

Local Board Approved	10/13/2009
Submitted	10/15/2009
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

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?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	Restructuring Implementation
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2009-10 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status Year 6

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	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	62.1		No	72.5		Yes	91.9			
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	75.0		Yes	88.5		Yes				
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	52.1	53.8	No	56.6	58.5	No	89.2			
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	62.7	66.4	No	74.7		Yes	92.9			
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American													
Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	47.0	55.0	No	65.8		Yes	92.2		
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	26.5	32.1	No	35.4	41.2	No	87.9		
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	58.1	63.2	No	69.7		Yes	91.6		

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:	Comprehensive
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in reading?	No
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in math?	Yes

In 2008, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) was one of 6 states to be chosen by the US Department of Education to participate on the Differentiated Accountability Pilot Program. The Differentiated Accountability classification applies only to schools in federal improvement status.

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 (%)	89.5	92.9	93.6	95.9	93.4	94.9	92.5	91.9
Truancy Rate (%)	21.8	11.5	8.2	1.2	7.7	2.5	16.5	15.2
Mobility Rate (%)	18.5	18.3	22.2	15.6	13.2	14.6	13.0	9.3
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	594	650	666	685	655	656	694	682
Low Income (%)	63.1	63.8	67.9	72.7	74.2	64.2	54.9	71.7
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.2	3.5	5.1	4.1	11.5	17.8	17.3	11.9
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	20.5	16.0	16.1	12.3	7.6	7.2	7.9	7.6
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	45.5	39.4	29.4	22.2	19.8	23.2	22.0	20.4
Hispanic (%)	31.8	41.2	50.0	60.9	68.1	66.5	66.4	67.3
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	2.2	3.4	4.5	4.2	3.5	2.6	2.4	2.9
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	0.1	0.2	-	-	0.1
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	0.3	0.8	0.6	1.2	1.6

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	21.4	38.4	34.7	5.3	0.2	-
	2000	21.5	42.9	31.4	4.2	-	-
	2001	19.8	47.0	30.7	2.5	-	-
	2002	20.5	45.5	31.8	2.2	-	-
	2003	16.0	39.4	41.2	3.4	-	-
	2004	16.1	29.4	50.0	4.5	-	-
	2005	12.3	22.2	60.9	4.2	0.1	0.3
	2006	7.6	19.8	68.1	3.5	0.2	0.8
	2007	7.2	23.2	66.5	2.6	-	0.6
	2008	7.9	22.0	66.4	2.4	-	1.2
D I S T R I C T	1999	16.6	26.9	53.8	2.7	0.1	-
	2000	15.0	26.2	56.3	2.4	0.1	-
	2001	13.4	24.7	59.4	2.4	0.1	-
	2002	11.9	23.1	62.6	2.3	0.1	-
	2003	10.6	22.1	64.9	2.3	0.1	-
	2004	9.7	20.9	67.1	2.2	0.1	-
	2005	8.9	20.6	68.0	2.0	0.1	0.3
	2006	8.2	19.4	69.5	2.1	0.1	0.8
	2007	7.2	18.3	71.0	1.8	0.1	1.5
	2008	6.9	18.0	71.6	1.6	0.1	1.8

	2009	6.2	17.9	71.8	1.6	0.1	2.4
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	-	51.1	100.0	88.8	32.5	115	23.6	-	-
	2000	-	57.3	100.0	89.6	31.6	133	28.4	-	-
	2001	0.5	63.8	90.0	89.5	25.7	152	27.2	-	-
	2002	0.2	63.1	95.0	89.5	18.5	128	21.8	-	-
	2003	3.5	63.8	96.0	92.9	18.3	73	11.5	-	-
	2004	5.1	67.9	100.0	93.6	22.2	51	8.2	-	-
	2005	4.1	72.7	95.0	95.9	15.6	8	1.2	-	-
	2006	11.5	74.2	95.0	93.4	13.2	50	7.7	-	-
	2007	17.8	64.2	95.0	94.9	14.6	16	2.5	-	-
	2008	17.3	54.9	95.0	92.5	13.0	112	16.5	-	-
2009	11.9	71.7	90.3	91.9	9.3	101	15.2	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	1999	22.3	53.8	100.0	90.9	36.0	1,633	13.2	10.2	81.6
	2000	19.7	56.4	100.0	92.2	33.0	1,656	13.1	2.0	74.6
	2001	24.4	56.6	96.6	92.1	19.6	2,017	14.3	7.5	69.0
	2002	23.9	54.8	95.8	91.9	20.4	1,585	10.9	4.9	100.0
	2003	25.9	54.0	98.6	92.3	17.3	1,501	10.4	6.5	61.0
	2004	23.4	58.1	100.0	92.7	18.2	1,257	8.6	4.2	83.6
	2005	23.9	62.2	99.1	92.4	17.0	1,674	11.4	4.6	86.8
	2006	23.3	71.2	99.7	92.5	18.6	1,822	12.6	3.4	66.4
	2007	30.5	57.4	99.3	91.5	20.5	1,218	7.8	6.5	69.6
2008	31.6	42.9	99.3	91.1	18.3	1,577	10.1	6.4	66.8	

	2009	31.0	73.9	96.6	91.8	17.6	1,306	8.3	7.6	71.4
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	-

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	495	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	478	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	560	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	594	-	-	-	211	174	-
	2003	650	-	-	-	211	220	-
	2004	666	-	-	-	251	191	-
	2005	685	-	-	-	206	251	-
	2006	655	-	-	-	204	215	-
	2007	656	-	-	-	208	200	-
	2008	694	-	-	-	252	217	-
	2009	682	-	-	-	208	243	-
D I S T R I C T	1999	13,655	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	14,391	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	14,972	1,338	1,289	1,269	1,119	1,044	705
	2002	15,713	1,383	1,375	1,342	1,144	1,094	852
	2003	15,482	1,434	1,328	1,269	1,207	1,094	811
	2004	15,758	1,418	1,376	1,320	1,226	1,157	857
	2005	15,176	1,358	1,385	1,354	1,184	1,198	863
	2006	14,819	1,273	1,331	1,389	1,231	1,129	869
	2007	16,224	1,344	1,287	1,312	1,231	1,206	902
	2008	16,185	1,421	1,310	1,257	1,344	1,187	1,004
	2009	16,007	1,336	1,328	1,290	1,224	1,283	834

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	660	14	42,585	53	47	26	27	-	-
	2000	845	12	42,324	58	42	22	21	-	-
	2001	890	12	44,578	57	43	22	21	-	-
	2002	855	12	45,805	58	42	24	22	8	6
	2003	844	12	46,591	57	42	23	22	8	14
	2004	874	12	48,737	57	43	22	24	9	8
	2005	903	11	49,607	61	39	22	22	6	9
	2006	916	11	50,765	57	42	20	22	5	2
	2007	941	11	51,657	54	46	21	22	5	4
	2008	975	11	54,145	50	50	20	22	4	4
2009	1,064	11	54,785	49	51	18	20	4	4	
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)

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	39.8	55.7	55.4	56.1	-	-	50.5	44.8	62.8	54.8	43.0	43.9	63.5	61.4	62.9	72.4
White	-	-	58.3	70.0	89.4	64.3	-	-	69.2	83.3	71.4	84.2	56.5	65.8	58.3	83.3	83.3	70.0
Black	-	-	46.3	39.6	40.9	55.5	-	-	30.8	35.0	51.9	39.6	38.7	39.4	67.5	52.1	57.5	58.4
Hispanic	-	-	35.3	61.1	54.9	53.5	-	-	53.9	43.4	65.3	54.9	44.3	40.2	62.9	62.6	62.5	76.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	5.7	-	30.4	27.2	-	-	-	10.0	47.8	9.5	-	-	-	-	33.3	38.7
Students with Disabilities	-	-	11.5	14.8	13.9	20.6	-	-	14.3	24.0	28.1	16.3	12.5	11.8	33.3	27.3	34.6	36.7
Low Income	-	-	38.0	51.7	53.3	53.2	-	-	50.0	43.6	59.4	51.9	36.6	41.6	57.6	61.3	61.4	67.6

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)

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	61.6	76.9	73.5	69.3	-	-	53.5	66.4	71.8	72.4	24.6	30.6	63.7	61.8	67.9	69.8
White	-	-	91.6	75.0	100.0	85.7	-	-	69.2	75.0	76.2	94.8	39.1	52.8	65.2	83.4	91.7	70.0
Black	-	-	58.5	64.2	52.2	64.4	-	-	38.5	52.5	52.7	45.8	20.0	19.7	55.0	45.9	56.4	51.0
Hispanic	-	-	58.9	84.5	76.1	69.4	-	-	56.1	70.0	77.4	78.2	23.8	29.2	65.2	66.1	67.6	74.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	44.1	-	60.9	48.5	-	-	-	43.3	61.2	52.4	-	-	-	-	47.6	48.4
Students with Disabilities	-	-	30.8	33.3	30.3	24.1	-	-	14.3	34.6	39.4	30.2	12.0	8.6	11.1	27.2	32.0	32.3
Low Income	-	-	59.9	75.0	72.7	68.2	-	-	52.0	65.2	68.5	69.2	21.6	28.1	59.4	58.9	68.7	66.9

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Data - What do the School Report Card data tell you about student performance in your school? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are indicated?

Observations from 2009 School Report Card Data:

-52.1 % of our African American Subgroup met AYP in reading Safe Harbor for African Americans in reading was 53.8%.

62.7% of our Hispanic student subgroup met AYP in reading

74.7% of our Hispanic student subgroup met AYP in math

47.0 % of our LEP students met AYP in reading

65.8% of our LEP students met AYP in math

26.5% of our students with disabilities met AYP in reading

35.4% of our students with disabilities met AYP in math

58.1% of our economically disadvantaged subgroup met AYP in reading

69.7% of our economically disadvantaged subgroup met AYP in math

-56.6 of our African American students met AYP in math

-62.1% of all our students met AYP in reading

-72.5% of all our students met AYP in math

After reviewing our 6th grade item response analysis section, we found that:

Standard 1A: Vocabulary Development our 6th grade students school scored a total of 51%. Our area of weakness and where we need to concentrate is determining the meaning of an unknown word or content; area vocabulary using knowledge of prefixes, suffixes, and word roots. Our 6th grade students scored 33 %.

10/22/2009 4:51:12 PM

Standard 1B/C: Reading Strategies, our 6th grade students correct responses totaled 54%. Our weakest area being under the strand of *Make and verify predictions based on prior knowledge and text*, we scored 35%.

Standard 1C: Reading Comprehension, our 6th grade students correct responses totaled 59%. Our weakest area being under the strand of *Determine the answer to a literal or simple inference question regarding the meaning of a passage*, we scored 53%.

After reviewing our 7th grade item response analysis section, we found that:

Standard 1A: Vocabulary Development, our 7th graders correct responses totaled 51%. Our weakest area being under the strand of *Determine the meaning of an unknown word using word, sentence, and cross-sentence clues*, the students scored 33%.

Standard 1B/C: Reading Strategies, our 7th grade students correct responses totaled 58%. Our weakest area being under under the strand of *Locate and interpret information found in heading, graphs and charts*, the students scored 49%.

Standard 1C: Reading Comprehension, our 7th grade students correct responses totaled 57%. Our weakest area being under the strand *Identify or summarize the order of events in a story or nonfiction account*, the students scored 50%.

After reviewing our 8th grade item response analysis section, we found that:

State Goal 1 Reading: Standard 1A: Vocabulary Development, our 8th grade students correct responses totaled 61%. It was determined after review that our weakest area being under the strand *Determine the connotation of a word using word, sentence, and cross-sentence clues*, the students scored 49%.

State Goal 1 Reading: Standard 1C: Reading Comprehension, our 8th grade students correct responses totaled 64%. It was determined after review that our weakest strand being under the *Determine the author's purpose as represented by the choice of genre, and literary devices employed*, our students scored 43%.

State Goal 2: Literature: Standards 2A, 21B: Literary elements and Techniques and Variety of Literary Works our 8th grade students correct responses totaled 64%. It was determined after review that our weakest strand was *Explain how the literary devices (e.g., imagery, metaphor, figurative language dialogue) contribute to the meaning of a literary selection*, our students scored 50%.

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

- External
-
- Discrepancy in Home Language. Parents Language skills make it difficult for parents to support students with educational reinforcement at home.
- Lack of afterschool transportation for students to be able to stay for extra support

- Parental involvement and home resources and materials
- No test for ELL students contributed to ELL not meeting AYP

Internal factors

- No system or vehicle for parent involvement
- insufficient professional development and guidance on how to implement and monitor a scientifically based inclusion model.
- No emphasis on writing
- No building wide reading program
- Math texts are only classroom sets
- Limited classroom libraries
- **Lack of common assessments aligned with stated standards**
- RTI not fully implemented - staff need training
- Getting the correct students in the correct interventions
- DI strategies needed across the curriculum for staff implementation in the classroom
-

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

The data analysis of our scores shows the following:

- We need to identify specific researched based instructional strategies that will be implemented in all classrooms. Strategies that have proven to increase student achievement. We need to continue our work in differentiation and embed these strategies in our instruction.
- We need to identify formative assessments in reading and math that will be implemented school-wide. The results of this should directly inform and guide instruction.
- We will be including professional development in Balanced Literacy, which will be taught across the curriculum to enhance our teachers skills and knowledge on teaching students to read. We will continue our Academic Vocabulary by including it in our Balanced Literacy Framework.

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data

Data - Briefly describe the relevant local assessment data used in this plan. What do these data tell you? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are apparent?

Local assessment has been identified as an area of weakness in our 2006-08 School Improvement Plan. Therefore specific assessments including universal screening (AIMS-web) has been implemented in 2008 and included in this 2008-2010 plan. The NWEA MAP adaptive/formative assessmet has also been included in this plan.

MAP DATA: This is the first year we have used MAP data. At this point grade we are the beginning stages of having our grade-level teams use baseline data to guide instruction.

- 41.8% of 6th grade students scored below the 25th percentile on the Reading MAP test
- 40.8% of 7th grade students scored below the 25th percentile on the Reading MAP test
- 49.3% of 8th grade students scored below the 25th percentile on the Reading MAP test

R-CBM DATA (AIMSweb)

- 32.8 % of our 6th graders are below basic and are receiving Rtl interventions

- 50% Word Analysis
- 43% Literature

- 40% of our 7th graders are below basic and receiving Rtl interventions

- 53% Word Analysis
- 47% Literature

- 54.8% of our 8th graders are below basic and receiving Rtl interventions

- 58% Word Analysis
- 55% Literature

- **Math - Projected proficiency in MAP data**
 - 6th Grade 40% Geometry
 - 49% Data Analysis

 - 7th Grade 45% Geometry

 - 49% Data Analysis

 - 8th Grade 45% Geometry

 - 50% Data Analysis

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

Internal Factors:

- Inconsistency of the input of local assessment
- Inconsistency in the use of data from local assessment data
- Inconsistency in the use formative assessment to guide instruction
- There has been no formal training of the use assessments and the data to be used in instructional decision-making

External Factors

- Low parent involvement
- High percentage of students coming from homes where English is not the dominant language

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

- Implement formative assessment
- Implement standards-based assessments by grade level and content area
- Implement professional development and training for all areas of assessment implemented
- Integrate local assessment into instructional design

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data
Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

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

- Current enrollment is at 648 students
- 67.9 % of our students are from low-income families
- Our student population have been identified with 11.9% as LEP students. Additionally, we have a large number of non-English speaking and/or limited English speaking parents. Consequently, many of our students do not speak English at home thereby limiting their acquisition of English vocabulary which in turn leads to low reading comprehension and writing skills.
-

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

- Students from low-income families do not have access to the resources and experiences needed to be academically successful. Although most parents want the best for their children, they may not be able to provide the academic support needed at home if they have not had the opportunity to complete their own education. Additionally, parents who are less inclined to assist their middle school child also feel less able to help their child with school work.

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

- We conclude that parent needs should be identified through a survey and prioritized by the BLT and the Jack Benny PTO and addressed with program that will benefit them. The school plans to provide appropriate programs based on those identified needs.
- We need programs to assist students in the transition to our school such as a peer mentor program, counselor meetings with new students, and make parents aware of team time opportunities to problem-solve transition and academic concerns.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data

Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

Data - Briefly describe data on educator qualifications and data and/or information about staff capacity and professional development opportunities related to areas of weakness and strength. What do these data and information tell you?

Total full time teachers 53

Full time certified support staff (Social worker, Nurse, Counselors) 4

Full time para-professionals 14

Other full-time employees 3

Teacher Data

Average Teacher Experience (in years) 9

Tenured Teachers (5+ years) 42

Non-tenured teachers (less than 5 years) 18

Master's Degree or Higher 22%

White Teachers 42

African American Teachers 3

Hispanic Teachers 5

Asian/Pacific 5

Male Teachers 23

Female Teachers 37

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

Our staff demographics does not match our student demographics, which can lead to cultural disconnect.

Additionally, with the high number of new teachers with less experience in the classroom, this may also lead to the lower performance from students due to inexperience of the majority of our teachers.

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

For our school improvement, in the area of teacher qualifications, that we must look to implement programs that enhance teacher retention, initiate educational opportunities to improve teacher expertise, and the maintain data of these records in house to monitor and follow through with professional development.

We are also planning to provide in-house support for our new teachers and then maintain data.

We will have two professional development meetings on cultural diversity and collect survey data.

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

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

- Parent/Teacher conferences participation - 52%
- Fine Arts Night 2008-47%
- Open House September 2008-68% attendance rate which varied by grade level
- Family Reading Night (3 x in 1 year) with approximately 25 % participated total

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

By having an identified day of the week specifically set aside for meetings with parents, each team has seen an increase in parents becoming actively involved in their students academic progress.

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

- Jack Benny needs to develop a more comprehensive and well-planned partnership between school and home.
- Since ISBE has recently developed a parent involvement needs analysis, Jack Benny will administer this analysis to assist in determining parent needs.

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

From the factor pages (I-A, I-B, and I-C), identify key factors that are within the school's capacity to change or control and which have contributed to low achievement. What conclusions about next steps have you reached from reviewing available data and information and about all the factors affecting student achievement?

- We need to identify specific researched based instructional strategies and strategies that have proven to increase achievement that will be implemented in all classrooms. We need to continue our work in differentiation and embed these strategies in our instruction. We need to analyze our local assessment data and develop next step strategies to address areas of need, .
- We need to identify formative assessments in reading and math that will be implemented school-wide. The results of this should directly inform and guide instruction.
- Academic Vocabulary will be encompassed by our balanced literacy professional development across curriculum
- We need programs to assist students in the transition to our student as a peer mentoring program and make parents aware of team time opportunities to problem-solve transition and academic concerns.
- We conclude that parent needs should be identified through a survey and prioritized by the BLT and the Jack Benny PTO and addressed with programs that will benefit them. The school plans to provide appropriate programs based on the those identified needs.
- We are planning on providing in-house support for our new teachers

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Implement a scientifically based research classroom instructional strategies with a balance reading program across the curriculum.	1,2,4,5,6,8,
2	Implement of a scientifically based research classroom instructional strategies with a balanced math program .	3,7,
3	Strengthen the building leadership team in their role as leaders in instructional planning, learning outcomes, planning professional development and facilitating increased parent involvement at Jack Benny Middle School.	1,2,4,5,6,8,3,7,

The following deficiencies have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for your school.

- ☒ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ☒ 2. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ☒ 3. Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ☒ 4. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ☒ 5. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ☒ 6. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ☒ 7. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ☒ 8. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives**Objective 1**

Implement a scientifically based research classroom instructional strategies with a balance reading program across the curriculum.

Objective 1 Description

While currently 62.% of our students are making AYP in Reading, our objective is for all students (including African American, Hispanic, LEP, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups which did not make AYP) to make AYP in Reading to at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or safe harbor.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- ⓑ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 2. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 3. Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 4. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 5. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 6. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 7. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 8. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-B Action Plan - Strategies and Activities for Students

Implement a scientifically based research classroom instructional strategies with a balance reading program across the curriculum.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will experience reading and writing across the curriculum with a focus on balanced literacy (such as but not limited to Reader's Theatre, Differentiated Instruction, Independent Reading). Teachers will use a variety of strategies to increase student learning. Instruction will include differentiation of content, processes, and products. Classroom characteristics in evidence will be: 1. instruction is concept focused and principle driven; 2. on-going common assessments of student readiness and growth are part of the curriculum 3. flexible grouping is consistently used Activity: The implementation of differentiated instruction will be measured by administration observation and/or completed Study Group Action Plans over time.	09/29/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Title I	
2	All students will experience the major reading strategies of comprehension (predicting, summarizing, connecting, questioning, inferring & imaging) on a monthly basis. Teachers will focus instruction on these 6 strategies used by proficient readers to increase comprehension. Strategies will be taught in depth, over an extended period of time, in a variety of texts. Instruction will include the gradual release of responsibility model. On-going assessment of students' abilities to internalize and self-initiate cognitive strategies will be done through small group conferencing and examining work samples.	09/29/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Title I	
3	All Students will experience common classroom assessments tied to the IAF every 4-6 weeks	11/02/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Title I	
	Data used from benchmark assessments will determine where students will be placed: universal, targeted, or intensive instruction. Teachers will be trained on Aimsweb Progress monitoring by our external and					

4	Internal RTI coach. Teachers will measure progress of students in Targeted programs bimonthly and measure progress of students in Intensive programs weekly. This will be done by 1 minute Curriculum Based Measurement from Aimsweb program.	09/14/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Title I	
5	Students and families support the Village Academic Academies through Saturday tutoring sessions focusing on intensive small-group reading and strategies. The Saturday Academies are designed to provide additional opportunities for students to experience culturally rich supplemental reading and math activities in a familiar setting. On-going assessments of students' progress through data collection of progress monitoring on Aimsweb and common assessments.	10/24/2009	02/26/2011	After School	Title I	10,000

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

Implement a scientifically based research classroom instructional strategies with a balance reading program across the curriculum.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All teachers will receive professional development on a balanced literacy approach to improve reading instruction to improve student achievement.	09/29/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Title I	10,000
2	All teachers will be trained on extended response writing and assessment	12/02/2009	06/02/2010	After School	Other	
3	All teachers will receive training related to the major reading strategies of comprehension	09/29/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	
4	All staff members will receive training on R-CBM, /Aimsweb, NWEA-MAP through external RTI coaches on a weekly basis	09/14/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	All teachers will receive training in writing and common assessments tied to the IAF.	09/11/2009	05/14/2010	After School	Other	

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

Implement a scientifically based research classroom instructional strategies with a balance reading program across the curriculum.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Establish PTO meetings monthly (one month-evening, one month-daytime) where we showcase a student, teacher, and parent.	10/05/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Other	
2	Establish bi-yearly PTO Goal Award Night for students and parents.	01/18/2010	05/13/2011	After School	Title I	1,000
3	Host 3 Family Reading Night for students and family with reading strategies/activities	10/12/2009	04/29/2011	After School	Title I	2,000
4	Send home monthly newsletters to families about reading strategies.	09/30/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Other	
5	Students and families support the Village Academic Academies through Saturday tutoring sessions focusing on intensive small-group reading and mathematical strategies.	10/10/2009	02/26/2011	After School	Title I	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Implement a scientifically based research classroom instructional strategies with a balance reading program across the curriculum.

The principal and assistant principal will be evaluating lesson plans to be sure that the reading strategies are incorporated cross-curriculum. Administration will designate school leaders to monitor grade level common assessments from team meetings, show samples of student work with grades, and show student examples of extended response. The written common assessment completed by the end of the first semester (January, 2010). Second semester common assessments will be completed by May 2010. Each staff member will have a walk-through by an administrator or designees bi-monthly to monitor differentiation of instruction.

Each team will be responsible for writing a monthly newsletter reviewing Reading Strategies to use at home.

TEST

	Name	Title
1	Sam Taylor	Principal

2	Catalina Quinones-Nelson	Assistant Principal
3	Dan Hill	Dean
4	Ms. Albino	BLT
5	Ms. Bredberg	BLT
6	Ms. Cohen	BLT
7	Ms. Ebert	BLT
8	Ms. Goodnature	BLT
9	Mr. Freels	BLT
10	Mr. Meneces	BLT
11	Mr. Nicolosi	BLT
12	Ms. Ragsdale	BLT
13	Ms. Richardson	BLT
14	Mr. Sagala	BLT
15	Ms. Sanchez	BLT
16	Mr. Stoller	BLT
17	Ms. Williams	BLT

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Implement of a scientifically based research classroom instructional strategies with a balanced math program .

Objective 2 Description

While currently 72.5% of our students are making AYP in Math, our objective is for all students (including African American and SWD subgroups who did not make AYP) to make AYP in Math to at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or safe harbor.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- e 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- e 2. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- b 3. Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- e 4. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- e 5. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- e 6. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- b 7. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- e 8. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-B Action Plan - Strategies and Activities for Students

Implement of a scientifically based research classroom instructional strategies with a balanced math program .

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All students will demonstrate knowledge of Balanced mathematical concepts across the curriculum.	09/14/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Title I	
2	All students will practice the major reading concepts related to math on a monthly basis.	11/02/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Title I	
3	All Students will experience common classroom assessments tied to the IAF every 4-6 weeks.	12/14/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Title I	
4	Data used from benchmark assessments will determine where students will be placed: universal, targeted, or intensive instruction.	09/14/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Other	
5	Students and families support the Village Academic Academies through Saturday tutoring sessions focusing on intensive small-group mathematical strategies.	12/05/2009	02/26/2011	After School	Title I	3,000

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

Implement of a scientifically based research classroom instructional strategies with a balanced math program .

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All teachers will be trained on extended response writing and assessment.	12/02/2009	06/02/2010	Before School	Title I	
2	All staff members will receive training on R-CBM, /Aimsweb, NWEA-MAP through external RTI coaches on a weekly basis.	09/14/2009	06/01/2011	Before School	Title I	
3	All teachers will receive training in writing and common assessments tied to the IAF.	09/11/2009	05/14/2010	Before School	Title I	

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

Implement of a scientifically based research classroom instructional strategies with a balanced math program .

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Host 3 Family Math Nights for students and family with math strategies/activities.	10/19/2009	04/29/2011	After School	Title I	1,200
2	Send home monthly newsletters to families about math strategies	09/30/2009	05/31/2011	During School	Title I	
3	Students and families support the Village Academic Academies through Saturday tutoring sessions focusing on intensive small-group reading and mathematical strategies.	10/24/2009	02/26/2011	After School	Title I	3,000

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Implement of a scientifically based research classroom instructional strategies with a balanced math program .

The principal and assistant principal will be evaluating lesson plans to be sure that the math strategies are incorporated cross-curriculum. Administration will designate school leaders to monitor grade level common assessments from team meetings, show samples of student work with grades, and show student examples of extended response. The written common assessment completed by the end of the first semester (January, 2010). Second semester common assessments will be completed by May 2010. Each staff member will have a walk-through by an administrator or designees bi-monthly to monitor differentiation of instruction.

Each team will be responsible for writing a monthly newsletter reviewing Math Strategies to use at home.

	Name	Title
1	Sam Taylor	Principal
2	Catalina Quinones-Nelson	Assistant Principal
3	Dan Hill	Dean

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3

Strengthen the building leadership team in their role as leaders in instructional planning, learning outcomes, planning professional development and facilitating increased parent involvement at Jack Benny Middle School.

Objective 3 Description

- Continue the use of Distributive Leadership Model that was part of Governance restructuring at Jack Benny
- Plan and provide quality professional development, support, and assessment of needs for teachers to improve student achievement.
- Improve student achievement by strengthening and building parent/school connections
- Use student tests, achievement, and formative assessment data to continue to plan for instruction and professional development

- Continue to develop and strengthen school culture by facilitating productive communications with Action, Grade level, and Department teams to support district initiatives regarding student achievement and behaviour. (PBIS-SWIS, RTI-AIMSWEB, NWEA MAP)
-

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- ↳ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ↳ 2. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ↳ 3. Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ↳ 4. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ↳ 5. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ↳ 6. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ↳ 7. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ↳ 8. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-B Action Plan - Strategies and Activities for Students

Strengthen the building leadership team in their role as leaders in instructional planning, learning outcomes, planning professional development and facilitating increased parent involvement at Jack Benny Middle School.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Review SWIS data for correlations of Behavioral data and student achievement	09/14/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Title I	

2	Oversee the implementation and monitoring of the School Improvement Plan	09/01/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Title I	
3	BLT will meet a minimum of 3 times a month to implement their governance role with recorded minutes distributes to staff	08/31/2009	05/30/2011	After School	Title I	
4	Provide quality professional development, support, and assess teachers needs to improve student achievement	09/11/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Title I	

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

Strengthen the building leadership team in their role as leaders in instructional planning, learning outcomes, planning professional development and facilitating increased parent involvement at Jack Benny Middle School.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide quality professional development , support and assess needs for teachers to improve student achievement	09/02/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Title I	
2	Assist Grade Level teams and RTI process in placing students in flexible groups by analyzing data through NWEA-MAP, AIMSWEB, and ISAT scores	08/26/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Title I	
3	Provide books, article, materials for teachers to assist them in improving their teaching strategies to increase student achievement	10/05/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	2,000

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

Strengthen the building leadership team in their role as leaders in instructional planning, learning outcomes, planning professional development and facilitating increased parent involvement at Jack Benny Middle School.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Develop a strong PTO and hold monthly meetings	10/01/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Title I	
	Increase parent and stakeholder involvement in School Improvement by					

2	recruiting a minimum of one parent and one outside stakeholder to be on BLT team	10/01/2009	06/01/2011	Before School	Title I	
---	--	------------	------------	---------------	---------	--

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Strengthen the building leadership team in their role as leaders in instructional planning, learning outcomes, planning professional development and facilitating increased parent involvement at Jack Benny Middle School.

- Monitor the effects of professional development by analyzing student data in MAP, RCBM, ISAT scores and reviewing lesson plans with walk through to view implementation
- Track the number of parents who participate in parent/student programs

	Name	Title
1	Sam Taylor	Principal
2	Catalina Quinones-Nelson	Assistant Principal
3	Dan Hill	Dean

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part A. Parent Notification*

This section describes how the plan has been developed and reviewed and identifies the support in place to ensure implementation.

Parent Notification - Describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand. (**Requirement for Title I Schools only.*)

All NCLB status notifications are sent via the district office of school improvement. CHOICE, SES, Corrective Action and Restructuring notices are first approved through the Illinois State Board of Education, translated into Spanish and sent to all appropriate students and families per the timeline set by our Illinois Board of Education in accordance with No Child Left Behind legislation. These letters and required information and response forms are sent via the U.S. postal service.

AMAO reports when applicable are sent to parents through the district English Language Learner Department.

Parents are also provided a letter of notification when the state report cards become available and posted on our district web site. This letter is sent home with each child from their school in English and Spanish.

Title One notice of service letter and the student/ parent/ teacher learning compacts, using the templates provided by the Illinois Board of Education are sent home via the Title One teacher at each of our K-8 schools participating in the Title One regular program.(in English and Spanish)

Parent Right to Know letters regarding Highly Qualified status are mailed to parents through our district human resource office in English and Spanish.

Our school also provides additional notification of instructional reform efforts through our newsletters, school web site, and individual teacher correspondence with our parents in English and Spanish.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part B. Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder Involvement - Describe specifically how stakeholders (including parents, school staff, and outside experts) have been consulted in the development of the plan. The names and titles of the school improvement team or plan developers must be identified here.

The stake holders involved in the construction of our SIP plan are as follows. We had input and training in the SIP writing process from ROE of Lake County and specifically from Shirley Anderson who help us with the construction and revisions of our plan in both the reading and math goals. We also had input from our staff members either directly or through our Building Leadership Team members who are listed below. We also worked with Min Owens our district RTI external coach to help in the development of the reading goals.

	Name	Title
1	Sam Taylor	Principal
2	Catalina Quinones-Nelson	Assistant Principal
3	Dan Hill	Dean
4	Pamona Albino	Teacher
5	Jennifer Bredberg	Teacher
6	Sheryl Cohen	Teacher
7	Linsey Ebert	Teacher
8	Greg Freels	Teacher
9	Omar Meneses	Teacher
10	Jonathon Nicolosi	Teacher
11	Jackie Richardson	Teacher
12	Steve Sagala	Teacher
13	Olga Sanchez	Teacher
14	Dan Stoller	Teacher
15	Vanessa Williams	Teacher

16	Shirley Anderson	RESPRO
17	Min Owens	District RTI Coach

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part C. Peer Review Process

Peer Review - Describe the district's peer review and approval process. Peer review teams should include teachers and administrators from schools and districts similar to the one in improvement, but significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students. As appropriate, peer reviewers may be teachers from other schools, personnel from other districts, Regional Office of Education staff, Intermediate Service Center staff, RESPRO staff, university faculty, consultants, et al., or combinations thereof. RESPRO staff serving on a School Support Team should not serve on a peer review team in the same district. The peer review should precede the local board approval and must be completed within 45 days of receiving the school improvement plan.

For further description of the peer review process see LEA and School Improvement: Non-Regulatory Guidance, July 21, 2006, at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

Description of peer review process including participants and date(s) of peer review.

Each School Improvement/ Building Leadership Team should score their plan using the most current rubric before submitting the plan to the district external review process. Each SIP/ BLT team has been instructed to use both the most current version of the rubric and appropriate SIP template to guide the revision process, in hopes that all required data will be included before submission for evaluation.

All 20 District School Improvement Plans will be scored by an external peer review committee, plans are returned for corrections, then each plan is presented to the Waukegan Board of Education for their approval with 45 days of plan submission. Each review team will be comprised of not fewer than three members with administration, teacher and special program representation when subgroups issues or content issues are present, who will first be trained on use of the scoring rubric. Then each member independently scores each plan assigned. Then as a team they will come to consensus and complete the final score sheet for each plan reviewed. No team members will score their own SIP plan. The score sheets must have both score and comments to guide improvement for each plan scored. It is important that the internal teams use the new state rubric and score their plan to make sure that the plan being submitted to the district office and the ROE is an approvable plan—scoring a minimum of pass (yes) in each of the State Compliance categories and in the Local Compliance categories. If the NCLB Status school plans do not have passing scores after the district review, the plans must be corrected, and then be re-scored by an expert panel prior to submission to our local board of education. All district schools will house a local board of education approvable plan on the IIRC website. Schools who are in NCLB or State status will also submit their plan once approved by our local board of education via the IIRC website for the system of support monitoring.

The peer review process is conducted as a workshop, for the 2009-2011 SIP plan submission it will take place on September 18, 2009 and the teams score section by section following opportunity for clarification as to intent and district as well as state requirements in each section. The district is thus proposing the following two-year cycle for district level SIP review, which will be funded through Title One. During the 2009-2010 school year, 10 district schools were identified as needing to submit due to AYP data and status changes. Schools newly added to the CHOICE status will submit a two-year plan, written to align to the most current rubric, including interventions that address the subject area or subgroup not meeting AYP. Schools who have state approved plans that are not due to expire, and added to the SES status, will revise the approved plan to include new test data, SES service targeted at the subgroup and /or subject area still not meeting AYP and will submit either to the ROE or ISBE based on directions provided by the Illinois State Board of Education. Schools that have been newly added to the Corrective Action NCLB status will re-write under the guidance of the district a one year plan aligned to the most current the rubric, include SES services to identified sub groups/ subject areas and the corrective action or restructuring determined after a meeting with District Administration beginning in 2008- 2009. All schools identified for Restructuring I begin the process of working with the District Restructuring Oversight Committee in development of their restructuring plan. All schools whether on or off the NCLB status will re-write their School Improvement Plan aligned to the most current rubric once their plan expires. These plans will be subject to local peer review and presented and approved by the Board of Education. The next step in the process will be determined by their AYP status. If the plan submission is required by the Illinois State Board of Education, it is then sent electronically via the IIRC website. NCLB entitlement funds will be budgeted to support the peer review process.

Whether a year for new plans or not, each SIP/ BLT team must revisit their SIP plan each June through August. The SIP/ BLT leadership team will analyze new test data, prepare to work with whole faculty on SIP plan revisions/ updates based on new data and information. Each team must revise and modify as needed to keep their SIP focus purposeful and meeting learning needs of their students.

For plans due to ISBE, a timeline is prepared so that peer review takes place prior to the presentation to the board of education for approval, to ensure that plans are submitted by due date established by the Illinois School Board of Education.

All schools who are meeting AYP will submit a three-year plan and update annually using the most current test data and make any modifications necessary. The updates are not subject to peer review unless the plan has expired.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

Part D. Teacher Mentoring Process

Teacher Mentoring Process - Describe the teacher mentoring program. Mentoring programs pair novice teachers with more experienced professionals who serve as role models and provide practical support and encouragement. Schools have complete discretion in deciding what else the teacher mentoring program should provide.

All School probationary teachers participate in the district's New Teacher Academy, which provides a variety of peer coaching, and mentoring programs. Procedural manuals exist for both programs and can be located at central office.

A week long new teacher boot camp is provided the week prior to the start of a new school year for new teachers. A combination of local and national workshop presenters provide support with district curriculum and reform initiatives. Each new teacher is assigned a mentor for the first year and on an as needed basis during their non-tenure period. Teachers have an opportunity to learn about our community, the district and their new school during this week of preparation.

A teacher facilitator oversees the New Teacher Academy and New Teacher Support/Mentoring meetings that take place quarterly. Mentors also meet with their protégé throughout the year to participate in a variety of professional developmental programs to assist new teachers in their first year. Highly qualified veteran teachers are selected to serve as mentors meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers as defined by NCLB requirements. (Brophy, 1999). Each school also provided mentoring and support to new staff with particular focus on the reform initiatives particular to their school improvement plan. Teacher also meet during their years 2-4 for additional professional support, but usually do not have mentors assigned during this timeframe.

Peer coaching is an alternate evaluative program in which tenured teachers that meet the necessary qualifications can participate. Teachers receive training in pre-conferences, observations, and post-conferencing. Meetings are held regularly during the school year and are based on Illinois Professional Standards for Teachers.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part E. District Responsibilities

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

District 60 provides professional development opportunities to all District School supporting the development of building leadership teams who in turn create, implement and revise their School Improvement Plans. Outside consultants have worked with our schools and district level leaders to shift toward data driven distributed leadership.

We have contracted with Urban Learning and Leadership Center to work with the school leadership as the corrective action / restructuring to provide support in change of governance to the Distributed Leadership Model. ULLC also provides professional development to all schools in data analysis to support data driven decision making at the BLT level to implement the SIP plan. We have also contracted with CORE, ASCD and SDE to provide support to our staff in reform strategies that improve instruction. RESPRO works with this school both with technical support and monitor implementation of this plan. Outside consultant has been appointed in to provide expertise that address identified needs and issues facing this individual school and district as a whole. Professional development is overseen by a district professional development committee and includes district wide full day in-service opportunities, on site coaching support, and half day workshops focused on the District and School Improvement plans and instructional improvement.

Central Office provides support both in data analysis (state and local benchmark/progress monitoring data) and research in selection of Core/ Tier I curriculum, Tier II interventions and Tier III intervention programs, including support for bilingual, gifted and special education programs. Program Directors work directly with the principal, building leadership team and teachers to support reform initiatives established in this plan. Building leadership teams receive technical support in School Improvement Plan design, implementation, monitoring, and revision process from both District leadership and RESPRO/ ROE consultants. District level professional development opportunities are provided to support the initiatives in this plan. NCLB funding prioritizes support for major reform initiatives.

District Directors, Coordinators and Cabinet level evaluators support their school's BLT team in monitoring the implementation process which is part of the District Oversight Committee support. The District Restructuring Oversight Committee works with schools implementing either the Corrective Action or Restructuring Plan. This provides additional support and technical guidance from both district and community experts in plan design, implementation and evaluation of impact of the reform measures identified. District 60 provides support to ensure that multiple data points are provided including state, district wide benchmark and local assessments, which are disaggregated and disseminated to building leadership teams through a new student information system. These data are triangulated and drive decisions on research based interventions that are aligned to student

needs. District 60 provides professional development opportunities to help support their SIP reform. Focus groups are formed to study issues and concerns. Long standing committees such as the: Education Progress Committee, Reading Committee, Math Committee, Technology Committee, meet with representation from all district schools served to provide an avenue for two way communication and support of this school's improvement effort.

District funds are prioritized to support the District Improvement plan (RTI) and school improvement initiatives. The district allocates NCLB funds to each school, empowering each school BLT to assume the leadership role in implementing and monitoring the school improvement process. SIP coordinators act as a link between school and central office and provide guidance and support for the school improvement process. Bilingual Coordinators, Special Education Coordinators, Reading Coordinator and Math Coordinator work with administrators and teachers to research best practice strategies and research-based resources to support reform efforts identified in the school improvement plan. The leadership team must align all expenditures to support the reform measures in this plan. The Bilingual Department provides services to all bilingual centers, Special Education Department provides services to all students with IEPs, as well as professional development for teachers working with these populations and developing intervention programs when needed. These funds provide support to student instruction initiatives, professional development and parent involvement opportunities that support each SIP plan.

The district leadership oversees submission of a SIP plan for all schools to our board of education regardless of NCLB or State Status. All plans are peer reviewed by the district peer review process. All schools meeting AYP will submit three-year plans and update annually the most current test data and any modifications made, the updates are not subject to peer review unless the plan has expired. All schools not meeting AYP for two or more consecutive years write, implement and monitor a two year plans which is also then submitted to the Illinois State Board of Education through the office of the Director of School Improvement.

Corrective Actions taken by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress for a fourth annual calculation (Corrective Action Status) should be aligned with the strategies and activities of this plan. The district must take one or more of the following actions in such a school per NCLB, Section 1116(b)(7)(C)(iv).

- é Require implementation of a new research-based curriculum of instructional program;
- é Extension of the school year or school day;
- é Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance;
- é Significant decrease in management authority at the school level;
- é Replacement of the principal;
- é Restructuring the internal organization of the school;
- ᵇ Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school.

Restructuring Options (allowed in Illinois) selected by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress for a fifth annual calculation (Restructuring Status) should be aligned with the strategies and activities of this plan. The district must take one or more of the following options in such a school.

- Ⓔ Reopening the school as a public charter school, consistent with Article 27A of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/Art. 27A.);
- Ⓔ Replacing all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school's inability to make AYP;
- Ⓔ Entering into a contract with a private entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the school as a public school;
- Ⓕ Implementing any other major restructuring of the school's governance that makes fundamental reform in:
 - Ⓕ governance and management, and/or
 - Ⓕ financing and material resources, and/or
 - Ⓕ staffing.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part F. State Responsibilities

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

The Illinois State Board of Education provides training and technical assistance to each school in the writing and scoring / review of the plan once completed through a variety of mediums: face to face meetings, phone and on site conferences, workshops, the technical guide for school improvement, corrective action and restructuring, as well as, regional consultants through the RESPRO system of support.

The RESPRO team from Lake County provides guidance in the plan creation and also monitors the plan implementation. They also provide professional development and support in strategy development to support full implementation of the reforms measures identified in the plan.

RESPRO also provides guidance in the analysis of state testing data, as well as, support for local benchmarking with tools such as DIBELS and NWEA MAP.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation
Part G. School Support Team

	Name	Title
1	Shirley Anderson	RESPRO
2	Bill Ware	RESPRO Literacy Coordinator
3	Jenny Winters	RESPRO Math Coordinator
4	Barry Beers	ULLC
5	Min Owens	RTI district external coach
6		

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: **10/13/2009**

A. ASSURANCES

1. The district has provided written notice in a timely manner about the improvement identification to parents of each student enrolled in the school, in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand (NCLB, Section 1116(c)(6)).
2. Strategies and activities have been founded in scientifically based research as required by NCLB, Section 1116(b)(3)(A)(i) and as defined in NCLB, Section 9101(37).
3. Technical assistance provided by the district serving the school is founded on scientifically based research (NCLB, Section 1116(b)(4)(C)) as defined in NCLB, Section 9101 (37).
4. The plan includes strategies and activities that support the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards and ensures alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessments with the Illinois Learning Standards.
5. The school will spend at least 10 percent of the funds made available under Section 1113 of NCLB for the purpose of providing teachers and the principal high-quality professional development. (Title I schools only.)

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified? [C]

Yes No

Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness? [C]

Yes No

Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students? [C]

Yes No

Does the analysis, along with other optional data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities? [C]

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Yes No N/A

If included, is there evidence that the SIP team analyzed optional data to clarify the areas of weakness?

Yes No N/A

Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?

Yes No N/A

Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

OTHER DATA

Yes No N/A

If included, has the SIP team analyzed other available data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities?

Yes No N/A

Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?

Yes No N/A

Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

Yes No Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance? [C]

Yes No Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control? [C]

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

Yes No Has the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan? [C]

Yes No N/A Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency? [C]

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

Yes No Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?

Yes No Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement? [C]

Yes No Are the strategies and activities measurable? [C]

Yes No Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified? [C]

Yes No Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear? [C]

Yes No N/A Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students? [C]

Yes No N/A Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status or in special education non-compliance?

Yes No N/A Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities? for students? [C]

Yes No N/A

Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?

Yes No

Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]

MONITORING

Yes No

Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]

Yes No

Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers? [C]

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

Yes No N/A

Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only) [C]

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

Yes No

Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]

Yes No

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

PEER REVIEW

Yes No

Is the peer review process described and is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have “the greatest likelihood” of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP? [C]

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS

Yes No

Is it clear how the school is ensuring that teachers are receiving the support needed for their professional growth and to retain them in the profession? [C]

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No

Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]

Yes No N/A

If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No

Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation? [C]

SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM

Yes No N/A

Have the names and titles of School Support Team members been listed in the plan? Does the team appear to have the expertise to support this school in regards to the school improvement plan? [C]

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD

Yes No

The plan indicates the approval date of this plan. [C]

PART II - COMMENTS