mary Lamping

Chief Academic Officer, District 60

Mrs. Judith M. Green

Director of School Improvement, Dist. 60

Dr. Julie Retzlaff

RESPRO Director, Lake County ESC

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

---

#### Part A - Stakeholder Involvement

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

Several groups participated in the plan formation beginning with a Strategic Plan committee comprised of community members, including parents, District administrators, School Administrators and teachers. This group analyzed district student test data and generated the District Mission Statement and Shared Values. Each group worked on parts of the plan formation.

Members include:

Dr. Richard Olson, former Superintendent; Dr. Donaldo R. Batiste, Current Superintendent; Dr. Steve Kukoch, Sopris West Consultant; Mrs. Anita Bajena, parent (BPAC- Bilingual Parent Action Council); Mr. Robert Evans, Community member; Mrs. Patricia Foley, Waukegan Foundation member; Mr. Richard Lee, Waukegan Public Library; Mr. Bruce Wilson, Pastor Christian Fellowship; Ms. Janalle Roth, parent (SEPTAC-Special Education Parent/Teacher Action Council); Mr. Carlos Sanchez (SEPTAC/BTAC); Mr. Fernando Shipley, Board of Education President; Mrs. June Maguire, Board of Education member; Mr. Jeff McBride, Board of Education member; Mr. Marvin Reddick, Board of Education member; Ms. Anita Hanna, Board of Education member; Mrs. Pat Jones, Board of Education member; Mr. Bill Anderson, Board of Education member; Mrs. Monica Velez-Gonzalez, parent (BPAC); Mr. Joel Zarnstorff, Community member; Mr. Patrick Gallagher, Waukegan Fire Chief; Mr. Dave Hayward, YMCA; Honorable Mayor Richard Hyde, Waukegan Mayor; Ms. Susana Figueroa, Waukegan City Liaison; Ms. Kristi Long, United Way Lake County; Ms. Alicia Mentel, Waukegan Park District; Mr. Ray Vukovich, Director of Governmental Services; Ms. Rita Wilkins, COSLA parent group; Mrs. Judy Fredbeck, Teacher Union; Mr. John Frew, Union Maintenance; Mrs. Kathy Ludowise, parent; Mrs. Jeanne Kearby, Administrator; Mrs. Mary Lee Borrero, Administrator; Mr. Fred Howard, Administrator; Mrs. Judy Green, Administrator; Mrs. Janine Gruhn, Administrator; Mrs. Deanne Elliott, Administrator; Mrs. Molly Schaefer, Administrator; Mr. John Samuelian, Principal; Mrs. Pat Ross, Principal; Mr. Angel Figueroa, Principal; and Mrs. Barbara Vasquez, Teacher.

District Leadership Committee / District Improvement Team worked on the data analysis and action plan objectives and strategy formation.

Members include:

Dr. Donaldo R. Batiste, Superintendent; Dr. Mary Lamping, Chief Academic Officer; Mr. Jules Gaudin, Chief Operations Officer; Dr. Jeanne Kearby, Executive Director; Dr. Harlene Shipley, Director; Dr. Ben Ditkowsky,

Director; Dr. Cathy Watkins, Principal; Mrs. Barbara Steinseifer, Principal; Mr. Fred Howard, Executive Director; Mr. Brian Luosa, Executive Director; Mr. Jose Lara, Principal; Mr. Angel Figueroa, Principal; Mr. Edward Guerra, Principal; Mrs. Janine Gruhn, Director; Mrs. Mary Lee Borrero, Director; Mr. Jim Graff, Director; Mr. Grant Flink, Director; Mrs. Judy Green, Director; and Mrs. Deanna Elliott, Director.

Professional Development Committee contributed to the professional development support for the action objective and strategies identified.

Members Include:

Dr. Mary Lamping, Chief Academic Officer; Dr. Jeanne Kearby, Executive Director; Dr. Harlene Shipley, Director; Dr. Linda Meczyk, Principal;  
Dr. Ben Ditkowsky, Director; Mrs. Stefanie Anastasia, SLD lead teacher;  
Mrs. Lynn Bailey, Principal; Mrs. Mary Lee Borrero, Director; Dr. Joan Brixey, Principal; Ms. Jackie Bucher, teacher; Ms. Bertha Campos, teacher; Mrs. Deanna Elliott, Director; Mrs. Judith M. Green, Director; Ms. Sue Greene, Coordinator; Mrs. Janine Gruhn, Director; Ms. Joan Guilianelli, Lead Teacher; Ms. Andrea Herbster, teacher; Ms. Marge Holbo, teacher; Ms. Sara Hitink, teacher; Mrs. Marilyn Krajenta, Principal; Ms. Cathy Lee, Lead OT/PT;  
Ms. Nicole Lemberger, Curriculum Specialist; Ms. Joyce Meyer, Principal; Ms. Mary Mlinar-Stephens, teacher; Ms. Deb Navarro, WTA facilitator; Ms. Juliane Ospina, teacher; Ms. Kathy Szempruch, teacher; Mr. Bruce Thezan, Associate Principal; Ms. Arlene Vombrack, inclusion facilitator; and Mrs. Louisa Zink, Principal.

District Restructuring Oversight Committee contributed formation for the monitoring and review process for this plan, as well as, strategies identified to support our schools in restructuring status.

Members Include:

Dr. Harvey Perkins, Urban Learning and Leadership Center Executive Director;  
Dr. Dawn Abt-Perkins, Lake Forest University; Dr. Shirley Anderson, Lake County RESPRO consultant; Dr. Julie Retzlaff, Lake County RESPRO consultant; Ms. June Maguire, Board of Education President; Ms. Anita Hanna, Board of Education Member; Dr. Mary Lamping, CAO; Dr. Jeanne Kearby, Executive Director; Dr. Harlene Shipley, Director; Dr. Ben Ditkowsky, Director; Ms. Janine Gruhn, Director; Ms. Deanna Elliott, Director; Ms. Mary Lee Borrero, Director; Ms. Judy Green, Director; Dr. Bethel Cager, Principal; Dr. Cathy Watkins, Principal; Mr. Sam Taylor, Principal; Mr. John Samuelian, Principal; Dr. Joan Brixey, Principal; Mr. Ed Guerra, Principal; Ms. Cabrina Williams-Leneau, Associate Principal; Ms. Brie Cederna, Special Education Coordinator; and  
TBA (3 parent representative to join in Fall).

Parent input from School Building Leadership Teams/ School Improvement Teams, include parents from parent organizations such as SEPTAC and BIPAC, and PTO provided input via the school improvement plan formations which were used to guide targets for the district improvement plan. BPAC board members include : Mr. Carlos Sanchez, President; Mrs. Felicitas Ortega, Vice President; Mrs. Rocio

Brindis, Secretary; and Mrs. Veronica Diaz, Secretary. SEPTAC board members include: Mrs. Amy Clark, President; Mrs. Janalle Roth, Vice President; Stacy Lunstrom, Secretary; and Mrs. Hilda Perez, Treasurer.

## REVIEW/ REVISION OF THE DIP PLAN

Describe the systematic revision and implementation of the plan based on information from the monitoring process (10.2).

District Improvement team will meet with RESPRO consultants through the monitoring process and will review and make modifications as suggested. At the end of April/ early May the District Improvement team will begin making necessary modifications to the existing plan to guide the next school year plans looking at staffing, intervention resources and professional development support that will impact budget and planning for the next year.

The District will also review their revisions with the District Oversight Committee to keep them apprised of any changes that would impact the support of the schools in Restructuring. Likewise the Board of Education will be kept apprised when changes/modifications are made to the District Improvement Plan.

Each school will also continue to follow the SIP review and revision process in place, which will be reviewed by District School Improvement Office by September, should additional modification be made to the District Plan to support the school plans, this will be done. Likewise each school will be encouraged to make modifications as the monitoring process takes place. The Action plan will be the focus of ongoing modifications, as this is the blueprint for the implementation process, if dates change, monetary sources shift, or new resource becomes available that addresses the goals in the Action plan, modifications will be made so that the implementation is communicated and clear to all involved in the ongoing improvement process. Schools will not be required to re-submit ongoing modifications. These are meant to guide and clarify ongoing implementation for authors and stakeholders of the school plan.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

---

#### Part B - District Responsibilities

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

District services and resources:

District 60 will co-mingle resources from local, state and federal funds to support the District Improvement Plan, as well as, the school improvement plans at each of our schools. Funds will be prioritized to support the Response to Intervention strategies which may include: staffing, intervention supplemental/ alternative curriculum materials, professional development opportunities and parent involvement support for the reform efforts indicated in this plan. Accountability measures will be put in place to ensure that intervention programs are effective. Student benchmark, progress monitoring and other state and local assessment data will be reviewed for students receiving Tier 2 or 3 intervention support.

District 60 will continue to provide additional technical assistance to schools not meeting AYP. This support will include things like: access to benchmark and progress monitoring tools, data analysis and support to guide intervention measures to our School-wide Title I schools, Title III schools, and to our Targeted Assisted and non-Title I sites. Local funds and other state funds will be used to ensure that the non-Title One schools receive technical and resource support necessary to implement the focus of this plan.

Extensive professional development will be provided to support each school in Response to Intervention strategies, including differentiated instructional strategies to support the 3 tier model implementation. This support will not be implemented with the one shot approach, but will be on-going with capacity building which is a key component for our professional development model. The on-site coaching will also be an important piece of the on-going support provided at each school. Accountability pieces will be devised to measure impact of the professional development provided.

Plan/Review/Monitoring of the DIP:

District Leadership Team (comprised of Superintendent, Chief Academic Officer, Chief Operations Officer, Directors, and Principal representatives) will collaborate in planning, review for submission and implementation process. The plan once written and peer reviewed will go to the Waukegan Board of Education for board approval. The District Leadership team will then support this plan through prioritization of resources (human, time, and materials) to fully implement the District Improvement Plan as well as support with resources to fully implement School Improvement/Restructuring Plans. NCLB funds will be used, comingled with state and local funds to support the objectives and strategies established in this plan. The leadership committee will analyze data and continue to make data driven decisions that increase the number of students meeting AYP in both reading and mathematics, with focused scientifically research based programs

identified for Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction and differentiated strategies that meet the learning needs of targeted sub group learning needs. Outside consultants will work with district leaders in providing ongoing professional development to school building leadership teams, focused professional development opportunities for classroom teachers and administrators aligned to objectives and strategies in this plan.

District 60 Restructuring Oversight Committee: This committee is already in place to monitor the restructuring plan implementations at all of our secondary and one elementary school, will also be kept apprised of the district improvement plan, implementation and revisions made to ensure that the district support of the schools in restructuring aligns to the District Improvement efforts.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

---

#### Part C - State Responsibilities

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

#### ISBE

District 60 will continue to work with the ISBE staff in finalization of the District Improvement Plan. Attending all State Sponsored meetings and trainings to guide planning, implementation and revision process. The guidance tools and training sessions at NCLB conference aided in planning process for this plan.

RESPRO: District 60 will continue to work with the Lake County Regional Office of Education and our RESPRO consultants in regards to the monitoring process. We currently work with our RESPRO in the monitoring of our School Improvement Plans and our Restructuring Plans. We will work on any monitoring process designed with Lake County under the direction of the Illinois School Board of Education.

We also work with our RESPRO consultants to provide professional development support to our schools, research and resource support in brainstorming strategies and programs that will be implemented, such as the CRISS program at the high school next year. Professional development for our Administrators through the Administrators' Academy also will continue to support our reform efforts as a district.

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

### Section IV-A Local Board Action

---

DATE APPROVED by School Board : 6/12/2007

#### 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 the 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 reflect the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with the Illinois Learning Standards.
4. The school will spend at least 10 percent of the funds made available under Section 1113 of NCLB, for the purpose of providing teachers and the principal high-quality professional development. (Title I schools only.)

#### B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

---

Signature of LEA Superintendent

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

---

### ISBE Monitoring - Part I

#### ANALYSIS OF DATA

##### REPORT CARD DATA

Yes Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified? Does the DIP include analysis of report card data that clarifies the areas of weakness? Is it clear that the area of weakness is broad or narrow and whether this affects many or few students?

##### LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes If included, is there evidence that the DIP team analyzed optional data to clarify the areas of weakness? Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?

##### OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes If included, has the DIP team analyzed other available optional data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities? If included, do the other data provide clear direction for the selection of strategies and activities?

#### CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

Yes Do the objectives address all areas of deficiency on the AYP sheet?

#### IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

Yes Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance?

Yes Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control?

#### ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

Yes Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?

Yes Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement?

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

---

### ISBE Monitoring - Part I

- Yes Is professional development aligned with the objectives?
- Yes Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status?
- Yes Do the parent involvement strategies and activities clearly align with the objectives?
- Yes Will these parent activities positively affect the factors contributing to low achievement?
- Yes Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?
- Yes Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?

### PART I - COMMENTS

The district made AYP for 2006. This plan addresses the varying needs of subgroups and addresses needs at the high school as well. Please implement this plan in consultation with your area RESPRO. The district is taking beginning steps at restructuring the high school.

To facilitate monitoring, a suggestion in describing the strategies and activities for a future plan: how can you more clearly describe the expectations for students and staff. What do you expect to see students doing? What practices do you expect to see from teachers?

Carol Diedrichsen 217/524-4832 cdiedric@isbe.net

## WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

---

### ISBE Monitoring - Part II

#### PLAN DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, AND IMPLEMENTATION

##### STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

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

##### DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

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

##### STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

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

#### APPROVAL DATE OF BOARD

Yes The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.

#### PART II - COMMENTS

This plan provides sufficient focus and clarity to be implemented. Best wishes as you do so.

08/15/07 We were grateful for the opportunity to talk with Dr. Lamping and Judy Green about the District Improvement Plan, the Title I District Plan, and the school and restructuring plans from this district. We have suggested some revisions in school plans and believe that you have a sound plan for restructuring your schools. I look forward to reviewing (and passing along to others!) the monitoring tool you will be developing to measure progress. Please keep in touch. Carol Diedrichsen