

Local Board Approved	
Initial Submission	
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)?	No	Has this School been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2011-12 Federal Improvement Status	Choice
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2011-12 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning Year 1

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		85.0			85.0			91.0		82.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	70.9		No	75.9		No	94.3	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	76.0	76.6	Yes	84.0		Yes	94.1			
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	71.7	74.9	Yes	68.3	70.5	Yes	94.2			
Hispanic														
Asian														

American Indian														
Two or More Races														
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities														
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	66.9	67.6	Yes	72.0	72.4	Yes	93.9			

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.

2011 DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION

The Differentiated Accountability classification for the School is:	Comprehensive
Is this School making AYP in the "ALL" subgroup in reading?	No
Is this School making AYP in the "ALL" subgroup in math?	No

In 2008, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) was one of 6 states to be chosen by the US Department of Education to participate in the Differentiated Accountability Pilot Program. The Differentiated Accountability classification **applies only to schools in federal improvement status that do not make AYP**.

The classification is a descriptor (i.e., focused or comprehensive) that is added to a school's improvement status. Current Title I requirements do not change. The classification assists in distinguishing between schools that need focused support versus more comprehensive interventions.

If a school does make AYP in ALL-student group in both reading and math, this school will be classified as a focused school; otherwise, the school will be identified as a comprehensive school.

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 (%)	94.1	94.2	93.6	93.8	94.3	94.3	94.0	94.3
Truancy Rate (%)	3.1	5.9	3.0	3.0	3.1	2.4	2.4	1.3
Mobility Rate (%)	13.9	34.1	27.1	34.6	25.5	28.5	28.1	25.0
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	480	444	501	421	409	478	431	398
Low Income (%)	82.3	78.2	79.8	78.6	79.5	77.0	82.6	86.2
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.3
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	16.2	17.3
White, non-Hispanic (%)	49.0	48.9	40.1	39.7	36.4	37.4	33.6	34.7
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	43.1	42.6	45.5	48.0	46.7	45.2	45.7	41.5
Hispanic (%)	7.5	8.1	11.6	8.3	8.3	4.8	6.5	10.8
Asian (%)	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.0	1.0	1.4	1.0
American Indian(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
Two or More Races (%)	-	0.0	2.2	3.3	8.6	11.5	12.8	11.8
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	51.7	43.1	4.8	0.4	-	-	-
	2001	46.8	45.9	6.6	0.7	-	-	-
	2002	46.9	45.6	7.0	0.6	-	-	-
	2003	46.6	45.8	7.0	0.6	-	-	-
	2004	49.0	43.1	7.5	0.4	-	-	-
	2005	48.9	42.6	8.1	0.5	-	-	-
	2006	40.1	45.5	11.6	0.6	-	2.2	-
	2007	39.7	48.0	8.3	0.7	-	3.3	-
	2008	36.4	46.7	8.3	-	-	8.6	-
	2009	37.4	45.2	4.8	1.0	-	11.5	-
	2010	33.6	45.7	6.5	1.4	-	12.8	-
2011	34.7	41.5	10.8	1.0	0.3	11.8	-	
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	-	75.9	100.0	94.3	28.0	15	2.8	-	-
	2001	-	73.9	100.0	94.0	24.1	6	1.1	-	-
	2002	-	80.8	100.0	93.6	24.3	13	2.3	-	-
	2003	-	72.5	100.0	94.2	23.9	12	2.4	-	-
	2004	-	82.3	100.0	94.1	13.9	15	3.1	-	-
	2005	-	78.2	100.0	94.2	34.1	27	5.9	-	-
	2006	2.6	79.8	100.0	93.6	27.1	15	3.0	-	-
	2007	0.7	78.6	100.0	93.8	34.6	13	3.0	-	-
	2008	-	79.5	100.0	94.3	25.5	13	3.1	-	-
	2009	-	77.0	100.0	94.3	28.5	11	2.4	-	-
	2010	0.9	82.6	100.0	94.0	28.1	10	2.4	-	-
2011	1.3	86.2	100.0	94.3	25.0	5	1.3	-	-	
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	561	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	560	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	542	82	93	96	-	-	-
	2003	502	81	88	85	-	-	-
	2004	480	72	85	81	-	-	-
	2005	444	64	72	82	-	-	-
	2006	501	70	73	83	-	-	-
	2007	421	75	59	67	-	-	-
	2008	409	73	71	55	-	-	-
	2009	478	72	75	79	-	-	-
	2010	431	69	60	63	-	-	-
2011	398	61	69	50	-	-	-	
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	76.9	59.5	59.5	62.5	72.5	73.3	50.7	64.0	65.7	61.1	60.3	66.2	52.5	49.2	79.3	69.2	55.5	65.4
White	93.1	54.8	55.5	74.1	82.6	68.2	58.4	84.0	55.5	69.5	80.0	76.2	61.2	48.7	85.7	61.3	52.7	84.3
Black	60.0	62.1	62.2	58.8	62.0	74.1	40.0	48.4	73.5	56.1	51.8	61.1	43.6	46.2	76.0	77.8	66.6	63.6
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	63.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	50.0	16.7	13.3	33.3	-	-	7.1	36.4	17.3	11.8	-	25.0	5.9	11.1	-	19.0	15.8	-
Low Income	75.5	55.3	55.7	62.1	69.5	73.6	42.1	56.2	63.1	56.6	54.8	61.9	50.8	45.8	77.1	64.5	47.1	61.4
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	86.2	83.8	68.5	70.9	75.4	85.0	71.0	75.0	80.6	57.0	68.0	81.1	68.8	69.6	73.6	79.5	58.8	55.7
White	96.5	77.4	66.6	81.5	82.6	100.0	77.8	92.0	77.7	73.9	85.0	81.0	75.0	69.2	90.5	67.7	68.4	79.0
Black	76.7	89.2	69.5	64.7	62.1	66.6	63.4	61.3	85.3	43.9	59.3	80.6	61.6	69.2	60.0	86.1	57.6	50.0
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	81.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	70.0	58.3	53.4	53.3	-	-	35.7	45.5	56.5	23.5	-	58.3	29.4	33.3	-	42.9	26.3	-
Low Income	83.0	82.1	65.3	68.9	71.2	83.0	68.4	70.8	78.2	56.6	66.7	77.8	65.6	66.1	68.6	79.1	54.9	50.0
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?

Overall academic performance continues to slowly improve in most areas. Each of our identified subgroups made AYP with safe harbor in reading and math, however the school did not make AYP in either reading or math. The achievement gap between racial subgroups at Sheridan has narrowed and in some cases been eliminated in reading. The gap continues to exist in math for racial subgroups, but is much smaller than state averages. The performance levels of the low income subgroup (which still makes AYP) continues to lag behind their non-low income peers. The schoolwide averages (as reported on the AYP report) for reading and math have steadily improved over the last three years. Attendance has improved, but still is an area of concern.

Sheridan School has not made AYP targets for two consecutive years.

STRENGTHS

- Student performance in reading has continued to exceed the state AYP safe harbor targets for all subgroups.
- **Black students are now performing as well as white students in reading on the state AYP report.**
- The percentage of students meeting and exceeding in reading has increased over the prior year.
- The percentage of students meeting and exceeding in math has increased over the prior year in third and fourth grade
- Low income student performance increased in reading and math for most grades over the prior year.

WEAKNESSES

- Reading and math have shown improvement, however Sheridan students have not met AYP in either subject
- Significant gaps exist between low-income and not low-income students in fourth and fifth grade
- When analyzing cohort groups fifth grade math scores have decreased from fourth grade levels
- Attendance rates are still lower than district averages.

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

FACTORS, STRATEGIES, AND INTERVENTIONS CONTRIBUTING TO SUCCESS

1. Early Start - 2002 to 2011 - A three week summer program continues to be held in August each year for every kindergarten student and at-risk students in first through fifth grades. **Emphasis is placed on skill areas where deficits exist, school structure / routines, and building relations with their new teachers.**
2. Increased Home / School Connections - Home visits by staff, activities at school that are “family friendly”, walk-in registration required for any student to be enrolled, and increased efforts to conference with every parent multiple times during the school year.
3. After School Opportunities for Intervention - **Small group sessions with Sheridan teachers are held after school in the Fall and Spring. Teachers focus on skill deficits and use intervention materials that may not be available during the day.**
4. Support from Outside Agencies / Community - Multiple groups (Kiwanis, University Sport’s teams, BHS Hype students, Big Brothers / Big Sisters) are now establishing **mentor relationships with students. Illinois State University Reading classes work with students one on one to tutor and support their academics. Illinois Wesleyan University has placed *America Reads* students at Sheridan to help in classrooms. After school programs like Western Avenue, the Boys and Girls Club, YWCA After School Care provide homework support. Junior Achievement, the Rotary Club, the Child Protection Network, McLean County Community Action, other groups all provide additional supports and programs for students.**
5. Early Intervention Emphasis - **Available resources are primarily targeted at students in Grades K, 1, and 2. Reading intervention occurs for most every student in these grades who exhibit a need.**
6. Response to Intervention - **Constant data analysis paired with progress monitoring makes sure students who are not progressing are identified and supported.**
7. PBIS Behavior Program - **All students are tracked to determine if they need additional supports. Student who are “on target” and making right choices are rewarded with Super Sharks, participate in motivating activities that are meant to increase good behavior, and honored in regularly scheduled student programs. Students who struggle with behavior may be involved in our Check-In / Check-Out program to allow for daily and individual encouragements. Other students may be involved in social / academic groups to learn and model appropriate behavior.**
8. Use of SRI and Reading Counts - **All students in grades 3, 4, and 5 are tested with the Scholastic Reading Inventory several times a year to help them select reading material. Once they are reading level appropriate material their progress is tracked by Reading Counts. Students take quizzes after reading a book and accumulate points which are acknowledged quarterly.**
9. All Day Kindergarten - This transition occurred ten years ago, however the importance of this initiative should not be minimized.

FACTORS THAT HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED AS “ROADBLOCKS”

INTERNAL

1. The previous curriculum (the roadblock) was lacking materials and "best practices". A new math curriculum has been acquired.
2. Thirteen of our eighteen grade level classroom teachers are new or in different roles than they were in nine years ago. Two more retirements in the Spring of 2012 will increase this number.
3. Student attendance has held steady, but not improved . Efforts have been made (and will continue to be made) to encourage attendance.
4. Student behavior has improved as indicated by the number of Office Discipline Referrals. Decreasing the number of incidents further will allow for more uninterrupted instruction.

EXTERNAL

1. Limited exposure to language prior to school experience.
2. High amount of student mobility.
3. Parent support for students and school is limited.

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

Many interventions are in place to develop skills in deficit areas. Our goal is to continue to use successful programs (additional intervention opportunities, computer assisted curriculum, research based curriculum, and data based decision making) which have resulted in Sheridan student achievement. Other programs used at other schools will be investigated, utilized, and adapted as necessary to make sure all students have the opportunity to succeed. Professional development will address targeted areas. Subscore scores for ISAT and SAT 10 will be analyzed to determine areas to target.

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?

The **Stanford Achievement Test, SAT 10**, provides an annual measure of performance for language, reading, math, science, and social studies. This information is provided to parents and teachers to help them better understand each child's needs. Analysis of the data tells us:

- Reading scores in all grades have shown some improvement over the last three years. Math scores have been stable over the same time period.
- Reading Scores in each skill area (word study skills, reading vocabulary, reading comprehension) are consistently low in grades 3, 4, and 5. There are no identifiable relative strengths or weaknesses.
- Reading scores in grades 1 and 2 show a deficit in sounds and letters (basic phonics) in relation to other scores.
- An achievement gap is still indicated between racial subgroups.
- The gap between low income and non-low income students has increased.

The **Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills, DIBELS**, are an individually administered measurement of early literacy development. Subtests include initial sound fluency, letter naming fluency, phoneme segmentation, nonsense word fluency, and oral reading fluency. Benchmarks are administered three times a year. Students with more intensive needs are progressed monitored every two to three weeks as a part of our Response to Intervention program. Analysis of the data tells us:

- Early grade skills continue to show dramatic improvement. Kindergarten and first grade students are increasingly on track when monitored.
- Oral reading fluency for second, third, fourth, and fifth grade students is a previously noted weakness. The percentage of students at benchmark in this area has risen from Fall 2010 (46.7%) to Spring 2011 (55%). These numbers were in the low 30's two years ago.
- The numbers below indicate the increased number of students who were at benchmark levels at the end of the year compared to the beginning of the year.

First Grade	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
2010 / 2011 Instructional Recommendations	Goal: Benchmark	Goal: Benchmark	Goal: Benchmark
Students Tested	78	75	70
	58% Benchmark	57% Benchmark	67% Benchmark
	33% Strategic	37% Strategic	26% Strategic
	9% Intensive	5% Intensive	7% Intensive

Second Grade	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
2010 / 2011 Instructional Recommendations	Goal: Benchmark	Goal: Benchmark	Goal: Benchmark
Students Tested	70	68	65
	43% Benchmark	63% Benchmark	57% Benchmark
	34% Strategic	15% Strategic	23% Strategic
	23% Intensive	22% Intensive	20% Intensive

Third Grade	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
2010 / 2011 Instructional Recommendations	Goal: Benchmark	Goal: Benchmark	Goal: Benchmark
Students Tested	63	62	61
	51% Benchmark	50% Benchmark	56% Benchmark
	35% Strategic	35% Strategic	39% Strategic
	14% Intensive	15% Intensive	5% Intensive

Fourth Grade	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
2010 / 2011 Instructional Recommendations	Goal: Benchmark	Goal: Benchmark	Goal: Benchmark
Students Tested	73	75	75
	41% Benchmark	60% Benchmark	51% Benchmark
	23% Strategic	20% Strategic	28% Strategic
	36% Intensive	20% Intensive	21% Intensive

Fifth Grade	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
2010 / 2011 Instructional Recommendations	Goal: Benchmark	Goal: Benchmark	Goal: Benchmark
Students Tested	53	53	52
	49% Benchmark	58% Benchmark	58% Benchmark
	25% Strategic	17% Strategic	19% Strategic
	26% Intensive	25% Intensive	23% Intensive

Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) allows for a reading lexile to be obtained for all of our students and facilitates students reading appropriate material. Students are tested periodically throughout the year. A measure is obtained at least four times a year. The percentage of readers reading at the appropriate level as measured by the SRI has increased from 62% in Fall of 2010 to 74% in Fall of 2011.

- Identifying each students' lexile has allowed for independent reading to occur at the correct level and increased library readership. Students have read over 82 million words during the 2010 - 2011 school year. This is a 60% increase in relation to reading levels in 2009 - 2010.
- A comparison of readers and their levels of proficiency at the beginning of the 2010 -2011 year and the beginning of the 2011 - 2012 year follows:

2010 - 2011 SRI Levels

Performance Standard	Percentage of Students
Advanced	0%
Proficient	19%
Basic	43%
Below Basic	38%

2011 - 2012 SRI Levels

Performance Standard	Percentage of Students
Advanced	4%
Proficient	34%
Basic	36%
Below Basic	27%

Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS) provides data concerning student behavior. Sheridan has been a PBIS school for five years. The program emphasizes identifying where, when, and what is happening and being proactive to address those issues. Office Discipline Referrals are one indicator of behaviors and they are tracked on the chart below:

School Year	Number of Referrals
2010 - 2011	571
2009 - 2010	624
2008 - 2009	782

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

The factors discussed in Section 1, Part A of this plan are same factors that would have contributed to many of these results. Additionally, specific intervention curriculum (Haggerty Phonemic Awareness) aligned to the DIBELS assessment has contributed to the success of lower grade students. Students reading appropriate material at their reading level (thanks to SRI measures) has led to increased library circulation, words read, and increased lexile scores. The decrease in behavior referrals can be directly linked to our PBIS efforts.

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

As stated earlier, many interventions are in place to develop skills in deficit areas. The information above confirms what the ISAT data revealed about areas of focus. Specific goals should be stated in the following areas:

- Reading comprehension
- Math number sense / problem solving

- Attendance
- Student behavior.

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?

Sheridan School is one of six elementary schools in Bloomington District 87. Our 390 students are served in grades kindergarten through five and reflect a rich cultural mix. Over 85 of the students at Sheridan come from low-income homes. Title I services are available at Sheridan School and this results in extra support in reading, all day kindergarten, and after school tutorial programs. Student mobility is quite high, and several strategies are in place to help acclimatize new students and families. Our staff of over 50 professionals include art, music, and physical education specialists, a full-time counselor, a school nurse, teachers trained to work with academically talented students, and many caring educators. Many innovative programs have been initiated over the years, and teachers have the freedom (and are encouraged) to embrace new strategies. Climate builders such as the *Annual Back to School Parade*, walk-in registration, and other community activities have established a positive and caring tone in the school that encourages participation, learning, and success.

Sheridan School has made substantial progress in improving test scores during the last decade. Reading scores have increased dramatically and Sheridan continues to grow in all areas tested. Sheridan has narrowed, and in some cases eliminated, the achievement gap for low-income and African-American students. There are a number of factors (both long term and short term) that created this improvement. The first and foremost is an incredibly talented, creative, and dedicated staff. Sheridan teachers have worked long and hard to make good things happen for students. A second factor that must be considered is the remarkable attitude and positive spirit of our students. These powerful factors combined with strategies and interventions listed below resulted in success for many more students.

Our school improvement goals continue to focus on reading and math improvement for all students. Vocabulary is an important emphasis in both areas. Activities will be conducted in class and during after school programs to help develop vocabulary, practice strategies for problem solving, and allow for guided practice for individual students. Students who have a demonstrated need will be targeted by analyzing our SAT-10 test scores, DIBELS results, and the Scholastic Reading Inventory.

Attendance and behavior are also areas to be considered. Students who attend school and behave are better able to learn what they need to succeed. This information will be tracked and encouragements will be made to improve both of these areas.

Any improvement endeavor for our children cannot be achieved by our school alone. We are fortunate to have community partners such as Rotary Club, Kiwanis, Western Avenue Community Center, State Farm, Electrolux, and many others to help our children grow. This responsibility to help children learn and grow extends throughout our community and

into our homes. Parents have skills and the ability to partner with school to help their children grow and learn. Our families will be an important resource to help increase achievement.

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

Income and experience affect school readiness. Vocabulary deficits, immature social behavior, and low pre-academic skills are intrinsic within this population. Continued training and sharing information about working with children and families affected by poverty is critical.

The staff dynamics mentioned above have resulted in an atmosphere that is positive and dynamic. Meaningful changes in routines, curriculum, interventions, and procedures happen because staff understand their critical roles, and are willing to “go the extra mile”. Staff efforts have led to improvements for students. Efforts to analyze data and plan instruction based upon individual strengths and weaknesses must continue. Time will need to be allocated to allow for data analysis and the associated planning for instruction.

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

There is a need for:

- Increased data analysis (and time to complete this task)
- Intervention tools need to be easily accessible for all staff
- Training with intervention tools is essential
- Additional opportunities should be sought to provide interventions
- Templates of successful programs should be shared and sought after to help meet student needs
- Time provided to access and train with interventions

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 teachers are highly qualified as defined by the *No Child Left Behind Act*. Thirteen of the eighteen regular classroom teachers are in different roles or new to their positions in the last nine years. Staff has been aggressive in attending professional development and furthering their education.

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

Highly qualified staff have contributed to high rates of student success.

Staff are becoming acquainted with more research based curriculums and are using them with at-risk students. Student performance has continued to improve as materials that focus on specific remediations are utilized.

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

100% of our staff are highly qualified.

Materials and training allow instructors to provide appropriate research-based interventions.

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?

The involvement and support of programs by engaged parents at Sheridan School has had a positive impact on student learning. Families are involved in various ways including: PTA membership, Family Reading Nights, Open House, Fall Festival, Title I meeting, parent conferences, home visits, volunteers, parent trainings, Family Activity Nights, Orientation, Ice Cream Social, After School Programs, Book Fair, Play Day, Musical Programs, Back-to-School Parade, Field Trips, Poetry Place, Student Led Conferences, and Honor's Night programs.

Parent signatures are obtained to verify handbook receipt and understanding.

A principal / parent compact is co-signed by parents and administration. The compact encourages parents to have their children to school on time, support the school in maintaining discipline, provide a quiet homework location, encourage their student, and communicate with teachers and the school. The principal agrees to provide an environment that fosters positive communication, provide a safe learning environment, and provide for the needs of each student.

Our school makes contact with 100% of our families as reported in the school report card.

Attendance for some of our events is quite low. PTA generally has less than 2% of our families represented. Parent trainings are often attended by only 5% to 10% of our families.

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

Parents who connect with school, reinforce what has been taught in class, and regularly attend school activities tend to help maximize their children's performance. Many of parents are a vital part of the home-school team. Conversely, parents who struggle to be involved in any way with school, many times have students who struggle at school.

We have many concrete examples of cases when the concerted efforts of a parent have made the difference between success and failure for an individual student. While we acknowledge the need for education and learning to be a "team effort" between home and school, many at risk students need additional intervention not only at school, but also at home.

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

We will continue to encourage parent involvement through family activities, student recognitions, classroom volunteers, parent conferences, PTA, and parent learning opportunities. Every opportunity for a positive parent contact results in increased student learning.

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?

Sheridan School did not make AYP in reading or math as noted by the state of Illinois. Our teachers continually strive to improve instructional practices. Our focus will continue to be using new information and best practices to improve our students reading and math skills.

Response to Intervention will be utilized to identify individual students who have specific needs and intervention curriculums will be utilized to address these concerns.

Attendance will also be a significant focus for our school, our families, and our students.

Encouraging appropriate behavior and creating an even more positive school climate will lead to more time on task and more learning.

Professional development will be provided in differentiated instruction, intervention strategies, and intervention tools.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Current achievement in reading for Sheridan School is 70.9% of students either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan students will continue to increase the percentage that meets or exceeds the expectations to 92.5%.	1,
2	Current achievement in math for Sheridan School is 75.9% of students either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan students will continue to increase the percentage that meets or exceeds the expectations to 92.5%.	2,
3	The Sheridan School attendance rate for 2010 - 2011 was 94.3%. Our objective is to increase this number in each of the next two years to 95%.	
4	The number of office referrals for the 2010 - 2011 school year was 571. The number of referrals will decrease in each of the next two years by 10%.	

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. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Current achievement in reading for Sheridan School is 70.9% of students either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan students will continue to increase the percentage that meets or exceeds the expectations to 92.5%.

Objective 1 Description

Reading is a multi-faceted skill. Vocabulary development, word recognition, and phonemic awareness all lead to fluency. Fluent reading does not automatically result in reading comprehension - instruction and interventions may be necessary. Understanding that reading comprehension is our final goal, Sheridan School teachers will work with each student to give them the skills (and if needed, the pre-skills) to be successful.

Measures of growth and ways to diagnose strengths and weaknesses will include SAT 10, ISAT, Scholastic Reading Inventory, DIBELS, Discovery Assessment, running records, the Phonological Awareness Language Screening (PALS), and the kindergarten "Blue Book".

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- ⓑ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓔ 2. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 1 Title :

Current achievement in reading for Sheridan School is 70.9% of students either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan students will continue to increase the percentage that meets or exceeds the expectations to 92.5%.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Targeted intervention using research based materials will be provided by Title I reading teachers to students identified as not reaching benchmark levels .	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Title I	300,000
2	Short term interventions for students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will focus on skills to make them successful in reading for junior high school and test situations.	01/05/2012	02/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	6,000

3	Students will develop reading skills by increasing the amount of independent reading as measured by Reading Counts.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	2,500
4	Students with significantly deficient skills will participate in Early Start Summer program to develop reading skills.	07/25/2011	08/10/2012	Summer School	Other	50,000
5	Students with significantly deficient skills will participate in after school reading small groups to develop skills.	11/01/2011	03/01/2013	After School	Title I	30,000
6	Use appropriate intervention materials to increase DIBELS, Discovery Education, and Scholastic Reading Inventory scores.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	30,000
7	Students in grades 2 - 5 will increase their comprehension and fluency by using 6 Minute Solutions. Progress will be monitored through the DIBELS.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	500
8	Utilize other research based curriculum at Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III levels to provide remediation and support for students who have not met benchmarks.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	500

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

Objective 1 Title :

Current achievement in reading for Sheridan School is 70.9% of students either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan students will continue to increase the percentage that meets or exceeds the expectations to 92.5%.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide multiple training opportunities throughout the year to access, interpret, and plan using various data sources.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Title I	0
2	Attend area and regional workshops focused on increasing reading achievement.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	500
3	Curriculum trainings for research based reading materials will be attended. Material will be shared during staff follow-up training.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	500
4	Provide ongoing training opportunities to use instructional technology to further engage students in the learning process.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	200

5	Provide ongoing professional development opprtunities in differentiated instruction for staff.	11/30/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	1,000
---	--	------------	------------	--------------	-------------	-------

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

Objective 1 Title :

Current achievement in reading for Sheridan School is 70.9% of students either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan students will continue to increase the percentage that meets or exceeds the expectations to 92.5%.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Conduct parent / child reading activities on a regularly scheduled basis. Activities would include Family Reading Night and Read Across America.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	200
2	Use reading motivation programs (Pizza Hut Book-It / Reading Counts) to encourage reading at home with parents.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Conference with parent to share SAT-10, SRI, and ISAT results.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Current achievement in reading for Sheridan School is 70.9% of students either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan students will continue to increase the percentage that meets or exceeds the expectations to 92.5%.

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

The ultimate indicator of student success will be ISAT scores that will be reviewed annually. As an intermediate check for progress the following tools will also be used:

- DIBELS
- Scholastic Reading Inventory
- Discovery Assessment
- SAT- 10 Scores

Data will be a part of discussions during each of our scheduled data days during the year. If progress is not noted or if it is unacceptably slow, instruction or interventions may be modified.

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	Jim Cooper	Principal, Sheridan Elementary School
2	Jaye Lamie	Social Worker / Data Team Member
3	Julie Hesse	Psychologist / Data Team Member
4	Carol Roehrig	Title I Interventionist / Data Team Member

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Current achievement in math for Sheridan School is 75.9% of students either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan students will continue to increase the percentage that meets or exceeds the expectations to 92.5%.

Objective 2 Description

Number Sense, Measurement, Geometry, Probability, Statistics, and Data Analysis will all continue to be evaluated each year. Sheridan has shown limited improvements in the last year and did not make AYP. We will continue to identify relative weaknesses and work to improve those areas. Based upon 2011 ISAT data, the areas of measurement, data analysis, geometry, and computation appear to be relative weaknesses.

Measures of growth and ways to diagnose strengths and weaknesses will include SAT 10, ISAT, Discovery Assessment, running records, and the kindergarten "Blue Book".

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- Ⓔ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓕ 2. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 2 Title :

Current achievement in math for Sheridan School is 75.9% of students either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan students will continue to increase the percentage that meets or exceeds the expectations to 92.5%.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Grades 2 through 5 will administer Discovery Assessment 3 times per year to glean timely data, organized by standard, for use in differentiated instructional planning.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	2,000
2	Math vocabulary will be emphasized at all grade levels.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Intentionally selected Internet-based programs will be used for concept introduction, skill development and guided practice during whole group lessons and small group or individual centers. (Education City, Brain Pop, Brain Pop, Jr., Symphony Math, FAST Math, and Discovery Assessment linked lessons.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	5,000
4	Our Pearson math curriculum (based upon the Common Core Standards) will be the core math program for every student.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	500,000

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

Objective 2 Title :

Current achievement in math for Sheridan School is 75.9% of students either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan students will continue to increase the percentage that meets or exceeds the expectations to 92.5%.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)

1	Provide multiple training opportunities throughout the year to access, interpret, and plan using various data sources.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	100
2	Use item analysis data from ISAT and Discovery Assessment to further differentiate instruction.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Curriculum trainings for research based math materials will be attended. Material will be shared during staff follow-up training.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	200
4	Provide ongoing training opportunities to use instructional technology to further engage students in the learning process.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
5	Provide professional development on differentiated instruction.	11/28/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	1,000

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

Objective 2 Title :

Current achievement in math for Sheridan School is 75.9% of students either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan students will continue to increase the percentage that meets or exceeds the expectations to 92.5%.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Conduct evening activities that give parents opportunities to learn how to best to help their children with math skills.	01/23/2012	05/31/2013	Before School	Title I	500
2	Increase parent awareness of grade level expectations by sharing standards and exit skills on-line or on paper.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	Before School	Title I	100
3	Communicate test data with parents including explanation of the various goals.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	Before School	Title I	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

Current achievement in math for Sheridan School is 75.9% of students either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan students will continue to increase the percentage that meets or exceeds the expectations to 92.5%.

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

The ultimate indicator of student success will be ISAT scores that will be reviewed annually. As an intermediate check for progress the following tools will also be used:

- Discovery Assessment
- Curriculum based measures

Data will be a part of discussions during each of our scheduled data days during the year. If progress is not noted or if it is unacceptably slow, instruction or interventions may be modified.

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	Jim Cooper	Principal, Sheridan Elementary School
2	Julie Hesse	Psychologist, Data Team Member
3	Patty Bucholtz	Teacher, Data Team Member
4	Krissy Mercer	Teacher, Data Team Member

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3

The Sheridan School attendance rate for 2010 - 2011 was 94.3%. Our objective is to increase this number in each of the next two years to 95%.

Objective 3 Description

Strategies will be initiated to increase student attendance rates and reduce the incidences of tardiness.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- Ⓔ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 2. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 3 Title :

The Sheridan School attendance rate for 2010 - 2011 was 94.3%. Our objective is to increase this number in each of the next two years to 95%.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students who attend on a consistent basis will be recognized and rewarded.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	200
2	Students and families that struggle to attend regularly will receive support services from our counselor and the ROE.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Students and families that refuse to comply after appropriate encouragement will be referred to the ROE truancy program.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 3 Title :

The Sheridan School attendance rate for 2010 - 2011 was 94.3%. Our objective is to increase this number in each of the next two years to 95%.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Procedures and incentives will be brainstormed and discussed at faculty meetings.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	0

2	Provide opportunities to attend workshops focused on best practices to increase attendance.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	500
---	---	------------	------------	--------------	-------------	-----

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

Objective 3 Title :

The Sheridan School attendance rate for 2010 - 2011 was 94.3%. Our objective is to increase this number in each of the next two years to 95%.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Letters and phone calls will encourage parents in their efforts to improve student attendance. Data will be shared regularly to increase awareness and raise concern.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Meetings will be held with parents to provide data and information on the importance of attendance.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 3 Title :

The Sheridan School attendance rate for 2010 - 2011 was 94.3%. Our objective is to increase this number in each of the next two years to 95%.

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

The ultimate indicator of student success will be attendance rates that will be reviewed annually. As an intermediate check for progress the following tool will also be used:

- Monthly Attendance Checks

Data will be a part of discussions during each of our scheduled data days during the year. If progress is not noted or if it is unacceptably slow, interventions may be modified.

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	Jim Cooper	Principal, Sheridan Elementary School
2	Teresa Morse	Administrative Assistant, Parent

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 4

The number of office referrals for the 2010 - 2011 school year was 571. The number of referrals will decrease in each of the next two years by 10%.

Objective 4 Description

Sheridan School is a PBIS school that has implemented Tier I and Tier II programs with considerable success. Teams of staff are active in planning and coordinating the activities which lead to student success. The continued efforts of this group will result in increased opportunities for students to succeed.

Tier I Activities include:

- Lessons teaching behavioral expectations in different settings
- Periodic behavior boosters to encourage and reward appropriate behavior
- Random recognitions for exemplary behavior
- Tracking school data to determine needs and strategies
- Recognition at quarterly assemblies

Tier II Activities include:

- A check-in and check-out system to encourage students with more intensive needs
- Social Academic Groups to teach and model appropriate behavior

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- ê 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ê 2. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 4 Title :

The number of office referrals for the 2010 - 2011 school year was 571. The number of referrals will decrease in each of the next two years by 10%.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Tier I PBIS activities will be developed to encourage appropriate behavior.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	200
2	Tier II PBIS activities will be developed to support students with behavioral challenges.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 4 Title :

The number of office referrals for the 2010 - 2011 school year was 571. The number of referrals will decrease in each of the next two years by 10%.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	PBIS training will be attended by coaches and team members.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	500
2	Utilize PBIS team to provide professional development for all staff.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 4 Title :

The number of office referrals for the 2010 - 2011 school year was 571. The number of referrals will decrease in each of the next two years by 10%.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	A parent contact will be made for every Office discipline Referral that is written.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	300
2	Check-in and check-out sheets will be signed by parents to acknowledge student progress.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Parents may attend quarterly awards programs to recognize positive student behavior.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	100

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 4 Title :

The number of office referrals for the 2010 - 2011 school year was 571. The number of referrals will decrease in each of the next two years by 10%.

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

The ultimate indicator of student success will be decreased number of ODR's and that will be reviewed annually. As an intermediate check for progress the following tools will also be used:

- Monthly Skyward Data Review
- Tracking CICO sheets

Data will be a part of discussions during each of our scheduled data days during the year. If progress is not noted or if it is unacceptably slow, instruction or interventions may be modified.

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	Sonja Huddleston	PBIS Coach
2	Messina Lambert	PBIS Coach
3	Patty Bucholtz	PBIS Coach
4	Dana Micks	PBIS Data Manager

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.*)

Sheridan School provides the families access to the School Report Card information through the district website, the school website, the Sheridan Shares school newsletter, teacher classroom newsletters, hard copies upon request and copies are available at the Parent Resource Center in our lobby. Parents are given individual student results at conferences. **Parent letters / notifications regarding school choice were sent to all parents in their home language.**

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.

Developing the School Improvement Plan is an essential goal for the entire Sheridan community. It is an ongoing process which includes the following to enhance development:

- Parent Surveys
- Staff PBIS Surveys
- Teacher School Improvement Days (two per year)
- PTA Meetings with ongoing presentations, input and updates
- Meet the Teacher Open House/Orientation
- Administrative meetings
- Elementary principal meetings
- IIRC staff training

Each of these groups and activities contribute to the goals of the Sheridan School Improvement Plan.

	Name	Title
1	Jim Cooper	Principal
2	Jaye Lamie	Social Worker
3	Carol Roehrig	Title I Teacher
4	Sonja Huddleston	First Grade Teacher
5	Messina Lambert	Fifth Grade Teacher
6	Patty Bucholtz	Special Education Teacher

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.

Colleagues review other schools' documents as they are developed. The process is dynamic and allows for the sharing of ideas and the adoptions of successful practices from other schools. This peer review has occurred continually in September, October, and November of 2011. Peers that were involved were Jeff Geringer, Mary Kay Scharf, Jeff Lockenvitz, Tina Fogal, Cindy Helmers, Barry Reilly, Becky Francois, David Wood, and Christina Lammers.

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.

Teachers who are new to the district and the school participate in the New Teacher Professional Development Series. This program brings new teachers from all elementary schools together for half day training and mentoring sessions with administrators and/or outstanding veteran teachers. The new teachers participate in workshops, hands-on training, and discussion on district curriculum, the Common Core Standards, teaching reading, communicating with parents and other topics. They take time to reflect on their experiences and formulate personal and professional goals. The teachers also receive print and other resources to support their continued growth. Teachers are also paired with an experienced “helper teacher” to serve as a resource, answer questions, and provide support as needed.

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 the following:

- Technical assistance including the analysis of local standardized achievement test scores, state test scores and subgroup performance
- Data management including the preparation of requested reports on individual students and groups of students
- Opportunities for collaboration among elementary school principals to improve the school improvement planning process
- Professional development on the use of IIRC for administrators and school teams
- Professional development for teachers on the Common Core Standards
- Workshop on the changes in the ISAT for administrators and school teams
- Other assistance at the request of and in collaboration with the building principals.

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.

Not Applicable

	Name	Title
1		

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:

A. ASSURANCES

1. The district has provided written notice in a timely manner about the improvement identification to parents of each student enrolled in the school, in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand (NCLB, Section 1116(c)(6)).
2. Strategies and activities have been founded in scientifically based research as required by NCLB, Section 1116(b)(3)(A)(i) and as defined in NCLB, Section 9101(37).
3. Technical assistance provided by the district serving the school is founded on scientifically based research (NCLB, Section 1116(b)(4)(C)) as defined in NCLB, Section 9101 (37).
4. The plan includes strategies and activities that support the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards and ensures alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessments with the Illinois Learning Standards.
5. The school will spend at least 10 percent of the funds made available under Section 1113 of NCLB for the purpose of providing teachers and the principal high-quality professional development. (Title I schools only.)

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

By submitting the plan on behalf of the school the district superintendent certifies to ISBE that all the assurances and information provided in the plan are true and correct and that the improvement plan has been duly approved by the local school board. By sending e-mail notification of the plan completion from the **Submit Your Plan** page (Section IV-C) the plan shall be deemed to be executed by the superintendent on behalf of the school.

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified? [C]

Yes No

Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness? [C]

Yes No

Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students? [C]

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (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