

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	12/18/2008
Submitted	12/24/2008
Plan Resubmitted	02/27/2009
ISBE Monitoring Completed	03/24/2009

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	140161300022008		
District Name:	COOK COUNTY SD 130	School Name:	PAUL REVERE INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL
Superintendent:	DR MICHAEL T KORSAK	Principal:	Wendy Bumphis
District Address:	12300 S GREENWOOD AV	School Address:	12331 S GREGORY ST
City/State/Zip:	BLUE ISLAND, IL, 60406 1558	City/State/Zip:	BLUE ISLAND, IL, 60406
District Telephone#:	Label 7083856800 Extn: 102	School Telephone#:	7083854450 Extn: 0
District Email:	woodrows@district130.org	School Email:	
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

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	60.3		Yes	76.8		Yes	96.3	Yes		
White														
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	57.7		Yes	75.0		Yes				
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	59.5		Yes	76.1		Yes				
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic												
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	43.0		No	68.4		Yes		
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes								
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	58.7		Yes	74.5		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 (%)	95.1	96.1	95.6	96.3	96.1	95.8	95.6	96.3
Truancy Rate (%)	1.3	6.0	1.2	0.8	0.7	1.3	-	-
Mobility Rate (%)	16.1	16.8	21.7	9.9	11.9	14.4	12.6	7.9
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	225	272	256	264	292	315	302	267
Low Income (%)	72.9	71.3	71.9	75.0	80.1	78.1	85.1	80.5
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	30.2	14.7	16.4	23.5	24.3	26.0	24.8	28.8
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	17.3	18.4	14.1	14.4	15.1	12.4	9.3	8.6
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	26.7	28.3	29.3	23.1	20.2	24.1	27.8	25.8
Hispanic (%)	55.6	52.9	56.6	61.7	63.0	63.2	62.3	63.7
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.4	0.4	-	0.8	0.7	0.3	0.3	-
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	0.3	1.9

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	20.2	30.5	49.3	-	-	-
	2001	17.3	26.7	55.6	0.4	-	-
	2002	18.4	28.3	52.9	0.4	-	-
	2003	14.1	29.3	56.6	-	-	-
	2004	14.4	23.1	61.7	0.8	-	-
	2005	15.1	20.2	63.0	0.7	-	1.0
	2006	12.4	24.1	63.2	0.3	-	-
	2007	9.3	27.8	62.3	0.3	-	0.3
	2008	8.6	25.8	63.7	-	-	1.9
	2009	8.6	23.7	64.4	-	-	3.2
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	-

PAUL REVERE INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL
School Improvement Plan 2008

S T A T E	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	29.6	68.5	99.7	95.4	17.5	4	1.8	-	-
	2001	30.2	72.9	99.0	95.1	16.1	3	1.3	-	-
	2002	14.7	71.3	100.0	96.1	16.8	16	6.0	-	-
	2003	16.4	71.9	100.0	95.6	21.7	3	1.2	-	-
	2004	23.5	75.0	100.0	96.3	9.9	2	0.8	-	-
	2005	24.3	80.1	100.0	96.1	11.9	2	0.7	-	-
	2006	26.0	78.1	100.0	95.8	14.4	4	1.3	-	-
	2007	24.8	85.1	100.0	95.6	12.6	-	-	-	-
	2008	28.8	80.5	100.0	96.3	7.9	-	-	-	-
	2009	26.6	85.6	100.0	96.2	2.9	-	-	-	-
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

PAUL REVERE INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL
School Improvement Plan 2008

S T A T E	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	213	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	225	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	272	-	125	147	-	-	-
	2003	256	-	135	121	-	-	-
	2004	264	-	141	123	-	-	-
	2005	292	-	151	141	-	-	-
	2006	315	-	152	163	-	-	-
	2007	302	-	146	156	-	-	-
	2008	267	-	137	130	-	-	-
	2009	278	-	138	140	-	-	-
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

PAUL REVERE INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL
School Improvement Plan 2008

S T A T E	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
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	65.4	60.0	61.5	40.9	51.8	53.2	56.6	58.7	59.4
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	73.4	61.6	78.5	52.4	68.8	66.7	66.7	42.8	75.0
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46.5	48.7	58.8	44.1	50.0	40.0	30.0	44.2	45.4
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	79.1	67.3	58.6	33.3	48.1	55.5	64.8	71.4	62.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43.9	7.7	-	-	-	-	31.3
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25.1	20.0	46.4	8.3	-	31.3	5.9	13.4	26.7
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	64.6	57.7	58.1	34.6	48.7	50.6	55.5	59.0	56.6

PAUL REVERE INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL
School Improvement Plan 2008

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	87.9	82.7	80.8	50.0	62.1	74.3	82.8	81.0	70.9
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	92.3	100.0	61.9	75.0	85.7	85.7	78.6	83.4
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76.7	70.7	70.6	41.2	57.9	70.0	63.3	72.1	63.7
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	93.8	89.1	81.9	49.2	61.1	72.2	90.2	87.3	71.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76.2	46.2	-	-	-	-	54.5
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	81.3	66.7	66.7	4.2	-	56.3	64.7	40.0	33.3
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	86.3	81.4	78.3	45.3	60.9	72.9	84.4	78.9	66.6

PAUL REVERE INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL
School Improvement Plan 2008

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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?*

Overall, the students at Paul Revere Intermediate School have shown a continued increase in Reading from 2002 to 2007. It is slightly below the State AYP minimum target of 62.5%. Our identified area of weakness is our LEP subgroup (43.0%). We are also concerned with our Black subgroup (57.7%) and Economically Disadvantaged subgroup (58.7%).

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

Contributing factors include limited literary resources for our population, limited literary resources for teachers and limited Professional Development for all teachers for best practices for teaching ELL students.

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

We need to target our at risk students at the beginning of the school year and closely monitor them. We need to maintain a unified building focus on comprehension strategies and overall school curriculum aligned to the Illinois State Standards. We need to teach specific strategies to enable all students to develop and maintain a strong interest in reading. We need to teach students specific reading skills including decoding, comprehension, reading stamina (how to push through slow passages), and test taking strategies. We need to provide engaging reading materials at all levels that support skill development.

We need to provide additional professional development for our staff that specifically addresses the needs of our English Language Learners.

We need to improve our literary resources for our teachers, our school library and classroom libraries.

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?

The local assessment tools that are used are the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS), Logramos, District Local Assessments (Language Arts and Math), Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA).

Weaknesses: ITBS is given in the Spring for promotion criteria. Our Local Assessments are not aligned to the Illinois State Standards. We lack a universal screening tool that is administered multiple times throughout the school year to chart growth.

Strengths: DRA is given quarterly; teachers are able to monitor progress and see growth, teachers are able to use data to drive instruction.

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

The District Local Assessments are outdated and inconsistent with the curriculum. There is a lack of a common time for teachers to develop and analyze assessments.

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

There is a need for more consistent local assessments that are updated and aligned with the State Standards.

There is a need for an assessment tool that is given multiple times throughout the year so that we can progress monitor and adjust the curriculum to address the deficiencies.

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?

Revision 2-25-09

28.8% of our students have limited English proficiency. Of this number, 43% made AYP. The other 57% of the LEP population are the focus of our strategies and activities. 57.7% of our black subgroup and 58.7% of our economically disadvantaged subgroup made AYP. These two groups also remain a focus of our strategies and activities.

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

Revision 2-25-09

Limited resources are available to assist LEP students in their academic language acquisition.
Bilingual teachers need additional training in the instruction of ELL students.
English only speaking teachers need training to support students who have transitioned from bilingual classes to regular education classes.
There is inconsistency of instruction due to the absence of an aligned curriculum.

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

Revision 2-25-09

We will identify "at risk" LEP students at the beginning of the school year based on AIMSWEB assessment results as well as previous ISAT test data.

2/7/2010 2:36:40 PM

We will provide intensive small group interventions to improve reading skills.

We will provide professional development for staff in the area of curriculum alignment and curriculum mapping.

Additional resources will be available for LEP students' academic language acquisition and reading comprehension.

Staff will receive professional development in literacy instruction.

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?

70% of our certified staff have a Master's Degree. 17.6% of our teachers participate in a Beginning Teacher Mentor Program. 47% of our teaching staff is non-tenured. There are two instructional aides assigned to our four bilingual classrooms and two instructional aides assigned to our special education classrooms.

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

Our teachers are highly qualified and support continuing education. They maintain a positive attitude toward learning and are continually looking for ways to implement current research findings and utilize best practices. Our staff is constantly adjusting our teaching methodologies to reflect the learning styles and needs of our students.

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

The staff at PRI must continue to look for professional development opportunities to address our school's sub-group needs. We will work on mapping out a school-wide curriculum that is aligned to the Illinois State Standards to ensure that there is consistency from year to year as to what the students are being taught.

There is a need for common planning time so that tenured and non-tenured teachers can collaborate.

We will participate on District Committees on Curriculum Assessment and Needs Assessment for Professional Development.

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

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

We have 80%-99% parent participation for Open House and Parent-Teacher Conferences. This year's wellness activities have been well attended. There is support for evening activities including concerts, science fair, Title I Parent Nights, Bilingual Parent Nights and Gifted Parent Nights. We are working on developing an active PTO. So far this year we have had 50 parents sign up as members of our PTO. There are translators available at all evening events to accommodate LEP parents. (revised 2-25-09)

Parent surveys from Parent-Teacher Conferences indicate that parents are well informed about what is happening at PRI and they are happy with the quality education that their child is receiving.

2/7/2010 2:36:40 PM

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

Revised 2-25-09

There is parental support of after school tutoring
There is improved two-way communication between school and home
Increased participation in scheduled evening activities
Parents work more than one job
Parents have limited English Proficiency

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

Revised 2-25-09

The next steps in improvement include maintaining and expanding the P.T.O., conducting several Parent Institutes where parents can learn strategies to support their children.
We will continue to create a positive school climate and encourage parents to be more active in their child's learning process.
We will continue to utilize monthly newsletters, the school's website, and PowerSchool Parent Portal to improve parent communication.

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?

There are many key factors that are within the school's capacity to change:

We will improve and increase resources to assist LEP students in their language acquisition and reading comprehension. This includes utilizing specific comprehension strategies through teaching charts, flash cards, online computer programs that focus on fluency and comprehension and leveled reading materials. **(revised 2-23-09)**

We will develop and use an assessment wall and an electronic data collection tool as a means to monitor the progress of our sub-group's performance. **(revised 2-23-09)**

We will provide professional development opportunities for all staff members in teaching English Language Learners (ELLs). This includes introducing them to the WIDA standards and checking lesson plans for the inclusion of WIDA standards. Also, using research to support best practices for academic language acquisition. Three books that will be used with the staff are *The Vocabulary Book: Learning and Instruction* by Michael Graves and *The Building Background Knowledge and Building Academic Vocabulary* by Robert Marzano. **(revised 2-23-09)**

We will also provide teacher in-service time to work on curriculum mapping and aligning local assessments with the Illinois State Standards. **(revised 2-23-09)**

With regard to our LEP population and the language barrier, we will continue to survey our parents to determine their needs and serve as a resource to the community. We will ensure that all meetings are conducted in English and Spanish and continue to do outreach to bring our parents into the school. **(revised 2-23-09)**

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	While a portion of our student body made AYP in reading through safe harbor, only 43% of our LEP students met the target. Efforts will be made to raise reading achievement to 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 or safe harbor for all students.	1,
2	Our current achievement in math shows 76.8% of our students in the meets and exceeds categories. All of our students will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 or safe harbor.	1,

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

- 1. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

While a portion of our student body made AYP in reading through safe harbor, only 43% of our LEP students met the target. Efforts will be made to raise reading achievement to 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 or safe harbor for all students.

Objective 1 Description

Our objective is to identify our AYP subgroup (LEP students) at the beginning of the school year and use specific programs to improve their reading skills. This may include after school time, one on one time, and extended practice at home. The strategies to be used will include: After school literacy program, Study Island computer program, Read Naturally software, Academy of Reading software, Reading A-Z, and other computerized programs for literacy.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- 1. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

While a portion of our student body made AYP in reading through safe harbor, only 43% of our LEP students met the target. Efforts will be made to raise reading achievement to 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 or safe harbor for all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Read Naturally is a web based program that focuses on reading fluency and comprehension. It is available to students in our sub group 30 minutes a day two times a week. (revised 2-23-09)	09/15/2008	05/15/2010	During School	Other	0
2	Academy of Reading is a web based program that builds automaticity and fluency in reading. The students in our sub group use it 30 minutes a day two to three times per week. (revised 2-23-09)	09/15/2008	05/15/2010	During School	Title V	0
3	Study Island is a web based computer program that focuses on standards mastery. It is based on the Illinois State Standards and is available to all students in the school. Students can access Study Island from home for additional practice. (revised 2-23-09)	09/15/2008	05/15/2010	During School	Other	0
4	Reading A-Z Computerized literacy subscriptions are available to all students to provide support materials for leveled reading instruction. (revised 2-23-09)	09/15/2008	05/15/2010	During School	Other	0
5	LEP Students in our targeted sub group are identified and chosen to attend after school literacy program where they receive small group instruction in reading strategies such as summarizing, questioning and	09/26/2008	02/26/2010	After School	Title I	4,000

	making inferences. The students meet Tuesdays and Thursdays after school for 1 hour. (revised 2-23-09)					
6	Volunteer Reading Buddies provide Tier II and Tier III level reading supports to our at risk students. (revised 2-23-09)	09/30/2008	05/15/2010	During School	Other	0
7	At risk students receive targeted interventions in small group settings. They work in 30 minute blocks 5 days a week. (revised 2-23-09)	10/13/2008	05/21/2010	During School	Other	0
8	All students will participate in the Aimsweb assessment for reading	08/24/2009	05/21/2010	During School	Other	0

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

While a portion of our student body made AYP in reading through safe harbor, only 43% of our LEP students met the target. Efforts will be made to raise reading achievement to 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 or safe harbor for all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will expand the use of the book "Daily Five" reading strategies in the classroom and discuss at monthly faculty meetings.	09/15/2008	05/15/2010	During School	Other	0
2	Teachers will receive research based Professional Development for teaching ELL strategies (Two times throughout the school year). (revised 2-23-09)	10/20/2008	05/15/2010	After School	Other	2,000
3	Teachers will continue to align the school curriculum with the Illinois State Standards during School Improvement Days. (revised 2-23-09)	10/27/2008	05/15/2010	During School	Local Funds	5,000
4	Teachers will receive information on WIDA Standards and be required to include WIDA Standards in monthly lesson plans. (revised 2-23-09)	10/20/2008	05/15/2010	During School	Other	0
5	Teachers will attend monthly literacy meetings that provide a variety of reading strategies.	09/10/2008	05/13/2010	After School	Other	0
6	Teachers will use the Student Analysis reports from Read Naturally, Academy of Reading, and Study Island computer programs to adjust and redirect instruction.	09/15/2008	05/15/2010	During School	Other	0
7	Teachers will be trained to use Aimsweb Progress Monitoring Assessment.	02/26/2009	05/15/2010	During School	Other	

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

While a portion of our student body made AYP in reading through safe harbor, only 43% of our LEP students met the target. Efforts will be made to raise reading achievement to 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 or safe harbor for all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will continue to participate in Parent Institutes provided by Paul Revere Intermediate. Quarterly (revised 2-25-09)	09/10/2008	04/22/2010	After School	Other	0
2	Parents will attend Title I Parent Meetings for hands on strategies to assist students at home. (revised 2-25-09)	11/13/2008	05/05/2010	After School	Title I	100
3	Expand participation at Family Curriculum Nights to provide parents insight to their child's education. (revised 2-25-09)	11/18/2008	11/18/2009	After School	Local Funds	200
4	Parents will be provided with strategies on creating a conducive homework/study environment	09/15/2008	05/15/2010	After School	Other	0
5	Parents will review student's work through assignment notebooks, nightly reading journals, and weekly folders. (revised 2-25-09)	09/15/2008	05/15/2010	After School	Other	0
6	Parents will continue to participate in P.T.O. activities through phone calls, meetings, and emails. (revised 2-25-09)	09/10/2008	05/15/2010	During School	Local Funds	500

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

While a portion of our student body made AYP in reading through safe harbor, only 43% of our LEP students met the target. Efforts will be made to raise reading achievement to 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 or safe harbor for all students.

A Reading Assessment Wall will be used to monitor student progress and interventions. We will also use an electronic data collection tool to organize student assessment data and chart growth. We will also use the student analysis reports provided by Academy of Reading program, Read Naturally program, and Study Island program. We will also use six week progress reports and interval testing to chart growth for students participating in the after school literacy program and the targeted intervention small groups.

(revised 2-23-09)

Name	Title
------	-------

1	Wendy Bumphis	Principal
2	Karen Johnson	5th grade Teacher/SIP Team member
3	Jaqueline Renko	4th grade Teacher/SIP Team member

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Our current achievement in math shows 76.8% of our students in the meets and exceeds categories. All of our students will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 or safe harbor.

Objective 2 Description

Our objective is to continue to use the best practices in math instruction to keep our students performing above average on all math exams.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- 1. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

Our current achievement in math shows 76.8% of our students in the meets and exceeds categories. All of our students will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 or safe harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Work on extended response math problems daily in all classrooms. (revised 2-23-09)	09/15/2008	05/15/2010	During School	Other	0
2	Use Study Island Computer program to assist with ISAT math preparation	09/15/2008	05/15/2010	During School	Other	0
3	Increase use of math manipulatives in all classrooms. (revised 2-23-09)	10/30/2008	05/15/2010	During School	Other	0
4	Have a Family Math Night to focus on math strategies such as extended response questions and math computation games. (Pi Day) (revised 2-23-09)	03/13/2009	03/13/2009	After School	Other	250
5	Comprehensive screening tool is being purchased by District 130 to give solid baseline math data and appropriate instructional level for every student. (revised 2-23-09)	01/12/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Other	0

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

Our current achievement in math shows 76.8% of our students in the meets and exceeds categories. All of our students will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 or safe harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Participate in all Houghton Mifflin Math K-5 Professional Development to go along with the new math text series purchase. (revised 2-23-09)	08/11/2008	05/15/2009	After School	Other	0
2	Research any other relevant math professional development opportunities	10/30/2008	05/28/2010	After School	Other	

3	Continue to work on aligning the math curriculum with the Illinois State Standards during School Improvement Days throughout the school year. (revised 2-23-09)	11/20/2008	05/19/2010	After School	Other	2,000
4	Teachers will be trained to use Aimsweb Progress Monitoring Assessment.	02/26/2009	05/15/2010	After School	Other	0

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

Our current achievement in math shows 76.8% of our students in the meets and exceeds categories. All of our students will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 or safe harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Attend Parent Institutes developed by Paul Revere Int. Quarterly	09/18/2008	05/18/2009	After School	Other	100
2	Attend Title I Parent Meetings for hands on strategies to assist students at home.	09/18/2008	05/19/2009	After School	Other	0
3	Attend Family Curriculum Nights to provide parents insight to their child's education.	09/15/2008	05/19/2009	After School	Other	250
4	Encourage parental review of student's work through assignment notebooks, nightly reading journals, weekly folders, phone calls, and emails.	09/15/2008	05/22/2009	After School	Other	0
5	Provide strategies to parents on creating a conducive homework/study environment	09/15/2008	05/22/2009	After School	Other	0
6	Encourage P.T.O. participation through phone calls, meetings, and emails.	09/15/2008	05/22/2009	After School	Other	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Our current achievement in math shows 76.8% of our students in the meets and exceeds categories. All of our students will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 or safe harbor.

The effectiveness of the strategies will be monitored by checking the progress of our students on math local assessments and classroom based assessments throughout the school year.

	Name	Title
1	Wendy Bumphis	Principal
2	Lydia Beth Ouimet-Stipp	5th grade Teacher/SIP Team member
3	David Bonnan	4th grade Teacher/SIP Team member

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.*)

Notice was sent home in English and Spanish to inform parents about the academic status of the school in the following ways:

October's Newsletter
With 1st Quarter Report Cards

Also copies of the School Improvement Plan and School Report Card are always available in both English and Spanish in the school office. **(revised 2-23-09)**

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 was made up of staff members and parents that were interested in participating. The school administrator verbally solicited participation from willing participants. We are always looking for new members who would be willing to serve on the team. The current members are: Wendy Bumphis, David Bonnan, Guadalupe Zambrano, Sharon Domas, Jeanette Henke, Karen Johnson, Wendy Peterson, Aide Ferrin, LaDonna Harlin, Lydia Beth Ouimet-Stipp, and Sara Dina.

	Name	Title
1	Wendy Bumphis	Principal
2	David Bonnan	4th grade teacher
3	Guadalupe Zambrano	Secretary
4	Sharon Domas	Librarian
5	Jeanette Henke	4th grade teacher
6	Karen Johnson	5th grade teacher
7	Wendy Peterson	5th grade teacher
8	Aide Ferrin	Parent
9	Lydia Beth Ouimet Stipp	5th grade teacher
10	Sara Dina	4th grade teacher
11	LaDonna Harlin	Parent

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.

Revised 2-25-09

The peer review process involved sharing the SIP Plan with three colleagues. One reviewer is the principal of another school in the district. The second reviewer is the Director

of Funded Programs in District 130. The third reviewer is an administrator at St. Xavier University. All three parties were asked to review the plan for content, clarity and comprehensiveness focusing on the targeted population. They received the plan on November 13, 2008 and were asked that they review it and respond with comments, advice, and recommendations by November 30, 2008. Upon receipt of feedback, the changes were made and follow up was made with the colleagues.

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.

Our teacher mentoring process pairs a new teacher with a more experienced teacher in the same subject area or same grade level. It is a two year commitment which also enables the novice teacher to move from an initial teaching certificate to a standard teaching certificate. We also have a "buddy" program for teachers who have teaching experience, but are new to our district. They are also partnered up with a teacher for assistance with learning how our district operates.

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.

The district provides time for the SIP Team to meet throughout the school year. Also, our district is very supportive of providing assistance with professional development opportunities for our staff. District 130 provides Title I Parent Workshops, Gifted Parent Workshops, and Bilingual Parent Workshops to address the needs of our diverse groups of learners. The district has also provided technology support by purchasing several licenses for various computer software programs, Paul Revere Intermediate had a Smartboard installed in the media center and we received 27 laptops to create a mobile computer lab. Funding for the After School Literacy Program (for students) and monthly literacy meetings (for staff members) was also provided by the District. (revised 2-23-09)

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).

- ⓔ Require implementation of a new research-based curriculum of instructional program;
- ⓔ Extension of the school year or school day;
- ⓔ Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance;
- ⓔ Significant decrease in management authority at the school level;
- ⓔ 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 school improvement team has attended a workshop entitled Ensuring and Writing a Quality School Improvement Plan which was provided by RESPRO. Some members of the team are also attending a workshop entitled Assessment Analysis which is provided by Illinois Principal Association (IPA).

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

	Name	Title
1	Ruby Roberson	RESPRO consultant
2	Jerry Lauritsen	RESPRO consultant
3	Bernie Ferrerie	RESPRO consultant

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

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 School, Whittier Elementary, Paul Revere Intermediate, and Nathan Hale Middle schools. This compliance item must be clarified and the plans resubmitted with this information. Please work with your area RESPRO for the updates to these plans in the district. Carol Diedrichsen, ISBE, cdiedric@isbe.net. See the readers' comments that follow specific for your school.

Section I - Data Analysis:

The analysis of the report card data is very specific and clear. You are proactive in the sense that the black and economically disadvantaged subgroups have been identified as at risk. Targeting at risk students at the beginning of the school year, using a universal screening tool and additional student data, is an excellent conclusion. (SIP page 17)

One factor identified on page 18 of your plan states that there are not enough resources to assist the LEP students with their academic language acquisition. Does this mean you are studying Marzano's Academic Vocabulary for your LEP students academic language acquisition?

The identification of the need to use data to drive instruction is very good. It has also been identified that the assessments currently being used by the school do not align with the state assessment frameworks or standards. (page 18) Have you considered an assessment tool for progress monitoring?

Have you considered the LEP population and the language barrier when planning parent programs? Are any programs directed at the LEP parents?(page 20)

Section II - Action Plan:

As far as the alignment of strategies and activities following observations have been made. The student activities and strategies are not specific, they appear to be a list for both objective 1 and 2. What specific group of students will use Read Naturally, for example, how long with they use it, and how will progress be measured and monitored? (page 21 & 22 of SIP)

The professional development strategies for objectives 1 and 2 do align with the student strategies but add how often professional development will be conducted. Be specific. The technology relationship between professional development strategies and the student strategies need to be made clearer. (SIP page 22)

You mention the language barrier with parents. How will you address this challenge with your parent involvement strategies for both objectives since research indicates a direct correlation between parent involvement and student academic success. (SIP page 22)

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 RESPONSIBILITIES

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 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?

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

March 24, 2009

Thanks for the update to this plan clarifying the peer review. This brings the plan into compliance: please implement this plan with the assistance of your area RESPRO. Best

2/7/2010 2:36:40 PM

wishes as you do so! Carol Diedrichsen

Readers' Comments:

Parent Notification:

Has the written notification of the school's academic status been sent in Spanish? If it is being done, please add it to your plan.

Stakeholder Involvement:

It is good to see parents involved in the school improvement process.

Peer Review:

The plan describes specifically who will participate in the peer review, but the peer review process is not described. The actual date the peer review took place is not written in the plan. Have you considered adding the suggestions made by the peer reviewers to your plan?

District Responsibilities:

How is the district specifically supporting the school action plan implementation?

Closing Comments:

January 22, 2009

The Paul Revere Intermediate School improvement plan does not comply with the 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.