

Local Board Approved	11/18/2009
Initial Submission	12/01/2011
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2011 AYP Report

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	Yes	Has this School been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	Yes	2011-12 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2011-12 State Improvement Status	

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		85.0			85.0			91.0		82.0	
All	100.0	Yes	99.5	Yes	84.1		Yes	92.0		Yes	95.4	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	99.4	Yes	84.0		Yes	92.5		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian														

American Indian														
Two or More Races														
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities														
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	98.7	Yes	77.3	69.1	Yes	87.7		Yes	94.4			

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 85% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 85% 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 85% 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 82% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2010.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 85% 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 - 2011 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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Attendance Rate (%)	95.8	95.3	95.8	95.4	95.3	95.6	95.3	95.4
Truancy Rate (%)	0.5	1.1	2.5	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.7
Mobility Rate (%)	18.4	14.8	13.0	12.6	10.0	10.2	29.7	13.0
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	554	528	542	545	569	577	563	579
Low Income (%)	38.1	40.2	39.9	38.5	41.1	40.9	43.7	39.9
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.4	0.8	1.5	0.7	1.8	0.9	1.1	1.2
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	19.2	16.8
White, non-Hispanic (%)	93.7	91.9	92.6	91.7	88.6	87.7	89.0	89.5
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	4.3	3.0	1.8	2.6	2.8	3.5	3.2	2.8
Hispanic (%)	0.7	1.5	1.3	1.7	2.5	2.6	2.1	1.4
Asian (%)	1.3	0.9	1.5	0.7	1.2	1.2	1.6	1.6
American Indian(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.5
Two or More Races (%)	-	2.7	2.8	3.1	4.6	4.7	3.9	4.3
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	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 (%)	American Indian (%)	Two Or More Races (%)	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander (%)
S C H O O L	2000	93.5	3.9	1.4	1.2	-	-	-
	2001	91.3	5.6	1.0	1.9	0.2	-	-
	2002	93.6	4.1	0.7	1.6	-	-	-
	2003	93.1	4.3	1.1	1.4	0.2	-	-
	2004	93.7	4.3	0.7	1.3	-	-	-
	2005	91.9	3.0	1.5	0.9	-	2.7	-
	2006	92.6	1.8	1.3	1.5	-	2.8	-
	2007	91.7	2.6	1.7	0.7	0.2	3.1	-
	2008	88.6	2.8	2.5	1.2	0.4	4.6	-
	2009	87.7	3.5	2.6	1.2	0.3	4.7	-
	2010	89.0	3.2	2.1	1.6	0.2	3.9	-
2011	89.5	2.8	1.4	1.6	0.5	4.3	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	95.4	2.8	0.9	0.8	0.1	-	-
	2001	94.6	3.2	0.8	1.3	0.1	-	-
	2002	95.0	3.0	0.9	1.0	0.1	-	-
	2003	94.8	2.8	1.2	1.1	0.1	-	-
	2004	94.3	3.2	1.2	1.2	0.1	-	-
	2005	93.0	3.3	1.4	1.2	0.1	0.9	-
	2006	93.2	2.9	1.4	1.0	0.1	1.4	-
	2007	91.9	3.0	1.4	1.0	0.2	2.4	-
	2008	91.0	3.6	1.8	1.0	0.3	2.4	-
	2009	91.0	3.1	1.7	1.0	0.2	3.0	-
	2010	90.6	2.8	1.7	1.3	0.2	3.4	-

	2011	90.3	3.2	1.2	1.1	0.5	3.6	-
S T A T E	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7	-
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8	-
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2	-
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7	-
	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	-
	2011	51.4	18.3	23.0	4.1	0.3	2.8	0.1

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truancy (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	-	25.4	97.3	95.0	20.0	2	0.4	-	-
	2001	-	33.8	100.0	95.5	14.1	21	3.7	-	-
	2002	0.7	30.1	100.0	95.4	19.3	6	1.0	-	-
	2003	0.7	31.1	98.0	95.0	16.8	7	1.3	-	-
	2004	0.4	38.1	98.0	95.8	18.4	3	0.5	-	-
	2005	0.8	40.2	100.0	95.3	14.8	6	1.1	-	-
	2006	1.5	39.9	100.0	95.8	13.0	13	2.5	-	-
	2007	0.7	38.5	100.0	95.4	12.6	1	0.2	-	-
	2008	1.8	41.1	100.0	95.3	10.0	1	0.2	-	-
	2009	0.9	40.9	100.0	95.6	10.2	3	0.5	-	-
	2010	1.1	43.7	100.0	95.3	29.7	2	0.4	-	-
2011	1.2	39.9	98.0	95.4	13.0	4	0.7	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	-	19.5	89.5	94.2	16.3	36	1.2	3.3	84.2
	2001	-	23.5	99.2	94.4	15.0	33	1.1	3.5	87.5
	2002	0.3	24.7	98.4	94.4	14.1	33	1.1	4.3	85.8
	2003	0.2	25.8	98.3	94.4	12.6	65	2.2	2.6	92.6
	2004	0.3	29.5	97.8	94.9	11.1	22	0.8	4.3	85.3
	2005	0.4	30.2	99.8	94.6	13.8	106	3.7	2.1	87.3
	2006	0.4	27.6	99.8	94.6	12.2	34	1.2	1.8	90.3
	2007	0.4	31.4	99.8	94.5	16.9	34	1.2	2.5	91.6
	2008	0.5	33.9	100.0	94.6	13.1	18	0.7	3.1	88.8
	2009	0.3	35.2	100.0	94.8	9.4	17	0.6	2.7	88.0
	2010	0.5	37.6	100.0	94.3	13.9	20	0.7	2.7	82.4
2011	0.5	36.2	99.6	94.6	10.3	17	0.6	2.7	84.5	

S T A T E	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
	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
	2011	8.8	48.1	96.0	94.0	12.8	63,067	3.2	2.7	83.8

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	565	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	518	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	564	181	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	562	191	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	554	173	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	528	202	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	542	177	-	-	-	-	-
	2007	545	163	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	569	187	-	-	-	-	-
	2009	577	186	-	-	-	-	-
	2010	563	186	-	-	-	-	-
2011	579	194	1	-	-	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	3,166	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	3,017	226	238	223	249	233	238
	2002	3,083	224	218	217	247	250	241
	2003	2,993	227	220	220	225	245	224
	2004	2,952	218	218	223	240	215	208
	2005	2,922	245	216	219	222	230	233
	2006	2,902	213	244	208	217	212	228
	2007	2,859	184	208	237	221	212	217
	2008	2,881	211	192	203	196	215	210
	2009	2,776	212	217	187	227	185	204
	2010	2,853	207	216	227	209	223	202
2011	2,849	213	204	213	181	204	198	
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-

S T A T E	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	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
	2010	2,064,312	155,468	154,389	152,681	154,465	154,982	146,919
	2011	2,074,806	153,516	153,301	154,241	153,981	153,986	151,059

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)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials (%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	194	17	39,593	36	64	19	21	-	-
	2001	196	17	40,782	36	64	18	20	-	-
	2002	192	16	42,395	38	63	19	20	-	-
	2003	191	17	44,700	35	65	19	20	1	-
	2004	185	16	44,576	35	65	20	20	-	3
	2005	181	16	45,498	36	64	19	23	1	-
	2006	179	15	46,068	36	64	20	23	1	-
	2007	187	15	45,983	40	60	18	22	1	1
	2008	184	15	47,897	39	61	19	22	1	-
	2009	189	15	48,475	39	61	18	19	-	1
	2010	180	15	50,336	37	63	20	20	-	-
2011	167	16	51,346	38	62	20	23	-	-	
	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

S T A T E	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
	2011	128,262	13	64,978	40	60	19	19	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, 2006-2011																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	75.1	77.9	75.0	80.1	81.7	83.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	76.8	78.3	75.6	80.5	81.6	83.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	35.9	39.5	45.0	53.2	56.8	58.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	60.8	63.9	67.5	71.6	67.6	74.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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, 2006-2011																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	85.9	89.9	89.1	92.5	89.8	92.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	85.9	90.4	89.9	92.1	88.0	92.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	59.0	73.7	77.5	81.3	72.8	74.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	76.8	80.3	82.6	90.5	84.5	85.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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?

Carl Sandburg students scored 85 percent meets/exceeds in ISAT reading (up 2.3 percent from last year) and 92 percent meets/exceeds in math (up 2.2 percent from last year). However only 75 percent of low income students met or exceeded in ISAT reading which was up 7.4 percent from last year. Eighty-four percent of those students met or exceeded in Math, which was just below the targeted score of 85 percent. In Math the data tells us we are reaching a greater number of students who meets and exceeds in the free and reduced lunch subgroup. Teachers use supplemental strategies and whole grade level activities such as Math Day, differentiated instruction and technology to foster growth.

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

Math - The math series is consistent through every grade level in the elementary level. Parents are aware of math homework expectations. Teachers use MAP data to track student progress and make instructional decisions. Third grade has special activities that promote math concepts. These activities include Math Day, ice cream math, accelerated math, and smart board activities. Last year the curriculum math committee met to align the math curriculum with the Common Core standards for the 2011-2012 school year. Teachers have noticed that there were some areas in the Common Core standards that were not addressed in the Illinois Learning Standards.

Reading - We have assessment data from the previous year's teachers along with using MAP data to help guide classroom instruction. Classroom teachers are using the computer lab and online activities to improve reading and math skills. Other technology such as smart boards, ebooks, and increased use of Education City help improve student performance. Teachers use the reading counts program and other reading resources such as National Geographic Explorer and Reading A-Z books. They also use parents, EIU students, and America Reads tutors to help students who are struggling academically. Carl Sandburg continues to improve the reading interventions provided by teachers and paraprofessionals.

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

We must continue to monitor all students through local assessments, progress monitoring and the assessment wall. Teachers must continue to implement the Comprehensive Literacy Model, which focuses on differentiated and small group instruction. Interventions will be provided to as many students as possible who are not meeting benchmarks. Teachers and administrators must use data analysis to look for trends in individual classrooms and the school as a whole and find ways to address deficiencies.

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?

When examining the MAP data Carl Sandburg students performed best in the areas of Phonological Awareness (75 percent of students met benchmark) and Phonics 75 percent. Concepts of Print was the weakest area with 71 percent of the students did not meet benchmark. In reading the low income students did the best in the areas of Phonics and Vocabulary with 73 and 70 percent of those students meeting the benchmark. While Writing was the weakest area for those students with 64 percent meeting the benchmark. In Math Carl Sandburg students scored the best in the areas of Statistics and Probability (72 percent met benchmark) and Computation (71 percent). Students in the low income subgroups scored well in Statistics and Probability (72 percent) and Computation (71 percent) meeting benchmark. They scored the lowest in Problem Solving with 66 percent meeting benchmark. The lowest scores for low income students were higher than last years lowest scores.

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

Carl Sandburg has focused on comprehension skills and strategies but there has been less emphasis on phonics skills in the third grade. There is a greater emphasis on data and sharing between parents and teachers. Students in intervention groups work to apply strategies learned to daily work. Students are selected for intervention groups based on classroom and local assessments. The economy has also effected time parents are able to spend interacting /reading with their children.

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

Teachers must continue to examine the MAP data and look for trends in classrooms and grade levels. Small group instruction, differentiation and intervention groups may target students who are below benchmark. The new language arts curriculum is aligned with the reading standards which can assist students in planning and instructions. There is work to be done with the math curriculum.

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?

Charleston, Illinois is a progressive city of over 21,000 persons located in East Central Illinois. Rich in the history of Abraham Lincoln, the city features a balance of industrial, agricultural, educational and cultural opportunity. Located on Highway 16, just 10 miles east of Interstate 57, Charleston is the county seat for Coles County and is the center of government and commerce for the predominantly rural and agricultural region surrounding Coles County. With nearly 183,000 people residing within a thirty-five mile radius of Charleston, a capable and willing workforce is readily available for business and industrial firms located here. Charleston is a city where the work ethic remains strong and the spirit of community support is high. Eastern Illinois University, located in Charleston, is the largest employer with a staff of approximately 1,800 and an enrollment of over 12,500 students. Highway 16 is the primary retail corridor in Charleston with a peak ADT of 25,000 vehicles per day. Our Industrial Area is located along Illinois Route 130 and Eastern Illinois Railroad on the north side of town. With its close proximity to large metropolitan areas, access to recreational sites, business and employment opportunities, Charleston provides its citizens with a full range of living experiences that are generally found in much larger communities. Today, Charleston is a community providing more than 300 stores and a wide variety of services in the downtown square shopping district and Lincoln Avenue commercial areas. The city's industrial complex is home to several national and international manufacturing firms. The Coles Business Park and East Side Commercial Area offer various opportunities for retail, service and industrial businesses. Surrounded by family farms and rich soils, Charleston's economy is bolstered by agriculture. The county's more than 900 farms produce 15.3 million bushels of corn and 4.6 million bushels of soybeans each year. (information from the Charleston Chamber of Commerce) Student learning is affected by a relatively high unemployment rate at 8 to 9%, a low-income rate in the 41 % range, and a mobility rate near 13%. Home ownership is impacted by a high real estate tax rate, which adds substantially to the overall cost of the home and gives many people pause before opting for home ownership over rental. Students from generational poverty need direct teaching to build cognitive structures necessary for learning. **Secondly, the relationships that will motivate them to learn need to be established. Third, hidden rules must be taught so they can choose the appropriate response if they so desire.** (Ruby Payne)

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

In recent years, the socioeconomic status of Charleston has changed with the closing of businesses. Although the school's mobility rate has seen a decrease, there seem to be more families who are transient moving to Charleston. Thirteen students have moved to Carl Sandburg and eight have dropped since the sixth day enrollment. That is twenty-one students in the last twenty-six days alone. **The mobility rate increased by one percent to 13 percent. When students move in and out of schools, it can be difficult to adjust to a new setting and routines.** Some students may also have new challenges adjusting to a school's curriculum. The number of low income students enrolled at Carl Sandburg has risen from 38.5 % in 2007 to 43.7% in 2010. Students who live in poverty face many challenges that effect academic performance. These are two areas where trend data should be monitored.

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

Carl Sandburg must find ways to meet the needs of students who are moving into the school or are low income. Currently we offer a breakfast program and have a Helping Hands Fund, which is money donated by community members that is used to meet some of the needs of those students. The school's assessment wall has information on these students used to track their academic progress. Teachers are informed of the names of the free and reduced lunch students. They are to track academic progress and use differentiated instruction to meet their needs.

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?

All certified staff members are considered highly qualified based on the HOUSSE verification process. Carl Sandburg teachers average 15 years of teaching experience. Thirty-seven percent have Bachelor's degrees and 63 percent have Master's degrees or above. **Two Carl Sandburg teachers have earned National Board Certification. During the past two years, Carl Sandburg teachers were involved in numerous professional development activities. These included but are not limited to training activities in the areas of: Reading Recovery training, Illinois State Library conference; Writing strategies and Writer's Workshop instruction; Reading Strategies and Engaged Reading Activities training; Response to Intervention (RTI) training, IEP goal writing and curriculum mapping, inclusion planning, Partnerships in Comprehensive Literacy Conference, Reading Curriculum Mapping, Measurement of Academic Progress (MAP) training, Keeping Students Engaged with Small Group Instruction, Advanced Guided Reading Strategies, and the Comprehensive**

Intervention Model Conference.

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

We are fortunate to have highly qualified teachers under NCLB. The teachers have expertise that addresses student needs within individual classrooms and the school as a whole. Teachers at Carl Sandburg are eager to share instructional strategies that help teachers in other classrooms. While it is becoming increasingly difficult to make AYP, having staff that can find resources to improve student achievement becomes even more important. The District's Instructional Coach plays a vital role in professional development. Without the services she provides, along with classroom and Title I teachers, it would be very difficult to provide professional development opportunities to as many staff members as we do. This year Carl Sandburg continues the Professional Learning Communities that meet once a month. These meetings are currently led by grade level facilitators who meet once a month to discuss agenda items. Teachers have facilitated these meeting for the past two years. Title II money has funded time for teachers to meet. During these meetings, teachers discuss assessments, data, student work and best practices. Paraprofessionals have also participated in in-house professional development to enhance their skills when working with students.

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

In house professional development is very effective. Using the two-hour early dismissal to in-service teachers on best instructional practices and data analysis is extremely beneficial to academic progress and professional growth. Teachers talking to teachers discussing student work, best practices, data and assessment will benefit students and teachers. It is especially helpful to new teachers to the profession and building. With decreased funding for professional development, teacher collaboration will be all the more important. Teachers also participate in Professional Learning Communities that discuss best practices and student work. There are six meetings scheduled for this school year.

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?

Two years ago, we conducted a parent/community survey to gather information on parents' views of the school. Although there was not the number of responses, as we would like, those completing the survey had a positive view of the school. Parents feel the school is welcoming and their views are heard. Parents also feel the teachers care about their child and are doing well with curriculum and instruction. Parent involvement occurs during Parent-Teacher Conferences, Teacher Collaboration Team Meetings, IEP meetings, Title

1 open House, and PTA functions, Book Club, Art Night and Family Reading Night along with a number of parents volunteering in the school on a regular basis just to name a few things the school has to offer. Another survey will be conducted next year to gain the parent/community points of view and concerns.

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

Parents are contacted via telephone, newsletters, email, phone calls, the Carl Sandburg Connection and parent-teacher conferences. There are number of parent volunteers who assist students and teachers at Carl Sandburg. We use these opportunities to inform parents of their child's progress and inform them of opportunities offered at Carl Sandburg or things they can do at home to improve academic performance. The more parental involvement a child has, the more successful he/she may be in school. The Carl Sandburg Connection is sent home monthly. This newsletter informs parents of events that take place at Carl Sandburg and celebrates our success. We provide many email updates to parents through a distribution list.

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

We must seek to improve parental contact and involvement in school. This will allow parents an opportunity to help their child, and become more knowledgeable of what the school is trying to accomplish. Again, later this year we will conduct another survey to gain the community's perspective of Carl Sandburg.

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?

Students come to Carl Sandburg with unique backgrounds. Although we cannot control this, we must continue to strive to meet the individual needs of all students. Providing professional development opportunities for teachers and collaborating with parents is one-step towards meeting those needs. The implementation of the Partnerships in Comprehensive Literacy Model is another step for Carl Sandburg. Using this model to differentiate instruction will help meet the academic needs of these students. Informing parents of this will only be an asset in student academic progress. We have already seen the success of the intervention groups implemented last year as reading ISAT scores improved across the board (low income and special education students). By adjusting schedules and finding central locations, they will only improve their effectiveness.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Students will improve literacy skills.	
2	Students will improve numeracy skills.	

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Students will improve literacy skills.

Objective 1 Description

Student performance on the reading portion of the ISAT will improve to 92.5 percent in the meets/exceeds category. Currently 84 percent of total students met or exceeded on ISAT testing. Only 75 percent of free and reduced lunch students met or exceeded in this category.

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

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students will improve literacy skills.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide instructional support for identified subgroups.	09/01/2011	05/14/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Continue to utilize parent and community volunteers to aid in the development of reading skills.	09/01/2011	05/14/2012	During School	Other	
3	Continue to provide students ample opportunities for independent practice in reading.	09/01/2011	05/14/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	Students who are at risk of meeting reading benchmarks will be targeted to receive additional reading support through interventions.	09/01/2011	05/14/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	Continue Professional learning Communities in each grade level.	09/01/2011	05/14/2012	During School	Title II	

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students will improve literacy skills.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Continue Professional Learning Communities in each grade level.	09/01/2011	05/01/2012	Before School	Title II	
2	Teachers will continue to discuss and implement the Partnerships in Comprehensive Literacy model	09/01/2011	05/01/2012	Before School	Title II	

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students will improve literacy skills.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Title 1 Parent Orientation Night	09/29/2011	09/29/2011	After School	Title I	
2	Teacher Collaboration Team Meetings	10/24/2011	04/23/2012	During School	Title II	
3	Parent Teacher Conferences	09/12/2011	05/09/2011	After School	Other	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Students will improve literacy skills.

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?)

Each grade level will meet to discuss progress on school improvement plan goals and set individual grade level goals. In addition to these meetings, the entire faculty will convene to review the plan and assess progress toward reaching the goals that have been identified. ISAT, MAP data and classroom assessment information will be reviewed and evaluated. Student data from MAP and the assessment wall will be included as part of the student data package. The Carl Sandburg SIP will be evaluated for progress at the end of each semester.

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	Chad Burgett	Principal
2	Rob Ulm	Assistant Principal
3	Grade Level Teachers	
4	Kristen Holly	District Instructional Coach
5	Gail Schultz	Reading Recovery Teacher Leader
6	Reading Recovery and LBS1 Teachers	

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Students will improve numeracy skills.

Objective 2 Description

Students will improve math scores on the ISAT so that 92.5 percent of our students score in the meets or exceeds category. Currently 92 percent of students scored in the meets and exceeds category.

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

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

Objective 2 Title :

Students will improve numeracy skills.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Utilization of the Accelerated Math networked programs to enhance problem solving and math concepts.	09/01/2011	05/14/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Utilization of the Math Flash program to enhance math computation skills.	09/01/2011	05/14/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	Increase tutoring opportunities for students including: America Reads Program, community and parent based programs, and cross-grade programs.	09/01/2011	05/14/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title :

Students will improve numeracy skills.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Periodic collaboration throughout the year through grade level and professional learning teams to discuss building strategies, identify concerns and areas of strength.	09/01/2011	05/14/2012	During School	Title II	

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

Objective 2 Title :

Students will improve numeracy skills.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents were notified that information concerning the school improvement plan could be located at the school website and on the school report card through the use of Parent Link (automated phone system), The Carl Sandburg Connection (newsletter) and our family email list. Copies of the school report card were made available in the school and district offices. We have made paper copies available to those requesting a paper copy.	09/01/2011	05/14/2012	After School	Title I	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

Students will improve numeracy skills.

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?)

Each grade level will meet to discuss progress on school improvement plan goals and set individual grade level goals. In addition to these meetings, the entire faculty will convene to review the plan and assess progress toward reaching the goals that have been identified. ISAT, MAP data and classroom assessment information will be reviewed and evaluated. Student data from MAP and the assessment wall will be included as part of the student data package. The Carl Sandburg SIP will be evaluated for progress at the end of each semester.

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	Chad Burgett	Principal
2	Rob Ulm	Assistant Principal
3	Classroom Teachers	

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.*)

Parents are notified that information concerning the school improvement plan could be located at the school website and on the school report card through the use of Parent Link (automated phone system), The Carl Sandburg Connection (newsletter) and our family email list. Copies of the school report card were made available in the school and district offices. We have made paper copies available to those requesting a paper copy.

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.

All Staff members are provided the opportunity to be a part of the School Improvement team. The team looks at academic issues, parent involvement opportunities and daily operations of our school. A peer review team, which may include outside experts also review the SIP and makes suggestions for needed changes.

	Name	Title
1	Rob Ulm	Assistant Principal
2	Patti Murphy	Middle School Teacher
3	Brad Oakley	Middle School Principal
4	Trevor Doughty	High School Principal
5	Todd Vilardo	Assistant Superintendent

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.

Charleston Community School District #1's review team consists of building administrators and the Assistant Superintendent. Review team members examined school improvement plans, asked for further explanation when needed and suggested changes and corrections.

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.

Our formal mentoring program provides assigned mentors to new and early onset teachers. Mentors work with mentees on a daily (through informal but frequent conversations), weekly (through professional learning team meetings) and monthly (through early dismissal activities). We meet on a monthly basis to review and revise the Carl Sandburg program as needed. Teachers that are new to the district have the opportunity to observe other teachers of their choice. Carl Sandburg staff also work directly with the Eastern Illinois University mentoring plan through the website located at www.eiu.edu/~induct.

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 district will provide the school with resources and expertise through staff development in improving instructional approaches. Best practice techniques and approaches will be presented and assistance for improvement provided by the consultants and literacy coaches. Charleston CUSD#1 will work with all stakeholders in developing a coherent, systemic, and sustainable plan for improvement. Progress towards goal attainment will be determined through the collection of common assessments that provide information regarding student achievement and behavior, parent and community satisfaction, and the manner in which information is communicated to stakeholders. Title 1 money is also used for professional development and the purchase of student materials along with providing Reading Recovery services to first grade students. General building budget money is used to purchase classroom supplies. Workshops, release time and stipends are all covered through Staff Development funds and Title II money.

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.

	Name	Title
1		

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 11/18/2009

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 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