

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	12/18/2008
Submitted	12/24/2008
Plan Resubmitted	02/18/2009
ISBE Monitoring Completed	03/20/2009



Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 1 - 2008 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	2007-08 Federal Improvement Status Choice	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2007-08 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning Year 1

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		62.5			62.5			90.0		75.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	70.5		Yes	82.2		Yes	94.6	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	84.2		Yes	92.1		Yes				
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	53.8	58.2	No	71.2		Yes	94.5			
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	35.6	46.0	No	66.7	Yes	94.1			
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	62.1		Yes	76.4	Yes				

**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 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 62.5% 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 62.5% 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 75% graduation rate for high schools.

\* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2007.

\*\* Safe Harbor Targets of 62.5% or above are not printed.

\*\*\* Subgroups with fewer than 45 students are not reported. Safe Harbor only applies to subgroups of 45 or more. In order for Safe Harbor to apply, a subgroup must decrease by 10% the percentage of scores that did not meet state standards from the previous year plus meet the other indicators (attendance rate for non-high schools and graduation rate for high schools) for the subgroup. For subgroups that do not meet their Safe Harbor Targets, a 75% confidence interval is applied. Safe Harbor allows schools an alternate method to meet subgroup minimum targets on achievement.

**DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION**

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

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

The classification is a descriptor (i.e., focused or comprehensive) that is added to a school's improvement status. Current Title I requirements do not change.

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

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

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 2 - 2008 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								
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Attendance Rate (%)	94.0	94.4	94.3	94.4	94.3	94.1	94.1	94.6
Truancy Rate (%)	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.5	4.0	0.2	-	0.8
Mobility Rate (%)	23.0	26.5	25.5	18.1	13.6	36.7	18.2	8.4
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	430	437	421	426	400	420	386	374
Low Income (%)	49.5	51.3	-	58.2	52.5	60.0	63.2	61.2
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	-	-	-	1.4	0.5	1.7	1.6	2.7
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	50.5	48.7	52.5	53.1	51.0	45.2	44.3	40.6
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	38.8	42.3	38.7	37.1	38.3	41.4	43.3	45.5
Hispanic (%)	7.2	7.3	6.7	8.9	9.8	9.8	11.4	12.3
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	3.5	1.6	2.1	0.9	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.3
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	0.5	3.1	0.5	0.3

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

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	2000	49.8	41.5	7.3	1.4	-	-
	2001	50.5	38.8	7.2	3.5	-	-
	2002	48.7	42.3	7.3	1.6	-	-
	2003	52.5	38.7	6.7	2.1	-	-
	2004	53.1	37.1	8.9	0.9	-	-
	2005	51.0	38.3	9.8	0.5	-	0.5
	2006	45.2	41.4	9.8	0.5	-	3.1
	2007	44.3	43.3	11.4	0.5	-	0.5
	2008	40.6	45.5	12.3	1.3	-	0.3
	2009	34.1	47.0	15.9	1.9	-	1.1
D I S T R I C T	2000	36.0	26.1	37.6	0.2	0.1	-
	2001	33.0	25.7	40.7	0.5	-	-
	2002	29.8	26.7	43.3	0.3	-	-
	2003	28.3	25.6	45.7	0.4	-	-
	2004	25.8	25.0	48.7	0.4	-	-
	2005	24.5	24.4	50.1	0.4	0.1	0.5
	2006	22.4	25.3	50.8	0.5	-	1.1
	2007	20.0	25.0	53.3	0.5	0.1	1.2
	2008	17.3	25.9	53.7	0.5	0.1	2.5
	2009	15.5	27.4	53.4	0.5	0.1	3.0
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-



<b>S T A T E</b>	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	2000	-	45.3	89.0	94.5	15.8	6	1.3	-	-
	2001	-	49.5	89.0	94.0	23.0	2	0.5	-	-
	2002	-	51.3	89.0	94.4	26.5	2	0.5	-	-
	2003	-	-	100.0	94.3	25.5	4	1.0	-	-
	2004	1.4	58.2	100.0	94.4	18.1	2	0.5	-	-
	2005	0.5	52.5	100.0	94.3	13.6	16	4.0	-	-
	2006	1.7	60.0	100.0	94.1	36.7	1	0.2	-	-
	2007	1.6	63.2	100.0	94.1	18.2	-	-	-	-
	2008	2.7	61.2	98.0	94.6	8.4	3	0.8	-	-
	2009	2.4	69.1	97.0	94.9	13.0	10	2.7	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	15.5	59.2	92.7	95.0	20.2	28	0.8	-	-
	2001	14.4	62.9	97.5	94.6	17.5	72	2.1	-	-
	2002	16.9	70.6	98.0	95.4	17.8	114	3.4	-	-
	2003	15.9	64.9	99.7	95.3	19.0	66	2.0	-	-
	2004	19.7	74.2	99.7	95.6	16.4	29	0.8	-	-
	2005	18.7	73.0	99.9	95.3	18.6	54	1.5	-	-
	2006	22.0	76.2	99.9	95.2	21.9	56	1.6	-	-
	2007	21.7	77.6	99.8	94.7	18.9	29	0.8	-	-
	2008	22.1	76.5	97.5	95.2	15.2	47	1.3	-	-
	2009	24.3	82.5	98.2	94.9	16.5	26	0.7	-	-
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6

<b>S T A T E</b>	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
	2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	422	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	430	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	437	-	-	-	138	136	-
	2003	421	-	-	-	153	132	-
	2004	426	-	-	-	129	150	-
	2005	400	-	-	-	137	131	-
	2006	420	-	-	-	136	150	-
	2007	386	-	-	-	132	123	-
	2008	374	-	-	-	135	132	-
	2009	372	-	-	-	103	142	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	3,509	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	3,507	399	389	412	381	380	-
	2002	3,613	429	397	387	398	369	-
	2003	3,544	382	416	393	403	385	-
	2004	3,569	425	389	396	375	409	-
	2005	3,645	420	409	386	380	381	-
	2006	3,707	397	396	430	427	401	-
	2007	3,649	372	383	385	408	403	-
	2008	3,649	400	374	369	438	426	-
	2009	3,743	410	404	386	377	446	-
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816

<b>S T A T E</b>	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	2000	228	14	40,155	60	40	19	-	-	-
	2001	242	13	40,513	63	38	19	-	-	-
	2002	250	13	40,793	65	35	20	-	1	-
	2003	260	14	41,987	65	35	18	-	1	-
	2004	253	15	46,844	58	42	18	-	2	-
	2005	245	13	44,363	56	44	18	-	3	-
	2006	240	13	45,928	57	43	19	-	3	-
	2007	249	13	43,169	54	46	18	-	1	1
	2008	258	13	49,538	52	48	18	-	1	2
2009	280	13	51,655	48	52	16	-	1	2	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	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	3	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	13	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, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>
All	-	-	-	57.9	68.8	76.7	-	-	-	51.3	63.9	70.1	43.5	58.0	69.0	64.1	69.3	66.9
White	-	-	-	72.1	87.7	84.4	-	-	-	67.3	81.6	88.3	55.7	78.6	79.4	78.0	70.6	82.5
Black	-	-	-	37.3	50.9	65.1	-	-	-	37.0	44.0	58.8	26.0	36.8	51.2	46.6	68.0	48.1
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	76.5	-	-	-	-	50.0	60.0	70.0	40.0	27.3	60.0	64.3	66.7	75.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	31.3	46.7	41.1	-	-	-	-	31.0	30.6	12.5	25.0	28.6	28.6	33.3	27.3
Low Income	-	-	-	45.9	58.5	68.4	-	-	-	39.7	57.0	65.9	31.3	40.0	57.1	50.0	63.8	57.7

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>
All	-	-	-	67.5	81.6	85.9	-	-	-	63.4	77.0	82.1	37.9	37.1	49.6	76.1	79.0	74.6
White	-	-	-	81.9	95.9	93.4	-	-	-	77.0	88.4	97.7	45.9	56.0	57.5	88.2	81.0	86.0
Black	-	-	-	51.0	67.8	76.7	-	-	-	50.0	62.0	75.0	18.0	14.0	32.6	67.2	73.5	61.8
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	88.2	-	-	-	-	50.0	90.0	75.0	70.0	27.3	60.0	50.0	91.6	84.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	43.8	73.3	94.1	-	-	-	54.5	62.0	75.0	3.1	22.5	28.6	67.9	56.5	42.4
Low Income	-	-	-	60.8	75.3	79.0	-	-	-	57.7	73.6	81.3	25.4	21.1	40.0	66.7	75.1	66.3

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?*

**READING--**

Students with Disabilities and our black students are deficient and not meeting AYP in reading, and those at-risk are our Economically Disadvantaged students.

If we look at trend data over the last three years, each cohort of students is significantly increasing the percentage of students that are meeting/exceeding state standards from our feeder schools into our 6th grade. We see a gradual increase within the entire cohort over the next two years going from 6th to 8th. With closer examination, we see that there is a consistent drop in scores of the Students with Disabilities during their seventh grade year. (amended: 2/18)

**MATHEMATICS--**

No students groups are deficient or not meeting AYP in Math, but those students that are at-risk are our Black Students and our Students with Disabilities.

If we look at trend data over the last three years, each cohort of students is significantly increasing the percentage of students that are meeting/exceeding state standards from our feeder schools into our 6th grade. We see a gradual increase within the entire cohort over the next two years going from 6th to 8th. (amended: 2/18)

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

**Contributing factors to the above data may include (Amended:2/17):**

\* Larger Special Education groupings

Our special Education population makes up over 25% of our school. When special education staff members, both cross-categorical and resource, are working at or near maximum, one-on-one instruction is not able to be given as much as some of the students need to comprehend a topic. Additionally, general education staff members may not have the understanding of how to assist special needs students in their classrooms.

\* General education teachers lacking motivation, responsibility, and confidence in dealing with resource student number

With a large mainstreamed resource population of Students with Disabilities, we need to ensure that our general education staff has strategies to assist the resource specialists with this at-risk population.

\* Resource teachers not co-teaching

The resource teachers need to be in the classroom with the general education staff members to model how to work with the students for the general education staff member, but the resource teacher needs to also be present so that they are teaching the same materials in a similar way to their students during one-on-one or small group instruction.

\* Over-modification of materials (especially in the Resource population)

If the resource teacher is not in the classroom with the general education staff member to see what major concept is being addressed and how, it may present an issue of simplifying a concept too much for a student.

\* Skills not mastered or retaught

Due to the large amount of material to be covered in a school year, some staff members may be moving on before the students have a complete understanding of a concept and the concept is rarely discussed again.

2/7/2010 2:35:20 PM

\* Students are lacking motivation, may be undergoing peer pressure, may have lack of self-confidence and self-image

Though difficult to measure, there may be a peer or self driven pressure or belief to not do well with academics. Students may feel it is not acceptable to succeed academically with their peers. This can be countered by ensuring that staff are using engaging lessons that improve the pride of the students in their own work.

\* Economics

Many of our students do not have resources at home that can assist in their educational process due to financial strains within the family. We cannot control this, but we can provide materials at school to assist these students in succeeding.

\* Community/Family support is lacking

This is an external factor that we can not control. We understand the valuable resources available in these populations, and we will continue efforts to improve this aspect of the school separate from the SIP.

\* High student transfer rate into the school

Though these student scores do not count for the ISAT in their first year, teachers may be disciplining or focusing more classtime on getting these students up to level that is taking away from the other students.

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

We can conclude that the contributing factors we can statistically measure and focus on deal with our Students with Disabilities which have a high overlap with our Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. Namely we will focus on our larger special education groupings data and find the skills that have yet to be mastered in this group and need to be retaught, specifically in the area of reading.

## 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?*

### **DISTRICT-WIDE SUBJECT AREA LOCAL ASSESSMENTS**

Students are tested in the core subject areas (language/reading, math, science, and social studies) using committee and district approved assessments that are aligned with state standards. Students are able to take these tests up to two times, and appropriate accommodations are made for students with disabilities. The scores for language/reading and mathematics are used annually as part of promotion criteria in the district. Students do not move onto the next grade level unless they have passed at least 70% of the local assessments given in these two subject areas.

In the Summer of 2008, staff members reviewed and restructured that local assessment data to redirect and inform instruction as a district.

Over 95% of students in the 2007-2008 school year passed 70% of the local assessments given in language/reading. This is compared to the 70.5% meeting or exceeding in reading on the ISATs.

### **IOWA TEST of BASIC SKILLS (ITBS) / Survey Testing**

General education, full-inclusion with resource, and other IEP'd students are tested each April in the Math, Language, Reading, and Cognitive sections of the ITBS. Students are expected to score a stanine of 4 or higher in Math and Reading to meet the district 130 promotion criteria. Students not scoring 4 or higher risk grade retention. Furthermore, the scores are used in the T-CAT processing of a student in an effort to better understand and assist a student.

Our Self-contained population takes the Survey, which is a test given one grade level lower than the students current grade, taken at the same time as the ITBS. These students are tested in Math, Language, and Reading. The self-contained students are also expected to score a stanine of 4 or higher, but this is not used for promotion criteria. The self-contained scores are used by teachers to better understand and

2/7/2010 2:35:20 PM

assist this student sub-group.

If a student is absent, teachers try to have the student make up the sub-tests missed during their absence. In the cases of prolonged absences, students do not make up the tests missed.

Out of the students taking the ITBS in 2007-2008 (about 85% of the students met or exceeded with a stanine of 4 or higher in reading. With the students taking the Survey (roughly 70% of the students met or exceeded with a stanine of 4 or higher in reading. As a total for the school (about 80% of the students met or exceeded the stanine of 4 or higher in reading. This is compared to the 70.5% meeting or exceeding in reading on the ISATs.

(amended: 2/18) NHM and Cook County School District 130 are looking to include more interim monitoring in 2009 by using the previous years ITBS and ISAT more proactively with students earlier in school year. Additionally, staff will start using Study Island software to monitor student mastery of standards, and the district is beginning to set up AIMSWeb to also monitor the interim progress of our students.

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

## **DISTRICT-WIDE SUBJECT AREA LOCAL ASSESSMENTS**

- \* Able to take test twice
- \* Over-accommodation of materials
- \* Knowledge based questions rather than application based
- \* Wording and vocabulary is different on local assessments than on ISATs
- \* Review of alignment necessary



- attempted in two day sessions during the 2008 summer break

## ITBS

\* Knowingly not aligned to state standards

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

We can conclude from the local assessment data that we need to review materials used in the promotion criteria, especially in language/reading and mathematics.

Because the significant discrepancy between ISAT scores and subject area local assessments, the administration of district 130 is in the exploratory level of reviewing our district-wide subject area local assessments. These local assessments have been reviewed and have started re-structuring during the 2008 summer break.

While the discrepancy between ISAT and ITBS scores are not as wide as those between the ISATs and the district-wide subject area local assessments, there is still a significant discrepancy due to the non-alignment to state standards of the ITBS. We will continue to use the ITBS to better understand the individual needs of our students, but we understand that the test is not aligned to Illinois state standards.

(amended: 2/18) In addition, interim monitoring is a necessity at NHM, and thus the staff will start to use Study Island and AIMSWeb software to meet this need.

**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?*

**LARGE SPECIAL EDUCATION POPULATION (Which includes many of our Black and Economically Disadvantaged Students)**

The following information was gathered during the writing of the 2005-2006 school year. This information has remained rather constant year after year.

Our school population in 2005-2006 was 402 students. Within that population there was a large sub-group of students with disabilities (n=87; 21.6% of the school population). There was also a large sub-group of black students (n=171; 42.5% of the school population) and a large sub-group of economic disadvantaged students (n=220; 54.7% of the school population).

With a closer look at the individual data to prove significant overlap, we found that of our 171 Black Students 49 individuals are also labeled as Students with Disabilities (12.2% of the school population).

We also compared our Economically Disadvantaged population with our Black student population to find an overlap of 141 students (35.1% of the school population).

We then compared the three factors to find an overlap of 48 individual students that are Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities (11.9% of the school population).

**HIGH ABSENTEEISM**

Our student population has reported high absenteeism (over 18 days or 10% of the school year) for all the years since the 2001-2002 school year when data began to be collected. On average roughly 12% of the school population falls into this category every year.

**ATTITUDE ABOUT SCHOOL**

In 2004-2005 the staff and students of Nathan Hale Middle School completed a post-survey to complete the school's guidance with Turning Points. In comparison with the pre-survey from the 2001-2002 school year, no significant difference in staff attitudes, classroom approaches, middle school philosophy, or behavior was noted. However there was a significant difference noted in the increased feeling of behavior interventions and increased self-esteem amongst the students. The school has also implemented PBIS (positive Behavior interventions and Support), which has shown a significant decline in student behaviors that disrupt classroom education.

**TECHNOLOGY**

While our student population may not have computers or other forms of technology at home, they get the opportunity to work with many aspects of technology in the classroom. Students are trained in Internet usage, Word, Excel, Publisher, Powerpoint, Inspiration, Moviemaker, Map maker, Regular Microscopes, Computer Microscopes, Encarta programs, Calculator literacy, Online labs, and Kurzweil, Alphasmarts, and Intelitools as needed. Beyond curricular usage of technology, there is an active technology club which works on maintaining a school website, developing slide shows and presentations, and learning how to further incorporate technology into their daily lives.

**GIFTED EDUCATION PROGRAM**

Students are tested to determine if they are considered educationally gifted. These students are pooled together with a number of students that are high achieving without the gifted label. Teachers challenge this group to think at a higher level more conducive to their learning styles. These students participate in enrichment activities to further their educational success.

**ESL PROGRAM**

While Nathan Hale Middle School does not have a high ELL population, there are a handful of students that have limited English skills. These students are incorporated into the regular classroom, and teachers actively incorporate WIDA (English Language Proficiency) standards to meet the needs of this population. These students are also pulled from the regular education classroom to meet with an ESL teacher and receive additional supports at least once a week.

2/7/2010 2:35:20 PM

## DISTRICT 218 CURRICULAR MEETINGS

District 130 students attend High School District 218 upon graduation. The Math and Science departments of Nathan Hale Middle School have been working in conjunction with the curricular heads of District 218 in efforts to align curriculum from 6th grade to 12th grade, increasing standardized scores across both districts.

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

(Amended: 2/18)

The Usage of Technology, Gifted Program, ESL Program, and District 218 Curricular Meetings are attributes which are believed to heighten the educational experiences of our students and help them achieve at higher levels. All of our gifted program students, meet/exceed state standards on the ISAT, and we have had an increase of 22% of our 8th graders receiving honors level courses in high school (based on high school entrance exam data) over the last three years. We believe that this is a combination of our gifted education program and the District 218 curricular meetings. Roughly 70% of our students that are part of the ESL program are meeting/exceeding state standards on the ISAT. We do not have base data to know if this is an increase or decrease from previous years. These are programs that Nathan Hale Middle School will continue to implement.

Attitudes about the school have been improving amongst our student population according to a 2004 Turning Points survey and on-going PBIS monitoring of the school, but there is no direct correlation between that fact and ISAT scores. And high absenteeism has been a chronic problem at the school, but looking at individual scores of students that fall into this category (over 80% M/E), we see no significant correlation between the high absenteeism and ISAT scores at NHM. We understand this is contradictory to research that exists, but it does not seem to apply to our student population.

As for high special education groupings, the focus becomes the high rate of overlap between our students with disabilities with the black student population and the economically disadvantaged population of the school. Prior to the 2006 ISAT, Nathan Hale Middle School was only tested at the 8th grade level. Since that time frame, there has been a significant growth seen in this entire focus population, especially in the area of math. The reading scores have also shown growth from the original 2006 data.

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

While other factors are present in the school such as high absenteeism and attitude about school, we can conclude that they do not have a significantly correlative relationship with the student scores on the ISATs. The only controllable and measureable correlation is in the Students with Disabilities. Thus they are our main focus, especially in reading. When these scores rise, because of the high rate of overlap with the Black and Economically Disadvantaged populations, there should be a rise in other scores that previously have been mentioned as "at-risk".

(Amended: 2/18) The DIP reflects the the RtI plan for the district and school which combines the successful efforts of PBIS on a behavior continuum in conjunction with the academic interventions.

### 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?*

Nathan Hale Middle School has 36 full-time Educators with an average of 13 years of experience. Roughly half of the staff holds a bachelor's degree while the other half holds a master's degree or higher. Demographically, the educators are 77.8% White, 19.4% Black, and 2.8% Hispanic, with 22.2% of the staff being male and 77.8% of the staff being female.

All educators of Nathan Hale Middle School are highly qualified to teach their respective content areas, either having a major, minor, or endorsement in the content area.

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

Educator data has not changed significantly in a number of years. Thus, there has been no significant correlation between educator qualifications and ISAT scores.

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

Educator qualifications are not a main focus of school improvement as all of our staff is highly qualified to teach their content area.

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

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

Nathan Hale Middle School has an annual open house within the first two weeks of school. Over the last five years, data has been collected by our sixth grade team. Within this time frame, on average just over 70% of the parents/guardians have been in attendance. (It should be noted: The 2008-2009 Open House had a significantly lower turn out compared to the previous four years)

Parents are also invited to attend student-led conferences at the end of the first quarter, a style of conference initiated in the 2004-2005 school year. Prior to 2004, conferences would draw 60-65% of the parent population, but this new conference style has shown an increase to 95% participation amongst our parents. There has been a significantly positive reaction to the new style of conferences.

The individual grade level teams of the school are encouraged to keep a log of parent contacts made throughout the year. Open communication from parent to teacher has been tracked, and those parents that are actively contacting the teachers exhibit better results

2/7/2010 2:35:20 PM

in the classroom, but no connection has been made between this and ISAT scores.

Parents are active members in the District Improvement Plan Committee. Nathan Hale Middle School has one parent involved in the school based School Improvement Plan (Parent: Denise Brand). Parents are informed of SIP development through the PTO and District Board meetings. The school sends a staff representative to meetings each month to address the community members' concerns in an open forum.

Nathan Hale is always actively looking for ways to get our parents more involved.

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

There is no direct data currently available between parent involvement and improved scores on the ISATs.

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

Parent involvement, while sought after by Nathan Hale Middle, is not the main focus for school improvement. There is no direct data currently available between parent involvement and improved scores on the ISATs at NHM.

### 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?*

#### **Contributing factors include:**

\* Larger Special Education groupings with high overlap to other "at-risk" populations (Black and Economically Disadvantaged Students)

- Within this group skills may not be mastered or retaught
- Staff may be lacking resources to deal with this particular population



Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	<a href="#">Make a significant increase in the number of Black Students and Students with Disabilities meeting or exceeding standards in reading (amended: 2/18)</a>	1,2,

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

- 1. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Make a significant increase in the number of Black Students and Students with Disabilities meeting or exceeding standards in reading (amended: 2/18)

Objective 1 Description

Focus resources and strategies on the students that are currently not meeting or exceeding standards in reading that are part of the black student and students with disabilities subgroups. Mainly focusing on those that are at the higher end of the "below standards" grouping (35% of target population), we can edge this group into AYP (70% M/E) or at least Safe Harbor (10% increase in students meeting standards). And our subgroups that are "at-risk" have a high rate of overlap with the students with disabilities subgroup, pulling them higher into the meet/exceed category.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- ⓑ 1. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

Make a significant increase in the number of Black Students and Students with Disabilities meeting or exceeding standards in reading (amended: 2/18)

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All students will participate twice a year in a grade-level vocabulary challenge to boost cross-curricular vocabulary comprehension.	08/01/2008	08/01/2010	During School	Other	250
2	All students will use Study Island (both at home and at school) as a supplemental to the classroom. Students scoring just above or below state standards (focus group) will have Lexia on a daily basis during Enrichment.	08/01/2008	08/01/2010	Before School	Local Funds	2,000
3	All students will use various reading strategies of pre-reading, post-reading, graphic organizers, and active reading strategies (as shown by staff members).	08/01/2008	08/01/2010	During School	Other	0
4	10 students per grade level will be chosen for daily Lexia programs to work on phonetic recognition and vocabulary building strategies.	08/01/2008	08/01/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
5	10-12 students per grade level chosen for once weekly afterschool reading enrichment program to work on inferring, comprehension, vocabulary, and test taking strategies	08/01/2008	08/01/2010	After School	Title I	4,000
6	All students will participate in Youth Reading month during October. They will read books during Enrichment time, novels as class during reading class, and be invited to bring their families to family reading night in the school media center.	08/01/2008	08/01/2010	During School	Other	0

7	Students will write Cross-curricular Extended Response to increase vocabulary comprehension and usage	08/01/2008	08/01/2010	During School	Other	0
8	10 Students chosen for check and connect system (school-wide behavior system) rewarded for correcting troubled behaviors to keep those students in the classroom to increase instructional time on-task in the classroom.	08/01/2008	08/01/2010	During School	Other	0
9	All IEP students will attend a motivational meeting for ISAT preparation and focusing on their individual strengths two weeks prior to the ISATs	08/01/2008	08/01/2010	Before School	Other	2,000

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

Make a significant increase in the number of Black Students and Students with Disabilities meeting or exceeding standards in reading (amended: 2/18)

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Reading staff attends sessions with district-level reading specialist	08/01/2008	08/01/2010	After School	Other	
2	Staff development for Special Education Staff - Focused on: Content area vocabulary building, word etymology, word usage, fluency and comprehension, guided reading, differentiated instruction	08/01/2008	08/01/2010	After School	Other	
3	increased collaboration between special education and general education staff members	08/01/2008	08/01/2010	During School	Other	0
4	Help students on check and connect system stay in the classroom	08/01/2008	08/01/2010	During School	Other	0
5	In-house reading strategies discussed on a weekly basis at faculty meetings	08/01/2008	08/01/2010	After School	Other	0
6	Reading and Special Education staff members continue on-going professional developments with Ernestine Foster (AIMS)	08/01/2008	08/01/2008	Before School	Other	0
7	Staff will get in-house training to use the IIRC website to analyze student data and help understand the deficiencies and strengths of individual students.	08/01/2008	08/01/2008	Before School	Other	0
8	Staff will use Study Island and AIMSweb to monitor student progress towards mastery throughout the entire 2008-2009 school year	08/01/2009	08/01/2010	Before School	Other	0

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

Make a significant increase in the number of Black Students and Students with Disabilities meeting or exceeding standards in reading (amended: 2/18)

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents invited to attend Family Reading Night, Vocabulary Challenge, Gifted Education family programs, History night, Science Night, and the annual Spelling Bee to get parents in to discuss and celebrate the curriculum.	08/01/2008	08/01/2010	During School	Other	0
2	Parents Newsletter about what is going on in the school	08/01/2008	08/01/2010	After School	Other	0
3	Parent Portal (Pwerschool) and school website accessible for parents to get involved in student academics	08/01/2008	08/01/2010	After School	Other	0

**Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring**

Make a significant increase in the number of Black Students and Students with Disabilities meeting or exceeding standards in reading (amended: 2/18)

The Nathan Hale Middle School administration will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities implemented for reading by collecting educator plan books and performing formal/informal classroom observations on a regular basis to note methods of implementation of strategies in daily instruction. Administrators will also analyze student work examples, report cards, local assessment data and the previous year's ISAT data to determine which students are at-risk of not meeting or exceeding standards in reading. They will use this collected data when meeting with grade-level teams, content area departments, and the entire staff to implement, develop and modify strategies to meet the needs of these at-risk students. The effectiveness of the strategies will be determined upon the arrival of the upcoming spring's ISAT data, which will be analyzed by the school administration. They will be looking for significant improvements across our entire student population with a focus on the Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantaged, and Black student subgroups.

2/7/2010 2:35:20 PM

Starting in 2009, administration will be asking teachers for reports using AIMSWeb and Study Island software to monitor student progression toward mastery on a monthly basis (amended: 2/18)

	Name	Title
1	Mrs. Linda Battles	Principal
2	Mr. John Dudzik	Assistant Principal
3		

### 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.*)

At registration, parents receive a district calendar that has all the information regarding promotion/graduation requirements. Parents also receive the Parents' Guide to Illinois Learning Standards which details District 130 outcomes as aligned to state standards. Furthermore, parents and students are required to sign contracts within the student handbook in order for students to attend Nathan Hale Middle School. Nathan Hale Middle School likes to keep an open line of communication with its parents. Teachers have been known to send home handwritten postcards referring to the positive qualities each student possesses. Faculty and staff also contact parents about student progress on a regular basis, as evident through call logs. Parents receive quarterly progress reports and report cards. Parents are also invited to award ceremonies, competitions, open houses, and after school curricular/extra-curricular events. And when there is important information regarding our school community, letters and memos to parents go home immediately.

Parents were notified via letter sent home with the students at the beginnings of the 2008-2009 school year that Nathan Hale Middle School is considered a choice school and is part of the Academic early warning list due to our ISAT scores.

Nathan Hale Middle School is always looking to involve parents more in the education process through constant notification of what and how the school is doing.

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 School Improvement team consists of the building-level administration of Nathan Hale Middle School and one representative teacher from each of the academic teams in the building. Each representative teacher is responsible for relaying the ideas between the school improvement team and the remainder of the faculty of Nathan Hale Middle School. The team also has a parent representative for consultation.

Upon completion of the school improvement plan, Superintendent Dr. Michael Korsak and the School Board of District 130 review and approve of the plan created by the aforementioned team.

	Name	Title
1	Mrs. Linda Battles	Principal
2	Mr. John Dudzik	Assistant Principal
3	Mr. Graig Mason	6th Grade
4	Mr. Chris Looby	7th Grade
5	Ms. Diane Parham	8th Grade
6	Ms. Cathie Sombraske	Special Education
7	Ms. Kathy Coticchio	Unified Arts/ Physical Education
8	Mrs. Denise Brand	Parent
9	Mr. Jerry Verschek	RESPRO consultant

### 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.*

Nathan Hale Middle School works with the South Cook Intermediate Service Center #4. South Cook ISC4 staff will review and provide feedback on the completed plan. SCISC4 will also send representatives (Jerry Lauritsen, Bill Wilson, Bernie Ferreri) to gather data on actual implementation of the activities in the plan. The plan and resulting data will be submitted to the district school board and state.

**(amended: 2/18)** The peer review process happens after the the initial fall completion of the SIP. Our peer reviewers look at a copy of our SIP and make suggestions for improvement/clarification. After corrections have been made the plan is either submitted to the board of education for review and approval (APPROVED INITIALLY 12/18/08) or sent back for peer review again. The peer reviewers from our school are representatives from each academic team, and we also include a parent representative in the process.

**(amended: 2/18)** Our outside consultant has looked over the materials in the SIP for its completion and to the likelihood he believes we will succeed in our objective of helping our black students and students with disabilities meet/exceed standards in reading using the strategies and activities planned. He meets with NHM at least once a year at request of the SIP team.

NHM works in conjunction with Veterans Memorial Middle School (Cook County 130). Their principal has also reviewed the components of this school improvement plan. Since VMMS and NHM have similar populations of students and similar subgroups not meeting state standards,



the two schools monitor each others on-going SIP throughout the year with a constant line of communication and idea sharing (Amended: 2/18)

Additionally, the district administration looks over the materials in the SIP to see that it is aligned with the DIP.

### 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 the new staff to District 130 are assigned a mentor teacher from their particular academic team. This mentor teacher provides resources, suggestions, and support to the new staff member. If a teacher is within their first two years of teaching, they also participate in the Governor State University mentoring program until the end of their second year in the teaching profession. Staff members participating in this state approved program attend meeting at GSU bi-monthly with their mentor teacher. Between meetings these teachers meet to complete assignments issued by Karen Peterson, head of the GSU mentor program. Also between these meetings at GSU, District 130 holds its own in-house meetings with just the new staff members to discuss issues and continue on-going support.

The administration at Nathan Hale Middle School also keeps an open line of communication with its new staff members. Outside of the scheduled observations of classroom instruction, administration circulates the building for informal observation. If a new staff member needs to improve in a particular area, the administration suggests techniques that may harbor success. Administration also observes tenured teachers to monitor progress in meeting professional teaching goals as stated in their professional development plans.

### 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 130 checks the credentials to verify highly qualified teacher status and the PPS provides continued educational training in programs like Wilson, Intelitools, Kurzweil, key math, and guided reading assessments for special education. The district also provides outside support services from the SCISC4 and AIMS.

From the beginning of the 2006-2007 School year to the end of the 2007-2008 school year, District 130 gradually added 30 additional minutes of curricular instruction time to the school day - 15 minutes to each school year.

District 130 will continue to review alignment and local assessments with Illinois State Standards, and provide support services to the staff.

**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;
- ᵇ 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;

2/7/2010 2:35:20 PM

- Ⓔ Replacement of the principal;
- Ⓔ Restructuring the internal organization of the school;
- ⓑ 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 state will monitor the implementation of the school improvement plan and collect data on the school's academic progress in meeting state AYP goals through the SCISC4 and a local RESPRO team.

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

	Name	Title
1	Jerry Lauritsen, Bill Wilson, Bernie Ferreri, Ruby Robinson	RESPRO team

---

**Section IV-A Local Board Action**

**DATE APPROVED** by Local Board:                   **12/18/2008**

**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?

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

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 (OPTIONAL)

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?

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

**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?

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

**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?

Yes  No Are the strategies and activities measurable?

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

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

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

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?

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?

#### MONITORING

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

#### PART I - COMMENTS

March 20, 2009

Updates to the plan are sufficient to bring the plan into compliance. The objective statement does not specifically focus on the two required years of the plan but it is clear from the action plan that you are planning for two years. Thanks also for clarifying the peer review process. Please implement this plan with the assistance of your area RESPRO. Best wishes, Carol Diedrichsen

February 6, 2009

Cook County SD #130 plans may have been peer reviewed prior to submission but this is not clear and the statewide reading team has noted this in reading the plans for Veteran's Memorial Middle, Whittier Elementary, Paul Revere Intermediate, and Nathan Hale Middle schools. Please work with your area RESPRO for the updates to these plans in the district. Carol Diedrichsen, ISBE, [cdiedric@isbe.net](mailto:cdiedric@isbe.net). See the readers' comments that follow specific for your school.

#### Section I - Data Analysis:

The areas of low achievement have been identified as students with disabilities and black students not meeting AYP in reading. It is proactive of this school to identify at risk subgroups in both reading and math. It may be helpful to dig deeper into the ISAT trend data and grade level data in order to develop effective strategies and activities that support academic improvement . (SIP page 17).

There needs to be more explanation on the contributing factors (SIP page 17). For example, economics and peer pressure. What, specifically, about economics or peer pressure



2/7/2010 2:35:20 PM

makes it a contributing factor?

The local assessments are used for promotional purposes instead of being used to inform instruction. (SIP page 18) The ITBS is a summative assessment as opposed to a formative assessment. Have you considered other assessments that progress monitor and would assist the school in making instructional decisions?

The ITBS data on SIP page 19 is incomplete. Also on SIP page 19 is the factor that the wording and vocabulary on the local assessments does not align with the ISAT. Have you considered investigating an assessment that aligns to the Illinois Standards and Assessment Frameworks? You may also want to assess whether the classroom instruction (curriculum) is aligned to the state standards.

You have done a fine job identifying the overlap between the at risk subgroups. (SIP pages 20 & 21)

Page 22 of the SIP plan indicates various factors that contribute to student performance. Evidence should be provided to support the positive affect these programs have had on student achievement. For example, report the increased reading or math scores of the students who participate in the ESL program or the gifted program. Absentee rates are within the control of a school. Research indicates a correlation between student attendance and academic performance. How are the attitudes of the student population measured? It is also mentioned that the school is implementing PBIS. Have you considered academic interventions as a link to PBIS since this has been a positive program for the school?

Congratulations on the success of your student-led conferences. (page 24) Since student-led conferences have had a positive impact on parent involvement, have you considered adding academic goal setting to these conferences? Keeping a log of parent to teacher communication is positive. Have you considered keeping a log of teacher to parent communication. Analysis of the combined data may assist with parent involvement strategies. (page 24)

There is research that suggests meaningful parent involvement does positively affect student achievement. This may be an area you would like to explore. (page 24)

The key factors must be within the district's capacity to change or control. (page 25) Having a special education population is not within the district's capacity to change. What can you control? What skills or strategies may be lacking. Be specific here when revising this section.

#### Section II - Action Plan:

Although objective 2 touches upon both areas of deficiency it is not stated as a measurable objective. The objective should be written to identify the current achievement level, and specific, measurable outcomes in terms of AYP to be achieved for each year of the 2 required years of the plan. Please refer the School Improvement Plan Guide for examples that may assist you when re-writing.

Objective 1 concerns the students with disabilities subgroup, but does not mention the black subgroup. Objective 2 mentions both subgroups but has no student activities,

2/7/2010 2:35:20 PM

---

professional development, parent involvement or monitoring. Perhaps the details of objective 2 were meant to be added to a revised objective 1 which would include both identified subgroups.

Page 26 of the plan lists student strategies and activities. These need to be research based strategies that increase the likelihood of improving achievement. The strategies should be written as what the students will experience. The strategies should be measurable. For example: All students who did not achieve AYP will participate in the Study Island program twice a week. Student progress will be analyzed and monitored each month. Although the strategies listed for students relate to reading activities, however they are not clearly instructional strategies.

The first two professional development strategies do not have a starting or ending date listed on the plan.(page 26) The professional development strategies need to directly relate to the key factors that caused the school to be in status.

No parent involvement strategies are included in this plan. (page 27) You have done such a nice job with student-led conferences and this is definitely evidence of parent involvement.

The monitoring process should be specific. (page 27) It should describe the process and measures of success. You do list the individuals responsible for monitoring yet specific roles for each person are not indicated in this plan. How will the monitoring of this plan provide direction for those implementing the plan? Consider progress monitoring throughout the year instead of waiting for the annual ISAT assessment.

The plan does not indicate any student strategies, staff development, parent involvement, or monitoring procedures for objective 2. Please be sure to check this when revising the plan.

**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)

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

Yes  No

Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?

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?

**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?

**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?

**DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITES**

Yes  No

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

**STATE RESPONSIBILITES**

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?

**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?

**APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD**

Yes  No

The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.

**PART II - COMMENTS**

Peer Review:

RESPRO can only be part of a peer review team if they did not help develop the plan. The peer review process must be described and you must provide evidence that the plan has been reviewed. Supplying a date the peer review occurred and any suggestions given by the peer review team would be helpful in this section of the plan. (page 31 of the SIP)

District Responsibilities:

The addition of instructional minutes to the school day is commendable! The district review of alignment and local assessments to the Illinois Standards is excellent support. During your revision process please include specifics as to how the district is supporting the strategies and activities included in this school improvement plan and how it relates to the objectives of the plan.(pages 32 & 33)

Closing Comments:

The Nathan Hale Middle School improvement plan does not comply with requirements and must be revised and resubmitted. Revisions to the improvement plan should be completed in the same template section(s) as the original submission by February 23, 2009. Contact your area RESPRO for assistance. Dating each revision to the school improvement plan is required so that updates are readily apparent. You do not need to gain local board approval again unless the revisions significantly change the plan. ISBE will update the ISBE monitoring prompt after reviewing your updates as this is the official state monitoring record.