

Peotone Jr High School

School Improvement Plan 2008

Board Approval Date	3/4/2009
Plan Submission Date	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number	56099207U261002		
District Name	PEOTONE CUSD 207U	School Name	PEOTONE JR HIGH SCHOOL
Superintendent	KEVIN CAREY	Principal	GREGORY OLIVER
District Address	212 W WILSON ST	School Address	1 BLUE DEVIL DR
City/State/Zip	PEOTONE,IL,60468 9205	City/State/Zip	PEOTONE,IL,60468
District Telephone#	7082580991 Extn:213	School Telephone#	7082583246 Extn:0
District Email	kcarey@peotoneschools.org	School Email	goliver@peotoneschools.org

Is this plan for a Title I School? False

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2008 AYP Report**

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	Yes	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	Yes	2007-08 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2007-08 State Improvement Status	

	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		62.5			62.5			90.0		75.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	85.5		Yes	92.4		Yes	94	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	86.5		Yes	93.4		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	43.8	38.9	Yes	76.6		Yes	93.1			
Economically Disadvantaged														

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.

2. At least 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. ***

3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.

4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 75% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2007.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 62.5% or above are not printed.

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2008 AMAO Report

Schools are not accountable for AMAO. This is a district level requirement only.

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 3 - School Information**

School Information								
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Attendance Rate (%)	92.7	94.3	95.2	95.1	94.4	93.9	94.4	94.0
Truancy Rate (%)	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.2	-	0.2	-	-
Mobility Rate (%)	8.1	4.4	9.6	8.9	9.8	4.4	11.1	4.0
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	290	417	446	445	457	446	466	497
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	3.4	5.8	5.6	8.1	9.4	-	8.6	-
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	98.6	99.3	98.0	98.4	97.4	94.8	91.8	90.1
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.7	-	0.2	0.2	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.8
Hispanic (%)	-	0.2	0.7	0.7	2.0	4.3	5.4	6.2
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.7	0.5	1.1	0.7	-	0.2	-	1.0
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.1	1.8

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

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

	Year	White(%)	Black(%)	Hispanic(%)	Asian/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
S C H O O L	1999	98.2	-	0.4	1.1	0.4	-
	2000	97.9	-	1.4	0.3	0.3	-
	2001	98.6	0.7	-	0.7	-	-
	2002	99.3	-	0.2	0.5	-	-
	2003	98.0	0.2	0.7	1.1	-	-
	2004	98.4	0.2	0.7	0.7	-	-
	2005	97.4	0.7	2.0	-	-	-
	2006	94.8	0.7	4.3	0.2	-	-
	2007	91.8	0.6	5.4	-	-	2.1
	2008	90.1	0.8	6.2	1.0	-	1.8
D I S T R I C T	1999	96.7	0.1	1.9	1.0	0.2	-
	2000	96.7	0.2	1.9	0.9	0.3	-
	2001	96.5	0.9	1.4	1.1	0.2	-
	2002	97.2	0.3	1.5	0.9	0.1	-
	2003	96.8	0.5	2.0	0.7	0.1	-
	2004	95.9	0.5	2.6	0.9	0.1	-
	2005	94.6	0.8	3.4	0.9	0.1	0.3
	2006	93.3	1.0	4.0	1.2	0.1	0.5
	2007	91.1	0.8	5.7	1.1	-	1.3
2008	89.7	1.1	6.6	1.0	-	1.5	

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

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

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

	Year	LEP(%)	Low Income(%)	Parental Involvement(%)	Attendance(%)	Mobility(%)	Chronic Truants(N)	Chronic Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
S C H O O L	1999	-	0.7	100.0	94.9	6.1	0.0	-	-	-
	2000	-	2.4	99.7	93.1	13.3	0.0	-	-	-
	2001	-	3.4	100.0	92.7	8.1	1	0.4	-	-
	2002	-	5.8	100.0	94.3	4.4	2	0.5	-	-
	2003	-	5.6	100.0	95.2	9.6	1	0.2	-	-
	2004	-	8.1	100.0	95.1	8.9	1	0.2	-	-
	2005	-	9.4	100.0	94.4	9.8	0.0	-	-	-
	2006	-	-	100.0	93.9	4.4	1	0.2	-	-
	2007	-	8.6	100.0	94.4	11.1	0.0	-	-	-
2008	-	-	100.0	94.0	4.0	0.0	-	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	1999	-	3.5	88.4	94.5	9.5	4	0.2	1.8	93.5
	2000	-	3.0	97.0	94.2	9.8	9	0.5	1.4	94.4
	2001	-	3.7	94.0	94.1	7.2	5	0.3	1.6	95.9
	2002	-	4.1	97.0	94.5	5.2	8	0.5	0.7	89.7
	2003	0.1	5.0	97.5	94.8	9.6	4	0.2	0.4	97.8
	2004	-	5.5	97.8	94.1	8.4	3	0.2	1.0	100.0
	2005	-	5.3	98.0	94.5	7.7	5	0.3	1.0	100.0
	2006	-	5.1	97.7	94.8	7.0	2	0.1	1.1	100.0
	2007	-	8.3	98.1	94.7	6.8	0.0	-	0.5	98.6
2008	0.1	6.2	98.8	94.4	6.1	3	0.1	0.5	96.7	

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

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

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

	Year	School(N)	Grade 3(N)	Grade 4(N)	Grade 5(N)	Grade 7(N)	Grade 8(N)	Grade 11(N)
S C H O O L	1999	281	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	288	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	290	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	417	-	-	-	129	145	-
	2003	446	-	-	-	151	132	-
	2004	445	-	-	-	157	151	-
	2005	457	-	-	-	148	161	-
	2006	446	-	-	-	152	152	-
	2007	466	-	-	-	144	157	-
	2008	497	-	-	-	173	152	-
D I S T R I C T	1999	1652	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1655	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1752	118	154	139	145	136	115
	2002	1720	120	119	152	129	145	141
	2003	1775	126	127	129	151	132	158
	2004	1839	127	129	140	157	151	137
	2005	1868	150	137	137	148	161	146
	2006	1999	128	162	158	152	152	143
	2007	2106	158	142	168	144	157	157
	2008	2129	143	157	149	173	152	177

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

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 7 - Educator Data, Staff Capacity and Professional Development

	Year	Total Teacher FTE(N)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary(\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree(%)	Teachers with Master's Degree(%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials(%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers(%)
D I S T R I C T	1999	82	15	35640	66	34	20	20	-	-
	2000	89	14	37096	66	34	19	18	-	-
	2001	99	15	39001	70	30	20	20	-	-
	2002	110	14	40749	74	26	17	19	-	1
	2003	112	15	42830	69	31	18	20	-	1
	2004	105	15	44017	66	34	20	20	-	-
	2005	118	13	44232	59	41	18	18	-	-
	2006	127	13	45643	58	42	17	19	1	-
	2007	129	13	46764	61	39	18	20	-	-
	2008	130	13	44002	62	38	18	20	-	-
S T A T E	1999	119718	15	45337	53	47	20	18	-	-
	2000	122671	15	45766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125735	15	47929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126544	14	49702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129068	14	51672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125702	14	54446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128079	14	55558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127010	13	56685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127010	13	58275	48	52	19	19	2	3
2008	131488	12	60871	47	53	18	18	1	1	

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	77.9	77.7	79.9	-	-	-	79.1	78.2	85.4	64.7	74.8	78.3	86.8	74.7	87.6
White	-	-	-	79.2	77.8	81.4	-	-	-	80.5	78.5	86.2	64.6	75.0	77.7	88.8	77.5	88.5
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	72.7	72.8	-	-	-	-	-	70.0	-	-	-	-	-	80.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Peotone Jr High School

School Improvement Plan 2008

3/10/2009 4:38:55 PM

Page 15 of 32

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	50.1	26.3	30.8	-	-	-	31.3	45.4	36.4	0.0	50.0	52.6	56.3	25.0	59.0
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	63.6	68.8	80.0	-	-	-	60.0	85.7	-	-	60.0	27.3	76.9	57.9	90.9

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	85.7	85.5	88.5	-	-	-	88.9	89.8	92.5	59.9	64.2	52.8	83.5	82.8	95.5
White	-	-	-	86.9	86.5	90.4	-	-	-	89.3	89.6	93.5	59.7	64.6	53.6	84.6	85.0	95.0
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	72.7	81.8	-	-	-	-	-	81.8	-	-	-	-	-	100.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Peotone Jr High School

School Improvement Plan 2008

3/10/2009 4:38:55 PM

Page 17 of 32

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	81.3	68.4	65.4	-	-	-	68.8	72.7	81.8	0.0	10.0	5.3	37.5	40.0	86.4
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	80.0	87.6	90.0	-	-	-	80.0	85.7	-	-	40.0	18.2	61.5	73.7	90.9

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?*

The results tell us that the subpopulation indicates students with disabilities in reading are not performing at or at an equal level as the rest of the population. A significant gain was achieved with the students with disabilities group. This group made a marked improvement with an 11.7% gain in reading scores, which met the safe harbor target. The general population is performing at or well above state standards. Reading was 85.5% and Mathematics achieved 92.4; both reading and mathematics made gains from the previous year. We will continue to adjust/address instruction and curriculum to continue meeting state standards. Reading and writing are being more fully integrated throughout the junior high curriculum. All data sources help to drive school improvement initiatives throughout the district.

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

Student IEP testing procedures are different from the requirements during standardized testing. In addition, modifications normally used or allowed during regular testing are prohibited during ISAT testing. Students are not tested at their reading level. For example, if a student is reading at a fourth grade level, he/she is required to still complete the eighth grade test. Reading is a developmental content area; in fact, many special education students as well as students who begin as transfers are reading below grade level. Curriculum changes/adjustments will be made to offer students with disabilities every opportunity to grow in reading. Departmental Meetings have assisted in creating a more uniform platform for discussion and decision-making process. These meetings provide an opportunity to communicate and provide consistency with goal setting and expectations. In addition, reading and writing across the curriculum is one method utilized to close the achievement gap.

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

A student with an IEP that struggles with reading should be required to test at his/her reading grade level. We are making achievement gains with the regular population and the students with disabilities, which is evident by the overall scores in reading and mathematics. Access to core curriculum is a top priority for all students. Curricular changes need to provide opportunities for rigorous course work and access to core curriculum for all students. Changing the math sequence at the junior high will help assist us in closing the achievement gap, so all students in 7th or 8th grade are exposed to Pre-Algebra or Algebra I. Reading and writing across the curriculum and interpreting charts & graphs are a part of our school initiative to increase scores in reading and writing. All sixth, seventh, and eighth grades students are assessed using AIMSweb in oral fluency, comprehension, and math computation. Additional academic supports are needed to help students entering junior high school not meeting standards or fail to attain standards while in school. Teachers need continual staff development opportunities to meet the instructional needs of the students. Also, changes in curricula, instructional delivery and assessment, as well as individualized instruction, will be the focus of staff development.

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

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

The AIMSweb benchmarking is showing improvement from the fall benchmark to the winter benchmark. More students are improving and making gains:

6th grade fall target 134 winter target 146

Special Ed - 126.1	Special Ed. - 139.4
General Ed. - 140.6	General Ed. - 155.9

7th grade fall target 136 winter target 145

Special Ed. - 102.1	Special Ed. 112.9
General Ed. - 150.3	General Ed. 163.5

8th grade fall target 142.0 winter target 149.0

Special Ed. - 95.1	Special Ed. 110.1
General Ed. 152.1	General Ed. 161.6

Terra Nova Reading performance for special population is below the median national percentile with 28.7% for 6th grade, which is well below the 50 percentile. The 7th grade reading performance for special population was 19.5% and the 8th grade was 26%. The students with disabilities are struggling in the area of reading.

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

These students' reading levels are significantly lower than the regular population; however, the student is required to perform at his/her grade level and not his/her reading level.

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

The special needs population will require additional support and interventions. These students will need practice testing in the same manner as the standardized testing conditions. Decisions are being made collaboratively within departments with the direction of department facilitators and the secondary curriculum director; through conducting such meetings, the school had identified gaps that have impacted student performance. Communication is critical to help drive and impact school improvement. Staff development opportunities will be offered to teachers that focus on meeting the academic needs of all students and those struggling learners.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)
Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

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

The Peotone School District is presently observing a trend that reflects a moderate growing student population. An increased number of students moving into the community with special needs; therefore, there is a higher demand on the classroom teacher as well as the support staff to meet the needs of these students. In addition, we have an increase in our population of students with English as a second language. We are striving to increase our communication between the district and community.

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

Clearly, our special needs students continue to perform in the bottom percentile group. These results have created our need to implement our Rtl plan district-wide K-12. This program will incorporate benchmarking testing three times per year, while progress monitoring others on a more frequent basis.

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

A growing number of students are not meeting state standards; therefore, program and interventions are needed to assist in meeting the needs of our special population students. Parental communication emphasizing the importance of attendance, motivation, and successful completion of course requirements needs to continue.

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

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

Presently, all educators employed at Peotone Junior High School are highly qualified according to state standards. These records are maintained, verified and documented each year. The Peotone Community School District offers internal and external opportunities for professional growth. In addition, professional development is encouraged and required by the curriculum director. These incentives have been implemented for the purpose of improving and enhancing instruction across the curriculum. Professional development activities have focused on differentiated instruction, instructional delivery methods, aligning the curriculum with Illinois Learning Standards, and curriculum mapping.

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

Highly qualified instructors with a broad range of certification allows the opportunity to update and revise our curriculum as needed. The faculty is informed of test results and make adjustments according to the students' needs. The professional development activities have assisted our teachers in refining existing skills, acquiring new skills, and identifying best practices.

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

We have a number of faculty members taking advantage of professional development opportunities, such as college courses and instructional workshops related to ISAT. Growth from these opportunities are evident through examination of daily lesson plans, collection of academic artifacts, and classroom observations, which are conducted periodically. Peotone Junior High School will continue to employ highly qualified teachers and provide them with professional development opportunities.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)
Item 3 - Parent Involvement**Data** - *Briefly describe data on parent involvement. What do these data tell you?*

The data reflects that parents have a desire to actively participate in their child's education. This is evident during school functions such as: open house, parent/teacher conferences, board meetings, growth and planning meetings, to name a few. In addition, parent/school interaction has been enhanced through the district website, posting of classroom assignments, listserve, newsletter, and individual letters, when necessary, use of daily assignment notebook, a weekly note and Friday folder for 6th grade students. Teachers writing regular emails to parents about positive and negative concerns as well as make necessary phone calls.

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

Parents who work with children on a regular basis and are frequently involved in the school will instill the importance of education to their children and encourage them to do their best in all aspects of school. Peotone Junior High School does not have casual data regarding parental involvement.

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

We will never be able to address concerns without a more active and informed parental population. Parental support is essential to the overall school improvement initiative; therefore, we will strive to keep the parents and community informed through the use of local newspapers, businesses, and advertising.

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

Section I-D - Key Factors – From the preceding screens (I-A, I-B, I-C-1, 2, 3) identify key factors that are within the school’s capacity to change or control and which have contributed to low achievement. What conclusions about next steps have you reached from reviewing available data and information and about all the factors affecting student achievement?

- Knowledge of differentiated instruction strategies to use with students across the curriculum
- Summer opportunities that students have to remain involved in math/reading (summer reading program/summer school)
- Changing demographics
- Uninformed parents
- Adding rigor for raising standards
- Accountability/ consistency
- Finding gaps/repetitions through curriculum mapping
- Schools in the district functioning more cohesively
- Rtl benchmarking/local assessment to change instruction when necessary
- Continue gathering additional data to drive SIP process
- Review performance on ISAT, TerraNova, EXPLORE - change local assessment practices to mirror format on standardized assessments
- Developing targeted interventions to improve student achievement for all students.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Increase Reading Achievement	

The following deficiencies [not objectives] have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for your school.

No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AYP Report.

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective: 1

Increase Reading Achievement

Objective 1 Description:

Our goal for the 2008-2009 school year is to increase reading score with students with disabilities from 43.8% to 50% of the students meeting the state standards. With significant growth from the previous year (11.7% gain), our goal is to once again move our student forward. Reading vocabulary development and comprehension are two of the targeted areas identified for improvement.

No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AYP Report.

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 1 Title : Increase Reading Achievement						
	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
1	Wilson pullout program for students identified with IEP reading deficiency, which focuses on decoding, vocabulary development, word analysis, and comprehension at instructional level.	9/2/2008	6/4/2009	During School	Other	
2	Create questions across the curriculum using Bloom's taxonomy.	9/2/2008	6/4/2009	During School	Other	
3	Benchmark all students in the areas of oral fluency and comprehension using AIMSweb reading instrument.	9/2/2008	6/4/2009	During School	Local Funds	1500
4	Summer Reading Program (Summer 2009)	6/5/2009	8/24/2009	After School	Local Funds	300
5	Incorporate a weekly lesson from the Illinois Reading Assessment Framework Workbook in Language Arts classes.	9/2/2008	3/13/2009	During School	Other	
6	Teach reading and test taking strategies across the curriculum.	9/2/2008	6/4/2009	During School	Other	

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

Objective 1 Title : Increase Reading Achievement						
	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
1	Differentiated Instruction book study using Differentiation in Action by Judith Dodge.	8/22/2008	6/4/2009	During School	Local Funds	1500
2	Teachers will participate in a workshop by the Professional Development Alliance on differentiated instruction techniques.	2/27/2009	2/27/2009	During School	Local Funds	1000
3	ISAT Reading Extended Response: Grades 6-8 by Professional Development Alliance	10/7/2008	10/7/2008	During School	Local Funds	130
4	Accelerating Student Learning and Motivation in the social studies classes- hands-on activities and engaging projects.	11/4/2008	11/4/2008	During School	Local Funds	199
5	IAHPERD convention	11/20/2008	11/22/2008	During School	Local Funds	120

	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
6	Conducted monthly department meeting to continue aligning objectives to the state standards.	8/24/2008	6/5/2009	During School	Other	
7	System Day meets to review AIMSweb benchmarking 3 times each year.	10/1/2008	6/5/2009	During School	Other	

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

Objective 1 Title : Increase Reading Achievement

	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
1	Track outside/independent reading through a merit system requiring parents signature.	6/5/2009	8/24/2009	After School	Other	
2	Direct parents to sign up for list serve to find out what is being offered throughout the district, message in district newsletter.	8/25/2008	8/24/2009	After School	Other	
3	Attached links are available on the district website for family participation to the summer reading program for family activities.	6/5/2009	8/24/2009	After School	Other	
4	Communication weekly with parents through phone calls, emails, Friday Folders, assignment notebooks, bi-weekly reports, etc. to inform parents of student progress and concerns.	8/25/2008	6/5/2009	During School	Other	
5	Offer book fair family night two times a year.	9/2/2008	3/9/2009	After School	Other	
6	Parents receive a letter if students are missing 3 or more assignments, which offer homework lab, tutoring opportunities, retention policy, etc.	9/2/2008	6/4/2009	After School	Other	
7	Parent Presentation on RtI as it applies to the school improvement plan.	9/2/2009	9/2/2009	After School	Other	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title : Increase Reading Achievement

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

- Student achievement data on standardized and local assessments will be analyzed to determine if current teaching methodologies and curricular structures/content are effective. Monthly meetings will be held with department facilitators, principal, director of curriculum and the director of special services to determine if the activities and strategies in the plan regarding this objective are being implemented and offer suggestions and direction for any changes.
- Review of curriculum mapping process,
- Impromptu classroom visits
- Annual classroom observations

- Approval of requested workshops/conferences
- Agenda and minutes from monthly department meetings

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

Name	Title
Paul Preuss	Curriculum Director
Kevin Carey	Superintendent

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation Part A. Parent Notification*

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

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

1. Mail home TerraNova reports; ISAT reports; letters of recommendation for homework lab; 6th grade Math Letter; incoming 6th grade parent orientation letter; invitation to attend Parent/Teacher conferences; Computer Proficiency Letter
2. ISAT student memo; trimester report cards; bi-weekly reports; daily work; test results
3. Emails and phone calls are made, when necessary
4. District report card is available for viewing on the district website at <http://www.peotoneschools.org>

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

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

School Improvement Team had input in all areas of the development of the plan. In addition, all faculty has the opportunity to preview and provide input before

the plan is finalized and submitted to the Board of Education.

Names and titles of school improvement team or plan developers:

	Name	Title
1	Paul Preuss	Curriculum Director
2	Diane Ahearn	Teacher
3	Rose Kramer	Sp. Ed. Teacher
4	Donna Breen	Teacher
5	Karen Heisner	Teacher
6	Terry Maxwell	Teacher
7	Claire Rademacher	Media Specialist

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

Peer Review - Describe the district's peer review and approval process. Peer review teams should include teachers and administrators from schools and districts similar to the one in improvement, but significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students. As appropriate, peer reviewers may be teachers from other schools, personnel from other districts, Regional Office of Education staff, Intermediate Service Center staff, RESPRO staff, university faculty, consultants, et al., or combinations thereof. RESPRO staff serving on a School Support Team should not serve on a peer review team in the same district. Peer review and subsequent local board approval must be completed within 45 days of receiving the school improvement plan.

For further description of the peer review process see LEA and School Improvement: Non-Regulatory Guidance, July 21, 2006, at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

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

All teachers have the opportunity to be a part of the development and approval of the School Improvement Plan.

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation Part D. Teacher Mentoring Process

Teacher Mentoring Process - Describe the teacher mentoring program. Mentoring programs pair novice teachers with more experienced professionals who serve as role models and provide practical support and encouragement. Schools have complete discretion in deciding what else the teacher mentoring program should provide.

Peotone Junior High School recognizes how critical the initial experiences in a new school can be. The long and short term impacts of these experiences have bearing on teacher success and effectiveness as well as on student learning. Peotone CUSD 207U has strong interest and obligation to see that teachers who are new to the system are supported and assisted. The first two teaching years within the district will be shared with a veteran colleague and enhanced by shared developmental experiences, including: monthly meetings and conferencing, new teacher inservice and trainings, observation of mentees by veteran teachers and observation of veteran teachers by mentees.

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

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

The process begins with every teacher being provided data from local and state assessments. This data then drives the identification of future goals and activities to be implemented. The district also provides every staff member an opportunity to attend or participate in a conference or workshop pertaining to district goals. The monies necessary to drive our school improvement are allocated by the Board of Education. We will provide professional development to administration on helping utilize best practices with the three-minute walk-through.

Corrective Actions taken by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress for a fourth annual calculation (Corrective Action Status) should be aligned with the strategies and activities of this plan. The district must take one or more of the following actions in such a school per NCLB, Section 1116(b)(7)(C)(iv).

Restructuring Options (allowed in Illinois) selected by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress for a fifth annual calculation (Restructuring Status) should be aligned with the strategies and activities of this plan. The district must take one or more of the following options in such a school.

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation
Part F. State Responsibilities

State Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that ISBE, RESPROS, and other service providers have provided the school during the development and review of this plan and other services that will be provided during the implementation of the plan. ISBE shall provide technical assistance to the school if district fails to do so.

We did not request support from the Regional Office of Education for development of the 2008-2009 School Improvement Plan.

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

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

	Name	Title
1	Paul Preuss	Curriculum Director
2	Diane Ahearn	Teacher
3	Rose Kramer	Sp. Ed. Teacher
4	Karen Heisner	Teacher
5	Terry Maxwell	Teacher
6	Claire Rademacher	Media Specialist
7	Donna Breen	Teacher

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:3/4/2009

A. ASSURANCES

1. The district has provided written notice in a timely manner about the improvement identification to parents of each student enrolled in the school, in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand (NCLB, Section 1116(c)(6)).
2. Strategies and activities have been founded in scientifically based research as required by NCLB, Section 1116(b)(3)(A)(i) and as defined in NCLB, Section 9101(37).
3. Technical assistance provided by the district serving the school is founded on scientifically based research (NCLB, Section 1116(b)(4)(C)) as defined in NCLB, Section 9101(37).
4. The plan includes strategies and activities that support the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards and ensures alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessments with the Illinois Learning Standards.
5. The school will spend at least 10 percent of the funds made available under Section 1113 of NCLB for the purpose of providing teachers and the principal high-quality professional development. (Title I schools only.)

B.SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

By submitting the plan on behalf of the school the district superintendent certifies to ISBE that all the assurances and information provided in the plan are true and correct and that the improvement plan has been duly approved by the local school board. By sending e-mail notification of the plan completion from the **Submit Your Plan** page (Section IV-C) the plan shall be deemed to be executed by the superintendent on behalf of the school.

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

	Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified?
--	------------------------------------------------------------

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

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

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

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

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

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

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

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

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

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

	Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency?
--	--------------------------------------------------------

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

	Are the strategies and activities measurable?
--	-----------------------------------------------

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

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

	Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students?
	Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status or in special education non-compliance?
	Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities? for students?
	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?
MONITORING	
	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?
	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

	Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only)
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?
	Does the SIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes?

PEER REVIEW

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

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS

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

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?
	If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school?

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

	Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation?
SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM	
	Have the names and titles of School Support Team members been listed in the plan? Does the team appear to have the expertise to support this school in regards to the school improvement plan?
APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD	
	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.

PART II - COMMENTS