

## **GCMS Middle School**

### **School Improvement Plan 2008**

Local Board Approved	
Submitted	5/27/2009
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

**PRELIMINARY INFORMATION**

RCDT Number	090270050261003		
District Name	GIBSON CITY-MELVIN-SIBLEY CUSD 5	School Name	GCMS Middle School
Superintendent	CHARLES AUBRY	Principal	Michael Bleich
District Address	217 E 17TH ST	School Address	316 E 19th St
City/State/Zip	GIBSON CITY,IL 60936	City/State/Zip	Gibson City ,IL, 60936
District Telephone#	2177848296 Extn:1003	School Telephone#	2177848731 Extn:2135
District Email	caubry@gcms.k12.il.us	School Email	

Is this plan for a Title I School? True

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data**  
**Item 1 - 2008 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	2007-08 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2007-08 State Improvement Status	

	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		62.5			62.5			90.0		75.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	88.4		Yes	94.2		Yes	96.3	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	88.2		Yes	94.1		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities														
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	79.0		Yes	85.5		Yes				

**Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress**

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 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 62.5% 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 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 75% graduation rate for high schools.

\* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2007.

\*\* Safe Harbor Targets of 62.5% 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 - 2008 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								
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Attendance Rate (%)	95.1	95.9	96.0	95.4	95.9	95.7	95.9	96.3
Truancy Rate (%)	-	0.4	-	0.4	-	-	-	0.4
Mobility Rate (%)	11.5	8.5	16.4	8.3	4.2	10.6	6.9	8.4
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	249	255	228	243	241	265	252	254
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	20.5	22.0	19.7	25.1	28.6	28.3	27.4	27.2
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	-	1.2	-	0.8	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	98.4	98.0	96.5	95.1	96.3	97.0	98.4	98.8
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	1.2	0.8	0.4	-	0.4	-	0.8	0.4
Hispanic (%)	0.4	1.2	1.3	2.5	1.7	2.3	0.4	-
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	-	1.3	2.1	0.8	0.4	-	-
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	0.4	0.4	-	-	0.4	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	0.8	0.4	-	0.8

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/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	1999	98.7	-	1.3	-	-	-
	2000	98.0	1.2	0.8	-	-	-
	2001	98.4	1.2	0.4	-	-	-
	2002	98.0	0.8	1.2	-	-	-
	2003	96.5	0.4	1.3	1.3	0.4	-
	2004	95.1	-	2.5	2.1	0.4	-
	2005	96.3	0.4	1.7	0.8	-	0.8
	2006	97.0	-	2.3	0.4	-	0.4
	2007	98.4	0.8	0.4	-	0.4	-
	2008	98.8	0.4	-	-	-	0.8
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	1999	97.9	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.1	-
	2000	97.8	1.0	1.1	0.2	-	-
	2001	97.7	1.1	1.1	0.2	-	-
	2002	98.1	0.6	1.2	0.1	-	-
	2003	96.9	0.8	1.5	0.6	0.2	-
	2004	96.7	0.9	1.3	1.0	0.2	-
	2005	97.1	0.8	0.7	1.0	0.2	0.2
	2006	97.0	0.8	1.2	0.6	0.2	0.2
	2007	97.0	0.8	1.2	0.2	0.3	0.5
	2008	96.8	0.7	1.2	0.3	-	1.0

	Year	White(%)	Black(%)	Hispanic(%)	Asian/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
<b>S T A T E</b>	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

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 Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	1999	-	19.8	99.8	95.0	6.3	1	0.4	-	-
	2000	-	19.2	98.9	94.8	12.3	3	1.2	-	-
	2001	-	20.5	100.0	95.1	11.5		-	-	-
	2002	1.2	22.0	100.0	95.9	8.5	1	0.4	-	-
	2003	-	19.7	100.0	96.0	16.4		-	-	-
	2004	0.8	25.1	100.0	95.4	8.3	1	0.4	-	-
	2005	-	28.6	100.0	95.9	4.2		-	-	-
	2006	-	28.3	100.0	95.7	10.6		-	-	-
	2007	-	27.4	100.0	95.9	6.9		-	-	-
	2008	-	27.2	99.7	96.3	8.4	1	0.4	-	-
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	1999	0.2	14.8	99.1	95.5	6.5	3	0.3	4.1	83.8
	2000	0.1	18.1	100.0	95.4	10.3	13	1.3	2.6	89.4
	2001	0.1	16.0	99.8	94.9	13.6	2	0.2	4.9	89.6
	2002	0.5	18.2	99.6	95.6	10.3	6	0.6	2.6	86.1
	2003	0.1	19.8	99.8	95.5	13.4	4	0.4	1.9	94.0
	2004	0.6	19.4	99.8	95.6	11.6	3	0.3	1.9	78.8
	2005	0.1	25.8	100.0	95.8	8.1	16	1.5	0.9	91.7
	2006	0.3	27.6	100.0	95.2	11.7	11	1.0	3.0	82.3
	2007	-	27.2	99.9	95.4	9.4	2	0.2	1.5	91.5
	2008	-	19.4	99.9	95.5	11.1	4	0.4	1.9	90.2

	Year	LEP(%)	Low Income(%)	Parental Involvement(%)	Attendance(%)	Mobility(%)	Chronic Truants(N)	Chronic Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
<b>S T A T E</b>	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

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>	1999	232	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	250	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	249	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	255	-	-	-	84	87	-
	2003	228	-	-	-	84	86	-
	2004	243	-	-	-	65	86	-
	2005	241	-	-	-	98	69	-
	2006	265	-	-	-	76	98	-
	2007	252	-	-	-	91	75	-
	2008	254	-	-	-	88	88	-
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	1999	1,022	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1,035	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,035	91	60	82	90	85	70
	2002	1,007	74	88	59	84	87	69
	2003	1,007	75	71	90	84	86	63
	2004	1,016	76	78	72	65	86	78
	2005	1,104	80	92	83	98	69	82
	2006	1,123	79	78	89	76	98	83
	2007	1,092	72	76	74	91	75	78
	2008	1,104	100	73	73	88	88	64

	Year	School(N)	Grade 3(N)	Grade 4(N)	Grade 5(N)	Grade 7(N)	Grade 8(N)	Grade 11(N)
<b>S T A T E</b>	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	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	2,060,048	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	2,062,912	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	2,075,277	136,123	139,619	146,935	153,566	154,856	-
	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

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**

	Year	Total Teacher FTE(N)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary(\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree(%)	Teachers with Master's Degree(%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials(%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers(%)
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	1999	69	15	37,729	74	26	17	13	-	-
	2000	67	16	39,545	69	31	17	13	-	-
	2001	67	17	42,479	71	29	17	13	-	-
	2002	69	16	43,327	67	33	16	12	-	-
	2003	80	16	43,683	68	32	15	13	1	-
	2004	80	16	44,622	68	32	15	13	-	-
	2005	78	14	44,246	68	32	16	15	-	-
	2006	81	15	45,889	70	30	16	14	-	-
	2007	82	14	47,208	68	32	15	14	1	-
	2008	83	14	48,508	68	32	16	14	1	-
<b>S T A T E</b>	1999	119,718	15	45,337	53	47	20	18	-	-
	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

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, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark   % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark   % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	82.4	81.1	89.8	-	-	-	74.6	88.2	83.6	67.8	83.2	91.3	86.5	82.7	91.9
White	-	-	-	82.1	80.9	89.3	-	-	-	74.0	88.2	82.9	67.4	85.9	91.0	88.1	82.2	92.8
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## GCMS Middle School

## School Improvement Plan 2008

8/19/2009 3:06:15 PM

Page 15 of 35

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	27.3	53.8	-	-	-	33.3	-	27.3	0.0	38.5	0.0	35.7	53.4	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	76.9	72.0	70.6	-	-	-	60.8	79.2	77.8	46.2	57.9	90.9	81.0	81.3	91.3

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark   % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark   % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	98.8	90.6	92.4	-	-	-	84.0	98.8	90.6	65.5	81.9	72.4	85.4	85.4	96.5
White	-	-	-	98.8	90.5	92.0	-	-	-	83.5	98.8	90.3	65.1	84.6	73.1	84.9	84.9	97.5
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



# GCMS Middle School

## School Improvement Plan 2008

8/19/2009 3:06:15 PM

Page 17 of 35

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	54.5	61.5	-	-	-	33.3	-	27.3	-	46.2	-	28.6	33.4	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	96.1	92.0	76.5	-	-	-	82.6	100.0	81.5	38.5	52.6	59.1	66.6	81.3	91.3

**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?*

**2008 Data Analysis****Math**

\*The ISAT "Meets and Exceeds" scores for Math increased for Grade 6 by 1.8% to 92.4%.

Grade 8 increased 11.1% to 96.5%.

\*Grade 7 Math scores decreased by 8.2%.

\*The "Economically Disadvantaged" subgroup at Grade 6 shows a decrease of 15.5%. Grade 7 shows a decrease in Math scores of 18.5%. However, the Grade 8 subgroup has an increase of 10%.

\*The Grade 6 "Students with Disabilities" subgroup had an increase of 7%. The Grade 7 scores were 27.3%, with no subgroup from the 2007 year for comparison. There was no Grade 8 subgroup for 2008.

**Reading**

\*The ISAT "Meets and Exceeds" scores for Reading increased at Grade 6 by 8.7%, and in Grade 8 by 9.2% for a total of 91.9%. Grade 7 saw a decrease of 4.6% to a score of 83.6%.

\*The "Economically Disadvantaged" Reading scores decreased at Grade 6 by 1.4% to 70.6%, and at Grade 7 by 1.4% to 77.8%. However the eighth grade scores were 91.3%, which was an increase of 10%.

\*The "Students with Disabilities" subgroup increased at Grade 6 by 26.5% to 53.8%. The Grade 7 subgroup was at 27.3%, with no subgroup report for 2007. There was no subgroup for Grade 8.

**Other Data**

\*Attendance rate increased by .4% to 96.3%.

\*The mobility rate increased by 1.5% to 8.4%.

\*Truancy rate for the middle school is at .4%.

**Areas of Strength and Weakness**

\*Math areas of strength:

\*Grades 6,7,8- Extended Response for Number Sense (Grades 6,7) and Algebra (Grade 8)

\*Math areas of weakness:

\*Grades 6,7,8-Algebra: Solve word problems (Grade 6)

Represent and analyze problems with linear equations and inequalities. (Grades 7,8)

\*Reading areas of strength:

\*Grade 6: Summarize Order of Events

\*Grade 7, 8: Determine the answer to a literal or simple inference question

8/19/2009 3:06:15 PM

\*Reading areas of weakness:

\*Grade 6: Comprehension- Drawing inferences

\*Grade 7,8: Literary Elements- identify elements of fiction

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

\*The high parental involvement could likely play a part in the low truancy rate, and high attendance rate.

\*Due to increase in new businesses in the area, we have seen a rise in the mobility rate.

\*Teachers across the curriculum are working to assist students in the areas of Math and Reading.

\*Eighth grade advanced Algebra class helps students by adding rigor to their curriculum.

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

\*Differentiation will be the key for improvement for all middle school students.

\*The Reading Specialist position will assist those students needing additional reading assistance.

\*The new Math series focuses on the Algebra aspect, and has increased rigor for all grade levels.

\*Implementation of the Rtl program will assist students to improve weak areas.

### 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?*

\*SAT10 tests are administered in the fall in grades six through eight. ISAT testing occurs in the spring in grades six through eight. Both tests are used at these grade levels as universal screeners, currently.

\*Teachers also look at the assessment data to create "Target Goals" in the areas of Math and Reading, in order to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses.

\*Individual test results are analyzed in order to determine the students who will need special assistance.

\*Curriculum-based assessments are utilized in grades 6,7, and 8 to determine mastery, and also needs that should be addressed. These assessments reveal helpful information both for the group as a whole, as well as for individual students.

ThinkLink was piloted during the 2008-2009 school year, and will be implemented in grades 6,7,and 8 in the 2009-2010 school year. The data can be used for many purposes through out the year, including as a screener.

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

- \*Increased focus in co-teaching in the areas of Reading and Math has helped improve scores.
- \*Tutoring and mentoring programs and Title I have helped assist individuals to improve in specific subject areas.
- \*After school homework programs at the middle school have helped the students to improve skills and responsibility.
- \*Inclusion and additional team teaching at the middle school has been beneficial to the students.
- \*The reading specialist at the middle school has been able to implement programs and differentiate instruction to help those with reading needs.

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

- \*Rtl plans and additional targeting of students in need could help all student achievement; especially the subgroups.
- \*Additional time spent analyzing assessment results will benefit both the students and the teachers. Focusing on both the group scores and the individual student scores would meet various needs.
- \*By using the tiered concept, continual assessment review will be necessary.
- \*Based on data evaluation, teacher, co-teachers, or teams will determine the students' needs, and adjust teaching in order to address those needs.
- \*As a building, ThinkLink was chosen as a universal screening tool that includes a progress monitoring component.
- \*Our core grade level teams with the help of our interventionists will look at results of our screeners and progress monitoring in order to determine the needs of students.
- \*The grade level teams will look at the needs of students and make adjustments as needed to improve or refocus instruction.
- \*Grade level teams and SAP teams will utilize the data to target students who need assistance

### 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?*

- \*Parent participation is a strength at the GCMS schools, district-wide, and will be utilized in the Rtl planning process.
- \*Parents will be introduced to the Rtl plan procedure at the middle school building. They will also receive communications and updates through out the year, concerning both the plan, and also how their specific student is involved within the plan.
- \*Both homework and tutoring programs have been a benefit to at-risk students, as well as for students who desire additional assistance.
- \*Economically disadvantaged or IEP subgroups need to be an area of focus.
- \*With the increase in the ESL population, finding resources are a challenge.

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

- \*Occasionally, lack of parental support and input creates difficulties for at risk students.
- \*Students have benefited from the homework and tutoring programs.
- \*Increasing team teaching at the middle school level has improved student achievement.
- \*The utilization of Reading specialists at all grade levels has also aided the students.
- \*An increased number of students with ELL parents has made communication difficult in some cases.

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

- \*Increasing paraprofessional involvement could be a benefit to the students at GCMS.
- \*Parent notification, education, and input concerning Rtl could be very advantageous to our building. Appropriate policies and procedures need to be frequently communicated to parents.
- \*Grade levels and subject areas are able to make good decisions concerning lesson implementation and student assistance. These decisions can be based on data from various assessments, as well as input from team teachers, specialists, and interventionists. Students will benefit from the frequent evaluations.
- \*The implementation of Rtl at the middle school is moving forward. We need to involve parents in the process. We plan to use our parent advisory group as a way to assist us in coming up with ways to notify and educate parents regarding Rtl.
- \*The middle school will also utilize parent night, parent/teacher conferences, and family night to educate parents regarding Rtl.
- \*A teacher liaison has assisted the staff with ESL students in the areas of translating phone calls, letters, and by sitting in on meetings.

**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 tell you?*

Professional Development opportunities for the 2009-2010 school year were based on results of data analysis.

Aug. 18, 2008 Rtl and SIP Informational Meeting

Aug. 19, 2008: Teacher meetings to review student accommodations and modifications and School Improvement Plan

Oct. 10, 2008: GCMS & PBL Institute, hosted by GCMS

Dec. 5, 2008- afternoon: Rtl Plan Development and Implementation Session

January 23, 2009: Implementing Rtl

\*GCMS University and New Teacher Mentoring Program- began August, 2008 and continued through the year.

\*Various workshops were attended by faculty members.

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

\*Professional Development at the GCMS Middle School is focused on areas of curriculum that need to be addressed, based on the evaluation during the SIP process. All students and teachers benefit from this process.

\*Professional Development will focus on the RtI process and implementation.

\*The utilization of the Reading Specialist for half days has aided students who are in need of extra assistance.

\*ThinkLink has targeted students who could benefit from the additional intervention.

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

\*Research has been done as a beginning step for the RtI process. With some RtI interventions already being utilized, the GCMS Middle School is ready to make decisions on incorporating components of the RtI program during the 2009-2010 school year.

\*Professional Development opportunities are developed based on results of data analysis.

Aug. 17, 2009: Teacher Preparations: Review student accommodations & modifications

Aug. 18, 2009: Teacher Meetings: Review student accommodations & modifications

Oct. 5, 2009: GCMS & PBL Institute, hosted by PBL

Dec. 4, 2009- afternoon: Differentiated Instruction

Jan. 15, 2010- a.m.: RtI Program Evaluation and Data Analysis

p.m.: HOIC Institute at ISU

\*GCMS University and New Teacher Mentoring Program will begin August 2009, and continue through the school year.

\*Various teacher workshops will be attended by faculty members.

**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?*

\*Teachers and administrators communicate with parents through phone, mail, e-mail, Edline, Listserve, websites, the emergency phone system, and other methods.

\*The parent advisory committee at the middle school level provides input directly to the principal, and will continue to be a great asset for feedback.

\*All three grade level teams strive for 100% parental contact. It is a regular occurrence for teams to meet with individual parents.

\*This year, parent notification occurred involving those students who received extra reading assistance. They also received progress reports, and at the 6th grade level, ThinkLink reports were sent home.

8/19/2009 3:06:15 PM

\*We have a high percentage of parents who attend a yearly parent lunch for each of our three grade levels. Also, a high percentage of parents continue to be actively involved in their student's education.

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

\*Parent communication is a strong asset for our middle school.

\*Parent support has helped improve student achievement.

\*Our parent volunteers and tutors assist our students and teachers.

\*Parental access to Edline has opened communication between the parents and staff, in order to promote academic success.

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

\*We need to use the support from our parents to assist us as we move forward to implement Rtl in our building.

\*We need to stay in contact with parents on an ongoing basis so as to gain their input and suggestions.

\*We will use the parents on the parent advisory committee to assist in communicating Rtl information to the community.

\*We will strive to develop ideas and strategies to involve parents of "at-risk" students.

**Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors**

**Section I-D - Key Factors** – *From the preceding screens (I-A, I-B, I-C-1, 2, 3) 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?*

\*Curriculum reviews occur on a rotational basis every seven years. At that time, the objectives are aligned to state standards, and a district wide scope and sequence is created in that subject area. In between those curriculum reviews, annual meetings are held in order to locate any areas of weakness that may cause changes in the curriculum objectives. Those issues are addressed and edited at that time.

\*By evaluating test results, grade levels and subject areas are able to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.

\*Increased research and education in the area of Rtl will help student achievement.

\*Finding additional methods to reach and teach the students (differentiated instruction) will serve the students well.

\*Additional research as to the best use of the Reading Specialist's focus with students at the middle school level would be beneficial. A review of the ISAT scores and other data will assist the specialist to differentiate instruction.

\*Continue to target key areas in academic and attendance areas.

\*Continue to encourage parent involvement in the area of Rtl, in order to ensure parent communication, and student success.

\*Increase faculty and staff knowledge of the five components of reading, and how those components can be integrated into the daily work in the classroom.

\*Continued research in order to locate the best screeners, monitors and probes will be essential for a quality program, whether it be for the areas of Math, Reading or behavior.

\*The middle school will continue to focus on math and reading by having co-teachers in those subject areas. Co-teaching will expand to the Language Arts area in the 2009-2010 school year.

\*We will work as a building to build a multi-tiered program which is scientifically based, data driven, including universal and individual screeners.

\*We will promote on-going support for our teachers, interventionists, and paraprofessionals.

\*We will keep in contact with parents regarding Rtl plans and procedures.

\*After piloting the ThinkLink program at the sixth grade level, it will be implemented as a universal screener for Grades 6-8.

\*After piloting the AutoSkills program during the fourth quarter of the 2008-2009 school year, it has been determined that AutoSkills will be used as an intervention tool at the middle school.

### Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed
1	The middle school researched and implemented a middle school Rtl plan in Reading that contains universal screening, curriculum-based measurements for progress monitoring, and appropriate tier-level activities to increase the overall AYP. Research will continue for future Math Rtl implementation.	

The following deficiencies [not objectives] have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for your school.

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

### Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

#### Objective: 1

The middle school researched and implemented a middle school Rtl plan in Reading that contains universal screening, curriculum-based measurements for progress monitoring, and appropriate tier-level activities to increase the overall AYP. Research will continue for future Math Rtl implementation.

#### Objective 1 Description:

\*The middle school will utilize a universal screener (ThinkLink) with progress monitoring beginning the fall of 2009.

\*The middle school will develop a reading schedule that allows for Tier time, in order for students to meet with interventionists, as well as having teams meet with the interventionists.

\*The middle school will develop a way to track progress and interventions used across grade levels for all students.

\*The middle school will investigate and research Rtl Math and behavior to see how they relate to the



needs of the GCMS Middle School students.

\*The middle school teachers will develop and promote the RtI image in a positive manner, in an effort to expand the student opportunities and interest in the program.

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

### Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

**Objective 1 Title :** The middle school researched and implemented a middle school RtI plan in Reading that contains universal screening, curriculum-based measurements for progress monitoring, and appropriate tier-level activities to increase the overall AYP. Research will continue for future Math RtI implementation.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	We will implement assessments and interventions in Reading, and research them in the areas of Math and behavior.	1/5/2009	6/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	
2	Develop a schedule that allows for Tier time and interventions.	1/5/2009	6/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Expand the use of AutoSkills to enhance student learning in reading.	8/17/2009	6/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	

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

**Objective 1 Title :** The middle school researched and implemented a middle school RtI plan in Reading that contains universal screening, curriculum-based measurements for progress monitoring, and appropriate tier-level activities to increase the overall AYP. Research will continue for future Math RtI implementation.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Middle school in-services will be provided in order to increase knowledge on action plan goals.	1/5/2009	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	
2	Teachers will be encouraged to attend district-funded workshops, which will enhance their knowledge in the action plan goal areas. Also, training in the areas of ThinkLink and AutoSkills will be needed. This knowledge will be disseminated to other staff members through faculty and team meetings.	8/17/2009	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Focus will be placed on differentiated instruction through out the curricular areas.	8/17/2009	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	
4	Faculty will frequently evaluate student assessment results in order to determine student need.	8/17/2009	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	
5	Presentations will be given to inform the middle school staff on the Math and behavior components of RtI, in order to make decisions concerning the implementation of the components.	8/17/2009	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	

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

**Objective 1 Title :** The middle school researched and implemented a middle school Rtl plan in Reading that contains universal screening, curriculum-based measurements for progress monitoring, and appropriate tier-level activities to increase the overall AYP. Research will continue for future Math Rtl implementation.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Information regarding Rtl will be presented at Parent Night.	8/17/2009	6/1/2010	After School	Local Funds	
2	There will be a differentiated instruction brochure prepared to be used for registration, parent/teacher conferences, Parent Night, and Family Night.	1/5/2009	10/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	
3	Parent Advisory will be informed about Rtl and help to review and revise the handbook information.	1/5/2009	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	

### Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 1 Title :** The middle school researched and implemented a middle school Rtl plan in Reading that contains universal screening, curriculum-based measurements for progress monitoring, and appropriate tier-level activities to increase the overall AYP. Research will continue for future Math Rtl implementation.

**Monitoring** - Describe the process and measures of success for the identified objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

\*The Rtl format and schedule will have to reflect not only the students' group and individual needs, but also be workable within the constraints of the schedule and the faculty that is available.

\*It will be high priority to identify quality and researched based interventions and assessment data.

\*The math and reading teachers will use the universal screener with progress monitoring to make determinations on student need.

\*The counselor and principal will develop a schedule based on student needs, guided by staff input.

\*The interventionists and grade level teams will come up with a way to keep track of interventions and data on students within and across grade levels.

**Monitoring Persons** - List the individuals and designate the role of each person(e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

Name	Title
Jeremy Darnell	GCMS Middle School Principal
Julie Withrow	Counselor
To be determined	Reading Specialist

### Section III - Plan 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.*)

\*The GCMS Website will include an Rtl segment.

\*The Principal's Advisory Committee (comprised of teachers representatives), the Parent Advisory Board (comprised of parent representatives), and the Curriculum Coordinating Committee can offer input, and review plans.

The following provide other opportunities for parent communication:

\*E-mail List Serve for notification of middle school events and notices

\*E-mail, phone, and U.S. mail correspondence

\*Class and school newsletters

\*Edline: online grading notification system

\*Global Connect Automated Telephone system

\*Parent Night

\*Parent-teacher conferences

\*Family Night

\*Midterm grades, quarterly progress reports

### Section III - Plan 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 middle school created an Rtl team. The team consisted of representatives of each grade level, and different representatives of other areas of the middle school. The members were: Mike Bleich (principal), Julie Withrow (counselor), Julie Audo (school psychologist), Troy Escamilla (reading specialist), Denise Kearfott (Title I), Anne Johnson (eighth grade teacher), Jenny White (seventh grade teacher), Deanna Hunt (sixth grade team), and Nancy Knittel (sixth grade team). After developing the district plan, the representatives returned to their respective buildings and met with other team members for the purpose of creating a grade level specific plan that would succeed in their building. After the district and building Rtl teams developed their plans, faculty meetings were conducted for the purpose of reviewing the the plan and its procedures. Then, upon completion of the Rtl plans at the building level, the Gibson City-Melvin Sibley

CUSD#5 Curriculum Coordinating Committee had the reports presented to them. This step assisted our district to have a comprehensive view of what our plan will look like, both at the district level and the building levels. After approval, each plan will be presented to the GCMS Board of Education.

The School Improvement team at the middle school met with team members to assist in determining what focus the goals should have for the 2009-2010 school year. The plan was developed by the team, taken to the faculty for approval, and then will be put into action.

After board approval, additional communication and feedback will be received through parent and principal advisory meetings. Faculty meetings will also serve as a time to update teachers on the Rtl and SIP plans and processes.

\*The GCMS Website will include an Rtl segment and/or links.

\* The Principal's Advisory Committee (comprised of teacher representatives), the Parent Advisory Board (comprised of parent representatives), and the Curriculum Coordinating Committee can offer input, and review plans.

\*Opportunities for parent communication were listed in the parent notification section.

**Names and titles of school improvement team or plan developers:**

	Name	Title
1	Mike Bleich	middle school principal
2	Julie Withrow	counselor
3	Lori Tate	sixth grade teacher
4	Dale Hoogstraat	seventh grade teacher
5	Mark Berry	eighth grade teacher
6	Sharon Pool	curriculum director

### Section III - Plan 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. Peer review and subsequent local board approval 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>.

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

Each curriculum area is on a seven-year rotation cycle for review. Each seven years, the faculty of that department revises the curriculum, and textbooks are selected. During the other six years, annual review meetings take place. This is the time when revisions, additions, and curriculum evaluations occur. Also during the year, teachers may submit course changes for approval, all which must be matched to the Illinois State Learning Goals and Standards. Five times a year, the GCMS curriculum Coordinating Committee meets. All curriculum additions, revisions, and concerns are communicated and discussed.

### Section III - Plan 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.

GCMS University is a mentoring program for new teachers that was implemented in 2004. Gene Everett, the Induction Coordinator, is an integral part of the successful program. He coordinates the training and in-service events for the new teachers. Gene helps to promote a working relationship between the inductees and the mentors. He also meets and talks with the new teachers several times a month. Gene has helped these new teachers by hosting socials at his house, as well.

Veteran teachers are paired with a new teacher in order to assist, coach, support, and encourage the teachers through out the two-year program. The program begins with a three-day mentoring program before the school year starts. During this time, the new employees are provided with district background information, an explanation of district policies, time lines for filling out employment paperwork, curriculum information, and also a tour of the towns in the GCMS district. During the school year, three half-day in-services are also provided. These cover discussions on: classroom management, curriculum, assessment, building policies, and other areas. It also provides a time for new teachers to share their questions and concerns. The mentee is observed three times during

the year by their mentor, and also receives two teacher observations. Then, reflective writings are required through out the year, which encourages self-evaluation.

For the new teacher, it is very valuable to have both a mentor and a coordinator to be able to bring questions and concerns to. Also, the GCMS Director of Student Services meets with each new teacher one time a quarter. This gives the new teacher an opportunity to discuss curriculum and assessment questions with her, as well.

GCMS University is recognized by the ISBE as a credible program that satisfies the criteria for Continued Professional Development Units (CPDUs). This enables the new teachers to move from an initial teaching certificate to a standard certificate after completing four years of teaching.

The GCMS Superintendent and the GCMS Board of Education show great support for the district mentoring program by funding and implementing it since 2004.

### Section III - Plan 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 GCMS District provides budgets for staff development, both at the district and the school level. Staff is often encouraged to take advantage of staff development opportunities that reflect the year's SIP goals.

The district continues to provide time and funding for the following:

- \*Daily grade level or team meetings
- \*Staff Development
- \*Out of district conferences and workshops
- \*School Improvement Teams, which address and plan improvement goals for the coming year
- \*Substitute teachers, in order to allow classroom teachers to attend the various events.

**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).

**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.

**Section III - Plan 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.

The IIRC, along with the ISBE has created a step-by-step outline for the school to follow, in order to create a specific district and building plans that will serve as an basis for what our schools will accomplish within the Rtl plans. The ROE will offer workshops on creating the plan, and later will offer more conferences on implementing the plan at the various grade levels. Each building will identify state resources that best benefit their needs, and will solicit their assistance. The Champaign- Ford County Regional Office of Education will provide staff development, curriculum round tables, and administrative workshops in areas of needed professional development for the staff.

The state government will provide financial funding. The federal governments will provide Title I Reading Improvement monies.

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

State Responsibilities – List the names and identify the roles (e.g., distinguished educator, district curriculum coordinator, university partner, or RESPRO consultant) of the School Support Team. If applicable, School Support Teams are assigned to schools in corrective action to provide sustained and intensive support for those schools to make adequate yearly progress. Note: School Support Teams are not the same as school improvement teams or the school planning team. Schools I academic watch, restructuring, or restructuring implementation status should have School Support Teams. Some schools in Choice, SES, or academic early warning status also have School Support Teams.

	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**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
|  | Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified?  |
|  | Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness?  |
|  | Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students?                                    |
|  | Does the analysis, along with other optional data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities? |

**LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  | If included, is there evidence that the SIP team analyzed optional data to clarify the areas of weakness?                              |
|  | Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?  |
|  | Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities? |

**OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  | If included, has the SIP team analyzed other available data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities? |
|  | Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?  |
|  | Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?                 |

**IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
|  | Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance? |
|  | Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control?                        |

**CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  | Has the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan? |
|  | Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency?   |

**ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
|  | Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected? |
|  | Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement?  |
|  | Are the strategies and activities measurable?   |
|  | Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified?  |
|  | Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear?   |

	Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students?
	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?
	Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities? for students?
	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?
<b>MONITORING</b>	
	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?
	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?

**PART I - COMMENTS****PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN****PARENT NOTIFICATION**

	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? <font color="red">(Title I Schools Only)</font>
--	--

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?
	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?

**PEER REVIEW**

	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?
--	---

**TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS**

	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?
--	---

**DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES**

	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?
	If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school?

**STATE RESPONSIBILITIES**

	Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation?
SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM	
	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?
APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD	
	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.

**PART II - COMMENTS**