

Local Board Approved	05/04/2010
Submitted	05/06/2010
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	06/01/2010

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	160194280260011		
District Name:	DeKalb CUSD 428	School Name:	De Kalb High School
Superintendent:	Dr. James Briscoe	Principal:	Mr. Doug Moeller
District Address:	901 S 4th St	School Address:	1515 S 4th St
City/State/Zip:	DeKalb,IL 60115 4411	City/State/Zip:	DeKalb,IL 60115 4656
District Telephone#:	Label 8157542350 Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	8157542100 Extn: 0
District Email:	jim.briscoe@dist428.org	School Email:	doug.moeller@dist428.org
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No			

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2009 AYP 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?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2009-10 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status Year 2

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		70.0			70.0			90.0		78.0	
All	98.5	Yes	98.5	Yes	58.6		No	50.3		No			87.7	Yes
White	98.7	Yes	98.7	Yes	64.5	63.7	Yes	57.6	57.7	Yes			90.5	
Black														
Hispanic	96.7	Yes	96.7	Yes	35.4		No	25.0		No				
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities													
Low Income	97.1	Yes	97.1	Yes	38.6	26.5	Yes	25.0	27.4	Yes		86.4	

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 70% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 70% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. ***
3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 70% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 78% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2008.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 70% 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.

DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION

The Differentiated Accountability classification for the school is:	-
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in reading?	-
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in math?	-

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.

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 will assist in distinguishing between schools that need focused supports versus more comprehensive interventions.

Focused-School does not make AYP overall, but does make AYP in the "ALL" students subgroup in both reading and math.

Comprehensive-School does not make AYP overall and does not make AYP in the "ALL" students subgroup in either reading or math.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2009 AMAO Report

Schools are not accountable for AMAO. This is a district level requirement only.

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

School Information								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	93.6	92.8	93.3	92.9	92.1	93.7	94.3	93.6
Truancy Rate (%)	1.3	0.5	0.5	1.3	1.4	1.1	2.7	2.0
Mobility Rate (%)	12.2	12.5	18.3	12.0	12.9	15.2	9.8	9.9
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	93.1	97.2	86.9	83.2	90.6	89.9	84.6	87.7
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	3.0	1.3	2.5	1.8	2.6	2.1	2.5	1.8
School Population (#)	1,510	1,520	1,578	1,589	1,661	1,709	1,694	1,593
Low Income (%)	19.7	27.4	21.5	23.9	26.1	28.6	30.8	29.1
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	4.4	3.4	2.7	3.1	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.5
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	78.2	77.9	77.0	76.3	76.7	75.4	74.1	72.8
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	7.4	8.0	8.3	9.1	8.3	8.1	8.8	9.7
Hispanic (%)	11.5	11.3	11.6	11.1	12.6	14.0	14.6	14.4
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	2.4	2.4	2.7	2.8	2.1	1.8	1.5	1.6
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.8	1.3

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

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	1999	83.9	6.1	7.8	2.2	0.1	-
	2000	81.8	7.3	9.5	1.4	-	-
	2001	79.9	7.3	10.4	2.3	0.1	-
	2002	78.2	7.4	11.5	2.4	0.5	-
	2003	77.9	8.0	11.3	2.4	0.5	-
	2004	77.0	8.3	11.6	2.7	0.4	-
	2005	76.3	9.1	11.1	2.8	0.5	0.2
	2006	76.7	8.3	12.6	2.1	0.2	0.1
	2007	75.4	8.1	14.0	1.8	0.2	0.5
	2008	74.1	8.8	14.6	1.5	0.2	0.8
	2009	72.8	9.7	14.4	1.6	0.3	1.3
D I S T R I C T	1999	79.0	8.8	9.5	2.5	0.1	-
	2000	77.3	8.8	11.4	2.5	0.1	-
	2001	76.5	9.2	11.7	2.5	0.2	-
	2002	74.3	9.8	13.0	2.6	0.3	-
	2003	73.2	10.2	13.7	2.6	0.3	-
	2004	72.7	10.5	14.1	2.3	0.3	-
	2005	70.3	10.8	14.6	2.3	0.3	1.7
	2006	69.6	9.9	15.9	2.0	0.2	2.4
	2007	67.5	10.3	17.4	1.9	0.2	2.7
	2008	64.8	11.9	17.4	1.9	0.2	3.9

	2009	62.3	12.3	17.9	1.9	0.2	5.5
S T A T E	1999	62.0	20.8	13.9	3.2	0.2	-
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	1999	4.1	20.3	83.5	93.4	15.4	25	1.7	3.9	93.1
	2000	3.4	13.6	86.1	94.0	15.9	10	0.7	1.8	93.0
	2001	3.3	18.5	90.5	93.3	12.0	17	1.2	2.1	92.1
	2002	4.4	19.7	92.5	93.6	12.2	21	1.3	3.0	93.1
	2003	3.4	27.4	93.0	92.8	12.5	6	0.5	1.3	97.2
	2004	2.7	21.5	94.0	93.3	18.3	7	0.5	2.5	86.9
	2005	3.1	23.9	94.0	92.9	12.0	20	1.3	1.8	83.2
	2006	3.4	26.1	97.0	92.1	12.9	23	1.4	2.6	90.6
	2007	3.5	28.6	97.0	93.7	15.2	19	1.1	2.1	89.9
	2008	3.2	30.8	98.0	94.3	9.8	45	2.7	2.5	84.6
2009	3.5	29.1	98.0	93.6	9.9	33	2.0	1.8	87.7	
D I S T R I C T	1999	4.6	26.9	93.0	94.7	15.7	60	1.3	3.9	93.1
	2000	4.9	22.6	90.0	95.7	17.3	33	0.6	1.8	93.0
	2001	5.5	23.6	96.3	94.7	18.8	52	1.1	2.1	92.1
	2002	6.0	27.5	96.8	94.7	19.0	54	1.1	3.0	93.1
	2003	5.6	30.5	97.6	94.7	19.6	22	0.5	1.3	97.2
	2004	5.8	29.8	98.0	94.6	22.1	43	0.8	2.5	86.9
	2005	5.4	31.3	98.2	94.4	18.0	41	0.8	1.8	83.2
	2006	5.9	32.5	98.8	94.3	17.9	68	1.3	2.6	90.6
	2007	6.3	34.5	97.8	94.9	17.9	58	1.1	2.1	89.9
	2008	6.9	37.4	98.9	95.3	15.4	106	1.9	2.5	84.6
2009	7.0	38.2	97.2	95.2	13.2	79	1.4	1.8	87.7	

S T A T E	1999	6.4	36.1	96.1	93.6	18.1	43,332	2.3	5.9	81.9
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1	

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	1999	1,298	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1,254	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,435	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	1,510	-	-	-	-	-	322
	2003	1,520	-	-	-	-	-	415
	2004	1,578	-	-	-	-	-	356
	2005	1,589	-	-	-	-	-	407
	2006	1,661	-	-	-	-	-	400
	2007	1,709	-	-	-	-	-	401
	2008	1,694	-	-	-	-	-	408
	2009	1,593	-	-	-	-	1	391
D I S T R I C T	1999	4,591	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	4,712	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	5,080	497	409	371	379	367	358
	2002	5,282	389	401	417	403	379	322
	2003	5,372	426	407	413	403	379	415
	2004	5,473	408	421	431	409	388	356
	2005	5,551	433	432	421	432	411	407
	2006	5,694	416	428	441	433	432	400
	2007	5,857	409	437	423	429	441	401
	2008	5,938	407	409	442	457	427	408
	2009	5,875	443	409	400	443	440	391

S T A T E	1999	1,962,026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2,044,539	164,413	157,570	159,499	160,924	156,451	138,559
	2004	2,060,048	161,329	160,246	158,367	162,933	160,271	139,504
	2005	2,062,912	156,370	158,622	160,365	162,047	162,192	142,828
	2006	2,075,277	155,155	154,372	158,822	160,362	160,911	147,500
	2007	2,077,856	155,356	153,480	154,719	162,594	159,038	150,475
	2008	2,074,167	155,578	152,895	153,347	160,039	161,310	149,710
	2009	2,070,125	156,512	152,736	152,820	155,433	158,700	144,822

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

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 7 - Educator Data**

Educator Data is available only for district level

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	1999	275	13	42,866	45	55	20	20	-	-
	2000	293	13	42,732	46	54	19	18	-	-
	2001	326	12	43,501	46	54	18	19	-	-
	2002	338	12	45,477	48	52	18	19	1	0
	2003	342	12	47,547	50	50	18	19	1	1
	2004	343	12	52,065	50	50	18	19	2	0
	2005	339	13	56,158	45	55	18	20	1	0
	2006	339	13	63,339	44	56	19	21	1	1
	2007	352	13	65,918	45	55	18	22	1	-
	2008	371	13	66,399	47	53	17	21	0	-
2009	358	12	65,513	45	55	18	21	1	-	
S T A T E	1999	119,718	15	45,337	53	47	20	18	-	-
	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	14	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	2	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1

2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1
2009	133,017	12	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1

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

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

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grade 11						
Groups	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	66.5	57.7	63.1	55.5	51.8	56.6
White	71.1	62.0	66.6	60.3	59.0	64.7
Black	44.4	29.6	41.7	26.9	21.9	35.7
Hispanic	27.8	40.7	40.6	41.5	20.0	28.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	76.9	-	84.6	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	0.0
Students with Disabilities	6.3	25.6	9.8	13.3	8.3	22.6
Low Income	55.6	25.8	33.8	30.2	19.8	35.7

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

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

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grade 11						
Groups	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	55.5	50.8	53.8	51.1	46.6	48.1
White	59.7	53.2	58.3	56.6	52.7	57.3
Black	11.1	22.2	16.7	22.2	15.6	14.3
Hispanic	33.3	50.0	25.1	31.7	25.0	20.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	69.3	-	92.3	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	0.0
Students with Disabilities	0.0	15.4	7.3	16.7	8.3	6.5
Low Income	18.5	24.1	23.9	24.7	19.6	22.4

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

Section II-A Plan Activities - Restructuring Options

Plan Requirements - District and school planners should consider what has occurred in a school that has brought it to restructuring. The restructuring plan should take into account the actions initiated in prior years. The actions required under the restructuring plan may be seen as deeper, broader, or more targeted to meet identified needs. Each restructuring plan must be submitted to ISBE with the approval of the local board no later than six months after the district's receipt of formal notification regarding the school's AYP status.

Restructuring Options - Identify which option(s) the district will initiate with an affected school that does not make AYP for a sixth calculation. Each school restructuring plan must indicate that the district is undertaking one or more of the following actions in the affected school:

- 1. reopening the school as a public charter school, consistent with Article 27A of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art.271],
- 2. replacing all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school's inability to make AYP,
- 3. entering into a contract with an entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the school as a public school,
- 4. implementing any other major restructuring of the school's governance that makes fundamental reform in:
 - i. governance and management, and/or
 - ii. financing and material resources, and/or
 - iii. staffing

Section II-B Plan Activities - Plan Description

Restructuring Plan - Describe the plan for restructuring the school discussing the rationale for option(s) selected, improvement actions prior to restructuring, progress in achieving AYP, timeline, measures for success and monitoring process.

History

For several years, DeKalb High School responded to a trend of decreasing test scores by implementing a series of short-term, unsustainable, and unevaluated initiatives in an effort to improve students' academic achievement. Many of these initiatives lasted for only a year or two and were never thoroughly evaluated for their efficacy. Curriculum mapping, CRISS reading strategies, extended day tutoring, and literacy coaching were all programs dropped after only a single year. Other initiatives such as Standards Aligned Classroom initiative, WorkKeys Interactive Network, and a math consultant lasted for two years but were soon dropped. While the research-based effectiveness of all of these programs was sound in theory, the lack of an overarching structure made them easy to implement with less than full integrity or to eliminate completely

when funding became an issue.

The District Secondary RtI Implementation Framework (see attached) was constructed in the fall of 2009 by a group of district administrators including the District #428 RtI Coordinator with input from the Content Area Coordinators. This framework, based on the accumulated research from various fields (see attached), is used by the School Improvement Team to set and monitor progress on the seven Areas of Implementation of a secondary RtI system. The seven Areas of Implementation are professional learning teams, establishing essential course content, forming common syllabi and grading systems, developing common formative assessments, the use of a multi-tiered system of support, positive behavioral support and parent and community involvement.

Although the RtI program has been expanding at the elementary and middle school levels of District 428, many of the tenets of RtI, reflected in the indicators on the Secondary RtI Implementation Framework, are still in the initial phases at the high school. In an effort to focus improvement strategies that would have the most far-reaching impact, the 2007-2008 School Improvement Team decided to focus on improving core curriculum and instruction. With feedback from several groups, the development of professional learning teams, establishing essential course content and developing common formative assessments to improve quality core curriculum and instruction delivered to all students were the first-year goals. These areas have been the primary focus of the work completed to date.

To make progress toward this goal of a quality core curriculum, a number of dramatic program changes, including changing and increasing graduation requirements from 22 to 23 credits were introduced. Unfortunately, as many of these changes altered students' scope and sequence of classes as well as increased the number of classes required for students, this amendment needed to begin with the freshman class of 2013. Thus, we have not, yet seen the corresponding increases in PSAE scores.

Some of the curricular shifts did, however, show promise as our two previously identifiable subgroups, white and economically disadvantaged students, improved sufficiently from 2008 to 2009 to make Safe Harbor. In reading, the percentage of white students who met or exceeded state standards leapt from 59.7% to 64.5%. Similar gains occurred in math where the 53% of white students who met or exceeded in 2008 grew to 57.6% in 2009. Even more impressive are the gains made by the economically disadvantaged students. Whereas only 18.3% met or exceeded in reading in 2008, that number swelled to 38.6% in 2009. Math gains for that subgroup were also significant with the 19.3% of students meeting or exceeding in 2008 increasing to 25% in 2009. The gains in reading in math were not contained solely to subgroup improvements. All of our students improved their scores in reading from 52.9% meeting in reading in 2008 to 58.6% in 2009. All students made strides in math as well; scores improved from 47.7% to 50.3% meeting and exceeding between 2008 and 2009. Despite the gains in most areas, the addition of the new Hispanic subgroup in 2009 kept the building from making AYP.

Although the PSAE data would indicate that the building made good progress in improving student achievement, one difficulty we currently face is determining what programmatic changes impacted those improvements. The restructuring plan will ensure that changes, outlined in the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 School Improvement Plans are implemented with fidelity and closely monitored. In addition, new core programs and the expanded targeted support for struggling students are fully aligned with the District 428 Strategic Plan and will, therefore, be implemented fully and evaluated for efficacy.

Responsibility for monitoring effectiveness, for securing necessary resources, and for revising the restructuring plan will fall on a reorganization of current committees into one School Improvement Team. This team is also charged with the setting and monitoring of goals associated with the district Secondary RtI Implementation Framework. Membership on the School Improvement Team will include representatives from content area departments in the building, building and district administration, and community stakeholders. This replaces the fragmented committees that currently exist in the building.

CORE COMPETENCIES

1. Professional Learning Teams

Research abounds regarding the effectiveness of professional learning communities (PLCs) (DuFour, 2005; DuFour, 2006) and learning organizations. Peter Senge defines a learning organization: "where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning to see the whole together" (1990). Very few schools can identify themselves as learning organizations, but the model includes systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, and team learning. PLCs allow for double-loop learning (Argyris & Schon, 1978) which is the management of knowledge through reflection in an effort to minimize ineffective assumptions and practices (Achinstein, 2002; Stevenson, 2001). Argyris and Schon (1978) and then Schon independently (1983) in *The Reflective Practitioner* are frequently referred to in the literature and significantly impacted this part of Senge's framework in explaining the need for individual and systemic reflection within an organization. This can be possible only with a culture of open dialogue such as is found in PLCs. Building shared vision is a long-term process and produces long-term effects. It creates commitment rather than compliance which can be spread through reinforcement (Smith, 2001). Additionally, a culture of collaboration, learning, and teaching that reflect this vision must pervade all school activities. Furthermore, there needs to exist a density of leadership that has built this shared vision.

Based on this solid foundation of research, the DeKalb High School (DHS) 2008-2009 School Improvement Plan included a plan to create a Professional Learning Community for the DHS staff to reflect on core curricular and instructional practices. As teams become more proficient in managing and using formative assessment data, school-wide supports and interventions for students who need added time or instruction can be developed. Adopting the approach of Dr. Charles Johns and Dr. Howard McMackin of the Empowered High Schools Model, the School Improvement Team proposed the development of Professional Learning Teams (PLTs) at DHS. After receiving approval from the school board in the 2008-2009, DHS altered the 2009-2010 school-week schedule in order to include a weekly late start period and began providing

professional development for teachers on working in Professional Learning Communities. In the fall of 2009, these 15 departmental teams started working under the guidance of a trained PLT Leader and the support of three RESPRO coaches to align all course curricula to ACT College Readiness Skills Standards as well as state or national content standards.

a. Essential Course Content

This spring 12 teachers in core content areas, with the financial backing of the NIU Professional Development School, completed the Survey of Enacted Curriculum to review and map current instructional practices and compare instructional content to state standards and assessments. In the fall of 2010, PLTs will begin dissecting that data and making informed curricular changes following the recommendations of Eric Osthoff (2007). After ensuring that all course content is aligned to standards, these teams will then establish common expectations, attendance policies, and grading standards to develop common course syllabi.

Following data analysis, teams will then reflect upon instructional delivery methods, scope and sequence of curricula, and student achievement. Additionally, teachers will be trained to disaggregate data to look at subgroups not making sufficient progress in classes and design school-supported interventions for those students. Individual student data will also be examined for developing interventions for those students in need of intensive individualized interventions.

b. Common syllabi

Research indicates that when teachers use common course syllabi, understanding and retention of the information by low-achieving students improves substantially (Deschler, 2006). In the spring of 2010, all teachers of common courses developed common course syllabi that will be used in the fall of 2010. These common course syllabi are used to guide essential core content, to plan and organize units, to demonstrate how those units maintain the “big ideas,” and to illustrate how critical information and concepts are related. Since a well-designed grading system can increase students’ motivation to behave in ways that will help them engage with the instructional content (Sprick, 2006), common syllabi should also indicate to parents and students the grading system used by all teachers of that course.

c. Data-based decision making

One of the most significant mental shifts that our teachers in PLTs must embrace is that of assessment FOR learning in which the teacher gathers formative student data in order to make instructional decisions (Stiggins, R.J., 2002; Black, P. & Wiliam, D., 1998; Darling-Hammond, 2002). Data tells us what we can do differently to solve the problem, eliminate the concern, create or increase progress. Professional development in the creation and monitoring of formative assessments is crucial for any teacher individually. When placed in the context of PLTs, it is equally important that teams of teachers develop common formative assessments in order to analyze data and evaluate benchmarks.

This diagnostic use of assessment to provide feedback to teachers and students over the course of instruction is called formative assessment. It stands in contrast to summative assessment, which generally takes place after a period of instruction and requires making a judgment about the learning that has occurred (e.g., by grading or scoring a test or paper). Black and Wiliam (1998a) conducted an extensive research review of 250 journal articles and book chapters, narrowed from a much larger pool, to determine whether formative assessment raises academic standards in the classroom. They concluded that efforts to strengthen formative assessment produce significant learning gains as measured by comparing the average improvements in the test scores of the students involved in the innovation with the range of scores found for typical groups of students on the same tests.

Feedback given as part of formative assessment helps learners become aware of any gaps that exist between the learning target and their current knowledge, understanding, or skill and guides them through actions necessary to obtain the goal (Ramaprasad, 1983; Sadler, 1989). This type of feedback is particularly helpful to lower-achieving students because it emphasizes that students can improve as a result of effort rather than be doomed to low achievement due to some presumed lack of innate ability.

d. Vertical teaming

Two middle schools feed into DeKalb High School, which presents challenges for the vertical alignment of curriculum. In fact, several years of fall ninth-grade EXPLORE test data revealed that freshmen are entering high school without the necessary skills to successfully complete rigorous high school curriculum. To ensure a seamless flow of instruction between both middle schools and the high school, eighth grade

language arts and math teachers will meet with DeKalb High School algebra and English teachers to perform a gap analysis to ensure that the scope and sequence of the language arts and math curriculum is aligned 6-12. These teams of teachers will clarify essential course content, develop transition assessments, analyze the results of these assessments, and make changes to curriculum at both levels (DuFour, et al., 2006).

While the effectiveness of PLTs has strong backing from research, the process is not a single-year initiative, and most research indicates that three to five years are necessary to implement such systemic change fully. The district leadership, building administration, and school board are committed to continuing the collaboration time and providing supports to the PLTs for the next several years, which should enable this initiative time to develop effectively.

2. Teacher Quality

a. Charlotte Danielson framework for enhancing professional practice

District 428 has been using an adaptation of the Charlotte Danielson framework since 2003. Currently, our use of the Danielson framework has been limited to the mentoring and evaluation process. As a part of the DHS restructuring plan, though, an instructional coach will help teachers utilize the Danielson model as an instrument to improve teacher quality throughout the course of the school year.

According to a survey devised by the District 428 Teacher Evaluation Committee and given in May 2009 to teachers (including related services and specialists), 14% of 178 respondents disagreed with the statement: “I understand the expectations in each area of the rubric and 51.7% disagreed with: “I received sufficient training on the use of the rubric.” This data reveals that the district expectations and vision for high quality teaching has not been clearly articulated.

More survey feedback indicated that the principal/teacher relationship surrounding evaluation and teacher performance was inadequate. Responses indicated 21.4% disagreed with: “Post-conference meetings provide a good opportunity to discuss the improvement of instruction.” Additionally, 30.7% disagreed with: “The feedback I receive from my evaluator is informative and specific to the improvement of instruction.” This was immediately addressed in training being provided in August 2009 to all evaluating administrators. All principals and teachers will receive additional training on the evaluation tool in 2010. The instructional coaches will imbed the framework in their work with classroom teachers in order to address the culture shift away from the Danielson framework being used merely as a means to judge performance and toward a means to examine and reflect upon instructional practice.

b. Instructional Coaches

Two fundamental components of high school reform need to take place for academic success of all students. First, ongoing instructional improvement will set the stage for student success. Secondly, structural changes must take place so students may receive the supports and interventions that will help them achieve academically (Quint, 2008).

In order to impact quality core instruction, we must address the needs of all of our teachers, not only our beginning teachers. Teaching quality is frequently cited as the prime factor of student success (Cortese, 2007). Closing the “knowing-doing” gap is essential for new and experienced teachers alike and is made possible through the use of mentors and coaches (Barlin, 2010). The best means of modeling effective teaching is through the use of instructional coaches (Wong, 2002, 2004). We will accomplish increased teacher quality by adding two instructional coaching positions to work with the 96 classroom teachers at DHS.

More research on the impact of Instructional Coaching on student achievement is needed and is being investigated (Cornett & Knight, 2008), but Knight (2007) states: “Teachers will not adopt practices that are difficult to implement...one of a site-based coach’s primary tasks is to do everything possible to make it easier for teachers to implement new teaching practices.”

Knight and Cornett, at Kansas University, have studied the impact of instructional coaching. Teachers who were coached reported they were more likely to use the new teaching practices in the future. This study suggests that instructional coaching will increase the likelihood that teachers adopt new teaching practices. The results also suggest that instructional coaching will increase the likelihood that teachers will use the practices with a higher degree of quality inside the classroom when compared with teachers who do not receive coaching support following professional development.

In Togneri’s (2003), “Beyond Islands of Excellence,” Recommendation #2 states that districts must put in place a system-wide approach to improving instruction. This includes distributing instructional leadership across stakeholders and rethinking professional development. Recommendation #5 is to adopt new approaches to professional development. Working with instructional coaches is an opportunity for continuous professional development unlike any that the teaching staff at DeKalb High School has yet experienced.

The instructional coaches will follow the Kansas University model that includes the essential characteristics of equality, choice, voice, dialogue, reflection, praxis, and reciprocity. Coaches will analyze teachers' needs, observe classes, collaborate on interventions, prepare materials, model instructional methods, and provide feedback to teachers. Program evaluation of this new corrective action will need to be closely monitored. The instructional coaches will also serve as vital resources for our newly developing professional learning communities.

c. New Teacher Induction and Mentoring

Evidence indicates that teacher qualification affects student achievement (Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002). Ensuring high quality teachers is particularly difficult in a district with large numbers of beginning teachers. There is little data that proves a causal connection between induction and student achievement, but there is much research that indicates that a high quality induction program improves teacher quality and retention. "Induction is the 'umbrella' label for the process of welcoming beginning educators to their new profession and preparing them to effectively assume the full responsibilities of the career" (Sweeny, 2008). Sweeny's work also cites seven components to successfully building a new teacher, including individualized support by mentors.

District 428 has had a state-approved two-year new teacher induction program since July 6, 2004, but inconsistencies in leadership and training have resulted in a fragmented program. A second program, that we are currently using, was approved April 3, 2009. In 2008, with the help of Consortium for Educational Change, our district applied for and received grant funds for our induction program. The last two years of mentors have received New Teacher Center training via CEC. Despite the uncertainty of grant funding, our mentor steering committee is dedicated to improving our program and is planning for 2010-2011. For each standard, consult the *Systematizing* column on the Continuum as our target.

After attending the INTC conference in February, our mentor steering committee chose to focus on "Standard 4: Site Administrator Role and Responsibilities" as our greatest priority. Principals have been completely disengaged from our induction program previously. In April 2009, in a survey for administrators developed by our district Induction Coordinator, 9 of 14 respondents answered that they had not been mentored at the start of their careers and only 7 had mentored a new teacher prior to being administrators. Questions regarding the content of the district induction program indicated that our administrators were not properly informed about the program. Even more indicative of principal unawareness concerning induction was the response regarding what they knew about their new teachers: 6 of 13 answered "I'm not sure" to "Do your second year teachers work with mentors?" All principals will engage in professional development in induction and mentoring by the start of 2010 school year.

Standard 8 address the use of formative assessments with an emphasis on documenting confidential use of formative assessment. Program leadership/district/site administrators, and induction and mentoring teams will analyze multiple forms of documentation to provide evidence of reflective processes that impact student learning and improve classroom practices. Standard 7 addresses the development of beginning teacher practice. Program leadership, district/site administrators, and induction and mentoring teams identify, monitor and consistently maintain sanctioned time for induction processes and full program implementation that regularly includes such things as analysis of student work, data collection, observations and reflective conversations. Mentors differentiate time in support of beginning teachers in ways that meet program design and are responsive to the needs of individual beginning teachers.

The New Teacher Induction program is district-wide, but we have specific goals for how it is implemented at DeKalb High School. We have added high school mentors to the district Mentor Steering Committee. In April 2010 we revised the mentor recruitment and selection process in order to ensure new teachers will have mentors within their content area.

3. DeKalb High School/Northern Illinois University Professional Development School (PDS)

a. Professional Development School Model

District 428 and Northern Illinois University have been engaged in a partnership school since 2004 at Wright Elementary School. In 2008, both organizations agreed to expand their partnership into DeKalb High School. With this expansion, a more cohesive organizational structure was developed and our collaborative goals were articulated:

- World class high school curriculum
- Positive school climate
- High level of student success
- Superior preparation of pre-service teachers

Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for both faculties

Opportunities for shared research

In July 2008, District 428 and NIU engaged in a collaborative workshop for stakeholders of both organizations. By the conclusion of this kickoff, participants had a working understanding of the RtI model, PDS model, and high school and university contexts. The collaborative group then forged a vision statement and identified gaps between the current reality and the vision. A two-year planning calendar was developed. Since that original workshop, a governance board has been established to monitor policy of not only the partnership with DHS, but also the other elementary partnership schools. The development of the partnership at DHS, however, is the first in the district to model itself as a PDS. A design team was created with sub-committees for professional development, pre-service, curriculum, and the national model.

We are following the model of PDS as outlined by Teitel in *The Professional Schools Handbook* (2003), the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Evaluation (2001), and the National Association for Professional Development Schools that includes a learning community, accountability and quality assurance, collaboration, diversity and equity, and structures, resources, and roles. All of these will be aimed at student learning outcomes.

Because of the potential power to support continuous improvement at both DHS and NIU teacher education programs, the DHS-NIU partnership chose to establish a PDS, a model that fosters innovation and rigor, when it began in 2008. A Design Team manages the partnership, supervising the work of five planning committees that will continue to meet at least monthly until the PDS is launched at the new high school building in August 2011. The Design Team and all committees have developed goals and implementation frameworks to guide their work and provide one basis for evaluation of the partnership's activities.

In addition, the partnership will use standards established by NCATE that are designed to serve PDS partnerships throughout the development process, promoting movement across stages within each standard towards implementation. The standards provide a means for feedback to the DHS-NIU partnership as it progresses and also provide a framework for evaluating the effectiveness of the partnership. There are five standards:

- Learning Community
- Accountability and Quality Assurance
- Collaboration
- Diversity and Equity
- Structures, Resources, and Roles

Each standard has a set of indicators and a range of accomplishments through four levels of a rubric: *beginning*, *developing*, *at standard*, and *leading*. A PDS is encouraged to achieve *at standard* as the minimum, with *leading* as the optimal level of achievement. In addition to meeting the goals and objectives of each PDS committee, the partnership will show progress across the four levels of the rubric.

The philosophy statement of the PDS Curriculum committee is: The Curriculum Committee provides resources, builds relationships between DHS and NIU faculty, and uses the RtI problem-solving model to improve student learning through good classroom practices by supporting Professional Learning Teams as they examine what DHS expects students to learn, assess what students have learned, and implement interventions. This committee has determined its goals to be:

1. Improve student achievement (DHS Students) through co-teaching and interventions such as STAR tutoring (based on data on student learning and achievement)
2. Improve in-service teachers (professional development for current DHS teachers) with the help of NIU resources (research)
3. Improve the quality of pre-service teachers (NIU Students) through the co-teaching format, more rigorous demands, higher expectations, and more responsibilities

b. STAR Tutoring

Another change that our PDS initiated is the addition of STAR tutoring (Students Tutors and Resources). This program began in January 2010. These tutors are NIU pre-service candidates who tutor during lunch periods and after school in English and Math. The intention of this program is to address the needs of Tier 1 students who occasionally need extra help. This is a passive intervention that relies on the student's motivation and decision to attend. According to data collected from January to April 2010 by STAR tutors, as led by Dr. Judy Cox-Henderson of NIU, 90 DHS students attended STAR tutoring across 200 sessions.

According to data analysis performed by Dr. Christine Malecki, eighty percent of the students attended only 1 or 2 times. Most of the students were tutored in algebra and geometry homework. No data could be collected regarding effectiveness of the tutoring. These preliminary findings indicate that the “drop-in” format is reaching neither a large enough population nor a targeted population. To increase participation in this tutoring program, a plan to improve communication between tutors and classroom teachers is being created.

c. Targeted Professional Development

As part of the DHS-NIU partnership curriculum development activities, math and science teachers at DHS completed the Survey of Enacted Curriculum (SEC) during the 2010 spring semester. By fall of 2010, they will begin studying the data. Participants in the survey expressed concerns about the validity of the results, since the survey was complicated and difficult to complete. Because of concerns expressed by past survey participants, the English teachers will participate in a pre-survey professional development session before completing the survey in early fall 2010. They will begin analysis in the fall as soon as results are available. NIU participants in the DHS-NIU partnership will collaborate with DHS faculty as they analyze the results of the SEC. Study of survey results will benefit NIU teacher preparation programs as well as DHS faculty by increasing understanding of how to align content knowledge and instructional methods with state and national standards. The PLTs offer a time and place for SEC data analysis. Once the results are fully understood, DHS faculty will be able to set specific goals for improvement. NIU and DHS faculty will use the survey results and analysis to determine needs for targeted professional development in content and instructional practices, which will be delivered as part of the partnership. Math, science, and English faculty will repeat the survey, probably in spring of 2012, to assess progress in aligning curriculum to state and national standards.

4. Literacy Focus

a. Adoption of Freshman Literacy Program

Several years of EXPLORE data from freshman fall testing revealed that students are entering their freshman year at DHS unprepared for the rigors of high school reading. EXPLORE data also reveals that students are coming in slightly less prepared every year, with mean reading scores on the EXPLORE falling from 15.7 in 2007 to 15.2 in 2008. Although no targets for ACT’s EPAS testing are directly aligned with the PSAE, ACT does publish College Readiness Benchmarks that predict success in entry-level college courses and mark the 2-3 points of growth in scores that ACT suggests all students should make every year in high school. As we have aligned our curriculum to ACT’s College Readiness Standards, using ACT’s College Readiness Benchmarks (CRBs) is an organic way to measure growth. In 2007, only 57% of freshmen in the class of 2011 were testing at or above ACT’s College Readiness Reading Benchmark score of 15 on the EXPLORE in reading. In 2008, that number fell to 52% for the class of 2012. Fall PLAN sophomore reading results are used as an indicator of growth made freshman year. These results revealed that the core freshman curriculum not only failed to make progress toward increasing the number of students who were meeting or exceeding ACT’s CRBs, the percentage of students on target for reaching CRBs actually fell. The class of 2011 declined from 56% on target to meet CRBs of 15 as freshmen, to 47% ready to meet the CRBs of 17 sophomore year. Similarly, the class of 2012 experienced a marked decline from 52% meeting or exceeding freshman CRBs to 41% meeting or exceeding sophomore CRBs of 17 the following year.

In light of this data, the School Improvement Team opted to highlight literacy as the focus of freshman year. Following the highly successful literacy model developed by Tim Reilly at Lincolnway Central High School, the School Improvement Team proposed a mandatory literacy course required of all freshmen who test below the 80th percentile on the 8th grade EXPLORE test. After receiving board approval for such a course, 19 teachers in 9 content areas received literacy training. Reading Across the Curriculum teacher training focused on research-based reading strategies such as vocabulary development, schema development, imaging, and examining text structures. Although not all of the teachers who were trained taught the course this year, all of the trained teachers were able to bring the knowledge of reading strategies and literacy development back to their own content areas.

As the current freshmen class of 2013 is the first class to participate in this major curricular shift, we anticipate that the intervention will increase the number of students meeting or exceeding CRBs on the fall PLAN test. Preliminary data, gathered from MAZE tests administered this year, indicate that students in the literacy classes have increased their correct responses by an average of .20 words per week, a statistically significant difference from last year’s tests in which the freshmen actually decreased in their average correct responses by .06 per week.

b. Expand Sophomore English to a full-year course

An analysis of our PLAN and Practice ACT data, an indicator of growth during sophomore year, demonstrated that sophomores are not progressing at a rate necessary to meet the increased difficulty level of a 21 on ACT’s CRBs. Whereas we would expect our sophomore curriculum to move more students into meeting or exceeding ACT’s CRBs from sophomore to junior year, we noted a profound decline, from 47% meeting or exceeding reading CRBs as sophomores in the Class of 2011 to 31% meeting or exceeding CRBs as juniors. This trend is consistent with the downward trend recorded for the last three years. Though spring

PSAE and ACT data illustrate that our juniors make great strides toward recovering their lost momentum over the course of junior year, this growth is insufficient to bridge the gap in the sophomore year. Our sophomore core curriculum has not been sufficient to help students make the progress necessary to make AYP. To remedy the obvious slump in scores during the sophomore year, the School Improvement Team proposed altering our required sophomore English curriculum. Previously, sophomores were scheduled for a single semester of tenth-grade English opposite a full semester of Speech. In light of our data, the School Improvement Team proposed expanding our sophomore offerings to include a full year of sophomore English coupled with a semester of Speech. The Class of 2013 is the first class graduating under the new graduation requirements, so 2010-11 will be the first year the course is offered. We must wait, therefore, to measure the effectiveness of this change.

5. Alteration of Math course delivery to all students

a. Single-Period Math for all students placed in Algebra

Giving all students “opportunities to learn” is a guiding principal of RtI and has proven to be a powerful factor in enhancing student achievement (Lezotte, 2005; Marzano, 2003). Further, research spanning three decades illustrates that schools must create an environment of high expectations for all students (Cotton, 2000; Newmann & Wehlage, 1996; Lezotte, 1991). Core instruction at DHS, must reflect the level of mastery we expect all students to achieve. For those students who struggle to meet those expectations, we must ensure that instructional time, not lowered expectations, is the variable.

Prior to 2007-2008, the scope and sequence of the math curriculum at DHS consisted of a number of lower-level course options for freshmen entering the building, including general math, math applications, and pre-algebra. After working with consultant Claren Einfeldt from CMath2, Inc., the math department made changes to course offerings. The department eliminated pre-algebra and started all freshmen, not already accelerated into geometry or advanced algebra, in an algebra-based course. In 2008-2009, freshmen were placed into either a single period or extended period and a half of algebra for those students who might need additional supports. Two years of data collection in the form of passing percentages and scores on common summative assessments, though, indicates that students in extended algebra are failing the common assessment at a rate four times higher than students in the regular algebra period. Reflecting on this data, the math department and building administration posited that the homogeneous grouping of all lower level students into the course may be impacting the climate of those classes, which in turn affected academic achievement. They have decided, therefore, to eliminate extended algebra and place all algebra students into a single-period algebra class beginning in the 2010-2011 school year. This decision effectively ensures that all freshmen have the opportunity to learn through advanced algebra prior to taking the PSAE junior year. Merely providing students with the “opportunity to learn” is insufficient, however, to meet the varying needs of our students. The increased rigor must be coupled with support for those students with skills deficits.

b. Algebra 2 as an option parallel to Advanced Algebra

With the change in the sequence of the math curriculum to start all freshmen in algebra, the three year math requirement for graduation mandated that all students pass Advanced Algebra to graduate from high school. To help differentiate this very theoretical subject for students who struggle with math, the math department opted to create a course of similar rigor to Advanced Algebra and based on the same National Council of Teachers of Math standards that would use more concrete, application-type strategies for instruction and assessment. The course would complement tests and quizzes with project-based assessments for Algebra 2 students. These students would still be college-bound but would approach material differently.

6. PBIS Implementation

Recognizing that students achieve more in an environment with a firmly established set of behavioral expectations and a generally positive atmosphere, DeKalb High School was one of the first high schools in the state to integrate Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) into the overall school culture in 2004-2005. The PBIS Universal Team has created a behavior matrix explaining appropriate school behavior. They have also instituted a method of delivery for teaching staff and students expected behaviors in a variety of situations. A school-wide system of student and staff incentives has also been established and is integrated into the culture of the building. Regular data team meetings to review discipline and attendance data drive the initiatives and interventions coming from the Universal Team. Data is then shared with the faculty through the Dean’s Barb Behavior newsletter, which includes positive referral information, discipline and attendance data. Reviews of the Benchmarks of Quality, School-wide Evaluation Tool, and Self-Assessment Survey indicate an effective program that reacts fluidly to the discipline needs of the building. After examining the data from this year, the team will roll out the theme for next year “Do the Right Thing, Right Now!” to address the increasing trend of students showing disrespect by being disruptive in the classroom and disrespectful toward substitute teachers. Again, the building and district administration has fully committed resources to making PBIS a part of the Three-Tiered Model.

7. Support for Students with IEPs in General Education Classes

a and b. Resource classes for “Core Plus More” and flexible service delivery

DHS, in accordance with the goals of our Secondary RtI Implementation Framework, is allowing for flexible use of specialized support staff in all core areas. Historically, students with significant basic skills deficits received intensive instruction, delivered by a special education teacher, for a full period each day. Other students in need of support in a given content area were provided with either daily support from a special education teacher in a general education classroom or they could voluntarily access support on an as needed basis.

In 2010-2011, students eligible for special education services will receive support that is specifically tailored to their individual needs. In all core content areas, DHS will continue to offer intensive level courses for students with basic skill deficits as well as general education co-taught classes; however, a content-area specific resource class will now be offered in addition to the previous programming (e. g. Algebra Resource or Humanities X). This aligns with the “Core plus More” philosophy of the RtI framework. Additionally, assistants will support in inclusion classes by providing logistical support. On the other hand, certified special education teachers will be scheduled more flexibly, enabling them to provide focused support to special education students within the general education course sections based on data (student performance on classroom assessments, lab performance etc.).

For the upcoming school year special and general education teachers will have common planning time to ensure that the content within any supported course aligns with the corresponding general education course. These collaborative teams will work together to develop a collective understanding of student learning and appropriate strategies for differentiating instruction within the general education setting to meet the needs of all students.

8. Structured Academic Intervention Periods

a. Structured Intervention Period with a Math Interventionists

Currently, math interventions for non IEP students at DeKalb High School rely on teachers trying to differentiate instruction for all students within a 48 minute period and on students voluntarily seeking tutoring from teachers or NIU volunteers during a study hall, lunch period, or outside the school day. DuFour et al. contend, however, that such interventions lead to wildly varying degrees of help for students. Rather, a school must have a “collective response” to struggling students that is timely, directive, systematic, and exists within the confines of the school day. If time and resources are the constants, then student achievement will always be the variable with some students meeting the rigorous expectations and some not meeting them. In contrast, if high standards are the constant for all students, then time and resources must be the flexible variables in a students’ journey toward academic achievement. DuFour et al. further argue, “It is disingenuous for any school to claim its purpose is to help all students learn at high levels and then fail to create a system of intervention to give struggling students additional time and support for learning.” Not all students will acquire the skills and knowledge of a course at the same pace, so students who are struggling to meet the high expectations of a solid core curriculum must have additional time and support built into the school day (DuFour et al., 2006).

Reorganizing our current model of self-directed, voluntary tutoring will require that students identified from 8th grade data as struggling in math will be assigned a study hall period. Students identified by data teams examining common formative assessments will then use that information to identify students in need of additional time and resources. Struggling students will be reassigned from study hall to a Structured Academic Intervention Period with a certified teacher who will work both to tutor the students to keep up with daily work while also working on skill development and remediation to ensure that any deficiencies are addressed. The students’ performance on future assessments will be monitored by both the classroom teacher and the intervention teacher. When data indicates that the student is achieving to a predetermined level of proficiency in the class, the student will be removed from the intervention period and scheduled back into a study hall. Thus, the intervention period is fluid, responding to the specific needs of the student.

At the upper grades in middle school and at the high school level, targeted support shifts from a focus on basic skill acquisition to supporting success in content area instruction. Research on this shift includes studies on teaching routines, those interventions focused on what teachers can use, and learning strategies, which have a focus on what students use for success (Strategic Learning Center, 2007).

Response to Intervention (RTI) begins with high-quality instruction and universal screening for ALL students. Whereas high-quality instruction seeks to prevent mathematics difficulties, screening allows for early detection of difficulties if they emerge (VanDerheyden, 2008). Universal screening and progress monitoring tools sample the curriculum and are indicators of general proficiency in a content area. The AAIMS, (Algebra Assessment and Instruction: Meeting Standards), is one such tool for use with students in Algebra (Foegen, 2007a).

In a multi-tiered system of support there are increasingly intensive supports available to match student need. For students who are in need of focused content area support, supplemental small group instruction aimed at building targeted proficiencies has been found effective (Burdette, 2006). This targeted support is provided by a highly qualified “interventionist” in a flexible system that is driven by student performance data (Shinn, 2008). Through direct work with students, the math interventionist imbeds learning strategies into instruction not only to improve outcomes, but also to increase student self sufficiency.

9. Increased Support for Hispanic Population

The term “Hispanic” does not describe a group of students at DeKalb High School with a unified set of characteristics or a prevailing set of attitudes. There is an enormous range of diversity among these students. Some students live in homes where Spanish is the only language spoken, while others speak English exclusively. Some families embrace the traditions of their home culture, while others have fully assimilated into the culture of the United States after several generations of living here. Students are charged with navigating both the home culture and the school culture and bridge the gaps with little to no assistance. Low achievement both on the EPAS and academic success within the classroom, as well as overrepresentation in discipline data, establish a need for support and educational interventions.

a. ELL Sheltered Literacy

Because English Language Learners have distinctly different literacy needs than the general education population, DHS will implement a sheltered ELL literacy course in the fall of 2010. ESL students will be placed into an ELL Literacy course tiered to their academic and language levels. The standard freshman literacy curriculum will be adapted to address both the literacy growth and language acquisition needs of this targeted group.

b. Parent programs

Other interventions implemented for Hispanic students are the Latino Parent Night and the Incoming ELL Students Orientation. During the Latino Parent Night counselors and administrators worked with parents of Hispanic students by providing them with current information related to the students’ performance and progress towards completing the graduation requirements. During the Incoming ELL Students’ Orientation, incoming ELL students and their families were provided with information related to the resources available, school expectations, graduation requirements, and course offerings. Both activities were presented in Spanish and parents were given the contact information of a Spanish-speaking administrator. For both activities one hundred percent of the students were Hispanic students.

Hispanic students identified by attendance, discipline, and/or academic issues are targeted for home visits by DHS administrators. Administrators and parents collaborate to resolve a myriad of student issues.

10. Plan for School Within A School

a. Freshman Academy for all incoming 9th graders

University of Chicago researcher Elaine Allensworth (2005), along with others, has found that the first-year high school grades are the best predictors of whether students will succeed in the rest of their high school career. Students who fail more than half of their freshmen classes and would need substantial interventions to graduate represent the biggest category of ninth graders who ultimately drop out of school. However, students who only fail a few classes are also at high risk of not graduating. Allensworth’s research found that failing just one semester-long class in the freshman year decreases the likelihood of graduating by 23 percent.

Data from DeKalb High School indicates that 23% of current 9th graders failed at least one course in the fall of 2010. With this in mind, teachers at DeKalb High School will begin planning a freshman academy to address both academics and a sense of belonging as students transition from middle school to high school. The goal of this freshman academy would be to make sure all freshman students are prepared with the skills to be successful in the regular college-preparatory classes the sophomore year.

11. Summer Opportunity for Academic Reinforcement (SOAR)

a. Summer bridge program from 8th to 9th grade

The SOAR program is based upon a similar program at Belleville High School East in Belleville, Illinois. The SOAR program targets incoming freshmen who have been identified as at-risk for not completing high school in four years. These eighth-grade students (generally Tier-2 students) may be recommended for SOAR placement for chronic attendance issues, excessive disciplinary referrals, or academic weaknesses. Students are generally not considered for SOAR placement if they are considered for enrollment in alternative placements, have IEPs that mandate intensive classes, or are ELL students for whom there would be a duplication

of services.

SOAR began in the summer of 2008, with 26 identified students attending a five-week, summer school program. The program focuses on reading and math with an additional emphasis on life skills (building relationships and career exploration) and study skills (organizational skills, listening skills, reading strategies, note-taking strategies, and test-taking strategies). Upon successful completion of the five-week program, students earn a .5 elective credit.

Although scheduling sometimes presents challenges, the intent of the program is to build on the rapport established during the summer and design students' schedules so that they will have at least one of their SOAR teachers during the school day.

There has been a 51% decrease in absenteeism from middle school to high school for the identified SOAR students. Twenty-four percent of the identified SOAR students have had an increase in behavior referrals at the high school, while 63% of the identified SOAR students have had a decrease in behavior referrals. The remaining 13% of the identified SOAR students did not have behavior referral issues at either the middle school or the high school. Currently only 18% of the identified SOAR students are on track to graduate within a four-year period, in terms of credits earned per semester.

b. Voluntary school-year support for SOAR students

The PBIS secondary team follows up the summer SOAR program with a research-based check-in program for students. This is a passive intervention where SOAR students are met by the check-in coordinators and invited to join the program. The purpose of the before school check-in with SOAR students is to build relationships with the students and to check on homework completion and the students' readiness to begin the school day. Students are offered school supplies on a daily basis along with a light breakfast.

The check-in coordinators began monitoring grades with this target group weekly during lunch time in an effort to increase student awareness of the importance of academics and attendance. Students are met by their counselor or check-in mentor and self-monitor their grade percentage, attendance, and tardiness using the Skyward student access. Students keep track of their progress and color code personal data. Although students are not passing 100% of their classes, they understand the importance of homework completion and set personal goals for success each week. Eighty percent of the check-in students are making progress toward graduation this year.

This voluntary program has 52% of the identified 2009-2010 SOAR students checking in on a regular basis. One hundred percent of the SOAR students who participate in check-in have had a decrease in absenteeism from middle school to high school.

In examining data from middle school to high school, seventy-three percent of the SOAR students participating in check-in have had a decrease in discipline referrals, seven percent of the students have not had a change in the number of discipline referrals, seven percent of the students have seen an increase in discipline referrals, and thirteen percent have no discipline history.

Twenty-seven percent of the check-in students are on track to graduate on time, forty-seven percent of the check-in students are within .5 credits to graduate on time, and twenty-six percent of the check-in students are not on target to graduate within a four- year period.

12. Parent Communication

a. Administrative Home Visits

The administration is using home visits to target parents of students with attendance concerns and multiple discipline referrals. Additionally, students who are in danger of dropping out of school have been identified and those families have been visited. The goals during the visits are to increase communication with parents and to collaborate and plan interventions that will help the students to become academically successful at DHS.

b. Teacher training in Skyward Email Blasts

The District 428 educational administrative software system, Skyward, has created many opportunities to increase parents' awareness of their children's educational progress. Daily as well as cumulative grades, attendance reports, and discipline logs can all be accessed by parents from any computer once parents are given an access code. This system has been a great success, with over one million hits in an eight-month period in 2009-2010. To fully use the capability of this software, teachers will be given the opportunity to be trained to send email blasts to all parents in a given class so that pertinent class information can be easily disseminated to parents.

References

- Achinstein, B. (2002). *Community, diversity, and conflict among school teachers*.
- Allensworth, E., and Quinn, J. (2005). *The on-track indicator as a predictor of high school Graduation*. Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago.
- Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1978) *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Reading, Mass: Addison Wesley.
- Attinello, J. (2004). The value of teacher portfolios for evaluation and professional growth. *National Association of Secondary School Principals* 90 (2), 132-152.
- Barlin, D. (2010). Better mentoring, better teachers three factors that help ensure successful Programs. *Education Week*.
- Bernstein, E. (2004). What teacher evaluation should know and be able to do. *National Association of Secondary School Principals* 88 (639), 80-88.
- Black, P., and Wiliam, D. (1998a). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education*, 5 (1): 7-74.
- Burdette, P. (2006). *Response to Intervention as it Relates to Early Intervening Services: Recommendations*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education.
- Cornett, J., & Knight, J. (2008). Research on Coaching. In J. Knight (Ed.) *Coaching: Approaches and perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Cotton, K. (2000). *The schooling practices that matter most*. Alexandria, VA: The Association For Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice*, 2nd edition. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Danielson, C. & McGreal, T.L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Darling-Hammond, L. & Youngs, P. (2002). Defining “highly qualified teachers.” *Educational Researcher*, 31 (9), 13-25.
- Descheler, D. (2006). *A Closer look: Closing the Performance Gap*. Retrived December 17, 2007, from Center for Research on Learning: <http://www.kucri.org>.
- DuFour, R., Eaker, R. & DuFour R. (Eds.) (2005) *On common ground: The power of professional learning communities*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., Many, T. (2006). *Learning by doing: A handbook for professional learning communities at work*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press
- Foegen, A., & Olson, J. (2007a). *Effects of teachers' engagement with student data on students' Algebra Progress technical report*. Project AAIMS, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Iowa State University, Ames, IA.
- Glickman, C. (2007). *Supervision and instructional leadership*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Ingersoll, R. & Smith, T.M. (2004). Do teacher induction and mentoring matter? *NASSP Bulletin* 88 (638), 28-40.
- Knight, J. (2007). Five key points to building a coaching program. *National Staff Development Council* 28 (1), 26-31.
- Knight, J. & Cornett, J. (2008). *Studying the impact of instructional coaching*. Kansas Coaching Project at the Center for Research on Learning. University of Kansas
- Lezotte, L. (1991). *Correlates of effective schools: The first and second generation*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products. Retrieved January 6, 2006, from <http://www.effectiveschools.com/freestuff.asp>.
- Lezotte, L. (2005). More effective schools: Professional learning communities in action. In R. DuFour, R. Eaker, and R. DuFour (Eds.), *On common ground: The power of professional learning communities* (pp. 171-191). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Marzano, R. (2003). *What works is schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2007). *55,000 Reasons to believe: The impact of national board certification on teacher quality in America*.

Arlington, VA: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Newman, F. & Wehlage, G. (1996). Restructuring for authentic student achievement. In F. Newmann (Ed.), *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality* (pp. 286-310). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Osthoff, E. (2007). *Using SEC data to improve curriculum content alignment in Oregon's Canyon Falls School District: Initial step and evolving challenges*. Wisconsin Center for Education Research

Quint, J. (2006). *Meeting five critical challenges of high school reform: Lessons from research on three reform models*. New York:MDRC.

Ramaprasad, A. (1983). On the definition of feedback. *Behavioral Science*, 28 (1): 4-13. *Science*, 18 (2): 119-144.

Sadler, D. R. (1998). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18 (2): 119-144.

Schon, D.A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York, NY: Basic.

Senge, P.M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Doubleday. Senge, P.M., et.al. (2000). *Schools that learn: a fifth discipline fieldbook for educators, parents, and everyone who cares about education*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Shinn, M. R. (2008). Implementatioin in Secondary Schools. In S. L. Fernley, *Answer Book on RTI* (pp. 8:1 - 8:17). Horsham, PA: LRP Publications.

Smith, M.K. (2001). Peter Senge and the learning organization. Retrieved January 26, 2007 from www.infed.org/thinkers/senge.htm

Smith, T.M. & Ingersoll, R.M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal* 41 (3), 681-714.

Sprick, R. B. (2006). *Discipline in the secondary classroom* (2nd ed). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

St. Maurice, H. (2004). Teacher portfolios come of age: A preliminary study. *National Association of Secondary School Principals* 88 (639), 15-25.

Strategic Learning Center. (2007). *The Strategic Instruction Model Content Literacy Continuum Leveraging Research to Promote School-Wide Literacy in Secondary Schools*. Retrieved March 10, 2008, from www.smarttogether.org

Stiggins, R. J. (2002). Assessment crisis: The absence of assessment for learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*.

Sweeny, B.W. (2008). *Leading the teacher induction and mentoring programs* 2nd ed. ThousandOaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Teitel, L. (2003). *The professional development schools handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Togneri, W. (2003). Beyond islands of excellence: What districts can do to improve instruction Achievement in all schools – *A Leadership Brief: Learning First Alliance*: Baltimore, MD.

Turley, S., Powers, K., & Nakai, K. (2006). Beginning teachers' confidence before and after induction. *Action in Teacher Education* 28 (1), 27-39.

VanDerHeyden, A. (n.d.). *RTI and Math Instruction*. Retrieved December 3, 2008, from RTI Action Network: www.rtinetwork.org

Wong, H.K. (2002). The best form of professional development. *Educational Leadership* 59 (6), 52-54.

Wong, H.K. (2004). Induction programs that keep new teachers teaching and improving. *NASSP Bulletin* 88 (638), 41-58.

Numbers in () correspond to the area of Implementation on the Secondary Rtl Implementation Framework

Focus		Core Competencies	Methods for Measurement	Timeline	Expected Outcomes

1. Professional Learning Teams (1)	a.	Essential Course Content (2) aligned to ACT, state and/or national standards Standardized test preparation in all academic content areas	Common formative and summative assessments (5) EPAS(EXPLORE, PLAN, ACT) data PSAE data Survey of Enacted Curriculum	09-10 professional development in deconstructing standards 09-10 PLTs began work of aligning content to ACT College Readiness Standards and national and/or state content area standards 10-11 Teams work to imbed standardized test preparation throughout curriculum and across content areas	Average rate of improvement of 3 points per year in EPAS data Make Safe Harbor in math and reading for all identifiable subgroups in 2011-2012 Consistent curriculum in alike courses
	b.	Common Syllabi including standardized grading system (3)	Principal review	09-10 professional development on effective course syllabi 09-10 common template created (disseminated to all teachers) 09-10 PLTs create common syllabi for alike courses August 2010 Common syllabi completed and used in courses	Consistent student expectations of courses and teachers
	c.	Data-based decision making (1)	Common formative and summative assessments (5)	By October 2010 Staff development in writing reliable and valid common formative and summative assessments	Teams record instructional changes made as a result of common formative and summative assessments

			Student EPAS performance data	<p>10-11 Professional Development in data teaming</p> <p>10-11 Data managing systems selected</p> <p>11-12 Data teams fully implemented with corresponding technology</p>	
	d.	Vertical teaming to provide articulation in English and math (8 th grade teachers included)	<p>Gap analysis</p> <p>Transition assessments aligned to articulated standards</p>	<p>10-11 vertical team organization, goal setting, and development of transition assessments in English and math</p> <p>11-12 begin use of transition assessments</p>	<p>Improved scope and sequence with clarified essential outcomes of each grade level/course</p> <p>Student skills will match the expected curriculum standards as evidenced by performance on transition assessments (formative and summative)</p>
2. Teacher Quality (1)	a.	Full implementation of the Charlotte Danielson framework as a tool for instructional practice (1)	Teacher evaluation climate survey	<p>03-04 District adopts Danielson framework for evaluation purposes only</p> <p>August 2008 District Evaluation Plan approved by ISBE</p> <p>09-10 and ongoing All administrators trained in use of evaluation tools and the Danielson framework for teaching</p>	<p>90% of teachers will report an understanding and use of Danielson framework to improve teaching</p> <p>80% of teachers will report that they received sufficient training on the use of the rubrics</p>

				September 2010 and ongoing with instructional coaches—professional development in using framework to drive professional practices	90% of teachers will report that post-conference meetings provide a good opportunity to discuss the improvement of instruction 80% of teachers will report that the feedback they receive from their evaluator is informative and specific to the improvement of instruction
	b.	2-Instructional Coaches (4)	Self-reported teacher checklist of instructional methods Instructional Coach effectiveness tool Aggregate use of coach walkthrough tool	By August 2010, create and/or select a tool for measuring the effectiveness of instructional coach By August 2010, create and/or select a coach walkthrough tool September 2010 professional development in accessing instructional coaches 2010-11 Instructional coaches gather classroom observation data, assist data teams, and incorporate literacy across content areas	Effectiveness tool will indicate increased use of varied instructional methods and confidence in using them Effectiveness tool will indicate increased feelings of trust and collegiality among staff members Aggregate departmental data will indicate use of literacy strategies and varied instructional methods
	c.	New Teacher Induction and Mentoring (2)	New Teacher Induction Survey for administrators, new teachers, and mentors	07-08 Training new teachers in Danielson framework	On the New Teacher Induction survey, all DHS administrators will indicate an understanding of

			ICE 21 formative assessment tools	<p>07-09 Mentors trained by CEC in the New Teacher Center model</p> <p>May 2009 new teacher induction survey administered to new teachers, mentors, and administrators</p> <p>09-10 Induction Coordinator began professional development with principals</p> <p>February 2010 INTC conference and mentor steering committee began aligning our existing program to the Continuum</p> <p>April 2010 (3) high school mentors added to mentor steering committee in order to address content-area needs of new teachers</p> <p>April 2010 Mentor steering committee revised the mentor selection/assignment tool and process</p>	<p>the program and their roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>Teams of mentors and proteges document reflective practice.</p> <p>Teams will report that they have met at their sanctioned/scheduled time 80% of the time</p>
3. DeKalb High School/Northern Illinois University Professional Development School (7)	a.	Professional Development School Model	<p>NCATE PDS Standards</p> <p>Partnership Implementation Framework</p>	<p>July 2008 (3)-day Workshop for DHS and NIU</p> <p>September 2008 Follow up workshop to recruit more NIU faculty</p> <p>08-09 Design Team and sub-</p>	<p>Move across at least one level within each standard</p> <p>PDS implemented in August 2011</p>

			<p>committees developed</p> <p>09-10 Established regular committee meeting schedule and goals</p> <p>March 2010 DHS/NIU participants at NAPDS conference</p> <p>Fall 10-11 establish baseline on standards and strategize implementation of each standard</p> <p>Fall 11-12 measure progress on standards</p>	
b.	STAR (Students Tutors and Resources) tutoring (4)	Survey data	<p>January 2010 - Pilot and monitor for effectiveness</p> <p>2010-2011 Expand tutoring program; develop system to increase communication between teachers and tutors</p>	Increase student participation in tutoring from the current 5% of student population to 10%
c.	Targeted Professional Development	Survey of Enacted Curriculum (SEC) results	<p>February 2010 (24) math and science teachers completed the Survey of Enacted Curriculum</p> <p>Fall 2010 pre-survey training and entire English department will complete the SEC</p> <p>10-11 Collaborative data</p>	<p>Improved curricular alignment to ACT college readiness standards in math, science, and English</p> <p>Specific measurable goals will be determined through study of the</p>

				analysis, professional development targeted to gaps in alignment, and goal setting 11-12 Math, science and English teachers will complete the SEC again	SEC results
4. Literacy Focus (4)	a.	Adoption of Freshman Literacy Program modeled after Lincoln Way Central High School	Common formative and summative assessments (5) Freshman EXPLORE to sophomore PLAN data	08-09 Program and curriculum development June 2009 training of (19) teachers in Reading Across the Curriculum 09-10 Full implementation and monitoring 10-11 Continuation of Literacy program 10-11 Professional development of more teachers in the Literacy Program (Reading Across the Curriculum)	Statistically significant improvement on common summative assessments Average of 3 points of growth in reading between freshman EXPLORE and sophomore PLAN data
	b.	Expand Sophomore English to a full-year course (4)	Common formative and summative assessments (5) Sophomore PLAN to ACT data	09-10 Curriculum development 10-11 common assessment development August 2010 Course implemented 11-12 Common assessments used	Average of 3 points of growth in reading between freshman EXPLORE and sophomore PLAN data

5. Alteration of Math course delivery to all students (4)	a.	Single-period math for all students placed in Algebra (4)	Common formative and summative assessments (5) EPAS data Algebra probes	09-10 Targeted students enrolled in Algebra Extended (longer class period) May 2010 Training in use of manipulatives in Algebra with Math Consultant June 2010 TI-Nspire Calculator Training in the Algebra Classroom July 2010 Gifted/Differentiation instruction professional development August 2010 Implement new math sequence starting all freshmen in single period of algebra or higher in math Summer 2010 training in developing formative assessments	Improved student scores on common formative and summative assessments EPAS—Average rate of improvement of 3 points per year Statistically significant improvement in number of students who meet expectations on the algebra probe
	b.	Algebra 2 as an option parallel to Advanced Algebra (4)	Common formative and summative assessments (5) EPAS data	June 2010 Algebra 2 Curriculum development August 2010 Course implementation	EPAS – Average rate of Improvement of 3 points per year Common formative and summative assessments
6. PBIS Implementation (6)	a.	Fully Implemented PBIS Universal Program	Discipline and attendance data	2005 Professional development and planning 2006-2008 Program growth	Decrease discipline referrals

			<p>Positive Referral data</p> <p>Benchmarks of Quality survey</p> <p>Discipline matrix developed through the dean's office</p>	<p>2008-2009 Fully implemented universal team</p>	<p>Decrease unexcused absences and tardies</p> <p>Increase number of positive referrals</p> <p>Consequences for discipline will become consistent across the building</p>
<p>7. Support for Students with IEPs in General Education Classes (4)</p>	a.	<p>Resource classes for "Core Plus More"</p>	<p>1.Number of students with IEP's in general education curriculum</p> <p>2.Student success in the least restrictive environment as measured by earned credits</p> <p>3.Performance on assessments comparable to peers participating in same core curriculum</p> <p>4.Algebra probes</p> <p>5.% of students meeting IEP goals as reported by My Service Tracker</p>	<p>Humanities Extension</p> <p>09-10 pilot program</p> <p>10-11 continued</p> <p>Algebra 1 Resource, Geometry Resource, Algebra 2 Resource</p> <p>10-11 reinstated support model</p> <p>Spring 2009 Teacher training on My Service Tracker</p>	<p>Data for number of students in general education courses</p> <p>Progression through the course sequence/ earned credits</p> <p>Increased scores on Algebra probes</p> <p>Increase in students meeting IEP goals</p>

				09-10 full implementation of My Service Tracker	Common formative and summative assessments
				10-11 Establish baseline data	
				11-12 Analyze and monitor data	
	b.	Flexible service delivery that allows for differentiation of services based on student need (Consult minutes vs. Direct minutes of service)	<p>1.Number of students with IEP's in general education curriculum</p> <p>2.Student success in the least restrictive environment as measured by earned credits</p> <p>3.Performance on assessments comparable to peers participating in same core curriculum</p> <p>4.Algebra probes</p> <p>5.% of students meeting IEP goals as reported by My Service Tracker</p>	<p>09-10 piloted in Science</p> <p>10-11 refined and expanded for Humanities and Math</p>	<p>Data for number of students in general education courses</p> <p>Progression through the course sequence/ earned credits</p> <p>Increased Algebra probe scores</p> <p>Increase in students meeting IEP goals</p> <p>Common formative and summative assessments</p>
8. Structured Academic Intervention Periods (4)	a.	Structured Academic Intervention Periods with a Math Interventionist	<p>Formative assessment data</p> <p>Algebra probes</p>	April 2010 Students at risk for failure in algebra identified and placed in study hall	Improvement on formative assessments

				<p>August 2010 Program pilot with certified math teacher</p> <p>2011-2012 Program growth with focus on supporting core program objectives</p>	<p>The rates of improvement of students in the intervention exceed the rate of improvement of a typically developing student on Algebra probes</p>
9. Increase support for Hispanic population (4)	a.	<p>Adoption of Freshman Literacy Program modeled after Lincoln Way Central High School and</p> <p>Adapted for a sheltered literacy course</p>	<p>Common formative and summative assessments (5)</p> <p>Freshman EXPLORE to sophomore PLAN data</p>	<p>08-09 Program and curriculum development</p> <p>June 2009 training of (17) teachers in Reading Across the Curriculum including (2) teachers of ELL students</p> <p>09-10 Implementation in general education courses</p> <p>10-11 Implementation of adapted curriculum for sheltered instruction</p>	<p>Statistically significant improvement on common summative assessments</p> <p>Average of 3 points of growth in reading between freshman EXPLORE and sophomore PLAN data</p>
	b.	<p>Parent programs targeting the needs of the Spanish-speaking population</p>	<p>Parent attendance data</p>	<p>08-09 and on-going annual Latino Parent night</p> <p>09-10 and ongoing Spanish translator for parent orientation night</p> <p>March 2010 ELL Incoming Student Orientation</p>	<p>Increased parent participation in conferences, Latino Parent night, and ELL Incoming Student Orientation night</p>
10. Plan and Implement	a.	<p>Freshman Academy for all</p>	<p>Indicators of best practice for</p>	<p>August 2010 Establish task force</p>	<p>Establishment of a task force to</p>

<p>School Within a School (4)</p>		<p>incoming 9th graders</p>	<p>small learning communities</p> <p>Task force action step progress</p>	<p>By December 2010 School-within-school developed</p> <p>2011-2012 Program implemented with program evaluation system in place</p>	<p>research and complete a proposal for a freshman academy</p>
<p>11. Summer Opportunity for Academic Reinforcement (SOAR) Program (4)</p>	<p>a.</p>	<p>Summer bridge program from 8th to 9th grade</p>	<p>School Motivation and Learning Strategies Inventory (SMALSI)</p> <p>Number of course credits earned</p> <p>Existing formative assessments in literacy and math that are gathered in those courses</p>	<p>Spring of 08 Pilot Check in group</p> <p>08-09 School year SOAR student check in began: discipline, attendance, grades tracked</p> <p>09-10 SOAR student check in with discipline, attendance, and weekly self-monitoring of grades with an adult mentor</p>	<p>Post-test on SMALSI will be in the average range.</p> <p>Students of SOAR will start high school with .5 elective credit.</p> <p>Rate of improvement on formative assessments will be greater than or equal to 9th grade student average.</p>
	<p>b.</p>	<p>Voluntary school year support through Freshman check-in and weekly grade monitoring</p>	<p>Discipline and attendance data</p> <p>Number of course credits earned</p>	<p>09-10 and ongoing Freshmen check-ins</p>	<p>The cohort group of check-in students will have the same average number of discipline referrals and attendance as the regular freshman population</p> <p>The cohort group of check-in students will earn 80% of the credits they attempt each semester</p>

1. Profe Learn Com (PLC)

<p>12. Parent Communication</p> <p>(7)</p>	<p>a.</p>	<p>Administrative Home Visits</p>	<p>Discipline and attendance data</p> <p>Number of course credits earned</p>	<p>Spring 2010 administrators began visiting the homes of students who were in danger of not graduating and had a number of discipline referrals.</p> <p>10-11 Continuation of home visits</p>	<p>Improve communication between the school and parents</p> <p>For the targeted population:</p> <p>Decrease attendance issues</p> <p>Increase graduation rate</p> <p>Decrease number of discipline referrals</p>
	<p>b.</p>	<p>Teacher email blasts as a communication option</p>	<p>Self-reported teacher use of email blasts to parents</p>	<p>May 2010 establish baseline data of email blast use</p> <p>September 2010 professional development in sending email blasts to parents of all students</p>	<p>Increase in self-reported number of email blasts sent with class information</p>

Area of Implementation	Includes:	Phase 1 Vision and Professional Development	Phase 2 Skill Building	Phase 3 Application in Practice	Phase 4 Established Custom/Institutionalization
		Choose a model for establishing essential content	PLC's map their current curriculum content PLC's record the time that is	Teachers implement curriculum content as prioritized for student groups and aligned to standards	Formative assessment data is used to adjust instruction when groups of students demonstrate that they have not acquired the essential course content

2. Essential Course Content

Aligning professional development

Learning standards

Inventory existing work and identify gaps. (those staff who have not had training on any model)

Develop a Professional Development model consistent with Implementation Framework goals

All 6-12 staff will participate in professional development on chosen model

PLT's become familiar with the appropriate standards relating to their content area

currently devoted to components of current curriculum content

PLC's align their course content to appropriate standards

PLC's will prioritize content, including reasoning and problem solving skills, for students with varying instructional levels

PLC's will develop common formative assessments that measure the essential course content

Implementation integrity will be accomplished through coaching sessions

Provide continued targeted professional development for all staff based on the Implementation Framework

PLC's will use common formative assessments that measure the essential course content

Monitor progress toward full implementation using integrity data.

Continue targeted Professional Development as necessary.

--	--	--	--	--	--

Area of Implementation	Includes:	Phase 1 Vision and Professional Development	Phase 2 Skill Building	Phase 3 Application in Practice	Phase 4 Established Custom/Institutionalization
		Investigate models and formats of effective syllabi and encourage individual use of course syllabi Investigate/examine	Adopt a model of effective syllabi for universal use Align course syllabi and grading policies with district policies	Teachers will consistently use the adopted model of course syllabi. Include description of a consistent grading system in district wide communications	Ongoing review and revision of course syllabi and alignment to district policies All aspects of the system of evaluation and grading, are communicated to students and

<p>3. Consistent Course Syllabi and Planning</p>	<p><i>Grading system</i></p>	<p>description of essential course content in individual syllabi and determine the methods by which student achievement will be measured in each course (e.g., homework, participation, formative and summative assessments, papers, projects, presentations, etc.)</p>	<p>Incorporate essential course content into common course syllabi</p>	<p>Develop plan for students to monitor individual grades and academic progress</p>	<p>parents</p>
	<p><i>Attendance policies</i></p>	<p>Inventory existing district attendance procedures/policies and data</p>	<p>Establish relative importance (weights) for each student evaluation method for each course(from phase 1)</p>	<p>Implement research-based attendance intervention and use data to make decisions.</p>	<p>Use attendance data to review school wide programming on a consistent basis</p>
	<p>Examine consistency of individual classroom policies with district attendance/grading policies</p>	<p>Develop/review attendance policy at building/district level</p>	<p>Align attendance policies district-wide</p>	<p>Establish a system for providing stakeholders with feedback regarding scores on stated evaluation methods</p>	
	<p>Investigate research-based attendance procedures/policies</p>	<p>Develop/define research-based attendance interventions based upon data and prior investigation</p>	<p>Provide Professional Development on grading and attendance systems for</p>		

			stakeholders		
--	--	--	--------------	--	--

Area of Implementation	Includes:	Phase 1 Vision and Professional Development	Phase 2 Skill Building	Phase 3 Application in Practice	Phase 4 Established Custom/Institutionalization
	<i>Scheduling</i>	<p>Collaboratively identify a desired model for a building schedule that allows time for targeted and intensive support</p> <p>Inventory the existing schedule and available resources within each building (personnel, materials, & interventions)</p>	<p>Develop systematic procedures for implementing Tier 3 interventions</p> <p>Teams are provided with training, guided practice and performance feedback on methods to monitor intervention integrity.</p>	<p>Implement scheduling model and monitor effectiveness</p> <p>Building uses multiple Tier 3 interventions with fidelity and integrity with variation in time, intensity, and instruction</p> <p>Tier 3 interventions are</p>	<p>Building schedule is reviewed yearly and adjusted to insure that it complements targeted and intensive support needs</p> <p>Research-based interventions are continually developed and modified based on student need and data collection.</p>

<p>4. Multi tiered system of support (3TM)</p>	<p><i>Research-based</i></p>		<p>Support staff is trained in the use of Instructional Planning Forms (IPF's).</p>	<p>supplemental to the core curriculum</p>	<p>Intervention integrity is monitored through each school's data team.</p>
	<p><i>Tier 3 tools</i></p>	<p>Building leadership team evaluates how the schedule of the school day supports instruction</p>	<p>Support staff engages in activities that are in line with a multi tiered model.</p>	<p>Building leadership team insures that the schedule of the school day supports instruction within a multi tiered model by writing measurable school improvement goals.</p>	<p>Building leadership team continues to write and evaluate measurable goals for the school improvement process that include the components of a multi tiered system of support</p>
	<p><i>Flexible use of support staff</i></p>	<p>Inventory existing Tier 3 tools</p>	<p>Research-based, skill building interventions and resources for research-based instructional strategies are available at each building.</p>	<p>Teachers demonstrate understanding of the differences between accommodations, modifications, and interventions by applying them in practice</p>	
		<p>Provide Professional Development for research-based Tier 3 interventions.</p>	<p>Staff practices the differences between accommodations, modifications, and interventions with performance feedback from coaches</p>	<p>Building utilizes support staff flexibly to meet the needs of individual children.</p>	
		<p>Building staff understands Response to Intervention (Rtl) and the term "research based."</p>			
		<p>Staff taught the differences between accommodations, modifications, and interventions</p>			

Area of Implementation	Includes:	Phase 1 Vision and Professional Development	Phase 2 Skill Building	Phase 3 Application in Practice	Phase 4 Established Custom/Institutionalization
		<p>Inventory the existing data sources and their use (e.g. essential content, skills, and performance).</p> <p>All staff receives training on the appropriate use of</p>	<p>Screening and progress monitoring tools are available to gather data for the identification of students' academic and behavioral needs</p>	<p>Establish and implement routines for benchmarking and progress monitoring</p> <p>Establish and implement a clear schedule for regular, systematic data analysis</p>	<p>Regularly monitor integrity of procedures and processes for analyzing and utilizing universal screening, progress monitoring, common assessments, and high-stakes tests.</p>

<p>5. Common formative assessment</p>	<p><i>Universal screening</i></p>	<p>assessment data, including general outcome measures, diagnostic assessments, and high-stakes tests.</p>	<p>Entrance and exit decision rules for academic and behavioral concerns at Tiers 2 & 3 are established.</p>	<p>(including universal screening, progress monitoring, and formative assessment data)</p>	<p>When data indicate student academic and behavioral concerns a formal Problem-Solving process is routinely followed with integrity</p>
	<p><i>Progress monitoring</i></p>	<p>Staff is trained on the critical components of common assessments and understands basic test development principles as delineated within the common assessment research</p>	<p>Staff develops common formative assessments based on learning standards/essential content in accordance with test development principles and common assessment research to track progress on learning standards/essential content</p>	<p>Measurable goals are used to evaluate student progress in all three tiers.</p>	<p>Formative assessment data is used to inform student and teacher decisions, plan interventions and differentiate instruction for all students</p>
	<p><i>High-stakes tests</i></p>	<p>Targeted building personnel participate in training on data management systems.</p>	<p>A system for sharing individual student plans across grade levels is established</p>	<p>Student performance data from a variety of sources is disaggregated by subgroup</p> <p>Available school-wide data are presented at an all-school staff meeting.</p> <p>Individual problem-solving plans are shared with all relevant staff.</p>	

--	--	--	--	--	--

Area of Implementation	Includes:	Phase 1 Vision and Professional Development	Phase 2 Skill Building	Phase 3 Application in Practice	Phase 4 Established Custom/Institutionalization
		<p>Explore possible models and their effectiveness for the secondary level.</p> <p>Investigate positive behavioral support models for completing critical content, including structure and logistics for implementation.</p>	<p>Establish and implement a school wide universal team</p> <p>Designate and train internal behavior coaches</p> <p>School wide behavioral expectations established</p>	<p>Teams meet regularly to review data and develop interventions at all three levels</p> <p>School wide behavioral expectations are posted throughout the building</p>	<p>Monitor the effectiveness of the behavioral model by regularly examining school wide trends in behavioral data</p> <p>Teams meet regularly to review data and develop interventions at all three levels</p>

Area of Implementation	Includes:	Phase 1 Vision and Professional Development	Phase 2 Skill Building	Phase 3 Application in Practice	Phase 4 Established Custom/Institutionalization
<p>7. Parent and Community Involvement</p>	<i>Information</i>	<p>Building staff have communicated the purpose of the multi tiered model to parents and other stakeholders</p>	<p>Building staff have provided information to parents on RtI when asked or when an academic or behavioral concern arises.</p>	<p>School and district websites contain information for parents and stakeholders who want to gain a stronger understanding of RtI</p>	<p>Building staff follow district protocol for educating parents and stakeholders about RtI</p>
	<i>Notification</i>	<p>Parents are informed when student concerns arise</p>	<p>Parent notification of group-level interventions occurs</p>	<p>Universal screening, common formative assessments, and high stakes assessment data are shared with parents and stakeholders in a systematic way as delineated in the strategic plan</p>	<p>Progress monitoring data are provided to parents of students receiving tier 2 or tier 3 interventions on a systematic, ongoing basis</p>
	<i>Participation</i>	<p>Parents are informed when their student is referred for Individual problem solving</p>	<p>Parents are participants in the individual problem-solving process</p>		<p>All data sources (universal screening, common formative assessment, high stakes tests) are easily available for all</p>

		<p>Parents and stakeholders have access to high stakes test data via school report cards.</p>	<p>Parents have access to high stakes assessment results (aggregated via school and district website)</p> <p>District leadership explores possible protocols for educating and involving parents in the Rtl process.</p>	<p>Involve community groups and agencies in the tiered system of support for all students</p> <p>District adopts a protocol for educating and involving parents in the Rtl process.</p>	<p>stakeholders to access as delineated in the strategic plan</p>
--	--	---	--	---	---

Teacher On Special Assignment –Instructional Coach (TOSA)

DHS

Job Description

ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

➤ Provide information and guidance regarding a range of effective and innovative research-based instructional practices including Danielson’s Framework, Marzano’s strategies, and Jim McKnight’s work through various activities such as:

- individual discussions (informal and formal)
- coaching sessions
- demonstration lessons with pre- and post-discussion/analysis
- study groups
- staff meetings
- professional development programs
- classroom observations

- Research and provide resources to staff regarding research-based instructional practices in the following four areas:

classroom management

content

instructional teaching practices

assessment techniques

Coordinate and support the infusion of literacy across all content areas.

Maintain paperwork consistently, appropriately and in a timely manner.

- Maintain the confidentiality of schools, teachers, and classrooms.
- Coordinate/facilitate instructional material pilots and implementations (including software and web resources).

SKILLS AND COMPETENCIES:

- An excellent classroom teacher with in-depth knowledge of sound instructional practice
- Ability to present to teacher groups and to facilitate teacher groups
- Ability to gather data from classroom observations
- Understand cross-curricular instructional practice
- Understand and apply differentiated instruction
- Knowledge of quality formative assessment
- Ability to engage in collaborative dialogue to improve instructional practice
- Ability to establish and maintain positive relationships with DHS staff

➤ Ability to coach and to model good instruction

-
- *This is a non-evaluative role
- *This position will not have supervisory issues/duties
- *This is not an administrative position
-

EVALUATION:

The TOSA for Instructional Coach will be evaluated by a member of the DHS administrative team.

Teacher On Special Assignment -Math Interventionist (TOSA)

DHS

Job Description

ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

Provide Tier 2 (small group) and Tier 3 (individual support) to algebra students identified as needing support beyond the core curriculum.

Gather data to help algebra teachers implement research-based instructional practices matched to identified student needs.

Provide Tier 2 supports such as: Introduction of a skill to be learned (pre-teaching), teaching a prerequisite skill to mastery, fluency building of an already acquired skill, guided practice to apply the skill under novel conditions

Support teachers to provide the following research-based instructional practices: sequencing content, ensuring that skills are taught to mastery as instruction progresses, and adequate corrective feedback matched to the student's level of competence.

Match the task difficulty to the capability of the identified students and provide high numbers of opportunities to practice the skill

Use data to provide the appropriate interventions matched to the targeted students' needs.

SKILLS AND COMPETENCIES

Evidence of experience and knowledge in using fundamental principles of mathematics teaching and learning, such as but not limited to

- Research-based instructional practices in the area of mathematics
- Inquiry based theory and research
- Familiarity with the DHS math curriculum
- Formative assessment practices and progress-monitoring
- Differentiated instructional practices
- Data-driven decision making
- Effective classroom management skills
- Use of manipulatives

- Computer literacy (SmartBoard)

Professionalism as demonstrated by the ability to manage time effectively, work with different stakeholders (students, teachers, staff, administrators)

Ability to establish a cooperative working relationship with the DHS staff

*This is a non-evaluative role

*This position will not have supervisory issues/duties

*This is not an administrative position

-

EVALUATION: The TOSA for Math Interventionist will be evaluated by a member of the DHS administrative team.

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: **05/04/2010**

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

RESTRUCTURING DESCRIPTION Yes No

Does the plan describe an option for restructuring allowed in the law?

 Yes No

Does the district make the case that the option selected is appropriate for the school?

 Yes No

Does the plan explain corrective actions (Title I funded schools) or other district improvement strategies implemented at the school that will remain in place or be a part of the restructuring plan?

 Yes No

Do state assessment data indicate that the school is showing progress from corrective actions? Is the continuation of these actions warranted or reasonable?

 Yes No

Does the plan provide a timeline for implementing the restructuring option and the corrective actions that precede it?

 Yes No N/A

Does the plan identify the measures for success associated with the district's actions and restructuring strategy?

 Yes No

What benchmarks of success are planned to monitor progress of this plan and who is responsible for overseeing the implementation and monitoring of this plan?

APPROVAL DATE OF BOARD Yes No

This section includes the certification of local board approval and provides ISBE staff the opportunity to reflect on the school improvement plan overall.

RESTRUCTURING PLAN COMMENTSILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Restructuring Conference Call
May 26, 2010

10:00 AM

Participants

District:

Doug Moeller - Principal, DeKalb High School

Roger Scott - Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment, Dist 428

Jennie Hueber - Assistant Principal, DeKalb High School

Kelly Powell - Assessment Coordinator, DeKalb High School

Cheryl Callighan - RESPRO Coach

JoAnn Miller - RESPRO Coach

Deb Schmalholz - RESPRO Coach

ISBE

Carol Diedrichsen, Innovation and Improvement, Principal Consultant

Dr. Roger Scott provided the following summary via email 05 25 10:

Items for Clarification

A. Overseer of the Implementation of the Plan

Doug Moeller, Principal

Roger Scott, Assistant Superintendent

B. Staff Buy-in

The School Improvement Team who created the restructuring plan is composed of a broad representation of departments in the building. These representatives were the conduits between individual teachers and the School Improvement Team. In addition, copies of the restructuring plan were transmitted to all staff via email and voluntary question and answer sessions were held for staff as well.

C. Community Involvement or Participation in the Development of the Plan

Although the truncated timetable prohibited extensive community involvement, faculty members who are parents and community members participated in writing the plan. Northern Illinois University faculty members who serve on the Professional Development School committee also participated in writing the plan. We are currently actively recruiting parents and community stakeholders to participate in the oversight of the plan.

D. Anticipated Challenges for the Next School Year

See Number 4 Below

3. Identify Indicators of Progress

Refer to Restructuring Grid “Methods of Measurement” and “Expected Outcomes”

4. Barriers and Challenges to Implementation

- Uncertainty of state funding levels to help offset the costs of professional development, teacher release time, a data management system, etc.
- Time and scheduling for vertical articulation
- Building consensus among stakeholders about the implementation of the plan

Deb Schmalholz from Dekalb took the following notes from our phone conference. Carol Diedrichsen's additions are inserted in blue.

I. Introductions

II. Initial remarks from Carol

- Compliments on comprehensive restructuring plan submitted especially when so short-timed
- Work already underway is impressive

CD: It is apparent that district and school leaders did not wait for state or federal requirements to prompt needed, sensible changes. It is apparent that leaders have acknowledged learning needs and have moved to address these, showing respect and support for students and staff. The result is that staff buy-in seems to be strong. The

improvement efforts are gaining momentum.

Jennie elaborated on above:

- Professional Learning Teams (PLTs) have accomplished much this year so far (meetings every Wednesday morning)
- Little prior preparation for enacting PLTs but teachers embraced concept of collegiality and worked on core essential content, standards-based curriculum and common syllabi per course

Kelly responded to Carol question re: “zeroes” (grading policy):

- Conversation on that topic not there yet but will emerge as work on the RTI / 3TM Framework continues into next year

CD: I was glad to hear that the changes are touching the core of instruction and student learning. You have not been shying away from tough conversations and a review of traditional practice if not benefiting students. It will be interesting to see what’s next with your assessment and grading policies.

III. Carol question: What are you wondering about?

Doug -- New staff for next year need to be brought on board to DHS plan

in progress and PLTs

-- Coordinating with middle school principals to have vertical

articulation as frequently as possible, as well as meetings of

MS and HS staff during PLT meeting times

-- All teachers are in PLTs; special educators meet in content areas

as much as possible

Roger - EXPLORE test now administered to 8th graders this year, helpful

in placing 9th graders

Carol - District-wide addressing of issues is laudable

CD: You have not regarded the status at the high school as a “problem” at the high school. Instead you have reviewed your system and are working towards improving opportunities system wide.

IV. Additional information reported in response to Carol’s questions:

- At mid-term, 83% of staff responded to survey in support of PLTs
- Main reason for 17% non-support: loss of class time
- No walk-throughs this year but will be instituted next year with instructional coaches (new) gathering data; also supportive of collegial environment
- Teachers’ union is on board; two key representatives and the union president are on leadership committees
- Phenomenal, dedicated staff willing to take hard look at themselves and accept responsibility for student achievement

- Plan's narrative captures unique essence of the history of DHS culture and how it is now changing in positive ways
- RESPRO support and coaching were well-utilized and constitute a huge piece of positive changes

CD: I am happy that your staff has largely embraced the opportunity of time for collaborative work. This is an essential not fringe element for improvement.

- V. Roger Questions: What artifacts / documentation does ISBE now require,
and what to expect for reporting back to ISBE?

Carol and Lori Response:

- ISBE will look at scores only. District and DHS is responsible for implementing, monitoring and supporting the plan on the local level, revising as needed.
- Multi-year plan; documents /artifacts maintained as per plan.
- RESPRO / Regional support will be ramped up (state-wide). RESPRO will continue to work with and provide tools to DHS to keep on track as a learning community.
- Carol requesting informal progress reports as well as notice of any support needed as plan moves forward.
- Doug extended invitation—come visit DHS any Wednesday morning!

CD: Restructuring plans are multiyear plans. The details of implementation are renewed in subsequent improvement plans. The restructuring plan itself remains unless a district decides that the restructuring experiment has not effected the needed change and that a radical shift of direction is required. At that point, districts have often contacted me and resubmitted a plan.

- VI. Final comments:

- Carol strongly recommending DHS/District 428 consider presenting its restructuring plan at regional conferences as a model for others, particularly Title I schools, to follow.
- Mutual appreciation for concern, support, efforts on behalf of Dekalb students.

CD: Restructuring takes place in a context: this is what is particularly good about yours. Your review of what has been needed district wide to effect change is worth imitation. Best to you.

Respectfully submitted by Deb Schmalholz

Please do not hesitate to contact me for assistance or to celebrate your wins along the way. Rooting for you, Carol Diedrichsen ISBE Innovation and Improvement
cdiedric@isbe.net

May 10, 2010

This plan shows that district planners have outlined a coordinated system of support to effect significant change in the high school consistent with restructuring requirements. The final aspect of the review of this plan is a brief conversation with me. This plan includes changes for student access to curriculum and significant changes for how staff will collaborate and serve students. (Who is responsible for overseeing the implementation of this plan?) I look forward to talking with you about your plan.

Topics I hope we can discuss:

overseer of the implementation of the plan

staff buy-in

community involvement or participation in the development of the plan

anticipated challenges for the next school year.

Please contact me about a convenient time for us to catch up about your plan. Best to you, Carol Diedrichsen ISBE Innovation and Improvement cdiedric@isbe.net