

| Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| Local Board Approved | 12/18/2008 |
| Submitted | 12/24/2008 |
| Plan Resubmitted | 02/16/2009 |
| 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 SES | |
| Is this School making AYP in Mathematics? | Yes | 2007-08 State Improvement Status | Academic Early Warning Year 2 |

| Student Groups | Percentage Tested on State Tests | | | | Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards* | | | | | | Other Indicators | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|---------|-------------|---------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---------|-------------|----------------------|---------|------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|
| | Reading | | Mathematics | | Reading | | | Mathematics | | | Attendance Rate | | Graduation Rate | |
| | % | Met AYP | % | Met AYP | % | Safe** Harbor Target | Met AYP | % | Safe** Harbor Target | Met AYP | % | Met AYP | % | Met AYP |
| State AYP Minimum Target | 95.0 | | 95.0 | | 62.5 | | | 62.5 | | | 90.0 | | 75.0 | |
| All | 100.0 | Yes | 100.0 | Yes | 75.0 | | Yes | 79.7 | | Yes | 95.5 | Yes | | |
| White | 100.0 | Yes | 100.0 | Yes | 81.6 | | Yes | 93.9 | | Yes | | | | |
| Black | 100.0 | Yes | 100.0 | Yes | 69.7 | | Yes | 75.3 | | Yes | | | | |
| Hispanic | 100.0 | Yes | 100.0 | Yes | 75.1 | | Yes | 78.5 | | Yes | | | | |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Native American | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----|-------|-----|------|------|-----|------|--|-----|------|--|
| Multiracial /Ethnic | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LEP | 100.0 | Yes | 100.0 | Yes | 55.0 | | Yes | 65.1 | | Yes | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 100.0 | Yes | 100.0 | Yes | 36.7 | 54.1 | No | 61.2 | | Yes | 93.1 | |
| Low Income | 100.0 | Yes | 100.0 | Yes | 72.6 | | Yes | 77.8 | | 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 (%) | | 94.7 | 95.3 | 95.5 | 95.6 | 95.1 | 95.0 | 95.5 |
| Truancy Rate (%) | | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.3 | - | 0.5 | 1.1 | 0.4 |
| Mobility Rate (%) | | 12.3 | 12.6 | 8.8 | 32.9 | 24.5 | 12.6 | 19.1 |
| HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| School Population (#) | | 370 | 399 | 391 | 394 | 397 | 434 | 451 |
| Low Income (%) | | 77.3 | 76.2 | 80.3 | 75.6 | 78.8 | 75.3 | 82.0 |
| Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%) | | 10.3 | 8.0 | 8.7 | 12.4 | 9.8 | 18.4 | 17.5 |
| Students with Disabilities (%) | | | | | | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic (%) | | 22.2 | 20.6 | 18.9 | 15.7 | 15.6 | 13.8 | 11.8 |
| Black, non-Hispanic (%) | | 29.5 | 27.8 | 25.3 | 27.4 | 24.9 | 24.0 | 24.8 |
| Hispanic (%) | | 48.4 | 51.6 | 55.8 | 56.1 | 57.9 | 61.3 | 61.9 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander (%) | | - | - | - | - | 0.3 | 0.2 | - |
| Native American or Alaskan Native(%) | | - | - | - | 0.8 | - | 0.2 | 0.7 |
| Multiracial/Ethnic (%) | | - | - | - | - | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.9 |

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 | 2002 | 22.2 | 29.5 | 48.4 | - | - | - |
| | 2003 | 20.6 | 27.8 | 51.6 | - | - | - |
| | 2004 | 18.9 | 25.3 | 55.8 | - | - | - |
| | 2005 | 15.7 | 27.4 | 56.1 | - | 0.8 | - |
| | 2006 | 15.6 | 24.9 | 57.9 | 0.3 | - | 1.3 |
| | 2007 | 13.8 | 24.0 | 61.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| | 2008 | 11.8 | 24.8 | 61.9 | - | 0.7 | 0.9 |
| | 2009 | 8.7 | 27.1 | 62.7 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.9 |
| 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 | - |
| | 2001 | 60.1 | 20.9 | 15.4 | 3.4 | 0.2 | - |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| S T A T E | 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 | 2002 | 10.3 | 77.3 | 100.0 | 94.7 | 12.3 | 3 | 0.8 | - | - |
| | 2003 | 8.0 | 76.2 | 100.0 | 95.3 | 12.6 | 1 | 0.3 | - | - |
| | 2004 | 8.7 | 80.3 | 100.0 | 95.5 | 8.8 | 1 | 0.3 | - | - |
| | 2005 | 12.4 | 75.6 | 100.0 | 95.6 | 32.9 | - | - | - | - |
| | 2006 | 9.8 | 78.8 | 100.0 | 95.1 | 24.5 | 2 | 0.5 | - | - |
| | 2007 | 18.4 | 75.3 | 100.0 | 95.0 | 12.6 | 5 | 1.1 | - | - |
| | 2008 | 17.5 | 82.0 | 100.0 | 95.5 | 19.1 | 2 | 0.4 | - | - |
| | 2009 | 17.0 | 85.6 | 100.0 | 94.5 | 18.1 | 8 | 1.7 | - | - |
| 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 |
| | 2001 | 6.3 | 36.9 | 94.5 | 93.7 | 17.2 | 42,813 | 2.2 | 5.7 | 83.2 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|--------|-----|-----|------|
| S T A T E | 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 | 2002 | 370 | - | - | - | 129 | 112 | - |
| | 2003 | 399 | - | - | - | 133 | 127 | - |
| | 2004 | 391 | - | - | - | 133 | 131 | - |
| | 2005 | 394 | - | - | - | 124 | 138 | - |
| | 2006 | 397 | - | - | - | 144 | 124 | - |
| | 2007 | 434 | - | - | - | 136 | 136 | - |
| | 2008 | 451 | - | - | - | 161 | 151 | - |
| | 2009 | 458 | - | - | - | 149 | 170 | - |
| 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 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 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 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 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 |
| 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 | - | - | - | 57.1 | 55.8 | 76.8 | - | - | - | 63.3 | 77.3 | 68.3 | 45.0 | 41.1 | 74.8 | 79.8 | 88.4 | 78.8 |
| White | - | - | - | 60.0 | 72.0 | 78.6 | - | - | - | 82.6 | 72.2 | 84.2 | 79.1 | 48.3 | 94.4 | 86.9 | 95.0 | 78.9 |
| Black | - | - | - | 60.6 | 42.9 | 64.1 | - | - | - | 51.1 | 80.0 | 63.1 | 38.5 | 34.3 | 64.3 | 75.7 | 84.6 | 76.1 |
| Hispanic | - | - | - | 55.0 | 55.3 | 82.0 | - | - | - | 64.8 | 76.4 | 66.6 | 35.7 | 40.7 | 75.7 | 78.8 | 88.7 | 79.5 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Native American | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Multiracial/Ethnic | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| LEP | - | - | - | 26.3 | 25.0 | 60.6 | - | - | - | 45.5 | 57.1 | 27.3 | - | - | - | - | - | 50.0 |
| Students with Disabilities | - | - | - | 23.5 | 22.2 | 31.3 | - | - | - | 28.6 | 33.3 | 36.8 | 15.4 | 28.6 | 47.1 | 56.0 | 80.0 | 40.0 |
| Low Income | - | - | - | 51.5 | 54.0 | 73.2 | - | - | - | 58.3 | 74.3 | 65.9 | 37.8 | 37.2 | 69.7 | 79.5 | 84.7 | 75.8 |

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 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 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 |
| 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 | - | - | - | 78.6 | 68.7 | 83.2 | - | - | - | 52.5 | 76.0 | 66.1 | 25.0 | 37.1 | 51.1 | 74.4 | 80.0 | 84.9 |
| White | - | - | - | 70.0 | 80.0 | 92.9 | - | - | - | 52.2 | 77.8 | 89.4 | 52.1 | 41.3 | 61.1 | 83.3 | 90.0 | 94.8 |
| Black | - | - | - | 66.7 | 60.0 | 76.9 | - | - | - | 46.7 | 65.9 | 55.2 | 15.4 | 14.3 | 35.7 | 57.5 | 69.2 | 80.4 |
| Hispanic | - | - | - | 87.0 | 68.2 | 84.1 | - | - | - | 56.3 | 80.5 | 67.0 | 21.1 | 47.5 | 58.6 | 78.8 | 83.1 | 84.5 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Native American | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Multiracial/Ethnic | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| LEP | - | - | - | 94.7 | 30.0 | 68.4 | - | - | - | 45.5 | 64.2 | 35.3 | - | - | - | - | - | 64.7 |
| Students with Disabilities | - | - | - | 58.8 | 61.1 | 81.3 | - | - | - | 21.4 | 33.3 | 26.3 | - | 8.6 | 5.9 | 20.0 | 46.7 | 60.0 |
| Low Income | - | - | - | 76.8 | 63.7 | 81.0 | - | - | - | 49.5 | 74.3 | 64.4 | 20.0 | 32.6 | 45.4 | 73.1 | 76.1 | 83.9 |

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

Revision 2/6/09

Reading:

Our students with disabilities are deficient and not meeting AYP in reading. 31.3% of 6th graders met or exceeded the standards, 36.8% of 7th graders met or exceeded the standards and 40% of 8th graders met or exceeded the standards.

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

Revision - 2/6/09

Some of the skills were not mastered.

Lack of motivation.

Low self-esteem and confidence

Very low levels to start with.

Over modification of materials in the LDR section.

The 6th grade scores are the lowest in the school followed by the 7th grade students and than the 8th grade students. This is attributed to the fact that the 6th grades students have an ajustment period they go through. As they become accustom to our methods, thier scores increase.

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

Revised 2/18/09

We concluded that we need to focus on our students with disabilities in the area of reading. We are going to put more of a focus on our special education subgroup, which in turn is the area we are low performing. Our next steps will be to implement a computer program entitled "Study Island" and continue with our other computer program "Lexia".

We will enroll all students with an IEP and any additional students that each grade level team would benifit from the program. This program will be done during the day as well as after school.

We will meet with all of the Special Education Teachers on a monthly basis to discuss what is happening in their class rooms and for each of them to share a lesson that has been successful in thier class room. The teachers will also meet with an outside source to cover the same topics.

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?

Revision - 2/6/09

The students are tested in the 5 basic core subject areas, using the districts local assesments that are aligned with the state standards. We make accomadations for our students according to thier IEP's. For every student, in addition to driving instruction, math and language assesments are used in thier promotion criteria. They have to master 70% in order to advance to the next grade level.

Students at every level are tested using the IOWA Basic Skills Test every Spring. The are tested in math, language, reading and cognitive sections. They are to score a stanine of 4 or higher in order to meet the Cook County School District 130 promotion criteria. Anyone not scoring a 4 or higher is placed on a possible retention list and given the opportunity to attend summer school. The Rtl process is also started for those students on that list.

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

Revision - 2/6/09

Local Assessments:

To many accomadations are made throughout the year, so when it comes to test time, they are not properly prepared.

The review of assessments is necessary.

-This was attempted over a two day period during the 2008 summer.

During the school year, according to the students IEP, several accomadations are made to prepare the students to take the assesments, however the accomadations are not available when they take the ISAT test. This process has brought us to review our internal policies and procedures for testing.

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

Revision - 2/18/09

We are receiving a very generous grant from our local RESPRO department that is being utilized to restructure our assesments and will be aligned with the state standards. Local assesments are being reviewed and restructured starting in "08" and continuing. We are meeting with our Special Education Teachers regarding thier students performance and what are some different ways we can reach our students. Everyone is bring in different lessons and presenting them to the group. We are also discussing student levels.

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?*

Our largest problem is our special education department. These students are at several different levels and their IEP's are followed to the letter. However, some of these students are so low, they will not be able to pass a state standard test (ISAT). This has been the problem for our school for several years and it has been documented.

We are a title 1 school that houses 30 students in Cross Catagorical classrooms and 30 students that are in our LDR department. These are the students that fall short. Out of the 60 students in this area, only 2 met or exceded the ISAT standards. These students attribute to 13% or our student body.

Veterans Middle School has a large ESL program. Last year was the first year they had to take the english form of the ISAT. We did make safe-harbor, however, we forsee this test becoming a problem in the future.

Cook County School District 130 staff members have been attending workshops with our High School district in order to align our curriculums.

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

Some of our special education students start out so low, that it is very difficult for them to pass the ISAT test. They may increase their reading levels, but it is not enough.

Our LDR students did not test as well as expected and need to increase thier scores.

Our ESL students did very well for their first time with the ISAT, however, this is seen as a problem in the future.

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

Our main focus is our special education reading scores, especially with our LDR students. These students have not just one teacher but another that is specifically assigned to them. The LDR teachers need to focus, as well as the general ed teachers, on their reading strategies.

It has been obvious that the outside programs in technology, sis tutoring, articulation with district 218 and title 1 tutoring are improving our over all scores, but the subgroups are our problem.

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?*

Veterans Memorial Middle School has 32 full-time educators with an average of 10.6 years of experience. 78% or our staff has their bachlors degree and 22% have their masters degree or higher. Demographically, we have 84% are white, 12% are hispanic and 4% are black. 69% are women and 31% are men.

Everyone is highly qualified except for 2 teachers in the bilingual area and they are in the process.

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

Sometimes a younger staff will have an effect on test scores due to thier lack of experience and not effort.

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

The educators qualifications do not have an impact on the students scores.

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

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

Veterans Middle School has several opportunities for parents to come into the building and meet with the faculty and administration. We are a "neighborhood" school, meaning we only have 8 students out of the 460 that take a bus. We have open houses, students led conferences, parent/principal council meetings, athletic programs, NJHS induction ceremony and other various programs where parents can come in and speak to a teacher or administrator.

Since the beginning of the students led conferences, we have gone from having 40% to 50% attendance to 95% attendance.

The teachers at Veterans Middle School also keep a log of different ways they have made attempts to contact parents.

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

We do not have any data directly relating parental involvement with 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).*

As much as we want parental involvement it is very difficult to attain and it is not our main focus. We are more focused on our test scores and we do not have the data to link parental involvement with the scores.

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?

Revision - 2/6/09

Extended response

After school tutoring

LEXIA - Reading software

Study Island - Reading software

Rtl Interventions

Articulation with 218 in order to align our curriculum with what the high school district is teaching.

Workshops for staff - Rtl, AIMS, Special Ed. Reading Strategies

ISC4 - Various workshops on Special Education and Reading Strategies in order to increase ISAT scores.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

| Objective Number | Title (click the link to edit any objective) | Deficiencies Addressed |
|------------------|---|------------------------|
| 1 | Revision - 2/6/09 Meet, exceed or maintain safe harbor in the area of reading for our special education department in the 08-09 and 09-10 school years. | 1, |

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

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Revision - 2/6/09 Meet, exceed or maintain safe harbor in the area of reading for our special education department in the 08-09 and 09-10 school years.

Objective 1 Description

Focus our efforts towards our special education department in the area of reading. We are not only focusing on the Cross Catagorical classrooms, but on our LDR students. We believe these are the students that can make a difference in next years testing.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

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

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

Revision - 2/6/09 Meet, exceed or maintain safe harbor in the area of reading for our special education department in the 08-09 and 09-10 school years.

| | | TimeLine | | | Budget | |
|---|---|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
| | Strategies and Activities | Start Date | End Date | | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Participate in Study Island (both at school and home) | 09/01/2008 | 06/01/2010 | During School | Local Funds | 700 |
| 2 | 20 students per grade level choosen for the LEXIA program. | 09/01/2008 | 06/01/2010 | During School | Local Funds | 0 |
| 3 | Linda Holdorf (AIMS)Instruct teacher strategies to the teachers. Revision 2/6/09 | 09/01/2008 | 06/01/2010 | During School | Title I | |
| 4 | Various reading strategies of pre-reading, graphic organizers, and active reading strategies. | 09/01/2008 | 06/01/2010 | During School | Other | |
| 5 | Title one after school tutoring with emphasis on ISAT reading and math. | 09/01/2008 | 06/01/2010 | After School | Title I | 4,000 |
| 6 | Enrichment program. Vocabulary notebooks. | 09/01/2008 | 06/01/2010 | During School | Local Funds | 300 |

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

Revision - 2/6/09 Meet, exceed or maintain safe harbor in the area of reading for our special education department in the 08-09 and 09-10 school years.

| | | TimeLine | | | Budget | |
|---|---|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
| | Strategies and Activities | Start Date | End Date | | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Reading staff attends sessions with district-level reading specialist. | 09/01/2008 | 06/01/2010 | During School | Title I | |
| 2 | Staff development for special education and general education teachers in the areas of reading. | 09/01/2008 | 06/01/2010 | During School | Local Funds | |
| 3 | Increased collaboration between special education teachers. | 09/01/2008 | 06/01/2010 | After School | Other | 1,500 |
| 4 | Check and connect program through PBIS | 09/01/2008 | 06/01/2010 | Before School | Other | |

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

Revision - 2/6/09 Meet, exceed or maintain safe harbor in the area of reading for our special education department in the 08-09 and 09-10 school years.

| | | TimeLine | | | Budget | |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
| | Strategies and Activities | Start Date | End Date | | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Revision - 2/6/09 Parent / Teacher Conferences | 09/01/2008 | 06/01/2010 | During School | Other | |
| 2 | Revision - 2/6/09 Open house | 09/01/2008 | 06/01/2010 | After School | Other | |
| 3 | Revision - 2/6/09 Fundraisers - We bring in the parents to help us out with them or we include them i the acitivity. | 09/01/2008 | 06/01/2010 | After School | Other | |
| 4 | Revision - 2/6/09 Monthly calendars - In order to keep the parents informed and to get their feedback. | 09/01/2008 | 06/01/2010 | During School | Local Funds | |
| 5 | Revision - 2/6/09 Website - Our school has a web site with links to all of our teachers. It also gives monthly updates and gives the parents an opportunity to give feedback. | 09/01/2008 | 06/01/2010 | During School | Other | |
| 6 | Revision - 2/6/09 PowerSchool - This is our grading and scheduling program that we use. There is a section that the parents can access to view thier child's grades at any time. | 09/01/2008 | 06/01/2010 | Before School | Local Funds | |

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Revision - 2/6/09 Meet, exceed or maintain safe harbor in the area of reading for our special education department in the 08-09 and 09-10 school years.

Revision - 2/6/09

The Veterans Memorial Middle School administration will monitor the teacher effectiveness to implement strategies and activities and to use differentiated instruction by collecting lesson plan books and formal and informal observations on all teachers. This will be done with a special focus on reading. Student work will be analyzed during the post observation meeting as well as when tenure teachers come in to discuss their plans. All of this data will be used throughout the year in team meetings, team leader meetings and faculty meetings to evaluate everyone's progress. The final measurement of the year's focus on reading strategies will be the ISAT, IOWA and local assessment tests. The results of these tests will be used to focus on next year's low performing areas.

| | Name | Title |
|---|---------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Mr. Michael P. McLaughlin | Principal |

2 Ms. Leah Humphrey

Assistant Principal

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.*)

A school report card was sent out to each household.

A letter was sent from the district office concerning Veterans Middle School not making AYP.

Each students was also sent their personal scores.

The district calander was handed out at registration, it contained the district promotion criteria.

Besides being in English, all of the above iteams were also sent out in Spanish.

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

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

The school improvement team consists of various teachers from different grade levels. We have teachers from regular education, special education and administration. Everyone is responsible for submitting ideas for the school improvement plan. It is also their responsibility relay this to the other faculty members in their team meetings as well as during faculty meetings. Upon completion of the school imporvement 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 | Mr. Michael P. McLaughlin | Principal |
| 2 | Ms. Leah Humphrey | Assistant Principal |
| 3 | Mrs. Carrie Tisch | 8th Grade Teacher |
| 4 | Ms. Lisa Szynalski | 6th Grade Teacher |
| 5 | Mr. Bruce Van Auken | 6th-8th Grade Special Education Teacher |

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.

Revision - 2/6/09

Veterans Memorial 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 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. This plan was reviewed by the peer review team that included, Michael P. McLaughlin, Leah C. Humphrey, Carrie Tisch Lisa Szynalski and Bruce Van Auken. We also had a district 130 parent, Teresa Knicker, review the plan as well as another district 130 administrator, Linda F. Battles.

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 new staff members in District 130 are required to become a member of the "New Teacher Mentoring Program". A mentoring teacher is provided to the new teacher by the Principal. That mentoring teacher is there to offer what ever support is needed. As well as attending quarterly meetings with and for the new teachers. The new teachers are required to attend several inservices held after school.

The Veterans administration also tracks the activities of not only the new teachers in the program, but the tenure teachers that are the mentors. If either one has any questions or concerns, the administration has an open door policy.

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.

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 state will monitor the implementation of the school improvement plan and collect data on the school's academic progress in the 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 | Michael P. McLaughlin | Principal |
| 2 | Leah C. Humphrey | Assistant Principal |
| 3 | Carrie Tisch | 8th Grade Teacher |
| 4 | Lisa Szynalski | 6th Grade Teacher |
| 5 | Bruce Van Auken | 6-8th Grade Special Ed. Teacher |
| 6 | Teresa Knicker | Parent |
| 7 | Linda F. Battles | District Administrator |
| 8 | Jerry Lauritsen | RESPRO |
| 9 | Bernie Ferreri | RESPRO |

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**

I have reviewed the compliance pieces that required revision that you submitted for your action plan and the peer review process; these revisions bring your plan into compliance. No further revisions are due to this plan at this time and it is recommended for implementation with the assistance of your area RESPRO. If you would like the rest of the checklist updated, please contact your area RESPRO for a review of the additional pieces. Best wishes to you, Carol Diedrichsen cdiedric@isbe.net

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. In addition, objective statements for Veterans Memorial must be further clarified. 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 A Data Analysis - Report Card page 17

The school did re-confirm the AYP Report Information that their Students with Disabilities did not meet AYP in reading. What other statistics did you use in your analysis? It might be helpful to "dig deeper" in terms of analyzing the additional ISAT statistics available in the plan and on the IIRC in order to provide more specific hypothesis of factors and

2/7/2010 2:38:10 PM

conclusions. This would provide clearer direction for the selection of objectives and strategies. Example: What might your analysis be regarding the difference in 7th and 8th grade trends in S/D scores in Reading and Math over the last three years...both strengths and weakness? Does this provide additional direction for next steps?

Section I B Data Analysis --Local Assessment pg 17 &18

The discussion of local assessment which includes district assessments aligned to the standards is good. Common assessments are certainly a valuable strength. However, it seems like they are used mostly for promotion purposes. Common assessments can be an excellent tool when they are given frequently enough to be used as information for teaching and re-teaching. When used as a summative test, they are not as helpful for providing direction for instruction. You are in the process of redesigning these. Using them to drive instruction may be something to consider. You also state some discrepancies with these and ISAT results. Have you assessed whether the classroom instruction (curriculum) is aligned to the state standards?

Section I D Data Analysis - Key Factors pg 20

This is an area that needs revision in order to identify specific Key Factors based on data and research AND that is within the school's capacity to change. Example: "Special Education Group" is not a key factor that is within the school's capacity to change. What else do you know about this group that will help you determine specific factors that need to be addressed. You mention you have 2 groups: Cross categorical, and LDR. Have you looked at test data for each of these? Aligned curriculum for each? Assessments for Learning eg. progress monitoring? RtI Tiered instruction / interventions?

You mention "skills not mastered that might not be unattainable." What about the specific reading instruction strategies / flexible grouping? What does the data tell you about what skills were mastered and which ones were not? (IIRC student data/frameworks and item analysis)

You correctly identified the LEP student scores in reading may become an issue (55%). Is this something you might want to begin addressing as this is a 2-year plan? This section should be able to be used to identify specific conclusions /factors and provide "next steps" which would then occur in your Action Plan's strategies and activities.

Section II - A Action Plan Objectives pg. 21

The objective stated needs to be re-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. (See examples in the School Improvement Plan Guide) - ISBE E-Plan.

Section II-B, C, D Action Plan - Strategies pg 21

When the Key Factors are clearly identified based on data, this may assist in clearer strategies that will align with data, key factors/ conclusions, and specific strategies. These should reflect scientifically based research so the strategies will likely improve student learning and achievement.

These **student strategies** (pg 21) need to be written in a way that is measurable and indicate what students will specifically experience that will directly relate to academic achievement. Now they are lists of materials or general activities. They also need to identify measures of progress for each of the strategies. Some issues discussed earlier related to curriculum alignment issues, ongoing assessment to assist in progress monitoring, and the identification of specific reading strategies that may include instructionally leveled materials, balanced literacy, Tier 2 & 3 interventions, time for direct reading instruction etc. These strategies need more specificity.

The **professional development** strategies (pg. 22) need more specificity with regard to the alignment with revised specific students strategies? All of the statements seem like they have merit; however...What is the PD session focus? What about increased collaboration between special education teachers? Is it on reading strategies, assessment, alignment, when, how frequently, etc.? PBIS was not mentioned earlier. Is this related to behavior or instructional interventions?

The **parent involvement** strategies (pg 22) need to be completed.

Section I-E - Monitoring pg. 22

It is clear that the Principal and Assistant Principal, named in the Plan, will oversee progress of the objectives. What needs to be clearer is the process of monitoring in relation to the specific strategies. The focus on student work through the collaboration of teachers is a very positive researched strategy. What assessment tools or rubrics might this entail? The monitoring progress should be specific in describing the process and measures of success. In other words, how will this ongoing process provide direction for those involved in the implementation of the plan?

| PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN | |
|---|--|
| PARENT NOTIFICATION | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> 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 | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 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 | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 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 | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 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

- Parent notification was accomplished in English and in Spanish. pg. 23
- Stakeholders are identified by name and their involvement in the plan pg. 23
- This Peer Review process does not show evidence that it has been accomplished prior to local school approval. It is suggested that peer review teams should include teachers and administrators from schools and districts similar to the one in improvement. RESPRO staff can be included if they have not assisted in the formation of the SIP. pg. 24
- District responsibilities are addressed. This could be enhanced by including more specificity with regard to what they will provide to ensure the success of the plan.

1/22/2009

These monitoring comments and feedback that correlate directly with the SIP and the School Improvement Plan Monitoring Prompt is meant to assist your team in completing any of the revisions that are needed for compliance. Strengths are also noted when applicable to specific areas. Some suggestions are also made for your consideration in areas that are in compliance.

The Veterans, Memorial Middle School, Cook County SD #130 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.