

Local Board Approved	11/22/2010
Submitted	12/02/2010
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)?	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	2010-11 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2010-11 State Improvement Status	

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	87.4		Yes	96.9		Yes	95.5	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	89.4		Yes	98.5		Yes				
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 (%)				96.3	96.1	96.3	96.4	95.5
Truancy Rate (%)				0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mobility Rate (%)				10.7	7.0	9.8	6.5	4.2
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)				-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)				-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)				326	508	587	577	594
Low Income (%)				10.1	4.9	3.9	6.9	5.1
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)				5.2	2.8	6.5	6.8	5.7
Students with Disabilities (%)				-	-	-	-	11.6
White, non-Hispanic (%)				72.1	76.0	72.6	73.7	70.4
Black, non-Hispanic (%)				4.3	2.8	3.7	2.8	5.2
Hispanic (%)				17.8	16.1	17.7	16.6	15.2
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)				5.2	3.5	3.1	3.3	4.4
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)				0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)				0.3	1.4	2.7	3.5	4.9

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 (%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	2006	72.1	4.3	17.8	5.2	0.3	0.3
	2007	76.0	2.8	16.1	3.5	0.2	1.4
	2008	72.6	3.7	17.7	3.1	0.2	2.7
	2009	73.7	2.8	16.6	3.3	0.2	3.5
	2010	70.4	5.2	15.2	4.4	-	4.9
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	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
<b>S T A</b>	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

---

T E	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 (%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	2006	5.2	10.1	100.0	96.3	10.7	-	-	-	-
	2007	2.8	4.9	100.0	96.1	7.0	-	-	-	-
	2008	6.5	3.9	100.0	96.3	9.8	-	-	-	-
	2009	6.8	6.9	100.0	96.4	6.5	-	-	-	-
	2010	5.7	5.1	100.0	95.5	4.2	-	-	-	-
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	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	
<b>S T A T</b>	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8

---

E	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)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	2006	326	56	57	47	-	-	-
	2007	508	87	87	72	-	-	-
	2008	587	95	95	98	-	-	-
	2009	577	86	95	96	-	-	-
	2010	594	108	90	92	-	-	-
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	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
<b>S T A T E</b>	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2,044,539	164,413	157,570	159,499	160,924	156,451	138,559
	2004	2,060,048	161,329	160,246	158,367	162,933	160,271	139,504
	2005	2,062,912	156,370	158,622	160,365	162,047	162,192	142,828
	2006	2,075,277	155,155	154,372	158,822	160,362	160,911	147,500
	2007	2,077,856	155,356	153,480	154,719	162,594	159,038	150,475

---

2008	2,074,167	155,578	152,895	153,347	160,039	161,310	149,710
2009	2,070,125	156,512	152,736	152,820	155,433	158,700	144,822
2010	2,064,312	155,468	154,389	152,681	154,465	154,982	146,919

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	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	-	-	
<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	

---

	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)

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2005-2010																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	-	73.5	86.3	85.1	83.2	87.2	-	80.0	81.5	85.7	88.0	83.0	-	90.9	88.7	88.3	83.4	86.6
White	-	68.4	85.0	86.3	85.5	89.3	-	91.9	83.7	90.1	87.2	87.3	-	90.6	96.3	92.5	90.3	90.0
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	91.0	80.0	66.7	86.6	-	-	71.4	66.6	93.4	61.6	-	100.0	-	73.7	57.9	76.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	66.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	81.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	70.0
Low Income	-	-	-	60.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50.0	-	-	70.0	-	-	50.0

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
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, 2005-2010																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	-	88.6	97.6	93.6	95.2	96.1	-	86.0	96.3	89.1	95.6	94.3	-	93.2	94.4	90.4	90.0	95.6
White	-	89.5	98.4	94.5	100.0	100.0	-	89.1	98.4	95.1	95.6	98.4	-	93.8	96.2	97.0	95.1	95.7
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	100.0	93.3	75.0	93.3	-	-	85.7	63.1	100.0	76.9	-	100.0	-	68.4	68.4	100.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	83.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	90.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	90.0
Low Income	-	-	-	90.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70.0	-	-	90.0	-	-	90.9

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
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 &amp; Analysis - Report Card Data

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

McDole's reading and math scores continue to meet and exceed state standards and continue to show improvement from one year to the next. 3rd and 5th grades made increases in both reading and math in all demographic areas. 4th grade had a nominal drop in scores overall in both reading and math, but did have a drop in scores from the Hispanic population in both reading and math. However, when you look at the same population (Hispanic) in the 3rd grade year, there is an increase in their math scores from 3rd to 4th grade.

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

Possible factors that contribute to an increase in student test scores in the alignment of our curriculum to state standards as well as a focus on red core objectives for each grade level. There was also a slight increase in enrollment from 2009 to 2010 which may have contributed to scores either remaining the same or slightly dropping in some demographic groups.

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

The school needs to continue to focus on professional educator development, continued improvement in math facts and continued focus on red core objectives along with instructional strategies of flexible grouping when necessary.

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

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

Curriculum Based Assessment (CBA) is utilized in every grade level from 1st through 5th grades. Teachers administer CBA's in both math and writing three times a year. The information is gathered and compiled at each building to be used to determine any gaps in skills that need to be addressed. This is one of the measurements that was taken into consideration when planning for this school year. The CBA data tells us that our school is progressing with the rest of the Kaneland district schools. By in large, the students at McDole are able to make the same outcomes as students in other schools in the district, but have larger gains throughout the year. We will continue to monitor the CBAs.

Rigby Benchmark Test are used to determine the level each child is currently reading based on oral accuracy and comprehension. These results are used to create guided reading groups and monitor student progress. It is an assessment that is benchmarked at the beginning and end of the year. Though this data is not being used to monitor the plan for this school improvement year, this is data that we monitor on a frequent basis and continue to come back to when looking at school improvement.

Illinois Snapshot of Early Literacy (ISEL) is used in kindergarten through second grades. These tests are administered as a pre and post test. It shows growth over time and is used to show comparative data based on norms for student in Illinois at the specific grade level. Again, this data is not being used to monitor the goals of the plan, but is referenced as data source by the School Improvement team.

AimsWeb is a progress monitoring system based on direct, frequent and continuous student assessment. The data source of information used to determine Response to Intervention in the area of reading fluency. At this time, we do not have a plan that is monitored by AimsWeb. However, this is a piece of data the School Improvement team monitors when planning for the future.

Extended Response probes were created during the 2008-2009 school year by each grade level. They were used by classroom teachers to guide instruction and part of past School Improvement plans. These probes will be used to monitor writing this school year. Each grade level will create a common rubric as part of this plan to evaluate students work based on their responses from the extended response probes. The feedback will identify instructional needs of students and aid in future planning for the School Improvement Team.

At the beginning of the 2010 school year, we have begun using SWIS to import student behavior. This data system along with charting positive tickets student receive will aid in our planning for behavioral needs of students and help us monitor the behavior goal established for the school.

Some of the data listed above are diagnostic in nature and provide specific information for the school to use to instruct individual students. Teams of teachers meet to discuss

the data throughout the year to inform their instruction. A continued area of strength are the gains our students make throughout the school year. They often come in lower, relative to other schools within the districts, but achieve within range or above other schools in the district. we continue to collect data to inform decisions on math fact fluency.

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

Diagnostic and local assessment data suggest that students enter McDole lower, relative to other schools in the district, but by the end of the school year are within range or exceeding other schools within the district. Some factors that may contribute to this are mobility, low-income, and Limited English Proficiency levels.

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

Utilizing local assessments, the school identifies students that need additional support in content areas.

#### 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?

As a district, we have decreased our teaching staff from 300 to 275. Our school enrollment has increased by 8% from last year to this year. We have also decreased Rtl support staff as a result of trying to work within the local school budget. As a result, we have fewer staff to provide more students with the appropriate education.

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

At this time, our student performance results have maintained the same.

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

These factors impact who is available to work with students identified as needing additional support from the diagnostic testing. We are able to focus on individual improvement at the Tier I level through the School Improvement Plan.

#### 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?

District wide, we have a decrease in the number of teaching staff from 300 to 275. For the last 4 years, the average number years of experience of teachers across the district continues to be 10. There is an increase in the number of teachers who have earned their Master's degree. All teachers at McDole hold an Illinois state teacher certificate and are highly qualified for the area they teach.

This information suggests that there are newer teachers to the profession who continue to increase their skills by seeking additional educational degrees. The data suggests that there is a decrease in teachers across the district.

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

Having a larger portion of the non-tenured staff, we are familiar with the newer teaching trends of differentiation, best practices, collaboration and balanced literacy. These skills coupled with an increase in teachers seeking Master's degrees could suggest that better instruction and an openness to sharing ideas which could lead to improving student achievement.

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

We conclude that continued professional development to maintain state certification and a high value on collaborative teachers is beneficial to increasing our test scores.

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?

We have 100% parent contact. Parent-Teacher conferences are held each November, following the end of the first quarter. Curriculum Night is held in the fall and Open House is held in the spring. Our school's PTO is supportive of the goals of the school and continues to develop ways to increase parent involvement and support for the school's goals.

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

Information through a variety of formats (newsletters, notecards, emails, website) has provided awareness of the school's curriculum and testing information so that support can be provided at home to further enhance student achievement.

**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 continue to foster relationships with parents and partner with parents in creating a positive school climate.

#### 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?

Report card and local assessment data show growth for McDole. Challenges facing the district are to be able to appropriately staff the building to provide direct, targeted interventions to individual students and maintain a lower class size while keeping within the district's budget. Conclusions we can arise from this information suggests that teams of teachers utilize the support of working within a highly functioning team to continue to meet the needs of students. Teachers can continue to optimize the strengths of fellow teachers by sharing ideas, flexible grouping as a way to meet the needs of students, and sharing these strategies outside of the grade level teams.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	<a href="#">Behavior</a>	
2	<a href="#">Student Writing</a>	
3	<a href="#">Math fact fluency</a>	

No deficiencies have been identified in the most recent AYP Report for your school

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Behavior

Objective 1 Description

By May 2012, 85% of students will consistently exhibit all behavioral expectations as defined on the behavioral matrix, to promote a positive and safe learning community.

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

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Behavior

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students and will participate in Expectation Walks to learn the targeted behaviors that are outlined on the Behavior Matrix.	09/07/2010	09/10/2010	During School	Local Funds	
2	Students and will participate in a school-wide behavior expectation assembly to learn behavioral expectations for an assembly and to launch the R3 tickets	09/10/2010	09/10/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Throughout the school year, students will receive R3 tickets for exhibiting the expectations listed on the behavior matrix.	09/13/2010	05/31/2010	During School	Local Funds	
4	Students will enter R3 tickets into a drawing. 3 students names will be drawn weekly to earn a prize	09/13/2010	05/31/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Behavior

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Training for staff on behavioral expectations and when to give an R3 ticket.	09/30/2010		During School	Local Funds	
2	Training for staff on SWIS referral form and training for select staff on how to enter data.	08/23/2010		During School	Local Funds	
3	Monthly behavior meetings for behavior team to interpret data and plan for follow up plan.	09/16/2010		During School	Local Funds	

4	Monthly updates for all staff at faculty meetings of where our school is in the problem solving process and also to share data.	10/22/2010		During School	Local Funds	
5	Behavior team meets every 4-6 weeks for the purpose of problem solving.	10/14/2010		During School	Local Funds	
6	Behavior team will monitor quarterly data from report card learner characteristics and begin to develop hypothesis and plan for problem solving.	11/11/2010		During School	Local Funds	

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Behavior

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will receive a copy of the behavior matrix as a reference at home to encourage positive behaviors in all settings.	09/10/2010		During School	Local Funds	
2	Parents will sign the R3 ticket that is sent home with individual students.	09/13/2010		During School	Local Funds	
3	Parents will receive updates on student progress for R3 tickets.	10/15/2010		During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 1 Title :**

Behavior

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

The behavior goal will be monitored by the number of students who are able to exhibit the expected behaviors as outlined on the behavior matrix. We will know this by the number of R3 tickets earned.

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	Martne McCoy	Principal
2	Kevin Gordon	Assistant Principal
3	Teaching Staff	Professional Educators

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Student Writing

Objective 2 Description

By May 2012, using a common grade level writing rubric, 85% of students will meet or exceed expectations on a common writing assessment piece.

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

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

Objective 2 Title :

Student Writing

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1st through 5th grade students will respond in writing to a question relating to a common passage they have listened to or read.	11/15/2010	11/19/2010	During School	Local Funds	

2	Kindergarten students will respond in writing or drawing to a question relating to a common passage they listened too.	01/03/2011	01/07/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	1st through 5th grade students will respond in writing to a question relating to a common passage they have listened to or read.	03/21/2011	03/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	Students will take both written passages through the writing process.	11/15/2010	04/15/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

Student Writing

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Grade level teams will develop common grade level rubrics with expectations	10/29/2010		During School	Local Funds	
2	School Improvement team will identify language we will use for the writing process.	09/30/2010		During School	Local Funds	
3	1st through 5th grade staff will administer extended probe.	11/15/2010	11/19/2010	During School	Local Funds	
4	Grade level teams will score students extended response probes and plan mini-lessons for moving students forward through the writing process.	11/23/2010		During School	Local Funds	
5	1st through 5th grade level teams will meet score writing	12/08/2010	12/10/2010	During School	Local Funds	
6	Kindergarten staff will adminisiter probe to students.	01/03/2011	01/07/2011	During School	Local Funds	
7	Classroom teachers will administer 2nd of 2 extended response probe	03/21/2011	03/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	
8	Teachers will score reading and plan writing process mini-lessons	03/25/2011		During School	Local Funds	
9	Teachers will score the writing from the extended response probe and record data.	04/11/2011		During School	Local Funds	
10	Teachers will meet in vertical teams to reflect on the writing process and student progress. This will aid in planning next steps.	04/19/2011		During School	Local Funds	

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

Student Writing

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Administration meets with PTO board to share goals for the year.	08/23/2010		Before School	Local Funds	
2	Parents are notified in newsletter and at board meeting of the goals and receive updates throughout the year as the writing process occurs.	09/27/2010		After School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 2 Title :**

Student 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?)

Teachers will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies by having two prompts to compare student growth and also by identifying the target on the rubric. Teachers will collaborate to identify instructional strategies to aid them in moving students towards the targeted goal.

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	Martne McCoy	Principal
2	Kevin Gordon	Assistant Principal
3	Kelly DeGaetano	Kindergarten Teacher
4	Jill Roderick	1st Grade teacher
5	Michelle Hanson/Liz Schulz	2nd Grade teacher
6	Julie McCombs	3rd grade teacher
7	Jenny Wold	4th grade teacher
8	Cathy Lannert	5th grade teacher

9	Vikki Moeller	Social Worker
10	Jeremy Berger/Lori Williams	Specials teacher
11	Betty Wojnowski	RtI Facilitator
12	Maria Valdovinos	ELL teacher

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3

Math fact fluency

Objective 3 Description

By May 2012, 85% of all students (1st-5th grade) will meet or exceed all specific grade level basic math fact benchmark goals.

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

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

Objective 3 Title :

Math fact fluency

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will practice math facts according to testing (+,-,x,/) on a daily basis.	10/04/2010		During School	Local Funds	
2	Students will graph their progress through the levels of math facts.	10/04/2010		During School	Local Funds	

3	Students will partner and question another student on basic math facts.	10/04/2010		During School	Local Funds	
---	---	------------	--	---------------	-------------	--

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

Math fact fluency

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will get a training on the math fact fluency and how to use it in their classroom.	09/20/2010		During School	Local Funds	
2	Teachers will establish quarterly benchmark expectations and report this on each student's report card.	09/20/2010		During School	Local Funds	

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

Math fact fluency

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents learned about the math fact fluency at the board meeting and in the McDole monthly newsletter.	09/27/2010		During School	Local Funds	
2	PTO board learned about math fact fluency goal at update in the summer.	08/23/2010		Before School	Local Funds	

## Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 3 Title :**

Math fact fluency

**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?)

Monitoring is built into the math fact fluency program in that students are to solve a targeted number of problems within one minute. Teachers report whether students are making progress on the end of the quarter report cards.

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	Martne McCoy	Principal
2	Kevin Gordon	Assistant Principal
3	Kelly DeGaetano	Kindergarten Teacher
4	Jill Roderick	1st Grade teacher
5	Michelle Hanson/Liz Schulz	2nd Grade teacher
6	Julie McCombs	3rd grade teacher
7	Jenny Wold	4th grade teacher
8	Cathy Lannert	5th grade teacher
9	Vikki Moeller	Social Worker
10	Jeremy Berger/Lori Williams	Specials teacher
11	Betty Wojnowski	RtI Facilitator
12	Maria Valdovinos	ELL teacher

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.

Teachers receive feedback from parents. They share this information with the administration and the SIP team when developing plans for the coming school year. Data gathered through local and state assessment are utilized along with best practice current research.

	Name	Title
1	Martne McCoy	Principal
2	Kevin Gordon	Assistant Principal
3	Kelly DeGaetano	Kindergarten Teacher
4	Jill Roderick	1st Grade teacher
5	Michelle Hanson/Liz Schulz	2nd Grade teacher
6	Julie McCombs	3rd grade teacher
7	Jenny Wold	4th grade teacher
8	Cathy Lannert	5th grade teacher
9	Vikki Moeller	Social Worker

10	Jeremy Berger/Lori Williams	Specials teacher
11	Betty Wojnowski	RtI Facilitator
12	Maria Valdovinos	ELL teacher

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 Peer Review process consists of 3 visits by an external peer review team. The first visit is scheduled for November 12th and will include Dr. Sarah Mumm, Erika Schlicter, Diane McFarlin and Laura Garland are part of the external peer review team. The first visit consists of sharing the 2 year School Improvement Plan goals, describing the student strategies and activities that will support the goals and the data used to inform the strategies and activities. Additionally, we share the process being used to measure the effectiveness of these student strategies and activities. We will share the professional development activities used in the plan as well as the parent and community involvement.

During the second visit, the focus will be on progress monitoring and a data collection update for the plan in place.

During the third visit, we will review data, and develop the projection for the upcoming year's 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.

Kaneland Community Unit District #302 provides FRIENDS/Mentoring program (Fostering Relationships Involving Educators New to District Schools). FRIENDS is a two year program with several critical and training opportunities for the new teacher.

The program includes a multi-day orientation program designed to introduce new teachers to important policies, practices and expectations set by the Kaneland School District. The primary purpose of the orientation program is to welcome, acclimate, guide and support new and novice teachers. Each teacher is paired with an experienced staff member in the same building of a like job assignment. As a result of the individual mentoring experiences, new teachers build a greater understanding of their job responsibilities and begin to understand the District's culture, values, beliefs and traditions.

Throughout the year, monthly training sessions are provided for the new and novice teachers. Topics covered in the sessions include parent communication, classroom instruction and assessment, effective communications, building a positive classroom environment, effective planning and preparation and the professional responsibilities of a teacher. Sessions are held at both the district and individual building level. The final session of the year allows the participants in the program an opportunity to provide feedback to help improve the program for the following year.

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.

None at this time

	Name	Title
1		

## Section IV-A Local Board Action

**DATE APPROVED** by Local Board: 11/22/2010

**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]

Yes  No  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?

Yes  No

Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]

**MONITORING**

Yes  No

Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]

Yes  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**

Yes  No  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**

Yes  No

Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]

Yes  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**