

**Old Orchard Jr High School  
Skokie SD 68  
Skokie, ILLINOIS**



**ILLINOIS  
SCHOOL  
REPORT  
CARD**

**GRADES : 6 7 8**

State and federal laws require public school districts to release report cards to the public each year. Starting in 2009, charter school information is included in district statistics.

**STUDENTS**

RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUND AND OTHER INFORMATION														
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Native American	Multi racial /Ethnic	Percent Low- Income	Percent Limited- English- Proficient	Percent IEP	High Sch. Dropout Rate	Chronic Truancy Rate	Mobility Rate	Attendance Rate	Total Enrollment
School	37.7	11.3	12.1	33.8	0.0	5.2	43.9	8.2	16.6		0.0	5.9	97.3	613
District	36.6	11.3	10.6	34.2	0.0	7.4	41.0	12.3	13.8		0.0	8.8	96.5	1,614
State	52.8	18.8	21.1	4.2	0.2	2.9	45.4	7.6	13.1		3.6	13.0	93.9	2,064,312

**Low-income** students come from families receiving public aid; live in institutions for neglected or delinquent children; are supported in foster homes with public funds; or are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches.  
**IEP** Students are those students eligible to receive special education services.

**Limited-English-proficient** students are those students eligible for transitional bilingual programs.  
**Mobility rate** is based on the number of times students enroll in or leave a school during the school year.  
**Chronic truants** are students who are absent from school without valid cause for 18 or more of the last 180 school days.

**INSTRUCTIONAL SETTING**

PARENTAL CONTACT*		STUDENT-TO-STAFF RATIOS			
	Percent	Pupil- Teacher Elementary	Pupil- Teacher Secondary	Pupil- Certified Staff	Pupil- Administrator
School	100.0	--	--	--	--
District	100.0	14.5		10.6	179.3
State	96.2	18.2		13.3	203.8

\* Parental contact includes parent-teacher conferences, parental visits to school, school visits to home, telephone conversations, and written correspondence.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE (as of the first school day in May)										
Grades	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 - 12
School							19.6	17.3	16.8	
District							19.6	17.3	16.8	
State							21.5	21.1	21.0	



TIME DEVOTED TO TEACHING CORE SUBJECTS (Minutes Per Day)												
Grades	Mathematics			Science			English/Language Arts			Social Science		
	3	6	8	3	6	8	3	6	8	3	6	8
School		40	40		40	40		80	80		40	40
District		40	40		40	40		80	80		40	40
State		54	51		43	44		103	93		43	44

TEACHER INFORMATION (Full-Time Equivalents)								
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Native American	Male	Female	Total Number
District	91.4	1.6	2.3	4.7	0.0	12.5	87.5	128
State	85.2	8.1	5.2	1.4	0.2	23.0	77.0	132,502

TEACHER INFORMATION (Continued)					
	Average Teaching Experience (Years)	% of Teachers with Bachelor's Degrees	% of Teachers with Master's & Above	% of Teachers with Emergency or Provisional Credentials	% of Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
School	--	--	--	0.0	1.4
District	10.7	22.9	77.1	0.0	0.8
State	12.7	42.2	57.4	0.5	0.7

Some teacher/administrator data are not collected at the school level.

### SCHOOL DISTRICT FINANCES



REVENUE BY SOURCE 2008-09				EXPENDITURE BY FUND 2008-09			
	District	District %	State %		District	District %	State %
Local Property Taxes	\$23,568,390	79.8	58.4	Education	\$20,750,029	74.5	69.6
Other Local Funding	\$3,429,073	11.6	6.9	Operations & Maintenance	\$2,277,165	8.2	7.9
General State Aid	\$509,662	1.7	14.5	Transportation	\$1,006,695	3.6	3.8
Other State Funding	\$1,255,043	4.2	8.3	Debt Service	\$2,320,620	8.3	7.0
Federal Funding	\$775,512	2.6	11.9	Tort	\$0	0.0	1.2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$29,537,680</b>			Municipal Retirement/ Social Security	\$703,792	2.5	1.8
				Fire Prevention & Safety	\$0	0.0	0.8
				Site & Construction/ Capital Improvement	\$806,949	2.9	7.9
				<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$27,865,250</b>		


OTHER FINANCIAL INDICATORS				
	2007 Equalized Assessed Valuation per Pupil	2007 Total School Tax Rate per \$100	2008-09 Instructional Expenditure per Pupil	2008-09 Operating Expenditure per Pupil
District	\$765,483	2.26	\$8,044	\$14,135
State	**	**	\$6,483	\$11,197

\*\* Due to the way Illinois school districts are configured, state averages for equalized assessed valuation per pupil and total school tax rate per \$100 are not provided.  
 Equalized assessed valuation includes all computed property values upon which a district's local tax rate is calculated.  
 Total school tax rate is a district's total tax rate as it appears on local property tax bills.  
 Instructional expenditure per pupil includes the direct costs of teaching pupils or the interaction between teachers and pupils.  
 Operating expenditure per pupil includes the gross operating cost of a school district excluding summer school, adult education, bond principal retired, and capital expenditures.


## ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

### OVERALL STUDENT PERFORMANCE

These charts present the overall percentages of state test scores categorized as meeting or exceeding the Illinois Learning Standards for your school, district, and the state. They represent your school's performance in reading, mathematics, and science.






**OVERALL ILLINOIS STANDARDS ACHIEVEMENT TEST (ISAT) PERFORMANCE**



**ISAT PERFORMANCE**

These charts provide information on attainment of the Illinois Learning Standards. They show the percents of student scores meeting or exceeding Standards for the grades and subjects tested on ISAT.



## PERFORMANCE ON STATE ASSESSMENTS

Federal law requires that student achievement results for reading, mathematics, and science for schools providing Title I services be reported to the general public.

The Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) is administered to students in grades 3 through 8. The Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE) is administered to students in grade 11. The Illinois Alternate Assessment (IAA) is administered to students with disabilities whose Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) indicate that participation in the ISAT or PSAE would not be appropriate.

Students with disabilities have an IEP (No Child Left Behind Act). An IEP is a written plan for a child with a disability who is eligible to receive special education services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Reading and Mathematics are tested in grades 3 through 8 and 11. Science is tested in grades 4, 7, and 11.

In order to protect students' identities, test data for groups of fewer than ten students are not reported.

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS NOT TESTED IN STATE TESTING PROGRAMS FOR READING AND MATHEMATICS														
		Gender			Racial/Ethnic Background						LEP	Migrant	Students with Disabilities	Economically Disadvantaged
		All	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	Native American	Multi racial /Ethnic				
School	*Enrollment	639	319	320	237	77	76	215	0	34	56	0	113	286
	Reading	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.00	0.0		0.0	0.0
	Mathematics	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.00	0.0		0.0	0.0
District	*Enrollment	1,168	588	580	433	148	119	393	0	75	114	0	204	509
	Reading	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
	Mathematics	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
State	*Enrollment	1,068,202	545,784	522,252	565,375	199,071	219,899	44,975	2,039	36,134	67,911	346	150,721	503,002
	Reading	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.9	0.5	0.3
	Mathematics	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.9	0.5	0.3

\* Enrollment as reported during the testing windows for grades 3 - 8 and 11.

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS NOT TESTED IN STATE TESTING PROGRAMS FOR SCIENCE ONLY														
		Gender			Racial/Ethnic Background						LEP	Migrant	Students with Disabilities	Economically Disadvantaged
		All	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	Native American	Multi racial /Ethnic				
School	Enrollment	208	105	103	71	34	19	71	0	13	16	0	37	96
	Science	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
District	Enrollment	383	191	192	134	59	29	135	0	26	34	0	65	163
	Science	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
State	Enrollment	449,149	228,523	220,563	244,235	81,931	88,351	19,309	898	14,165	23,830	105	62,715	201,259
	Science	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.2	1.0	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.5	1.9	0.9	0.6

\* Enrollment as reported during the testing windows for grades 4, 7, and 11.

**ILLINOIS STANDARDS ACHIEVEMENT TEST (ISAT)**

The following tables show the percentages of student scores in each of four performance levels. These levels were established with the help of Illinois educators who teach the grade levels and learning areas tested. Due to rounding, the sum of the percentages in the four performance levels may not always equal 100.

- Level 1 -- Academic Warning - Student work demonstrates limited knowledge and skills in the subject. Because of major gaps in learning, students apply knowledge and skills ineffectively.
- Level 2 -- Below Standards - Student work demonstrates basic knowledge and skills in the subject. However, because of gaps in learning, students apply knowledge and skills in limited ways.
- Level 3 -- Meets Standards - Student work demonstrates proficient knowledge and skills in the subject. Students effectively apply knowledge and skills to solve problems.
- Level 4 -- Exceeds Standards - Student work demonstrates advanced knowledge and skills in the subject. Students creatively apply knowledge and skills to solve problems and evaluate the results.

**Grade 6**

**Grade 6 - All**

Levels	Reading				Mathematics			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
School	0.0	10.8	50.7	38.5	0.0	7.8	58.4	33.8
District	0.0	10.8	50.7	38.5	0.0	7.8	58.4	33.8
State	0.2	18.6	55.1	26.1	0.5	14.9	60.2	24.4

**Grade 6 - Gender**

Levels	Reading				Mathematics				
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Male	School	0.0	14.3	54.1	31.6	0.0	10.8	57.8	31.4
	District	0.0	14.3	54.1	31.6	0.0	10.8	57.8	31.4
	State	0.3	21.8	54.8	23.1	0.7	16.2	58.2	24.9
Female	School	0.0	7.8	47.8	44.3	0.0	5.1	59.0	35.9
	District	0.0	7.8	47.8	44.3	0.0	5.1	59.0	35.9
	State	0.1	15.1	55.5	29.2	0.4	13.5	62.2	23.9

**Grade 6 - Racial/Ethnic Background**

Levels	Reading				Mathematics				
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
White	School	0.0	2.5	43.8	53.8	0.0	4.8	48.2	47.0
	District	0.0	2.5	43.8	53.8	0.0	4.8	48.2	47.0
	State	0.1	10.9	53.8	35.2	0.2	8.3	59.0	32.4
Black	School	0.0	19.0	61.9	19.0	0.0	18.2	72.7	9.1
	District	0.0	19.0	61.9	19.0	0.0	18.2	72.7	9.1
	State	0.5	32.9	56.6	10.0	1.3	30.0	60.3	8.4
Hispanic	School	0.0	16.1	58.1	25.8	0.0	6.5	77.4	16.1
	District	0.0	16.1	58.1	25.8	0.0	6.5	77.4	16.1
	State	0.3	27.0	59.2	13.5	0.7	19.6	66.1	13.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	School	0.0	16.7	53.0	30.3	0.0	10.3	52.9	36.8
	District	0.0	16.7	53.0	30.3	0.0	10.3	52.9	36.8
	State	0.2	7.4	43.3	49.1	0.4	4.5	42.0	53.1
Native American	School								
	District								
	State	0.0	20.1	63.3	16.6	0.0	15.7	66.6	17.8
Multiracial/Ethnic	School	0.0	6.7	46.7	46.7	0.0	0.0	80.0	20.0
	District	0.0	6.7	46.7	46.7	0.0	0.0	80.0	20.0
	State	0.2	16.1	56.4	27.3	0.5	13.9	62.1	23.5

**Grade 6 - Limited-English-Proficient**

Levels	Reading				Mathematics			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
School	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	26.9	57.7	15.4
District	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	26.9	57.7	15.4
State	1.0	60.8	36.4	1.8	2.1	41.7	52.6	3.6

**Grade 6 - Students with Disabilities**

Levels	Reading				Mathematics				
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
IEP	School	0.0	25.8	67.7	6.5	0.0	29.0	67.7	3.2
	District	0.0	25.8	67.7	6.5	0.0	29.0	67.7	3.2
	State	1.2	55.0	37.9	5.9	2.9	43.7	47.6	5.9
Non-IEP	School	0.0	8.2	47.8	44.0	0.0	4.3	56.9	38.8
	District	0.0	8.2	47.8	44.0	0.0	4.3	56.9	38.8
	State	0.1	13.1	57.7	29.1	0.2	10.6	62.1	27.2

**Grade 6 - Economically Disadvantaged**

Levels	Reading				Mathematics				
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Free/Reduced Price Lunch	School	0.0	18.9	64.4	16.7	0.0	16.7	71.9	11.5
	District	0.0	18.9	64.4	16.7	0.0	16.7	71.9	11.5
	State	0.4	29.0	58.3	12.3	0.9	23.3	63.9	11.8
Not Eligible	School	0.0	4.9	40.7	54.5	0.0	0.8	48.0	51.2
	District	0.0	4.9	40.7	54.5	0.0	0.8	48.0	51.2
	State	0.1	8.8	52.2	39.0	0.2	7.0	56.7	36.2

**Grade 7**

**Grade 7 - All**

Levels	Reading				Mathematics				Science			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
School	0.5	19.7	55.2	24.6	1.0	14.6	49.5	35.0	4.4	10.7	60.7	24.3
District	0.5	19.7	55.2	24.6	1.0	14.6	49.5	35.0	4.4	10.7	60.7	24.3
State	0.3	22.3	57.8	19.6	1.6	14.1	56.2	28.2	5.4	12.2	60.4	22.0

**Grade 7 - Gender**

Levels	Reading				Mathematics				Science				
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Male	School	1.0	25.5	53.9	19.6	1.0	17.3	46.2	35.6	6.7	10.6	58.7	24.0
	District	1.0	25.5	53.9	19.6	1.0	17.3	46.2	35.6	6.7	10.6	58.7	24.0
	State	0.4	26.1	56.7	16.9	2.0	15.1	54.2	28.8	6.3	12.1	57.3	24.4
Female	School	0.0	13.9	56.4	29.7	1.0	11.8	52.9	34.3	2.0	10.8	62.7	24.5
	District	0.0	13.9	56.4	29.7	1.0	11.8	52.9	34.3	2.0	10.8	62.7	24.5
	State	0.1	18.3	59.1	22.5	1.2	13.0	58.2	27.6	4.5	12.3	63.6	19.6

**Grade 7 - Racial/Ethnic Background**

Levels	Reading				Mathematics				Science				
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
White	School	0.0	15.7	45.7	38.6	0.0	11.4	44.3	44.3	1.4	11.4	47.1	40.0
	District	0.0	15.7	45.7	38.6	0.0	11.4	44.3	44.3	1.4	11.4	47.1	40.0
	State	0.1	14.2	59.0	26.7	0.8	8.4	53.9	36.9	2.5	6.3	59.2	32.0
Black	School	0.0	38.2	55.9	5.9	2.9	38.2	47.1	11.8	14.7	20.6	61.8	2.9
	District	0.0	38.2	55.9	5.9	2.9	38.2	47.1	11.8	14.7	20.6	61.8	2.9
	State	0.6	37.5	54.2	7.6	3.8	27.7	57.9	10.6	12.0	23.5	59.1	5.4
Hispanic	School	5.3	31.6	57.9	5.3	5.3	15.8	78.9	0.0	5.3	10.5	78.9	5.3
	District	5.3	31.6	57.9	5.3	5.3	15.8	78.9	0.0	5.3	10.5	78.9	5.3
	State	0.4	32.1	58.9	8.5	1.8	18.3	63.9	16.0	7.8	18.7	65.3	8.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	School	0.0	11.9	62.7	25.4	0.0	8.6	44.3	47.1	2.9	4.3	68.6	24.3
	District	0.0	11.9	62.7	25.4	0.0	8.6	44.3	47.1	2.9	4.3	68.6	24.3
	State	0.1	8.4	53.8	37.8	0.5	4.3	38.0	57.2	2.3	4.5	55.4	37.8
Native American	School												
	District												
	State	0.0	24.8	58.9	16.2	2.0	13.6	60.9	23.5	7.6	10.0	58.5	23.9
Multiracial/Ethnic	School	0.0	15.4	61.5	23.1	0.0	0.0	69.2	30.8	0.0	15.4	61.5	23.1
	District	0.0	15.4	61.5	23.1	0.0	0.0	69.2	30.8	0.0	15.4	61.5	23.1
	State	0.2	21.6	57.7	20.4	1.4	14.0	58.0	26.6	4.7	11.6	63.4	20.4

**Grade 7 - Limited-English-Proficient**

Levels	Reading				Mathematics				Science			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
School	0.0	69.2	30.8	0.0	0.0	37.5	50.0	12.5	12.5	37.5	50.0	0.0
District	0.0	69.2	30.8	0.0	0.0	37.5	50.0	12.5	12.5	37.5	50.0	0.0
State	1.3	69.0	28.6	1.1	5.4	39.4	50.8	4.4	22.6	35.2	40.8	1.5

**Grade 7 - Students with Disabilities**

Levels		Reading				Mathematics				Science			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
IEP	School	2.9	57.1	28.6	11.4	5.7	45.7	42.9	5.7	14.3	31.4	45.7	8.6
	District	2.9	57.1	28.6	11.4	5.7	45.7	42.9	5.7	14.3	31.4	45.7	8.6
	State	1.6	60.9	34.3	3.3	8.4	41.5	44.0	6.1	19.4	26.5	47.9	6.2
Non-IEP	School	0.0	11.9	60.7	27.4	0.0	8.2	50.9	40.9	2.3	6.4	63.7	27.5
	District	0.0	11.9	60.7	27.4	0.0	8.2	50.9	40.9	2.3	6.4	63.7	27.5
	State	0.1	16.5	61.4	22.1	0.6	10.0	58.0	31.5	3.4	10.0	62.2	24.4

**Grade 7 - Economically Disadvantaged**

Levels		Reading				Mathematics				Science			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Free/Reduced Price Lunch	School	0.0	33.7	58.7	7.6	2.1	21.1	60.0	16.8	6.3	21.1	64.2	8.4
	District	0.0	33.7	58.7	7.6	2.1	21.1	60.0	16.8	6.3	21.1	64.2	8.4
	State	0.5	34.1	57.0	8.3	2.7	21.9	61.4	14.0	9.1	19.5	62.6	8.8
Not Eligible	School	0.9	8.1	52.3	38.7	0.0	9.0	40.5	50.5	2.7	1.8	57.7	37.8
	District	0.9	8.1	52.3	38.7	0.0	9.0	40.5	50.5	2.7	1.8	57.7	37.8
	State	0.1	11.7	58.6	29.6	0.6	7.1	51.5	40.8	2.2	5.7	58.4	33.7

**Grade 8**

**Grade 8 - All**

Levels		Reading				Mathematics			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
School	0.5	14.9	71.8	12.9	1.0	13.1	47.1	38.8	
District	0.5	14.9	71.8	12.9	1.0	13.1	47.1	38.8	
State	0.2	15.7	72.4	11.7	0.6	15.7	53.0	30.7	

**Grade 8 - Gender**

Levels		Reading				Mathematics			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Male	School	1.0	11.4	76.2	11.4	0.9	13.9	46.3	38.9
	District	1.0	11.4	76.2	11.4	0.9	13.9	46.3	38.9
	State	0.3	19.0	70.4	10.3	0.8	17.5	51.3	30.4
Female	School	0.0	18.6	67.0	14.4	1.0	12.2	48.0	38.8
	District	0.0	18.6	67.0	14.4	1.0	12.2	48.0	38.8
	State	0.1	12.2	74.6	13.1	0.5	13.7	54.8	31.0

## Grade 8 - Racial/Ethnic Background

Levels	Reading				Mathematics				
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
White	School	1.3	6.3	77.5	15.0	1.2	9.9	49.4	39.5
	District	1.3	6.3	77.5	15.0	1.2	9.9	49.4	39.5
	State	0.1	9.8	74.2	15.9	0.3	9.6	50.8	39.3
Black	School	0.0	36.8	63.2	0.0	5.3	31.6	57.9	5.3
	District	0.0	36.8	63.2	0.0	5.3	31.6	57.9	5.3
	State	0.4	27.4	69.0	3.2	1.5	30.4	55.7	12.3
Hispanic	School	0.0	16.7	70.8	12.5	0.0	8.0	60.0	32.0
	District	0.0	16.7	70.8	12.5	0.0	8.0	60.0	32.0
	State	0.3	22.3	72.3	5.2	0.7	20.0	60.4	18.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	School	0.0	17.8	68.5	13.7	0.0	12.0	40.0	48.0
	District	0.0	17.8	68.5	13.7	0.0	12.0	40.0	48.0
	State	0.1	6.6	66.2	27.2	0.2	5.1	33.5	61.3
Native American	School								
	District								
	State	0.0	13.9	73.9	12.2	0.3	13.2	60.2	26.3
Multiracial/Ethnic	School								
	District								
	State	0.2	13.6	73.0	13.2	0.6	15.1	53.2	31.2

## Grade 8 - Limited-English-Proficient

Levels	Reading				Mathematics			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
School	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	57.1	14.3
District	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	57.1	14.3
State	1.0	60.1	38.4	0.5	2.3	44.1	47.8	5.8

## Grade 8 - Students with Disabilities

Levels	Reading				Mathematics				
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
IEP	School	2.6	48.7	43.6	5.1	5.1	56.4	33.3	5.1
	District	2.6	48.7	43.6	5.1	5.1	56.4	33.3	5.1
	State	1.0	52.0	45.2	1.7	3.6	49.9	41.0	5.4
Non-IEP	School	0.0	6.7	78.5	14.7	0.0	3.0	50.3	46.7
	District	0.0	6.7	78.5	14.7	0.0	3.0	50.3	46.7
	State	0.1	10.2	76.5	13.2	0.2	10.6	54.8	34.4

## Grade 8 - Economically Disadvantaged

Levels	Reading				Mathematics				
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Free/Reduced Price Lunch	School	1.1	22.7	70.5	5.7	2.2	23.1	50.5	24.2
	District	1.1	22.7	70.5	5.7	2.2	23.1	50.5	24.2
	State	0.3	24.6	70.6	4.5	1.1	24.4	58.2	16.4
Not Eligible	School	0.0	8.8	72.8	18.4	0.0	5.2	44.3	50.4
	District	0.0	8.8	72.8	18.4	0.0	5.2	44.3	50.4
	State	0.1	8.1	74.0	17.8	0.3	8.3	48.6	42.8

## 2010 ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS (AYP) Status Report

Is this school making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this school making AYP in Reading?	No	2010-11 Federal Improvement Status	Choice
Is this school making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2010-11 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning Year 1

	Percent 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
<b>State AYP Minimum Target</b>	95.0		95.0		77.5			77.5			91.0		80.0	
<b>All</b>	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	84.8		Yes	88.1		Yes	97.3	Yes		
<b>White</b>	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	92.0		Yes	92.4		Yes				
<b>Black</b>	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	65.5	70.5	Yes	61.8	73.1	No	96.8			
<b>Hispanic</b>	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	78.1		Yes	89.0		Yes				
<b>Asian/Pacific Islander</b>	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	83.7		Yes	89.4		Yes				
<b>Native American</b>														
<b>Multiracial /Ethnic</b>														
<b>LEP</b>	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes										
<b>Students with Disabilities</b>	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	53.6	58.4	No	50.5	55.5	No	95.7			
<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b>	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	74.5		Yes	78.8		Yes				

**Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP):**

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 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. \*\*\*
3. At least 91% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 80% graduation rate for high schools.

\* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2009.

\*\* Safe Harbor Targets of 77.5% 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.

**2010 DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION**

The Differentiated Accountability classification for the school is:	Focused
Is this school making (AYP) in the "ALL" subgroup in <b>reading</b> ?	Yes
Is this school making (AYP) in the "ALL" subgroup in <b>math</b> ?	Yes

In 2008, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) was one of 6 states to be chosen by the US Department of Education to participate on the Differentiated Accountability Pilot Program. The Differentiated Accountability classification **applies only to schools in federal improvement status that do not make AYP.**

The classification is a descriptor (i.e., focused or comprehensive) that is added to a school's improvement status. Current Title I requirements do not change. The classification assists in distinguishing between schools that need focused supports verses more comprehensive interventions.

If a school does make AYP in ALL-student group in both reading and math, this school will be classified as a focused school; otherwise, the school will be identified as a comprehensive school.

## PLANNED IMPROVEMENT FOR THE SCHOOL AND DISTRICT

During the 2009-10 school year, the School District 68 Board of Education continued implementation of the Strategic Plan Goal Areas which included the following initiatives identified as district priorities for planned improvement in the schools and the district. The primary focus for the 2007-2008 school year was the analysis of both formative and summative student assessment data and its application to instruction.

### **Strategic Plan Goal Area 1: Curriculum**

*The District 68 curriculum will continue to reflect high academic standards in all subject areas and the curriculum will be implemented to optimize student achievement for students at all levels.*

#### **2009-2010 District Priorities:**

**1. *Refine the role of the grade level team using the Standards in Practice (SIP) model as the Tier I component of Response to Intervention (RtI)***

Standards in Practice (SIP) was used to improve the alignment of lessons with state standards, increase the level of rigor in lessons, diagnose the aspects of the lesson students can and cannot do, and develop strategies for re-teaching. SIP was thought to assist teachers in developing Tier I interventions to increase student achievement.

This past spring, we surveyed our faculty on the usefulness of the SIP process in developing classroom-based interventions. While many benefits were noted in lesson design and collaborative team planning as a result of the SIP process, the majority of our teachers found the process cumbersome and overly time-consuming.

K-5 teacher leaders and 6-8 department chairs and team leaders met this past spring with the administrative team to reassess our district priorities and to develop more efficient and effective models for intervening with at-risk students in the general classroom. A Professional Learning Communities model was emphasized, resulting in a clearer understanding of the need to assess learning through ongoing formative assessment, collaborative data analysis of student performance, common planning of key assignments and assessments, and collaborative goal setting to guide daily instruction. This information was also shared by the superintendent with all faculty at a district wide meeting in May 2010.

As a result, goal setting templates have been created at each grade level in the area of literacy, and work has begun on developing and/or refining common key assignments and assessments to better assess learning each trimester throughout the 2010-2011 school year. This work will continue over the summer so that common assignments and assessments and grade-level and/or content-area achievement goals are in place for the start of the upcoming school year. Any identified gaps will be addressed during the 2010-2011 school year.

**2. *Apply curriculum-based assessment measures to instruction via AIMSweb and/or MAP in relation to RtI Tier I, II, and III interventions***

Both the MAP and AIMSweb assessments were administered to all students this past fall and spring. During the past school year, Map data was used to inform both reading and math instruction and AIMSweb probes were used to inform reading instruction in K-8 and mathematics intervention in 6-8. In September, 2009, this data was used to group students into various Tier II intervention groups at the elementary schools and into the reading and/or math labs at the junior high. Using quick AIMSweb assessment probes, students receiving interventions were monitored by their classroom teachers and/or grade-level teams by analyzing performance data collected every other week. By November, students who demonstrated a limited pattern of growth over six data points (twelve weeks of intervention) were either provided a different set of interventions or were moved into more intensive intervention groups (Tier III). This ongoing assessment and continual monitoring of at-risk students occurred throughout the past school year, resulting in some students achieving grade-level performance and exiting from intervention groups while

other students were recommended for more intensive interventions, recommended for an alternate intervention, or assessed for special education eligibility.

Beginning with the 2010-2011 school year, AIMSweb probes will be used K-8 as a universal screening assessment three times per year in both reading and mathematics.

**3. *Expand the K-2 writing program***

The *Units of Study for Primary Writing*, developed by researcher Lucy Calkins, was selected and implemented this past school year in all K-2 classrooms. Grading rubrics for narrative and expository writing were collaboratively developed by our teachers and utilized in all K-2 classrooms as well. Teachers have consistently reported throughout the past school year that students generated written work with more focus, depth, and overall confidence than previously seen. This initiative was viewed by all as very successful.

**4. *Incorporate No Excuses University tenets to guide students in prioritizing and setting both short-range and long-range educational goals***

Over the 2009 summer, team leaders and department chairs at OOJH developed templates to be used this past fall in helping students review their MAP scores and set achievement goals for themselves. At the elementary schools, some classrooms began experimenting with student goal-setting based on MAP scores. With the reworking of the SIP process (noted above) spring, 2010 goal-setting will become a routine practice for grade-level and/or content-area teachers during the 2010-2011 school year. Our RtI initiatives fit directly with the tenets of the *No Excuses University* systems of collaboration, assessment, data analysis, and interventions.

**5. *Expand the incorporation of technology applications, such as interactive whiteboards, in teaching and learning***

Since the 2008-2009 school year, 79 interactive whiteboards and associated peripherals have been installed in K-8 classrooms across the district along with concurrent teacher training. We will have approximately forty-seven remaining classrooms to be equipped with whiteboard technology over a remaining two-year phase-in program. During the current school year, we also purchased thirty new computers for student use in classrooms with ELL students by using Title I funds for Highland and Stenson and district funds for Devonshire. A multi-year purchase schedule is under development for classroom student-use computers with first priority to classrooms with Level I ELL students.

The expansion of technology usage across the district produced the need for more knowledgeable and coordinated oversight of technology infrastructure and instructional initiatives. The administrative team developed a proposal for additional staffing in this area, and the Board of Education approved the allocation for a Director of Instructional Technology position effective with the 2010-2011 school year.

**6. *Facilitate a K-8 Art Learning Team***

Art Learning Team recommendations were completed this past November and presented to the Board of Education in December, 2009. An Art Implementation Team, comprised of our district's art teachers, two administrative representatives, and a consultant have completed their work aligning the curriculum scope and sequence to both state and national standards as well as developing summative assessments that will guide the selection of core art assignments in the future.

## **Strategic Plan Goal Area 2: Multiculturalism and Diversity**

*District 68 will continue to embrace the diverse community within District 68 and increase cultural awareness.*

### **2009-2010 District Priorities:**

#### **1. *Continue professional development activities about socio-economic diversity and effective schooling practices***

Our professional development activities were focused throughout this past school year on the analysis of student performance during daily instruction through various formative assessments. This focus on instructional practice related to daily student performance is designed to narrow achievement gaps between our demographic subgroups and is in line with effective schooling practices related to socio-economic diversity.

To address the needs of our English language learners from diverse backgrounds, a software program, *Imagine Learning*, was piloted with 50 students in K-8; student-use computers were installed in various classrooms across the district to support the program (noted above). All of our ELL tutors and ELL faculty received training in the use of the software as well. The software programs were especially effective with students at the beginning levels of English language learning. The program will expand to 125 students next year along with the installation of additional student-use classroom computers.

Our heightened focus on diversity, and in particular, at-risk students and effective educational programming, has created sensitivity within the community regarding programming and resources directed to our successful students. A more public effort on our part to monitor and highlight the academic achievement of our successful students has begun, as reflected in the spring, 2010 MAP report to the Board, and in revisions being made to the performance scorecard.

#### **2. *Expand participation of District 68 ELL parents in opportunities provided by the Niles Township ELL Parent Center***

Since its opening in August of 2008, the ELL Parent Center has served 466 visitors, and has more than doubled its participation rate in this second year. District 68 parents are consistently represented in Center programs, with 142 participants, or 30 percent of the total, this past school year. The following twenty-two adult education programs were offered at no cost to participants in 2009-2010:

##### **ENGLISH CLASSES**

- ESL
- Family Literacy
- Mom From Another Country Blog group
- Tea-n-Talk (Conversation Class)
- Tutoring (Small Group and/or One-on-One)

##### **PARENT EDUCATION**

- Bridging the Gap: Mother-Daughter Group
- Homework Help & Parent Education
- Learning Basket for Birth to Age Three
- Positive Parenting

##### **HEALTH**

- All Kids Insurance Information
- Children's Health Information
- Flu Information
- August Back-to-School Health Fair/Immunization Clinic
- Teddy Bear Clinic
- US Health Expectations

## **CITIZENSHIP**

- Citizenship Class
- Paths to Citizenship & Paying for Higher Education

## **EMPLOYMENT**

- Upwardly Global Employment Information Workshop for Immigrants with Professional Degrees

## **COMMUNITY RESOURCE**

- Fire Safety Information
- Stenson Family Field Trip to the ELL Parent Center
- Public Transportation Workshop

## **TECHNOLOGY**

- Computer Class

Plans to expand the use of electronic communication directly to ELL families are currently being developed to include an updated website and direct e-mail. The district's new Director of Instructional Technology will oversee electronic communication and marketing for the ELL Parent Center.

### **Strategic Plan Goal Area 3: Communication**

*District 68 will continue to demonstrate open communication between all interest groups.*

#### **2009-2010 District Priorities:**

**1. *Continue to refine the District 68 Performance Scorecard to more clearly delineate Board goals and to more efficiently document longitudinal district performance data***

A subcommittee of the Board of Education is currently working with the district superintendent to refine the district's performance scorecard in alignment with the 2006 Strategic Plan. More clearly delineated outcome goals have been identified under each strategic goal, and specific performance targets will soon be added to guide the district to increasingly higher levels of performance. In addition, perception surveys will be developed for use during the 2010-2011 school year to ascertain how the performance of the district in areas ranging from student achievement to financial stability is perceived by district stakeholders. The ongoing work of the subcommittee is reported to the Board each month.

**2. *Refine the District 68 web site to ease navigation***

This past fall, the district's webmasters investigated web infrastructure software in order to streamline web page management. Concurrently, we explored cost-effective site licensing options so that new software could be used across the district. A new template for an updated web page design including easier navigation and refreshed background color was initiated, but completion of the project was halted when it became apparent that we needed more in-house expertise to guide technology-related initiatives and future planning. Further review culminated in a recommendation to the Board for additional staffing in the area of technology and a new Director of Instructional Technology position was approved by the Board at its May, 2010 meeting (noted above). We are currently receiving applications from potential candidates and interviewing will begin later this month.

**3. *Develop individual K-8 teacher web pages***

We began the year with the expectation that all teachers would have an active web page beginning with the 2010-2011 school year. To this end, a teacher web page sub-committee of the District Technology Committee formed this past fall to begin designing parameters for teacher web pages. Consistent formatting, content expectations, consistent maintenance schedules, and legal considerations were discussed concurrently with discussions involving the district web page revision, noted above. This initiative was halted when, after researching options, it became apparent that

teacher web pages may not be the most effective mode of electronic communication with our students and their parents, and that more in-house expertise was warranted to guide decision-making regarding the technology resources of the district. The new Director of Instructional Technology position has been designed to oversee electronic communication with district stakeholders; the new Director will initiate a logical, efficient electronic communication plan for teachers and the district at large during the 2010-2011 school year.

**4. *Refine the capacity of the Power School data base to support online student registration, fee payments, and parent portals to grades, attendance, and homework assignments***

Parent access to Power School data was available at OOJH for student attendance, grades, and completed and/or missing assignments throughout this past school year. Parent-teacher conference registration at our three elementary schools was successfully implemented as well; the online system for conference registration has been in place at OOJH for several years. Online fee payments were also available this past school year.

We initiated online student registration in the spring of the 2009-2010 school year, but only a third of our students registered electronically. This past spring, we used our direct e-mail system to inform parents of the newly-required online registration process for all new and continuing students. While the response rate has been slow, we do have 850 completed registrations to date with approximately 500 more to go. Building secretaries will be making personal phone calls home over the next two weeks to those families not yet registered in order to complete the online registration process this month.

***CONCLUSION***

The 2009-2010 school year was very active and productive. The refinement of our instructional practice in relation to student performance data has been a demanding, yet rewarding undertaking, with increased student achievement across all curriculum areas as our ultimate goal. Continued attention to assessment data and its application to instruction and the use of technology to enhance opportunities for communication between all district constituencies continue to drive our professional development and administrative activity. By all measures, the 2009-2010 school year has been a success.