

## J W Riley Elem School

### School Improvement Plan 2008

Local Board Approved	
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

<b>PRELIMINARY INFORMATION</b>
--------------------------------

RCDT Number	140160870022007		
District Name	BERKELEY SD 87	School Name	J W RILEY ELEM SCHOOL
Superintendent	Joseph Palermo	Principal	Michelle Gambardella
District Address	1200 N WOLF RD	School Address	123 S WOLF RD
City/State/Zip	BERKELEY,IL,60163 1219	City/State/Zip	NORTHLAKE,IL,60164 2392
District Telephone#	7084493350 Extn:0	School Telephone#	7084493180 Extn:0
District Email	jpalermo@berkeley87.org	School Email	mgambardella@berkeley87.org

**Is this plan for a Title I School?** True

**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?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2007-08 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2007-08 State Improvement Status	

	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	56.7		No	80.8		Yes	95.7	Yes		
White														
Black														
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	55.9		No	80.9		Yes				
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	46.3		No	75.9		Yes				
Students with Disabilities														
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	51.9		No	77.9		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.

**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**

<b>School Information</b>								
	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
Attendance Rate (%)	95.0	95.2	95.8	96.2	99.7	95.7	95.6	95.7
Truancy Rate (%)	-	-	-	0.8	-	-	-	-
Mobility Rate (%)	35.9	33.8	26.2	52.9	51.9	57.2	60.6	22.2
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	450	486	547	545	534	489	500	501
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	50.2	57.6	60.7	64.6	65.9	74.2	75.0	72.7
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	70.0	82.7	64.0	47.2	68.4	87.1	58.0	64.5
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	8.0	7.2	4.8	3.7	3.2	2.7	1.2	0.6
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	2.0	2.5	1.5	1.1	1.7	1.6	1.0	1.2
Hispanic (%)	88.7	89.1	92.7	93.6	92.1	93.3	94.2	95.0
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.7	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.4
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	1.9	1.4	2.4	1.8

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/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	1999	14.9	3.0	79.5	2.7	-	-
	2000	11.0	2.3	84.6	2.1	-	-
	2001	8.0	2.0	88.7	1.3	-	-
	2002	7.2	2.5	89.1	1.2	-	-
	2003	4.8	1.5	92.7	1.1	-	-
	2004	3.7	1.1	93.6	1.7	-	-
	2005	3.2	1.7	92.1	1.1	-	1.9
	2006	2.7	1.6	93.3	1.0	-	1.4
	2007	1.2	1.0	94.2	1.2	-	2.4
	2008	0.6	1.2	95.0	1.4	-	1.8
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	1999	24.8	33.9	38.4	2.7	0.2	-
	2000	19.3	37.5	40.5	2.7	-	-
	2001	17.4	36.3	43.1	3.0	0.2	-
	2002	16.4	36.4	44.1	3.0	0.2	-
	2003	14.1	34.9	48.4	2.4	0.1	-
	2004	12.4	33.2	51.9	2.4	0.1	-
	2005	9.8	29.0	56.7	2.0	0.1	2.4
	2006	8.2	28.6	58.7	1.7	0.1	2.7
	2007	7.0	26.2	61.9	1.4	0.2	3.4
	2008	6.6	25.2	62.9	1.5	0.3	3.5

	Year	White(%)	Black(%)	Hispanic(%)	Asian/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
<b>S T A T E</b>	1999	62.0	20.8	13.9	3.2	0.2	-
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7	

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 Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	1999	58.9	50.0	98.6	94.5	29.3	0.0	-	-	-
	2000	86.7	80.9	98.7	95.3	33.7	0.0	-	-	-
	2001	70.0	50.2	100.0	95.0	35.9	0.0	-	-	-
	2002	82.7	57.6	100.0	95.2	33.8	0.0	-	-	-
	2003	64.0	60.7	98.7	95.8	26.2	0.0	-	-	-
	2004	47.2	64.6	100.0	96.2	52.9	4	0.8	-	-
	2005	68.4	65.9	98.7	99.7	51.9	0.0	-	-	-
	2006	87.1	74.2	100.0	95.7	57.2	0.0	-	-	-
	2007	58.0	75.0	100.0	95.6	60.6	0.0	-	-	-
	2008	64.5	72.7	100.0	95.7	22.2	0.0	-	-	-
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	1999	14.2	35.2	100.0	94.8	25.7	2	0.1	-	-
	2000	19.9	41.4	96.2	95.2	30.3	4	0.2	-	-
	2001	17.7	37.7	91.1	95.0	25.4	3	0.1	-	-
	2002	20.4	44.0	93.0	95.1	23.8	4	0.2	-	-
	2003	17.4	48.0	99.4	95.5	23.6	2	0.1	-	-
	2004	12.8	53.0	99.8	95.5	30.4	10	0.4	-	-
	2005	18.2	56.6	97.9	96.0	30.7	8	0.3	-	-
	2006	21.1	59.1	99.5	95.6	29.0	1	-	-	-
	2007	14.1	60.7	99.5	95.3	33.4	17	0.6	-	-
	2008	18.1	62.3	99.3	95.5	23.2	18	0.7	-	-

	Year	LEP(%)	Low Income(%)	Parental Involvement(%)	Attendance(%)	Mobility(%)	Chronic Truants(N)	Chronic Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
<b>S T A T E</b>	1999	6.4	36.1	96.1	93.6	18.1	43332	2.3	5.9	81.9
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.9	94.0	16.4	37525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40764	2.1	4.6	86.5
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49056	2.5	3.5	85.9
2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49858	2.5	4.1	86.5	

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

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

	Year	School(N)	Grade 3(N)	Grade 4(N)	Grade 5(N)	Grade 7(N)	Grade 8(N)	Grade 11(N)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	1999	404	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	429	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	450	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	486	104	88	-	-	-	-
	2003	547	102	80	81	-	-	-
	2004	545	104	88	79	-	-	-
	2005	534	84	97	77	-	-	-
	2006	489	85	72	86	-	-	-
	2007	500	71	83	73	-	-	-
	2008	501	70	69	89	-	-	-
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	1999	2475	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	2547	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2623	310	299	297	294	265	-
	2002	2796	330	324	299	286	295	-
	2003	2838	336	339	323	294	271	-
	2004	2949	343	335	344	289	283	-
	2005	2911	293	350	345	333	282	-
	2006	2886	303	283	333	326	311	-
	2007	2855	316	316	288	324	314	-
	2008	2825	315	321	311	325	321	-

	Year	School(N)	Grade 3(N)	Grade 4(N)	Grade 5(N)	Grade 7(N)	Grade 8(N)	Grade 11(N)
<b>S T A T E</b>	1999	1962026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1983991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2007170	164791	161546	162001	151270	148194	123816
	2002	2029821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2044539	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	2060048	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	2062912	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	2075277	136123	139619	146935	153566	154856	-
	2007	2077856	155356	153480	154719	162594	159038	150475
2008	2074167	155578	152895	153347	160039	161310	149710	

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, Staff Capacity and Professional Development**

	Year	Total Teacher FTE(N)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary(\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree(%)	Teachers with Master's Degree(%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials(%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers(%)
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	1999	158	10	33170	69	31	19	-	-	-
	2000	158	10	35252	71	29	20	-	-	-
	2001	160	10	36340	72	28	20	-	-	-
	2002	165	10	37666	72	28	20	-	3	-
	2003	177	9	38261	73	27	20	-	4	-
	2004	172	9	40071	72	28	20	-	2	-
	2005	175	8	40089	68	33	20	-	4	-
	2006	177	8	43446	58	42	19	-	2	1
	2007	175	9	43781	57	43	19	-	2	-
	2008	171	9	45651	57	43	19	-	2	-
<b>S T A T E</b>	1999	119718	15	45337	53	47	20	18	-	-
	2000	122671	15	45766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125735	15	47929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126544	14	49702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129068	14	51672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125702	14	54446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128079	14	55558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127010	13	56685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127010	13	58275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131488	12	60871	47	53	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	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	85.7	72.7	58.6	82.6	60.0	57.1	-	-	-	63.4	69.6	41.4	42.1	51.3	60.4	55.9	43.3	61.1
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	88.0	73.7	65.0	82.4	66.7	56.9	-	-	-	60.9	71.5	40.0	40.9	51.8	55.3	58.0	42.8	60.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	52.6	-	-	-	-	-	22.9	-	-	-	-	-	38.7
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.0	-	-	-	-	41.7	40.0
Economically Disadvantaged	82.4	72.7	47.4	81.3	61.5	51.7	-	-	-	59.1	65.1	36.0	38.9	36.4	48.0	54.2	43.8	55.9
	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	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**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	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	94.3	68.2	75.8	91.3	100.0	85.7	-	-	-	86.6	92.9	77.2	52.6	51.4	72.1	73.5	76.7	77.8
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	92.0	63.2	85.0	94.1	100.0	84.6	-	-	-	86.9	95.9	75.4	49.0	51.9	73.7	77.4	79.6	79.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	83.1	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	-	-	-	-	-	77.4
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	-	-	-	-	66.7	60.0
Economically Disadvantaged	94.2	54.5	63.2	87.5	100.0	86.2	-	-	-	90.9	93.0	70.0	50.0	45.5	76.0	83.4	77.1	75.0
	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	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**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?

**Strengths**

The school report card data shows that 80.8% of Riley students in Math achievement met/exceeded state standards in 2008. There was a decrease in third grade Math scores from 100% of students meeting/exceeding in 2007 to 85.7% in 2008. Fourth grade Math scores also decreased from 93% in 2007 to 77.1% in 2008. Fifth grade Math scores increased from 77% in 2007 to 77.8% in 2008.

**2007 IMAGE Reading Data (Given to LEP students only)**

Grade	Met/Exceeded	Below/Warning
3 <sup>rd</sup>	61%	39%
4 <sup>th</sup>	80%	20%
5 <sup>th</sup>	50%	50%

**LEP ISAT Reading Data 2008**

Grade	% Met/Exceed	Number of Students Met/ Exceed	Number of Students Below the standards	Total Number of Students	Total students tested by grade.
3 <sup>rd</sup> (LEP)	52%	30	28	58	
3 <sup>rd</sup> (Non-LEP)	80%	8	2	10	68
4 <sup>th</sup> (LEP)	21%	7	26	33	
4 <sup>th</sup> (Non-LEP)	59%	20	14	34	67

4/22/2009 10:39:30 AM

5 <sup>th</sup> (LEP)	38%	11	18	29	
5 <sup>th</sup> (Non-LEP)	73%	43	16	59	88

On the 2007 IMAGE test in reading, 60% of Riley's 3rd graders met/exceeded the standards. The same students in 4th grade took the ISAT reading test in 2008, and 21% met or exceeded the standards. On the 2007 IMAGE test in reading, 80% of the 4th graders met/exceeded the standards. The same students took the ISAT reading test in 2008, and 38% met/exceeded the standards.

#### **IEP Students (2008 ISAT Reading Data)**

Grade	% Met/Exceeded	Number of Students Met/Exceeded	Number of students Below the standards	Total Number of IEP students	Total Number of students tested (grade)
3 <sup>rd</sup> (IEP)	38%	3	5	8	68
4 <sup>th</sup> (IEP)	10%	1	9	10	67
5 <sup>th</sup> (IEP)	40%	4	6	10	88

The IEP data shows that students with an IEP in 4th grade had the lowest number of students meet/exceed the ISAT Reading standards.

#### **Extended Response Average Score (ISAT Reading)**

Grade	2007	2008	2008
	<u>Non-LEP</u>	<u>LEP</u>	<u>Non-LEP</u>
3 <sup>rd</sup>	1.7	1.8	2.1
4 <sup>th</sup>	1.9	1.7	1.9
5 <sup>th</sup>	2.0	1.5	1.9

The data shows that the LEP students scored significantly lower than the Non-LEP students. There was no LEP subgroup for 2007 and there was also no extended response question for the LEP students who took the 2007 IMAGE test.

**Reading ISAT Item Analysis (2008)**

3rd grade Strengths

1. Purpose for Reading
2. Support Inferences with Textual Evidence
3. Identify Genres

3rd Grade Weaknesses

1. Determine the Meaning of Unknown Compound words
2. Fact and Opinion
3. Purpose for Writing

4th Grade Strengths

1. Identify Probable Outcomes or actions
2. Distinguish between main idea and supporting details

4th Grade Weaknesses

1. Identify the roots, prefix, and suffix of familiar words
2. Differentiate between fact and opinion
3. Determine cause of character actions
4. Identify the author's message
5. Use synonyms of words

5th Grade Strengths

1. Use synonyms to define words
2. Draw inferences, conclusions, generalizations
3. Determine character motivation
4. Identify genres
5. Establish and adjust purposes for reading

5th Grade Weaknesses

1. Identify and Interpret Figurative Language
2. Difference between fact and opinion
3. Characterization

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

All English Language Learners took the ISAT test for the first time in 2008. This may have contributed to the decline in test scores. In previous years, English Language Learners took the IMAGE test. The IMAGE test was a simplified version of the ISAT test.

The district does not have a formal research based reading program at the 3rd-5th grade levels. Teachers are currently using the Accelerated Reading program.

There has been a strong focus on professional development in the area of Math in the district for the past few years and not a large focus on Reading.

Riley has an LEP population of 64.5% and also houses the Transitional Bilingual Education program for the entire district. Students from the other three elementary schools who qualify for bilingual services are serviced at Riley. Many of the students who took the ISAT test have not yet reached the level of academic English as their English speaking counterparts (See ACCESS data analysis.)

Teachers in the bilingual classroom have not been following the guidelines for the amount of time being spent on English vocabulary in the content areas from the Bilingual/ESL curriculum. This has been evidenced by discussions with bilingual teachers and informal observations.

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

This data indicates a need for reform in the area of reading instruction for all grade levels and subgroups. All Riley teachers will facilitate guided reading and literacy centers. Instruction will focus on the Illinois Learning State Standards and English Language Proficiency Standards. Teachers will implement Project CRISS and sheltered instruction strategies to differentiate instruction for Riley students.

In order to meet the diverse needs of the student body, Riley will implement the district Response to Intervention plan. Students will be administered curriculum based measurements to determine the need for specialized interventions in the area of reading. Riley will utilize the problem solving process to provide ongoing assistance to students not achieving grade level proficiency in reading.

Riley will also be offering after school ISAT test taking skills and English Skills assessment practice to all 3rd-5th grade students.

Riley will review how much time is spent teaching students English skills in the Bilingual classrooms. If more English time is needed, the committee will make suggestions to increase the amount of time students learn academic vocabulary in English.

Riley 3rd-5th grade teachers will need to teach students how to read a selection and then take the extended response and respond to the literature. Further professional development for teachers will need to be conducted on how to work with students to improve their extended response.

### Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data (Optional)

**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?

#### Terra Nova Data Analysis - Reading (National Percentile Composite Scores)

Grade	2007	2008
1 <sup>st</sup>	50	55
2 <sup>nd</sup>	45	44
3 <sup>rd</sup>	37	38
4 <sup>th</sup>	40	35
5 <sup>th</sup>	33	40

The 1st grade scores increased by 5, the 2nd grade scores decreased by one, the third grade scores increased by one, the 4th grade scores decreased by 5 and the 5th grade scores increased by 7. These scores are consistent with the ISAT scores which indicate a decrease in 4th grade scores and an increase in 5th grade scores in Reading.

#### 1st Grade Strengths

1. Oral Comprehension
2. Introduction to print
3. Consonants and sight words

#### 1st Grade Weaknesses

1. Analyzing the text
2. Editing Skills
3. Vowels

#### 2nd Grade Strengths

1. Oral comprehension
2. Introduction to print

4/22/2009 10:39:30 AM

3. Consonants
4. Identifying reading strategies

2nd Grade Weaknesses

1. Evaluating meaning
2. Writing conventions
3. Vowels

3rd Grade Strengths

1. Evaluating Meaning
2. Word meanings
3. Consonants
4. Vowels

3rd Grade Weaknesses

1. Analyzing text
2. Multi meaning words
3. Sentence Structure
4. Root affix

4th Grade Strengths

1. Word meanings
2. Introduction to print

4th Grade Weaknesses

1. Identifying reading strategies
2. Words in context
3. Multi meaning words
4. Vowels and consonants

5th Grade Strengths

1. Multi meaning words
2. Consonants

5th Grade Weaknesses

1. Identifying reading strategies
2. Sentence structure
3. Writing conventions

**STAR Test Score Analysis****Star Early Literacy (Kindergarten and First Grade students only)**

Star Early Literacy scale scores for Kindergarten increased 73.2 points during the 2007-2008 school year.

Star Early Literacy scale scores for 1st grade increased 155 points during the 2007-2008 school year.

**Star Reading Assessments (Accelerated Reader Program)**

Second grade students made a 0.71 grade equivalent growth during the 2007-2008 school year.

Third grade students made a 0.68 grade equivalent growth during the 2007-2008 school year.

Fourth grade students made a 0.55 grade equivalent growth during the 2007-2008 school year.

Fifth grade students made a 1.2 grade equivalent growth during the 2007-2008 school year.

**Literacy Skills Test Score Analysis (Percentage correct) 2007-2008**

Grade	Initial Understanding	Inferential Comprehension	Literary Analysis	Constructing Meaning
3rd	82.5%	73.5%	79.8%	68.25%
4th	63.3%	73%	73.3%	56.6%
5th	71.8%	71.3%	70.5%	67.8%

All 3rd-5th grade students scored the lowest in constructing meaning. The 4th grade students scored the lowest with 56.6%. This is consistent with dip in 4th grade scores on the Terra Nova and ISAT.

Student Mobility Rate 2006-57.2%

Student Mobility Rate 2007-60%

Student Mobility Rate 2008-22%

The 2007-2008 school year marked a significant decrease in student mobility. The current Riley students are staying at Riley and not transferring to other schools or out of the country at such a high rate as in past years.

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

During the 2007-2008 school year the Principal and Assistant principal were newly hired. There were also five new teachers. Two were 1st grade bilingual teachers, one third grade bilingual teacher, one fourth grade teacher, and one fifth grade teacher. A number of teachers also changed grade levels. This required the training and professional development for the teachers on various aspects of the curriculum.

The kindergarten-1st grade reading program has been very successful as the data has shown. The 2nd-5th grade reading curriculum, consisting of the Accelerated Reader program, is in need of changes. Those changes began during the 2007-2008 school year with the implementation and training of centers, guided reading, and literature circles.

Students in the upper grades need to spend more time learning English. In grades 3rd-5th a large number of students transfer in from other countries and may have not had appropriate education in their home language or in English and have a more difficult time learning English through the academic subject areas.

Local assessment data indicate that there is a significant dip in scores in the 4th grade.

The decrease in student mobility has yet to produce positive achievement scores. This may be because students transferred into Riley in the 2006-2007 school year were below grade level in Reading and Math. It may take more than one year for these students to reach grade level.

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

This data indicates a need for reform in the area of reading instruction for all grade levels. All Riley teachers will facilitate guided reading, literacy centers and literature circles. Instruction will focus on the Illinois Learning State Standards and English Language Proficiency Standards. Teachers will implement Project CRISS and sheltered instruction strategies to differentiate instruction for Riley students.

In order to meet the diverse needs of the student body, Riley will implement the district Response to Intervention plan. Students will be administered curriculum based measurements to determine the need for specialized interventions in the area of reading. Riley will utilize the problem solving process to provide ongoing assistance to students not achieving grade level proficiency in reading.

Teachers will utilize specific grade level analysis of strengths/areas of improvement to design data-based instructional plans. Teachers will attend a reading ISAT workshop. This workshop will focus on the specific skills included in the ISAT Reading test.

Riley will examine the language allocation within our bilingual classrooms. A plan to increase the opportunities for students to practice social and academic English will be created.

Continued discussion and implementation of guided reading will take place on a monthly basis during staff meetings and common plant times. Classroom observations and dicussions will take place to monitor the impact of guided reading on student learning.

Students who transfer into Riley will take the Star Reading and Star Math assessments to determine if remediation is in order.

**Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)**  
**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?*

**2008 ACCESS Data Analysis (English Language Proficiency Levels 1-6)**

Grade	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing	Composite
Kindergarten	2.9	2.7	1.7	1.7	1.8
1 <sup>st</sup> Grade	3.9	3.5	2.7	2.4	2.8
2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade	4.4	5.1	4.2	2.8	3.8
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	4.8	2.7	4.7	4.0	4.0
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	4.4	3.9	3.8	3.2	3.6
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	5.0	3.9	4.5	3.7	4.1

Riley students who start their school career in the Transitional Bilingual Education program in kindergarten, tend to make significant growth in English Language Skills. The data shows that each grade level from kindergarten to second grade showed an increase in learning English Skills. Beginning in 3rd grade the proficiency levels began to level off and decrease in some of the English domains.

Riley school houses the Limited English Proficient Community Enrichment Program. This program offers English as a Second Language classes to District 87 parents on a weekly basis. In addition to ESL instruction, the program offers mini workshops on community resources. Along with parent classes, District 87 students are encouraged to attend the Pre-K through 8th grade fine arts classes which occur on the same nights.

**Focus Walk Data**

	6's	5's	4's	3's	2's	1's
<b>Fall 2005</b>	5%	1%	47%	35%	10%	2%
<b>Fall 2006</b>	5%	4%	46%	35%	7%	3%
<b>Spring 2007</b>	6%	4%	42%	35%	7%	6%
<b>Fall 2007</b>	0%	8%	64%	26%	2%	0%
<b>Spring 2008</b>	1%	5%	62%	26%	5%	0%
<b>Fall 2008</b>	25%	5%	45%	17%	7%	1%
<b>Spring 2009</b>	14%	5%	48%	24%	7%	2%

6 – Student Active Engaged Learning

5 – Student Learning Conversations

4 – Teacher Led Instruction

3 – Student work with Teacher engaged

2 – Student work with teacher not engaged

1 – Complete disengagement

The focus walk data indicates an increase in student active engaged learning from 5% to 14%. Student learning conversations have increased from 1% to 5%. Teacher led instruction has slightly increased by 1%. Student work with teacher engaged has decreased by 9%. Student work with teacher not engaged has decreased by 3%. Complete disengagement has remained the same.

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

The number of new teachers was a result of many factors including transfers and resignations.

The Limited English Proficient Community Enrichment Program has led to improved home-school connections. According to informal surveys, parents appreciate this program for several reasons. By attending ESL classes, parents are able to assist their children with homework. They learn techniques to navigate the school system and are informed of their rights as parents. The LEP Community Enrichment Program allows teachers to build stronger relationships with parents and has increased communication regarding student achievement. Parents participate in authentic learning activities which they are able to transfer into the home. For instance, parents learn how to access the local library and implement literacy strategies at home.

Along with an interest in ongoing teacher collaboration, Riley has expressed interest in engaged and cooperative learning methodologies. According to data collected from the November 17, 2008 Focus Walk 25% of the school day is spent on engaged student activities and 5% on student led conversations. Authentic learning experiences have led to greater focus on students' interests and unique characteristics. Cooperative learning activities have not only increased student achievement levels, but have addressed the socio-emotional needs of our children.

After school Reading/Math classes, ISAT preparation, and the Reading Improvement Program have provided supplemental instruction for students. These programs provide students with targeted instruction which has led to increased Math and Reading achievement.

Highly qualified teachers which engage in ongoing professional development has led to increased achievement in Math, Reading, and English as a Second Language.

An increased focus on curriculum design, has led to a greater emphasis on effective teaching methods. Riley teachers incorporate a variety of best practice teaching strategies within their lessons. Specific English language learning and vocabulary strategies have assisted teachers in utilizing scientifically research based instructional techniques. Teachers share strategies monthly during staff meetings and have developed structures to facilitate the exchange of successful methods.

Along with an interest in ongoing teacher collaboration, Riley has expressed interest in engaged and cooperative learning methodologies. According to data collected from the November 17, 2008 Focus Walk 25% of the school day is spent on engaged student activities and 5% on student led conversations. Authentic learning experiences have led to greater focus on students' interests and unique characteristics. Cooperative learning activities have not only increased student achievement levels, but have addressed the socio-emotional needs of our children.

16 out of 29 Riley teachers have participated in Project CRISS training. This has improved the quality of instruction in all academic areas.

Ongoing professional development activities are pursued by all members of the Riley staff. Fifteen of the 28 full-time teachers currently hold a Master's degree in education related fields and seven are taking classes to obtain their degree. Staff are always involved in a variety of professional development experiences provided by and/or funded by District 87, as evidenced by the extensive list of activities linked to specific SIP strategies. Riley is committed to improving the quality of teaching for its students.

An active Parent Teacher Association is yet another attribute to Riley. Riley currently has approximately 100 members of the PTA and plans a variety of activities throughout the year. Parent participation in this organization has had a dramatic effect on the overall school climate. Many home-school connections have been strengthened as a result of the PTA's efforts.

District 87 is committed to providing educational materials for Riley teachers and students. In the 2005-2006 school years new Social Studies, Math, Music, Reading Improvement, Spanish Reading and Health materials were purchased. Updates to classroom collections, Art supplies, the computer lab, and library materials were also made. Each year teachers are allowed to order supplemental teaching materials for their classrooms. Teachers and students have adequate materials and supplies required of learning. New in the 2008-2009 school year is the addition of a new Reading program for K-1st grade students in English and a new Spanish Reading program for students in grades K-2nd who are in the Transitional Bilingual Education program.

### **Challenges**

Riley hired 7 new staff members in the 2007-2008 school year. Teachers need to have time to learn the new curriculum at their grade level. This may have had an effect on the 2007-2008 data.

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

New teachers require mentoring and training in many areas including district procedures, district curriculum programs and instructional methods. New teachers participate in the district mentoring program for their first year of employment. Continued professional development and discussion will take place for these teachers.

District 87 will continue the LEP Community Enrichment Program.

Riley will continue to implement the Reading and Math after school programs. Teachers will align instruction in the Reading program to classroom instruction and the Illinois Assessment Framework. All third through fifth grade students will participate in ISAT/ESL after school clubs.

Continuing professional development opportunities will be provided in the area of strategy and reading instruction. Riley teachers will continue to create structures for ongoing collaboration.

Suggestions from district consultants will be implemented and monitored on a regular basis.

District 87 will adopt specific Tier I, II and III interventions. Riley will continue to utilize the problem solving model. The district Special Education Restructuring Committee will continue its efforts.

**Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)**  
**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 tell you?

In 2008-2009, Riley has a total of 32 Full-time (FTE) teachers. 26 are female and 2 are male. Eight teachers are Hispanic, and 24 teachers are White, non-Hispanic. The average teacher experience is 8.0 years. Thirteen teachers have a Bachelor's degree, while 15 teachers have a master's degree or higher. Currently, 5 teachers are working on a master's degree. Of the 32 FTE teachers 9 teachers are bilingual; 7 teachers are new to Riley school; 10 teachers have taught from 1-5 years; 12 teachers from 6-10 years; and 10 teachers from 11+ years.

Riley has a very good mix of new and veteran teachers.

Having 10 teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience can be a challenge. Those teachers will need continual professional development in the areas they are currently teaching and in the area of reading instruction.

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

The bilingual teachers have provided students with instruction in their native language and in English. Many teachers have also completed their bilingual/ESL endorsement.

According to Stronge (2002), "researchers indicate that teachers develop from novices to masters at different intervals over time, taking from five to eight years to master the art, science, and craft of teaching." Having teachers with more than five years of experience has been a great benefit to Riley.

Ongoing professional development has been shown to produce the following effects: ongoing emphasis on conceptual knowledge and hands-on learning techniques in the classroom; stronger classroom management skills; and the ability to apply and integrate knowledge or skills to a particular population in a specific setting (Stronge, 2002).

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

With seven new teachers and a number of teachers switching grade levels, or subject areas, professional development opportunities must be provided to further develop these teachers. The need for male teachers will be a goal for the 2009-2010 school year. Riley would like to retain highly qualified teachers. Teachers who possess ESL/BL endorsements will be recruited and current teachers will continue to be encouraged to obtain these credentials.

Ongoing professional development in the areas of reading will take place throughout the school year. Teachers will implement guided reading, literature circles, and literacy centers.

**Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)**  
**Item 3 - Parent Involvement**

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

Riley has tremendous support from its parents. Over 100 parents are in attendance for PTA sponsored events. At parent-teacher conferences, more than 90% of the parents at Riley attend.

Approximately 50 Riley parents attend the Limited English Proficient Community Enrichment Program.

According to data from the 2007-2008 Technology survey, 55% of parents stated they have a home computer. 44% stated they have access to the Internet. Ten percent of parents stated they strongly agree and 35% stated they agree with the statement "I assist my child in using a computer for school projects."

A new executive PTA board was elected for the 2008-2009 school year. The PTA will conduct fundraisers to purchase items that will enhance students performance in the classroom.

According to AIMS CBM assessments, many of our Kindergarten students are not meeting grade level contents in letter/sound recognition, number recognition, oral counting and other basic skills. Parents have requested assistance in helping reinforce these skills at home.

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

Parents often ask how they can help their child at home if they are not proficient in English. The LEP program offers them English as a Second Language instruction and on-going assistance on homework strategies.

Parents don't always know how to help their children at home. Riley will continue to offer opportunities for Riley parents to attend grade level and school functions to further understand their role as parents and working collaboratively with the school and staff.

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

This data demonstrates the importance of district programs such as the LEP Community Enrichment Program. Although these programs are offered to all parents, only a very small number attend. Riley will continue to encourage parents to take advantage of these programs.

PTA will continue to strengthen home-school connections by planning monthly events. They will also continue to recruit new members.

A special class will be offered to Kindergarten parents focusing on reinforcing basic letter/number facts.

Riley will also offer special classes to parents of the 1st-5th grade students on skills the students need to learn to be successful in school.

**Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors****Section I-D - Key Factors** – *From the preceding screens (I-A, I-B, I-C-1, 2, 3) 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 is a need for Professional Development in the areas of Reading. New teachers require professional development on the specifics of the ISAT test and standards based instruction.

Students must have consistent opportunities to practice extended response items.

There is a need for a research-based reading program which meets the needs of Riley's LEP students. Riley teachers require professional development in the area of research-based reading instruction.

The Riley staff must make decisions based on student data analysis and give students immediate feedback. Instruction must be driven by frequent formal and informal assessments.

The Response to Intervention model is new in the 2008-2009 year. There is a need for professional development in the area of differentiation and interventions for struggling students.

Students in grades 3rd-5th who are in the transitional bilingual education program must spend more time learning academic english language vocabulary. Teachers will increase the amount of time and teach academic vocabulary throughout the content areas.

**Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies**

Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed
1	While our current achievement, meet/exceed, in Reading for the LEP subgroup in 3rd grade was 52%, 4th grade 21%, and 5th grade 38%, Riley LEP students in grades 3rd-5th will acheive 70% meet/exceed in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010.	1,2,3,4,
2	While, 64.5% of Riley's students were considered Limited English Proficient in 2007-2008. Riley would like to decrease the percentage of LEP students to 57%.	1,2,3,4,

The following deficiencies [not objectives] have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for your school.	
1	School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2	Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
3	LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
4	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective: 1**

While our current achievement, meet/exceed, in Reading for the LEP subgroup in 3rd grade was 52%, 4th grade 21%, and 5th grade 38%, Riley LEP students in grades 3rd-5th will acheive 70% meet/exceed in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010.

**Objective 1 Description:**

Riley school would like to improve the percentage of the LEP students meeting/exceeding state standards in Reading to 70%. This goal will be achieved by utilizing guided reading, literature circles, differentiated reading instruction, and CRISS and ELL teaching methods.

Teachers in the 3rd-5th grade transitional bilingual education program will teach at least 1 hour of ESL throughout the content areas.

Test preparation and English as a Second Language after school clubs will be provided to all third through fifth grade students.

Riley will also implement the Response to Intervention model to target students who may be at-risk and for those who are not meeting standards through various reading interventions. Students will recieve Tier I, II and III interventions.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency	
1	School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2	Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

3	LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
4	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

**Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities**

**Objective 1 Title :** While our current achievement, meet/exceed, in Reading for the LEP subgroup in 3rd grade was 52%, 4th grade 21%, and 5th grade 38%, Riley LEP students in grades 3rd-5th will acheive 70% meet/exceed in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Students in grades 3-5 will complete literacy skills tests on a quarterly basis.	9/5/2008	6/5/2009	During School	Other	
2	Students will participate in guided reading, literature circles, and literacy centers to address individual student needs.	9/5/2008	6/5/2009	During School	Other	
3	Students will keep a reading log listing the genre of the book and the level of the book.	9/5/2008	6/5/2009	During School	Other	
4	All students will participate in fluency and comprehension curriculum based measurements three times per year. Students who score below the 25th percentile on curriculum based measurements will participate in tiered intervention groups. Students not meeting grade level targets will be monitored monthly or bi-weekly.	9/20/2009	6/5/2009	During School	Other	
5	All 3rd-5th grade students will attend ISAT test prep and English Language Skills for assessment in after school classes.	10/20/2008	2/26/2009	After School	Title I	
6	All 3rd-5th grade students will participate in a practice ISAT test in November and January and complete a self-reflection activity.	11/6/2008	1/8/2009	During School	Other	
7	All students will participate in weekly extended response activities.	9/5/2008	6/5/2009	During School	Other	

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

**Objective 1 Title :** While our current achievement, meet/exceed, in Reading for the LEP subgroup in 3rd grade was 52%, 4th grade 21%, and 5th grade 38%, Riley LEP students in grades 3rd-5th will acheive 70% meet/exceed in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	All teachers will be trained to administer curriculum based measurements.	9/5/2008	6/5/2009	After School	Title II	
2	All teachers will attend professional development workshops on guided reading, literature circles and reading strategies.	9/5/2008	6/5/2009	After School	Title II	
3	All teachers will receive training on the SIOP instructional model.	10/17/2008	10/17/2008	During School	Other	
4	All teachers will be trained on using Tier I, Tier II and Tier III interventions.	9/5/2008	6/5/2009	After School	Other	

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
5	All third through fifth grade teachers will attend an ISAT Reading presentation.	1/21/2009	1/21/1909	After School	Other	
6	Teachers will meet with the district math coach to discuss content area vocabulary instructional strategies.	9/12/2008	6/5/2009	During School	Other	
7	Teachers will share and discuss guided reading lessons with colleagues on a monthly basis.	1/7/2009	6/5/2009	During School	Other	
8	Teachers will participate in peer observations.	4/1/2009	4/30/2009	During School	Other	

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

**Objective 1 Title :** While our current achievement, meet/exceed, in Reading for the LEP subgroup in 3rd grade was 52%, 4th grade 21%, and 5th grade 38%, Riley LEP students in grades 3rd-5th will acheive 70% meet/exceed in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Parents will attend a workshop conducted by Dr. Lourdes Ferrer on interpreting ISAT reports and homework help strategies.	11/18/2008	3/15/2009	After School	Other	3000
2	Parents will attend the Limited English Proficiency Community Enrichment Program to further their English skills.	9/15/2008	4/27/2009	Before School	Title III	
3	Parents will attend Family Reading Nights and be provided with ongoing assistance in utilizing these strategies.	2/24/2009	2/24/2009	After School	Other	500

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

**Objective 1 Title :** While our current achievement, meet/exceed, in Reading for the LEP subgroup in 3rd grade was 52%, 4th grade 21%, and 5th grade 38%, Riley LEP students in grades 3rd-5th will acheive 70% meet/exceed in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010.

**Monitoring - Describe the process and measures of success for the identified objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)**

Literacy Skills Reports will be printed and analyzed on a quarterly basis by 3rd-5th grade level teams.

Informal observations will take place to monitor guided reading, literature circles, and literacy instruction. Teachers ill receive written and verbal feedback from informal observation. Lesson plan review will take place every other weekwith administrators looking for specific ELL strategies and reading assessment framework objectives. Ongoing discussions will take place during staff meetings.

Teachers will collect students' Reading logs on a monthly basis to monitor the genres students are reading.

AIMS reports will be printed and analyzed by grade level teams three times per year. Intervention groups will be created and progress/strategic monitoring reports utilized to adjust instruction.

Focus walks will take place twice a year to monitor the instruction of specific reading strategies and engaged student learning. Focus walk data will be shared with the entire staff one week after the focus walk has been conducted.

Attendance sheets will be collected and student absences tracked for after-school ISAT test prep classes.

Teachers will collect ISAT practice test, student self-reflection activities, and discuss at grade level team meetings.

**Monitoring Persons** - List the individuals and designate the role of each person (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

Name	Title
Michelle Gambardella	Principal
Noah Little	Assistant Principal
All Teachers	

## Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

### Objective: 2

While, 64.5% of Riley's students were considered Limited English Proficient in 2007-2008. Riley would like to decrease the percentage of LEP students to 57%.

### Objective 2 Description:

Riley has continually made progress in students obtaining English proficiency and making English progress based on ACCESS test data for the last two years.

Riley teachers will increase the amount of time being spent teaching academic english language vocabulary.

Monthly ESL observations are completed by the ELL coordinator and curriculum supervisor.

Parents attend English Language Learning classes for two eight week sessions to learn English. Classes are offered to parents on homework assistance strategies.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency	
1	School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2	Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
3	LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
4	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

**Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities**

**Objective 2 Title :** While, 64.5% of Riley's students were considered Limited English Proficient in 2007-2008. Riley would like to decrease the percentage of LEP students to 57%.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Students will participate in differentiated language activities.	8/26/2008	5/26/2009	During School	Other	
2	Students will participate in English Language activities at proficiency levels.	8/26/2008	5/26/2009	During School	Other	
3	Students will participate in English as a Second language activities as described in the Berkeley District 87 English Language Learning Curriculum Guide.	8/26/2008	5/29/2009	During School	Other	

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

**Objective 2 Title :** While, 64.5% of Riley's students were considered Limited English Proficient in 2007-2008. Riley would like to decrease the percentage of LEP students to 57%.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Teachers will attend the 32nd Annual State Conference for Educators serving Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Learners and share information at staff meetings.	1/7/2009	1/9/2009	During School	Other	
2	Teachers will attend workshops at the Illinois Resource Center.	9/5/2008	5/26/2009	During School	Other	
3	Teachers will use ESL strategies during ESL lessons and receive feedback from ELL coordinator.	9/5/2008	5/26/2009	During School	Title III	
4	Teachers will increase opportunities for students to learn English vocabulary throughout the curriculum.	9/5/2008	5/29/2009	During School	Other	

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

**Objective 2 Title :** While, 64.5% of Riley's students were considered Limited English Proficient in 2007-2008. Riley would like to decrease the percentage of LEP students to 57%.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Parents will be offered English as a Second language classes.	10/20/2008	4/26/2009	After School	Title III	
2	Parents will attend the annual Bilingual Parent Summit.	5/2/2009	5/2/2009	After School	Title III	

### Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 2 Title :** While, 64.5% of Riley's students were considered Limited English Proficient in 2007-2008. Riley would like to decrease the percentage of LEP students to 57%.

**Monitoring - Describe the process and measures of success for the identified objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)**

The School Improvement team will analyze the ACCESS and ISAT data at the beginning of the school year.

The ELL Coordinator and Curriculum Supervisor will conduct monthly observations of ESL lessons, give feedback in written form, and assist teachers in planning ESL lessons.

**Monitoring Persons - List the individuals and designate the role of each person(e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.**

Name	Title
Noah Little	Assistant Principal
Michelle Gambardella	Principal
Kathy Moesch	Curriculum Supervisor

### Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation

#### Part A. Parent Notification\*

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

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

All Riley parents will receive a letter regarding NCLB status in both English and Spanish. Parent may also view the school profile by accessing the Illinois Interactive School Report Card website. General information regarding Riley data may be accessed via the Berkeley District 87 website.

### Section III - Plan 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 2008-2009 School Improvement Team consisted of teachers representing the ESL, Bilingual, primary, and intermediate population of the school. The principal and assistant principal were also members of the School Improvement team. The School Improvement Plan was presented and discussed during weekly faculty meetings with the entire Riley staff. Each staff member was given a copy of the School Improvement Plan. Grade level teams were asked to discuss various topics related to the SIP throughout the year. At the end of the 2008-2009 school year teachers will be asked to evaluate SIP successes and areas of improvement. Weekly lesson plans are reviewed to ensure inclusion of lessons and standards related to the SIP action plan. Classroom observations are also a part of ongoing monitoring of SIP implementation.

Mrs. Kathy Moesch, the district Curriculum Supervisor, provided curricular leadership and assisting staff members in effectively implementing all aspects of the curriculum. Mrs. Moesch also coordinated the district professional growth program. In order to provide meaningful workshops for teachers, she created a Professional Development Committee. She facilitated the technology-based programs in the district, such as the Accelerated Reading and Accelerated Math programs, too. Mrs. Moesch facilitated ongoing in-service education for the instructional staff on curricular implementation, effective teaching techniques, and learning strategies. She assisted Riley teams in selecting workshops that specifically relate to SIP strategies and district curriculum goals. Mrs. Moesch met with the SIP team and administrators quarterly to monitor effectiveness provide input and offer technical assistance in regards to school improvement.

Outside experts available for school improvement support included West 40 and the Illinois Resource Center which both provided workshops and conferences for staff related to English Language Learning instruction. Dr. Carla Carter, an outside Special Education consultant was brought in to assist the district in restructuring its special education program. Mrs. Kathy Carter (Math Coach) and Mrs. Kathy Bruni (Reading Coach) also assisted in School Improvement initiatives.

Dr. Doug Dirks, an outside consultant, analyzed the ISAT data and offered insight and information in regards to areas of weakness and strengths. He assisted

in writing, and reviewing the plan and offered suggestions on areas for improvement.

**Names and titles of school improvement team or plan developers:**

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
1	Noah Little	Assistant Principal
2	Michelle Gambardella	Principal
3	Dr. Kathy Moesch	Curriculum Supervisor
4	Lorraine Kibbons	1st Grade Teacher
5	Jennifer Lipscomb	Computer Teacher
6	Angelica Gonzalez	3rd Grade ESL Teacher
7	Laura Taylor	5th Grade Teacher
8	Elaine Gray	ESL Teacher
9	Anissa Hammond	3rd Grade Teacher
10	Dr. Doug Dirks	District Consultant

### Section III - Plan 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. Peer review and subsequent local board approval 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>.

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

The Riley School Improvement Plan will be submitted for peer review three weeks prior to being submitted to the District 87 Board of Education. District 87 will have a Peer Review Team which will include Dr. Doug Dirks, an outside consultant, the District Curriculum Supervisor and the Principals/Assistant Principals of each building. The team's primary responsibility will be to provide specific feedback by providing meaningful advice on each component of the plan. Advice on each component will revolve around the following areas: effective components, areas of improvement, questions to consider and refinements/comments.

The timetable for the peer review consists of one all day session. During the session, the peer review team will review the plan and use the state monitoring rubric as a tool to assess the plan. The review team will not assign number ratings, only narrative feedback on each component of the plan.

Meetings will also take place in September, November, January, and April with the Curriculum Supervisor and Dr. Doug Dirks (an outside consultant). These meetings will focus on the analyzing of the data and writing of the action plan as it relates to the objectives and specific activities and strategies to be completed by students, parents, and staff.

### Section III - Plan 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.

#### Program Guidelines:

A mentor is an experienced, highly effective teacher who offers continuing support and assistance to a novice teacher or an experienced teacher new to the district. Mentors will orient new teachers to the district and will assist new teachers in developing the skills necessary for achieving instructional excellence. The Assistant Superintendent will serve as the facilitator for the district's mentorship program. The facilitator will coordinate district meetings and promote the implementation of common program practices throughout the district. The Teacher Mentorship Program committee consisting of BEA members and administrators, will periodically review the program and make adjustments as needed to ensure maximum program effectiveness.

**Mentor Guidelines:**

1. Mentors will not evaluate or formally supervise protégés.
2. Mentors will respect the confidentiality of the mentoring process, recognizing that their role in working with the protégé is that of a coach.
3. Mentors will serve as a role models and good listeners.
4. Mentors will help the protégés implement effective teaching practices.

**Mentor Responsibilities:**

1. Mentors will hold regular meetings, both planned and unplanned, with their protégés. Formal meetings will focus on but not be limited to the following topics:
  - Orient the protégé to the Curriculum Handbook and the Curriculum Guides.
  - Teach the protégé effective classroom management techniques.
  - Review with the protégé successful classroom and school routines.
  - Help the protégé understand how to meet the needs of children of varying academic levels through curriculum compacting, curriculum modification, and lesson plan adjustment.

- Ensure that the protégé understands how to use classroom technology as an effective tool in helping children learn.
  - Review with the protégé the Best Practice Strategies in the Teaching of Reading.
  - Help the protégé understand how to plan effective units, how to address district pacing guidelines, and how to plan effective lessons.
  - Teach the protégé motivation strategies that will impact student learning.
  - Help the protégé understand how to cultivate good working relationships with parents.
  - Help the protégé understand how to effectively interact with children of varying ethnic backgrounds and different socioeconomic backgrounds.
2. Mentors will review the District #87 curriculum appropriate for the protégé's grade level and/or subject area.
  3. Mentors will review special education procedures as they relate to the protégé's building.
  4. Mentors will help the protégé understand which people to see to get various types of questions answered.

5. Mentors will visit the protégé's classroom in a non-evaluative manner.
6. Mentors will review the protégé's lesson plans and offer suggestions.
7. Mentors will model appropriate lesson delivery for their protégés.
8. Mentors will offer moral support, guidance, and feedback to the protégé in various aspects of the protégé's professional roles.

### Section III - Plan 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 main office administrative team in District 87 was a valuable resource in the development of the plan. The District will continue to provide assistance in implementing the plan.

Ms. Eva Smith, Assistant Superintendent for Special Services, writes grants and coordinates particular grant funded programs such as English as a Second Language classes for parents and after school academic clubs. Ms. Smith also plans and facilitates school participation in district, parent showcase, community, and West 40 events. She is an integral part of the school improvement process by providing technical assistance and guidance in these areas.

Mrs. Kathy Moesch, the district Curriculum Supervisor, is a valuable asset to our district by providing curricular leadership and assisting staff members in effectively implementing all aspects of the curriculum. Mrs. Moesch coordinates the district professional growth program which meets the needs of District 87 students and teachers. In order to provide meaningful workshops for teachers, she has created Professional Development teams at each school. She facilitates the technology-based programs in the district, such as the Accelerated Reading and Accelerated Math programs, too. Mrs. Moesch facilitates ongoing in-service education for the instructional staff on curricular implementation, effective teaching techniques, and learning strategies. She assisted Riley teams in selecting workshops that specifically relate to SIP strategies and district curriculum goals. Mrs. Moesch met with the SIP team and administrators quarterly to monitor effectiveness, provide input and offer technical assistance in regards to school improvement.

Dr. Shiela Perry, Assistant Superintendent studies and evaluates, and as appropriate, recommends adoption of new instructional materials, methods, and programs to the District 87 Board of Education. Dr. Perry assists in budget preparation for newly improved instructional programs as related to specific strategies and activities mentioned in the Riley school improvement plan. He recommends ways in which the curriculum can be adjusted to meet the special

learning needs of the bilingual and ESL students. Dr. Perry provides staff leadership to ensure understanding of the educational objectives of the district and administers educational activities and staff development for instructional personnel at Riley School. He provided the Riley SIP team with local assessment data and analysis.

Dr. Joseph Palermo, Superintendent, approves and supervisors all district and school programs that support the strategies and activities implemented in the school improvement plan.

Outside experts available for school improvement included West 40 and the Illinois Resource Center which both provided workshops and conferences related to English Language instruction. Dr. Carter, an outside Special Education consultant was brought in to assist the district in restructuring its special education program in 2007. She will continue to provide resources and support to Riley during the 2008-2009 school year. During the 2008-2009 school year Riley will also utilize Kathy Bruni, reading coach, and Cathy Carter, math coach, to work with administrators and staff on the areas of Reading and Math.

Doug Dirks, district consultant, will work with Riley on analyzing the data, and developing and monitoring its school improvement plan.

**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).

**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.

### Section III - Plan 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.*

Another resource Riley utilizes is the Illinois Resource Center. According to the IIRC website: Since 1972, the Illinois Resource Center (IRC) has provided assistance to teachers and administrators serving linguistically and culturally diverse students. With support from the Illinois State Board of Education, the IRC has emerged as a major statewide intermediate service agency, and its educational and professional development programs have helped thousands of teachers throughout Illinois and the nation to develop effective instructional practices for language minority students.

The IRC presents many useful professional development workshops for our Bilingual and ESL teachers. Many of our strategies included in the SIP stem from

workshops attended at the IRC. This year, the resource center has been our main source of technical assistance and professional development regarding the WIDA English Language Learner standards.

The Illinois State Board of Education has provided Riley with resources also. The Interactive Report Card was made available four years ago. This website has been very helpful for data analysis purposes. ISBE has also created a new on-line SIP template which has simplified the process of writing and publishing the plan. The extra time gained by utilizing this technology has been invaluable. The SIP team has finally been able to make implementation of the SIP its priority, not creation of the plan. ISBE also has many valuable resources available when working with students who will be taking the ISAT test.

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

State Responsibilities – List the names and identify the roles (e.g., distinguished educator, district curriculum coordinator, university partner, or RESPRO consultant) of the School Support Team. If applicable, School Support Teams are assigned to schools in corrective action to provide sustained and intensive support for those schools to make adequate yearly progress. Note: School Support Teams are not the same as school improvement teams or the school planning team. Schools in academic watch, restructuring, or restructuring implementation status should have School Support Teams. Some schools in Choice, SES, or academic early warning status also have School Support Teams.

	Name	Title
1	Dr. Kathy Moesch	Curriculum Supervisor
2	Dr. Doug Dirks	District Consultant
3	Kathy Bruni	Reading Consultant
4	Kathy Carter	Math Coach/Consultant
5	Dr. Carla Carter	Special Education Coach/Consultant

---

**Section IV-A Local Board Action**

---

**DATE APPROVED** by Local Board:

**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

Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified?

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

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

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

##### LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

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

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

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

##### OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

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

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

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

##### IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance?

Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control?

##### CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

Has the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan?

Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency?

##### ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?

Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement?

Are the strategies and activities measurable?

Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified?

Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear?

	Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students?
	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?
	Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities? for students?
	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?
<b>MONITORING</b>	
	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?
	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?

**PART I - COMMENTS**

**PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN**

<b>PARENT NOTIFICATION</b>	
	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? <font color="red">(Title I Schools Only)</font>
<b>STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT</b>	
	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?
	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?
<b>PEER REVIEW</b>	
	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?
<b>TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS</b>	
	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?
<b>DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES</b>	
	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?
	If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school?
<b>STATE RESPONSIBILITIES</b>	

	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	
	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	
	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.

**PART II - COMMENTS**