

Local Board Approved	06/16/2011
Initial Submission	
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	99.4	Yes	99.4	Yes	84.5		Yes	84.7		Yes	93.3	Yes		
White	99.3	Yes	99.3	Yes	85.0		Yes	84.8		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American													
Multiracial/Ethnic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes									
LEP													
Students with Disabilities	97.3	Yes	97.3	Yes	37.3	40.0	Yes	52.5	45.7	Yes	91.2		
Economically Disadvantaged	98.8	Yes	98.8	Yes	72.9		Yes	77.4		Yes			

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 (%)	93.3	94.3	94.2	94.7	93.6	94.4	94.7	93.3
Truancy Rate (%)	1.1	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.6	1.4
Mobility Rate (%)	12.2	10.2	13.6	9.6	9.4	12.9	14.5	12.7
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	657	640	623	619	631	613	645	638
Low Income (%)	27.4	28.6	32.3	35.7	32.8	31.6	33.5	32.6
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.2
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.6
White, non-Hispanic (%)	96.3	94.8	92.9	92.6	93.5	92.0	89.9	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	1.4	1.4	0.2	0.5	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.6
Hispanic (%)	2.0	3.0	1.9	1.8	1.3	1.8	2.9	2.5
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.3	0.6	1.3	1.3	1.1	0.8	1.6	1.1
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.0	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	3.2	3.7	3.3	4.7	5.0	6.6

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

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	2000	95.6	1.4	2.1	0.9	-	-
	2001	96.4	1.4	1.7	0.6	-	-
	2002	95.7	1.4	2.4	0.5	-	-
	2003	96.3	1.4	2.0	0.3	-	-
	2004	94.8	1.4	3.0	0.6	0.2	-
	2005	92.9	0.2	1.9	1.3	0.5	3.2
	2006	92.6	0.5	1.8	1.3	0.2	3.7
	2007	93.5	0.8	1.3	1.1	-	3.3
	2008	92.0	0.7	1.8	0.8	-	4.7
	2009	89.9	0.6	2.9	1.6	-	5.0
	2010	89.0	0.6	2.5	1.1	0.2	6.6
D I S T R I C T	2000	96.3	1.2	1.7	0.8	-	-
	2001	95.8	1.3	2.1	0.7	-	-
	2002	95.6	1.4	2.0	1.0	0.1	-
	2003	94.8	1.5	2.5	1.1	0.2	-
	2004	94.5	1.8	2.7	0.9	0.1	-
	2005	93.2	0.5	2.2	1.4	0.2	2.5
	2006	92.1	1.2	2.3	1.4	0.3	2.8
	2007	91.9	0.7	1.7	1.1	-	4.6
	2008	91.2	0.8	1.5	1.2	0.1	5.3
	2009	90.5	1.1	1.7	1.3	0.4	5.1
	2010	88.5	1.4	1.8	1.3	0.4	6.5
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

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

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	-	27.7	99.9	93.9	10.6	4	0.6	-	-
	2001	0.2	27.0	92.0	93.6	10.8	4	0.6	-	-
	2002	-	23.7	95.0	94.1	11.4	3	0.4	-	-
	2003	0.3	27.4	95.0	93.3	12.2	7	1.1	-	-
	2004	0.5	28.6	95.0	94.3	10.2	4	0.6	-	-
	2005	0.3	32.3	95.0	94.2	13.6	3	0.5	-	-
	2006	0.3	35.7	95.0	94.7	9.6	4	0.7	-	-
	2007	-	32.8	95.0	93.6	9.4	5	0.8	-	-
	2008	-	31.6	95.0	94.4	12.9	5	0.8	-	-
	2009	0.3	33.5	95.0	94.7	14.5	4	0.6	-	-
2010	0.2	32.6	95.0	93.3	12.7	9	1.4	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	-	28.6	100.0	95.1	15.6	10	0.5	-	-
	2001	0.2	28.7	96.6	94.7	18.3	9	0.5	-	-
	2002	0.3	28.4	97.3	94.9	14.9	7	0.4	-	-
	2003	0.4	30.6	98.1	94.7	16.4	10	0.5	-	-
	2004	0.5	31.6	97.9	95.5	15.0	5	0.3	-	-
	2005	0.6	33.5	97.2	95.3	17.8	5	0.3	-	-
	2006	0.4	37.1	97.7	95.5	13.6	6	0.3	-	-
	2007	0.2	35.2	98.3	94.4	14.7	26	1.4	-	-
	2008	0.1	34.9	98.3	94.8	14.0	5	0.3	-	-
	2009	0.3	36.3	98.2	95.2	16.7	4	0.2	-	-
2010	0.8	37.5	98.2	94.3	15.5	9	0.5	-	-	
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2

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

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	660	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	659	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	654	-	-	-	228	219	-
	2003	657	-	-	-	229	218	-
	2004	640	-	-	-	216	215	-
	2005	623	-	-	-	210	206	-
	2006	619	-	-	-	205	212	-
	2007	631	-	-	-	205	200	-
	2008	613	-	-	-	220	203	-
	2009	645	-	-	-	191	220	-
	2010	638	-	-	-	248	194	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	1,960	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,933	224	204	214	216	219	-
	2002	1,891	198	221	203	228	219	-
	2003	1,931	190	197	228	229	218	-
	2004	1,883	223	194	199	216	215	-
	2005	1,841	186	220	194	210	206	-
	2006	1,887	229	191	229	205	212	-
	2007	1,828	196	234	189	205	200	-
	2008	1,808	184	193	227	220	203	-
	2009	1,811	199	185	197	191	220	-
	2010	1,812	160	216	183	248	194	-
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

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

Educator Data is available only for district level

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	131	16	39,240	74	26	18	-	-	-
	2001	134	16	42,509	75	25	18	-	-	-
	2002	130	15	43,570	58	42	17	-	-	-
	2003	124	15	44,871	58	42	19	-	-	-
	2004	126	13	43,198	59	41	19	-	-	-
	2005	124	13	47,802	55	45	18	-	-	-
	2006	125	10	45,002	59	41	18	-	-	-
	2007	127	10	43,686	58	42	18	-	1	-
	2008	125	10	45,879	58	42	18	-	-	-
	2009	122	11	47,601	55	45	18	-	-	-
2010	121	11	49,543	49	51	18	-	-	-	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1
2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1	

	2010	132,502	13	63,296	42	57	18	18	1	1
--	------	---------	----	--------	----	----	----	----	---	---

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

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

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
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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	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	-	78.5	81.3	78.3	83.1	82.3	-	78.0	79.9	85.0	76.5	82.1	76.3	80.8	84.3	85.0	85.4	83.9
White	-	79.1	81.3	77.3	83.9	83.2	-	78.9	79.2	85.0	75.2	82.9	76.0	81.6	84.0	84.5	86.0	83.8
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	100.0	72.8	75.1	-	-	81.8	-	100.0	85.7	-	-	-	-	-	93.3
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	11.1	27.8	52.7	36.0	40.7	-	38.1	21.7	31.3	11.1	18.2	34.5	45.9	61.1	50.0	16.7	16.7
Low Income	-	56.9	71.8	65.7	65.8	67.1	-	73.3	57.6	78.3	67.2	66.6	67.2	68.0	77.1	68.9	78.7	78.0

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)

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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	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	-	78.9	85.4	76.6	80.4	82.7	-	82.3	82.3	83.5	82.1	83.7	59.6	79.3	85.0	83.0	88.2	84.9
White	-	78.9	85.1	75.4	81.4	81.9	-	84.0	81.3	84.4	80.9	85.2	61.0	80.5	86.1	82.9	89.0	85.0
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	91.7	72.7	93.8	-	-	90.9	-	100.0	78.5	-	-	-	-	-	93.3
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	14.8	33.3	47.3	38.4	48.1	-	52.4	39.1	43.8	17.6	36.4	3.6	40.5	57.9	55.0	41.7	50.0
Low Income	-	63.0	79.5	65.2	62.3	74.3	-	72.6	66.1	74.7	78.5	74.7	49.2	72.0	75.7	73.7	86.8	80.5

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?

While our meets/exceeds rate for all students in Math and Reading has had an upward trend over the last several years, our special education population has demonstrated a significant downward trend over the last two years.

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

One significant internal factor contributing the the downward trend in special education Reading results, is due to a lack of access to the core curriculum in Literature and Language Arts. A mobility rate of 12.7% is an external factor contributing to the low performance of our special education population in Reading.

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

More access to the core curriculum is necessary for all students with IEP's. In addition a the following strategies will be implemented:

- Staff will familiarize themselves with the recently adopted Common Core Standards.
- Staff will begin the process of aligning the current curriculum to the Common Core Standards.
- Develop and implement an Adolescent Literacy Policy.
- Students will continue to receive direct, explicit comprehension instruction in research-based comprehension strategies.
- Staff will imbed effective instructional principles into their instruction
- Students will have access to diverse text in all content areas.
- Students will be given opportunities for self-directed learning.
- Continue our system of on-going formative assessment of students to guide instruction.
- Continue to identify students with delays in Reading and provide strategic tutoring for them through our RtI model.
- A concerted effort from the math department to increase student engagement through research-based instructional strategies

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

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

Central Jr. High School uses many local assessments to gather data related to the academic achievement of its students. These assessments can be broken down into two divisions. The first division is assessments that are consistent throughout each grade level. These assessments include pre and post tests, MAP tests, STAR Reading test, and CBM-R for reading fluency.

Every student at Central takes the MAP (measures of academic progress) test three times a year. MAP is a computer based reading and math assessment designed to show academic growth over a period of time. It assesses the students in the same way as ISAT. Students at Central also take the STAR reading test two times a year. Similarly to MAP, the STAR reading test assesses growth in the area of reading. In addition, to the MAP and STAR tests, content area teachers assess academic growth by administering pre and post test to their students.

The second division of local assessments is grade level specific. 8th grade students are given the Explore Test. This is a test that assesses the students' ability on reading, mathematics, and science. In addition to Explore, the 8th grade students' writing skills are assessed using

There is a direct correlation between the local assessment data and the data collected from the state assessment. This is by design. As stated, MAP tests the same concepts as the ISAT test.

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

The external factors that are likely to have contributed to these results are:

- 1) Student attitude when taking the test
- 2) High absentee rate of some students
- 3) Test bias
- 4) Format of the local assessments
- 5) The number of assessments each student is given throughout the school year

The internal factors that are likely to have contributed to these results are:

- 1) Teacher attitude towards the assessments
- 2) **Teacher training with regards to understanding how to correctly interpret data**
- 3) Teacher training with regards to understanding how to use the data to better student achievement
- 4) Use of computer for certain assessments

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

The following steps are the next in order to improve the use of local assessments at Central:

- 1) Use the five phase model (Analyze/Reflect, Professional Development, Design and Develop, Implement and Evaluate) to plan effective staff development
- 2) Education of students, parents and staff on interpreting the local assessments
- 3) Continued professional development training for staff
- 4) Linking MAP data to making necessary adjustments in the reading and math curriculum

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

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

The East Peoria community has many attributes that have positively affected Central Jr. High School. One of the most important is the close relationship District 86 has with the city of East Peoria. In 2008, the East Peoria City Council voted to raise the city's sales tax a quarter of one cent. The revenue generated from this increase supported the construction of an addition to Central. This addition included a gymnasium, cafeteria, fine arts area, kitchen, and district offices. It will allow the students at Central to have P.E. everyday, as well as allow the school's already established fine arts program to continue to flourish. Another attribute related to the East Peoria is the effective collaboration that takes place between both the public and private entities within the community. For example, Central Jr. High School collaborates with several local churches during the holidays by delivering food to people in need. In addition, the school has built a positive relationship with the local library, local park district, and police and fire departments.

While the community has many attributes, it also has several challenges. The low income rate associated with the students at Central has grown from 23.7% in 2002 to 33.5% in 2010. As Central's low income rate continues to grow, so do the challenges associated with it. In addition, the East Peoria community has seen an increase in unemployment. This has added to the already difficult economic situation. Another challenge related to the East Peoria community is the mobility rate of many its residents. In the same time period Central Jr. High School has seen its mobility rate increase from 11.4% to 12.7%. As the community's mobility rate increases, so do the challenges associated with it.

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

The community's attributes have positively affected student performance in the following ways:

- 1) The new addition to Central, funded by the city's sales tax increase, allowed for a new more academically inclined schedule that was implemented for the 2010-2011 school year. This schedule replaced a student's "flex" time with an enrichment/intervention time. This will allow new lessons to be introduced and taught.
- 2) The new addition to Central, funded by the city's sales tax increase, will allow for 2nd and 3rd tier RtI groups to meet without conflict with the students other classes. In addition, it will allow for several additional hours of reading and math instruction for special education students.
- 3) The new addition to Central, funded by the city's sales tax increase, will allow the students to participate in physical education on a daily basis. This will fulfill the requirements set forth by the state of Illinois.
- 4) The new addition to Central, funded by the city's sales tax increase, will free up classrooms that will now be used for instructional space.

The community's challenges have negatively affected student performance in the following ways:

- 1) Statistics show that there is a direct correlation between a student's academic performance and their social economic status. Traditionally, students who meet the criteria for free and reduced lunch struggle more than their more affluent peers to meet and exceed the standards associated with ISAT.
- 2) There are many challenges associated with students who continually change academic settings. Many academic classes require students to build upon previous knowledge. Students who are constantly changing schools struggle with these classes. This is reflected in these students' standardized tests scores, as well as their academic achievement.
- 3) Many of Central's low income students also have special needs. In addition, many of the students with a high mobility rate qualify for free and reduced lunch.

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

In order to address these issues, the following steps should be taken:

- 1) Professional development for staff in the area of better instructing low income students
- 2) Better assessment of where to academically place transfer students
- 3) Continue targeting at risk students for RtI at Central
- 4) Continue using MAP scores to assess student achievement in the areas of math and reading
- 5) Continue to allow students to be placed into academic classes based on teacher recommendation
- 6) Provide additional counseling services to students that have a record of high school mobility

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?

As of the 2010-2011 school year, at the district level, 99.2% of teachers are white and 0.8% of teachers are black, with 10.7% and 89.3% being male and female respectively. The average teaching experience for teachers in District 86 is 10.8 years, with 54.9% of those teachers holding only Bachelor's degrees and 45.1% also holding Master's degrees. The pupil to teacher ratio is 18.2:1, while the pupil to certified staff ratio is 12.3:1. The average teacher salary in District 86 is \$47,601, and the average administrator salary is \$79,875.

During the 2010-2011 school year, the staff at Central Junior High School participated in 3 full-day school improvement days and 5 half day school improvement days. At these times, teachers and staff have worked together as curriculum departments and grade level teams to gather and interpret student data, use data to plan instruction, and identify students with additional curriculum needs. During this past year, CJHS also implemented PBIS.

In addition to school improvement days, staff members have also participated in other professional development opportunities. The district technology trainer has offered the following technology-based trainings: technology orientation for new staff, GradeQuick training for new staff, open lab sessions for staff to work on web pages or ask tech-related questions, training for library aides, and Flip video training. They also took part in a Techno-Expo in which some staff presented tech-related lessons, while the remaining staff members attended training sessions. Finally, several staff members worked on gathering and organizing web links for staff to use.

Some teachers also received training for implementing RtI instruction and grouping. The Special Education Coordinator and School Title I teacher trained teachers on how to administer tests, interpret results, and implement instruction in a small group setting for students needing additional reading instruction.

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

The educator qualifications, data, and information about staff capacity and professional development have contributed to student performance results in the following ways:

- 1) Teachers have used data collected from testing to determine grouping and differentiation strategies.
- 2) Teachers have used data collected from office discipline referrals to identify students requiring Tier II and Tier III social/emotional services.
- 3) **Technology related development opportunities have helped to streamline daily administrative duties for teachers and increase school to home communication. Technology related lessons have been implemented in classrooms as well.**
- 4) Training and implementation of RtI has increased instruction for students reading below grade level.

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 imply that the staff should:

- 1) Continue gathering data to drive instruction
- 2) **Continue moving forward with implementation of PBIS**
- 3) Continue adding technology as appropriate
- 4) Continue furthering RtI instruction

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)
Item 3 - Parent Involvement

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

The parent contact rate at CJHS for the 2010-2011 school year was 100%. The following areas comprise the 100% contact: parent/teacher Conferences, meet your teacher night, open house, sporting events, music and chorus concerts, Jazz Café, speech - parents night, 5th grade orientation, school play, music boosters, parent club, awards day/night, graduation, positive parent contacts, state track and baseball, newsletter, report cards, midterms, and progress reports. Hard data was collected through a parent survey that was given during parent/teacher conferences. The data from the survey is as follows:

- 1) 89% of parents monitor their child's homework and their progress at school
- 2) 87% of parents feel informed about the school's progress towards goals and visions
- 3) 67% of parents feel like they are treated as a partner in the school's decision making process
- 4) **90% of parents feel East Peoria has a high quality curriculum**
- 5) 86% of parents feel that students demonstrate an acceptable level of achievement relative to the district curriculum and state standards

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

Statistics show that there is a correlation between parental involvement and student achievement. The staff at Central understands this and is constantly trying to get parents involved in the school. This is one of the reasons that the school culture and climate committee is working on ways to continue involving parents in their student's education. Although the parent surveys were anonymous, in many ways the data collected from them mirrors the data related to Central's achievement on the state and local assessments. **Ninety percent of Central's parents reported positive remarks when asked questions about their student's academic achievement. This is similar to the percentage of students that met or exceeded state standards on ISAT.**

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

The following steps are the next to improve planning for parental involvement:

- 1) Continue to contact parents regarding student success/concerns
- 2) Continue to send home newsletters and post information online
- 3) Continue and add events that will increase parent involvement
- 4) Continue to share ISAT results, MAP results, etc. at conferences
- 5) Continue to involve parents in committees
- 6) Continue dialogue in School Culture and Climate committee about increased parent participation

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 following conclusions about key factors that are within the school's capacity to change or control and which have contributed to low achievement are:

- Continue high expectations and commitment of staff and students through more effective communication and shared understanding of achievement standards and learning targets.
- Create and implement a building-wide policy for Literacy instruction
- Provide greater interventions for students with mild to significant social/emotional needs
- Increase student engagement through research-based instructional strategies
- Align lessons with the Illinois Learning Standards/Common Core Standards

- Communicate learning targets to students and parents.
- Monitor and evaluate the progress of students at subgroup levels using a variety of assessments (MAP, Star Test, AIMSWEB, ect.) to identify strengths and weaknesses in reading and math.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	While our current achievement in reading for all grades shows 85% of our students in the Meets/Exceeds categories, 90% of our students will meet or exceed state standards in reading on the 2012 ISAT. In addition, while our current achievement in math for all grades shows 85% of our students in the Meets/Exceeds categories, 90% of our students will meet or exceed state standards in math on the 2012 ISAT.	

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

While our current achievement in reading for all grades shows 85% of our students in the Meets/Exceeds categories, 90% of our students will meet or exceed state standards in reading on the 2012 ISAT. In addition, while our current achievement in math for all grades shows 85% of our students in the Meets/Exceeds categories, 90% of our students will meet or exceed state standards in math on the 2012 ISAT.

Objective 1 Description

- Staff will familiarize themselves with the Common Core Standards.
- Develop and implement an Adolescent Literacy Policy.
- Students will continue to receive direct, explicit comprehension instruction in research-based comprehension strategies.
- Staff will imbed effective instructional principles into their instruction

- Students will have access to diverse text in all content areas.
- Students will be given opportunities for self-directed learning.
- Continue our system of on-going formative assessment of students to guide instruction.
- Research-based strategies to increase student engagement will be piloted in the math department.
- Continue to identify students with delays in Reading and provide strategic tutoring for them through our RtI model.

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

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

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in reading for all grades shows 85% of our students in the Meets/Exceeds categories, 90% of our students will meet or exceed state standards in reading on the 2012 ISAT. In addition, while our current achievement in math for all grades shows 85% of our students in the Meets/Exceeds categories, 90% of our students will meet or exceed state standards in math on the 2012 ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All students will be trained in 3-4 transportable and transparent reading comprehension strategies in all classes.	08/22/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Other	0
2	Students will be exposed to academic vocabulary that is taught using research-based instructional methods.	08/22/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Other	0
3	Students will receive explicit instruction in all classes in specific writing strategies including sentence combining and summarization.	08/22/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Other	0
4	Students identified as being delayed in reading and math will receive strategic tutoring using research-based instruction.	08/22/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Other	1,000
5	Students will be exposed to research-based strategies for improving engagement in their math classes.	08/22/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Other	0

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

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in reading for all grades shows 85% of our students in the Meets/Exceeds categories, 90% of our students will meet or exceed state standards in reading on the 2012 ISAT. In addition, while our current achievement in math for all grades shows 85% of our students in the Meets/Exceeds categories, 90% of our students will meet or exceed state standards in math on the 2012 ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Using team articulation and team meeting time, all staff will be trained in two to four transportable and transparent reading comprehension strategies that will be incorporated into instruction in all classes.	08/22/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Other	0
2	All departments will develop essential academic vocabulary lists. Using team articulation and team meeting time, staff will be trained in effective academic vocabulary instruction within their respective content areas.	08/22/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Other	0
3	Using team articulation and team meeting time, staff will be trained in how to incorporate research-base writing strategies into their instruction. Strategies that will be focused on for 2011-2012 include sentence combining and summarization.	08/22/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Other	0
4	Through the Problem Solving Process, provide more opportunities for literacy instruction for students identified as being delayed.	08/22/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Other	0
5	The math department will participate in book study of The Highly Engaged Classroom by Robert Marzano in order raise staff knowledge on strategies to bolster student engagement and motivation.	08/22/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	250

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

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in reading for all grades shows 85% of our students in the Meets/Exceeds categories, 90% of our students will meet or exceed state standards in reading on the 2012 ISAT. In addition, while our current achievement in math for all grades shows 85% of our students in the Meets/Exceeds categories, 90% of our students will meet or exceed state standards in math on the 2012 ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Through monthly newsletter, parents will receive tips to monitor and assist their children in the development of literacy skills.	08/22/2011	05/31/2012	Before School	Local Funds	500
2	Quarterly meetings will be conducted with the CJHS Principal's Advisory Council to update progress toward meeting this goal and to solicit feedback and suggestions.	08/22/2011	05/31/2012	After School	Local Funds	200

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in reading for all grades shows 85% of our students in the Meets/Exceeds categories, 90% of our students will meet or exceed state standards in reading on the 2012 ISAT. In addition, while our current achievement in math for all grades shows 85% of our students in the Meets/Exceeds categories, 90% of our students will meet or exceed state standards in math on the 2012 ISAT.

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 process for monitoring the progress toward this goal will be done during regularly conducted team and department meetings. In addition, all staff will be required to maintain a portfolio documenting the strategies associated with this goal. Classroom local assessments will be used to measure the goal's effectiveness.

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	Daniel Mair	Principal
2	Jason Warner	Assistant 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.*)

Parent notification of the school's academic status is done through mailings and posting on the school's website.

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.

This plan was developed in collaboration with the staff at CJHS. The goals and strategies associated with this plan were communicated to parents at a meeting on May 5, 2011.

	Name	Title
1	Daniel Mair	Principal
2	Jason Warner	Assistant Principal
3	Elaine Winkler	Language Arts Teacher
4	Lisa Eller	Math Teacher
5	Josh Prichard	PE/Health Teacher
6	Shane Smith	Social Studies Teacher
7	Ashley Ricca	Language Arts Teacher
8	Tori Barth	Parent
9	Julie Watson	Parent

10 Gretchen Vance

Special Education 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.

Because CJHS is not in status, a peer review process was not created.

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.

All newly hired teachers at Central Jr. High School are given a mentor. This person is an experienced teacher who has not received a substandard teacher evaluation. The mentor program at Central is designed to help novice teachers become familiar with its policies and procedures. In addition to informal conversations, novice teachers are required to meet with their mentors to discuss a variety of issues throughout the year. They are also given the task of observing their mentor, and their mentor observes them. Both parties are asked to give feedback on the observations. The faculty and administration at Central believe that its mentoring program allows for the learning environment at the school to expand.

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.

The district is providing the following services and resources for Central Jr. High School:

- The district will continue to provide resources for MAP testing, AIMSWEB, and other local assessments.
- The district will continue to provide resources for the implementation of PBIS.
- The district has dedicated a portion of its SIP days for data analysis and other SIP related tasks.

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.

At this time no resources or services are required of ISBE for the implementation of this plan.

	Name	Title
1		

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 06/16/2011

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

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

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

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

PEER REVIEW

Yes No

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

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS Yes No

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

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES Yes No

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

 Yes No N/A

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

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES Yes No

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

SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM Yes No N/A

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

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD Yes No

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

PART II - COMMENTS