

Local Board Approved	
Initial Submission	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	170640870251002		
District Name:	Bloomington SD 87	School Name:	Bloomington Jr High School
Superintendent:	Dr. Barry Reilly	Principal:	Dr. Susan J Silvey
District Address:	300 E Monroe St	School Address:	901 Colton Ave
City/State/Zip:	Bloomington, IL 61701 4028	City/State/Zip:	Bloomington, IL 61701 3374
District Telephone#:	Label 3098276031 Extn: 221	School Telephone#:	3098270086 Extn: 0
District Email:	reillyb@district87.org	School Email:	silveys@district87.org
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this School been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2011-12 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2011-12 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status Year 4

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	100.0	Yes	80.9		No	86.8		Yes	93.6	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	88.1		Yes	91.2		Yes				
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	66.3	70.0	No	77.1	79.5	Yes	93.0			
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	73.7	68.9	Yes	84.2		Yes	94.2			
Asian														

American Indian													
Two or More Races	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	77.5		No	85.9		Yes			
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	40.6	43.6	Yes	55.0	55.3	Yes	91.7		
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	69.0	71.3	No	78.6	79.7	Yes	92.1		

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 (%)	93.0	93.2	93.2	92.8	93.3	93.0	93.2	93.6
Truancy Rate (%)	3.6	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.0	3.4	3.5	3.9
Mobility Rate (%)	18.4	15.4	13.7	13.1	16.4	15.1	14.4	11.8
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	1,349	1,338	1,254	1,260	1,191	1,207	1,146	1,198
Low Income (%)	42.4	44.8	47.2	48.9	50.0	50.4	51.5	54.2
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	2.9	2.7	2.4	2.8	2.0	3.1	3.8	1.9
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	16.5	15.6
White, non-Hispanic (%)	66.6	64.1	61.7	61.6	59.5	59.7	57.2	54.9
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	25.0	25.9	24.5	24.2	23.2	24.5	25.6	24.8
Hispanic (%)	5.4	6.7	7.5	7.2	7.8	8.0	8.0	10.6
Asian (%)	3.0	3.4	2.6	2.3	2.4	2.9	3.4	2.3
American Indian(%)	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.3
Two or More Races (%)	-	0.0	3.6	4.6	6.9	4.9	5.5	7.0
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	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 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	73.1	21.3	3.9	1.4	0.3	-	-
	2001	71.1	21.8	4.8	1.9	0.4	-	-
	2002	69.8	22.8	5.0	2.2	0.2	-	-
	2003	69.5	23.7	4.6	2.2	-	-	-
	2004	66.6	25.0	5.4	3.0	-	-	-
	2005	64.1	25.9	6.7	3.4	-	-	-
	2006	61.7	24.5	7.5	2.6	0.1	3.6	-
	2007	61.6	24.2	7.2	2.3	0.1	4.6	-
	2008	59.5	23.2	7.8	2.4	0.3	6.9	-
	2009	59.7	24.5	8.0	2.9	0.1	4.9	-
	2010	57.2	25.6	8.0	3.4	0.3	5.5	-
2011	54.9	24.8	10.6	2.3	0.3	7.0	0.1	
D I S T R I C T	2000	72.4	21.6	4.3	1.6	0.1	-	-
	2001	70.6	22.1	5.1	2.1	0.2	-	-
	2002	68.7	22.7	5.7	2.8	0.1	-	-
	2003	67.5	23.1	6.1	3.3	0.1	-	-
	2004	65.2	24.0	6.7	4.1	-	-	-
	2005	63.2	25.9	6.9	4.0	0.1	-	-
	2006	61.7	25.2	6.5	4.2	0.1	2.3	-
	2007	60.6	24.3	7.4	3.8	0.1	3.9	-
	2008	58.8	22.9	8.2	3.9	0.1	6.1	-
	2009	57.6	22.9	8.4	3.9	0.1	7.2	-
	2010	55.8	23.4	9.0	3.7	0.1	8.1	-

	2011	54.8	22.4	10.5	4.0	0.3	7.9	0.1
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	0.8	33.8	100.0	93.7	13.9	36	2.9	-	-
	2001	1.5	37.0	97.0	92.8	15.1	30	2.5	-	-
	2002	-	42.7	99.0	93.1	9.5	64	4.8	-	-
	2003	-	37.1	99.0	93.1	18.1	41	3.0	-	-
	2004	2.9	42.4	98.0	93.0	18.4	49	3.6	-	-
	2005	2.7	44.8	99.0	93.2	15.4	57	4.3	-	-
	2006	2.4	47.2	99.0	93.2	13.7	54	4.3	-	-
	2007	2.8	48.9	99.0	92.8	13.1	52	4.2	-	-
	2008	2.0	50.0	99.0	93.3	16.4	48	4.0	-	-
	2009	3.1	50.4	99.0	93.0	15.1	41	3.4	-	-
	2010	3.8	51.5	99.0	93.2	14.4	40	3.5	-	-
2011	1.9	54.2	99.0	93.6	11.8	45	3.9	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	1.5	34.5	100.0	93.6	20.1	171	3.1	4.1	88.4
	2001	2.0	36.0	99.3	93.6	18.2	68	1.3	3.9	88.5
	2002	-	41.4	99.8	93.8	16.2	126	2.3	5.0	88.6
	2003	2.0	35.0	99.8	93.8	21.7	89	1.6	3.8	89.2
	2004	3.2	41.4	99.5	94.1	19.3	100	1.8	4.9	89.1
	2005	2.4	44.1	99.8	93.9	18.1	135	2.4	2.2	92.0
	2006	2.5	45.5	99.8	94.0	18.4	135	2.5	2.5	89.5
	2007	3.6	47.3	99.8	93.5	19.0	116	2.3	2.2	90.0
	2008	3.9	47.3	99.8	93.6	18.8	109	2.1	2.1	89.2
	2009	4.4	49.4	99.8	93.6	17.0	101	1.9	1.8	90.0
	2010	5.0	52.5	99.8	93.7	16.3	118	2.3	2.1	91.4
2011	4.7	53.4	99.8	94.1	16.4	127	2.4	1.6	76.4	

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	1,322	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,309	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	1,332	-	-	-	433	447	-
	2003	1,377	-	-	-	469	429	-
	2004	1,349	-	-	-	469	449	-
	2005	1,338	-	-	-	410	453	-
	2006	1,254	-	-	-	448	389	-
	2007	1,260	-	-	-	413	423	-
	2008	1,191	-	-	-	404	399	-
	2009	1,207	-	-	-	397	412	-
	2010	1,146	-	-	-	399	370	-
	2011	1,198	-	-	-	380	397	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	5,611	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	5,580	474	497	455	456	426	254
	2002	5,594	484	449	475	433	447	336
	2003	5,701	442	474	445	469	429	330
	2004	5,547	436	421	476	469	449	334
	2005	5,384	408	411	417	410	453	319
	2006	5,288	411	407	421	448	389	316
	2007	5,220	394	389	398	413	423	309
	2008	5,201	386	378	386	404	399	338
	2009	5,304	419	409	377	397	412	283
	2010	5,250	403	407	384	399	370	324
	2011	5,414	441	428	384	380	397	306
	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	358	16	47,672	59	41	19	20	-	-
	2001	362	17	49,099	60	41	18	20	-	-
	2002	367	17	51,757	60	40	18	20	1	-
	2003	379	16	52,473	56	44	18	20	-	-
	2004	356	16	52,932	53	47	19	19	1	-
	2005	351	15	53,460	52	48	19	19	1	-
	2006	352	15	54,373	55	46	19	19	1	-
	2007	355	15	55,946	54	46	18	19	1	-
	2008	360	15	57,758	52	48	18	18	-	-
	2009	362	15	58,651	52	48	18	18	-	-
	2010	370	15	60,364	49	49	18	18	1	-
	2011	355	15	61,612	49	51	19	19	1	-
	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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	73.9	71.6	78.5	82.5	82.6	80.4	73.9	70.7	74.3	70.9	77.6	74.3	79.3	81.7	79.8	80.2	79.6	81.8
White	81.5	81.3	86.1	90.4	84.6	90.4	82.6	81.5	84.3	79.3	86.7	84.0	87.4	87.0	87.7	88.7	84.3	88.7
Black	56.6	44.2	60.2	67.4	76.9	66.7	50.0	44.8	56.1	50.5	60.2	53.3	57.1	67.9	64.1	62.4	64.6	68.1
Hispanic	62.1	63.2	70.4	69.3	72.0	73.9	65.4	61.7	48.4	57.7	58.8	65.8	71.4	77.8	63.1	56.7	70.9	73.8
Asian	-	-	100.0	93.8	91.0	-	100.0	90.9	-	91.6	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	100.0
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	80.0	81.3	86.4	73.3	89.6	72.4	81.8	75.9	68.0	100.0	78.6	78.6	81.8	83.3	82.7	88.5	100.0	75.9
LEP	63.6	-	36.4	56.3	61.5	33.3	-	45.5	18.2	40.0	-	-	-	-	-	54.5	-	-
Students with Disabilities	38.6	27.0	35.3	34.6	28.8	39.4	31.3	34.7	33.4	32.0	26.0	23.2	31.3	32.8	48.0	44.9	45.4	40.7
Low Income	60.5	57.0	64.0	74.6	73.5	71.5	55.8	53.4	63.7	55.7	63.0	58.0	62.0	68.4	66.3	70.5	67.7	70.8
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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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	82.4	83.4	82.2	88.2	87.6	82.2	78.4	81.2	81.3	78.0	84.7	84.8	80.1	82.5	81.9	79.9	81.8	88.6
White	90.6	89.4	86.5	92.6	89.7	89.4	87.0	87.6	87.1	87.3	89.3	90.5	88.6	90.6	89.9	88.3	86.2	91.1
Black	63.7	66.6	70.4	79.8	83.5	74.8	57.5	65.7	66.3	60.6	72.8	72.2	55.0	61.9	62.2	59.0	69.8	79.5
Hispanic	75.9	73.7	81.5	75.0	80.0	73.9	61.5	76.4	74.2	62.9	76.5	74.3	85.7	74.1	73.7	63.3	79.1	90.5
Asian	-	-	92.3	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	91.7	100.0
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	84.6	93.8	86.3	93.3	86.2	68.9	81.8	82.8	84.0	83.4	100.0	96.5	72.7	91.7	82.7	92.3	88.9	89.6
LEP	81.8	-	63.6	61.1	84.6	50.0	-	90.9	90.9	35.7	-	-	-	-	-	54.5	-	-
Students with Disabilities	46.0	53.1	55.9	59.0	47.5	50.7	34.4	42.1	56.2	43.0	44.0	48.2	32.8	35.9	52.6	44.9	40.9	55.6
Low Income	71.8	72.8	74.0	81.0	80.1	72.3	62.6	68.9	71.1	65.8	74.3	76.7	62.4	67.0	70.1	70.9	73.8	81.8
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?

ISAT data in the area of reading indicates that students from certain subgroups (Black, multi-racial and economically disadvantaged) are not making AYP in reading.

At the sixth grade level, Black students are currently at 66.7% meeting/exceeding in reading, two or more races, 72.4% meeting/exceeding in reading, and economically disadvantaged, 71.5% meeting/exceeding in reading.

At the seventh grade level, Black students are currently at 53.3% meeting/exceeding in reading, two or more races, 78.6% meeting/exceeding in reading, and economically disadvantaged, 58.0% meeting/exceeding in reading.

At the eighth grade level, Black students are currently at 68.2% meeting/exceeding in reading, two or more races, 75.9% meeting/exceeding in reading, and economically disadvantaged, 70.8% meeting/exceeding in reading.

Further analysis by grade level indicates that, as a group, seventh grade students in each subgroup are performing at lower levels than their counterparts in grades 6 and 8. Additional ISAT data analysis indicates that trend data from '09, '10 and '11 for 6th, 7th, and 8th grade students shows that all grades indicate an area of weakness is reading strategies (33.2%, 49.2% and 47.5% respectively in '11, but 7th grade has been low performing in the area of reading strategies for the past three years (49.9% in '09, 46.6% in '10 and 49.2% in '11).

An area of strength designated by ISAT performance are Lexile scores for all three grade levels. Lexile indicates the level and which students can read and understand. Grade 6 average is 927 Lexile, close to the state average of 944, grade 7 is at Lexile 1042, above the state average of 1036 and 8th grade is at 1051, above the state average of 1043.

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

Historically, populations of black, multi-race and economically disadvantaged students struggle with the academic demands, especially in the area of reading. Research indicates that economically disadvantaged students require a very systematic approach to reading instruction, complete with graphic organizer support and direct instruction. Research in the area of black and multi-race students indicates that along with a systematic approach, these students perform at a higher level with a more community-type, small group approach to learning. The ISAT data indicates this type of systematic approach to reading is not embedded into instructional practice schoolwide, as indicated by the dip in 7th grade performance.

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

These factors imply that a systematic approach to reading strategies and comprehension, complete with focused small group instructional opportunities across all content areas, including the ELA CCSS is imperative.

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?

MAP 2011 Summary

BJHS:

Fall Scores

- **Reading: The percentage of students that M+E decreased in 6th grade, did not change in 7th grade and increased in 8th grade:**
 - 64.1% of 6th Grade students M+E (-2.8%)
 - 62.5% of 7th Grade students M+E (0%)

- o 70.3% of 8th Grade students M+E (+0.8%)
- **Math: The percentage of students that M+E decreased significantly in 6th grade and increased in 7th and 8th grades:**
 - o 58.5% of 6th Grade students M+E (-14.6%)
 - o 73.2% of 7th Grade students M+E (+2.3%)
 - o 71.1% of 8th Grade students M+E (+1.7%)
- **By Grade and Race (* = Low N):**
 - o In 6th grade Reading, the percentages are White (77.6%), Black (47.7%), Hispanic (44.4%), Multiracial (59.3%) and Asian (66.7%).
 - o In 6th grade Math, the percentages are White (71.9%), Black (38.3%), Hispanic (42.2%), Multiracial (51.9%), Asian (87.5%) and *American Indian (100%).
 - o In 7th grade Reading, the percentages are White (72%), Black (44.4%), Hispanic (50%), Multiracial (66.7%), Asian (50%) and *American Indian (100%).
 - o In 7th grade Math, the percentages are White (81.5%), Black (52.2%), Hispanic (68.8%), Multiracial (80.8%), Asian (75%), *American Indian (100%) and *Pacific Islander (100%).
 - o In 8th grade Reading, the percentages are White (79.2%), Black (54.1%), Hispanic (53.3%), Multiracial (63.3%), *Asian (100%) and *American Indian (100%).
 - o In 8th grade Math, the percentages are White (78.9%), Black (56%), Hispanic (57.8%), Multiracial (64.3%), *Asian (100%) and *American Indian (100%).
- **By Grade and Income:**
 - o 82.5% of 6th Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 50.9% of the Low Income students (Gap = 31.6%). In Math, 82% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 41.6% of Low Income students (Gap = 40.4%).
 - o 77.4% of 7th Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 49% of the Low Income students (Gap = 28.4%). In Math, 89.2% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 58.5% of Low Income students (Gap = 30.7%).
 - o 86.3% of 8th Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 54.3% of the Low Income students (Gap = 32%). In Math, 87.2% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 54.7% of Low Income students (Gap = 32.5%).
- **By Grade and IEP Status:**

- o In Reading and Math, significant gaps exist in the percentage of students M+E in the Not IEP and IEP subgroups.

§ Reading Gaps: 6th gr = 70.7% v 28.6% (42.1%), 7thgr = 69.8% v 12.5% (57.3%), 8th gr = 76% v 29.2% (46.8%)

§ Math Gaps: 6th gr = 64.5% v 27% (37.5%), 7thgr = 78.4% v 38.8% (39.6%), 8th gr = 77.6% v 25% (52.6%)

Spring Scores

- **Reading: The percentage of students that M+E decreased in 6th grade compared to prior year and fall, increased in 7th grade compared to prior year and fall, and increased in 8th grade compared to prior year but decreased compared to fall:**
 - o 57.9% of 6th Grade students M+E (-11.7% to PY, -6.2% to Fall)
 - o 65.9% of 7th Grade students M+E (+1.4% to PY, +3.4% to Fall)
 - o 67.2% of 8th Grade students M+E (+1.4% to PY, -3.1% to Fall)
- **Math: The percentage of students that M+E decreased significantly in 6th grade compared to prior year, increased in 7th and 8th grade compared to prior year and decreased in all grades compared to fall:**
 - o 56.7% of 6th Grade students M+E (-10.8% to PY, -1.8% to Fall)
 - o 65.2% of 7th Grade students M+E (+2.7% to PY, -8% to Fall)
 - o 63.7% of 8th Grade students M+E (+4.2% to PY, -7.4 to Fall)
- **By Grade and Race (* = Low N):**
 - o In 6th grade Reading, the percentages are White (75.7%), Black (30.6%), Hispanic (44.7%), Multiracial (53.6%) and Asian (75%).
 - o In 6th grade Math, the percentages are White (71.2%), Black (34.3%), Hispanic (44.7%), Multiracial (53.6%), Asian (75%) and *American Indian (100%).
 - o In 7th grade Reading, the percentages are White (74.3%), Black (44.6%), Hispanic (54.5%), Multiracial (74.1%), Asian (83.3%), *American Indian (100%) and *Pacific Islander (100%).
 - o In 7th grade Math, the percentages are White (75.6%), Black (43.4%), Hispanic (48.5%), Multiracial (72%), Asian (57.1%), *American Indian (100%) and *Pacific

Islander (100%).

- o In 8th grade Reading, the percentages are White (76.3%), Black (48.1%), Hispanic (53.7%), Multiracial (60%), *Asian (100%) and *American Indian (100%).
- o In 8th grade Math, the percentages are White (74.4%), Black (40.7%), Hispanic (46.3%), Multiracial (60%), *Asian (100%) and *American Indian (100%).

● **By Grade and Income:**

- o 82.7% of 6th Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 38.5% of the Low Income students (Gap = 44.2%). In Math, 85.3% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 38.5% of Low Income students (Gap = 46.8%).
- o 82% of 7th Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 48.6% of the Low Income students (Gap = 33.4%). In Math, 83.1% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 49.2% of Low Income students (Gap = 33.9%).
- o 82.3% of 8th Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 43.9% of the Low Income students (Gap = 38.4%). In Math, 84.4% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 48.9% of Low Income students (Gap = 35.5%).

● **By Grade and IEP Status:**

- o In Reading and Math, significant gaps exist in the percentage of students M+E in the Not IEP and IEP subgroups.
 § Reading Gaps: 6th gr = 65.5% v 18.8% (46.7%), 7thgr = 73.7% v 16.3% (57.4%), 8th gr = 73.5% v 27.5% (46%)
 § Math Gaps: 6th gr = 62% v 29.7% (32.3%), 7thgr = 72.2% v 22% (50.2%), 8th gr = 70.4% v 21.6% (48.8%)

● **By Grade and Teams: (% Meeting or Exceeding)**

<u>Reading</u>	<u>B</u>			<u>J</u>			<u>H</u>			<u>S</u>		
	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Gap</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Gap</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Gap</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Gap</u>
6 th Grade	78.2%	63.2%	-15	81.0%	58.7%	-22.3	73.5%	55.4%	-18.1	83.0%	51.9%	-31.1
7 th Grade	88.6%	76.7%	-11.9	75.8%	65.3%	-10.5	67.0%	54.9%	-12.1			
8 th Grade	86.3%	71.5%	-14.8	85.4%	66.7%	-18.7	81.1%	64.8%	-16.3			
<u>Math</u>	<u>B</u>			<u>J</u>			<u>H</u>			<u>S</u>		

	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Gap</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Gap</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Gap</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Gap</u>
6 th Grade	82.0%	62.6%	-19.4	72.8%	58.1%	-14.7	74.4%	54.6%	-19.8	83.0%	50.0%	-33
7 th Grade	90.8%	76.7%	-14.1	89.2%	70.1%	-19.1	79.1%	48.2%	-30.9			
8 th Grade	87.6%	62.6%	-25	80.0%	64.1%	-15.9	81.7%	65.6%	-16.1			

● **Subscores:**

Grade	<u>Comprehension</u>			<u>Vocabulary</u>			<u>Literature</u>			<u>Literary Works</u>		
	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Gap</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Gap</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Gap</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Gap</u>
6 th Grade	33.8%	33.8%	0	34%	31.2%	-2.8	37.5%	42.1%	4.6	41.6%	36.5%	-5.1
7 th Grade	41.3%	43.4%	2.1	42.1%	43.9%	1.8	51.2%	53%	1.8	44%	46.4%	2.4
8 th Grade	39.5%	43.4%	3.9	38.7%	41.5%	2.8	51.1%	53.6%	2.5	41.3%	42.6%	1.3

Grade	<u>Number Sense</u>			<u>Measurement</u>			<u>Algebra</u>			<u>Geometry</u>			<u>Data Analysis</u>		
	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Gap</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Gap</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Gap</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Gap</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Gap</u>
6 th Grade	28.2%	25.5%	-2.7	35.5%	30.8%	-4.7	34.3%	29%	-5.3	34.3%	34.8%	0.5	35.8%	36.9%	1.1
7 th Grade	31.2%	31.4%	0.2	40.1%	35%	-5.1	38.8%	35.6%	-3.2	45.5%	41.4%	-4.1	41.2%	40%	-1.2
8 th Grade	31.9%	35.8%	3.9	36.2%	37.7%	1.5	34.2%	44.2%	10	39.8%	47.4%	7.6	40.9%	40.7%	-0.2

The ISAT results and the relevant local assessment data: MAP, administered in September are correlated to ascertain what areas are most readily remedied and which areas are in the most need of improvement.

The data will be used to adjust instruction in the area of reading to improve the academic achievement of the three lagging subgroups. In addition, the data will be used to specifically group students into small instructional learning communities to focus on their strengths and weaknesses in order to accelerate achievement.

Areas of strength in reading: Vocabulary and literature.

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

Lack of systematic approach to reading instruction and support coupled with almost predominately whole group instruction, rather than focused small group instruction, in all grades may be a contributing factor to lower performance in comprehension and reading strategies.

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

Reading teachers will be implementing a systematic approach for the direct instruction of reading, complete with whole and small group instruction. This approach includes precise formative and summative assessment tools for identifying student strengths and weaknesses. Reading teachers will also be embedding the new Common Core State Standards for Reading Literature and Informational Text into their instruction.

Literature teachers will be creating and implementing a curriculum that incorporates all of the Common Core State Standards in Language, portions of which are specifically designed to improve vocabulary, and underlying support for reading comprehension.

Social Studies and science staff will be systematically applying and assigning focused reading comprehension strategies in their classrooms regularly, as well as, embedding the new Common Core State Standards for Reading in History/Social Studies, and Reading in Science and Technical Subjects into their daily lessons.

Administrators will be trained to use a comprehension instruction walk-through document in order to create opportunities from mentoring and monitoring.

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?

Attribute: The special education staff took part in an intensive professional development series of workshops focused on the systematic approach to reading instruction. Their students were able to make annual yearly progress in '11, indicating such an approach is successful.

Challenge: Developing a cross-curricular approach to reading instruction and support that is embraced by staff and students.

Attribute: All language arts, reading and special education teachers are participating in Standards Aligned Classroom (SAC) training in order to implement the new Common Core Standards at each grade level. Topics of discussion include identifying the target, developing common assessments and adjusting instructional strategies to increase student achievement.

Challenge: Organization and structure of BJHS included consistency in assessment across all teams and grade levels. Consistency in assessment (using the same exit exams or major tests in each course will drive both curriculum and assessment).

Attribute and Challenge: Growing diversity in the student population (e.g., increase in the number of students living in poverty; increase in number of students from non-traditional families, non-midwestern cultures).

Challenge: Experience of staff in identifying and serving a wider range of student abilities, experiences and needs.

Attribute: The use of data-driven instruction by all teachers, daily core curriculum interventions, differentiated instruction, and frequent progress monitoring of students with Response to Intervention during the daily scheduled block for mastering state learning standards has improved achievement.

Attribute: Organizationally, BJHS is divided in to smaller learning communities or teams. Each team builds an academic culture of high expectations for every student. Team teachers meet daily to discuss student academic needs, share progress-monitoring data and make scheduling adjustments for students who need additional interventions and supports.

Attribute: Student engagement for the majority of our students is high. They participate in school activities and are engaged in classroom activities. Increased standards for promotion have contributed to increased student engagement for many students.

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

These attributes and challenges have caused BJHS to place an increased emphasis on providing assistance and intervention thorough the Rtl process for students who struggle. Teachers use Student Progress Monitoring System (SPMS) assessment.

The special education classrooms have implemented a systematic reading approach resulting in improvement of student scores. An increased emphasis on the co-teaching model between special education and general education teachers and including special education students with general education students in the Rtl groups, the special education students made annual yearly progress in '11 in both math and reading.

Increasing the special education students' exposure to the general educational and access to the curriculum through co-teaching and Rtl have resulted in documented, increased achievement.

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

Professional development and materials support for the improvement of reading strategies and comprehension schoolwide.

Redesign of current curriculum that specifically outlines a balanced approach to reading instruction including formative and summative assessment to provide focused small group instruction as well as content area support of reading.

Professional development and support for embedding the CCSS into the newly designed curriculum for reading instruction through a standards aligned classroom initiative throughout the building and the district.

Professional development will be provided in data analysis.

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?

BJHS has been involved in a long term staff development project focused on the area of reading instruction. The staff is becoming well versed in the complex task of teaching and supporting reading. The current professional development will result in a completely redesigned reading and language arts curriculum, reflecting the inclusion of all the ELA Common Core State Standards.

All BJHS staff members and program assistants are highly qualified. All BJHS teachers are highly qualified, dedicated and life-long learners. Teachers are knowledgeable in research-based methods of instruction and technology. Teachers value diversity and support multiple learning styles with differentiated instruction and progress monitoring.

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

The ongoing professional development has improved certain subgroups of student performance (special education students) as well as maintaining and improving student scores in reading at 6th and 8th grade.

Increasing special needs student exposure to the general curriculum through increasing the number of co-taught classes and inclusion of special needs students in the RtI groups has increased the special education student performance on the ISAT in math and reading.

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

Continuation of the current professional development project, with the addition of the implementation of the new ELA Common Core Standards will be a focus. Continuing to increase the number of co-taught classes to increase exposure and access to the general curriculum will increase the number of students in a least restrictive environment.

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?

BJHS staff members make contact with all parents during the school year. This takes place in a variety of ways. The school offers parent teacher conferences during the evening as well as during the day. Students and parents at each grade level participate in an orientation/open house at the beginning of the school year. This allows the parents to meet school staff and administrators and learn about school policies. A large number of parents attend these events. In addition, BJHS staff members have provided parents with information about colleges and careers. The school has worked with Bloomington High School to inform parents of the coursework students need to be successful in high school and college.

When students struggle in coursework, teachers contact parents directly to share concerns and discuss strategies. Parents are provided with online access to monitor their students' grades throughout the school year. In addition, at the end of each quarter, guidance counselors and school administrators contact the parents of students who receive a grade of "F" in a class.

Parents and guardians are invited to contact teachers frequently and often. Teachers are accessible during daily plan time, by phone, by email and after school for meetings if needed. Reading teachers are members of an interdisciplinary teaching team. Teams of grade level teachers promote parent involvement in the classroom as guest speakers, family helpers on Positive Reinforcement Time (PRT) field trips, attendance at student-lead conferences and participation in outdoor education.

The RtI committee has provided a brochure to communicate to families the importance of attending student progress meetings, to understand the RtI process and to know how to encourage students to self-advocate for help in learning.

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

Because BJHS staff have communicated openly with parents regarding school policies and behavioral and academic standards, parents are more knowledgeable about student achievement that has risen significantly over the last five years. Parents have encouraged their children to participate fully in classes and to challenge themselves to take higher level classes. Communication with parents also includes information on student deficit skills and what RtI interventions are being used to increase their skills.

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

BJHS will continue to enhance parent involvement to ensure that all parents have positive contacts with school personnel and to ensure that parents know who they can contact for information and assistance.

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?

Overall achievement in reading at BJHS is adequate, however, additional progress must be made in helping black and multiracial students as well as students who are economically disadvantaged. Key factors that must be addressed are: complete implementation of a systematic approach to reading, administration monitoring and mentoring of implementation process, ongoing professional discussion among staff regarding the shared responsibility of fostering strong readers.

The next steps will be as follows:

1. Provide the staff with additional professional development and support in implementing a systematic approach to reading.
2. Administrative walk-throughs and teacher conferences.
3. Common assessments for providing differentiated reading support.
4. Redesign of curriculum to embed the ELA CCSS.
5. Introduction and support of the ELA CCSS designed for literacy in content areas.
6. Continue to increase the number of co-taught classes so special education students have greater access to the general education curriculum.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Improving Student Proficiency in Reading	1,2,3,4,

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. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 3. Multi-Racial students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 4. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Improving Student Proficiency in Reading

Objective 1 Description

Based on the 2011 ISAT data, BJHS did not make AYP in the area of reading. 80.9% of students met and exceeded state standards in reading. All teachers will address these goals in the context of their lessons. BJHS will make AYP/Safe Harbor by achieving within the confidence interval of 92.5% all students.

Based on the 2011 ISAT data, black students did not make AYP in the area of reading. 63.3% of students met and exceeded state standards in reading. A systematic approach to

reading will be implemented, including using formative assessment data to form small instructional groups for the improvement of reading for this population. Black students will make AYP/Safe Harbor by achieving at least 67% meets/exceeds.

Based on the 2011 ISAT data, multi racial students did not make AYP in the area of reading. 77.5% students met and exceeded state standards in reading. A systematic approach to reading will be implemented, including using formative assessment data to form small instructional groups for the improvement of reading for this population as well as support across content areas. Multiracial students will make AYP/Safe Harbor by achieving at least 80% meets/exceeds.

Based on the 2011 ISAT data, economically disadvantaged students did not make AYP in the area of reading. Sixty-nine percent of the students met and exceeded state standards in reading. A systematic approach to reading will be implemented, including direct instruction and graphic organizers as well as the embedding of the ELA CCSS addressing vocabulary development will be implemented, meeting the needs of this group. Economically disadvantaged students will make AYP/Safe Harbor by achieving at least 72% meets/exceeds.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- ↳ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ↳ 2. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ↳ 3. Multi-Racial students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ↳ 4. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improving Student Proficiency in Reading

Strategies and Activities	TimeLine		Budget	
	Start Date	End Date	Fund Source	Amount(\$)
Students will be instructed in reading class using a systematic approach				

1	to reading complete with small group instruction. Student progress will be monitored every 4 to 6 weeks.	09/01/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	5,000
2	Students will be taught vocabulary acquisition skills as addressed in the ELA CCSS.	09/01/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	5,000
3	Students will be practicing and applying their reading skills in content area classrooms on a regular basis.	09/01/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	5,000
4	Students who struggle with reading will participate in an intensive reading program, Knights of Knowledge Academy, designed to increase their reading comprehension skills and increase their ISAT scores.	10/31/2011	03/01/2013	After School	Local Funds	8,000
5	Students who struggle with reading in Tier II and Tier III will participate in Rtl groups where interventions are designed to increase a student's skill level where achievement gaps have been identified.	09/06/2011	05/24/2013	During School	Local Funds	6,000

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improving Student Proficiency in Reading

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Administrators will be trained in a comprehensive reading walk-through document designed to provide monitoring and mentoring of reading curriculum implementation.	09/01/2011	05/30/2013	During School	Local Funds	3,500
2	Teachers will continue an intensive course of professional development workshops providing the materials and support for implementing a systematic reading curriculum.	09/01/2011	05/30/2013	During School	Local Funds	49,500,000
3	Teachers will be immersed in curriculum redesigning project which incorporates the ELA CCSS.	09/01/2011	05/30/2013	During School	Local Funds	5,000
4	Teachers participated in data training with a consultant for the Northwest Evaluation Association. During the in-service, teachers learned how to access, interpret and apply the information from the	10/21/2011	03/01/2013	During School	Local Funds	3,000

	MAP results. They will continue to plan together to use the data to select RtI groups and to inform their instruction.					
5	Teachers will participate in the Common Core Standards Training through a Standards Aligned Classroom initiative in the building which includes identifying the targets, developing common assessments, differentiating instructional strategies to meet the needs of students.	09/06/2011	05/17/2013	During School	Local Funds	8,000

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improving Student Proficiency in Reading

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Host orientation nights for 6th, 7th, and 8th grade parents to share information for promoting student achievement and expectations for success.	08/15/2011	08/26/2011	After School	Local Funds	400
2	Transition program is provided for incoming sixth grade students prior to the opening of school. This focuses on building relationships with staff, developing study and organizational skills and providing family support.	08/08/2011	08/12/2011	Summer School	Local Funds	5,000
3	Guidance counselors and administrators will make personal contact with parents of students who receive one or more Fs.	10/28/2011	05/29/2013	During School	Local Funds	400
4	Parents of students in special education receive quarterly updates on their childs' progress.	10/28/2011	05/30/2013	During School	Local Funds	200
5	Parents are invited to a college night at BJHS where they are provided with information about colleges and careers.	11/14/2011	11/11/2013	After School	Local Funds	200

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Improving Student Proficiency in Reading

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?)

School personnel will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities by analyzing summative student performance data from the mid year MAPS (to make mid-year corrections) and the ISAT data.

School personnel will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities by analyzing the formative student performance data using prescriptive comprehension assessments as well as fluency assessments.

Reading teachers will use Student Progress Monitoring System (SPMS) assessments with Tier II and Tier III intervention students to identify skill level achievement gaps in learning grade level reading skills. Individual student data is used to show mastery of standards identified.

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	Dr. Susan Silvey	Prinicapl
2	Mrs. Cindy Helmers	Asst. Supt. for Curriculum and Instruction
3	Mrs. Sherrilyn Thomas	Associate Principal BJHS
4	Ms. Leslie Alappattu	Assistant Principal BJHS
5	Mrs. Debbie Davis	Reading/Language Arts Depart. Chair
6	Mrs. Lynn Stege	Special Education Depart. Chair

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

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

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

The school report card is mailed to all BJHS students' families and the report is available for review by the community on the school and district website. The parent-teacher organization receives a report about student achievement and interventions. There is an informational brochure explaining the Rtl process to families.

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 department chairpersons, Mrs. Cindy Helmers, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, BJHS administration and the reading consultant were consulted in the development of the plan. These individuals participated in planning meetings focused on the content areas discussed in the school improvement plan. They reviewed student achievement data for the last several years and made recommendations based on progress that has been made and the continuing areas of concern.

Gretchen Courtney & Associates, Ltd., a literacy engineering firm, made recommendations for the 2011 School Improvement Plan which will continue to be implemented in 2012-2013. Plans are based on the most current research and best practices in the area of reading.

The school report card is sent to all parents and available for review by the community on the website. The BJHS PTO also received information on student achievement information and interventions.

	Name	Title
1	Mrs. Cindy Helmers	Assistant Supt. Curriculum
2	Mrs. Gretchen Courtney	Reading Consultant
3	Dr. Susan Silvey	Building Principal
4	Mrs. Deb Davis	Reading/Language Arts Dept. Chair
5	Mrs. Lynn Stege	Special Education Dept. Chair
6	Dr. Lynette Mehall	Principal Kingsley Junior High School

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.

Mrs. Cindy Helmers, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, Mrs. Gretchen Courtney, Reading Consultant, Mrs. Diane Stempinski, Assistant Regional Superintendent of Schools, and Dr. Lynette Mehall, Principal of Kingsley Junior High School served as our peer review team.

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.

Each new teacher at Bloomington Junior High School is assigned a teacher from his/her curricular area. Assisting veteran teachers serve as role models and provide practical support in curriculum and instructional areas as well as with policies (e.g., grading, discipline). Daily team meetings provide new teachers with support and encouragement.

New teacher orientation is provided by the building level administration. A luncheon is held for new teachers and the district-level administration provides information and support.

In addition, from Dr. Sandra Spault-Fulte, new teachers receive yearly, weekly and daily planning strategies. Information and role-playing on handling parent contacts and information about what to expect of themselves and others as they embark on their first year in the building. They also receive positive student/parent interaction forms and tips on how to use them productively.

Dr. Spault-Fulte follows up with classroom observations, feedback on classroom lessons, discussions and individual goal-setting conferences to monitor and help the new mathematics teachers chart their growth as a professional.

The assistant superintendent introduced a leadership development tool that principals use to work with new teachers as well as teachers new to the building. This process is used to develop leadership potential and relationships with new teachers so principals can help maximize the individual's impact and potential as the principal coaches new teachers. New teachers and teachers new the building respond to a predetermined set of questions online at the end of the first, third and twelfth week of school. The principal uses information gained from this survey as the basis for discussions and coaching sessions.

In-district classes, workshops, training and opportunities for off-site classes/conferences continue to be offered to teachers to assist in their professional growth.

Administrative walk-throughs are used to help and support new teachers.

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 has provided and/or will provide the following: (1) technical assistance including the analysis of local standardized achievement test scores, state test scores, MAPS scores, subgroup performance (disaggregated data); (2) data management, including the preparation of requested reports on individual students and groups of students; (3) access to student data on the IIRC system; (4) professional development and support on the use of IIRC for administrators and school teams; (5) professional development for teachers on the Common Core Standards; (6) workshops on the changes in the ISAT for administrators and school teams; (7) professional development for teachers on differentiated instruction; (8) assistance identifying students whose performance falls below the standard through the use of MAPS, ISAT, SPMS in the Illinois Data System; (9) resources to support new teacher development; curriculum initiatives and the services of a reading and math consultant; (10) other assistance at the request of and in collaboration with the building administrators; (11) opportunities for all teachers to participate in a variety of reading related district courses.

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.

Mrs. Cindy Helmers will provide in-service on the interpretation of the MAPS and ISAT scores. Time will be spent analyzing the data and learning how to identify those students who need additional interventions.

Mrs. Gretchen Courtney will provide reading in-service to the reading/language arts teachers on the reading strategies (e.g., predicting, summarizing). There will be direct instruction on teaching comprehension strategies and the assessment strategies for each comprehension strategy. For the science and social studies teachers, Mrs. Courtney will provide in-service on applying comprehension strategies in science and social studies classrooms.

Mrs. Suzy Dees, Common Core Standards Consultant, will provide in-service on the Common Core Standards which includes identifying the targets, developing common assessments and making instructional decisions based on assessment data.

The District will provide staff develop on the implementation of differentiated instruction through District-Level Courses.

	Name	Title
1	Dr. Susan Silvey	Principal
2	Mrs. Cindy Helmers	Asst. Supt. for Curriculum and Instruction
3	Mrs. Gretchen Courtney	Reading Consultant
4	Mrs. Suzie Dees	Common Core Consultant
5	Mrs. Diane Stempinski	ROE Asst. Regional Superintendent
6		

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 (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