

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	11/11/2009
Submitted	11/12/2009
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)?	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	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	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	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	57.1		Yes	57.1		Yes			92.9	Yes
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 (%)	92.6	93.2	89.3	94.6	93.8	93.5	93.3	93.9
Truancy Rate (%)	7.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.2
Mobility Rate (%)	7.6	15.2	13.5	6.2	11.9	8.8	8.0	8.0
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	96.7	90.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.8	100.0	92.9
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	3.4	-	-	1.2	2.4	1.3	1.6
School Population (#)	90	88	92	97	83	85	76	63
Low Income (%)	35.6	34.1	39.1	37.1	38.6	23.5	28.9	20.6
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	97.8	97.7	97.8	97.9	97.6	98.8	100.0	96.8
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic (%)	2.2	1.1	1.1	1.0	-	-	-	3.2
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	1.1	1.1	1.0	2.4	-	-	-
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	-	1.2	-	-

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

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	2000	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	97.8	-	2.2	-	-	-
	2003	97.7	-	1.1	1.1	-	-
	2004	97.8	-	1.1	1.1	-	-
	2005	97.9	-	1.0	1.0	-	-
	2006	97.6	-	-	2.4	-	-
	2007	98.8	-	-	-	-	1.2
	2008	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2009	96.8	-	3.2	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	99.7	0.3	-	-	-	-
	2002	99.1	-	0.6	0.3	-	-
	2003	99.4	-	0.3	0.3	-	-
	2004	99.3	-	0.3	0.3	-	-
	2005	99.0	-	0.7	0.3	-	-
	2006	99.3	-	-	0.7	-	-
	2007	98.9	-	-	-	-	1.1
	2008	99.2	-	-	-	-	0.8
	2009	99.2	-	0.8	-	-	-
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

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

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	2000	-	25.0	77.7	92.8	14.0	-	-	-	90.3
	2001	-	29.9	77.7	93.1	19.9	4	4.7	4.6	75.0
	2002	-	35.6	40.0	92.6	7.6	7	7.6	-	96.7
	2003	-	34.1	100.0	93.2	15.2	-	-	3.4	90.5
	2004	-	39.1	83.0	89.3	13.5	-	-	-	100.0
	2005	-	37.1	96.0	94.6	6.2	-	-	-	100.0
	2006	-	38.6	92.0	93.8	11.9	-	-	1.2	100.0
	2007	-	23.5	97.4	93.5	8.8	-	-	2.4	95.8
	2008	-	28.9	100.0	93.3	8.0	-	-	1.3	100.0
	2009	-	20.6	100.0	93.9	8.0	2	3.2	1.6	92.9
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	2000	-	23.0	88.6	94.8	24.8	-	-	-	90.3
	2001	-	33.2	89.5	95.0	14.0	4	1.3	4.6	75.0
	2002	-	34.9	73.9	95.1	11.1	7	2.1	-	96.7
	2003	0.3	38.7	95.6	94.6	11.6	1	0.4	3.4	90.5
	2004	-	44.4	92.3	90.2	11.6	-	-	-	100.0
	2005	-	43.4	97.7	95.5	8.0	-	-	-	100.0
	2006	-	47.6	97.2	95.0	8.2	-	-	1.2	100.0
	2007	-	36.2	97.9	95.0	9.8	-	-	2.4	95.8
	2008	-	37.8	100.0	94.9	10.7	-	-	1.3	100.0
	2009	-	37.1	100.0	95.1	12.9	3	1.4	1.6	92.9
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6

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

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	2000	112	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	87	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	90	-	-	-	-	-	20
	2003	88	-	-	-	-	-	17
	2004	92	-	-	-	-	-	18
	2005	97	-	-	-	-	-	23
	2006	83	-	-	-	-	-	19
	2007	85	-	-	-	-	-	25
	2008	76	-	-	-	-	-	15
	2009	63	-	-	-	-	-	12
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	2000	339	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	331	-	-	-	-	-	30
	2002	332	28	23	26	33	24	20
	2003	315	17	26	23	24	31	17
	2004	306	24	16	25	19	25	18
	2005	297	20	26	12	23	16	23
	2006	273	11	17	23	24	21	19
	2007	265	17	11	20	12	24	25
	2008	254	29	16	10	18	17	15
	2009	240	13	27	15	15	17	12
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816

S T A T E	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	2000	35	13	30,084	74	26	13	9	-	-
	2001	33	12	30,969	79	21	16	7	-	-
	2002	32	12	32,076	68	32	16	8	-	-
	2003	29	13	33,386	72	28	15	9	-	1
	2004	30	12	32,252	74	27	12	12	-	-
	2005	29	10	32,318	76	24	12	12	-	-
	2006	28	12	35,420	71	29	12	10	-	-
	2007	27	13	36,789	67	33	12	11	-	-
	2008	27	12	36,707	62	38	12	11	-	-
2009	26	13	37,823	49	51	11	11	-	-	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1

---

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

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

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

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grade 11						
Groups	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>
All	72.2	68.0	58.6	55.0	46.2	57.2
White	70.6	68.0	58.6	55.0	46.2	53.9
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	81.8	40.0	-	-	-

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

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

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grade 11						
Groups	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>
All	55.6	60.0	51.7	40.0	38.5	57.2
White	52.9	60.0	51.7	40.0	38.5	53.9
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	54.5	40.0	-	-	-

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?*

My reading scores are leveling off. Even though they are making AYP they are not raising each year as much as they need to. Our math scores have improved from last year. The high school added some programs and incentives to work on this weakness. This year we did make AYP in math and our scores went from 38 to 57.1. We are continuing the programs from last year in hopes that the scores continue to go up. In reading we are starting a new program that concentrates on vocabulary to see if improvement happens.

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

We have many resistant readers in the high school. They just do not see any purpose or meaning in what is required. We are looking at getting the student academically engaged in reading.

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

We started many different factors to improvement. We have math support during last hour of the day when the students go to the math teacher for 50 minutes of help if they are on the D/F list. We have instructional Wednesdays where we look at test format and instruct the students on how to take state tests. We also have divided the students into mentoring groups. Each teacher is responsible for 7 to 8 students. They check on them, ask them if they need help or are just another adult for them to talk too.

**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?

We use several assessment when creating our building goals for the year. We look at Explore, Plan and PSAE as well as data from ITBS results. We get together in our curriculum committees and then as a building to look at the data. We analysis the data to find our weaknesses and strenghts. From these meetings we create a plan for the year. Last year we discovered that we had a weakness in math computations. We put daily activities in this area and created a support math period. This was very successful because our PSAE scores went up 20 points and we made AYP for this year. This year we are continuing all of our math supports and adding english and science to the mix.

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

We discovered that the factor in math was computation. The students on the ITBS test did well on the high level thinking math but did very poorly on the computation part. Internally we put in daily computation skills throughout the content area. We also began to look at the scope and sequence of all grades in the district to see if there were any missing holes.

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

We saw that we needed to create awareness in the math department that something different needed to happen. We needed to show them that additional concepts were needed in their curriculum.

**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?

As an administrator it is always a challenge to get your staff see that the way they instruct needs to change. The way student's learn now is so different from years before. Their ability to multi task is unbelievable. We need to tap into this ability and get the student academically engaged in the classroom.

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

If we don't get student's academically engaged, they will not get needed information into their long term memory. Student centered learning is the best way to get the results we need from our students.

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

By creating support systems in Mathematics, English and Science. We are giving our students a avenue to get the needed help. If they are on the D/F/ list they are required to go the support class.

---

**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?

We have a highly qualified staff here. The high school staff is young but we have veterans also. I am very lucky that the veteran staff is willing to listen to new ideas and concepts. The new staff is willing to try anything if it is going to benefit their students. I have started a book study concept with the staff. This year we are reading *What Works in Schools* by Robert Marzano. Each faculty meeting we discuss one or two chapter in the book. This has created many great discussion among the veteran and young staff.

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

Last year we conducted a book study with *Building Academic Vocabulary* by Marzano and Pickering. We saw with our data that the students background knowledge was limited. By following the techniques of the book we started a whole school vocabulary initiative. The student's performance on the PSAE improved by using these techniques.

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

We are going to continue book studies in the high school. The more that teachers share among each other the more that they learn. Networking through book studies have been an interesting and rewarding process.

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

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

We are a small community. Parents are very supportive of our schools. I had a 60.8% turn out for this year's parent/teacher conference. Before the school year ends, I will have talked to each parent in my district at least once. It is very important that the parents feel that they are a part of their child's education.

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

If you have the backing of your parents and community anything is possible. The parents want to know that they are welcome and are an important part of their child's education. Without the support and contribution of our parents this school district would not do all that it does.

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

We believe that the community and parents are the backbone of this district. Each year we celebrate and appreciate all these individuals do for the district. We host an appreciation dinner to honor all the parents and/or community members who have contributed throughout the year. This shows the community that we do need and desire their participation in our school district.

### 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?*

The factors that we can control is how much time we are giving each students for improvement. Our support system during homeroom is one of the greatest factors. We are giving our students 50 minutes everyday to have extra help in English, Mathematics and Science. We monitor who is struggling and is the support helping them. Professional development is another key factor to improvement. The more professional development that the staff receives that can be embedded into their teaching will keep teachers on the cutting edge of education. Providing academic engaged learning with a student centered approach will get background knowledge into the students' long-term memory. Vocabulary building techniques will also increase the background knowledge and give the students the ability to make informed and accurate decisions.

### Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	<a href="#">Increase Mathematic and reading scores on the PSAE for the year 2010 and 2011.</a>	

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

### Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

#### Objective 1

Increase Mathematic and reading scores on the PSAE for the year 2010 and 2011.

#### Objective 1 Description

We are proud to state that our scores did increase on this year's PSAE scores. However, we will continue to increase our scores. The eleventh grade will make AYP of at least 77.5% or Safe Harbor.

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

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Increase Mathematic and reading scores on the PSAE for the year 2010 and 2011.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All students that are on the ineligible list will be required to atten Math Support with the math teacher.	09/08/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Other	
2	We will inititate "Instructional Wednesday's" inwhich all students twice a month will work on the "work keys" of the PSAE test.	01/06/2010	08/18/2010	During School	Other	

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Increase Mathematic and reading scores on the PSAE for the year 2010 and 2011.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	The teacher's are participating in a book study with the book "What works in Schools" by Robert Marzano	09/09/2009	05/13/2009	Before School	Other	

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Increase Mathematic and reading scores on the PSAE for the year 2010 and 2011.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	A letter will be sent home to the parents describing our strategies and asking them for assistance in improving our test scores	10/29/2009	04/14/2010	After School	Other	

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Increase Mathematic and reading scores on the PSAE for the year 2010 and 2011.

**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?)

Our math, reading and science teachers will monitor the process of students. They will track who participates in their support groups and how often they attend. Our goal is that no one is on the ineligible list in these contest areas. During the support sessions, the students will be given additional support in the areas needed.

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	Tina C. Stier	High School Principal
2	Howard Hansen	Mathematic instructor
3	Amy Mayall	Science instructor
4	Mary Peterson	English instructor

### 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.

School Improvement Team for Avon High School

Tina Stier---HS Principal  
Mary Peterson---HS English  
Howard Hansen--HS Math  
Martin Pio---HS Special Ed.  
Amy Mayall---HS Science  
Marlee Abbot--Parent

	Name	Title
1		

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

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

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

The review process begins with our oversight committees. They work on the plan with a specific content area in mind. This committee submits a plan after looking at all the data. After each report is available, the building committee looks at the reports and make suggestions on what the goals should be and the action plan suggested for each goal.

**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.

We are a very small district. Therefore with limited staff ,we pair up a veteran teacher with a novice teacher of similar content area.

### 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.

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:                    **11/11/2009**

**A. ASSURANCES**

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

**B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION**

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

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**