

Local Board Approved	
Initial Submission	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	



Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 1 - 2011 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	2011-12 Federal Improvement Status	Choice
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2011-12 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning Year 1

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		85.0			85.0			91.0		82.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	73.1		No	90.3		Yes	95.9	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	87.8		Yes	95.9		Yes				
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes										
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	55.6	44.5	Yes	79.6		Yes	96.4			
Asian														

American Indian														
Two or More Races														
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities														
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	64.8	68.9	No	86.4		Yes	95.6			

**Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress(AYP)**

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 85% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 85% 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 85% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 91% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 82% graduation rate for high schools.

\* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2010.

\*\* Safe Harbor Targets of 85% 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.

#### 2011 DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION

The Differentiated Accountability classification for the School is:	Comprehensive
Is this School making AYP in the "ALL" subgroup in reading?	No
Is this School making AYP in the "ALL" subgroup in math?	Yes

In 2008, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) was one of 6 states to be chosen by the US Department of Education to participate in the Differentiated Accountability Pilot Program. The Differentiated Accountability classification **applies only to schools in federal improvement status that do not make AYP**.

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 assists in distinguishing between schools that need focused support versus more comprehensive interventions.

If a school does make AYP in ALL-student group in both reading and math, this school will be classified as a focused school; otherwise, the school will be identified as a comprehensive school.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 2 - 2011 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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Attendance Rate (%)	95.9	96.1	96.0	95.4	95.6	95.3	95.2	95.9
Truancy Rate (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	1.2	0.5
Mobility Rate (%)	24.5	18.2	17.6	22.9	19.5	15.4	13.0	14.7
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	333	311	298	347	374	385	427	440
Low Income (%)	48.6	50.2	49.3	64.0	67.1	69.6	72.8	75.0
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.0	0.0	0.7	21.3	27.0	23.9	25.5	27.3
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.1	10.2
White, non-Hispanic (%)	72.7	68.5	65.1	48.7	43.9	41.3	39.1	38.4
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	22.8	25.7	21.5	16.7	16.0	17.1	18.5	18.2
Hispanic (%)	3.0	3.5	4.7	24.5	28.9	31.4	32.1	31.4
Asian (%)	1.5	2.3	3.4	1.2	0.8	0.3	0.9	1.1
American Indian(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Two or More Races (%)	-	0.0	5.4	8.9	10.4	9.9	9.4	10.5
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0

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 (%)	American Indian (%)	Two Or More Races (%)	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander (%)
S C H O O L	2000	79.2	17.2	2.7	0.9	-	-	-
	2001	80.7	16.9	1.5	0.9	-	-	-
	2002	81.0	16.0	2.1	0.6	0.3	-	-
	2003	77.1	17.9	3.2	1.8	-	-	-
	2004	72.7	22.8	3.0	1.5	-	-	-
	2005	68.5	25.7	3.5	2.3	-	-	-
	2006	65.1	21.5	4.7	3.4	-	5.4	-
	2007	48.7	16.7	24.5	1.2	-	8.9	-
	2008	43.9	16.0	28.9	0.8	-	10.4	-
	2009	41.3	17.1	31.4	0.3	-	9.9	-
	2010	39.1	18.5	32.1	0.9	-	9.4	-
2011	38.4	18.2	31.4	1.1	0.5	10.5	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	72.4	21.6	4.3	1.6	0.1	-	-
	2001	70.6	22.1	5.1	2.1	0.2	-	-
	2002	68.7	22.7	5.7	2.8	0.1	-	-
	2003	67.5	23.1	6.1	3.3	0.1	-	-
	2004	65.2	24.0	6.7	4.1	-	-	-
	2005	63.2	25.9	6.9	4.0	0.1	-	-
	2006	61.7	25.2	6.5	4.2	0.1	2.3	-
	2007	60.6	24.3	7.4	3.8	0.1	3.9	-
	2008	58.8	22.9	8.2	3.9	0.1	6.1	-
	2009	57.6	22.9	8.4	3.9	0.1	7.2	-
	2010	55.8	23.4	9.0	3.7	0.1	8.1	-

	2011	54.8	22.4	10.5	4.0	0.3	7.9	0.1
S T A T E	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7	-
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8	-
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2	-
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7	-
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5	-
	2010	52.8	18.8	21.1	4.2	0.2	2.9	-
	2011	51.4	18.3	23.0	4.1	0.3	2.8	0.1

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 (%)
S C H O O L	2000	-	34.1	100.0	96.1	20.8	4	1.2	-	-
	2001	-	36.8	100.0	96.1	16.0	1	0.3	-	-
	2002	-	47.5	100.0	95.8	14.3	-	-	-	-
	2003	-	38.1	100.0	95.7	14.8	-	-	-	-
	2004	-	48.6	100.0	95.9	24.5	-	-	-	-
	2005	-	50.2	100.0	96.1	18.2	-	-	-	-
	2006	0.7	49.3	100.0	96.0	17.6	-	-	-	-
	2007	21.3	64.0	100.0	95.4	22.9	1	0.3	-	-
	2008	27.0	67.1	100.0	95.6	19.5	-	-	-	-
	2009	23.9	69.6	100.0	95.3	15.4	1	0.3	-	-
	2010	25.5	72.8	100.0	95.2	13.0	5	1.2	-	-
2011	27.3	75.0	100.0	95.9	14.7	2	0.5	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	1.5	34.5	100.0	93.6	20.1	171	3.1	4.1	88.4
	2001	2.0	36.0	99.3	93.6	18.2	68	1.3	3.9	88.5
	2002	-	41.4	99.8	93.8	16.2	126	2.3	5.0	88.6
	2003	2.0	35.0	99.8	93.8	21.7	89	1.6	3.8	89.2
	2004	3.2	41.4	99.5	94.1	19.3	100	1.8	4.9	89.1
	2005	2.4	44.1	99.8	93.9	18.1	135	2.4	2.2	92.0
	2006	2.5	45.5	99.8	94.0	18.4	135	2.5	2.5	89.5
	2007	3.6	47.3	99.8	93.5	19.0	116	2.3	2.2	90.0
	2008	3.9	47.3	99.8	93.6	18.8	109	2.1	2.1	89.2
	2009	4.4	49.4	99.8	93.6	17.0	101	1.9	1.8	90.0
	2010	5.0	52.5	99.8	93.7	16.3	118	2.3	2.1	91.4
2011	4.7	53.4	99.8	94.1	16.4	127	2.4	1.6	76.4	

S T A T E	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
	2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1
	2010	7.6	45.4	96.2	93.9	13.0	72,383	3.6	3.8	87.8
	2011	8.8	48.1	96.0	94.0	12.8	63,067	3.2	2.7	83.8

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	331	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	337	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	337	60	55	57	-	-	-
	2003	341	54	51	54	-	-	-
	2004	333	55	53	58	-	-	-
	2005	311	50	48	48	-	-	-
	2006	298	57	48	51	-	-	-
	2007	347	52	66	48	-	-	-
	2008	374	59	46	64	-	-	-
	2009	385	62	57	49	-	-	-
	2010	427	65	63	56	-	-	-
	2011	440	75	67	63	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	5,611	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	5,580	474	497	455	456	426	254
	2002	5,594	484	449	475	433	447	336
	2003	5,701	442	474	445	469	429	330
	2004	5,547	436	421	476	469	449	334
	2005	5,384	408	411	417	410	453	319
	2006	5,288	411	407	421	448	389	316
	2007	5,220	394	389	398	413	423	309
	2008	5,201	386	378	386	404	399	338
	2009	5,304	419	409	377	397	412	283
	2010	5,250	403	407	384	399	370	324
	2011	5,414	441	428	384	380	397	306
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-

S T A T E	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2,044,539	164,413	157,570	159,499	160,924	156,451	138,559
	2004	2,060,048	161,329	160,246	158,367	162,933	160,271	139,504
	2005	2,062,912	156,370	158,622	160,365	162,047	162,192	142,828
	2006	2,075,277	155,155	154,372	158,822	160,362	160,911	147,500
	2007	2,077,856	155,356	153,480	154,719	162,594	159,038	150,475
	2008	2,074,167	155,578	152,895	153,347	160,039	161,310	149,710
	2009	2,070,125	156,512	152,736	152,820	155,433	158,700	144,822
	2010	2,064,312	155,468	154,389	152,681	154,465	154,982	146,919
	2011	2,074,806	153,516	153,301	154,241	153,981	153,986	151,059

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)	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>	2000	358	16	47,672	59	41	19	20	-	-
	2001	362	17	49,099	60	41	18	20	-	-
	2002	367	17	51,757	60	40	18	20	1	-
	2003	379	16	52,473	56	44	18	20	-	-
	2004	356	16	52,932	53	47	19	19	1	-
	2005	351	15	53,460	52	48	19	19	1	-
	2006	352	15	54,373	55	46	19	19	1	-
	2007	355	15	55,946	54	46	18	19	1	-
	2008	360	15	57,758	52	48	18	18	-	-
	2009	362	15	58,651	52	48	18	18	-	-
	2010	370	15	60,364	49	49	18	18	1	-
2011	355	15	61,612	49	51	19	19	1	-	
	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

S T A T E	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
	2010	132,502	13	63,296	42	57	18	18	1	1
	2011	128,262	13	64,978	40	60	19	19	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, 2006-2011																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	75.0	82.3	67.8	71.9	64.1	74.1	70.5	69.2	62.9	78.7	81.6	70.2	69.1	68.9	70.7	69.8	75.0	77.8
White	73.6	84.0	92.3	87.1	87.5	93.1	73.6	74.2	84.0	96.0	93.1	87.5	80.6	80.0	83.9	81.9	88.9	86.7
Black	58.4	63.7	80.0	62.6	66.7	72.3	-	-	-	81.3	80.0	58.8	33.3	-	-	50.0	78.6	58.3
Hispanic	-	-	30.0	42.8	33.3	47.7	-	-	9.1	50.0	53.9	54.6	-	-	41.2	41.7	42.9	69.2
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	26.3	46.6	23.8	42.1	-	-	10.0	53.0	57.1	43.8	-	-	35.7	41.7	42.9	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.0	-	-	-	-	27.3	-	30.0	-	-	-
Low Income	60.8	72.0	51.3	65.2	56.0	65.4	65.2	48.1	51.5	67.5	77.3	65.4	55.2	58.3	60.0	64.7	62.2	71.4
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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, 2006-2011																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	91.0	91.1	81.0	87.9	82.1	90.9	93.1	84.6	75.9	85.2	96.6	92.6	80.0	77.3	75.4	81.1	87.5	84.2
White	97.0	96.0	92.0	100.0	95.8	96.5	94.2	83.9	88.0	96.0	100.0	95.9	88.9	86.7	77.4	81.8	92.6	93.3
Black	66.6	72.8	90.0	87.5	73.3	88.9	-	-	-	75.0	100.0	94.1	66.7	-	-	80.0	85.7	75.0
Hispanic	-	-	65.0	62.6	70.9	80.9	-	-	27.3	77.8	85.7	86.4	-	-	64.7	75.0	78.6	61.5
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	63.2	64.7	66.6	79.0	-	-	20.0	76.5	86.7	81.3	-	-	57.1	75.0	78.6	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	-	-	-	-	45.5	-	40.0	-	-	-
Low Income	89.3	84.0	71.8	85.4	76.0	87.3	91.3	81.5	66.7	77.5	95.6	90.3	72.4	73.9	66.6	73.5	83.8	79.6
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

## Section I-A Data &amp; 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?

## ISAT 2011 Spring Summary

- Reading: The percentage of students that M+E increased in 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades and decreased significantly in 4<sup>th</sup> grade:**
  - o 74% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade students M+E (+9.8%).
  - o 70.1% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (-11.6%).
  - o 77.8% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (+2.8%).
  
- Math: The percentage of students that M+E increased in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade and decreased in 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades (3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grades above Illinois Benchmarks):**
  - o 90.9% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade students M+E (+8.8%).
  - o 92.5% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (-4.2%).
  - o 84.1% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (-3.4%).
  
- By Grade and Race (\* = Low N):**
  - o In 3rd grade Reading, the percentages are White (93.1%), Black (72.2%), Hispanic (47.6%) and \*Multiracial (77.8%).

- o In 3<sup>rd</sup> grade Math, the percentage M+E are White (96.6 %), Black (88.9%), Hispanic (81%) and \*Multiracial (100%).
- o In 4<sup>th</sup> grade Reading, the percentages are White (87.5%), Black (58.8%), Hispanic (54.5%) and \*Multiracial (100%).
- o In 4<sup>th</sup> grade Math, the percentages of students M+E in all race subgroups are above Illinois Benchmarks.
  - § White (95.8%), Black (94.1%), Hispanic (86.4%) and \*Multiracial (100%).
- o In 5<sup>th</sup> grade Reading, the percentages are White (86.7%), Black (58.3%), Hispanic (69.2%) and \*Multiracial (87.5%).
- o In 5<sup>th</sup> grade Math, the percentages are White (93.3%), Black (75%), Hispanic (61.5%) and \*Multiracial (100%).

**By Grade and Income:**

- o In Reading, all the percentages of students M+E in Not Low Income subgroups are above the Illinois Benchmarks. In Math, the percentages of students M+E in the Low Income and Not Low Income subgroups in 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grades and the Not Low Income group in 5<sup>th</sup> grade are above the Illinois Benchmarks.
- o 95.5% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 65.5% of the Low Income students (Gap = 30%). In Math, 100% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 87.3% of Low Income students (Gap = 12.7%).
- o 86.7% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 65.4% of the Low Income students (Gap = 21.3%). In Math, 100% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 90.4% of Low Income students (Gap = 9.6%).
- o 100% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 71.4% of the Low Income students (Gap = 28.6%). In Math, 100% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 79.6% of Low Income students (Gap = 20.4%).

**By Grade and IEP Status:**

- o In Reading, significant gaps exist in the percentage of students M+E in the Not IEP and IEP subgroups in all grades. A gap also exists in the percentage of

students M+E in Math in 5<sup>th</sup> grade. The N of IEP students is 22 (9, 5, 8).

§ Reading Gaps:

3<sup>rd</sup> gr = 80.9% v 22.2% (58.7%), 4<sup>th</sup> gr = 72.6% v 40% (32.6%), 5<sup>th</sup> gr = 83.6% v 37.5% (29.2%)

§ Math Gaps:

3<sup>rd</sup> gr = 92.6% v 77.8% (14.8%), 4<sup>th</sup> gr = 91.9% v 100% (-8.1%), 5<sup>th</sup> gr = 87.3% v 62.5% (24.8%)

### SAT-10 Fall 2011-12 Summary

- Reading: The percentage of students that M+E increased in 2<sup>nd</sup> - 4<sup>th</sup>, and decreased in 1<sup>st</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades:**
  - o 43.2% of 1<sup>st</sup> Grade students M+E (-8.7%)
  - o 72.7% of 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade students M+E (+14.7%)
  - o 63.6% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade students M+E (+3.2%)
  - o 44.9% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (+8.1%)
  - o 40.3% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (-8.1%)
  
- Math: The percentage of students that M+E increased in 1<sup>st</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grades, and decreased in 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades:**
  - o 50% of 1<sup>st</sup> Grade students M+E (+3.7%)
  - o 47.7% of 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade students M+E (-2.3%)

- o 45.5% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade students M+E (-6.4%)
- o 50.7% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (+3.6%)
- o 51.6% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (-4.9%)

**By Grade and Race (\* = Low N):**

- o In 1<sup>st</sup> grade Reading, the percentages are White (50%), Black (36.4%), \*Hispanic (100%), Asian (66.7%) and Multiracial (16.7%).
- o In 1<sup>st</sup> grade Math, the percentages are White (68.2%), Black (27.3%), \*Hispanic (100%) and Multiracial (16.7%).
- o In 2<sup>nd</sup> grade Reading, the percentages are White (79.2%), Black (50%), \*Hispanic (100%) and Multiracial (77.8%).
- o In 2<sup>nd</sup> grade Math, the percentages are White (58.3%), \*Hispanic (100%) and Multiracial (55.6%).
- o In 3<sup>rd</sup> grade Reading, the percentages are White (79.3%), Black (40%), \*Asian (100%) and Multiracial (22.2%).
- o In 3<sup>rd</sup> grade Math, the percentages are White (41.4%), Black (60%), \*Asian (100%) and Multiracial (44.4%).
- o In 4<sup>th</sup> grade Reading, the percentages are White (76.7%), Black (25%), Hispanic (11.1%) and \*Multiracial (33.3%).
- o In 4<sup>th</sup> grade Math, the percentages are White (66.7%), Black (33.3%), Hispanic (38.9%) and \*Multiracial (44.4%).
- o In 5<sup>th</sup> grade Reading, the percentages are White (70.8%), Black (20%), Hispanic (17.4%) and Multiracial (40%).
- o In 5<sup>th</sup> grade Math, the percentages are White (75%), Black (70%), Hispanic (17.4%) and Multiracial (60%).

**By Grade and Income:**

- o 50% of 1<sup>st</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 39.3% of the Low Income students (Gap = 10.7%). In Math, 68.8% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 39.3% of Low Income students (Gap = 29.5%).
- o 88.9% of 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 61.5% of the Low Income students (Gap = 27.4%). In Math, 77.8% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 26.9% of Low Income students (Gap = 50.9%).
- o 83.3% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 50% of the Low Income students (Gap = 33.3%). In Math, 50% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 42.3% of Low Income students (Gap = 7.7%).
- o 81.8% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 27.7% of the Low Income students (Gap = 54.1%). In Math, 68.2% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 42.6% of Low Income students (Gap = 25.6%).
- o 83.3% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 22.7% of the Low Income students (Gap = 60.6%). In Math, 83.3% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 38.6% of Low Income students (Gap = 44.7%).

 **By Grade and IEP Status:**

- o In Reading, 47.5% of 1<sup>st</sup> Grade Not IEP students M+E. In Math, 55% of 1<sup>st</sup> Grade Not IEP students M+E. (No Reading or Math scores for IEP students in 1<sup>st</sup> Grade.)
- o In Reading, 75.6% of 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 33.3% of IEP students (Gap = 42.3%). In Math, 51.2% of 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade Not IEP students M+E. (No Math scores for IEP students in 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade.)
- o In Reading, 70.3% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 28.6% of IEP students (Gap = 41.7%). In Math, 54.1% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Not IEP students M+E. (No Math scores for IEP students in 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade.)
- o In Reading, 46% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 33.3% of IEP Students (Gap = 12.7%). In Math, 52.4% of Not IEP students M+E compared to 33.3%

of IEP students (Gap = 19.1%).

- o In Reading, 41.4% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 25% of IEP students (Gap = 16.4%). In Math, 51.7% of Not IEP students M+E compared to 50% of IEP students (Gap = 1.7%).

 **Fall Subscores:**

Reading:

	<u>Word Study Skills</u>		<u>Vocabulary</u>		<u>Comprehension</u>		<u>Language</u>		<u>Mechanics</u>		<u>Expression</u>		<u>Spelling</u>		<u>Listening</u>		<u>Sentence Reading</u>		<u>Sounds and Letters</u>		<u>Word Reading</u>		
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	
1 <sup>st</sup>															50	61.4	44.4	34.1	44.4	31.8	38.9	38.6	
2 <sup>nd</sup>	46	61.4	66		56	72.7	54	63.6					60	86.4			60	65.9					84.1
3 <sup>rd</sup>	50	61.4	64.2	79.5	63	77.3	50	54.5					55.6	54.5									
4 <sup>th</sup>	33.8	42	26.5	44.9	42.6	49.3	48.5	44.9					41.2	46.4									
5 <sup>th</sup>	40.3	40.3	53.2	40.3	56.5	48.4	54.8	41.9	50	46.8	53.2	37.1	56.5	41.9									

Math:

	<u>Problem Solving</u>		<u>Procedures</u>	
	2011	2012	2011	2012
1 <sup>st</sup>				
2 <sup>nd</sup>	56	54.5	52	47.7
3 <sup>rd</sup>	51.9	59.1	50	45.5
4 <sup>th</sup>	48.5	53.6	51.5	53.6
5 <sup>th</sup>	50	41.9	67.7	54.8

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

Bent School's population continues to increase over time. Since 2009, Bent School's student population has increased 12.5%. The student population has increased 24.4% since 2004. Due to space constraints, District 87 has invested considerable resources in construction projects aimed at increasing learning space at Bent Elementary. Additionally, while the mobility rate has remained relatively stable, the low income rate increased to 75% in 2011 from 69.6% in 2009. The LEP population increased to 27.3% from 23.9% during this same time period. This population growth, coupled with a change in leadership at Bent, has presented challenges to the staff. The staff has worked hard to maintain a positive climate in response to these challenges.

The new leadership and staff at Bent Elementary has decided to focus on the following curricular areas to address deficits identified in SAT 10 data:

Reading - vocabulary and comprehension, with additional focus on literature, and fluency and supported by writing

Math - procedures, especially with measurement

Math is an area of strength for Bent, especially with the LEP subgroup. This subgroup has shown a steady gain in mathematics across grades 3-5. Bent staff wants to continue with a math focus to improve in other subgroups as well. Reading needs improvement. This includes a decrease in the number of students meeting or exceeding the reading standard in 4th grade. There is a 30% gap in reading scores between low income students and not low income students. This gap ranges from 30% in third grade to 21% in fourth grade to 28% in fifth grade.

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

Bent's student population continues to be very diverse. When planning for improvement, care must be taken to consider the high percentage of low income students as well as the high percentage of LEP students. Communications with parents need to play an important role in school improvement. Bent School currently has a parent serving on the PBIS team. Parents have also been invited to join the reading, math, and building leadership teams. Differentiating instruction to target specific groups will also need to be considered for improvement planning.

## Section I-B Data &amp; 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?

Teachers use Discovery Assessment data to help drive instruction. This data helps identify individual student strengths and weaknesses, including reading strategies and comprehension. Dibels Next is also used to measure fluency and includes a comprehension component to assist in measuring progress as applicable interventions are implemented. DIBELS data shows that oral reading fluency has decreased overall from 71.1% to 69.9%. Grade levels, when measured as cohort groups showed declining scores in fluency from the previous year in grades 3-5. Grade 3 fluency decreased from 67.3% to 65.9%. Grade 4 fluency decreased from 70.4% to 68.6%. Grade 5 fluency decreased from 68.1% to 67.2%. By comparison, the current grade 2 scored 79.5%.

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

Reading fluency had been a major focus. Dibels 6th Edition had been used to monitor progress of fluency. With Dibels Next, we have a comprehension measurement tool to monitor progress. In focusing on improving comprehension and reading strategies, Dibels Next will provide the data necessary to track the effectiveness of intervention. One contributing factor for the fluency scores in grades 3-5 is the presence of the Bilingual program at Bent Elementary. This is a developmental program from grades K-5. Instruction at grade K is 90% in Spanish and 10% in English. By the time the students reach grade 5, 10% of instruction is in Spanish, while 90% is in English. Grade 3 is a transition year in this program. Instruction in English gradually becomes more dominant and assessments begin to be done in English. Scores in DIBELS and ISAT reflect this. Additionally, many of these same students come from low income homes where Spanish is the only language spoken.

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

Bent Elementary will focus on instruction in reading strategies and comprehension. Diagnostic tools like Dibels Next will help determine effectiveness. This will have implications on instruction at all levels, including general education, special education, and the bilingual program. Increased interventions targeted to address skill deficit areas will be provided to all students that meet criteria. Tier 1 interventions will occur in the classroom. Tier 2 interventions will occur in the classroom as well when possible. Tier 2 and 3 interventions will happen with the assistance of the reading interventionist, bilingual interventionist and special education teachers.

---

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?

Bent Elementary has a 75% low income rate and also houses the district's bilingual population. In addition, Bent Elementary has had three instructional leaders in the last four years. In the past year, the staff has made a concentrated effort to analyze student performance data to determine student progress. Staff has participated in training with the newest version of Dibels. (Dibels Next) Staff has also had training on using Illinidata to access a wealth of student data from Dibels, SAT 10, Discovery Assessment, Access, and ISAT. Additionally, staff has participated in training on the use of supplemental tools, integration of technology, and a new math curriculum.

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

The staff continues to become more proficient in interpreting data to make educational decisions about instruction. The analysis of SAT 10 data has shown need in comprehension and reading strategies overall. Bent Elementary has a new instructional leader intent on staying in that role for the foreseeable future. Dibels Next benchmark scores include reading comprehension data to support our focus in comprehension and reading strategies.

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

Data analysis days have been scheduled, and will continue to be regularly scheduled. Initially, data from the various points mentioned above are analyzed to determine educational need and interventions. Dibels Next provides on-going and updated data through progress monitoring to measure the effectiveness of interventions. This data is considered at various scheduled data meetings through the school year. The RtI team analyzes and discusses the data to make educational decisions. Interventions will be targeted to address skills in deficit areas. In addition, Dibels Next has given staff reading comprehension scores through progress monitoring that had not been previously available. Additional progress monitoring through Aimsweb will target the progress for bilingual students.

---

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 and information tell you?

Bent Elementary teachers are all highly qualified. Teachers with master's level degrees or higher account for 50% of the teaching staff. The staff has an average of 15 years teaching experience. Additionally, the staff is committed to the RtI process and meets regularly with the RtI team to make educational decisions based on benchmark and progress monitoring data obtained through Dibels and other assessments.

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

Many teachers attend professional development training provided by the regional office of education. Teacher leaders are identified through ROE professional development and other professional development to provide workshops and training to other district colleagues. Bilingual teachers attend additional professional development. Bent school's proximity to Illinois State University and Illinois Wesleyan University provides a great resource. Bent Elementary benefits from these relationships through student interns and teachers, social work interns, and college mentors. Additionally, Bent provides work-study opportunities to Illinois Wesleyan students.

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

Bent Elementary is fortunate to have access to higher education resources. Student teachers and interns come prepared with knowledge of the RtI process, the new common core standards, and are adept at interpreting data for educational decisions. Additionally, these student teachers and interns are an excellent source of teacher candidates. Further, the ROE provides valuable support for improvement.

---

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?

Every teacher at Bent sends out a weekly newsletter to parents. A monthly newsletter is generated from the office. The PTO also uses the newsletter as a means of communication to parents. Additionally, Bent continues to make contact with 100% of our parents either directly or by telephone. Several events are scheduled to foster parent involvement. These include: Family Reading Night, Family Movie Night, Weiner Roast, Bilingual parent Nights, Grade Level Open Houses, and monthly PTO Meetings.

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

As parents get more involved, parents and students take a greater ownership in academic performance. Parents volunteer in the classroom providing valuable assistance. Parents also provide valuable input into the amount and difficulty of homework assignments. The PTO has provided leadership in securing parent volunteers to assist in a lunch recess reading program.

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

Because parents are a valuable part of the team and Bent's student population is 33% LEP, every attempt should be made to provide communications in both English and Spanish. This not only includes newsletters and other school flyers, but also the school website. The office has two secretaries, one of which is fluent in both English and Spanish to improve communications with all homes represented at Bent.

---

### 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?

Teachers continue to target and address data for the purposes of improving instruction and targeting instruction to deficit areas. Differentiated instructional practices will continue to provide specific instruction in areas of need. Several staff attended a differentiated instruction workshop in the fall of 2011. Professional development activities are also targeted to address performance data. Interventions will be implemented to improve academic success based on best practices and research. Teachers will access to student data through Illinidata. Data days are scheduled to review individual student data to provide meaningful research. Because Bent Elementary is a bilingual school, every effort is made to make communications in both English and Spanish. This includes the school's web site, newsletters, and automated phone calls. This effort has extended to the local PTO. Regularly scheduled PTO meetings include agendas printed in both English and Spanish. An interpreter is also present. Bent benefits from a wide pool of student teacher and teacher candidates due to its proximity to Illinois State University and Illinois Wesleyan University.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	<a href="#">All students will increase ISAT reading scores from 73.1% to 92.5% by targeting reading strategies, comprehension, literature, fluency and writing.</a>	1,2,
2	<a href="#">All students will increase ISAT math scores from 90.3% to 92.5% by targeting number sense and measurement.</a>	

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

- Ⓟ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓟ 2. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

All students will increase ISAT reading scores from 73.1% to 92.5% by targeting reading strategies, comprehension, literature, fluency and writing.

Objective 1 Description

The purpose of this objective is to increase comprehension across all race and income levels by applying reading and writing strategies in a variety of contexts through the use of various interventions and activities. Various reading strategies will be introduced and implemented by staff, while being explained to parents through regular communications.

**This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:**

- b 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- b 2. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

All students will increase ISAT reading scores from 73.1% to 92.5% by targeting reading strategies, comprehension, literature, fluency and writing.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students, including general education, special education, and bilingual education, will read a variety of genres through after school reading instruction and home reading.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Title I	1,000
2	Students, including general education, special education, and bilingual education, will activate background and life knowledge prior to, during, and after reading.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	500
3	Students, including general education, special education, and bilingual education, will decode text into words and meanings during reading.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
4	Students, including general education, special education, and bilingual education, will visualize settings, character, and actions as stories are read silently to themselves or during read aloud by a teacher.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	500
5	Students, including general education, special education, and bilingual education, will learn to ask questions about the text, self, and the author before, during, and after reading.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
6	Students, including general education, special education, and bilingual education, will learn to monitor understanding by continuously checking that reading makes sense, and learn to use fix-it strategies when it doesn't.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
	Students, including general education, special education, and bilingual					

7	education, will reflect on meaning of text by connecting text to other stories, self, and world.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
8	Students, including general education, special education, and bilingual education, will understand and apply vocabulary and word meanings in context in a variety of genres	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
9	Low income students will participate in activities designed to strengthen and expand vocabulary development and build background knowledge.	09/01/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
10	All students will create a book from beginning to end utilizing elements from the common core standards.	09/01/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	200
11	Students will learn to use the writing process in a developmentally appropriate way as defined by the common core standards.	09/01/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
12	Students will use editing marks designated for each grade level.	09/01/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
13	Students will apply grammar skills presented in the H-M Reading Curriculum and Writer's Workshop.	09/01/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

All students will increase ISAT reading scores from 73.1% to 92.5% by targeting reading strategies, comprehension, literature, fluency and writing.

	Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All staff will continue to focus on reading strategies, and genre by using HM Curriculum leveled readers.	09/01/2011	05/31/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
2	All staff will continue to encourage home reading by setting weekly/monthly goals.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	0
3	All staff in grade 2-5 will continue to encourage home reading by setting quarterly goals and encouraging students to pass Reading Counts Quizzes.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
4	All staff will continue to read a variety of genres aloud to students.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	500

5	All staff will continue to implement reading strategies when reading aloud to students.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
6	All staff will identify and apply key vocabulary words in a variety of genres.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	Before School	Local Funds	0
7	Staff, under the guidance of the Reading Interventionist, will use supplemental reading interventions like, Lexia, Soliloquy, Elements of Reading, Six Minute Solutions, SRA, Road to the Code, Heggerty, Horizons, Phonics Intervention Kits, and Great Leaps.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Title I	10,500
8	staff will participate in Professional Development on building background knowledge and differentiated instruction.	09/01/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	1,000
9	Staff will train on common core writing strategies.	09/01/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
10	Staff will attend Writer's Workshop training and conduct workshops to train other staff.	09/01/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

All students will increase ISAT reading scores from 73.1% to 92.5% by targeting reading strategies, comprehension, literature, fluency and writing.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Meet the teacher night will include information for parents on how to help their child increase reading comprehension.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	200
2	During Parent/Teacher conferences, parents will receive information to further understand and support grade level content and standards.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	0
3	Themed parent nights will provide parents the opportunity to engage in activities to help learning.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	500
4	Reading comprehension activities and strategies will be communicated through classroom and school newsletters and websites.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	0
5	An "Everybody has a Story" night will be conducted at Bent for students to share written work with parents.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	200

6	School and classroom newsletters and websites will include information about all grade level curriculum standards and expectations.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
7	School and classroom newsletters, websites, and flyers will include tips and strategies that parents can use to assist students in the reading and writing processes.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Other	0
8	Meet the teacher night will include information for parents on how to help their child improve the writing process.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Other	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 1 Title :**

All students will increase ISAT reading scores from 73.1% to 92.5% by targeting reading strategies, comprehension, literature, fluency and writing.

**Monitoring** - Include the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities for the objective and identify the person(s) responsible for overseeing the work. Describe the process and measures of success of this objective. (How will school personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

**The following assessment measures will be used in order to monitor the strategies and activities of objective 1:** H-M Core Curriculum assessments, Discovery Assessment, ISAT, SAT 10, Dibels Next/Mide, SRI, Reading Counts quizzes, Soliloquy, and Lexia.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	Name	Title
1	Jeff Geringer	Principal
2	Terri Matlock	Reading Chairperson
3	Julie Vesper	
4	Guille Delgado	
5	Julie Cooper	

## Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

## Objective 2

All students will increase ISAT math scores from 90.3% to 92.5% by targeting number sense and measurement.

## Objective 2 Description

The purpose of this goal is to improve number sense and measurement skills in all students through the use of various interventions and activities.

**This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:**

- € 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- € 2. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

## Objective 2 Title :

All students will increase ISAT math scores from 90.3% to 92.5% by targeting number sense and measurement.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will increase the use of math manipulatives, graphic organizers, calculators, and technology in math instruction	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Basic facts will be taught (grades (K-3) and reviewed (4-5).	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Customary and metric measurement will be incorporated into other content area instruction, as well as in Music, PE, and Art	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	Before School	Local Funds	0
4	Students will complete a weekly activity related to all math strands.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
5	Focus will be on key math vocabulary and their related operations.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0

6	Discovery Assessment, Fastt Math, Go Solve, Number Worlds, and Symphony Math will be used to provide math intervention.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Title I	3,600
7	Envision math diagnostic and intervention tools will be used to provide supplemental intervention.	09/01/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

All students will increase ISAT math scores from 90.3% to 92.5% by targeting number sense and measurement.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Discovery Assessment and intervention training.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	1,000
2	Exploration of Envision math resources and interventions	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	1,000
3	Building-wide training on number sense and measurement strategies	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	500
4	Building wide training for math intervention software programs	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	500
5	Training on differentiated instruction.	09/01/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

All students will increase ISAT math scores from 90.3% to 92.5% by targeting number sense and measurement.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Meet the Teacher Night will include information about all grade level curriculum standards and expectations.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	200
2	School activities will increase parent/child opportunities to read and learn together including Family Math Night.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	200

3	School and classroom newsletters/websites will include information about all grade level curriculum standards and expectations.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	100
---	---	------------	------------	--------------	-------------	-----

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 2 Title :**

All students will increase ISAT math scores from 90.3% to 92.5% by targeting number sense and measurement.

**Monitoring** - Include the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities for the objective and identify the person(s) responsible for overseeing the work. Describe the process and measures of success of this objective. (How will school personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

The following measures will be used to monitor strategies, activities, and interventions: ISAT, SAT 10, Discovery Assessment, Symphony Math, FastMath, GoSolve, and local classroom assessments.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	Name	Title
1	Jeff Geringer	Principal
2	Jeff Dobbs	Math Chairperson
3	Idaliza Publes	
4	Kathy Hernandez	

---

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.*)

Bent Elementary School provides parents access to the School Report Card information through the district website, the school newsletter, teacher classroom newsletters. Copies are also available upon request. This information is communicated in both English and Spanish. Parents were given notice of choice options through U.S. Mail, website, and by telephone.

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 development of the School Improvement Plan has been done through the consultation of a variety different stakeholders. Input was recived through School Improvement Days as well as through meetings with the Reading, Math, and Writing Committees. Additional input has been sought through PTO Meetings, Elementary Principal Meetings, and discussions with the Building Leadership Team.

Jeff Geringer - Principal  
Terri Matlock - Reading Chair  
Jeff Dobbs - Math Chair  
Lisa Wills - Writing Chair

	Name	Title
1	Jeff Geringer	Principal
2	Terri Matlock	Reading Chairperson
3	Jeff Dobbs	Math Chairperson
4	Lisa Wills	Writing Chairperson

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.

Peer review for Bent Elementary School's SIP is done by educators outside of Bent. A review was conducted by the District 87 Superintendent, Asst. Superintendent of Human Resources, Asst. Superintendent of Curriculum, and Director of Special Education. Additional reviews were conducted by elementary school administrators from within District 87. Members of the Bent PTO also reviewed the school improvement plan.

---

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.

Teachers that are new to the district participate in a New Teacher Professional Development Series. The program brings new teachers from all schools together for training with regard to common technologies necessary for teachers in the district. This continues with training and mentoring sessions with outstanding veteran teachers and administrators with regard to curriculum, classroom management, and communication skills. New teachers, as well as veteran teachers, are involved in on-going training concerning the new common core curriculum and appraisal standards. New teachers are polled through an internet polling service to gauge their comfort and progress in adjusting to their work environment. Each new teacher is assigned to a "helping teacher" within their building. Additionally, an Rtl coach position has been added to assist classroom teachers in the implementation of appropriate interventions. A district class is also offered to all new teachers as induction. Informal mentors are assigned to all new teachers.

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

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

At the district level, resources are available for staff development opportunities that support school improvement. The curriculum department and special education office continues to provide instruction covering the common core standards. Technical assistance is available and utilized in the analysis of local standardized achievement test scores, state test scores and subgroup performance. Teachers and administrators have the opportunity to participate in Illinidata for access to individual, group, and class data. The district provides access to technological supports that enhance the delivery of instruction. Examples include Smartboards in classrooms, extra computer stations in classrooms, and mobile computer labs. Opportunities for collaboration among elementary school principals improves the school improvement planning process by allowing administrators to share ideas and provide feedback.

**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). (Check all that apply.)

- 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. (Please check all that apply.)

- 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.

	Name	Title
1		

---

**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

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (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? [C]

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

**CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES**

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

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

**ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> 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?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]
<b>MONITORING</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers? [C]

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

**PARENT NOTIFICATION**

<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) [C]
---	---

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]
<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? [C]

**PEER REVIEW**

Yes  No

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

**TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS**

Yes  No

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

**DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES**

Yes  No

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

**STATE RESPONSIBILITIES**

Yes  No

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

**SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM**

Yes  No  N/A

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

**APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD**

Yes  No

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

**PART II - COMMENTS**