

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	06/14/2010
Submitted	06/15/2010
Plan Resubmitted	06/15/2010
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	090270050260001		
District Name:	Gibson City-Melvin-Sibley CUSD 5	School Name:	GCMS High School
Superintendent:	Charles Aubry	Principal:	Michael J Lindy
District Address:	217 E 17th St	School Address:	815 N Church St
City/State/Zip:	Gibson City,IL 60936 1072	City/State/Zip:	Gibson City,IL 60936 1074
District Telephone#:	Label 2177848296 Extn: 1003	School Telephone#:	2177844292 Extn: 3001
District Email:	spool@gcms.k12.il.us	School Email:	lindym@gcms.k12.il.us
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	Yes	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2009-10 State Improvement Status	

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		70.0			70.0			90.0		78.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	70.2		Yes	60.7		No			93.8	Yes
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	72.5		Yes	61.3	68.3	No			93.8	
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities													
Low Income													

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 70% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 70% 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 70% 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 78% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2008.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 70% 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.

DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 3 - School Information

School Information								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	94.8	94.9	95.0	95.4	93.8	94.7	94.0	94.3
Truancy Rate (%)	1.7	1.3	0.6	4.8	2.5	0.3	1.0	1.9
Mobility Rate (%)	9.1	12.0	11.4	5.1	10.3	4.7	9.3	14.1
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	86.1	94.0	78.8	91.7	82.3	91.5	90.2	93.8
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	2.6	1.9	1.9	0.9	3.0	1.5	1.9	1.2
School Population (#)	302	311	319	344	328	328	318	322
Low Income (%)	14.2	14.1	16.0	19.2	23.5	23.8	25.2	22.7
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.9	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	98.0	97.1	97.8	96.8	97.0	97.0	97.2	96.0
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.7	1.0	0.6	0.9	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Hispanic (%)	1.0	1.3	0.9	0.6	1.2	2.4	2.5	3.1
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.3	0.6	0.6	1.5	0.9	-	-	0.6
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	0.3	0.3	0.3	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	-

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	97.7	0.3	1.3	0.7	-	-
	2001	97.5	0.3	1.5	0.6	-	-
	2002	98.0	0.7	1.0	0.3	-	-
	2003	97.1	1.0	1.3	0.6	-	-
	2004	97.8	0.6	0.9	0.6	-	-
	2005	96.8	0.9	0.6	1.5	0.3	-
	2006	97.0	0.3	1.2	0.9	0.3	0.3
	2007	97.0	0.3	2.4	-	0.3	-
	2008	97.2	0.3	2.5	-	-	-
	2009	96.0	0.3	3.1	0.6	-	-
D I S T R I C T	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
	2009	95.2	0.9	2.6	0.4	0.2	0.8
	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

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	0.3	10.4	90.5	95.1	9.1	1	0.3	2.6	89.4
	2001	0.3	8.6	100.0	93.4	17.2	-	-	4.9	89.6
	2002	0.3	14.2	100.0	94.8	9.1	5	1.7	2.6	86.1
	2003	0.3	14.1	100.0	94.9	12.0	4	1.3	1.9	94.0
	2004	0.6	16.0	100.0	95.0	11.4	2	0.6	1.9	78.8
	2005	0.3	19.2	100.0	95.4	5.1	16	4.8	0.9	91.7
	2006	0.9	23.5	100.0	93.8	10.3	8	2.5	3.0	82.3
	2007	-	23.8	100.0	94.7	4.7	1	0.3	1.5	91.5
	2008	-	25.2	100.0	94.0	9.3	3	1.0	1.9	90.2
	2009	-	22.7	100.0	94.3	14.1	6	1.9	1.2	93.8
D I S T R I C T	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
	2009	0.4	29.0	100.0	95.5	13.1	6	0.6	1.2	93.8
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6

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

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

Section I A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 6 - Enrollment Trends

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	307	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	325	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	302	-	-	-	-	-	69
	2003	311	-	-	-	-	-	63
	2004	319	-	-	-	-	-	78
	2005	344	-	-	-	-	-	82
	2006	328	-	-	-	-	-	83
	2007	328	-	-	-	-	-	78
	2008	318	-	-	-	-	-	64
	2009	322	-	-	-	-	-	89
D I S T R I C T	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
	2009	1,115	80	106	74	79	90	89
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816

S T A T E	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2,044,539	164,413	157,570	159,499	160,924	156,451	138,559
	2004	2,060,048	161,329	160,246	158,367	162,933	160,271	139,504
	2005	2,062,912	156,370	158,622	160,365	162,047	162,192	142,828
	2006	2,075,277	155,155	154,372	158,822	160,362	160,911	147,500
	2007	2,077,856	155,356	153,480	154,719	162,594	159,038	150,475
	2008	2,074,167	155,578	152,895	153,347	160,039	161,310	149,710
	2009	2,070,125	156,512	152,736	152,820	155,433	158,700	144,822

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

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

Educator Data is available only for district level

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	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	-
	2009	85	13	49,784	73	27	16	14	1	-
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1

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

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

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

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grade 11						
Groups	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	66.6	68.3	72.4	66.3	70.7	69.8
White	66.2	70.9	72.0	67.9	70.7	72.2
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	36.4	-	7.1
Low Income	-	53.3	66.7	53.3	-	55.0

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

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

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grade 11						
Groups	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	69.3	59.7	73.7	63.8	67.2	60.3
White	68.9	62.0	73.4	65.4	67.2	60.7
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	27.3	-	7.1
Low Income	-	40.0	41.7	53.3	-	45.0

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

- The 2009 PSAE scores show a decrease in the Reading scores of .9%, with a total score of 69.8%. The five-year average is 69.5%.
- The Math “Meets and Exceeds” scores decreased by 6.9%, with a total score of 60.3%. The five-year average for Math PSAE scores is 64.94%.
- Attendance rate for the 2008-2009 school year was 94.3%, which was an increase of .3% from the previous year. The five-year average for attendance is 94.4%.
- Chronic truants went from 3 in 2007-2008 to 6 in 2008-2009. This was an increase of .9% to a total of 1.9%.
- Low income has decreased 2.5%.
- The high school dropout rate is down .7%, to 1.2%. The graduation rate rose in the 2008-2009 school year to 93.3%. It is up 3.6%.
- Parent involvement continues to be at a solid 100%.
- GCMS High School enrollment increased by four students for a total of 322. The junior class had 89 students, compared to a class of 64 the previous year.

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

- While low income appears to have decreased for the 2008-2009 school year, since the district group has increased, and so has the mobility, it is assumed that the high school students would rather not indicate their low income status due to status issues. Therefore, the results are not accurate.
- While AutoSkills, co-teaching and additional focus on math, reading, and writing was implemented last year, the class received this assistance on a limited basis, so test results do not reflect the additional resources.
- Emphasis on the importance of school attendance and graduation has shown its value in the resulting data.

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

- The reading specialist, AutoSkills, and reading across the curriculum must continue in order for student **achievement to improve**. Early intervention is vital.
- Co-teaching needs to be “taken to the next level” in order for students to benefit from having two teachers **available within a class period**.
- Continued emphasis in the areas of attendance and graduation will serve our students well.
- Knowledge of the importance of the PSAE as early as middle school could help to improve effort on the **assessments**.
- The RtI team will work together to improve implementation of data analysis.
- A focus needs to be placed on moving more students of all nationalities into the areas of “meets and exceeds” in math.

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data

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

- Individual test results are analyzed in order to determine the students who will need special assistance, for example: AutoSkills, reading specialist, and extra math assistance.
- EPAS testing is utilized in grades eight through eleven. These assessments are given in order to prepare the students for the PSAE, which is taken their junior year. The group and individual test results help to individualize both student and classroom interventions.
- Curriculum-based assessments are utilized in grades 9-12 to **determine mastery, and also determine the needs that should be addressed**. These assessments reveal helpful information both for the group as a whole, as well as for individual students. It also indicates areas where reteaching will be necessary.
- Test data indicates that students need additional assistance in the areas of geography, math conversions, and science scientific methods.

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

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 plan that will serve as a basis for what our school will accomplish with the SIP and RtI plan. The ROE will offer workshops on creating the plan, and later will offer more workshops on assisting with the RtI component. The Champaign-Ford County Regional Office of Education also provides staff development, curriculum round tables, and administrative workshops in the areas of needed professional development for the staff. Again, due to limited funds, few teachers are allowed to take advantage of these workshops, due to the prohibitive costs.

Each building will identify state resources that best benefit their needs, and will solicit their assistance. The difficulty lies in the fact that while many of our programs are much needed for student achievement, the state government funding for a school of our demographics and needs is very limited.

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

- All high school teachers will be made aware of the need to include study and practice in geography, conversions, and the scientific method.
- The assessment process will continue to be communicated to the parents so that the parents, students, and teachers are all aware of the process.
- Reading: More teacher collaboration for reading strategies will be implemented.
- Reading: Improved progress monitoring tools will be utilized.
- Writing: The writing focus will continue across the curriculum, with a new subject specific schedule to be implemented. The required writing will be standard MLA format, with grading done according to the ACT writing rubric.
- Math: Increased connection with the middle school will occur, in order for vertical alignment and mastery of basic mathematics objectives to be communicated, so that students will be prepared for the high school math curriculum.

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

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

- Parent participation is a strength at the GCMS High School, as well as throughout the district.
- Consistent parent communication positively affects the high school learning environment.
- The tutoring and mentoring programs have been a benefit to at-risk students, as well as for students who desire additional assistance.
- Strong graduation and attendance rates have been a positive influence on achievement, though these areas must be constantly **monitored and evaluated**.
- Economically disadvantaged and IEP subgroups need to be an area of focus.
- An increase in mobility presents additional challenges to the high school.
- District-wide curriculum committees exist to review each academic discipline. This is also a good avenue to discuss assessment results and student need.
- The junior class student population was increased by 15 students from the 2007-2008 school year.
- Attendance rate for the 2008-2009 school year was 94.3%, which was an increase of .3% from the previous year. The five-year average for attendance is 94.4%.
- Chronic truants went from 3 in 2007-2008 to 6 in 2008-2009. This was an increase of .9% to a total of 1.9%.
- Low income has decreased 2.5%.
- The high school dropout rate is down .7%, to 1.2%. The graduation rate rose in the 2008-2009 school year to 93.3%. It is up 3.6%.
- Parent involvement continues to be at a solid 100%.

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 mentoring and tutoring programs.
- The increase of team teaching at the high school level has improved student achievement.
- The utilization of the reading specialist at all grade levels has also aided the students.
- Teacher availability before and after school benefits those students who needs assistance.
- While illiteracy is not a large problem at the high school, it is important that “alliteracy” be addressed.

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

- Math- There is a need for peer tutors in an effort to focus on math improvement.
- Better communication and parental involvement and awareness are necessary for all student success, but especially for those at-risk or under-performing students.
- Focus on attendance for those at-risk students will need to increase, as will the parental information and contact concerning student attendance.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data

Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

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

Teachers attended various workshops this past year, in order to gain knowledge in various areas, especially dealing with co-teaching, Rtl, and differentiation.

Professional Development activities for the 2009-2010 school year were based on the results of data analysis, and teacher education needs. The activities were as follows:

- August 12,13,14, 2009 New Staff Induction Orientation*
- August 17, 2009 Teacher Institute

- August 18, 2009 Half Day Teacher Workshop
- October 5, 2009 GCMS/PBL Teacher Institute
- December 4, 2009 Half day School Improvement Workshop
- January 15, 2010 Technology Interventions and HOIC Institute

*GCMS University begins two-year new teacher mentoring program.

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

- Professional Development at the GCMS High School is focused on areas of curriculum and assessment that need to be addressed, **based on the evaluation during the SIP process. All students and teachers benefit from this process.**
- Implementation of AutoSkills has assisted in identification and intervention for students needing additional assistance.
- Co-teaching has proven to be very beneficial in assisting students of all abilities.

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

- Professional Development activities for the 2010-2011 school year are based on the results of data analysis, and teacher education needs.
- August 18, 19, 2010 New Staff Induction Orientation*
- August 20, 2010 Teacher Institute
- August 23, 2010 Teacher Workshop
- August 24, 2010 Half day Teacher Workshop
- October 8, 2010 Teacher Institute
- January 14, 2011 Half day School Improvement Workshop
- *GCMS University begins two-year new teacher mentoring program.
- Data analysis will be done frequently in order to focus attention on areas of student weakness.

- Continued curriculum assessment analysis will be done for horizontal and vertical alignment and articulation. Special focus will be on the new core curriculum standards to make sure that each objective is part of the high school curriculum.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data 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, listserv websites, the Global Connect phone system, and school events.
- The parent advisory committee at the high school level provides input directly to the principal, and will continue to be a great asset for feedback.
- The high school strives for 100% parental contact. It is a regular occurrence for each grade level at-risk team and/or RtI team to meet with individual parents.
- Parents receive progress reports at the midpoint of each nine weeks.
- Open Houses and Falcon Pride Night in April helps to keep the parents informed.

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

- Parent communication is a strong asset for our high school.
- Parent support has helped to improve achievement.
- Parent volunteers assist both students and teachers.
- Parental access to Edline has opened communication between the parents, and staff, in order to promote academic success.
- Technology has improved parent communication.

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

- Changes and improvements that are made to the high school program are best accepted and implemented when those changes are communicated to the parents.
- Better communication methods will improve parent contact.
- The high school benefits when parents are given the opportunity to offer their input on an ongoing basis. In the 2010-2011 school year, more parents will be involved in both planning and implementation of high school programs.
- Parent volunteers will be invited to assist with high school programs and events.

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?



-

- Math skill and score improvement will be a major concentration for all high school students.
- Consistent attendance will continue to be a top priority for all students, and individual monitoring will increase for the 2010-2011 school year.
- Work completion in all subject areas will be focused on and evaluated by both teachers and students.
- The GCMS High School will work to maintain high graduation rates, and will instill the value of a degree to all students.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Improvement in attendance, work completion, and graduation rates will help to improve math scores for students of all nationalities.	1,2,

The following deficiencies have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for your school.

-  1. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
-  2. White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Improvement in attendance, work completion, and graduation rates will help to improve math scores for students of all nationalities.

Objective 1 Description

In order to improve all student math scores, the following areas will be addressed, using various strategies:

1. Work on specific math skills in order to improve student achievement.

Targeting the skills will be done through organized data analysis.

2. Devise a plan to reinforce the importance and value of consistent attendance.
3. Evaluate the goals and philosophy of homework that is assigned, dedicating time to a review of homework completion, and techniques that can be used to improve the amount and quality of work that is turned in.
4. Determine methods to improve graduation rates, which will include methods to educate students on the importance of earning a high school degree.
5. Increase parent involvement at the high school level, through additional communication, parent membership on committees, and the use of parent volunteers.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- ☐ 1. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ☐ 2. White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improvement in attendance, work completion, and graduation rates will help to improve math scores for students of all nationalities.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Catch-up Cafe- Lunch time tutoring program. Some peers will serve as tutors.	08/30/2010	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	Credit Retrieval Program- E20/20 will allow students to earn online credits. This can also occur during school hours.	08/30/2010	08/15/2011	After School	Local Funds	
3	Incentive Program- Students will take part in an incentive program in order to show that consistent attendance is a priority.	08/23/2010	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	Teacher/Student Mentoring- At-risk students will have a mentor to monitor and assist them throughout the school year.	08/30/2010	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	Before and after school help- Students will have assistance available before and after school. This service may be required attendance for some students.	08/30/2010	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	
6	Tutor- A tutor will be available in the library three days a week to assist any student. Tutoring may be a requirement for certain students who need assistance.	08/30/2010	06/03/2011	During School	Other	
7	Reading Intervention Pull-out Program: Students who could benefit from extra reading skills will take part in this pull-out program.	08/23/2010	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
8	Summer Bridge Program- Incoming freshmen students who could benefit from remedial study will be asked to take part in this program.	07/19/2010	07/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	
9	Math Problem of the Week: All students will take part in a "Math Problem of the Week."	08/30/2010	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
10	Sports Study Tables- Students involved in a sport who have difficulty with a class will be required to attend study tables twice a week	08/30/2010	06/03/2011	Before School	Local Funds	

during that particular sports season, until grades are raised.					
--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improvement in attendance, work completion, and graduation rates will help to improve math scores for students of all nationalities.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	GCMS University- New teachers will take part in this two year program that will include orientation and mentoring.	08/18/2010	06/01/2012	After School	Local Funds	
2	GCMS Institute and Workshops- These days will be used to offer teachers professional development that will cover the objectives in the high school improvement plan.	08/20/2010	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	Inservice- Teachers will take part in a Googledocs and E20/20 in-service in order to improve communication and assist students in a new credit retrieval program.	08/20/2010	08/23/2010	During School	Local Funds	
4	Reading Strategy of the Month- A new reading strategy will be presented at the monthly faculty meetings, with the goal of implementing the strategy during that month.	08/30/2010	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	Teacher/Student mentoring- Teachers will mentor and connect with one student throughout the school year, in order to develop and maintain a relationship.	08/24/2010	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
6	Data Analysis and cross-curricular work- Teachers will work frequently to evaluate student data, especially in the area of Math. Technique and concepts will be used in cross-curricular areas in order to continue math skill building.	08/24/2010	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
7	Curriculum Departmental Meetings- Departments will convene in order to assess both students and curricular needs.	08/20/2010	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	
8	Coaches will be in charge of study tables for students needing study assistance during that sport season.	08/23/2010	06/03/2011	Before School	Local Funds	

9	Attendance Committee- An attendance committee will be formed to plan an incentive program to be put into place during the 2010-2011 school year.	05/24/2010	08/20/2010	After School	Local Funds	
---	--	------------	------------	--------------	-------------	--

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improvement in attendance, work completion, and graduation rates will help to improve math scores for students of all nationalities.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	New Data System- The new data system that will be implemented in the 2010-2011 school year will allow for more parental input and	08/23/2010	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	Parent Advisory- The parent advisory committee will be continued for the 2010-2011, but will also be enlarged in order to gain additional parent input and ideas.	08/23/2010	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	
3	Parent Volunteers- In an effort to increase parent communication and awareness of high school programs, parents will be invited to volunteer to assist with school projects.	08/23/2010	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	Teacher websites, podcasts, and vodcasts will continue to be available to parents as another means of communication concerning student achievement and student activities.	08/23/2010	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	
5	Parent-Teacher Conferences, Falcon Pride Night, and other high school events- Parent involvement through high school activities will continue to be a priority.	08/30/2010	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Improvement in attendance, work completion, and graduation rates will help to improve math scores for students of all nationalities.

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?)

Organization and evaluation will occur through the following steps:

- A “to-do” list has been created with a time line, in order to determine who will be responsible for each strategy.
- Data analysis will become a routine at the high school level, in order to determine math progress as well as student need.
- Department meetings will occur in order to evaluate progress.
- Specific teachers will be part of the evaluation process for reading intervention, E20/20, and other programs.
- Faculty meetings will provide a venue to discuss plans and progress of the various strategies.
- Parent advisory meetings will give the principal a chance to connect with the parents in order to determine the progress of parent communication.

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	Michael Lindy	High School Principal
2	Mike Allen	Athletic Director
3	KiLee Lidwell	Art Teacher
4	Jenny DeSchepper	Social Worker
5	Mike McDevitt	High School Guidance Counselor

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.*)

- The GCMS website has a link that includes all school report cards, as well as the building and district school improvement plans. Both the report card and the SIP will be available in the high school office.
- The Principals' Advisory Committee (comprised of teacher representatives), the Parent advisory Board (comprised of parent representatives), and the Curriculum Coordinating Committee review both report the report card and the SIP annually.
- Each year at school registration, grade level parent guides are handed out. The books outline all subjects' curricula, matched to the state standards.
- The Gibson Courier and WGCY both report the AYP to the community.
- The following provide other opportunities for parent communication:
 - 1) E-mail List Serve for notification of middle school events and notices
 - 2) E-mail, phone, and U.S. mail correspondence
 - 3) Class and school newsletters
 - 4) Edline: online grading notification system
 - 5) Global Connect Automated Telephone system
 - 6) Falcon Pride Night
 - 7) Parent-teacher conferences
 - 8) Midterm grades, quarterly progress reports
 - 9) GCMS District #5 Needs Assessment: available online

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

Part B. Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder Involvement - Describe specifically how stakeholders (including parents, school staff, and outside experts) have been consulted in the development of the plan. The names and titles of the school improvement team or plan developers must be identified here.

The GCMS High School created a team to devise the SIP plan. The members were chosen as representatives and are responsible to bring the ideas from other faculty members, as well as report the final plans back to the faculty. The team also reviews the current Rtl plan, with decisions as to how to improve the process. Next, the School Improvement Team will analyze and review data for the purpose of determining what focus the goals should have for the 2010-2011 school year. After the building team develops their plan, a faculty meeting will be conducted so that the plan can be communicated to the entire staff for the purpose of reviewing the plan and its procedures. Upon completion of the plan at the building level, it will be submitted to the CUSD #5 Curriculum Coordinating Committee for review. This step assists our district in having a comprehensive view of what the building plan will look like, as well as how it will fit into the plans for the district. The plan will then be taken to the board for approval. Also, 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. Also, department level meetings occur frequently in order to review student data, curriculum, and other concerns. The grade level student at-risk teams also meet regularly to identify students who may need additional interventions. The Director of Student Services also shares curriculum and assessment information with the high school faculty and staff through out the year.

- The GCMS website will include the school improvement plans.
- The Principals' Advisory Committee, (comprised of teacher representatives) the Parent Advisory (comprised of parent representatives), and the Curriculum Coordinating Committee can offer input, and review plans.
- Other opportunities for parent communication are listed in IIIA.

	Name	Title
1	Mike Allen	Athletic Director
2	Kyle Bielfeldt	Hlstory Teacher
3	Julie Briney	Technology Teacher
4	Jenny DeSchepper	Social Worker
5	Erica Kostoff	English Teacher
6	Michael Lindy	High School Principal
7	KiLee Lidwell McFerren	Art Teacher
8	Erin McKavanagh	Reading Specialist
9	Sharon Pool	Director of Student Services
10	Susan Riley	Math Teacher
11	Cindy Wade	Home Economics 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.

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. This is the time when curriculum revisions, additions, and curriculum evaluations occur. Peers work together to articulate and evaluate each grade levels' goals and objectives, and review the connection to the state standards. Also during the school year, the 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 to evaluate and discuss such revisions. The peer group takes this

opportunity to communicate together about the district curriculum, which must be fluid and ever changing to meet student needs.

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.

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 throughout the two-year program. The program begins with a three-day training session 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 School District #5. 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 his/her 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 individually 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 - 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. As our budget becomes tighter, it is more difficult to provide differentiated instruction for each building. We find that we now have to share speakers, both among buildings, as well as with another school district.

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

- * Team meetings
- * Staff Development
- * Out-of-district conferences and workshops (These will be limited for the 2010-2011 school year.)
- * 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). (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.

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 plan that will serve as a basis for what our school will accomplish with the SIP and RtI plan. The ROE will offer workshops on creating the plan, and later will offer more workshops on assisting with the RtI component.

The Champaign-Ford County Regional Office of Education also provides staff development, curriculum round tables, and administrative workshops in the areas of needed professional development for the staff. Again, due to limited funds, few teachers are allowed to take advantage of these workshops, due to the prohibitive costs.

Each building will identify state resources that best benefit their needs, and will solicit their assistance. The difficulty lies in the fact that while many of our programs are much needed for student achievement, the state government funding for a school of our demographics and needs is very limited.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

Part G. School Support Team

	Name	Title
1		

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: **06/14/2010**

A. ASSURANCES

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

B.SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

OTHER DATA

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS☐ Yes ☐ No

Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance? [C]

☐ Yes ☐ No

Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control? [C]

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES☐ Yes ☐ NoHas the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan? [C]☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency? [C]

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES☐ Yes ☐ No

Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement? [C]

☐ Yes ☐ No

Are the strategies and activities measurable? [C]

☐ Yes ☐ No

Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified? [C]

☐ Yes ☐ No

Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear? [C]

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students? [C]

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status or in special education non-compliance?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities? for students? [C]

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

MONITORING☐ Yes ☐ No

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers? [C]

PART I - COMMENTS**PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN****PARENT NOTIFICATION**☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only) [C]

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT☐ Yes ☐ No

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

Does the SIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes? [C]

PEER REVIEW

☒ Yes ☐ No

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

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS☒ Yes ☐ No

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

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES☒ Yes ☐ No

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

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES☒ Yes ☐ No

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

SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD☒ Yes ☐ No

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

PART II - COMMENTS