

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

## PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	140160870022007		
District Name:	Berkeley SD 87	School Name:	J W Riley Elem School
Superintendent:	Ms. Eva Smith	Principal:	Dr. 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 2353
District Telephone#:	Label 7084493350                      Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	7084493180                      Extn: 0
District Email:	esmith@berkeley87.org	School Email:	mgambardella@berkeley87.org
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 1 - 2009 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	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status Choice	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2009-10 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		70.0			70.0			90.0		78.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	52.0		No	81.7		Yes	95.8	Yes		
White														
Black														
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	51.8	60.3	No	82.2		Yes	95.9			
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	44.6	51.7	No	80.0		Yes	96.0		
Students with Disabilities													
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	49.4	56.7	No	81.9		Yes	95.8		

**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 70% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 70% 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 70% 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 78% graduation rate for high schools.

\* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2008.

\*\* Safe Harbor Targets of 70% or above are not printed.

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

**DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION**

The Differentiated Accountability classification for the school is:	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 on the Differentiated Accountability Pilot Program. The Differentiated Accountability classification applies only to schools in federal improvement status.

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

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

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

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 2 - 2009 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								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	95.2	95.8	96.2	99.7	95.7	95.6	95.7	95.8
Truancy Rate (%)	-	-	0.8	-	-	-	-	-
Mobility Rate (%)	33.8	26.2	52.9	51.9	57.2	60.6	22.2	50.9
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	486	547	545	534	489	500	501	482
Low Income (%)	57.6	60.7	64.6	65.9	74.2	75.0	72.7	78.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	82.7	64.0	47.2	68.4	87.1	58.0	64.5	67.4
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	7.2	4.8	3.7	3.2	2.7	1.2	0.6	0.2
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	2.5	1.5	1.1	1.7	1.6	1.0	1.2	0.8
Hispanic (%)	89.1	92.7	93.6	92.1	93.3	94.2	95.0	96.3
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	1.2	1.1	1.7	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.2
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.8
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	1.9	1.4	2.4	1.8	0.6

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

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	2000	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
	2009	0.2	0.8	96.3	1.2	0.8	0.6
D I S T R I C T	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
	2009	5.9	24.6	63.7	1.7	2.5	1.7
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

<b>S T A T E</b>	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 5 - Educational Environment

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	86.7	80.9	98.7	95.3	33.7	-	-	-	-
	2001	70.0	50.2	100.0	95.0	35.9	-	-	-	-
	2002	82.7	57.6	100.0	95.2	33.8	-	-	-	-
	2003	64.0	60.7	98.7	95.8	26.2	-	-	-	-
	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	-	-	-	-
	2006	87.1	74.2	100.0	95.7	57.2	-	-	-	-
	2007	58.0	75.0	100.0	95.6	60.6	-	-	-	-
	2008	64.5	72.7	100.0	95.7	22.2	-	-	-	-
	2009	67.4	78.4	100.0	95.8	50.9	-	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	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	-	-
	2009	23.7	64.4	100.0	95.3	30.4	14	0.5	-	-
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6

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

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	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	-	-	-
	2009	482	83	67	68	-	-	-
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	2000	2,547	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,623	310	299	297	294	265	-
	2002	2,796	330	324	299	286	295	-
	2003	2,838	336	339	323	294	271	-
	2004	2,949	343	335	344	289	283	-
	2005	2,911	293	350	345	333	282	-
	2006	2,886	303	283	333	326	311	-
	2007	2,855	316	316	288	324	314	-
	2008	2,825	315	321	311	325	321	-
	2009	2,829	300	309	323	288	338	-
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816

<b>S T A T E</b>	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2,044,539	164,413	157,570	159,499	160,924	156,451	138,559
	2004	2,060,048	161,329	160,246	158,367	162,933	160,271	139,504
	2005	2,062,912	156,370	158,622	160,365	162,047	162,192	142,828
	2006	2,075,277	155,155	154,372	158,822	160,362	160,911	147,500
	2007	2,077,856	155,356	153,480	154,719	162,594	159,038	150,475
	2008	2,074,167	155,578	152,895	153,347	160,039	161,310	149,710
	2009	2,070,125	156,512	152,736	152,820	155,433	158,700	144,822

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

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 7 - Educator Data**

\*\*Educator Data is available only for district level\*\*

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	2000	158	10	35,252	71	29	20	-	-	-
	2001	160	10	36,340	72	28	20	-	-	-
	2002	165	10	37,666	72	28	20	-	3	-
	2003	177	9	38,261	73	27	20	-	4	-
	2004	172	9	40,071	72	28	20	-	2	-
	2005	175	8	40,089	68	33	20	-	4	-
	2006	177	8	43,446	58	42	19	-	2	1
	2007	175	9	43,781	57	43	19	-	2	-
	2008	171	9	45,651	57	43	19	-	2	-
2009	168	9	48,219	50	50	19	-	-	-	
<b>S T A T E</b>	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1

---

	2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1
--	------	---------	----	--------	----	----	----	----	---	---

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
 Item 8a - Assessment Data (Reading)

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>
All	72.7	58.6	82.6	60.0	57.1	60.1	-	-	63.4	69.6	41.4	54.7	51.3	60.4	55.9	43.3	61.1	39.7
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	73.7	65.0	82.4	66.7	56.9	61.9	-	-	60.9	71.5	40.0	52.5	51.8	55.3	58.0	42.8	60.2	39.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	52.6	35.1	-	-	-	-	22.9	45.0	-	-	-	-	38.7	23.3
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	20.0	-	-	-	-	10.0	-	-	-	-	41.7	40.0	20.0
Low Income	72.7	47.4	81.3	61.5	51.7	61.0	-	-	59.1	65.1	36.0	51.0	36.4	48.0	54.2	43.8	55.9	34.0

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>
All	68.2	75.8	91.3	100.0	85.7	87.6	-	-	86.6	92.9	77.2	84.6	51.4	72.1	73.5	76.7	77.8	70.0
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	63.2	85.0	94.1	100.0	84.6	89.5	-	-	86.9	95.9	75.4	83.8	51.9	73.7	77.4	79.6	79.5	69.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	83.1	89.2	-	-	-	-	60.0	85.4	-	-	-	-	77.4	53.1
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	-	-	-	-	60.0	-	-	-	-	66.7	60.0	40.0
Low Income	54.5	63.2	87.5	100.0	86.2	90.6	-	-	90.9	93.0	70.0	85.2	45.5	76.0	83.4	77.1	75.0	66.7

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data**

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

**INTRODUCTION**

Riley is a Pre-K through 5th grade school located in the Near west suburbs of Chicago. In 2009 482 students attended Riley school. The attendance rate for Riley in 2009 is 95.8% and the mobility rate 50.9%. The parental involvement rate for Riley is 100%. 96.3% of Riley students are Hispanic, 0.2% White, 0.8% Black, 1.2% Asian, 0.8% Native American, and 0.6% Multiracial. 78.4% of Riley students are Low Income. 96.3% of Riley students are Hispanic of those 67.4% are LEP. Riley school has many strengths and the school report card has shown improvement in Mathematics over the last three years. The following information describes our data analysis in Mathematics and our weaknesses through the 2009 school report card analysis.

**STRENGTHS****Math**

The 2009 School Report Card data show that 81.8% of Riley children attained Meets and Exceeds designations in Mathematics in 2009. The paragraphs and tables below compare the 2008 and 2009 Mathematics data. The reason for this comparison is that the LEP students began to take the ISAT test in 2008. (The IMAGE test was the state assessment that was used prior to 2008 for all LEP students.)

The 2009 school report card data show that in mathematics 87.6% of 3rd graders Met/Exceeded state standards, at the same grade level, 89.5% of the Hispanic students Met/Exceeded state standards, 89.2% of the LEP students Met/Exceeded state standards, and 90.6% of low income students Met/Exceeded state standards.

The 2009 school report card data show that in mathematics 84.6% of 4th graders Met/Exceeded state standards, 83.8% of the Hispanic students Met/Exceeded state standards, 85.4% of the LEP students Met/Exceeded state standards, and 85.2% of low income students Met/Exceeded state standards.

The overall percentage of all students who Met/Exceeded state standards in mathematics was 81.7%. This is a 1% increase from 2008 in which 80.8% of all students met/exceeded on the ISAT math test.

Tables 1 and 2 demonstrate that our LEP subgroup has made significant gains in 3rd and 4th grade from 2008 to 2009. In 3rd grade from 2008 to 2009 our LEP subgroup increased 5.2% Meets and Exceeds. In 4th grade from 2008 to 2009 our LEP subgroup increased 34.4% Meets and Exceeds.

**Table 1**  
**LEP ISAT Math Data 2008**

Grade	% Meet/Exceed	Students Meet/Exceed	Students Below	Total Students
3 <sup>rd</sup> (LEP)	84%	49	10	59
3 <sup>rd</sup> (Non-LEP)	100%	11	0	11
4 <sup>th</sup> (LEP)	51%	18	17	35
4 <sup>th</sup> (Non-LEP)	94%	33	2	35
5 <sup>th</sup> (LEP)	77.4%	24	7	31
5 <sup>th</sup> (Non-LEP)	78%	46	13	59

**Table 2**  
**LEP ISAT Math Data 2009**

Grade	% Meet/Exceed	Students Meet/Exceed	Students Below	Total Students
3 <sup>rd</sup> (LEP)	89.2%	33	4	37
3 <sup>rd</sup> (Non-LEP)	86%	37	6	43
4 <sup>th</sup> (LEP)	85.4%	35	6	41
4 <sup>th</sup> (Non-LEP)	83%	20	4	24
5 <sup>th</sup> (LEP)	53.1%	17	15	32
5 <sup>th</sup> (Non-LEP)	84%	32	6	38

While our 3rd and 4th grade LEP student scores increased, the 5th grade LEP group did not. This data analysis points to a possible need for instructional strategies at this grade

for this particular subgroup.

**Weaknesses**

Reading

Riley students met AYP in Reading from 2004-2007. (The LEP students were not included in the Reading data from 2004-2007 because they took the IMAGE test.) Beginning in 2008, the LEP students were required to take the ISAT test with no accomodations. The data in the tables below the report card data show that ALL Riley students are not meeting AYP in Reading, this includes the Hispanic, LEP, and low income subgroups. The number of students who are now tested using the ISAT test is larger than the number of students who took the ISAT test between 2004-2007. It is very difficult to compare data from 2004-2007 to the 2008 and 2009 data for this reason. The reason for the analysis of the data below for the 2008 and 2009 state data was to focus on the LEP versus the Non-LEP students to determine if there was a gap in Reading acheivement.

The school report card data shows that 52% of Riley students Met/Exceeded the state standards in Reading in 2009. 51.8% of the Hispanic students Met/Exceeded state standards, 44.6% of the LEP students Met/Exceeded state standards, and 49.4% of the low income students Met/Exceeded state standards.

The Hispanic 3rd grade student scores increased from 56.9% to 61.9% from 2008 to 2009. While the LEP subgroup in 3rd grade decreased from 52.6% to 35.1%. The low income 3rd grade student scores increased from 51.7% to 61% from 2008 to 2009.

The Hispanic 4th grade group increased from 2008 to 2009 from 40.0% to 52.5%. The LEP subgroup for this grade also showed an increase from 22.9% to 45%. The low income 4th grade student scores increased from 36% to 51%.

In contrast, the 5th grade Hispanic subgroup dropped from 60.2% to 39.7% from 2008 to 2009. The LEP subgroup from the same grade dropped from 38.7% to 23.3%. The low income 5th grade students decreased from 55.9% to 34%.

In all instances, grades 3 and 4 have shown growth although they are not making AYP. The 5th grade across all subgroups have not shown growth over the past two years. Riley staff will continue to investigate this decline in 5th grade scores. Some of the elements present in third and fourth grade may not be present in the fifth grade.

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																			
Grade 3					Grade 4					Grade 5									
2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009		

<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	72.7	58.6	82.6	60.0	57.1	60.1	-	-	63.4	69.6	41.4	54.7	51.3	60.4	55.9	43.3	61.1	39.7
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	73.7	65.0	82.4	66.7	56.9	61.9	-	-	60.9	71.5	40.0	52.5	51.8	55.3	58.0	42.8	60.2	39.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	52.6	35.1	-	-	-	-	22.9	45.0	-	-	-	-	38.7	23.3
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	20.0	-	-	-	-	10.0	-	-	-	-	41.7	40.0	20.0
Low Income	72.7	47.4	81.3	61.5	51.7	61.0	-	-	59.1	65.1	36.0	51.0	36.4	48.0	54.2	43.8	55.9	34.0

**ISAT Reading Weaknesses (Item Analysis 2009)**

Riley reviewed the Reading item analysis for each grade level to determine areas of weaknesses to assist in the development of the action plan. The areas of weakness that were selected were determined by comparing Riley to the state. Riley students significantly underperformed all Illinois children on the listed objectives (at the 95% confidence level) in both 2008 and 2009.

3rd Grade Weaknesses

1. Identify the word base with affixes from roots and affixes. 1.3.02
2. Determine the meaning of unknown words using context clues. 1.3.07
3. Use information in illustrations to help understand a reading passage. 1.3.14
4. Identify or summarize the order event in a story. 1.3.23
5. Drawing conclusions from information in maps, charts, and graphs. 1.3.26
6. Determine character motivation. 2.3.08

4th Grade Weaknesses

1. Determine the meaning of an unknown word 1.4.01
2. Determine the meaning of an unknown compound word 1.4.03

3. Determine the meaning of an unknown word using word, sentence, and cross-sentence clues 1.4.04
4. Use antonyms to define words 1.4.06
5. Distinguish between minor and significant details 1.4.13
6. Making comparisons across reading passages 1.4.16
7. Summarize a story passage or text, or identify the best summary 1.4.20
8. Differentiate between fact and opinion 1.4.23
9. Determine the causes of character's actions 2.4.10
10. Identify genres 2.4.13

#### 5th Grade Weaknesses

1. Use antonyms to define words. 1.5.04
2. Demonstrate understanding by using sophisticated graphic organizers. 1.5.13
3. Distinguish the main ideas and supporting details in any text. 1.5.17
4. Identify or summarize the order of events in a story or non-fiction account. 1.5.20
5. Differentiate between fact and opinion. 1.5.23
6. Interpret an image based on information provided in a passage. 1.5.25
7. Determine the author's purpose for writing a fiction or non-fiction text. 1.5.27
8. Differentiate among the literary elements of plot, character, setting, and theme. 2.5.01
9. Recognize points of view in narrative. 2.5.07
10. Determine character motivation. 2.5.09

There are many comparisons of similar weaknesses across all grade levels. There are four specific Reading assessment framework objectives that show up at grades 3, 4, and 5.

1. Determining the meaning of an unknown word.
2. Distinguish between the main idea and supporting details.
3. Differentiate among the literary elements of plot, character, setting, and theme.
4. Differentiate between fact and opinion.

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

1. Prior to 2009 the Reading curriculum was not standards aligned.
2. Children are not provided the same accommodations on the Reading test as they are on the Math test.
3. Prior to 2009 the Transitional Bilingual Education Program only allowed thirty minutes of English as a Second Language instruction per day.
4. Riley has only 4 teachers with a Reading endorsement.
5. There has been a strong emphasis on Math professional development and not reading.
6. Teachers have received a great deal of professional development in the area of English language learning. The teachers may not have had time to fully implement these strategies and their effectiveness.
7. Teachers may not be familiar with the content and complexity level of the ISAT test.
8. Parents may not have been invited to become partners in their child's education.

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

1. Riley will implement a standards-based Reading curriculum.
2. Teachers will explicitly teach ISAT vocabulary and test taking strategies.
3. The amount of English as a Second Language instruction has been increased to sixty minutes per day.
4. More teachers will be encouraged to obtain Reading endorsements.
5. Professional development will be provided in the area of Reading by the Reading coach on a biweekly basis.

6. Teachers will be given time to implement the strategies they have learned through professional development. These strategies will take place during the Language Arts instructional time in the form of Reading Rtl interventions and ISAT specific skills.
7. Teachers will become confident with ISAT content or complexity through professional development opportunities.
8. Parents may not have been invited enough to become partners in their child's education and Riley will make an effort to provide those opportunities to parents.

### Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data

**Data** - Briefly describe the relevant local assessment data used in this plan. What do these data tell you? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are apparent?

#### Terra Nova Test

Every year first through fifth grade students, including IEP students, take the Terra Nova norm-referenced standardized test. Bilingual students are exempt from the Terra Nova tests. This test assesses students in the areas of Reading and Math. Table 3 below shows the National Percentile Ranking score for each grade level since 2007. The data shows that the 1st grade students have scored at or above the 49th percentile in all three years. The percentiles begin declining in 2nd grade and continue to 5th grade. When analyzed over time, this data reveals a decrease in percentiles from 1st grade to 5th grade over a three year time.

Table 3

#### Terra Nova Reading National Percentile Composite

Grade	2007	2008	2009
1 <sup>st</sup>	50	55	49
2 <sup>nd</sup>	45	44	37
3 <sup>rd</sup>	37	38	38
4 <sup>th</sup>	40	35	35

---

5th	33	40	32
-----	----	----	----

### **Terra Nova (2009) Reading Weaknesses**

**The areas of weaknesses for the Terra Nova Reading tests were determined by using the school national percentile ranking. If the difference between the school and the nation was at least 8 percentile points or more that specific reading area was identified as a weakness.**

#### **1st Grade Weaknesses**

- 1. Word Meaning**
- 2. Analyze test**
- 3. Word Meaning**

#### **2nd Grade Weaknesses**

- 1. Evaluate and Extend Meaning**
- 2. Word Meanings**
- 3. Multimeaning Words**
- 4. Vowels**

#### **3rd Grade Weaknesses**

- 1. Analyze Text**
- 2. Identify Reading Strategies**
- 3. Multi-meaning Words**
- 4. Roots and Affixes**

#### **4th Grade Weaknesses**

- 1. Multimeaning Words**

2. **Identifying Reading Strategies**
3. **Words in Context**
4. **Sent, phrases, clauses**

#### 5th Grade Weaknesses

1. **Multimeaning words**
2. **Identifying Reading Strategies**
3. **Words in context**
4. **Editing skills**

The Terra Nova results support the ISAT with similiar weaknesses in the area of vocabulary. Specifically, the area of determining the meaning of words in context, multimeaning words, and identifying Reading strategies were low on both assessments.

-

#### **ACCESS**

The ACCESS test is an annual state assessment administered from the middle of January to middle of February to all students who have been identified as LEP regardless if they are receiving ELL services. The test assesses students' English proficiency skills in the domains of: Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. The state of Illinois has set the criteria at a minimum of 4.0 composite proficiency level score on a scale of 1.0-6.0. Students must continue to take the annual exam until they reach a 4.0 or higher composite level score. An LEP student needs to reach a 6.0 proficiency level to be comparable to a native English speaking student. Many of the students at Riley have transitioned from the Transitional Bilingual Education program at a 4.0 level or higher, but have not reached the 6.0 composite proficiency level. These students still need English language learning support in the general education classroom in order to be successful in school.

The data in table 4 and 5 show that only 50% of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students in 2008 and 47% of the 3rd grade students in 2009 reached the 4.0 composite proficiency level. This is a slight decrease of 3%. In 2008 28% of 4th graders reached proficiency and 55% in 2009 reached proficiency. This is an increase of 27%. In 2008 40% of 5<sup>th</sup> grade students reached proficiency and in 2009 17% reached proficiency. These numbers match the number of LEP who Met/Exceeded on the ISAT test in 2008 and 2009. The students' proficiency levels directly correlate with ISAT performance.

**Table 4**

**ACCESS 2008 Data Analysis (Number and percentage of students who have reached 4.0 proficiency level or higher)**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Tested</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Percent Proficient</b>
Kindergarten	73	0	0
1 <sup>st</sup> Grade	81	5	6
2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade	60	18	30
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	40	20	50
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	29	8	28
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	30	12	40
<b>Totals</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>25.7</b>

**Table 5**

**ACCESS 2009 Data Analysis (Number and percentage of students who have reached 4.0 proficiency level or higher)**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Tested</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Percent Proficient</b>
Kindergarten	79	0	0%
1 <sup>st</sup> Grade	70	8	11%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade	70	27	39%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	38	18	47%
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	20	11	55%
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	23	4	17%

---

Totals	300	68	28.2 %
--------	-----	----	--------

### **AIMS Web Benchmark Assessments.**

**Riley began using the AIMS Web curriculum based benchmarks assessments in the 2008-2009 school year. The benchmark assessments are given to students three times per year (fall, winter, and spring). Students are tested in Kindergarten on Letter Naming Fluency and Letter Sound Fluency. First grade is tested on Letter Naming Fluency, and Letter Sound Fluency in the fall and then Oral Reading Fluency in the winter and spring. Second- fifth grades students are tested on Oral Reading Fluency in the fall, winter, and spring. The Letter Naming and Letter Sound Fluency are one minute timed tests in a one on one situation. For Oral Reading Fluency, students read three short passages and are timed for one minute on each one. The median score of the three is recorded.**

**The data from the AIMS tests demonstrate that across all grade levels, at least 75% of the students met the 25th percentile on the Spring benchmark tests. This demonstrates that the general curriculum is meeting the needs of 75% of Riley students in the areas assessed through the AIMS tests. These scores do not correlate with the ISAT or Terra Nova tests. This may be because the AIMS test assesses general Reading skills, such as fluency, while the other two tests assess standards and specific skills students across the nation should know.**

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

1. The students may not have been familiar with the academic vocabulary.
2. Teachers are not explicitly teaching grade level Reading and vocabulary strategies.
3. The 2008-2009 school year was the first year of implementing RtI and using AIMS Web benchmark assessments.

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

1. Teachers need to use and instruct academic vocabulary.
2. Teachers need to explicitly teach Reading and vocabulary skills.
3. Teachers will use specific interventions to address student needs according to AIMS web assessments.

### Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

**Data** - *Briefly describe attributes and challenges of the school and community that have affected student performance. What do these data and/or information tell you?*

#### ATTRIBUTES

School Attributes

District 87 has committed itself to engaged learning. Teams of three district administrators collect 300 data points on one specific date. The administrators take a quick "snapshot" of the activities and note the level of engagement. The purpose of the Focus Walk is to gauge the types of engaged activities students are working on a regular basis. A score of six reflects student active engaged learning, five for student learning conversations, four for teacher led instruction, three for student work with teacher engaged, two for student work with teacher not engaged and one for complete disengagement.

**Focus Walk Data**

	<b>6's</b>	<b>5's</b>	<b>4's</b>	<b>3's</b>	<b>2's</b>	<b>1's</b>
Fall 2005	5%	1%	47%	35%	10%	2%
Fall 2006	5%	4%	46%	35%	7%	3%
Spring 2007	6%	4%	42%	35%	7%	6%
Fall 2007	0%	8%	64%	26%	2%	0%
Spring 2008	1%	5%	62%	26%	5%	0%
Fall 2008	25%	5%	45%	17%	7%	1%
Spring 2009	14%	5%	48%	24%	7%	2%
Fall 2009	<b>12%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>55%</b>	18%	1%	0%

At the beginning of the year, the entire Riley staff discussed examples and non-examples of engaged learning. The staff analyzed the previous year's scores and provided authentic references to engaged learning within their own classrooms. After each focus walk data is analyzed and staff recognized each others' accomplishments.

The focus walk data indicates an increase in student active engaged learning from 5% to 14% from the fall of 2005 to the spring of 2009. Student learning conversations have increased from 1% to 5% from the fall of 2005 to the spring of 2009. Teacher led instruction has slightly increased by 1% from the fall of 2005 to the spring of 2009. Student work with teacher engaged has decreased by 11% from the fall of 2005 to the spring of 2009. Student work with teacher not engaged has decreased by 3% from the fall of 2005 to the spring 2009. Complete disengagement has remained the same over this same time period. The data shows that as student engagement increases, so does student achievement.

**Discipline and Positive Behavior Systems**

Riley has committed itself to provide a safe and nurturing environment for all students. Riley has very few students who are placed on suspension. Riley only had 4 students who were suspended in school and 6 students who were suspended out of school for a total of 15 days. Students missing instructional time due to discipline issues is not a problem at Riley based on the number of suspensions.

Riley has many school wide positive behavior systems in place which include:

1. Student of the month
2. Lunch with the principal for the best behaved class during lunch, including a trophy and certificate
3. Riley Rocket Rewards - Given to students who exhibit positive behaviors
4. Character Education recognition
5. Perfect Attendance on a quarterly basis
6. Honor Roll for grades 3rd-5th on a quarterly basis

### **Attendance**

Riley school has consistently had a very high attendance rate from 2002-2009. In 2009 the attendance rate was 95.8%. Riley staff emphasize the need for students to attend school each day.

### **Parental Involvement**

The parental involvement at Riley from the 2009 school report cards shows that from 2006-2009, Riley had 100% parental involvement. Riley acknowledges that this is just one of the components of a successful parent partnership.

Riley had over 300 students and parents attend the October 7, 2009 Family night. Parents went to each grade level presentation that focused on reading strategies.

Riley had 125 students and parents attend the January 21, 2010 Family Night which focused on ISAT, vocabulary, project CRISS strategies, and making words activities.

Riley has begun parent partnership meetings to focus on the connection with the parents and the school and ways to work together to help our students succeed. Meetings have been held on October 19th, December 3, 2009. There has been an estimated 25-30 parents in attendance.

Breakfast with the principal has begun this school year and three breakfast get togethers have been held with 20-25 parents in attendance.

### **Community Attributes**

Riley is situated in a community that has access to all major highways and O'hare Airport. The community also enjoys many major retail stores and small independent companies. Our families access residential and industrial conveniences within the community. Residents participate in community activities and reflect diversity in culture and language.

### **CHALLENGES**

Community

The mobility rate at Riley has increased from 22.2% in 2008 to 50.9% in 2009. This means that 50.9% of the students in 2009 either moved in to Riley or left the school. With more than half of our students new to Riley School it is difficult to establish consistency in instructional strategies and practices.

School

There were 13 out of 33 new staff over the past two years to Riley which is 39% of the staff. There were new programs implemented during the 2008-2009 school year, which included: Response to Intervention, primary reading curriculum, guided reading and the use of centers in the classroom. Staff at Riley have limited communication abilities with parents due to a language barrier. Another challenge Riley faces is that there is no current program for new students and families.

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

1. The number of student suspensions is very low at a total of 15 days and the attendance rate at Riley in 2009 was 95.8%, however students are still not performing on standardized tests.
2. Mobility rate contributes to lack of consistent instruction.
3. New teachers may not be aware of standardized test content, procedures and curricular expectations.
4. Teachers have limited communication with parents.

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

1. Riley would like to increase the level of active engagement necessary for student achievement. Riley would like to have a minimum of a 5-10% increase in student engaged learning. This will be achieved through continued discussions and examples.
2. Teachers are not using appropriate strategies to address student needs.
3. Families will be invited to attend a welcome event to outline Riley's academic expectations.
4. New teachers will attend training on standardized test content, procedures and curricular expectations.
5. Riley staff will pursue effective communication strategies with parents.

**Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data**  
**Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development**

**Data** - *Briefly describe data on educator qualifications and data and/or information about staff capacity and professional development opportunities related to areas of weakness and strength. What do these data and information tell you?*

Demographics	2008	2009
--------------	------	------

Male	2	3
Female	30	30
White-Non Hispanic	24	25
Hispanic	8	8
1-5 Years	10	13
6-10 Years	12	6
11+ years	10	14
ESL Endorsement	8	9
Reading Endorsement	4	4
Bachelor's Degree	16	16
Master's Degree	15	17

The data shows the need for more teachers to possess or work towards the ESL endorsement. Although approximately half of the teachers at Riley possess a Master's Degree, the number of teachers with Reading endorsements is very low. The data also suggests that Riley teachers need professional development in the areas of Reading. There are a three males in the Riley staff who teach computer and P.E. There are 11 teachers who are bilingual, 8 of those are Hispanic.

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

1. Thirteen of the thirty-three FTE teachers have 1-5 years of teaching experience.
2. Riley has highly qualified staff, but few have a Reading endorsement.
3. Riley has 9 teachers who have an English as a Second Language endorsement.
4. Riley only has 11 bilingual teachers.

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

1. New and veteran Riley teachers will receive explicit training on ESL and Reading strategies.
2. Teachers will be encouraged to pursue a Reading endorsement.
3. Teachers will be encouraged to pursue an ESL endorsement.
3. Riley will work to hire more Male and bilingual teachers.

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

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

The 2009 school report card data show that 95.8% of Riley's parents are involved. Over 100 parents are typically in attendance at PTA events. At parent-teacher conferences, more than 90% of Riley parents attend. Approximately 25 parents attended the Limited English Proficient Community Enrichment Program in 2009. This program offers ESL classes to parents. Riley also offers computer classes to its parents. The Riley PTA conducts frequent fundraisers to purchase educationally related materials, such as listening stations for the school library. While the percentages reported to the state regarding parent involvement are high, parents have not been invited to participate regularly in their child's education.

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

1. Riley has not welcomed parents as partners in the development of specific Reading skills at home and at school..
2. Riley has not consistently sought parental input or feedback.

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

1. Teachers will provide specific strategies that families can implement at home. Parental input will be solicited on the usefulness of these strategies.
2. Riley will work to communicate the importance of parent partnerships through the use of Parent Forums, Parent meetings, PTA events, climate surveys, and conferences. Riley will begin to investigate Joyce Epstein's work on parent and community partnerships.

### 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?*

Riley' has seen a decrease in student performance in Reading for two years in a row. Riley will focus on Reading for the 2009-2010 school year addressing the following areas:

1. Teachers will explicitly teach ISAT vocabulary and test taking strategies.
2. Professional Development in the areas of Reading for all staff and teacher assistants is needed.
3. Riley will work to communicate the importance of parent partnerships through the use of Parent Forums, Parent meetings, PTA events, conferences and parent climate surveys.
4. Teachers, students, and parents will become more familiar with the ISAT test.



## Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	<a href="#">All students at Riley will determine the meaning of unknown words including prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms, and antonyms.</a>	1,2,3,4,
2	<a href="#">All students will understand how literary elements and techniques are used to convey meaning.</a>	1,2,3,4,
3	<a href="#">All students will summarize and sequence story events and distinguish between minor and significant details.</a>	1,2,3,4,
4	<a href="#">All students will differentiate between fact and opinion.</a>	1,2,3,4,
5	<a href="#">Students in grades 1st-5th will improve their writing performance on extended response and expository writing.</a>	1,2,3,4,

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. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 3. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 4. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

---

**Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives****Objective 1**

All students at Riley will determine the meaning of unknown words including prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms, and antonyms.

**Objective 1 Description**

Riley's current achievement in Reading for all students is 52%, Hispanic 51.8%, LEP 44.6%, and low income 49.4%, all Riley students will achieve 77% meet/exceed in 2010 and 85% meet/exceed in 2011.

**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. 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 at Riley will determine the meaning of unknown words including prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms, and antonyms.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All students (LEP, Hispanic and Low Income) in grades 1st-5th will use the Frayer model to discover synonyms and antonyms of academic vocabulary on a weekly basis during their RtI intervention time.	11/30/2009	06/11/2010	During School	Other	
2	Students in grades 3-5 will participate in making words activities. These activities will focus on the meaning making of new words from base words, suffixes and prefixes during their RtI intervention time.	10/01/2009	06/11/2010	During School	Other	
3	Students in grades 3-5 will practice test taking strategies using academic and ISAT vocabulary.	09/01/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	
4	Students in grades K-2 will participate in making words activities. These activities will focus on the meaning making of new words from base words, suffixes and prefixes during their RtI intervention time.	09/06/2010	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	
5	Students in grades K-2 will learn testing taking strategies.	02/01/2010	06/10/2011	Before School	Title I	

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

All students at Riley will determine the meaning of unknown words including prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms, and antonyms.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will participate in staff meeting presentations which focus on the Frayer model and facilitating Making Words activities.	11/18/2009	06/04/2010	Before School	Title III	
	Teachers will attend the workshop called The Truth, the Whole Truth					

2	and Nothing but About ISAT Reading workshop and report back to the entire staff.	12/03/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title III	
3	Teachers will discuss and implement test taking strategies under the guidance of the Reading coach.	02/23/2010	06/04/2010	During School	Title III	
4	Riley staff will investigate Joyce Epstein's work on parent and community partnerships.	12/16/2009	06/04/2010	Before School	Title III	
5	Riley staff will implement Joyce Epstein's work on parent and community partnerships.	08/31/2010	06/10/2011	During School	Title III	
6	Teachers will complete a survey in response to parent and community partnerships.	01/27/2010	06/10/2011	Before School	Title I	

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

All students at Riley will determine the meaning of unknown words including prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms, and antonyms.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will learn how to use the Frayer Model so that parents can be partners in their child's education.	01/13/2010	06/10/2011	After School	Title III	3,000
2	Parents will be surveyed on how well they like the reading strategies.	04/07/2010	06/10/2011	After School	Title I	

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

All students at Riley will determine the meaning of unknown words including prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms, and antonyms.

**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?)

1. Teachers will collect Frayer models on a weekly basis.

2. Administrators and teachers will analyze weekly selection Reading tests to determine vocabulary growth. Teachers will turn in their class average correct each week.
3. Parents will complete a survey updating the school on the take-home activities, backpacks, and family night.
4. Teacher workshops will be tracked on a quarterly basis.
5. Administrators will investigate Joyce Epstein's Six Types of Involvement on a monthly basis during the 2009-2010 school year and implement during the 2010-2011 school year.
6. Administrators will conduct weekly walkthroughs to collect data on vocabulary strategies and activities and test taking skills.

*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	Michelle Gambardella	Principal
2	Noah Little	Assistant Principal
3	All Classroom Teachers	

## Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

### Objective 2

All students will understand how literary elements and techniques are used to convey meaning.

### Objective 2 Description

Riley's current achievement in Reading for all students is 52%, Hispanic 51.8%, LEP 44.6%, and low income 49.4%, all Riley students will achieve 77% meet/exceed in 2010 and 85% meet/exceed in 2011.

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

1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

- b 2. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- b 3. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- b 4. 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 understand how literary elements and techniques are used to convey meaning.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students in grades 3-5 (Hispanic, Low Income and LEP) will demonstrate a knowledge of Author's Purpose to inform, entertain, and persuade by reading grade level selections on a weekly basis during RtI intervention time.	10/01/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title I	
2	All students (K-5), including LEP, Hispanic and Low Income, will determine the causes of character actions by using a cause and effect graphic organizer to identify cause/effect relationships on a weekly basis during RtI intervention time.	10/01/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title I	
3	All students in 5th grade will identify literature structures, terms, and devices on a weekly basis during RtI intervention time.	10/01/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title I	
4	Students in grades 1-2 will will demonstrate a knowledge of Author's Purpose to inform, entertain, and persuade by reading grade level selections on a weekly basis during RtI intervention time.	09/06/2010	06/10/2011	During School	Title I	

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

All students will understand how literary elements and techniques are used to convey meaning.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Grade level Meetings with Reading Coach will focus on literary elements used to convey meaning twice per month.	10/01/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title I	
2	Riley staff will explore literature structures, terms and devices on a weekly basis.	01/06/2010	06/10/2011	Before School	Title I	
3	Riley staff will investigate Joyce Epstein's work on parent and community partnerships.	10/02/2009	06/04/2010	Before School	Title I	
4	Riley staff will implement Joyce Epstein's work on parent and community partnerships.	09/06/2010	06/10/2011	Before School	Title I	

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

All students will understand how literary elements and techniques are used to convey meaning.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will use information on author's purpose, cause and effect and main idea at home learned during Family Curriculum Nights.	10/07/2009	06/11/2010	After School	Title I	3,000
2	Parents will participate in parent meetings regarding Joyce Epstein's parent community partnership model.	01/04/2010	06/10/2011	After School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 2 Title :**

All students will understand how literary elements and techniques are used to convey meaning.

**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?)

1. Teachers will collect and analyze student journals that focus on author's purpose.
2. Teachers will randomly select five graphic organizers per week until 80% accuracy is reached for causes of character actions and cause/effect.
3. Teachers will utilize the Reading curriculum's Assessment Handbook to assess students use of literature structures, terms, and devices and administrators will collect the class mastery percentage on a monthly basis.
4. Notes from meetings between the Reading coach and teachers will be turned in to administrators.
5. Parents will be surveyed about the usefulness of the literary elements and techniques used at home.
6. Administrators will implement Joyce Epstein's Six Types of Involvement on a monthly basis.
7. Administrators will conduct walkthroughs looking for evidence of author's purpose, cause and effect, and literature structures.
8. Administrators will attend grade level meetings on a weekly basis.

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	Michelle Gambardella	Principal
2	Noah Little	Assistant Principal
3	All Teachers	

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

**Objective 3**

All students will summarize and sequence story events and distinguish between minor and significant details.

**Objective 3 Description**

Riley's current achievement in Reading for all students is 52%, hispanic 51.8%, LEP 44.6%, and low income 49.4%, all Riley students will achieve 77% meet/exceed in 2010 and 85% meet/exceed in 2011.

**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. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

All students will summarize and sequence story events and distinguish between minor and significant details.

Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
Hispanic, low income, LEP, students in grades 3-5 will utilize story					

1	retelling cards to summarize and sequence story events and determine which details are minor or significant on a weekly basis during RtI intervention time.	10/01/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title III	
2	Students in grades 3-5 (Hispanic, Low Income and LEP) will utilize Project CRISS strategies to summarize and sequence story events and distinguish between minor and significant details by using one sentence summaries,read-recall-check summarize strategy and main idea-detail summary on a weekly basis during RtI intervention time.	10/01/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title III	
3	Students in grades K-2 will utilize story retelling cards to summarize and sequence story events and determine which details are minor or significant on a weekly basis during RtI intervention time.	09/06/2010	06/10/2011	During School	Title III	
4	Students in grades K-2 will utilize Project CRISS strategies to summarize and sequence story events and distinguish between minor and significant details by using one sentence summaries,read-recall-check summarize strategy and main idea-detail summary on a weekly basis during RtI intervention time.	09/06/2010	06/10/2011	During School	Title III	

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

All students will summarize and sequence story events and distinguish between minor and significant details.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Staff Meeting presentations will involve teachers in sequencing and summarizing activities.	10/01/2009	06/04/2010	Before School	Title I	
2	ISAT Workshops and Reading workshop materials will be shared at staff meetings that focus on summarizing and distinguishing between minor and significant details.	10/01/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title I	
3	The Reading Coach will share, at grade level meetings, information that will focus on learning teaching strategies involving summarizing and	10/01/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title I	

	sequencing activities.					
4	All teachers will utilize Project CRISS strategies in their lesson plans. (One sentence summaries, read-recall-check summarize and main idea/detail notes)	10/01/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title I	
5	Riley staff will investigate Joyce Epstein's work on parent and community partnerships.	12/16/2009	06/11/2010	Before School	Title I	
6	Riley staff will implement Joyce Epstein's work on parent and community partnerships.	09/06/2010	06/10/2011	Before School	Title I	

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

All students will summarize and sequence story events and distinguish between minor and significant details.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will learn Project CRISS strategies to assist their children in summarizing, sequencing and distinguishing between minor/significant details during family curriculum nights.	10/07/2009	06/10/2011	After School	Title I	3,000

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

All students will summarize and sequence story events and distinguish between minor and significant details.

**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?)

1. Teachers will assess students using story retelling cards until 80% accuracy.
2. Unit benchmark assessment results will be analyzed by staff and administrators to determine the effectiveness of CRISS strategies.
3. Teachers will highlight selected CRISS strategies in their lesson plans. Lesson plans will be collected to monitor the use of CRISS strategies.

4. Parents will complete a survey regarding the usefulness of CRISS strategies.
5. Administrators will implement Jocyce Epstein's six types of involvement on a monthly basis.
6. Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs looking for evidence of summarizing, sequencing, and distinguishing between minor and significant details.
7. Administrators will attend grade level meetings on a weekly basis and collect minutes from the meetings.
8. Minutes from the grade level meetings with the Reading coach will be turned into administrators.

*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	Michelle Gambardella	Principal
2	Noah Little	Assistant Principal
3	All Teachers	

## Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

### Objective 4

All students will differentiate between fact and opinion.

### Objective 4 Description

Riley's current achievement in Reading for all students is 52%, hispanic 51.8%, LEP 44.6%, and low income 49.4%, all Riley students will achieve 77% meet/exceed in 2010 and 85% meet/exceed in 2011.

**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

- b 4. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective 4 Title :**

All students will differentiate between fact and opinion.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students in grades 3-5 (Hispanic, Low-Income, and LEP) will utilize the ten important sentences from each Reading selection to determine if they are facts or opinions. LEP students will utilize story cards and identify if they are facts or opinions on a weekly basis during RtI intervention time.	10/01/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title III	
2	All students (Hispanic, Low-Income, and LEP) will create their own facts and opinions based on Reading selections. The students will sort facts and opinions with partners on a weekly basis during RtI intervention time.	10/01/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Title III	
3	Students in grades K-2(Hispanic, Low-Income, and LEP) will utilize the ten important sentences from each Reading selection to determine if they are facts or opinions. LEP students will utilize story cards and identify if they are facts or opinions on a weekly basis during RtI intervention time.	09/10/2010	06/10/2011	During School	Title III	

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

**Objective 4 Title :**

All students will differentiate between fact and opinion.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	The Reading Coach will involve teachers in discussions regarding strategies that teach fact and opinion.	01/27/2010	06/10/2011	During School	Title III	
2	Riley staff will investigate Joyce Epstein's work on parent and community partnerships.	12/16/2009	06/10/2011	Before School	Title III	
3	Riley staff will implement Joyce Epstein's work on parent and community partnerships.	09/06/2010	06/10/2011	Before School	Title III	

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

**Objective 4 Title :**

All students will differentiate between fact and opinion.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will assist thier children in using strategies to differentiate between fact and opinion that they learn from Family Curriculum Nights.	10/07/2009	06/10/2011	After School	Title I	3,000

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

**Objective 4 Title :**

All students will differentiate between fact and opinion.

**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?)

1. A random sample from each classroom (5) will be taken and the average score recorded until 80% or better mastery is met.
2. Lesson plans will be monitored to ensure that specific fact/opinion strategies are utilized.
3. Notes will be collected for meetings between the Reading Coach and the teachers.
4. A parent survey will be distributed to determine the usefulness of fact and opinion strategies.
5. Administrators will implement Joyce Epstein's six types of involvement on a monthly basis.
6. Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs to observe evidence of fact and opinion activities.
7. Notes from grade level meetings will be turn into administrators.

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	Michelle Gambardella	Principal
2	Noah Little	Assistant Principal
3	All Teachers	

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

**Objective 5**

Students in grades 1st-5th will improve their writing performance on extended response and expository writing.

**Objective 5 Description**

11% of Riley 3rd grade students and 7% of 5th grade students met or exceeded on the Reading extended response portion of the ISAT. Therefore, the data reveals that students

need explicit practice in expository writing and specifically with the Reading extended response items.

**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. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective 5 Title :**

Students in grades 1st-5th will improve their writing performance on extended response and expository writing.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will write expository papers on a monthly basis.	10/02/2009	06/10/2011	During School	Title III	
2	Students will learn and practice how to write an expository paper using the evidence and interpretation graphic organizer and the ISAT expository rubric to score own writing sample and peer samples.	02/05/2010	06/10/2011	During School	Title III	

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

**Objective 5 Title :**

Students in grades 1st-5th will improve their writing performance on extended response and expository writing.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers in grades 2-5 will participate in two extended day workshops on expository writing and extended response.	01/19/2010	01/26/2010	After School	Title III	
2	Teachers will score expository papers on a weekly basis using the ISAT writing rubric, and the Reading extended response rubric.	02/08/2010	06/10/2011	During School	Title III	

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

**Objective 5 Title :**

Students in grades 1st-5th will improve their writing performance on extended response and expository writing.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will return a signed copy of the students' formal writing at the end of each month.	03/31/2010	06/10/2011	After School	Title III	
2	Parents will learn how to use the expository writing graphic organizer through participation at the family night.	04/07/2010	06/10/2011	After School	Title I	

## Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 5 Title :**

Students in grades 1st-5th will improve their writing performance on extended response and expository 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?)

1. Administrators will collect signed writing samples throughout the school year and use the Extended Response rubric and ISAT writing rubric to score them and track the progress of each classroom.
2. Teachers will collect journals on a weekly basis and score samples using the ISAT expository writing rubric.
3. Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs looking for evidence of improvement in expository writing.

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	Dr. Michelle Gambardella	Principal
2	Mr. Noah Little	Assistant Principal
3	Classroom teachers	

### 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.*)

Parents were notified through a district letter in English and Spanish explaining to the parents that Riley did not meet AYP for the second year. The letter states that the parents have the choice to send their child to another school in the district that is making AYP. This letter was mailed to parents on September 21, 2009. A special parent meeting was also held on October 14, 2009 to address specific questions relating to AYP.

### 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 2009-2010 School Improvement Team consisted of six 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 Director of Assessment and School Improvement, Dr. Kathryn Moesch was also a part of the team. Two parents were recruited and became members of the team in February.

The Riley staff has been an integral part in the developing of the 2009-2010 School Improvement Plan. The staff have worked in grade level teams looking at the data and creating specific student and staff strategies that were written in the plan.

Outside experts have met with Riley on a weekly basis to analyze the data and determine the specific areas of need.

	Name	Title
1	Dr. Michelle Gambardella	Principal
2	Mr. Noah Little	Assistant Principal
3	Dr. Kathryn Moesch	Director of Assessment and School Improvement
4	Dr. Doug Dirks	Outside Consultant
5	Ms. Elaine Gray	ESL Teacher
6	Ms. Laura Taylor	5th Grade Teacher
7	Ms. Cristina Pruitt	1st Grade Bilingual Teacher
8	Ms. Crystal Juarez	1st Grade Bilingual Teacher
9	Ms. Lorraine Kibbons	1st Grade Teacher
10	Ms. Angelica Gonzalez	3rd Grade Teacher
11	Dr. Jennifer Berry	West 40 Consultant
12	Ms. Maritza Guillermo	West 40 Consultant
13	Saul Torres	Parent
14	Paula Soto	Parent

**Section III - Development, Review and Implementation**  
**Part C. Peer Review Process**

**Peer Review** - Describe the district's peer review and approval process. Peer review teams should include teachers and administrators from schools and districts similar to the one in improvement, but significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students. As appropriate, peer reviewers may be teachers from other schools, personnel from other districts, Regional Office of Education staff, Intermediate Service Center staff, RESPRO staff, university faculty, consultants, et al., or combinations thereof. RESPRO staff serving on a School Support Team should not serve on a peer review team in the same district. The peer review should precede the local board approval and must be completed within 45 days of receiving the school improvement plan. For further description of the peer review process see LEA and School Improvement: Non-Regulatory Guidance, July 21, 2006, at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

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

The Riley School Improvement Plan will be submitted for peer review on October 8, 2009 and has been submitted to the District 87 Board of Education to be approved at the October 26, 2009 Board Meeting.

District 87 had a Peer Review Team which included an outside consultant, the Director of Assessment and School Improvement, and two West 40 Consultants. The team's primary responsibility was to provide specific feedback by providing meaningful advice on each component of the plan. Advice on each component assisted in the revision of the following areas: data analysis, specific strategies and activities that are measurable in the action plan, and areas for improvement.

The timetable for the peer review consisted of one all-day session. During the session, the peer review team reviewed the plan and used the state monitoring rubric as a tool to assess the plan. The review team provided narrative feedback on each section of the plan.

Riley's school improvement team has been meeting on a weekly basis for on hour since the first week of September. Quarterly meetings will take place in September, November, January, and April with the Director of School Improvement and Assessment and an outside consultant. The quarterly meetings will focus on the implementation and monitoring of the 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.

#### District 87 Mentoring Program

##### 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 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 - 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.

Mr. Evan Whitehead, 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. Mr. Whitehead also plans and facilitates school participation in district, parent showcase, community, and West 40 events. He is an integral part of the school improvement process by providing technical assistance and guidance in these areas.

Dr. Kathy Moesch, the Director of School Improvement and Assessment, is a valuable asset to our district by providing curricular leadership and assisting staff members in effectively implementing all aspects of the curriculum and RTI implementation. Dr. 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. Dr. 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. Dr. Moesch met with the SIP team and administrators weekly and quarterly to monitor effectiveness, provide input and offer technical assistance in regards to school improvement.

Dr. Sheila 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. She 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.

Ms. Eva Smith, Superintendent, approves and supervisors all district and school programs that support the strategies and activities implemented in the school improvement plan.

The district also provided the services of several outside experts in the creation and implementation of this plan. An outside consultant, analyzed the ISAT data and offered insight and information in regards to the areas of strengths and weaknesses. He assisted in writing, and reviewing of the plan and offered suggestions on areas of improvement. Mrs. Cathy Carter (Math Coach) and Mrs. Kathy Bruni (Reading Coach) also assisted in School Improvement initiatives and work with the Riley staff to effectively implement the Reading and Math curriculum.

**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.

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.

The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) has provided Riley with resources. The Illinois 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. ISBE has many valuable resources available when working with students who will be taking the ISAT test.

IWAS through the State Board of Education website has been a valuable tool when accessing and sorting out the required state data.

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

	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

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

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**