

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	140160990022003		
District Name:	Cicero SD 99	School Name:	Columbus East Elem School
Superintendent:	Donna Adamic	Principal:	Joyce Hodan
District Address:	5110 W 24th St	School Address:	3100 S 54th Ave
City/State/Zip:	Cicero,IL 60804 2948	City/State/Zip:	Cicero,IL 60804 3953
District Telephone#:	Label 7088634856 Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	7086526085 Extn: 224
District Email:	dadamic@cicd99.edu	School Email:	jhodan@cicd99.edu
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			

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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status Choice	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2009-10 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning Year 1

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	56.9		No	68.4		Yes	95.7	Yes		
White														
Black														
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	58.0	52.9	Yes	68.9		Yes	95.9			
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	51.4	45.5	Yes	61.1	62.6	Yes	96.1		
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	20.3		No	43.8		No			
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	54.9	53.3	Yes	68.0		Yes	95.7		

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:	Comprehensive
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in reading?	No
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in math?	Yes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

School Information								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	94.7	94.8	95.3	95.1	94.4	94.6	95.3	95.7
Truancy Rate (%)	0.8	0.4	-	0.2	0.3	4.5	8.7	2.9
Mobility Rate (%)	23.3	23.8	15.0	19.6	17.5	19.4	14.9	12.5
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	660	693	620	560	618	654	629	628
Low Income (%)	71.4	85.3	88.7	92.3	87.5	85.3	92.2	93.2
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	28.5	17.5	36.0	35.7	46.4	35.9	55.6	53.2
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	4.4	2.9	4.7	4.5	3.2	2.3	2.9	2.5
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.6	0.6	1.0	1.4	1.3	2.1	2.5	4.3
Hispanic (%)	94.5	96.0	94.4	94.1	95.0	95.6	94.6	92.7
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.3	0.3	-	-	0.3	-	-	-
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.2	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	-	0.5

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	6.6	0.8	92.6	-	-	-
	2001	6.0	0.5	93.4	0.2	-	-
	2002	4.4	0.6	94.5	0.3	0.2	-
	2003	2.9	0.6	96.0	0.3	0.3	-
	2004	4.7	1.0	94.4	-	-	-
	2005	4.5	1.4	94.1	-	-	-
	2006	3.2	1.3	95.0	0.3	-	0.2
	2007	2.3	2.1	95.6	-	-	-
	2008	2.9	2.5	94.6	-	-	-
	2009	2.5	4.3	92.7	-	-	0.5
D I S T R I C T	2000	8.0	0.6	90.8	0.5	0.1	-
	2001	6.3	0.7	92.3	0.7	-	-
	2002	6.6	0.6	92.4	0.4	-	-
	2003	4.8	0.7	94.2	0.3	-	-
	2004	4.6	1.1	94.0	0.3	-	-
	2005	4.0	1.2	94.5	0.3	-	-
	2006	2.9	1.6	95.1	0.2	-	0.2
	2007	2.5	1.7	95.4	0.2	-	0.1
	2008	2.4	2.1	95.1	0.2	-	0.2
	2009	2.6	2.1	94.6	0.2	-	0.4
	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	27.0	66.4	100.0	94.6	23.4	5	0.8	-	-
	2001	15.8	84.0	100.0	94.2	34.8	1	0.2	-	-
	2002	28.5	71.4	100.0	94.7	23.3	5	0.8	-	-
	2003	17.5	85.3	100.0	94.8	23.8	3	0.4	-	-
	2004	36.0	88.7	100.0	95.3	15.0	-	-	-	-
	2005	35.7	92.3	100.0	95.1	19.6	1	0.2	-	-
	2006	46.4	87.5	100.0	94.4	17.5	2	0.3	-	-
	2007	35.9	85.3	96.5	94.6	19.4	29	4.5	-	-
	2008	55.6	92.2	97.2	95.3	14.9	54	8.7	-	-
	2009	53.2	93.2	96.5	95.7	12.5	19	2.9	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	41.1	67.7	100.0	94.9	31.9	196	1.7	-	-
	2001	48.2	69.9	95.6	94.6	32.6	146	1.2	-	-
	2002	48.7	71.8	94.8	94.8	30.4	146	1.2	-	-
	2003	48.8	75.4	98.1	95.4	37.6	66	0.6	-	-
	2004	46.3	76.4	98.2	95.3	33.2	488	3.9	-	-
	2005	44.2	78.7	97.5	95.1	28.3	419	3.3	-	-
	2006	45.8	75.0	99.1	95.0	23.0	467	3.7	-	-
	2007	44.6	77.7	98.8	95.1	21.7	663	5.4	-	-
	2008	38.6	82.6	98.7	94.9	22.8	1,198	9.7	-	-
	2009	55.5	84.7	97.4	95.7	14.3	330	2.5	-	-
	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	625	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	651	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	660	-	54	112	219	180	-
	2003	693	-	50	105	198	203	-
	2004	620	-	162	96	-	-	-
	2005	560	-	-	190	-	-	-
	2006	618	-	-	335	-	-	-
	2007	654	-	-	296	-	-	-
	2008	629	-	-	309	-	-	-
	2009	628	-	116	202	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	11,917	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	12,577	1,500	1,488	1,377	1,226	1,125	-
	2002	12,972	1,507	1,473	1,431	1,282	1,199	-
	2003	13,276	1,531	1,497	1,430	1,336	1,261	-
	2004	13,479	1,490	1,514	1,463	1,415	1,315	-
	2005	13,624	1,561	1,485	1,458	1,383	1,403	-
	2006	13,528	1,474	1,516	1,434	1,385	1,348	-
	2007	13,458	1,507	1,440	1,444	1,302	1,353	-
	2008	13,552	1,533	1,482	1,410	1,332	1,296	-
	2009	13,713	1,521	1,515	1,475	1,392	1,325	-
	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	608	11	37,131	66	34	23	-	-	-
	2001	617	11	38,271	68	32	24	-	-	-
	2002	619	11	39,521	67	33	25	-	14	1
	2003	675	10	42,548	63	37	23	-	16	3
	2004	751	10	47,037	64	36	21	-	16	1
	2005	820	9	48,677	66	34	19	-	17	1
	2006	785	9	51,891	63	37	20	-	15	1
	2007	734	10	54,358	64	36	21	-	8	5
	2008	740	10	55,817	58	42	21	-	4	3
2009	740	10	56,975	57	43	22	-	3	3	
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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	48.8	34.5	40.0	41.1	48.1	41.5	58.5
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53.9	33.3	41.6	42.3	48.8	41.4	58.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	47.3	-	-	65.2	52.9	32.1	47.6
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.1	-	-	5.9	-	5.9	19.0
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46.7	31.8	45.7	37.9	47.7	41.1	58.0

	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	-	-	49.6	57.5	52.9	57.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	50.8	57.4	52.2	58.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	49.2	63.4	44.2	50.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	18.8	4.0	15.0	13.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	51.2	55.8	51.9	55.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	75.5	57.2	43.7	57.8	70.2	63.2	70.8
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	72.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76.5	57.4	47.9	57.7	69.2	62.9	70.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76.4	-	-	69.6	70.6	54.5	57.2
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59.1	-	-	23.5	-	25.0	38.1
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	75.8	57.8	50.0	57.3	69.9	61.6	71.3

	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	-	-	70.6	70.4	67.7	61.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	73.0	71.5	67.6	63.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	75.4	82.1	62.1	54.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	56.3	16.0	23.8	26.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	68.6	70.1	67.5	60.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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?*

Looking first at our AYP Status Report, it is evident that we need to concentrate on instruction received by our special education population. This population was not evident as a separate subgroup in our previous reports and affect our scores significantly. We are doing remarkably well in our attendance rates and have significantly improved in our truancy rate. All of our students were in attendance at the time of testing. A closer examination of the Data Analysis section in depth illustrates more detailed contributions of all subgroups to our overall ratings.

While examining the data provided from our school report cards, it is interesting to note that in grade five that there has been an overall growth in the percentage of Meets/Exceeds in the areas of both reading (41.1% to 58.5%) and math (57.8% to 70.8%) during the past four years. This is extremely evident in the special education subgroup. Although the scores are very low, there were double digit gains in each subject area (reading 5.9% to 19% and math 25% to 38.1%). If this continues, we will be able to meet safe harbor during the upcoming school year. It is also wonderful to note that both 4th and 5th grade overall percentages met the newest state score target of 70%. In sixth grade, there has been a consistent gain in Reading scores over the four year span, from 49.6% to 57.7%. The math scores have dropped and this appears to be attributed to all subgroups, recognized or not. Our fourth grade population, now in its second year for our school, met the state score target for math (scoring 75.5%) and even had a much higher special education score than the other two grades (59.1%). Reading proved to be a much larger challenge for special education students in fourth grade, with an overall score of 9.1%. This may have contributed greatly to the 48.8% overall score for fourth graders on reading.

Further review reveals that in all grades our LEP population has begun a positive trend in scoring just two years since the disappearance of IMAGE testing. In grade five, both reading and math had positive uptrends for the LEP population, and in sixth grade reading also improved for the LEP group. Another indicator of positive growth can be found in district data provided by the Language Minority Services dept. They compiled comparison data between school sites with transitional pilot programs and those with traditional self-contained bilingual programs. Math in sixth grade fell slightly for the LEP group, but also for all other subgroups as well. Our fourth grade class, had extremely high math scores as they continue on to fifth grade for the 2010 school year.

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

1. The addition of a special education (IEP) subgroup to our overall composition.
2. The number of students that are currently enrolled in our bilingual/transitional classrooms and the number of limited English students enrolled in our special education programs.
3. Lack of consistency in differentiated instructional practices in reading and math instruction to meet the needs of individual students.
4. Newly enrolled students arriving in our school (and district) at any of our grade levels with severe reading deficits. (illustrated in local data: MAP, DRA, lexile charting)

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

1. Identifying student reading performance levels (early in their arrival to our site) with reliable assessment tools and providing staff with information regarding the progress levels about individual students will aid in planning for individual students needs, address differentiating and tailoring activities, and increase reading scores of individual students.
2. Targeting student individual instructional needs will assist in selection of students for levels of intervention and/or additional activities such as additional support in reading/math instruction.
3. Exposing LEP students to applicable terminology/vocabulary and instruction in the content areas in both English and Spanish will increase their performance on math assessments (as well as other content areas) . This would include students in general education and special education that are ELL students.
4. A focus on reading comprehension and instruction at all grade levels will provide increased achievement in individual reading items on assessment including the comprehension of literature and student identification of comprehension strategies.

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?

MAP - Measure of Academic Progress

This test is a state-aligned computerized adaptive assessment program that gives educators the information they need to improve teaching and learning. The district is currently administering this test to students in grades 3-8 three times a year. The results help educators make student-focused, data-driven decisions. In our MAP testing this past year (grades 4-6), the teachers were able to utilize a recording sheet for students who were functioning 2 or more years below grade level in reading comprehension and vocabulary. Teachers were able to extrapolate the students that were "below" or "academic warning" on ISAT and divide them according to grade and RIT (Rasch Unit Score). This was helpful in the identification of struggling students at each grade level. In 2008-2009, the staff examined Columbus East students that ranked below the median RIT range on two of the four reading subtests. The data showed that in reading comprehension 94 of our students out of 619 were below the median RIT and in vocabulary 101 students were below. It is important to note that only students with a 4.0 level of English proficiency on ACCESS were included in these results. An analysis of the subtest data demonstrates that 15-18 percent of the Columbus East students were in need of additional focused instruction in the areas of vocabulary development and comprehension/reading strategies to support literacy development. Similar data comparison was conducted with the Math MAP scores. Subtest data indicated that 83 of our students were below the median RIT score for Data Probability and Analysis and 93 were below in Number Sense out of 619 students. This clearly indicates that 13-15% of our students were in need of additional focused instruction in the areas of Number Sense and Data Probability.

Read 180 Data

Read 180 is a comprehensive teaching system that provides an instructional program, provides a clear instructional path, integrated professional development, and resources for assessing students and differentiating instruction. During the 2008-2009 school year, seventeen students at the sixth grade level were involved in the program. Utilizing their MAP results along with the Read 180 assessment results, it was determined that 59% of the students increased their scores. This was in comparison to a sample group of 24 students of whom only 8 increased scores with the core curriculum.

ISEL Assessment

Illinois Snapshots of Early Literacy. This test will be administered individually to students using measures based on research. Teachers will administer the test using a hand held personal digital assistant. The two main areas of focus will be reading fluency and reading comprehension. The assessment will provide immediate information about students' progress to help guide instruction. Teachers will then address the deficient areas. We do not yet have results of this testing.

Local DRA (Diagnostic reading assessment) scores along with any available lexile scores were provided to the teachers on classroom basis to utilize while forming the beginning

guided reading groups and to plan lessons for said groups. This data, collected by classroom teachers and utilized with selected students, showed that roughly 5-10% of our students are reading at least 2 or more years below grade level.

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

1. Reading level of students upon entering Columbus East School. This would include students at all grade levels and in all subgroups including special education.
2. Deficits in reading due to student and instructional factors (ie: instructional practices, lack of formative and diagnostic assessments, lack of early accurate identification of reading levels, lack of parental involvement, attendance)
3. Limited English proficiency levels of students.

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

1. Early assessment and teacher preparation work on MAP/ISEL analysis for individual students.
2. Independent DRA, and progress monitoring of individual students, particularly those in the bottom 20% per classroom.
3. Consideration of professional development focus on differentiated instruction.
4. Additional assessment tools for measuring reading and math progress.

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?*

Students and staff take great pride in belonging to our school community. Our school mission statement states "Columbus East will support and motivate students in developing a love of learning that will help them to develop the tools needed to become resourceful individuals. We will strive to prepare our students to become critical thinkers through differentiated instruction while maintaining a well balanced curriculum. As part of the community, Columbus East is a committed participant of ensuring that a positive

environment exists for our students." Our students are aware of our mission and our staff is striving for completing the mission. We currently house 577 students. We have 25 homerooms and we house students in grade 4 through 6. Many of our students arrive by bus and still others transfer in throughout the year from other school districts. A majority of our families also have students attending one or more additional schools and this does pose a challenge in eliciting parent involvement. It is very helpful for us to be an intermediate grade center. Having a large number of teachers in each grade level fosters productive articulation and support.

Columbus East School is currently on Level One of academic early warning. Prior to the 2008-2009 we were recognized as a Spotlight School and had attained AYP status. We have many recognizable attributes in our school. Staff members are heavily involved in the examination and analysis of data. They have been trained in the administration of individual student assessments and the interpretation of other acquired scores. This has resulted in earlier identification of the students in need of support. This year our staff is beginning the process outlined in RTI. This process has involved a study of our current curricula, an analysis of various types of assessment, and discussions regarding instructional practices. Our staff has been assembled into Professional Learning Teams and meet on a regular basis to discuss common goals and their measurement. Attendance rate at our school has increased, while our chronic truancy and mobility rates have decreased. During the 2008-2009 school year, our LEP population was able to meet Safe Harbor for Reading and Math. This appears to be attributed to our participation in the transitional bilingual pilot program. Students in these classes receive a half day of instruction in English and a half day in Spanish negligent of proficiency status. We have completed and successfully implemented our former goal of guided reading into all of our homerooms. We have continued to meet the overall AYP goal for mathematics over the past four years.

Some of our challenges involve the factor of time. Short meeting time with staff lessens the effectiveness of our professional learning teams, our early identification and examination of strategies for students in need of support, and upcoming incorporation of the RTI process and PBIS model into our program. The school improvement team also needs additional time to procure and analyze quantitative data from individual classrooms and monitor activities effectively. Our special education population has now become a subgroup and has had an adverse effect on our AYP scores. A challenge in our school will be examining instructional strategies that are selected to support struggling students and determining their efficiency in achieving success. It is a challenge to find and develop local assessments that measure student progress efficiently. We need to address deficiency directly and in a timely manner. Parental involvement is also challenging. We have steadily increased are parental involvement. Part of this progression is due to the variety of programs we are starting to offer by eliciting suggestions from parents. Needs assessment becomes a valuable tool in determining topics of interest. More parents have also been participating since adding the fourth grade to our program.

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

1. The configuration of transitional ELL classrooms are proving to be an attribute to student performance. It allows both staff team members to jointly plan and assess student progress in both languages. They have become creative in curricular content coverage (ex: teacher instructs math in native language, ESL teacher examines written responses to math problems during a language arts format). We hope that this will continue to have a positive effect on performance results.
2. The addition of fourth grade to our grade levels has allowed consistency for students to remain in one school, teachers the time to have more cross grade level articulation, and increased steady parental involvement. All of these appear to have a positive effect on student achievement.
3. Engaging, focused professional development for staff on working with students with reading deficits has a positive effect on performance results. The concentration on early diagnosis of reading/math difficulties aids in offering support at a more efficient time.

4. Continued, increased teacher collaboration between programs and grade levels fosters student support.
5. Focus on individual students with active IEPs and actively monitoring their progress will result in higher performance results.

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

1. Our staff needs to prepare for the beginning of school in advance examine student individual profiles upon entrance to the school. Reading scores and MAP results need to be prepared in a format comprehensible for the receiving teacher.
2. Additional concentration must be placed on the identification of students with active IEPs for all teacher involved, instructional support in place for such students, a progress monitoring system available, and time for collaboration among instructors.
3. Efficiency in developing needs assessment surveys and examining results is key in planning parental involvement opportunities. Additional involvement must be identified and encouraged in the decision-making roles of parent volunteers.

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?*

We currently have 25 homeroom teachers and twelve additional teachers. Out of our homeroom staff, 16 of 25 have been in our district for five or less years. All of our additional special area and support staff are tenured teachers. This includes our literacy support staff, our team facilitator and our ESL staff who bring a wealth of instructional knowledge to our school community. Despite the lack of years in the classroom, over 50% of our homeroom teachers hold, or are currently completing masters degrees in educational fields. We currently have staff members collaborating in professional learning teams and during our School Improvement Days (early student dismissal). Our focus this year has been on data collection, data analysis and identification of student instructional needs. In addition, we have been examining our curriculum at district level, and instructional practices/strategies at a school level. We have additional training opportunities during other building/district meeting days as well as workshops that are offered throughout the year. We continue to offer support to staff regarding working with ELL students and students with special needs.

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

1. Experience with strategies and instructional methodology
2. Experience and knowledge of working with ELL/ESL students
3. Familiarity of curricular frameworks and district learning outcomes
4. Formation of goals in professional learning teams for both literacy and math, as well as for individual students
5. Selection of mentors and identification of teacher leaders that aid in support

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

1. Professional Learning Teams must select "smart" goals for literacy and math and identify the tool for measurement to assess progress of meeting goals.
2. Early identification of individual student needs and deficits is a necessity.
3. Instructional strategies and curricular areas must be addressed and discussed on a regular basis.
4. Differentiated instruction in content areas as well as literacy must be a continuous focus.
5. Mentoring and teaming is key to positive productivity of new teachers and tenured staff.

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

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

Parents and families are invited to Open House as well as two parent/teacher conferences. Our building turnout for each of these events has been averaging 75% for both events, although this has been much lower in the special education self-contained classrooms (around 45% for Open House and 60% for conferences). During the Open House general information is discussed, the parents are provided with information about school status and the school mission, the student/parent/teacher compact is reviewed along with the homework and reading policies, and student work is showcased. During the 2009-2011 school years we will be offering additional parent workshops regarding assessments and testing. We host approximately 5-6 literacy activities for parent/family attendance on a yearly basis that have had an average attendance rate of 10% or less. These events include family literacy night with storytellers and/or authors, Author's Fair, family math nights and parent coffees. Our social evening events such as winter program, movie night, talent

show, and games night have larger attendance rates averaging around 20-25%. In addition to whole school programs, we will be hosting parent nights for our 21st Century "Blast" program and inviting parents into classrooms for literacy and math related activities. We have also incorporated parents into our Career Education Week, Veteran's Day, and Earthday celebrations as both participants and presenters. We have enlisted parents for our School Improvement Team and attendance has been more consistent. Our first volunteer breakfast in the Spring of 2009 brought in more parents and ideas.

Parents will be actively recruited for additional volunteer roles during the beginning weeks of each school year. We have developed a volunteer template with various functions and also have involved more staff members as contacts. The school improvement team will be compiling the data and providing information to teachers. The family newsletter will involve "tips for reading and math at home with your children" and also a SIP team report presented by our own SIP team parent representatives. Students take home monthly math activities and the school has initiated the mandatory use of planners to aid in parent/teacher communication. We have a family book group which will begin its second year. The group meets three times a year and discusses books read by all members. The school has also established a "parent points" system of tracking participation through incentives to classrooms.

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

1. Parents who communicate regularly with the teacher through the student planner check on work progress and student growth.
2. Parents who attend literacy events and visit classrooms for instructional periods become more involved with asking their children higher level thinking questions about academic experiences.
3. Parental involvement on the school improvement team and in the parent participation program have boosted involvement and positive attitude about the school as a welcoming environment for learning.
4. Attendance is affected by work schedules, distance of homes from school and, for some, lack of transportation.
5. Language barriers are still a challenge to direct communication between parent and teacher in both written print and conversation.

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

1. There is a definite need for a needs assessment survey for parents in order to gather data.
2. There is a direct correlation between the increased parent participation and school level incentives for parental/family involvement.
3. More information is needed regarding assessment and progress of students in school. Programs and support available is also more effective if presented in person.
4. Further collaboration among staff would aid in fostering positive communication between parents and staff when language is an issue.

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?

Key Factors

1. Reading Levels of Students
2. Instructional strategies/approaches utilized to address student needs in Literacy and Math
3. Limited English Proficiency in both general education and special education

The three primary causal factors indicated by the data are the issues of reading levels, instructional practices and limited English proficiency. Early identification of reading levels for all of our students will assist us in providing as much support as possible to students as soon as possible. Surveying our current instructional practices will allow us to identify areas lacking in differentiated instruction and addressing individual student concerns. We must continue to seek out appropriate assessment tools to help form the student reading profile. We must also offer comprehensive training to our staff as they continue to develop their abilities to analyze data and assess needs. As our transitional pilot program for our ELL students strengthens so do our methods of instruction. We need to concentrate additional focus on selection of efficient methodologies for working with ELL students in all classrooms including special education.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	While 54.1% our current Columbus East students met AYP in Reading Achievement for 2009, our overall school will reach an AYP of 77% and our IEP and LEP subgroups will meet safe harbor in the 2010 school year as so evidenced by the ISAT.	1,2,
2	While Columbus students at grades 5 and 6 attained 58% of response analysis in vocabulary development during the 2009 school year, students in grade five and six will achieve at least 65% in 2010 and 70% in the 2011 school year.	1,2,
3	While 68.4% of all students at Columbus East School met AYP in 2009, our school will make an AYP of 77% and subgroup of IEP(43.8%)students will make safe harbor in 2010.	3,

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

- 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 3. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

While 54.1% our current Columbus East students met AYP in Reading Achievement for 2009, our overall school will reach an AYP of 77% and our IEP and LEP subgroups will meet safe harbor in the 2010 school year as so evidenced by the ISAT.

Objective 1 Description

Our first objective target: Learn and apply reading strategies to improve both literal and inferential comprehension text.

Students will engage in partner engage in daily, independent reading with appropriate level text, partner discussions and/or retellings of key ideas of texts, be able to identify characteristics of genre, and evaluate a text to locate examples of the characteristics during guided or independent reading.

Staff will be provided with models of independent reading notebooks, guided in the development of comprehension rubrics for independent reading, given examples of discussion strategies for talking about books and assessing comprehension, and involved in the selection of consistent resource materials which describe/explain the characteristics of various genre.

Parents will be engaged in meaningful book group activities, take part in workshops that examine test results and reading assessment, and receive information through discussion and newsletter that focus on reading.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- ⓑ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓔ 3. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

While 54.1% our current Columbus East students met AYP in Reading Achievement for 2009, our overall school will reach an AYP of 77% and our IEP and LEP subgroups will meet safe harbor in the 2010 school year as so evidenced by the ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will engage in daily, independent reading with appropriate level text, to apply and demonstrate the use of strategies such as connecting, inferring, predicting, etc.	09/07/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Other	0
2	Students will engage in partner discussions and/or retellings or key ideas of texts, heard during Interactive Read Aloud or read in guided	10/05/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Other	0

	reading group.					
3	Students will identify characteristics of genre, and evaluate a text to locate examples of the characteristics during guided or independent reading. Additional attention will be given to books available in bilingual and special education rooms	09/21/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Title I	1,200
4	Selected students in special education resource and at- risk students in sixth grade will be selected and involved in the Read 180 program.	10/05/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Other	0
5	Identified students will be engaged in small reading comprehension activities with individual teachers for additional assistance.	11/09/2009	03/05/2010	After School	Title I	5,000

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

While 54.1% our current Columbus East students met AYP in Reading Achievement for 2009, our overall school will reach an AYP of 77% and our IEP and LEP subgroups will meet safe harbor in the 2010 school year as so evidenced by the ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Homeroom teachers will assist in developing a comprehension rubric for independent reading responses and review models of independent reading notebooks. Teachers will review these during professional learning team meetings.	10/26/2009	01/22/2010	During School	Other	0
2	Teachers will examine discussion strategies for talking about books and assessing comprehension through discussion.	10/05/2009	03/05/2010	During School	Other	0
3	Teachers will review and identify students that are in the bottom 20% of their grade level in reading scores by using our local assessments and determining areas of need by use of the performance descriptors in the ILS and MAP DesCartes.	09/16/2009	10/14/2009	After School	Other	0
4	Teachers will be engaged in the selection of resource books, posters or other materials which describe/explain the characteristics of various genre.	11/18/2009	01/13/2010	After School	Title I	1,000

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

While 54.1% our current Columbus East students met AYP in Reading Achievement for 2009, our overall school will reach an AYP of 77% and our IEP and LEP subgroups will meet safe harbor in the 2010 school year as so evidenced by the ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	A parent/family book club discussion group will incorporate comprehension strategies, discussion and information about genre into its program.	10/08/2009	02/18/2010	After School	Title I	250
2	Informational parent meeting will target the interpretation of state reading assessment results and examine book selection with the use of lexile scores. Workshop will provide additional information for target ELL student population.	10/15/2009	10/15/2009	After School	Title I	120
3	Reading informational program on family literacy night will be hosted for parents of special education parents.	01/21/2010	01/21/2010	After School	Title I	120

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

While 54.1% our current Columbus East students met AYP in Reading Achievement for 2009, our overall school will reach an AYP of 77% and our IEP and LEP subgroups will meet safe harbor in the 2010 school year as so evidenced by the ISAT.

Student Strategies and Activities

1. Review of independent reading notebook or teacher/student conference notes based on rubric for comprehension during independent reading. Monitored weekly during first month of school, and then monthly by classroom teacher.
2. Teacher observation of discussion with notes/checklist of observed behaviors. Monitored weekly by classroom teachers.
3. Student-created web or other graphic organizer which describes the characteristics of a particular genre. OR Teacher/student conference to discuss examples of characteristics found in student's independent/guided reading. AND/OR A sample of student-generated writing in the genre being studied. Monitored quarterly by classroom teacher, reviewed by Professional Learning Teams(PLT).
4. Assessment results of progress monitoring generated by computer. Reviewed by teachers involved on a quarterly basis.
5. Examination of MAP results and additional local assessment results on a monthly basis. Monitored by classroom teacher.

Professional Development

1. Peer evaluation of student notebooks or teacher's conference notes with feedback. Monitored quarterly at PLT meetings.
2. Teacher review of notes/checklists for evidence of growth in discussion and comprehension skills. Monitored monthly by Literacy Support Teachers(LST).
3. Identification lists of students and selection of placement into flexible reading groups as indicated in lesson plans. Monitored by building administrators.
4. Evidence of application to classroom instruction in reading/writing lesson plans. Monitored quarterly by LST staff, teachers, and building administrators.

Parent Involvement

1. Parent feedback (written survey) at end of the year Family Book Club Meeting. Twice a semesters as part of meetings. Monitored by LST staff.
2. Parent evaluation of program. Monitored by staff presenters and administrative staff then shared with School Improvement Team.
3. Parent evaluation of program. Student progress monitoring of attendee families. Monitored by special education staff and administrative staff.

	Name	Title
1	Joyce M. Hodan	Principal

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

While Columbus students at grades 5 and 6 attained 58% of response analysis in vocabulary development during the 2009 school year, students in grade five and six will achieve at least 65% in 2010 and 70% in the 2011 school year.

Objective 2 Description

Learn and apply word analysis and vocabulary-building strategies.

Students will build academic vocabulary from the District Learning Outcomes list. Teacher will be engaged in exploring vocabulary strategies and creating literacy center activities focused on word study. Parents will be encouraged to use the parent resource library to find word and language building books, games, and materials. They will find information regarding tips for building vocabulary in the school newsletter and they will be encouraged to discuss books that students are reading at home.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- b 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- b 2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- e 3. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

While Columbus students at grades 5 and 6 attained 58% of response analysis in vocabulary development during the 2009 school year, students in grade five and six will achieve at least 65% in 2010 and 70% in the 2011 school year.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Build academic vocabulary from the District's Learning Outcomes list.	10/05/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Other	0
2	Keep a "word section" in journal/notebook for storing new, interesting, or unusual words encountered during reading, discussion or classroom study. Use as a resource for writing(word choice).	10/05/2009	05/07/2010	During School	Other	0

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

While Columbus students at grades 5 and 6 attained 58% of response analysis in vocabulary development during the 2009 school year, students in grade five and six will achieve at least 65% in 2010 and 70% in the 2011 school year.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide professional development for exploring/learning vocabulary strategies.	10/12/2009	10/30/2009	During School	Title I	0
2	Provide time for teams to create literacy center activities focused on word study (Latin/Greek roots, affixes, Spanish-English cognates, etc.)	11/02/2009	02/17/2010	After School	Title I	0

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

While Columbus students at grades 5 and 6 attained 58% of response analysis in vocabulary development during the 2009 school year, students in grade five and six will achieve at least 65% in 2010 and 70% in the 2011 school year.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Utilize newsletter to provide tips for building vocabulary; publish word puzzles	10/30/2009	05/28/2010	After School	Other	50
2	Encourage the use of the Parent Resource Library to find word and language building books, games, materials.	10/05/2009	05/17/2010	Before School	Other	500
3	Encourage family discussion of the books that students are reading at home.	10/15/2009	02/18/2010	After School	Title I	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

While Columbus students at grades 5 and 6 attained 58% of response analysis in vocabulary development during the 2009 school year, students in grade five and six will achieve at least 65% in 2010 and 70% in the 2011 school year.

Student Strategies

1. Teacher observation/documentation of understanding, usage and acquisition of vocabulary during classroom discussion. Monitored weekly all year by classroom teacher through classroom assessments.
2. Teacher/peer conference with student to review word section. Monitored quarterly by teacher.

Professional Development

- 1 and 2. Classroom implementation, peer observation/discussion at grade level meetings. Monitored at one meeting quarterly with LST staff.

Parent Involvement

1. Return receipt/parent acknowledgement slip. Monitored by Parent Liaison and shared with SIP team.
2. Frequency of use of materials measured by checkout status. Monitored by Parent Liaison and shared with SIP team.
3. Parent point sign off. Monitored by Asst. Principal and parental volunteers

	Name	Title
1	Joyce M. Hodan	Principal

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3

While 68.4% of all students at Columbus East School met AYP in 2009, our school will make an AYP of 77% and subgroup of IEP(43.8%)students will make safe harbor in 2010.

Objective 3 Description

Columbus East School will improve math achievement by focusing on specific math strategies for all students in each subgroup. Students will learn and apply math strategies to increase comprehension and understanding of word problems involving data analysis, numbers sense, estimation and probability.

Students will be involved in flexible math groups for instruction based on assessments, responsible for completing extended response items and short response items independently, know how to score extended and short response items using the student friendly rubric, participate in hands-on math centers.

Teachers will establish math goals in their professional learning teams, score math items utilizing the state rubric, model identification of key elements and vocabulary in math, and develop a minimum of four math centers to address areas of need.

Parents will be engaged in math workshops during and after school hours, and attend information regarding math assessments scores and examples.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- Ⓔ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓕ 3. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

While 68.4% of all students at Columbus East School met AYP in 2009, our school will make an AYP of 77% and subgroup of IEP(43.8%)students will make safe harbor in 2010.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will be placed in small flexible math groups for instruction based on local and state assessments with emphasis on math comprehension, number sense, word problems, data analysis and probability.	10/05/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Other	0
2	Special education students will be identified for additional help after school in areas of need. This will include all students with active IEPs.	11/09/2009	03/05/2010	After School	Title I	3,000
3	Students in every class will be responsible for completing one math extended response and two short responses independently and demonstrate the ability to score items successfully utilizing the "student friendly" state rubric.	11/27/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Other	0
4	Students will use a apply new skills and revisit previously learned skills in hands-on math centers	10/05/2009	01/29/2010	During School	Other	0

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

While 68.4% of all students at Columbus East School met AYP in 2009, our school will make an AYP of 77% and subgroup of IEP(43.8%)students will make safe harbor in 2010.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will be responsible for selecting, establishing and assessing math goals for individual students and small groups	09/14/2009	12/18/2009	During School	Other	0
2	Teachers will establish and maintain a minimum of four math centers in the classroom to address realistic usage of math concepts learned. these centers will address basic skills, math vocabulary, and critical	10/28/2009	11/25/2009	During School	Title II	0

thinking.					
-----------	--	--	--	--	--

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

While 68.4% of all students at Columbus East School met AYP in 2009, our school will make an AYP of 77% and subgroup of IEP(43.8%)students will make safe harbor in 2010.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will attend an informational meeting regarding student assessment scores in mathematics.	10/15/2009	01/14/2010	After School	Title I	100
2	Parents will become participants at two evening workshops involving math activities that can be done at home with families.	11/19/2009	02/19/2009	After School	Title I	400
3	Parents will read and participate in math activities outlined in Home/School Math Connections. Students will receive parent participation points for involvement.	09/25/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Title II	1,000

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

While 68.4% of all students at Columbus East School met AYP in 2009, our school will make an AYP of 77% and subgroup of IEP(43.8%)students will make safe harbor in 2010.

Student Strategies

1. Assessment of participation in groups by grading of assignments and participation. Monitored 1-2 days a week during school year by classroom teachers.
2. Progress monitoring by use of classroom assessment tools. Monitored monthly by teachers involved in program.
3. Collection of samples of extended response and short response items written by students. Reviewed by teachers and PLTeams.
4. Establishment of centers as indicated by lesson plans. Monitored by building administrators.

Professional Development

1. Completion of assessment tools used during School Improvement days. Monitored by PLT teams and building administrators during meetings..
2. Evidence of establishment of centers in classroom by direct observation and discussion. Monitored quarterly by school administrators.

Parent Involvement

1. Completion of program evaluation tool. Monitored by Asst. Principal and shared with SIP team.
2. Participation and feedback from parents. Monitored by staff presenters.
3. Collection of completed activities and award of parent points in participation system. Monitored by Asst. Principal and parent volunteers.

	Name	Title
1	Michele Washington	Assistant Principal

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part A. Parent Notification*

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

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

In accordance with the NCLB Act of 2001, notification must be provided to parents of student in districts/schools that are identified for improvement for failure to make adequate yearly progress. A letter that explained district status was sent to Cicero District 99 parents in English and Spanish. A copy of the district's current AYP Status Report was also disseminated to parents at this time. Notification of status was also sent to parents explaining options available to students by offering Choice and/or Supplemental Educational Services where mandated.

Columbus East School has provides parents with notification of its academic status publicly at the beginning of the school year during Open House. In addition, the first parent coffee presented ISAT information for both the school and the interpretation of individual test scores. Throughout the year, these items are provided in writing and verbally in a specified area of the school, in newsletters and during parent and family events and workshops. Our mission statements and literacy/math goals are also prominently displayed at the school.

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 stakeholders; parents, community members, students, teachers and administrators will provide Cicero District 99 schools with feedback regarding the School Improvement Plans through informal interviews, surveys, and evaluations. Parents and community members receive newsletters and notices from the schools and the district which include information dealing with the implementation of the school and district improvement plans. Regular updates on the district website keep interested community and educational organizations informed as to our progress. The Action Plan from each school's improvement plan is posted on the district's website as well as being available in each school and the district central office.

Parents and community members are given numerous opportunities to become involved with the school improvement process. They are invited to participate in the development, implementation and review of the plan. Our parents and community are vital to the success of the school improvement process and the opportunities are also outlined in the district and school parental involvement policies. These policies are available in the student handbook and at each school and the district central office. Parent and community representatives also serve on our school improvement team.

Cicero District 99 students and parents are predominantly Hispanic therefore, communication is provided in English and Spanish. Accommodations for language assistance are made in written documents that are distributed and posted and verbally through the use of interpreters at meetings, conferences, workshops and family events. All of the above are developed and communicated with the purpose of identifying, supporting and initiating the school improvement plan.

	Name	Title
1	Joyce M. Hodan	Principal
2	Michele N. Washington	Asst. Principal
3	Lupe Melo	Community Representative
4	Lucia Martinez	Parent Representative
5	Cindy Colletta-Schloss	Literacy Support Teacher
6	Elana Gordon	Literacy Support Teacher
7	Nicole DenHamer	Special Education Self Contained Teacher
8	Damaris Guirola	Bilingual Interventionist/ Parent Liaison
9	Janet Poleski	ESL Teacher
10	Barbara Johnston	Fourth Grade Teacher
11	Colleen Dreyer	Fifth Grade Teacher
12	Jennifer Weidner	Sixth Grade Teacher
13	Kathleen Delaney	Sixth Grade Teacher

14	Susan Winningham	Sixth Grade Transitional Bilingual Pilot Teacher
15	Linda Zakarian	District Representative
16		
17		

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.

Cicero Public School District 99 SIP Peer Review - A Process of Collaboration and Support

Composition of the Peer Review Team

The Peer Review Team consists of the District Director of School Improvement, an appointed co-facilitator, and additional individuals comprised of each building's Assistant Principal or an appointed lead teacher agreed upon by the schools' SIP team. The Peer Review Team is then divided into teams of two individuals.

Responsibilities of the Peer Review Team

The primary responsibility of the SIP Peer Review Team is to provide feedback specific to the state SIP rubric. This feedback will assist each school's SIP team with meaningful advice for further refinement of their plan.

Timetable for the Peer Review Process

The timetable for the 2009-2011 Peer Review consists of two sessions:

Session 1 consists of 1/2 day of rubric review using one SIP with all teams to calibrate scores. This is followed by using the rest of the day to provide peer review and feedback specific to one school's plan. Thus, 8 plans are reviewed during the first session.

Session 2 consists of one day for each team to provide peer review and feedback specific to one school's plan. Thus, 8 plans were reviewed during the second session for a total of 16 plans.

Protocol of the Peer Review Team

- It is extremely important to calibrate one SIP together prior to any team review.
- Feedback regarding SIPs must be specific to each criterion within each component and focused on details specific to the criterion within the rubric.
- Focus feedback on big ideas contained within the rubric that will move the plan toward an implementation score. In contrast, cosmetic feedback (word choices, formatting and spelling) is an expectation of the building SIP team.
- Refine feedback before submitting recommendations to the Director of School Improvement.
- Submit all recommendations to the Director of School Improvement upon completion of SIP Peer Review.

Cicero District 99 School Improvement Planning Overview

At the district level, school improvement planning is the integration of a district-wide team effort. The School Improvement Team at this level consists of:

Assistant Superintendents

Director of School Improvement

Director of Special Education

Director of Language Minority Services

Director of Science and Math

Director of Social Studies

Director of Technology

Directors participate in a session of learning the rubric and reflecting on how they can assist School Improvement Teams in the development of their plans. District Directors and Program Supervisors work directly with school teams they are assigned to.

At the building level, school improvement planning is the integration of a school wide team effort. The School Improvement Team at the building level consists of :

Principal and/or Assistant Principal who:

- Provides leadership in facilitating the school improvement planning process and implementation of the plan
- Facilitates a process of ongoing evaluation and refinement toward achieving the goals with the school SIP Team

1/27/2010 2:36:00 PM

- Engages in data driven decision making
- Revises the school improvement plan based on data, research and state and federal requirements
- Writes and submits the school improvement plan
- Provides communication to stakeholders

Teachers who:

- Collect and synthesize necessary data to develop and monitor progress towards goals and activities
- Assists in developing and revising the school improvement plan
- Communicates the standards and activities in the plan and the progress toward achieving the goals to students and parents

Community Members/Stakeholders who:

- Engage in data driven decision making
- Share in the writing of the school improvement plan
- Provide a vital communication link to all stakeholders
- Share in the review and improvement of the school improvement plan

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.

The Cicero School District 99 Induction and Mentoring Program was approved by the ISBE in January 2004. The mission of the program is to develop and retain quality educators by providing support and training through professional collaborative teams, thereby resulting in improved student academic achievement.

The goals are 1) to establish a collaborative team of mentors responsible for providing assistance to, support for, and collegiality with new teachers;

2) to provide new teachers with meaningful opportunities to improve teaching performance by upgrading skills and knowledge in implementing research-based effective instructional practices; 3) to familiarize new teachers with the philosophy and expectations of the district and the local community; 4) to retain quality teachers within the district; 5) to integrate technology into the communication process; and 6) to satisfy Illinois mandated requirements for teacher induction, certification and professional development.

The components of the program include new teacher orientation, mentor facilitated monthly support meetings for new teachers at each building to address needs and concerns, weekly personal contact between mentor and new teacher, peer observations of the new teacher's classroom practice by an experienced teacher, professional development opportunities including observation of experienced teachers and/or attendance at professional development workshops and seminars for the new teacher each semester, reflection by the new teacher on his or her teaching practices in relation to the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, and review and analysis of the new teacher's progress by the mentor.

Teachers new to School District 99 are offered the opportunity to participate in this program during New Teacher Orientation in the fall. They record their decision and present it to their principal for approval. If they choose to fully participate in the program, they are paired with a trained mentor who will support them through two school years. They may prefer instead to attend the monthly support meetings at their buildings. Mentors must attend mentor training sessions provided by the ISBE and Strategies that Support Instruction for English Language Learners provided by School District 99 as a condition of their selection.

Responsibility for coordination of the Induction and Mentoring Program is assigned to a Program Supervisor in the Language Minority Services Department. Responsibilities include program design and coordination, mentor selection, training, and matching to new teachers; coordinating professional development for program participants; documenting program completion requirements to ensure compliance with ISBE requirements; and coordinating program research and evaluation efforts. The program is reviewed annually and revised according to participant evaluation responses, district needs, and data indicators required of induction and mentoring programs by the ISBE.

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 Columbus East School Improvement Plan has as its foundation the Comprehensive District Plan/Comprehensive School Reform model. This includes district professional development, a standards aligned curriculum, instructional resources, and support personnel as confirmation of a supportive district structure where leadership and responsibility are shared. Professional Development is well supported by Cicero District 99 through internal and external sources funded by local, state, and federal resources.

The schools in the district are supported by the following district positions that provide on-going professional development and support throughout the year:

- Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services
- Assistant Superintendent of Student Services
- Assistant Superintendent of Personnel
- Director of School Improvement and Community Relations
- Director of Language Minority Services
- Director of Special Education
- Director of Math, Science, Health, PE
- Director of Social Studies, Fine Arts, Gifted Education
- Director of Technology
- Program Supervisors
- Resource Teachers

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).

- ⓔ 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.

- ⓔ 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.

Over the past several years, ISBE has provided support to Cicero District 99 in many ways. A new comprehensive approach to increasing school improvement was recently developed and responds directly to the mandates of NCLB. ISBE developed a plan that would shift delivery of services from a centralized to a regionalized model. Regional Offices of Education act as primary providers of services, while Regional Service Providers (RESPROS) offer the district technical support. West 40 Intermediate Service Center assumes this supportive role for District 99. NCLB Section 1003: School Improvement states that 95% of the NCLB School Improvement money available each year must be used for activities connected to school improvement plans and are provided for through the RESPRO (West 40). The agency also acts as the External Partner for the district's Comprehensive School Reform model and monitors school improvement planning.

Other West 40 (RESPRO) services to the district include but are not limited to:

- Assisting schools in development of SIP's, reviewing and analyzing all facets of school operation
- Providing support and training in data collection and analysis
- Providing professional development opportunities designed for activities specifically in SIP's
- Providing support in alignment of curriculum with ILS/Benchmarks/Performance Descriptors
- Facilitating collaboration of parents and community members in the design, implementation and monitoring of SIP's
- Facilitating the collaboration of and provide models for development of district and school policy on parental involvement
- Facilitating the collaboration of and provide models for the development of school-parent compacts
- Providing training required of districts and schools in developing state approved mentoring and induction programs
- Providing Administrator Academies to support building level administrators
- Using SIP, identify personnel concerns and provide models for identifying outstanding school personnel
- Developing written reports that analyze the organization and implementation of the school's improvement plan
- Providing support teams to schools undergoing Restructuring or Corrective Action, Supplemental Educational Services and Choice

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:

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]

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

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

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

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

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

PEER REVIEW

Yes No

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

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS

Yes No

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

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No

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

Yes No N/A

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

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No

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

SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM

Yes No N/A

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

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD

Yes No

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

PART II - COMMENTS