

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



Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 1 - 2009 AYP Report

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act? <b>No</b>
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	2009-10 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		70.0			70.0			90.0		78.0	
All														
White														
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														



<b>DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION</b>
---

The Differentiated Accountability classification for the school is:	-
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in reading?	-
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in math?	-

In 2008, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) was one of 6 states to be chosen by the US Department of Education to participate on the Differentiated Accountability Pilot Program. The Differentiated Accountability classification applies only to schools in federal improvement status.

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

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

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

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 2 - 2009 AMAO Report

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

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

School Information								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	95.7	95.7	96.1	95.7	95.4	94.5	94.8	95.2
Truancy Rate (%)	2.1	1.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mobility Rate (%)	23.2	14.1	9.9	17.2	15.8	16.9	16.9	10.9
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	460	454	432	402	360	444	477	491
Low Income (%)	27.4	33.5	37.3	38.8	45.0	24.3	22.6	13.6
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	27.8	-	-	25.1	31.9	28.6	30.8	19.8
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	49.8	44.1	42.8	44.8	41.7	43.5	40.5	41.8
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	2.6	2.4	2.3	1.7	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8
Hispanic (%)	41.7	49.3	50.0	48.5	49.7	45.5	46.5	42.8
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	5.9	4.0	4.6	4.2	4.7	5.6	6.5	6.5
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	0.2	0.2	0.5	-	-	0.4	0.2
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	0.2	3.1	4.5	5.2	7.9

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 (%)
S C H O O L	1999	66.4	2.3	25.4	5.6	0.2	-
	2000	62.0	2.4	30.7	4.6	0.4	-
	2001	55.2	3.2	38.1	3.2	0.4	-
	2002	49.8	2.6	41.7	5.9	-	-
	2003	44.1	2.4	49.3	4.0	0.2	-
	2004	42.8	2.3	50.0	4.6	0.2	-
	2005	44.8	1.7	48.5	4.2	0.5	0.2
	2006	41.7	0.8	49.7	4.7	-	3.1
	2007	43.5	0.9	45.5	5.6	-	4.5
	2008	40.5	0.8	46.5	6.5	0.4	5.2
D I S T R I C T	1999	76.2	1.9	15.2	6.5	0.2	-
	2000	72.6	2.0	18.7	6.5	0.2	-
	2001	70.4	1.9	21.7	5.5	0.4	-
	2002	67.7	2.4	23.7	6.0	0.2	-
	2003	64.0	2.1	27.3	6.3	0.3	-
	2004	61.1	2.3	30.6	5.8	0.2	-
	2005	59.1	2.6	32.4	5.0	0.1	0.8
	2006	56.3	1.9	34.6	5.0	-	2.2
	2007	52.6	1.4	38.3	4.7	-	3.0
	2008	50.1	1.1	39.2	5.2	0.2	4.2



	2009	47.5	1.3	39.2	5.5	0.2	6.4
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
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	1999	13.2	17.7	94.8	95.4	9.6	1	0.2	-	-
	2000	21.5	21.7	100.0	94.4	10.4	10	2.4	-	-
	2001	22.3	24.8	100.0	95.5	19.9	11	2.3	-	-
	2002	27.8	27.4	100.0	95.7	23.2	10	2.1	-	-
	2003	-	33.5	100.0	95.7	14.1	8	1.6	-	-
	2004	-	37.3	100.0	96.1	9.9	-	-	-	-
	2005	25.1	38.8	100.0	95.7	17.2	-	-	-	-
	2006	31.9	45.0	100.0	95.4	15.8	-	-	-	-
	2007	28.6	24.3	100.0	94.5	16.9	-	-	-	-
	2008	30.8	22.6	100.0	94.8	16.9	-	-	-	-
2009	19.8	13.6	100.0	95.2	10.9	-	-	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	1999	4.9	13.9	97.7	95.2	11.2	5	0.2	-	-
	2000	8.1	14.0	100.0	95.0	10.5	46	2.1	-	-
	2001	8.2	13.5	93.5	95.4	13.1	45	2.0	-	-
	2002	10.3	15.2	92.0	95.5	16.4	18	0.9	-	-
	2003	5.2	18.0	97.3	95.2	10.0	8	0.4	-	-
	2004	7.1	22.4	97.3	95.9	8.3	4	0.2	-	-
	2005	13.5	26.1	97.2	95.3	11.4	6	0.3	-	-
	2006	16.7	30.6	97.7	95.5	11.8	3	0.1	-	-
	2007	17.3	26.6	97.7	95.8	11.5	1	0.1	-	-
2008	21.4	23.9	98.5	95.7	7.8	-	-	-	-	

	2009	17.5	18.7	98.9	95.3	6.9	-	-	-	-
S T A T E	1999	6.4	36.1	96.1	93.6	18.1	43,332	2.3	5.9	81.9
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1	

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	515	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	502	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	475	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	460	78	79	80	-	-	-
	2003	454	90	78	83	-	-	-
	2004	432	57	91	76	-	-	-
	2005	402	69	48	82	-	-	-
	2006	360	70	74	49	-	-	-
	2007	444	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	477	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2009	491	-	-	-	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	1999	2,297	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	2,296	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,293	258	245	265	257	204	-
	2002	2,380	267	258	254	272	262	-
	2003	2,281	266	272	256	240	257	-
	2004	2,156	227	254	263	250	246	-
	2005	2,112	234	218	248	252	248	-
	2006	2,089	217	239	230	266	259	-
	2007	2,050	203	213	232	250	268	-
	2008	1,971	200	197	214	229	249	-
	2009	1,933	184	199	201	221	229	-

S T A T E	1999	1,962,026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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

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	1999	131	11	35,893	78	22	20	-	-	-
	2000	142	11	35,410	75	25	19	-	-	-
	2001	139	11	36,519	72	28	18	-	-	-
	2002	146	10	38,157	70	30	18	-	3	-
	2003	146	11	39,349	66	34	18	-	4	-
	2004	145	10	40,777	65	35	18	-	4	-
	2005	144	10	43,620	66	34	17	-	4	-
	2006	150	10	44,769	60	40	16	-	7	1
	2007	147	10	44,016	56	44	15	-	3	2
	2008	141	10	47,441	55	45	16	-	2	-
2009	141	10	48,272	49	51	15	-	-	2	
S T A T E	1999	119,718	15	45,337	53	47	20	18	-	-
	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	14	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	2	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	12	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>
All	74.4	77.5	72.1	-	-	-	-	-	89.3	-	-	-	75.8	64.0	88.1	-	-	-
White	75.0	80.6	75.9	-	-	-	-	-	92.8	-	-	-	81.6	75.0	95.3	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	76.5	61.6	61.6	-	-	-	-	-	84.3	-	-	-	65.2	50.0	84.2	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	53.3	42.9	-	-	-	-	-	72.7	-	-	-	-	50.0	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	73.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	82.3	-	-	-	77.2	59.3	86.6	-	-	-



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

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>
All	90.7	95.9	95.3	-	-	-	-	-	96.5	-	-	-	90.9	92.0	90.5	-	-	-
White	91.6	93.6	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	92.9	-	-	-	94.8	92.5	95.3	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	94.1	100.0	84.7	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	87.0	89.3	89.4	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	86.7	85.7	-	-	-	-	-	81.8	-	-	-	-	70.0	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	94.1	-	-	-	86.4	85.2	80.0	-	-	-

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

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

**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?

Washington School had set a goal for the 2007-2008 school year that 100% of the students in Kindergarten and First grade would perform at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile rank or higher on the Spring 2008 ISEL. On several snapshots they were nearing the goal. A deeper analysis of the data indicated that the data was not representative of all students and that there were inconsistencies in the assessment procedures. The Fall 2009 data assisted the staff identifying the target snapshots for each grade level to monitor for the 2008-09 school year. A goal of 90% or better achieving at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile rank or higher on target snapshots was identified for the 2008-2009 school year.

Target areas are highlighted on the chart.

ISEL Percentile Results Spring 2008 & 2009				
	Kindergarten		First Grade	
	Spring 2008	Spring 2009	Spring 2008	Spring 2009
Alphabet Recognition	87%	92%	97%	99%
Story Listening	62%	79%	95%	93%
Phonemic Awareness	80%	89%	96%	99%
One-to-One Matching	76%	86%	99%	99%
Letter Sounds	84%	95%	95%	88%
Developmental Spelling	nv	75%	83% nv	82%
Word Recognition	XXX	XXX	54% nv	50%
Vocabulary	XXX	XXX	56% nv	72%
Passage Reading	XXX	XXX	78% nv	82%
Fluency	XXX	XXX	61% nv	50%

not valid- all students were not assessed

XXX Not assessed

### Spring 2009 ISEL Average Composite

Kindergarten		First Grade	
Average Percent Score	Percent of students*	Average Percent Score	Percent of students*
40% or below	6	40% or below	3
50%	5	50%	6
60%	12	60%	6
70%	16	70%	22
80%	27	80%	26
90%	26	90%	25
100%	8	100%	13

The Staff also identified a Social Emotional goal for reducing interferences of teaching and learning by students for the 2008-09 school year. Perception surveys indicate a reduction in 25% of the staff indicating that that their instruction has been effected by distractions and/ or interruptions caused by students.

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

The results showed varied positive and negative change. Discussions on assessment practices and instructional implications uncovered discrepancies in assessment procedures. The discussions have supported more consistent assessment protocols. The varied comparative data can not be indicative of growth or lack of growth. Other informal indicators demonstrate increased performance of students. The discussions assessment discrepancies lead to discussions on instructional practice to effectively address the target areas.

The change in reduced interruptions may be based on a school wide commitment to teaching pro-social school behaviors. These lessons were presented by the school social worker and supported throughout the week by all staff members. Classroom teachers provided follow-up mini-lessons with their class. Parent were informed on a regular basis about the goals and the instruction support towards achieving the goals.

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

The data from Spring 2009 provides us with a more solid data base to monitor data. The data does indicate that the target areas identified in the 2 year plan are the appropriate targets. The grade level teams will look closer at instructional practices that support the development of the skills assessed on ISEL that will support the development of literacy learners and ensure they are on track.

The evidence of growth in the pro-social behavior supports the school wide commitment to the focus and the targeted lessons. The SEL committee will review lesson delivery and determine the most effective way to continue the instructional delivery of the pro-social skills.

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

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

Grade level ISEL data for Spring 2008, Spring 2009 and Fall 2009 data was reviewed to clarify and confirm the 2<sup>nd</sup> year literacy goal focuses for the 2009-2010 school year.

The preliminary Parent, Student & Staff SEL survey determined the goal focus for this area, a internal staff perception survey was completed in fall of 2009 which identified growth in the area of outside of classroom distraction but a need to continue to focus in classroom distractions.

The Math goal is to evaluate if the MAP Skills Checklist assessments will provide the best information on students demonstrating grade level performance expectations in Math. This will help identify areas of focus in Math.

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

The ISEL will provides increased reliability in the data with the greater degree of consistency in the assessment procedures. The data more effectively clarifies and confirms the goal focus. The instructional implications have generated a better understanding of the assessment information and how these factors impact the various aspects of literacy development. With this increased understanding, teachers are modifying their focus and progress monitoring students to more carefully monitor progress. Some instructional practices did not support the goals and have been modified.

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

Maintain commitment of goals to achieve the expected levels of performance for the two year focus in both Literacy and SEL. We will also identify the focus for math improvement needs and determine if the assessment provides the information needed.

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

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

We serve a diverse population. 25% of our students qualify for either full or part-time ELL services and 33% of the students qualified for intervention support through RtI last school year. Students coming to Washington School have had varied preschool experiences that create some differences in the learning foundation that they bring to school. There seems to be a data connection that is tied to language.

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

Language learning and varied opportunities prior to school impact the skills and strategies children demonstrate at school.

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

The data identifies areas where we need to provide targeted instruction to address the needs of students to ensure they are proficient in the prerequisite skills they will need to continue to succeed.

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

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

Washington School has 38 certified staff members and 8 instructional assistants. The staff has varied expertise and training. We have 4 Reading Specialist that are Reading Recovery trained. Our Social Worker and Family Coordinator provide resource support to address the SEL aspect of our improvement plan. They work collaboratively to address the common instructional focuses as well as determining effective ways to address individual challenges. The teams address Improvement goals and Power standards mastery through a collective inquiry.



---

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

The varied experience levels and areas of expertise have presented both challenges as well as an effective way to support staff. Since staff members had previously worked in various buildings they had received training on assessments differently and when implementing instructional programs with differing approaches. The professional development in the 2008-2009 school year provided the staff with consistent information on assessment practices and initial inquiry into word learning practices. The expertise of the reading specialist supported many aspects of the professional development.

As the school restructured into a PreK-First Grade school for the district the staff had not reviewed their behavioral expectations and instructional program to address the Social Emotional growth of the students at this level. Staff have varied experiences and approaches based on the previous school. Professional development sessions supported discussions on effective implementation of a developmentally appropriate way to foster pro-social skills. Collaboratively pro-social skills instruction was planned and implemented.

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

The staff is deepening its study of the literacy components that address word learning, comprehension and fluency. We will be working on developing these through the literacy framework and determining the most effective ways to strengthen learning in these areas.

We will continue to monitor the pro-social instruction to determine the effectiveness and explore ideas as a staff to further support the reduction of interruptions.

Grade levels will collaboratively review the MAP skills checklist data to identify target focus areas of strength and those that need to be addressed.

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

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

All parents and guardians are members of Washington School's Parent Teacher Organization as they enroll their child in Washington School. Parent participation and leadership is varied based on the activity. The leadership continues to strive for more involvement in PTO meetings and committees. Parent participation is higher when Parent-Child activities are planned.

There has been an increased attendance in the curriculum night attendance and a strong attendance for conference. In winter of 2009 Bilingual staff members provide a parent-child homework help club one evening a week. The staff was able to provide parents with tools and opportunities that would help them support their child's learning. The program was consistently attended by 15 of the 17 who signed up. The evaluations indicated that it was supportive of the parents and children's needs.

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

When parents attend activities with their child there seems to be an increased positive response about their child's success in school. Children have a strong positive response when their parents are with them at school events and teachers report a carry-over into the classroom performance. Parents were informed of the school wide focuses of the ISIP through classroom newsletters and the monthly school newsletter.

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

Knowing that our greatest impact occurs with parent-child activities we are working on effective and varied ways to provide these types of opportunities. Several parent-child activities outside the school day are currently planned for the 2009- 2010 school year.

### 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?*

As a school we will continue to address the need to:

- administer assessment consistently
- review data collectively to monitor growth and evaluate instructional effectiveness
- refine instructional practice to maximize results
- collaboratively explore effective practices to support the refinement of instruction
- explore effective ways to engage and inform parents in their child's learning

**Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies**

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	<a href="#">90% of Kindergarten and First Grade students will master literacy skills to perform at or above the 50%PR on ISEL.</a>	
2	<a href="#">90% of Kindergarten and First Grade students will achieve mastery on Math MAP Skills Checklist Assessments.</a>	
3	<a href="#">Maximize teaching and learning opportunities by reducing disruptive behaviors that interfere.</a>	

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

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

**Objective 1**

90% of Kindergarten and First Grade students will master literacy skills to perform at or above the 50%PR on ISEL.

**Objective 1 Description**

Washington School had set a goal for 90% of students in kindergarten and first grade would perform at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile or better on specific Snapshots of ISEL in Spring 2009. On several of the ISEL Snapshot assessments students were nearing the 90% goal. There were however some snapshots that 50% to 83% performed at the 50th percentile rank. The composite scores show that 94% or better of the students are at the 50th percentile rank or better. We will continue to target our focus to achieve the target goal.

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

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

90% of Kindergarten and First Grade students will master literacy skills to perform at or above the 50%PR on ISEL.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Using whole group and flexible group instruction provide phonemic awareness lessons will be taught to address rhyming with Harcourt resources.	09/15/2008	03/15/2010	During School	Local Funds	
2	Using whole group and small group instruction provide phonemic awareness lessons will be taught to match beginning and ending sounds with Harcourt resources.	09/15/2008	03/15/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Using whole group and flexible group instruction provide phonemic awareness lessons will be taught to address sound blending and segmentation with Harcourt resources.	03/09/2009	05/31/2010	During School	Local Funds	
4	Provide comprehension strategy instruction in kindergarten using whole group to target mental imagery with Harcourt and picture books that support curriculum focus.	12/01/2008	05/31/2010	During School	Local Funds	
5	Provide comprehension strategy instruction in kindergarten using whole group to target retelling with Harcourt and picture books that support curriculum focus.	02/02/2009	05/31/2010	During School	Local Funds	
6	Provide comprehension strategy instruction in kindergarten using whole group to target prediction with Harcourt and picture books that support curriculum focus.	03/02/2009	05/31/2010	During School	Other	
7	Provide comprehension strategy instruction in kindergarten using whole group to target connections with Harcourt and picture books that support curriculum focus.	04/03/2009	05/31/2010	During School	Local Funds	

**Washington Elem School  
School Improvement Plan 2009**

11/13/2009 1:59:00 PM

Page 30 of 46

8	Using Literacy by Design, first grade will provide instruction to target word recognition with the support of word walls, sight words, identified in various text while reading and writing.	09/02/2008	06/04/2010	During School	Local Funds	
9	Using Literacy by Design, first grade will provide instruction to target vocabulary with the support of vocabulary journals text organizers, read alouds, guided reading, personal dictionaries and oral discussions.	09/02/2008	06/04/2010	During School	Local Funds	
10	Using Literacy by Design, first grade will provide increased reading instruction through shared and guided reading, poetry, classroom and library books to develop fluency in reading.	09/02/2008	06/04/2010	During School	Local Funds	
11	Build receptive and expressive vocabulary for fulltime Bilingual students using picture dictionaries, acting out vocabulary words, stories read alouds, and independent reading in both Spanish and English vocabulary.	09/02/2008	06/04/2010	During School	Other	
12	Teach listening strategies through large and small group guided instruction using think alouds, stop and check, pair share and following directions with independent tasks.	09/02/2008	06/04/2010	During School	Local Funds	
13	Provide whole group and small group instruction in Concepts About Print with Harcourt Resources.	10/26/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Local Funds	
14	Pre-K classes with increase letter exposure activities.	10/26/2009	06/02/2010	During School	State Funds	
15	Pre-K will increase focus on emnviromental print to demonstrate print has meaning and letters make-up our print system.	10/26/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Other	
16	Pre-K will provide phonemic awareness activities to support segmentation and rhyme.	10/26/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Other	
17	Through Read alouds and literature discussions Pre-K will support story listening, vocabulary development and story recall.	10/26/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Other	

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

90% of Kindergarten and First Grade students will master literacy skills to perform at or above the 50%PR on ISEL.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	The Kindergarten Team will continue to investigate effective practices regarding phonemic awareness development to refine instructional program to meet students needs.	09/10/2008	06/04/2010	After School	Local Funds	
2	The Kindergarten Team will continue to investigate effective practices in comprehension strategy instruction to refine instructional program to target needs.	12/01/2008	06/04/2010	After School	Local Funds	
3	First Grade Team will continue to investigate effective practices in comprehension strategy instruction, word recognition, vocabulary and fluency to refine instructional program to target needs.	12/01/2008	06/04/2010	After School	Local Funds	
4	The First Grade Team will explore the development of writing to support literacy skill development identified in the plan.	01/11/2010	06/04/2010	After School	Local Funds	
5	Pre-K Team will review best practices in literacy for Pr-K students and identify resources to support instructional program.	11/04/2009	06/04/2010	After School	State Funds	

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

90% of Kindergarten and First Grade students will master literacy skills to perform at or above the 50%PR on ISEL.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Reinforcement activities and parent education supports will be sent home with PreK students and provided through Parent Education sessions to increase parent awareness and support.	09/23/2008	05/11/2010	After School	State Funds	
	Reinforcement activities and parent education resources will be sent					

2	home with kindergarten students for increased guided practice with their parents.	09/15/2008	05/24/2010	After School	Local Funds	
3	Reinformaent activities will be sent home with First Grade Students for increased guided practice on word recognition comprehension strategies and fluency with their parents.	09/15/2008	05/24/2010	After School	Local Funds	
4	Provide parent workshops for Pre-K parents on the development of Early Literacy skills, Language development, Math literacy and Kindergarten readiness.	09/23/2008	05/11/2009	After School	State Funds	

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

90% of Kindergarten and First Grade students will master literacy skills to perform at or above the 50%PR on ISEL.

Grade level teams have established benchmark assessments and assessment dates to monitor the progress of the the target goals. Building wide ISEL and MAP testing will occur in January and May to monitor progress. AIMSWEB will progress monitor students with most significant growth needs. Pre-K program assessments and kindergarten screening will provide monitoring data on Pre-K students.

	Name	Title
1	Mary Beth licke	Principal

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

**Objective 2**

90% of Kindergarten and First Grade students will achieve mastery on Math MAP Skills Checklist Assessments.

**Objective 2 Description**

The staff is working to ensure students have developed skill development necessary and mastered the critical concepts to be successful in Math.

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



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

90% of Kindergarten and First Grade students will achieve mastery on Math MAP Skills Checklist Assessments.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide Math instruction aligned with Power standards for each grade level.	09/09/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Local Funds	
2	Identify and developed vocabulary necessary to be proficient in Math.	09/09/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Based on Checklist Assessments results provide targeted assistance to support mastery in skills when students need additional support.	11/12/2009	06/04/2010	During School	State Funds	

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

90% of Kindergarten and First Grade students will achieve mastery on Math MAP Skills Checklist Assessments.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Data analysis support sessions	11/23/2009	05/28/2010	After School	Local Funds	
2	Provide vocabulary development support for Math.	11/23/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Title I	
3	Professional development support using MAP DesCartes instructional framework to identify vocabulary.	11/23/2009	06/04/2010	Before School	Title I	

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

90% of Kindergarten and First Grade students will achieve mastery on Math MAP Skills Checklist Assessments.

	Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide parents with math instructional focus information to parents through newsletters and practice activities for home.	09/14/2009	06/04/2010	After School	Local Funds	

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

90% of Kindergarten and First Grade students will achieve mastery on Math MAP Skills Checklist Assessments.

	Name	Title
1		

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

**Objective 3**

Maximize teaching and learning opportunities by reducing disruptive behaviors that interfere.

**Objective 3 Description**

The staff has identified behaviors that disrupt the learning process and provide direct instruction on school expectations to set norms of the learning environment. Students will participate in lessons provided by the school social worker and classroom teacher on pro-social skills that support the learning that needs to occur. Building Leadership Team has explored next steps to support teachers and parents to effectively coordinate the focus.

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

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

Maximize teaching and learning opportunities by reducing disruptive behaviors that interfere.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide direct instruction to students by teacher and school social worker.	12/01/2008	06/04/2010	During School	Local Funds	
2	Provide school-wide targeted messages around goal focus for the week that will be followed up with 5-10 minute mini-lessons.	12/01/2008	06/04/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Monitor the progress of the students demonstrating difficulty following norm expectations and design plans to address areas of concern.	11/17/2008	06/04/2010	During School	Other	

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

Maximize teaching and learning opportunities by reducing disruptive behaviors that interfere.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide staff with curriculum overview for pro-social skills on weekly basis and through periodic staff literature and video discussions.	11/17/2008	05/21/2010	During School	Local Funds	

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

Maximize teaching and learning opportunities by reducing disruptive behaviors that interfere.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide parents with information on pro-social skills that are being targeted in classroom newsletter and school monthly newsletters.	01/05/2009	06/01/2010	After School	Local Funds	

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

Maximize teaching and learning opportunities by reducing disruptive behaviors that interfere.

A March and May perception survey will be administered to determine growth in the reductions on distractions during instructional time.

	Name	Title
1	Mary Beth Licke	Principal

### 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.

The Building Leadership Team, Grade level teams and Resource Support Teams actively developed the plan after a thorough analysis of data. The teams have established a monitoring plan to maintain focus and determine progress towards goals.

	Name	Title
1	Mary Beth Licke	Principal
2	Pre-K Team	Teachers
3	Kindergarten Team	Teachers
4	First Grade Team	Teachers
5	Resource Support Teeam	various specialists
6	Building Leadership Team	

### 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.

The school district has developed a mentoring program for the teachers for their first two years in the district. Regularly scheduled meetings and peer observations occur to support the teachers and district level support is provided through new teacher support sessions.

### 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.

Annually the District provides each school with a staffing and budget allocation that may be used at the discretion of the principal and the building leadership team. These allocations are intended to provide flexibility to meet the academic needs of the school. The District also provides technical assistance through the following activities:

- Development and implementation of a Long Range Plan designed to improve student achievement, encourage student growth and develop the whole child through cultural, social and emotional learning opportunities.
- Interpretation of data from various assessments at both district and school level.
- **Use of surveys to determine professional development needs and to gather staff and parent feedback.**
- Coordination of curriculum review process designed to align with state standards
- Coordination of curriculum review process designed to align with state standards
- Development of formative and summative assessments to support the effective implementation of the curriculum
- Coordination of professional development activities to improve instruction
- Communication
- Administrative and financial resources including local funding, grants, entitlements and categorical aid

**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).

- ⓔ 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.

- ⓔ 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.

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

	Name	Title
1		

---

**Section IV-A Local Board Action**

**DATE APPROVED** by Local Board:

**A. ASSURANCES**

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

**B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION**

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

OTHER DATA

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

**IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS**

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

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

**CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES**

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

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

**ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]
<b>MONITORING</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers? [C]

**PART I - COMMENTS**

**PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN**

**PARENT NOTIFICATION**

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only) [C]
---	---

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the SIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes? [C]

**PEER REVIEW**

Yes  No

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

**TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS**

Yes  No

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

**DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES**

Yes  No

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

**STATE RESPONSIBILITIES**

Yes  No

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

**SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM**

Yes  No  N/A

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

**APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD**

Yes  No

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

**PART II - COMMENTS**