

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	06/14/2010
Submitted	05/05/2010
Plan Resubmitted	06/15/2010
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:	Jeremy Darnell
District Address:	217 E 17th St	School Address:	316 E 19th St
City/State/Zip:	Gibson City,IL 60936 1072	City/State/Zip:	Gibson City,IL 60936 2008
District Telephone#:	Label 2177848296 Extn: 1003	School Telephone#:	2177848731 Extn: 2135
District Email:	spool@gcms.k12.il.us	School Email:	darnellj@gcms.k12.il.us
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input checked="" 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)?	Yes	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	Yes	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2009-10 State Improvement Status	

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		70.0			70.0			90.0		78.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	91.3		Yes	93.1		Yes	95.7	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	91.1		Yes	93.4		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities													
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	82.8		Yes	84.5		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 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 (%)	95.9	96.0	95.4	95.9	95.7	95.9	96.3	95.7
Truancy Rate (%)	0.4	-	0.4	-	-	-	0.4	-
Mobility Rate (%)	8.5	16.4	8.3	4.2	10.6	6.9	8.4	17.0
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	255	228	243	241	265	252	254	241
Low Income (%)	22.0	19.7	25.1	28.6	28.3	27.4	27.2	29.5
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	1.2	-	0.8	-	-	-	-	1.2
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	98.0	96.5	95.1	96.3	97.0	98.4	98.8	95.0
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.8	0.4	-	0.4	-	0.8	0.4	1.2
Hispanic (%)	1.2	1.3	2.5	1.7	2.3	0.4	-	1.7
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	1.3	2.1	0.8	0.4	-	-	0.4
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	0.4	0.4	-	-	0.4	-	0.8
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	0.8	0.4	-	0.8	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 (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	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
	2009	95.0	1.2	1.7	0.4	0.8	0.8
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	-	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	-	-
	2009	1.2	29.5	100.0	95.7	17.0	-	-	-	-
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	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	-
	2009	241	-	-	-	79	90	-
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)

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	82.4	81.1	89.8	88.9	-	-	74.6	88.2	83.6	92.0	83.2	91.3	86.5	82.7	91.9	88.9
White	-	-	82.1	80.9	89.3	89.8	-	-	74.0	88.2	82.9	93.2	85.9	91.0	88.1	82.2	92.8	89.6
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	27.3	53.8	54.5	-	-	33.3	-	27.3	-	38.5	-	35.7	53.4	-	40.0
Low Income	-	-	76.9	72.0	70.6	76.0	-	-	60.8	79.2	77.8	80.0	57.9	90.9	81.0	81.3	91.3	80.7

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	98.8	90.6	92.4	93.0	-	-	84.0	98.8	90.6	92.0	81.9	72.4	85.4	85.4	96.5	91.3
White	-	-	98.8	90.5	92.0	94.2	-	-	83.5	98.8	90.3	93.1	84.6	73.1	84.9	84.9	97.5	92.2
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	54.5	61.5	63.6	-	-	33.3	-	27.3	-	46.2	-	28.6	33.4	-	50.0
Low Income	-	-	96.1	92.0	76.5	84.0	-	-	82.6	100.0	81.5	73.3	52.6	59.1	66.6	81.3	91.3	84.0

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?

Math:

- * The ISAT “Meets and Exceeds” scores for Math increased for Grade 6 by .6% to 93%, and Grade 7 increased by 1.4% to 92%.
- * Grade 8 Math scores decreased by 5.2% to 91.3%.
- * “The Economically Disadvantaged” subgroup at Grade 6 shows an increase of 7.5%. Grade 7 shows a decrease of 8.2%, and Grade 8 also has a decrease of 7.3%.
- * The Grade 6 “Students with Disabilities” subgroup had an increase of 2.1%. The Grade 7 did not have a subgroup for the 2008-2009 school year. The Grade 8 scores for this subgroup were at 50%. While there were not enough IEP students to create a subgroup for 2008, this score increased 16.6% from 2007.

Reading:

- * The ISAT “Meets and Exceeds” scores for Reading decreased at Grade 6 by .9%, and in grade 8 there was a 3.0% decrease, for a score of 88.9%. However, Grade 7 saw an increase of 8.4% for a score of 92%.
- * The “Economically Disadvantaged” Reading scores increased for Grade 6 by 5.4% for a total of 76%. Grade 7 showed an increase of 2.2% to raise the score to 80%. Grade 8 however, decreased by 10.6% to 80.7%.
- * The “Students with Disabilities” subgroup increased at Grade 6 by .7% to 54.5%. Grade 7 did not have enough students to have a subgroup. The Grade 8 subgroup reported a score of 40%, though there was no 2008 subgroup from which they could draw a comparison.

Other Data:

- * The attendance rate decreased by .6% to 95.7%.
- * The mobility rate more than doubled, from 8.4% to 17.0%.
- * Truancy rate for the middle school was at zero for the 2008-2009 school year.

Areas of Strength:**Math:**

- * **Sixth Grade:** Read, write, and recognizing place value

Measurement- Extended Response

Algebra: Solving for the Unknown

- * **Seventh Grade:** Measurement: perimeter, area, volume, area
Algebra: Missing Terms

- * **Eighth Grade:** Measurement: Standard units, and solving problems
Data, Prob. and Stats: solve problems

Reading:

- * **Sixth and Seventh Grade:**

Vocabulary Development

Literary Elements- Genres

- * **Sixth and Seventh Grade:**

Drawing conclusions

- * **Seventh Grade:** Comprehension- main ideas

- * **Eighth Grade:** Comprehension- Interpreting Instructions
Literary Elements- motivation
Literary Elements- Literary Devices

Areas of Weakness:

Math:

- * **Sixth Grade:** Number Sense- Ratios
Geometry- plane figure attributes
Geometry- Short response: circles
- * **Seventh Grade:** Algebra- Equivalent forms
Algebra- Variable changes
Probability- Event outcomes
- * **Eighth Grade:** Algebra- Equivalent forms
Algebra- Linear equation problems
Geometry- Triangle & quadrilateral properties

Reading:

- * **Sixth and Eighth Grade:**

Vocab. Development- Determining word meanings

- * **Sixth and Eighth Grade:**

Literary Elements- Extended response about characters

- * **Sixth Grade:** Comprehension- Main Ideas
- * **Seventh Grade:** Comprehension- Sequencing
Comprehension- Sequencing: Extended Response
Literary elements- genres
- * **Eighth Grade:** Comprehension- Answering literal/inferred questions

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 an increase in new businesses in the community, we have seen a rise in the mobility rate. There have also been multiple business closures within the local area, which has caused some of our students to leave our school district.
- * Teachers across the curriculum work to assist students in the areas of math and reading.
- * Eighth grade advanced Algebra class assists 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).

- * The reading specialist position will assist those students needing additional reading assistance.
- * Differentiation will be the key for improvement for all middle school students. For some, that will mean RtI interventions.
- * The current math series focuses heavily on algebra concepts, which are being introduced at the elementary level.
- * The RtI program can be evaluated and refined for improved student service.

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?

- * SAT10 Assessments were administered in the fall in grades six through eight.
- * Teachers examined the assessment data from the ISAT testing to develop “Target Goals” in the areas of math and reading, in order to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses. (Refer to I-A)
- * 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 the needs that should be addressed. These assessments are tied to the local objectives, which are matched to the Illinois State Standards. These assessment results provide helpful information both for the group as a whole, as well as for individual students.
- * For the past two years, ThinkLink has been implemented. The data is used for many purposes, including pre and posttests, and as a screener.
- * AutoSkills have been implemented for an intervention and screener, and is currently used with Rtl students.

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

- * Increased co-teaching in math, language arts, science, and literature has helped to improve learning and scores.
- * Tutoring and mentoring programs and Title I have helped to assist individuals to improve in specific subject areas.
- * The reading specialist has been able to implement programs and differentiate instruction to help those with reading needs.
- * Rtl assessment tools help to identify those students in need of academic assistance.
- * Daily grade level team meetings help by having consistent communication on students who seem to be struggling in an area.
- * Academic lunches with the principal have been instituted for those students receiving failing grades on progress reports.
- * Teachers continue to offer assistance to any student who requests to meet for help both during class, as well as outside of the regular school day.

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

- * "Outside of school day" assistance will be available.
- * Teacher collaboration will be a necessary component in order to develop a high quality program.
- * RtI time is important for the success of the program.
- * Time must be allowed for both teacher and student support.

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 Middle School, as well as throughout the district.
- * Consistent parent communication positively affects the middle school learning environment.
- * Both homework and tutoring programs have been a benefit to at-risk students, as well as for students who desire additional assistance.
- * Economically disadvantaged and IEP subgroups need to be an area of focus.
- * An increase in mobility presents additional challenges to the middle school.
- * Some students in the district's outlying communities face geographical restrictions, which makes transportation to events that occur before and after school events impossible.

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.
- * The increase of team teaching at the middle school level has improved student achievement.
- * The utilization of the reading specialist at all grade levels has also aided the students.
- * Some parents have transportation issues, which affects the students' ability to get to school events.

- * RtI identification, monitoring, and supports need to be increased according to student needs.

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

- * 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, parents, and interventionists.
- * Students will benefit from frequent identification and evaluation. The RtI process will be fluid, causing the targeted student groups to change.
- * The implementation of RtI at the middle school continues to improve and evolve. Communication with parents is necessary and beneficial.
- * The middle school will also utilize parent night, parent/teacher conferences, and family nights to educate and inform parents on student achievement and curriculum.

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, RtI, 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/PBLTeacher 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 Middle 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 Thinklink, AutoSkills has assisted in identification and intervention for students needing additional assistance.
- * Co-teaching and paraprofessionals are very beneficial in assisting students of all abilities.
- * The reading specialist assists both students and faculty in developing skills for reading improvement.

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

- * With RtI interventions being utilized at the GCMS Middle School, they are now ready to identify what schedule changes could be made to best assist students at all achievement levels.
- * Determine what class instructor changes could be made in order to best serve the students.
- * Co-teachers and paraprofessional training and collaboration concerning best practices need to be continually monitored and improved.
- * Written expectations for both co-teachers and paraprofessionals need to be communicated and understood by all faculty.
- * The reading strategies position will adapt on a year by year basis, according to student need.

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 |

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, Listserve websites, the Global Connect phone system, and school events.
- * 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.

- * Parents receive progress reports at the midpoint of each nine weeks.
- * Senior citizen involvement through breakfasts, etc. has helped to keep the community informed about the middle school.
- * Parent breakfasts for grades 6,7, and 8 have been well received this year, and provide an opportunity for additional and positive parent contact.

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 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.

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 middle school program are best accepted and implemented when those changes are communicated to the parents.
- * The middle school benefits when parents are given the opportunity to offer their input on an ongoing basis.
- * Communication to parents concerning the area of RtI will benefit students, parents, and faculty.

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?

- Curriculum reviews occur on a rotational basis every seven years. At that time, the objectives are aligned to state standards, and to the new core curriculum, as well. A district-wide scope and sequence is also developed. IN between those curriculum reviews, annual meetings are held in order to locate any areas of weakness that my

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. Achievement gaps can be identified and goals can be determined.
- Continue to refine in the Rtl process will help student achievement.
- Finding additional methods to reach and teach the students through differentiated instruction will serve the students well.
- Evaluation of the schedule and student need will drive the schedule changes for the 2010-2011 school year.
- Continuing to target academic areas and attendance will improve student achievement.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Use RtI to meet individual student needs and challenges.	

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Use RtI to meet individual student needs and challenges.

Objective 1 Description

1. Provide training for teachers and administer universal screeners to students.
2. Identify individual student needs for reading math, and behavior.
3. Adapt student and teacher schedules based on need.
4. Provide collaboration time for staff.
5. Communicate RtI process and purpose to parents and students.
6. Communication and continuity with other buildings in the district will be a necessity.
7. Utilize SAP for behavior intervention.
8. Frequent monitoring of individual student interventions will be a priority.
9. Delineate and communicate responsibilities for paraprofessionals and teachers in co-taught classes.

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

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

Objective 1 Title :

Use RtI to meet individual student needs and challenges.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will take universal screeners to determine how they can best be assisted.	09/01/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	Student schedules will be adapted in order to best address needs and abilities.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	Communicate RtI process to students, including academic and achievement updates.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	Utilize SAP for behavior intervention.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	Students will be informed in the monitoring process, in order to best address academic or behavioral needs.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

Use RtI to meet individual student needs and challenges.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide training for use of the universal screener.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	

2	Work with grade level teams to determine individual needs for reading, math, and behavior.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	Adapt teacher schedules based on need, and communicate information concerning changes.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	Provide collaboration time for staff.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	Communicate RtI process to staff, and in turn, prepare to inform parents and students.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
6	Increase communication and continuity with other buildings within the district.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
7	Utilize SAP for behavior interventions.	09/01/2010	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	
8	Monitor individual student interventions.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
9	Delineate and communicate responsibilities for paraprofessionals and teachers in co-taught classes.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

Use RtI to meet individual student needs and challenges.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Communicate student need to parents concerning RtI by online information, Edline, parent teacher conferences, and parent nights.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	Communicate student student schedule information, as well as any permanent schedule changes that are made through out the year.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	
3	Communicate the RtI process to the parents.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	
4	Communicate the SAP process to the parents. Some parents may be requested to be part of the SAP process.	09/01/2010	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Use RtI to meet individual student needs and challenges.

Monitoring - Include the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities for the objective and identify the person(s) responsible for overseeing the work. Describe the process and measures of success of this objective. (How will school personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

The GCMS Middle School personnel will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities by looking at several types of data:

*Teacher observation

*Teacher evaluation

*Student performance

*Data collection sheets

*SAP monitors, which include: detentions, suspensions, attendance, and tardies

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	Jeremy Darnell	Middle Pchool principal
2	Julie Withrow	Middle School Guidance Counselor
3	Deanna Hunt	RtI Coordinator
4	Joan Ricks	Sixth Grade Team Leader
5	Jenny Allen	Seventh Grade Team Leader
6	Carol Bierman	Eighth Grade Team Leader

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.
- * 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) Parent Night
 - 7) Parent-teacher conferences
 - 8) Family night
 - 9) Midterm grades, quarterly progress reports
 - 10) Parent Breakfasts

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.

Section III- Part B Stakeholder Involvement

The GCMS Middle 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.

- 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	Deanna Hunt	6th Grade Team Leader
2	Jill Gibson	7th Grade Team Leader
3	Mark Berry	8th Grade Team Leader
4	Amy Doman	Middle School Teacher
5	Julie Withrow	Middle School Guidance Counselor
6	Jeremy Darnell	Middle School Principal
7	Sharon Pool	GCMS Director of Student Services

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 mentoring 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, but 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 will become 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:

- * Daily/weekly grade level or 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
- * Web-based workshops
- * Faculty Lunch and Learn programs
- * Faculty Book Clubs

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

☐ 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