

**TO: The Board of Education and
Dr. Albert Roberts, Supt. of Schools**

FROM: Dr. Kevin M. Anderson

BOARD DATE: October 26, 2010

SUBJECT: FYI: 2010 Summer School Report

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide the Board of Education with a description and cost review from the 2010 summer school programs. A look at student performance within the 2010 summer school was intended to be provided, but the amount of time spent on the new Lexia reading program was insufficient to yield meaningful results after only 3 weeks. Improved performance reports will be available next summer from Lexia and MAP.

The information in this report is divided into three sections:

1. School Daze/Music Camp
2. Early Start/Middle School Academy
3. Extended Year Summer School

Surveys about the effectiveness of the Early Start and Middle School Academy programs were given to summer school students, teachers and parents. The data collected for the 2010 summer school will be used by the Summer School Committee which will meet later this year to determine dates, areas of instruction, and grade level changes and/or improvements for the 2011 summer school programs.

Sections of this report were prepared by:

Stephanie Avila, School Daze Secretary
Faith Cole, Teacher-Leader for Early Start/Middle School Academy
Paula Andries, Co-Supervisor for Extended School Year

Attachment: School Daze and Music Camp Offerings

OAK PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT 97
Oak Park, Illinois

October 26, 2010

FYI: 2010 Summer School Report

This report summarizes summer school information from the 2010 summer school sessions.

Goal Statements Addressed:

- a. Guide the ongoing monitoring of student achievement throughout the year using both classroom and testing data to assess progress.

Strategic Plan Connection:

The Strategic Plan end results that are most closely tied to this program are:

1. (1.3) Adapt instruction to meet the needs of different academic abilities and learning styles.
2. (1.11) Determine whether to continue, discontinue or modify academic programs based on data.

The purpose of this report is to provide the Board of Education with a description and cost review from the 2010 summer school programs. The information in this report is divided into three sections:

1. School Daze/Music Camp
2. Middle School Academy/Early Start
3. Extended Year Summer School

1. School Daze/Music Camp

School Daze and Music Camp are tuition-based programs. The student cost in School Daze for a 90-minute class was \$100 and a 3 hour class was \$200. School Daze was composed of high interest classes that were offered at Hatch and Lincoln from June 8 through June 25. This past year there were 44 classes proposed and 26 classes actually run, taught by 23 teachers at two schools, Hatch and Lincoln. One hundred fifty-four students participated in this summer school. Scholarships were available from District 97 and the Township for students who were unable to pay the tuition.

Summer Music Camp was another summer program that included band, orchestra, and chorus. In addition, Jazz Camp was added to the music offerings in summer 2010. This past summer the camps were held from August 2 to August 13. Ninety-nine students

attended classes that were taught by 7 teachers. A fee of \$75 for each general music session was charged. Because of the time involved, the fee for Jazz Camp was \$150. Scholarships were available for students who wished to participate but lacked the funds to do so.

Program cost - School Days/Music Camp

\$32,117 Teachers and building supervisors – Salaries

\$ 5,526 Music Camp Teachers

\$ 914 Supplies/Printing

\$38,557 Total

Revenue

\$32,747 checks, credit cards and cash

\$ 3,676 Township gr. 4-8 scholarships

<-\$2,200> refunds to parents who changed their mind

\$34,223 Total

Potential Revenue: \$9,793 District absorbed K-3 scholarships (34 students)

\$4,334 - Total district budget impact for School Daze/Music Camp summer schools

If all scholarship costs had been paid as fees in grades K-3, the District would have finished \$5,459 to the good.

2. Early Start/Middle School Academy

Summer school for students needing extra help in reading was held at three elementary schools and in reading and math at the two middle schools. Based on the recommendations of the Middle School principals and teachers, middle school attendance (Middle School Academy) was mandatory during the summer of 2010 for students who completed 6th and 7th grades. The elementary program was not mandatory for the summer of 2010, including those students who attended the Middle School Academy as incoming 6th graders.

Early Start classes met in the morning from June 28th through July 16th at Lincoln, Longfellow, and Whittier in two sessions each day: K-2 students met from 8:00 to 10:00, and 3-4 students met from 10:00 – 12:00. Hatch, Mann, Holmes, and Whittier students met at Whittier. Irving and Lincoln students met at Lincoln, while Beye and Longfellow students met at Longfellow. There were 242 students who participated in Early Start, most of whom were Tier 2 RTI students needing additional reading instruction.

Early Start Program Costs

\$ 10,122 Early Start Coordinators (3 sites plus 1 overall supervisor)

\$ 39,826 Early Start teacher salaries (27 teachers)

\$ 708 Printing and Postage

\$ 50,656 Total Expense

The middle school program started on June 8th and ended on July 9th. One hundred forty fifth, sixth and seventh graders attended the morning Middle School Academy at the middle schools.

Middle School Academy Program Cost

\$ 5,832 Middle Level Coordinators (2 building supervisors plus one shared supervisor)

\$42,369 Middle Level teacher salaries (14 teachers)

\$48,201 Total Expense

\$98,857 - Early Start/Middle School Academy Summer School Total Expense

(Down from \$104,163 in summer 2009)

Early Start and Middle School Academy Overview

(submitted by Faith Cole, Teacher-Leader for Summer School)

This report summarizes the 2010 summer school program for District 97 and provides suggestions for improvements for future summer programs. The 2010 summer school program consisted of two different sections: the **Early Start** program for elementary school students and the **Middle School Academy** for middle school students. I collected comments from teachers, parents, and students about the two programs. Their responses varied greatly and are summarized below.

Early Start Program Overview:

Students in grades K-5 were recommended by their teacher for the Early Start Program if they received a grade of two or lower on their second or third trimester report cards. In addition, students who were identified as Tier 2 RTI students were recommended for the Early Start program. This summer's program ran for two hours a day, five days a week for a total of three weeks, with a focus on reading and literacy. On a daily basis, the students spent 30-45 minutes working with either the Reading Plus or the Lexia computer programs followed by additional classroom instruction using the Open Court reading series.

1. Elementary School Teachers'/Supervisors' Survey Findings:

a. Positives:

- Teachers were placed according to their home schools and consequently were able to work with students they were already familiar with.

- Many teachers agreed that the smaller class size was a significant improvement. The typical class size was ten students.
- The Lexia Reading Program and Reading Plus for K-5 was a good supplement to the curriculum.
- Teachers were allowed the flexibility to select their curriculum, which was considered a strong positive.

b. Suggestions for Possible Future Program Changes:

- Progress reports and report cards need to be updated to reflect what is being taught.
- Longer summer school hours are needed; the program should be extended to three hours instead of two hours.
- Access to IEPs for the summer school students would be beneficial.
- Student forms should be given to teachers prior to the start of summer school.
- More instruction is needed for computer program usage and additional training on how to analyze the scores
- Access to more authentic literature for summer school students.
- It was recommended that the Lexia reading computer program for K-1 be cut down to 20 minutes instead of 30 minutes a day.
- Communication is needed between the Hephzibah Summer program and Longfellow supervisor regarding the list of students that would be attending both the summer school program and the scheduled field trips and other activities.

2. Parents' - Early Start Students Survey Findings:

a. Positives:

- Summer school classes were in close proximity to home.
- Parents were already familiar with the teachers from their home schools.
- The progress reports were helpful and informative.
- The summer program was a great refresher for students.

b. Suggestions for future summer programs:

- The summer school recommendation letter should be sent out earlier in the year (March).
- A reminder letter should be sent out at the beginning of the summer school program to the parents.
- The parents agreed with the teachers that a longer school day was needed. The recommendation was to move to a three-hour day.
- Math should be incorporated into the program
- The recommended dates for summer school were June/July.

Middle School Overview:

This five week mandatory program began the first Monday after the regular school term ended in June. Students were divided based on grade level and by teams. This program ran for three hours a day, five days a week and lasted for five weeks. Reading and math topics were emphasized, with social studies and science instruction integrated into the lessons.

1. Middle School Teachers'/Supervisors' Survey Findings for Julian and Brooks:

a. Positives:

- Teachers were placed according to their home schools and consequently were able to work with students they were already familiar with.
- The length of the program was appropriate.

b. Suggestions for future summer programs:

- An easier system is needed to receive and collect materials. The curriculum should be more consistent and focused.
- Access is needed to additional reading materials for students.
-

2. Parents' Middle School Academy Survey Findings for Julian and Brooks:

a. Positives:

- Parents were already familiar with the teachers from their home schools.
- The length of program was adequate.
- A few homework assignments were provided on a nightly basis.

b. Suggestions for future summer programs

- Classes should be held in air-conditioned rooms.

3. Middle School Students' Survey Findings for Julian and Brooks:

a. Positives:

- The teachers were more "interactive."
- Exceptional teachers.

b. Suggestions for future summer programs:

- The rooms were too hot. The air conditioner did not seem to be working correctly.
- The students felt homework was unnecessary.
- The students wanted smaller classes. Typical class sizes were about seventeen students.

3. Extended Year Summer School

(Submitted by Paula Andries, ESY Co-Supervisor)

Student Recommendation Process-

The students were recommended for Extended School Year at their annual review IEP meetings. The team would discuss if the program would benefit the student and their identified needs. The teachers collected data to quantify the regression that would take place over an extended break and how long it would take for the student to recoup the identified skill. The data was sent to central office with a recommendation sheet. Letters were sent to the parents and guardians to let them know that they have been recommended to participate in the program. Parents and guardians were asked to reply if their child would attend.

Staffing-

Based on the reply from the parent/guardian letters, a needs assessment was completed to see how many teachers would be necessary for the program. In district teachers and assistants were invited to apply. Applications were sent out in March. We identified that we would need 4 Early Childhood teachers, 4 Developmentally Delayed teachers, 3 Daily Living Program teachers, and 7 Cross-Categorical teachers. In addition to the classroom teachers, we had 2 Social Workers, 2 Speech Therapists, 1 Occupational Therapist, 1 Physical Therapist and 1 School Nurse. A Technical Support Specialist supported the assistive technology needs of the students. Two teachers taught SLANT to children that would benefit from this instruction. Each Early Childhood and Daily Living Program classrooms had two teaching assistants. The other classrooms had one teaching assistant assigned to them, in addition to any one-to-one individual assistant that was needed by a student. There was one office assistant for the program. There were Coordinators for the program, one that focused on the Low-Incident population and the other that worked with the Early Childhood and Cross-Categorical populations.

In-district staff filled the following position: 2 Coordinators, 1 Early Childhood teacher, 2 Cross-Categorical teachers, 2 DD teachers, 1 DLP teacher, 2 resource (SLANT) teachers, 2 Social Workers, 2 Speech Therapists, 1 Physical Therapist, 1 Occupational Therapist.

Interviews were conducted for hire the remaining summer staff needed. The following positions were filled: 3 Early Childhood teachers, 2 DLP teachers, 2 DD teachers, 5 Cross-Categorical teachers, 1 nurse. We were unable to fill the nurse's position, so the vacancy was contracted out through an agency.

The teaching assistants were hired from within the district. Human Resources informed the special education department that employees that are currently in a teaching assistant position will be the first to be hired, and then the positions can then subsequently be filled with lunchroom managers, secretaries and nurse attendants.

Staff attendance was an ongoing issue throughout the summer. There were days when there were as many as seven teaching assistants and 2 teachers were absent on the same day.

Building Needs-

Fourteen classrooms were used on the first floor and three classrooms on the second floor. We needed to have access to the elevators. Some of the students required air conditioning because of medical needs, but most classrooms were not air conditioned. Two fans were provided for each non-air conditioned classroom. In addition to the classroom space, the program also utilized the school office, nurse's office, workroom, workroom office, therapy room, social work office, media center and the computer lab.

The fourteen buses used the drop-off circle for drop-off and pick-up. Not all buses would fit in the turn around at the same time, so arrival and dismissal was staggered.

The playground equipment was not utilized during the program. Some classes did use the field area for classroom activities. Teachers were asked to carry a cell phone with the office having their number when they left the building.

Technology-

The Director of Special Education, Extended School Year Coordinator, Assistive Technology Coordinator and the Technology Coordinator met to discuss the technology needs for the summer. Because of the curriculum chosen, each classroom needed to have two classroom computers with printer access. In addition to the classroom needs, we needed access to the computer lab.

Many students had individual technological devices that the assistive technology coordinator was able to assist with programming the devices and training the staff to utilize the equipment.

The Assistive Technology Coordinator was available to do an overview of the use of assistive technology in the general education program to all teachers in the program.

Training-

Training for certified staff was held for two days before the program began. Teaching assistants attended the second day of the training. The training schedule was:

Friday

8:00-9:00

- Introductions,
- Building information
- Time sheets
- Bathrooms
- No breaks
- No Food (because of allergies)
- Printing
- How to work well with Teaching Assistants

- Communication with parents
- Bus arrivals/dismissals
- Rules and Regs.

9:00-11:00

- Lexia training

11:00-12:00

- Lunch
- Introduction of therapists

12:00-2:00

- Tasks:
 - Set up room
 - Letters to parents
 - Schedule
 - Go over curriculum
 - Schedule with therapists
 - Schedule Computer Lab

2:00-3:00

- Department Meetings
 - Talk about progress monitoring
 - Curriculum
 - Give out final progress reports templates.

Nurse will need to read over files, and create a list for each classroom teacher of meds and medical needs.

Monday

8:00-9:00

- Introductions
- Nurse- Health Information

9:00-10:00

- Sheri Talk about AT
- ESY computer use
- Help desk.

10:00-11:00

- Meet with TA's about class and curriculum

11:00-11:30

- Open Lunch

11:30-1:30

- Department meetings
- Progress monitoring
- DD/DLP (Sue leads)
- Cross Cat (Paula leads)

1:00-2:00

- Department Meetings
- Progress Monitoring.

- EC (Paula leads)

2:00-3:00

- Teachers work on room
- Open House
- Classroom responsibilities
 - Come up with a summer school letter to the parents. Include an introduction, an overview of the classroom and include related services the children will be receiving during ESY.

Curriculum-

All teachers were instructed on how to use Lexia during the teacher in-service date. Lexia program works with students ages 4 – Adult acquire and improve reading skills. Lexia Reading includes an Auto Placement tool, helping students begin using Lexia at their individually-suited skill level. Teachers decided if the program would meet their students' educational needs.

Early childhood-The Early Childhood Program utilized the Creative Curriculum for Preschool. The focus was on the development of reading, writing, and math pre-readiness skills along with the development of social skills and language skills through a theme based approach. All activities aligned with Illinois Early Learning Standards. The Creative Curriculum is used in our District 97 Early Childhood classrooms during the school year and is a research-based program. The curriculum is focused on implementing developmentally appropriate practice in the preschool classroom

Cross-categorical and Resource- In addition to Lexia to work on the reading skills, teachers used the MONDO curriculum for reading comprehension. This guided reading program offers leveled books. The curriculum provides a wide range of interesting topics and themes including poetry, non-fiction and fiction texts. The series include guided reading texts, supplemental literature and teacher plans with activities. The literature also provided the teachers with writing topics. The students were assessed at the beginning of the summer program with a Pearson product called GMADE. The Group Mathematic Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation was administered at the child's grade level and individual skill deficits were identified. The teachers had access to GMADE support activities that could be matched with the identified areas of student math deficiencies.

Low-incidence- The low incidence programs used a curriculum called "Unique Learning". It is an online, downloadable, leveled program, linked to state standards. It includes information on finding a student's reading instructional level, providing pre and post tests on content as well as other concepts. It also includes 5 weeks worth of lesson plans. There are a total of 27 new lessons provided within each grade band. Lesson plans encompass a consistent format of activities with varied content and skills for each monthly unit. They center around an Instructional Target which aligns with the essence of the national content standards. Each plan is also differentiated into three learning levels to provide teachers with the ability to teach the same material to all students of varying

cognitive abilities. The low incidence coordinator sent the materials to the print shop to be printed in color before the summer session began, and each teacher was given materials in their grade band (elementary, intermediate, or middle school), so they were able to begin teaching immediately. The program also provided rubrics for early emerging readers, which allowed us to take data on our students who are the most difficult to test.

Attendance-

There were 158 students that were recommended by their IEP teams to participate in the Extended School Year Program. Letters were sent to the 158 families and 23 families responded that they would not be sending their students to the program. We planned to have 135 students and an additional 15 students had informed the program that they were non-attending in the first week of the program. The program consisted of 120 students in total.

Progress Monitoring Results-

Due to the nature of the Individualized Education program it is difficult to compile a global perspective of student growth since each child was working on individual goals. Students that participated in the SLANT reading program were assessed with a pre and post test. Many students were assessed this the Pearson Group Mathematics Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation with a pre and post test. The Unique Learning Curriculum has an evaluation component as part of the curriculum that was utilized during ESY. Early childhood students were assessed on their individual goals. Lexia reports were sent home to parents that identified the progress on individual skills.

Parent Communication-

The ESY coordinator attended a parent workshop at Whittier School to address parent questions and concerns. One idea that was presented to the coordinator was the idea of having an Open House before the program began to help with students that may have difficulty transitioning into a new building with new teachers. The idea was very well received by staff and parents and implemented during the last training day. There was an additional Open House held during the first week giving the parents and guardians an opportunity to meet the staff, visit the classroom and peruse the curriculum. Another Open House was held the last day of the program.

Feedback-

Surveys were passed out to both parents/guardians and staff members to assess the ESY program.

Surveys were distributed to all staff, teaching assistants, related services and teachers. The staff survey questions included:

1. Did you feel that the ESY program was a beneficial experience?
2. Were you supplied with adequate materials?
3. How did you use technology with your students?
4. Did the information you received from Math/Reading Assessment help drive your instruction? Explain.
5. Do you have any suggestions to further improve the ESY program?

Responses

1.
 - Totally.
 - Yes. It was great to work with populations that I don't typically work with during the school year.
 - Yes.
 - Yes, it was a good experience.
 - Yes.
 - I believe that I gained more experience and enjoyed working with a supportive staff. With the assessments I can also see that my students also benefited.
 - Yes.
 - Absolutely!
 - Yes!
 - Yes. It had enough structure but allowed for teacher creativity as well.
2.
 - Except for running out of copy paper, yes.
 - Yes.
 - Yes, shared with other related service staff.
 - Yes.
 - The \$75 from the teacher store was a blessing. The math and reading curriculum was in abundance.
 - Related services were not provided with the same amount of money as teachers.
 - Yes.
 - We definitely had enough materials- with Unique Learning we had plenty to complete and work on maintaining current goals.
 - Yes!
3.
 - Communication, academic work, Lexia.
 - Used SLANT program- did not involve technology.
 - Assistive tech, Go Talk, iTunes.
 - Lexia, interactive reading and math work.
 - Lexia, Classroom Suite, Web 2.0 tools, AAC, low-tech communication
 - Computer lab, Lexia, laptop, classroom suite
 - Computer lab every day, Lexia, classroom suite.

4.

- For math, not really. The assessments were difficult for my children. The reading assessment was great.
- It helped the teachers determine the individual needs of the students and helped identify additional materials and supplies to supplement the curriculum.
- The initial assessment through Unique Learning drove instruction.
- Yes. I used the weakest areas as a starting point but tailored my instruction to immediate needs as I got to know the students better.
- The information from the SLANT pre-test drove my instruction and all the students made progress.
- Yes. The programs give specific information on reading level, areas of strength/challenge.
- I think the math assessment definitely helped. It showed my students' areas of weakness and allowed me to pull worksheets to fit their needs. I do not think the reading tests helped.
- Yes, it allowed me to know what my students needed more practice on and I could develop activities for them.
- Yes. I felt like I didn't have to reinvent the wheel. I love the unique learning program.
- No, because the students had a hard time focused on the test and I don't believe it was a true reflection of their abilities.
- Yes, I appreciated having a set curriculum for math and reading. Overall, the program was more organized compared to previous years and this was largely due to the coordinator.

5.

- Slant was great. My kids really progressed. Collaborating with the therapists and other services worked well.
- I like the new format than the last two years working ESY. There was more instruction and a curriculum to follow which made the day more productive. It has been an enjoyable experience.
- Continue to have the same coordinator of ESY. OT should be better organized for scheduling.
- Can we view the materials before summer school starts. Have enough information given out at the first day we meet without the children. Give the children a break to keep them focused.
- Please put recess back into the agenda.
- Yes, I really do wish you all could or would provide incentive pay to the TAs that have been selected to work this wonderful program. Even if it is a couple of dollars more.
- Manuals should be given in order to teach the program correctly.
- Being a former TA, I forget how hard they work and how much work they do! It is terrible that they do not get paid more during summer school, but teachers will and some didn't deserve it.

- The children need some kind of physical activities to do also. Maybe we can spend some time in the gym.
- It needs to be expanded especially for children who tend to be slower than others.
- Have the same coordinator back next year. She did a great job! I think this year was much more organized and productive than previous years. The curriculum was very well thought out and put together. Very pleased with this year!
- As a TA, I believe this year was really the hardest I have ever had in my career. Teacher was unprepared not giving me a heads up but just told me to do this and less than a few minutes later given another directions. I will come back next year if asked.
- I was lucky to work in an air conditioned space, it would be nice if all the rooms had AC. The coordinators did a great job!!! They were good leaders, organized, helpful, available and knowledgeable. Thanks!!
- The coordinator did a fabulous job as the director. She was thorough, conscientious, and very professional. I really enjoyed working with her and it was obvious from the beginning that her number one priority was the children. She was quick to respond to any concerns and available to us at any time. I felt appreciated and respected for my area of expertise and really enjoyed teaching this summer. The other coordinator did a great job. I like that the special education directors were visible during the program. Two social workers were nice. We need air-conditioning for all classrooms. Fans were noisy. The two in-service days were valuable and helped build a cohesive program.
- Make sure everyone receives email about ESY during school year, after we are notified that we will be working ESY.
- It was nice to have two social workers. Clear expectations need to be given to new teachers regarding what to do with behavior incidents.
- Students in SLANT should be post-tested in their home school at the end of the year to assist in developing groups.
- Taking longer time for pre/post assessment would be helpful.
- Get the groups that are same age together for organized activities to work on social skills.
- Let's stress the importance of attendance to parents. Could we go 4 not 5 weeks?
- Provide related services with a budget for ESY supplies.
- I was impressed with the flow/coordination of the program. I saw a lot of special need children who seemed happy in a strong learning environment.
- Two full coordinators so Ms. Diehl isn't teaching and coordinating.

Parent surveys were sent home and also handed out at the last Open House. An impressive 39 surveys were returned.

The parent survey questions included:

1. Did the ESY program meet your expectations?
2. Did the curriculum meet your child's needs?
3. If your child rode the bus, did the transportation services meet his/her needs?
4. We welcome additional comments:

The responses included:

1. 37 of 39 responses stated that they were satisfied. 1 parent was not satisfied. 1 was unsure. One stated that it was too short.
2. 36 of 39 responses stated that they were satisfied. 1 parent was not satisfied. 2 were unsure.
3.
 - Driver was friendly.
 - Yes!
 - After making a phone call they got it together.
 - Bus drivers are punctual and friendly. Bus had no air conditioning and puts the kids in hot bus ride.
4.
 - I appreciated the daily reports. I was glad the OT and speech services were included. I appreciated how friendly, open and flexible the coordinator was to the parents' requests and questions. Playground should be used more and the kids should go outside.
 - I think the ESY program is great for all of Special Education students and I highly recommend this program. I am very happy that my child had an opportunity to be part of ESY. It really helped him improve in the areas he needed help in.
 - Thank you for all the hard working teachers, paras and support staff for spending their summers with kids.
 - The teacher was caring and professional. We were happy to have the teaching assistants since she is familiar with our child and his unique needs. Thank you for a great ESY experience.
 - Thank the special education department for the opportunity for my child.
 - My son had a great experience in his classroom. I wish the program was longer than 5 weeks. Overall the program seemed to be run very well.
 - This year the program was much different from last years. This year was more organized. Just wanted to add this program was wonderful.
 - My husband and I are very pleased and grateful for the ESY program. Our son has continued to blossom.
 - My student is always excited to ride the yellow bus and go to school. He is always is excited to see his teacher and his friends. His vocabulary is improving. We are very pleased.
 - ESY was very organized this year. Seemed more serious. Staff was impressive. Good summer! Would definitely send my child next year.
 - No comments. Everything was great.

- The teacher and aides were great about helping with toilet training and working at writing his name. I wish there had been more communication on specifics of daily activities.
- I am happy with the ESY program.
- Curriculum was good- even if field trips could not be arranged; could people or professional be brought in? Firefighters, police, artists....Art League is down the street. Walking field trip?
- She was very happy about the class. I think she improved some. Thank you so much.
- Thanks for helping my child receive additional help in the areas needed most.
- I was pleased with everything in general. No complaints!
- Child has been working hard to keep up her skills and productivity. Thank you.
- The staff at Oak Park was great to work with. Everyone worked together as a team and was supportive of one another.
- I suggest the kids should do exercise 10 minutes every morning.
- Great teacher! My child enjoying going to ESY. She was welcoming and enthusiastic.
- My child seemed to like ESY- he told me that he liked it much better than regular summer school. His teacher was very nice, very helpful and enthusiastic. I have not yet had an opportunity to assess his progress, but the overall experience seemed to be a good one.
- They really help with the curriculum. I was really impressed with the touch math.
- Student had a great time!
- It would be beneficial to us to get a teeny bit more feedback with regards to the class structure. We thought our child was receiving individual therapy when it was received in a group. Not a big deal but just having that relayed to us would have been helpful.
- The program seems to be much better than last year. Thanks for working so hard with my son.
- I think that has been a wonderful experience for my son. I would like to thank you very much.
- This program is exactly what I encourage every student to partake in. Very much a stepping stone.
- Teacher and assistants were responsive and helpful.

Recommendations for 2011 Extended School Year:

- Continue with the two-day in-service prior to student arrival. One day exclusive to the teaching staff and the next day with the assistants and teachers.
- Consider the relationship with the teacher store, Bright Ideas. The teachers were given a \$75 credit to purchase materials for their classrooms but the store was considerably under stocked.

- Rewrite the student recommendation sheet to include a cross-cat selection for classroom placement.
- Create incentives for more peer participation from students in the general education program to assist with their special education peers.
- Continue to foster relationships with universities for student teachers to participate in the Extended School Year Program.
- Investigate online curriculum that include adaptive technology support to meet all students' needs.
- Continue the use of Lexia, or another online curriculum that has progress monitoring built into the program.
- Investigate a math curriculum that can be used in the Extended School Year Program.
- Hire one or two floating teachers and assistants to cover the excessive absences of staff on a daily basis to ensure a cohesive program.
- The Unique Learning Curriculum worked exceptionally well for our summer needs.
- Continue the relationship with Lakeview Bus Company to provide transportation for the children.
- Consider window air-conditioning units for all students, not only the students with medical needs.

Budget

District 97 Staff Salaries

2 Coordinators	\$10,370.00
22 Teachers	\$59, 837.00
32 Teacher Assistants	\$ 41,312.00
1 Nurse	\$ 783.00
1 Assistive Technology	\$ 1,660.00
Total:	\$113,962.00

Contracted Services:

1 Physical Therapist	\$ 4,462.00
2 Occupational Therapist	\$ 7,068.00
1 Nurse	\$ 4,680.00
Total:	\$ 16,210.00

Instructional and Classroom Supplies \$ 8,572.00

Transportation \$ 77,500.00

Extended School Year 2010 total expenditures: \$216,244.00

Estimated State Reimbursement for certified staff: \$ 36,712.00

Estimated State Reimbursement for non-certified staff: \$ 14,944.00

Cost to district minus reimbursement: \$164,588.00

Total Number of students that attended program: 120

Attachment 1: School Daze/Music Camp Classes from Summer 2010

Classes that ran:

- Band 1
- Orchestra 1
- Jazz Band 1
- Chorus 1
- Chorus 2
- Band 2
- Orchestra 2
- Fraction Fun House
- Around the World in 14 Days
- Fun with Spanish
- 1st Grade Follow-up
- German Immersion
- Book Covers – Movie Posters
- Arthur Book Club
- Spanish Art and Immersion
- Introduction to Basic Web Producing
- Puppets, Masks, and Robots
- 1st Grade Readiness
- Spanish Stories and Fables
- Play Sports – Read Books – Play Sports
- World Traveler
- Becoming an Illustrator
- Theatre Workshop/Skit Writing
- A Brief Course for Struggling Spellers
- Reading/Writing Workshop
- Creative Art Explorations
- Math Club
- Spanish TPRS: Teaching Proficiency and Reading
- Eric Carle Author Study

Classes that were cancelled due to low enrollment:

- Plays that Teach
- The Modern Kids Guide to Prairie Life
- When Am I Ever Going to Use That?
- Fun with Spanish
- Great Games for Visual/Spatial Learning

- Health and Wellness through Education and Physical Activity
- Wright Geometry
- Café Francais – Beginning French
- Becoming a Poet
- Dance
- Spanish Stories and Fables
- Ready – Set – Go!
- Reading for Fun and Creativity
- Zine-Making and Publishing
- For the Love of Reading!
- The Wright 3 Reading Club

(Many classes were offered at multiple times. Sometimes one section ran while another was cancelled due to low enrollment.)