

Local Board Approved	
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2010 AYP Report

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this School been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2010-11 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2010-11 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning Year 2

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		77.5			77.5			91		80	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	61.0		No	51.6		No			100.0	Yes
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	64.9	77.1	No	54.4	66.9	No			100.0	
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American													
Multiracial/Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities													
Economically Disadvantaged													

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

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 77.5% 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 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 91% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 80% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2009.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 77.5% 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 - 2010 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	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Attendance Rate (%)	94.8	94.5	93.9	93.0	95.0	92.2	91.2	94.4
Truancy Rate (%)	0.4	1.0	2.3	1.5	1.3	0.4	0.2	0.0
Mobility Rate (%)	5.9	7.9	8.2	5.4	7.8	5.5	5.1	4.3
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	100.0	97.7	100.0	97.0	96.0	99.6	96.4	100.0
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	1.3	0.6	0.9	0.8	0.5	0.4	1.2	0.5
School Population (#)	861	932	994	1,025	1,096	1,113	1,209	1,292
Low Income (%)	2.1	3.3	5.3	7.8	5.9	7.6	9.3	12.3
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.3	0.5	0.9	0.7	0.3	1.0	1.8	1.1
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.4
White, non-Hispanic (%)	95.4	94.7	92.1	90.7	88.0	86.3	84.6	84.0
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.3	1.6	1.3	0.9	1.3
Hispanic (%)	2.4	3.5	5.1	6.0	7.8	9.3	10.9	12.1
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	1.2	0.9	1.4	1.8	1.8	2.0	2.4	1.7
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	0.4	0.1	0.7	1.0	0.9	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	96.4	0.5	2.3	0.5	0.3	-
	2001	96.4	0.4	1.9	0.9	0.4	-
	2002	96.0	0.7	2.1	0.9	0.4	-
	2003	95.4	0.7	2.4	1.2	0.3	-
	2004	94.7	0.8	3.5	0.9	0.1	-
	2005	92.1	0.9	5.1	1.4	0.1	0.4
	2006	90.7	1.3	6.0	1.8	0.1	0.1
	2007	88.0	1.6	7.8	1.8	0.1	0.7
	2008	86.3	1.3	9.3	2.0	0.1	1.0
	2009	84.6	0.9	10.9	2.4	0.2	0.9
	2010	84.0	1.3	12.1	1.7	0.3	0.6
D I S T R I C T	2000	96.1	0.6	2.4	0.8	0.2	-
	2001	96.1	0.7	2.5	0.5	0.1	-
	2002	95.0	0.9	3.0	0.9	0.1	-
	2003	94.4	0.9	3.3	1.2	0.1	-
	2004	92.8	1.1	5.0	1.1	0.1	-
	2005	90.4	1.1	6.2	1.7	0.1	0.4
	2006	88.7	1.3	7.4	1.9	0.2	0.5
	2007	86.5	1.4	8.9	2.1	0.1	1.1
	2008	84.1	1.6	10.0	2.4	0.2	1.8
	2009	84.1	1.2	9.9	2.5	0.2	2.1
	2010	83.4	1.7	9.6	2.7	0.2	2.4
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

S T A T E	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5
	2010	52.8	18.8	21.1	4.2	0.2	2.9

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	-	1.7	75.7	95.1	5.7	2	0.3	0.8	95.7
	2001	1.0	1.1	100.0	94.6	18.2	4	0.5	1.0	99.4
	2002	0.7	1.3	90.0	94.0	8.1	3	0.4	2.0	96.5
	2003	0.3	2.1	94.0	94.8	5.9	4	0.4	1.3	100.0
	2004	0.5	3.3	100.0	94.5	7.9	10	1.0	0.6	97.7
	2005	0.9	5.3	100.0	93.9	8.2	23	2.3	0.9	100.0
	2006	0.7	7.8	100.0	93.0	5.4	16	1.5	0.8	97.0
	2007	0.3	5.9	100.0	95.0	7.8	14	1.3	0.5	96.0
	2008	1.0	7.6	100.0	92.2	5.5	4	0.4	0.4	99.6
	2009	1.8	9.3	100.0	91.2	5.1	2	0.2	1.2	96.4
2010	1.1	12.3	100.0	94.4	4.3	-	-	0.5	100.0	
D I S T R I C T	2000	0.7	2.0	93.6	95.6	8.3	5	0.2	0.8	95.7
	2001	1.3	2.3	98.0	95.5	10.2	5	0.2	1.0	99.4
	2002	1.4	2.5	94.6	95.2	8.1	8	0.3	2.0	96.5
	2003	0.6	2.7	96.0	95.7	7.0	7	0.2	1.3	100.0
	2004	1.4	3.2	98.2	95.6	8.6	11	0.3	0.6	97.7
	2005	1.6	4.8	99.4	95.2	11.9	26	0.7	0.9	100.0
	2006	1.4	6.4	99.5	95.1	7.3	22	0.6	0.8	97.0
	2007	1.4	5.6	99.5	95.6	7.5	28	0.7	0.5	96.0
	2008	2.6	5.9	99.4	95.5	6.1	4	0.1	0.4	99.6
	2009	3.0	7.3	99.6	94.6	4.8	3	0.1	1.2	96.4
2010	2.4	9.1	98.4	95.1	4.8	-	-	0.5	100.0	
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2

S T A T E	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
	2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1
	2010	7.6	45.4	96.2	93.9	13.0	72,383	3.6	3.8	87.8

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	749	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	783	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	815	-	-	-	-	-	186
	2003	861	-	-	-	-	-	218
	2004	932	-	-	-	-	-	235
	2005	994	-	-	-	-	-	240
	2006	1,025	-	-	-	-	-	264
	2007	1,096	-	-	-	-	-	245
	2008	1,113	-	-	-	-	-	283
	2009	1,209	-	-	-	-	-	290
	2010	1,292	-	-	-	-	-	294
D I S T R I C T	2000	2,647	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,747	224	219	213	229	228	202
	2002	2,862	218	225	221	220	231	186
	2003	3,049	236	238	236	228	245	218
	2004	3,325	280	262	255	266	237	235
	2005	3,616	302	299	286	275	277	240
	2006	3,994	328	355	327	276	289	264
	2007	4,146	352	335	352	326	292	245
	2008	4,409	399	367	360	355	336	283
	2009	4,581	358	395	379	362	353	290
	2010	4,757	364	358	393	358	367	294
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

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

Educator Data is available only for district level

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	161	14	43,713	46	54	19	18	-	-
	2001	175	14	44,072	44	56	18	18	-	-
	2002	193	13	45,355	46	54	17	17	1	-
	2003	195	13	48,386	39	61	18	17	1	-
	2004	202	12	52,447	39	61	19	19	1	-
	2005	219	11	52,107	42	58	18	19	-	-
	2006	240	11	52,226	48	52	18	18	-	-
	2007	276	10	52,884	48	52	16	17	1	-
	2008	285	10	54,648	46	54	17	17	-	-
	2009	300	10	56,525	39	61	16	17	-	-
2010	275	10	58,870	32	68	19	19	-	-	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1
2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1	

	2010	132,502	13	63,296	42	57	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)

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grade 11						
Groups	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	56.4	64.1	54.6	57.8	71.0	61.3
White	56.5	66.1	59.1	60.0	74.2	65.0
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	33.4	14.3	34.6	48.0	43.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	10.0	27.8	-	27.6	23.1	24.0
Low Income	20.0	40.0	41.2	20.0	57.9	50.0

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)

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grade 11						
Groups	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	55.5	58.5	57.1	53.8	61.6	52.1
White	56.5	60.6	61.0	55.3	63.1	54.9
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	25.0	28.6	34.6	52.0	40.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	20.0	19.4	-	10.3	23.1	-
Low Income	20.0	40.0	41.2	6.7	42.1	28.9

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

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

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

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?

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

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

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?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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?

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

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

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?

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

No Objectives have been developed to address the areas of deficiencies.

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. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 3. White students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 4. White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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.)*

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.

	Name	Title
1		

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.

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.

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.

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

- Require implementation of a new research-based curriculum of instructional program;
- Extension of the school year or school day;
- Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance;

- Significant decrease in management authority at the school level;
- Replacement of the principal;
- Restructuring the internal organization of the school;
- Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school.

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

- Reopening the school as a public charter school, consistent with Article 27A of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/Art. 27A.);
- Replacing all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school's inability to make AYP;
- Entering into a contract with a private entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the school as a public school;
- Implementing any other major restructuring of the school's governance that makes fundamental reform in:
 - governance and management, and/or
 - financing and material resources, and/or
 - staffing.

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

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

	Name	Title
1		

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

Yes No Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance? [C]

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]
MONITORING	
<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