

Local Board Approved	11/15/2010
Initial Submission	11/16/2010
Plan Resubmitted	01/12/2011
ISBE Monitoring Completed	02/23/2011

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:	caubry@gcms.k12.il.us	School Email:	lindym@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 - 2010 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	2010-11 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2010-11 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning Year 1

	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
Student Groups	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		77.5			77.5			91		80	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	72.4		Yes	63.8		No			98.8	Yes
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	71.9		Yes	64.9	65.2	Yes			98.7	
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American														
Multiracial/Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities														
Economically Disadvantaged														

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress(AYP)

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. ***
3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 91% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 80% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2009.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 77.5% or above are not printed.

*** Subgroups with fewer than 45 students are not reported. Safe Harbor only applies to subgroups of 45 or more. In order for Safe Harbor to apply, a subgroup must decrease by 10% the percentage of scores that did not meet state standards from the previous year plus meet the other indicators (attendance rate for non-high schools and graduation rate for high schools) for the subgroup. For subgroups that do not meet their Safe Harbor Targets, a 75% confidence interval is applied. Safe Harbor allows schools an alternate method to meet subgroup minimum targets on achievement.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2010 AMAO Report

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 3 - School Information

School Information								
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Attendance Rate (%)	94.9	95.0	95.4	93.8	94.7	94.0	94.3	95.0
Truancy Rate (%)	1.3	0.6	4.8	2.5	0.3	1.0	1.9	0.0
Mobility Rate (%)	12.0	11.4	5.1	10.3	4.7	9.3	14.1	11.2
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	94.0	78.8	91.7	82.3	91.5	90.2	93.8	98.8
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	1.9	1.9	0.9	3.0	1.5	1.9	1.2	0.7
School Population (#)	311	319	344	328	328	318	322	307
Low Income (%)	14.1	16.0	19.2	23.5	23.8	25.2	22.7	24.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.7
White, non-Hispanic (%)	97.1	97.8	96.8	97.0	97.0	97.2	96.0	96.7
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	1.0	0.6	0.9	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	1.0
Hispanic (%)	1.3	0.9	0.6	1.2	2.4	2.5	3.1	2.0
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.6	0.6	1.5	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.3
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

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	-	-
	2010	96.7	1.0	2.0	0.3	-	-
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
	2010	96.5	0.9	1.5	0.3	0.1	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
	2010	52.8	18.8	21.1	4.2	0.2	2.9

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	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
	2010	-	24.4	100.0	95.0	11.2	-	-	0.7	98.8
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
	2010	-	30.8	100.0	95.6	8.7	-	-	0.7	98.8
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2

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

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	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
	2010	307	-	-	-	-	-	63
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
	2010	1,029	89	80	94	76	72	63
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

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

Educator Data is available only for district level

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	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	-
	2010	85	14	51,997	65	35	15	13	-	-
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1
	2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1

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

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

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

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grade 11						
Groups	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	68.3	72.4	66.3	70.7	69.8	68.8
White	70.9	72.0	67.9	70.7	72.2	70.7
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	36.4	-	7.1	40.0
Low Income	53.3	66.7	53.3	-	55.0	42.8

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	59.7	73.7	63.8	67.2	60.3	60.7
White	62.0	73.4	65.4	67.2	60.7	63.8
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	27.3	-	7.1	10.0
Low Income	40.0	41.7	53.3	-	45.0	50.0

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 2010 PSAE scores show that while there was an improvement of 3.5% in the Math Meets and Exceeds score, AYP of 77.5% was not met, due to a total percentage of 63.8%.
- Attendance rate for the 2009-2010 school year was 95%, which was an increase of .7% from the previous year.
- Low income increased by 1.7% for a total of 24.4%
- **The high school dropout rate is at .7%, which is a .5% improvement from the previous year.**
- The high school graduation rate is at 98.8%, which was a .5% increase from the 2009-2009 school year.
- Parent involvement continues to remain at a solid 100%.
- High school enrollment decreased from 2008-2009 by 15 students. The junior class enrollment was at 63, which is down 26 students from the previous year. This class is known for its small numbers.

1/7/2011 Achievement Gap Subgroups: IIRC data shows that there are two

subgroups that need additional focus for improvement in the area of math. The

groups are IEP and Low Income. These subgroups have only been large enough to be

recorded for 2009 and 2010.

PSAE Results: IEP vs. Group Scores

Year	Group PSAE Score-	IEP Math PSAE Score	Spread Between IEP
------	-------------------	---------------------	--------------------

	<i>Meets and Exceeds</i>		<i>Group and Whole Group</i>
2009	71%	7%	64%
2010	71%	10%	61%

PSAE Results- IEP Subgroup

<i>Year</i>	<i>Exceeds</i>	<i>Meets</i>	<i>Below</i>	<i>Warning</i>
2009	0%	7%	57%	36%
2010	10%	05	70%	20%

WorkKeys Results- IEP Subgroup

<i>Year</i>	<i>Levels 5-7</i>	<i>Level 3-4</i>	<i>Levels < 3</i>
2009- IEP	14%	72%	14%
2009-Group	81%	19%	0%
2010	10%	70%	20%
2010-Group	77%	23%	0%

The low income subgroup achievement gap, while not as severe, could also be an area of focus for improvement.

PSAE Results: Low Income Subgroup vs. Group Scores

Year	Group PSAE Score- Meets and Exceeds	Low Income Math PSAE Score	Spread Between Low Income Subgroup and Whole Group
2009	65%	45%	20%
2010	64%	50%	14%

PSAE Results- Low Income Subgroup

Year	Exceeds	Meets	Below	Warning
2009	5%	50%	35%	20%
2010	7%	43%	20%	7%

WorkKeys Results- Low Income Subgroup

Year	Levels 5-7	Level 3-4	Levels < 3
2009- Low Income	45%	45%	10%
2009-Group	78%	22%	0%
2010- Low Income	50%	50%	0%
2010-Group	71%	25%	4%

Individual item analysis in the area of math would be very valuable data from the PSAE test in order to determine specific areas of weakness, such as Algebra, Geometry, etc. Currently, this item analysis is not available either from the PSAE reports or through the IIRC. The GCMS High School will need to analyze local data results in order to make these determinations.

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

Revision of Key Factors for Report Card Data

1/12/11

- *While low income has increased by 1.7%, even though students prefer not to report their low-income status, they need to see the value in doing so.*
- *We lack the appropriate amount of time needed to study assessment tools and student achievement results.*
- *There is a need for increased parental involvement in order to focus on the importance of school attendance, graduation rates, as well as student achievement, especially in the area of Math.*
- *There is a need for math curriculum revision to address the areas of low achievement for “all” students as well as subgroups.*

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

- The focus on math through additional assistance with AutoSkills, co-teaching will need to continue.
- Co-teaching continues to be a vital component in assisting students in the STEM subject areas.
- Continued emphasis in the areas of attendance and graduation will serve our students well.
- Continuing the EPAS process, and also promoting the importance of the PSAE skills for college and career readiness as early as the middle school level could help to improve ability and effort on the PSAE.
- The students will benefit from frequent data analysis done by the entire staff. From this data will stem ideas for assisting students who need help in specific areas.
- A focus needs to be placed on assuring that students of all nationalities achieve in the areas of meets and exceeds for math.
- Grade level at-risk teams need to continue in order to best serve students in need.

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

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

- AutoSkills, MAP test scores, voluntary ACT for freshmen and sophomores, as well as results from EPAS testing done in grades eight through eleven are used to determine areas of strength and weakness for both individual students as well as for groups.
- Data analysis determined that some students were weak in the areas of reading comprehension and also specific math skills.
- Test data indicates that students need additional assistance in the areas of geography, math conversions, and science scientific methods.

- Curriculum-based assessments are utilized throughout the semester in each class to determine mastery, and also to evaluate any needs that need to be addressed, either for the class as a whole, or for individual students.
- Semester exams, which are matched to state standards, are administered at the end of each semester. Again, these results indicate to a teacher the areas where individual students show strengths and weaknesses. It also gives indicators as to changes that the teacher should make in their teaching of a specific objective.

1/11/10 Additonal Analysis

Test	Grade Level	Test Data
PLAN 4/2010	Sophomores	GCMS Math Achievement compared to National Norms
	Class of 2012	17.8%- National Norms
		19.2%- Local 2007-2008 Sophomores
		20.1%- Local 2008–2009 Sophomores
		20.6%- Local 2009-2010 Sophomores
	Sophomores	Average PLAN Math Scores
		18.6- Local 2007-2008 Sophomores
		19.7- Local 2008–2009 Sophomores
		21.1- Local 2009-2010 Sophomores
	Sophomores	48% of students reported needing help in improving math skills

	Sophomores	Weakness: geometry, plane geometry <i>Item analysis not available</i>
EXPLORE 4/2010	Freshmen	16.3%- National Norms
	Class of 2013	17.7%- Local 2008-2009 Freshmen 17.3%- Local 2009-2010 Freshmen
	Freshmen	Average EXPLORE Math Scores 17.1%- Local 2008-2009 Freshmen 16.6% Local 2009-2010 Freshmen
	Freshmen	31% of students reported needing help in improving math skills
	Freshmen	Weakness: geometry <i>Item analysis not available</i>
VOLUNTARY ACT 9/2010	Freshmen, Class of 2014	Weaknesses: (According to item analysis, questions on the following were a weakness)
	Sophomores, Class of 2013	1. Pre Algebra: percents “average speed of” least common denominator signed-number operations
	<i>Many of these students have not yet taken Alg. II, Geometry, or Trig, and some are just</i>	2. Algebra I: multiply binomials

beginning Alg. I

quadratic factorable

difference of squares

estimate a solution

average speed

commutative property

3. **Algebra II:** quadratic solutions

divide expressions

absolute value

literal inequality

distance formula

exponents

number line

absolute value equations

4. **Coordinate Geometry:**

slope

point/slope

circles

understanding domain

linear equation

ellipse intersection

perpendicular equation

5. **Plane Geometry:**

area and Pythagorean theorem

rhombus diagonals

subtracting areas

literal evaluation

circumference

inscribed square apothem

area- solve for radius

application- radius

understanding separate planes

6. **Trigonometry:**

		<p>trigonometric equations</p> <p>right triangle</p> <p>identity</p> <p>right triangle</p>
AutoSkills		<i>Item analysis not available</i>
Fall 2010		
MAP	Class of 2014,2013,2012	number sense
9/10, 1/11		measurement
		data analysis
Semester Exams	All Students	All teachers will do an item analysis of test questions in order to determine areas of weakness that need reteaching. Poor test items will be rewritten.
12/10		

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

1/12/11

- *There is a lack of appropriate time to study assessment tools and student achievement results. This would also include data analysis of MAP, AutoSkills, and EPAS results.*
- *There is a need for teachers and administrators to be trained both in the area of organized data analysis, as well as in the process of test development.*
- *Math teachers need to review data in order to revise their math curriculum to address the low achievement areas for the “all” students group, as well as the subgroups.*

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

- Through data analysis, the teachers determined a list of students who would benefit from additional class time during advisory where they would receive math or reading assistance.
- Students with failing grades or missing work in specific subject areas would be required to attend before or after-school work sessions with the subject area teacher.
- Mandatory sports study tables before school will occur twice weekly for all students in a sport who carry either two “D’s” or an “F” in any subject. Any student who has one “D” is required to attend tables once a week. The Athletic Director is in charge of the tables, and all coaches are apprised weekly of students who have academic issues.
- Students with failing grades or missing work are required to attend a three hour study session on both Thursdays and Fridays in an effort to complete the unfinished assignments.
- Teachers should use chapter and semester exams to make determinations of what adjustments need to be made in teaching the content for the next semester.
- Grade level at-risk teams need to continue in order to best serve students in need.

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

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

- Parent participation is strength at the GCMS High School, as well as throughout the district. Consistent parent communication positively affects the high school learning environment.
- The high school has mentoring programs for at-risk students. This has been a benefit for them in many ways.
- Strong graduation and attendance rates have been a positive influence on achievement, though these areas must be constantly monitored and evaluated. Student attendance increased by .7% to 95.5%. The ten-year average is 94.53%. The graduation rate increased by 5% to 98.8%.
- The dropout rate was .7%, which was a .5% decrease from the 2008-2009 statistics.
- Economically disadvantaged and IEP subgroups need to be an area of focus.
- A decrease in mobility may be an asset to the high school with future scores.
- District-wide curriculum committees exist to review each academic discipline. This is also a good avenue to discuss assessment results and student need. Objectives at the high school level are now matched to Core Standards.
- Low-income percentage increased by 1.7% to 24.4%.

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

- *There is a need for increased parent involvement.*
- *Students who are achieving at a low level in math have the opportunity to receive assistance both before and after school. Evaluating the results of this assistance for specific students is needed.*
- *The math curriculum is aligned to the state standards and is now also addresses the core curriculum. Math teachers need to frequently review and revise the curriculum in order to address the needs of “all” students as well as those in subgroups.*
- While literacy is not a large problem at the high school, it is important that “alliteracy” be addressed. This issue can cause problems in math comprehension, as well.

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

- There is a need for a math tutor to assist students who would like extra help throughout the day.
- Better parent communication and increased parent involvement and academic awareness are necessary for all students to succeed, but especially for those at-risk or under-performing students.
- Additional parent contact for those at-risk students would help students to find success.
- All students need to take responsibility for their education, including being willing to seek out additional opportunities for help when necessary.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)
Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

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

The GCMS High School professional development for 2010-2012 will have several goals to accomplish. First the teachers will be trained to do both student and item analysis of all testing data, such as EPAS, AutoSkills, and MAP. From there, data will be evaluated frequently through out the year in order to target both students who need additional assistance, as well as areas of study that need to have an increased or revised focus. Teachers will also investigate the achievement gap in various subject areas.

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

The GCMS High School is fortunate to have teacher leaders who see areas of need for both students and teachers, and are willing to spearhead a project or program to address the needs. GCMS teachers see the need to help all students take responsibility and ownership for their learning. *1/12/11 The results of the philosophy and implementation need to be documented and evaluated as the programs are put into action.* Co-teaching has been very beneficial in assisting students of all abilities. GCMS University is a mentoring program that helps our new teachers learn about the workings of the school, and also best practice for helping our student to reach their highest potential. *1/12/11 Teachers will continue to need to be trained in the areas of data analysis and assessment development to best assist our math curriculum for "all" students, as well as for the student subgroups.*

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

- After determining which students need additional assistance, differentiated instruction will be planned and implemented. This will be a fluid process throughout the year.
- Data analysis will help to drive instruction, and also determine best educational practice for each student.
- At least one book study will be conducted in the 2010-2011 school year, and again in the 2011-2012 school year that addresses needs concerning student achievement.

- Professional development will continue to center around improving student achievement.
- Teachers will align both their curriculum and assessments to the Common Core Standards and the Illinois State Standards, where appropriate.
- GCMS University will continue to train and assist teachers who are new to the district.

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

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

For the past ten years, the GCMS High School has enjoyed parent participation at 100%. Parents regularly attend academic, fine arts, sporting events, open houses, Falcon Pride Night, and honors ceremonies. Teachers and administrators communicate frequently with parents through e-mail, Lumen Student Information System, listserv websites including the parent listserv, the school website, and the Global Connect phone system. Parents receive progress reports at the midterm of each nine weeks. Lumen also affords the capability of teachers sending notes to parents via the system. It is also a regular occurrence for each grade level at-risk team and or RtI team to meet with individual parents. **As part of the student transition process from the middle school to the high school, parents are invited to a meeting that describes the requirements and events of GCMS High School.** Finally, 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.

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 access to Lumen has opened communication between parents, students, and staff in order to promote academic success.

- Technology has improved parent communication in multiple ways for our district.
- While parents receive the Parents' Guide to Illinois Learning Goals and Standards, most parents are not clear on the required learning expectations for each subject.

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

- Any changes and improvements that are made to the high school program are best accepted and implemented when those changes are communicated to the parents.
- Our improved and increased communication methods will improve student contact.
- The high school benefits when parents are given the opportunity to offer their input on an ongoing basis. In the 2010-2012 school years, 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?

Based on the PSAE results and the results of the MAP testing, the GCMS High School needs to continue its focus on improving math scores, both for students of all nationalities, but also for the subgroups.

Formative assessment scores will be analyzed in order to best serve the students' needs. While success is found in the areas of attendance and graduation, continued emphasis need to be place in these areas to assure that progress continues.

GCMS High School has found success in their team-teaching approach, and also increasing teacher availability before and after school. In the past, some students took advantage of this on a voluntary basis. Now, some teachers are making it mandatory attendance for those students who have failing grades or missing work.


While the high school has enjoyed good parent involvement, some of the at-risk students do not have a lot of parental support. Increased parent involvement opportunities may help with this problem. Some students have been motivated by the PSAE incentives; others still do not see the value in working to their potential. Perhaps additional parent involvement could assist in this area.

Data analysis is a very worthwhile, but time-consuming process. Time has been scheduled so that teachers can work as a group to analyze both student and test item data.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	While our current achievement in math is 63.8%, all students will make at least 85%in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012 or Safe Harbor.	1,

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

-  1. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

While our current achievement in math is 63.8%, all students will make at least 85%in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012 or Safe Harbor.

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. Determining those specific skills and the students who need additional assistance will be accomplished through data analysis.
2. Include subject areas besides math to incorporate additional math skills, as well as reading across the curriculum, which will also assist students when working with math high level thinking skills.
3. Evaluate the goals and philosophy of homework that is assigned, dedicating staff 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. Continue to find methods to help students realize the importance of a strong work ethic and school success. The importance of testing such as MAP, EPAS, and the PSAE will also be a focus.
5. Increase parent involvement at the high school level, through additional communication, parent membership on committees, and the use of parent volunteers.
6. Devise a plan to reinforce the importance and value of consistent attendance.
7. Determine methods to improve graduation rates, which will include methods to educate students on the importance of earning a high school degree.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

1. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in math is 63.8%, all students will make at least 85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012 or Safe Harbor.

		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	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Credit Retrieval Program- E20/20 will allow students to earn online credits. This can also occur during school hours.	06/01/2010	05/31/2012	After School	Other	1,050
3	Incentive Program: Students will take part in an incentive program in order to show that consistent attendance and academic success is a priority.	08/30/2010	05/30/2012	During School	Local Funds	600
4	Teacher/Student Mentoring- At-risk students will have a mentor to monitor and assist them throughout the school year.	08/30/2010	05/30/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
	Before and After School Help-Students will have assistance available					

5	before and after school. This service may be required attendance for some students.	08/30/2010	05/30/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
6	Math 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.	11/01/2010	05/18/2012	During School	Other	5,500
7	Summer Bridge Program- Incoming freshmen students who could benefit from remedial study will be asked to take part in this program.	07/18/2011	07/27/2012	Summer School	Local Funds	2,600
8	Math Problem of the Week- All students will take part in a "Math Problem of the Week."	08/30/2010	05/30/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
9	Sports Study Tables- Students involved in a sport who have difficulty with a class will be required to attend early morning study tables twice weekly.	08/30/2010	05/25/2012	Before School	Other	0
10	Reading Intervention Pull-out Program- Students who could benefit from extra reading skills will take part in this pull-out program that will include AutoSkills work. In turn, improved comprehension will increase ability in reading and comprehending math problems.	08/30/2010	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	8,000
11	AutoSkills Math Practice- Specific classes will improve math skills by utilizing the AutoSkills program at least twice weekly, which will provide differentiated instruction.	08/30/2010	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	8,000
12	Formative assessments using AutoSkills, STAR, and MAP will be given to students to determine student need in the areas of math and reading.	08/30/2010	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	8,000
13	EPAS testing will be given to students in grades 8-11 in order to prepare them and also to indicate areas of strength and weakness. Students will receive feedback on scores.	09/06/2010	04/23/2012	During School	Local Funds	1,600
14	All students will receive weekly targeted instruction aligned to the Illinois Learning Standards, practice, and review on math skills as indicated by local objectives and state standards so that they can increase their performance to 85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012 or by Safe Harbor.	08/23/2010	05/30/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
15	Math test reteach and retest periods will be available for all math students.	08/30/2010	05/31/2012	Before School	Local Funds	0

16	Incoming Freshmen students will be invited to attend a freshmen transition day to assist and communicate to them about their high school career. This will culminate with an all-school cookout, sponsored by the Board of Education.	08/19/2010	09/10/2012	During School	Local Funds	200
----	---	------------	------------	---------------	-------------	-----

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

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in math is 63.8%, all students will make at least 85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012 or Safe Harbor.

		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	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	1,000
2	GCMS Institutes and Workshops- These days will be used to offer teachers professional development that will cover the objective in the high school improvement plan.	08/19/2010	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	1,800
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.	08/19/2010	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
4	Reading Strategy of the Month- A new reading strategy will be presented at the monthly faculty meetings with of the goal of implementing the strategy during the month, as well as tying it into math objectives.	08/19/2010	06/01/2012	Before School	Local Funds	0
5	Teacher/Student Mentoring- Teachers will mentor and connect with one student throughout the school year, 1/7/2011 "At the start of the school year Mentor Coordinator KiLee Lidwell McFerren will provide a short training for teachers who will be mentoring students. An update will be provided to the coordinator at the end of each nine weeks, and an evaluation will also take place at the end of the school year in order to improve the program and help to assist the students in order to	08/19/2010	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

	develop and maintain a relationship. Hopefully, this will give the student the incentive to improve their achievement level.					
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.	08/19/2010	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
7	Curriculum Departmental Meetings- Departments will convene in order to assess both student and curricular needs.	08/19/2010	06/01/2012	After School	Local Funds	0
8	Attendance Committee- An attendance committee will be formed to plan an incentive program to put into place during the 2010-2012 school years.	11/01/2010	06/01/2012	After School	Local Funds	0
9	Teachers will have the opportunity to learn more about the low income subgroup through a book study on, "Frameworks of Poverty" by Ruby Payne.	11/08/2010	05/16/2011	Before School	Local Funds	450
10	Added 1/11/11- All teachers will do an item analysis of test questions in order to determine areas of weakness that need reteaching. Poor test items will be rewritten.	01/14/2011	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in math is 63.8%, all students will make at least 85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	The GCMS High School Parent Advisory Committee will be continued for the 2010-2012 school years, but will also be enlarged in order to gain additional parent and community input and ideas. This parent outreach will hopefully help the teachers and administrators gain insight as to how to better serve the students.	08/23/2010	05/31/2012	After School	Local Funds	0
	Parent Volunteers- In an effort to increase parent communication and					

2	awareness of high school programs, parents will be invited to volunteer to assist with school projects.	08/23/2010	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Parent-Teacher Conferences, Falcon Pride Night and other school events- Parent involvement and through school activities will continue to be a priority.	08/19/2010	06/04/2012	After School	Local Funds	0
4	Teacher websites, Lumen data system which is a parent portal that provides a plethora of school information, podcasts, and vodcasts, and community newspaper articles will continue to be available to parents, as another means of communication concerning student achievement and student activities.	08/23/2010	05/31/2012	After School	Local Funds	0
5	Parent Contact- Teachers will make a concerted effort to contact parents about both positive achievement, as well as academic concerns, especially in the area of math achievement.	08/23/2010	05/31/2012	After School	Local Funds	0
6	Freshmen Parents will be invited to attend a transition meeting to inform them about their students' high school career.	08/19/2010	08/19/2011	After School	Local Funds	0
7	Parent and community mentors will volunteer their time to assist at-risk students, either with homework help, or just to spend time with them.	08/18/2010	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
8	The GCMS High School offers many opportunities for parent involvement, such as: booster club, band boosters, student activities, and parent group meetings, such as the junior class parent meetings. These opportunities provide a chance for parents to connect with other parents, staff, and students.	08/18/2010	05/31/2012	After School	Local Funds	0
9	Parents will receive the curriculum outline for all high school classes.	08/02/2010	05/31/2012	Before School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in math is 63.8%, all students will make at least 85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012 or Safe Harbor.

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:

- 1) A "to-do" list will be created with a time line, in order to determine who will be responsible for each strategy and task.
- 2) Data analysis will become a routine that will occur frequently at the high school level, in order to determine math progress as well as student need.
- 3) Department meetings will occur often in order to evaluate progress.
- 4) At-risk teams for each grade level will meet throughout the year to determine students who need extra help.
- 5) A teacher team will be developed that will be part of the student evaluation process for reading intervention, E20/20, and other assessment programs.
- 6) Faculty meetings will provide a venue to discuss plans and progress of the various strategies and student needs.
- 7) Parent advisory meetings will give the principal a change to connect with the parents in order to gather input on a variety of topics.
- 8) *Added 1/7/2011 Monthly updates and reports of the high school SIP progress will be made by the principal at faculty meetings, and the timelines will also be reviewed.*

2010-2012 High School SIP Timeline

DATES	TIME	STRATEGY GROUP	STRATEGY
Jun-10			
6/1/2010-5/31/2012	After School	Students	E20/20 begins
Jul-10			

7/18/2011-7/28/2010 Aug. 2010	During School	Students	Pending local funding availability, Summer Bridge Program will take place
8/02/10-5/31/2012	Before School	Parents	Parents will be given curriculum outlines at registration, or upon moving to the district
8/18/2010- 5/31- 2012	Before School	Faculty	GCMS University begins for new teachers
8/19/2010 - 6/01/2012	During School	Faculty	Data Analysis and Cross Curricular Work
8/19/2010 - 6/01/2012	After School	Faculty	Curriculum/Departmental Meetings begin
8/19/2010 - 6/01/2012	During School	Faculty	Googledocs and E20/20 Inservices
8/19/2010 - 6/01/2012	During School	Faculty	GCMS Institutes and Workshops begin
8/19/20-9/10/2012	After School	Students	Freshman Transition Day
8/19/2010-8/19/2011	After School	Parents	Freshmen Parent Meetings
8/19/2010 - 6/01/2012	During School	Faculty	Reading Strategy of the month introduced at monthly faculty meetings
8/18/2010- 5/31- 2012	During School	Parents	Parents and community mentors will begin working with students
8/19/2010 - 6/04/2012	After School	Parents	Activities to encourage parent involvement begins
8/23/2010-5/30/2012	During School	Students	Math Targeted Instruction begins
8/23/2010-5/30/2012	After School	Parents	High School Parent Advisory Committee begins their meetings

8/23/2010-5/30/2012	During School	Parents	Parent Volunteering begins
8/23/2010-5/30/2012	After School	Parents	Technological communications for parents commence
8/23/2010-5/30/2012	After School	Parents	Parent contact by the teachers will commence
8/30/2010-5/30/2012	Before School	Students	Math Test Reteach and Retest times begin
8/30/2010-5/25/2012	During School	Students	Catch-up Café begins

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	GCMS High School Principal
2	Mike Allen	Athletic Director
3	KiLee Lidwell McFerren	Art Teacher
4	Jenny DeSchepper	Social Worker
5	Mike McDevitt	Guidance Counselor
6	Erin Nuss	Reading Specialist
7	Susan Riley	Math Teacher

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

Part A. Parent Notification*

This section describes how the plan has been developed and reviewed and identifies the support in place to ensure implementation.

Parent Notification - Describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand. *(*Requirement for Title I Schools only.)*

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

Part B. Stakeholder Involvement

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

The GCMS High School planned several steps to involve stakeholders in the SIP process:

1. May 2010: Teacher representatives met to review the 2009-2010 assessment strengths and weaknesses in order to determine goals for the coming school year. These teachers also represented the high school departments so that all teachers were represented, and both internal and external factors for progress and improvement were discussed. Principal Mike Lindy brought ideas and concerns that were identified throughout the year by parents at the principal advisory meeting.
2. June 2010: The GCMS Board of Education was presented with all of the school and the district improvement plans. Goals and procedures were explained in detail.
3. September 2010: The GCMS High School SIP was presented at the GCMS Curriculum Coordinating Committee. This was an opportunity to communicate the goals and procedures to teacher representatives from other buildings, as well as student and parent representatives.
4. October 2010: The GCMS High School SIP was written for the 2010-2012 school years using the Illinois State Board of Education Monitoring prompt as the rubric to determine if the School Improvement Plan was aligned to the criteria.
5. October 2010: The GCMS High School SIP was presented to the faculty, including special education teachers for the 2010-2012 school years using the Illinois State Board of Education Monitoring prompt as the rubric to determine if the School Improvement Plan was aligned to the criteria.
6. October 2010: The GCMS High School SIP was presented to the GCMS High School Principal Advisory Committee, which is composed of high school parent representatives, the principal, teacher representatives, and the district curriculum director. The SIP was read and discussed using the Illinois State Board of Education Monitoring prompt as the rubric to determine if the School Improvement Plan was aligned to the criteria.
7. October 2010: The GCMS High School SIP was submitted for a peer review at the Champaign Ford County Regional Office of Education (ROE). The SIP was read and

discussed using the Illinois State Board of Education Monitoring prompt as the rubric to determine if the School Improvement Plan was aligned to the criteria.

8. November 2010: The GCMS High School SIP was submitted for review at the GCMS Board of Education Meeting. The SIP was read and discussed using the Illinois State Board of Education Monitoring prompt as the rubric to determine if the School Improvement Plan was aligned to the criteria.
9. November 2010: The 2010-2012 School Improvement Plan will be shared with all high school staff.

	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
12	Susie Tongate	Parent

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.

Members of the School Improvement Team from GCMS participated in a Peer Review Session hosted by ROE School Works on October 28, 2010. During the session we presented our plan to other educators from around the area (see list below). Each member of the Peer Review Team read the plan, asked clarifying questions about action plan components, discussed implementation of strategies/activities, and posed questions about monitoring processes. After discussion the team provided us with feedback and presented suggestions for strategies and activities that could be incorporated into the plan. The Peer Review Team members were:

*Michelle Kimbro- Oakwood

*Tara Wienke- PBL

*Sarah Heller- Oakwood

*Vanessa Bunch- Catlin

*Michael Lindy- GCMS

*Sharon Pool- GCMS

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 first implemented in 2004. Gene Everett, then Induction Coordinator, is an integral part of the successful program. He coordinates the training and in-service events for the new teachers. Gen 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 town 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 from 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:

1. Team meetings
2. Staff development
3. Out-of-district conferences and workshop (Limited for 2010-2012)
4. School improvement teams, which address and plan improvement goals for the coming year.
5. 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 Champaign Ford County ROE will offer workshops on preparing and peer evaluating the SIP. They will also provide workshops to assist teachers in raising student achievement for the ISAT and PSAE. Again, due to limited funds, few teachers will be allowed to take advantage of these workshops, due to prohibitive costs.

The high school will identify any state resources that best benefits the needs of GCMS high school, 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.

	Name	Title
1	Mary Beth Johnson	ROE Schoolworks

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 11/15/2010

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 (OPTIONAL)

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS☐ Yes ☐ No

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES☐ Yes ☐ 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]

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

PART I - COMMENTS

December 20, 2010

Overall, the Data Analysis section is well written.

Data Analysis (Report Card) provides a good overview. The plan lacks specificity such as listing areas in Math where problems exist in (e.g., Geometry, Algebra). **Although not** required, it is suggested that you begin analyzing the data for the sub-groups Students with Disabilities and Low Income. These students are included in your "All" category and analysis of their data will be beneficial for proactive planning.

Data Analysis (Local Data): Local assessment refers to the results of AutoSkills, MAP, ACT, and EPAS. Inclusion of the data is needed to add clarity to the conclusions.

Key Factors are written as next steps rather than factors. Example: Lack of time to complete in-depth data analysis.

Description of objectives adds clarity and provides solid foundation for strategies and activities. Nice combination of commercial programs and locally developed initiatives that target areas of deficiency.

Objective 1/Professional Development Strategy 5-Is there professional development to support the Teacher/Student Mentoring program?

Monitoring: Utilizing a timeline would strengthen the monitoring plan. In addition, a description of how staff will be made aware of the progress and level of implementation of the

plan would be beneficial.

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN	
PARENT NOTIFICATION	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only) [C]
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the SIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes? [C]
PEER REVIEW	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Is the peer review process described <u>and</u> 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	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 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	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> 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

December 20, 2010

Very well written plan.

This plan has been reviewed by Area IV ARRA consultants. Gibson City-Melvin-Sibley High School Improvement Plan will be recommended for implementation after revision/consultation with your local ROE. Updates to the improvement plan should be completed in the same template section(s) as the original submission by January 13, 2011. Dating of each revision to the plan is required so that updates are readily apparent.

Date: February 4, 2011

The staff of ROE SchoolWorks has concluded a second review of this plan. No further updates to this improvement plan are necessary at this time. The GCMS High School Improvement Plan is recommended for implementation with the assistance of ROE SchoolWorks ARRA consultants.