

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

## PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

|   |   |                    |   |
|---|---|--------------------|---|
| RCDT Number:  | 170640870252003                                 |                    |   |
| District Name:  | Bloomington SD 87                               | School Name:       | Bent Elem School                        |
| Superintendent:   | Dr Robert S Nielsen                             | Principal:         | Vickie Slagell                          |
| District Address:   | 300 E Monroe St                                 | School Address:    | 904 N Roosevelt Ave                     |
| City/State/Zip:   | Bloomington,IL 61701 4028                       | City/State/Zip:    | Bloomington,IL 61701 2936               |
| District Telephone#:  | Label 3098276031                      Extn: 221 | School Telephone#: | 3098284315                      Extn: 0 |
| District Email:   | nielsenr@district87.org                         | School Email:      |   |
| Is this plan for a Title I School? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |   |                    |   |

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

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

| Student Groups           | Percentage Tested on State Tests |         |             |         | Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards* |                      |         |             |                      |         | Other Indicators |         |                 |         |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|---------|-------------|---------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---------|-------------|----------------------|---------|------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|
|                          | Reading                          |         | Mathematics |         | Reading                              |                      |         | Mathematics |                      |         | Attendance Rate  |         | Graduation Rate |         |
|                          | %                                | Met AYP | %           | Met AYP | %                                    | Safe** Harbor Target | Met AYP | %           | Safe** Harbor Target | Met AYP | %                | Met AYP | %               | Met AYP |
| State AYP Minimum Target | 95.0                             |         | 95.0        |         | 70.0                                 |                      |         | 70.0        |                      |         | 90.0             |         | 78.0            |         |
| All                      | 100.0                            | Yes     | 100.0       | Yes     | 75.0                                 |                      | Yes     | 86.0        |                      | Yes     | 95.3             | Yes     |                 |         |
| White                    | 100.0                            | Yes     | 100.0       | Yes     | 84.5                                 |                      | Yes     | 91.4        |                      | Yes     |                  |         |                 |         |
| Black                    |                                  |         |             |         |                                      |                      |         |             |                      |         |                  |         |                 |         |
| Hispanic                 | 100.0                            | Yes     | 100.0       | Yes     |                                      |                      |         |             |                      |         |                  |         |                 |         |
| Asian/Pacific Islander   |                                  |         |             |         |                                      |                      |         |             |                      |         |                  |         |                 |         |
| Native American          |                                  |         |             |         |                                      |                      |         |             |                      |         |                  |         |                 |         |

|                            |       |     |       |     |      |     |      |     |  |  |  |  |
|----------------------------|-------|-----|-------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|--|--|--|--|
| Multiracial /Ethnic        |       |     |       |     |      |     |      |     |  |  |  |  |
| LEP                        | 100.0 | Yes | 100.0 | Yes |      |     |      |     |  |  |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities |       |     |       |     |      |     |      |     |  |  |  |  |
| Low Income                 | 100.0 | Yes | 100.0 | Yes | 67.1 | Yes | 80.0 | Yes |  |  |  |  |

**Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress**

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 70% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 70% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. \*\*\*
3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 70% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 78% graduation rate for high schools.

\* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2008.

\*\* Safe Harbor Targets of 70% or above are not printed.

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

|   |
|---|
| <b>DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION</b> |
|---|

|   |   |
|---|---|
| The Differentiated Accountability classification for the school is: | - |
| Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in reading?           | - |
| Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in math?              | - |

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

| School Information                    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|---------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                                       | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| Attendance Rate (%)                   | 95.8 | 95.7 | 95.9 | 96.1 | 96.0 | 95.4 | 95.6 | 95.3 |
| Truancy Rate (%)                      | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 0.3  | -    | 0.3  |
| Mobility Rate (%)                     | 14.3 | 14.8 | 24.5 | 18.2 | 17.6 | 22.9 | 19.5 | 15.4 |
| HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%) | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| School Population (#)                 | 337  | 341  | 333  | 311  | 298  | 347  | 374  | 385  |
| Low Income (%)                        | 47.5 | 38.1 | 48.6 | 50.2 | 49.3 | 64.0 | 67.1 | 69.6 |
| Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)  | -    | -    | -    | -    | 0.7  | 21.3 | 27.0 | 23.9 |
| Students with Disabilities (%)        |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| White, non-Hispanic (%)               | 81.0 | 77.1 | 72.7 | 68.5 | 65.1 | 48.7 | 43.9 | 41.3 |
| Black, non-Hispanic (%)               | 16.0 | 17.9 | 22.8 | 25.7 | 21.5 | 16.7 | 16.0 | 17.1 |
| Hispanic (%)                          | 2.1  | 3.2  | 3.0  | 3.5  | 4.7  | 24.5 | 28.9 | 31.4 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander (%)            | 0.6  | 1.8  | 1.5  | 2.3  | 3.4  | 1.2  | 0.8  | 0.3  |
| Native American or Alaskan Native(%)  | 0.3  | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Multiracial/Ethnic (%)                | -    | -    | -    | -    | 5.4  | 8.9  | 10.4 | 9.9  |

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 4 - Student Race/Ethnicity

|                                      | Year | White (%) | Black (%) | Hispanic (%) | Asian (%) | Native American (%) | Multi racial /Ethnic (%) |
|--------------------------------------|------|-----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| S<br>C<br>H<br>O<br>O<br>L           | 2000 | 79.2      | 17.2      | 2.7          | 0.9       | -                   | -                        |
|                                      | 2001 | 80.7      | 16.9      | 1.5          | 0.9       | -                   | -                        |
|                                      | 2002 | 81.0      | 16.0      | 2.1          | 0.6       | 0.3                 | -                        |
|                                      | 2003 | 77.1      | 17.9      | 3.2          | 1.8       | -                   | -                        |
|                                      | 2004 | 72.7      | 22.8      | 3.0          | 1.5       | -                   | -                        |
|                                      | 2005 | 68.5      | 25.7      | 3.5          | 2.3       | -                   | -                        |
|                                      | 2006 | 65.1      | 21.5      | 4.7          | 3.4       | -                   | 5.4                      |
|                                      | 2007 | 48.7      | 16.7      | 24.5         | 1.2       | -                   | 8.9                      |
|                                      | 2008 | 43.9      | 16.0      | 28.9         | 0.8       | -                   | 10.4                     |
|                                      | 2009 | 41.3      | 17.1      | 31.4         | 0.3       | -                   | 9.9                      |
| D<br>I<br>S<br>T<br>R<br>I<br>C<br>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                      |
|                                      | 2000 | 61.1      | 20.9      | 14.6         | 3.3       | 0.2                 | -                        |

|                                  |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |
|----------------------------------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| <b>S<br/>T<br/>A<br/>T<br/>E</b> | 2001 | 60.1 | 20.9 | 15.4 | 3.4 | 0.2 | -   |
|                                  | 2002 | 59.3 | 20.8 | 16.2 | 3.5 | 0.2 | -   |
|                                  | 2003 | 58.6 | 20.7 | 17.0 | 3.6 | 0.2 | -   |
|                                  | 2004 | 57.7 | 20.8 | 17.7 | 3.6 | 0.2 | -   |
|                                  | 2005 | 56.7 | 20.3 | 18.3 | 3.7 | 0.2 | 0.7 |
|                                  | 2006 | 55.7 | 19.9 | 18.7 | 3.8 | 0.2 | 1.8 |
|                                  | 2007 | 54.9 | 19.6 | 19.3 | 3.8 | 0.2 | 2.2 |
|                                  | 2008 | 54.0 | 19.2 | 19.9 | 3.9 | 0.2 | 2.7 |
|                                  | 2009 | 53.3 | 19.1 | 20.8 | 4.1 | 0.2 | 2.5 |

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

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

|  | Year | LEP (%) | Low Income (%) | Parental Involvement (%) | Attendance (%) | Mobility (%) | Chronic Truants (N) | Chronic Truants (%) | HS Dropout Rate (%) | HS Graduation Rate (%) |
|--|------|---------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| <b>S<br/>C<br/>H<br/>O<br/>O<br/>L</b>             | 2000 | -       | 34.1           | 100.0                    | 96.1           | 20.8         | 4                   | 1.2                 | -                   | -                      |
|  | 2001 | -       | 36.8           | 100.0                    | 96.1           | 16.0         | 1                   | 0.3                 | -                   | -                      |
|  | 2002 | -       | 47.5           | 100.0                    | 95.8           | 14.3         | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                      |
|  | 2003 | -       | 38.1           | 100.0                    | 95.7           | 14.8         | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                      |
|  | 2004 | -       | 48.6           | 100.0                    | 95.9           | 24.5         | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                      |
|  | 2005 | -       | 50.2           | 100.0                    | 96.1           | 18.2         | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                      |
|  | 2006 | 0.7     | 49.3           | 100.0                    | 96.0           | 17.6         | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                      |
|  | 2007 | 21.3    | 64.0           | 100.0                    | 95.4           | 22.9         | 1                   | 0.3                 | -                   | -                      |
|  | 2008 | 27.0    | 67.1           | 100.0                    | 95.6           | 19.5         | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                      |
|  | 2009 | 23.9    | 69.6           | 100.0                    | 95.3           | 15.4         | 1                   | 0.3                 | -                   | -                      |
| <b>D<br/>I<br/>S<br/>T<br/>R<br/>I<br/>C<br/>T</b> | 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                   |
|  | 2000 | 6.1     | 36.7           | 97.2                     | 93.9           | 17.5         | 45,109              | 2.4                 | 5.8                 | 82.6                   |

|                       |      |     |      |      |      |      |        |     |     |      |
|-----------------------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|--------|-----|-----|------|
| S<br>T<br>A<br>T<br>E | 2001 | 6.3 | 36.9 | 94.5 | 93.7 | 17.2 | 42,813 | 2.2 | 5.7 | 83.2 |
|                       | 2002 | 6.7 | 37.5 | 95.0 | 94.0 | 16.5 | 39,225 | 2.0 | 5.1 | 85.2 |
|                       | 2003 | 6.3 | 37.9 | 95.7 | 94.0 | 16.4 | 37,525 | 1.9 | 4.9 | 86.0 |
|                       | 2004 | 6.7 | 39.0 | 96.3 | 94.2 | 16.8 | 40,764 | 2.1 | 4.6 | 86.6 |
|                       | 2005 | 6.6 | 40.0 | 95.7 | 93.9 | 16.1 | 43,152 | 2.2 | 4.0 | 87.4 |
|                       | 2006 | 6.6 | 40.0 | 96.6 | 94.0 | 16.0 | 44,836 | 2.2 | 3.5 | 87.8 |
|                       | 2007 | 7.2 | 40.9 | 96.1 | 93.7 | 15.2 | 49,056 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 85.9 |
|                       | 2008 | 7.5 | 41.1 | 96.8 | 93.3 | 14.9 | 49,858 | 2.5 | 4.1 | 86.5 |
|                       | 2009 | 8.0 | 42.9 | 96.7 | 93.7 | 13.5 | 73,245 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 87.1 |

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

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

|                                      | Year | School<br>(N) | Grade 3<br>(N) | Grade 4<br>(N) | Grade 5<br>(N) | Grade 7<br>(N) | Grade 8<br>(N) | Grade 11<br>(N) |
|--------------------------------------|------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| S<br>C<br>H<br>O<br>O<br>L           | 2000 | 331           | -              | -              | -              | -              | -              | -               |
|                                      | 2001 | 337           | -              | -              | -              | -              | -              | -               |
|                                      | 2002 | 337           | 60             | 55             | 57             | -              | -              | -               |
|                                      | 2003 | 341           | 54             | 51             | 54             | -              | -              | -               |
|                                      | 2004 | 333           | 55             | 53             | 58             | -              | -              | -               |
|                                      | 2005 | 311           | 50             | 48             | 48             | -              | -              | -               |
|                                      | 2006 | 298           | 57             | 48             | 51             | -              | -              | -               |
|                                      | 2007 | 347           | 52             | 66             | 48             | -              | -              | -               |
|                                      | 2008 | 374           | 59             | 46             | 64             | -              | -              | -               |
|                                      | 2009 | 385           | 62             | 57             | 49             | -              | -              | -               |
| D<br>I<br>S<br>T<br>R<br>I<br>C<br>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             |
|                                      | 2000 | 1,983,991     | -              | -              | -              | -              | -              | -               |
|                                      | 2001 | 2,007,170     | 164,791        | 161,546        | 162,001        | 151,270        | 148,194        | 123,816         |

|                                  |      |           |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|----------------------------------|------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| <b>S<br/>T<br/>A<br/>T<br/>E</b> | 2002 | 2,029,821 | -       | -       | -       | -       | -       | -       |
|                                  | 2003 | 2,044,539 | 164,413 | 157,570 | 159,499 | 160,924 | 156,451 | 138,559 |
|                                  | 2004 | 2,060,048 | 161,329 | 160,246 | 158,367 | 162,933 | 160,271 | 139,504 |
|                                  | 2005 | 2,062,912 | 156,370 | 158,622 | 160,365 | 162,047 | 162,192 | 142,828 |
|                                  | 2006 | 2,075,277 | 155,155 | 154,372 | 158,822 | 160,362 | 160,911 | 147,500 |
|                                  | 2007 | 2,077,856 | 155,356 | 153,480 | 154,719 | 162,594 | 159,038 | 150,475 |
|                                  | 2008 | 2,074,167 | 155,578 | 152,895 | 153,347 | 160,039 | 161,310 | 149,710 |
|                                  | 2009 | 2,070,125 | 156,512 | 152,736 | 152,820 | 155,433 | 158,700 | 144,822 |

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

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

\*\*Educator Data is available only for district level\*\*

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

---

|  |      |         |    |        |    |    |    |    |   |   |
|--|------|---------|----|--------|----|----|----|----|---|---|
|  | 2009 | 133,017 | 13 | 61,402 | 44 | 56 | 18 | 18 | 1 | 1 |
|--|------|---------|----|--------|----|----|----|----|---|---|

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

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

| ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009 |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|  | Grade 3     |             |             |             |             |             | Grade 4     |             |             |             |             |             | Grade 5     |             |             |             |             |             |
|  | 2004        | 2005        | 2006        | 2007        | 2008        | 2009        | 2004        | 2005        | 2006        | 2007        | 2008        | 2009        | 2004        | 2005        | 2006        | 2007        | 2008        | 2009        |
| <b>AYP Benchmark<br/>% Meets + Exceeds</b>                     | <b>40.0</b> | <b>47.5</b> | <b>47.5</b> | <b>55.0</b> | <b>62.5</b> | <b>70.0</b> | <b>40.0</b> | <b>47.5</b> | <b>47.5</b> | <b>55.0</b> | <b>62.5</b> | <b>70.0</b> | <b>40.0</b> | <b>47.5</b> | <b>47.5</b> | <b>55.0</b> | <b>62.5</b> | <b>70.0</b> |
| All  | 72.2        | 71.8        | 75.0        | 82.3        | 67.8        | 71.9        | -           | -           | 70.5        | 69.2        | 62.9        | 78.7        | 63.4        | 50.0        | 69.1        | 68.9        | 70.7        | 69.8        |
| White  | 74.4        | 80.5        | 73.6        | 84.0        | 92.3        | 87.1        | -           | -           | 73.6        | 74.2        | 84.0        | 96.0        | 85.7        | 62.0        | 80.6        | 80.0        | 83.9        | 81.9        |
| Black  | -           | -           | 58.4        | 63.7        | 80.0        | 62.6        | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 81.3        | 15.4        | 28.5        | 33.3        | -           | -           | 50.0        |
| Hispanic   | -           | -           | -           | -           | 30.0        | 42.8        | -           | -           | -           | -           | 9.1         | 50.0        | -           | -           | -           | -           | 41.2        | 41.7        |
| Asian/Pacific Islander   | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| Native American  | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| Multiracial/Ethnic   | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| LEP  | -           | -           | -           | -           | 26.3        | 46.6        | -           | -           | -           | -           | 10.0        | 53.0        | -           | -           | -           | -           | 35.7        | 41.7        |
| Students with Disabilities                                     | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 10.0        | -           | -           | -           | 7.1         | 27.3        | -           | 30.0        | -           |
| Low Income   | 57.7        | 59.1        | 60.8        | 72.0        | 51.3        | 65.2        | -           | -           | 65.2        | 48.1        | 51.5        | 67.5        | 40.0        | 30.7        | 55.2        | 58.3        | 60.0        | 64.7        |

|  | Grade 6 |      |      |      |      |      | Grade 7 |      |      |      |      |      | Grade 8 |      |      |      |      |      |
|--|---------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|
|  | 2004    | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2004    | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2004    | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| <b>AYP Benchmark<br/>% Meets + Exceeds</b> | 40.0    | 47.5 | 47.5 | 55.0 | 62.5 | 70.0 | 40.0    | 47.5 | 47.5 | 55.0 | 62.5 | 70.0 | 40.0    | 47.5 | 47.5 | 55.0 | 62.5 | 70.0 |
| All  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| White                                      | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Black                                      | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Hispanic                                   | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Asian/Pacific Islander                     | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Native American                            | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Multiracial/Ethnic                         | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| LEP  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Students with<br>Disabilities              | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Low Income                                 | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |

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

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data**  
**Item 8b - Assessment Data (Mathematics)**

| ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009 |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|  | Grade 3     |             |             |             |             |             | Grade 4     |             |             |             |             |             | Grade 5     |             |             |             |             |             |
|  | 2004        | 2005        | 2006        | 2007        | 2008        | 2009        | 2004        | 2005        | 2006        | 2007        | 2008        | 2009        | 2004        | 2005        | 2006        | 2007        | 2008        | 2009        |
| <b>AYP Benchmark<br/>% Meets + Exceeds</b>                         | <b>40.0</b> | <b>47.5</b> | <b>47.5</b> | <b>55.0</b> | <b>62.5</b> | <b>70.0</b> | <b>40.0</b> | <b>47.5</b> | <b>47.5</b> | <b>55.0</b> | <b>62.5</b> | <b>70.0</b> | <b>40.0</b> | <b>47.5</b> | <b>47.5</b> | <b>55.0</b> | <b>62.5</b> | <b>70.0</b> |
| All  | 96.3        | 91.5        | 91.0        | 91.1        | 81.0        | 87.9        | -           | -           | 93.1        | 84.6        | 75.9        | 85.2        | 71.1        | 68.0        | 80.0        | 77.3        | 75.4        | 81.1        |
| White  | 97.6        | 94.4        | 97.0        | 96.0        | 92.0        | 100.0       | -           | -           | 94.2        | 83.9        | 88.0        | 96.0        | 88.6        | 86.2        | 88.9        | 86.7        | 77.4        | 81.8        |
| Black  | -           | -           | 66.6        | 72.8        | 90.0        | 87.5        | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 75.0        | 30.8        | 35.7        | 66.7        | -           | -           | 80.0        |
| Hispanic   | -           | -           | -           | -           | 65.0        | 62.6        | -           | -           | -           | -           | 27.3        | 77.8        | -           | -           | -           | -           | 64.7        | 75.0        |
| Asian/Pacific Islander   | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| Native American  | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| Multiracial/Ethnic   | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| LEP  | -           | -           | -           | -           | 63.2        | 64.7        | -           | -           | -           | -           | 20.0        | 76.5        | -           | -           | -           | -           | 57.1        | 75.0        |
| Students with Disabilities   | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 60.0        | -           | -           | -           | 21.4        | 45.5        | -           | 40.0        | -           |
| Low Income   | 96.2        | 86.4        | 89.3        | 84.0        | 71.8        | 85.4        | -           | -           | 91.3        | 81.5        | 66.7        | 77.5        | 56.0        | 57.7        | 72.4        | 73.9        | 66.6        | 73.5        |

|  | Grade 6 |      |      |      |      |      | Grade 7 |      |      |      |      |      | Grade 8 |      |      |      |      |      |
|--|---------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|
|  | 2004    | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2004    | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2004    | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| <b>AYP Benchmark<br/>% Meets + Exceeds</b> | 40.0    | 47.5 | 47.5 | 55.0 | 62.5 | 70.0 | 40.0    | 47.5 | 47.5 | 55.0 | 62.5 | 70.0 | 40.0    | 47.5 | 47.5 | 55.0 | 62.5 | 70.0 |
| All  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| White                                      | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Black                                      | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Hispanic                                   | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Asian/Pacific Islander                     | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Native American                            | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Multiracial/Ethnic                         | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| LEP  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Students with Disabilities                 | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Low Income                                 | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |

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

## Section I-A Data &amp; 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?

By analyzing the School Report Card, the following strengths and weaknesses have been identified:

**Reading: The percentage of students that M+E increased in 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grades and decreased in 5<sup>th</sup> grade (3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grades are above the Illinois Benchmark)**

- 71.9% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade students M+E (+4.1%).
- 78.7% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (+18%).
- 67.3% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (-3.5%).

**Math: The percentage of students that M+E increased in all grades: (All grades above Illinois Benchmarks)**

- 87.9% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade students M+E (+6.9%).
- 85.2% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (+10.2%).
- 78.2% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (+2.8%).

**By Grade and Race:**

- In 3<sup>rd</sup> grade Math, the percentages of students M+E in the White and Black subgroups are above Illinois Benchmarks.
  - White (100 %), Black (87.5%) and Hispanic (62.5%)
- In 3<sup>rd</sup> grade Reading the percentages are White (87.1%), Black (62.5%) and Hispanic (42.9%).
- In 4<sup>th</sup> grade Math the percentages of students M+E in all race subgroups are above Illinois Benchmarks.

- White (96%), Black (75%), and Hispanic (77.8%)
- In 4<sup>th</sup> grade Reading the percentages are White (96%), Black (81.3%), and Hispanic (50%).
- In 5<sup>th</sup> grade Math the percentages of students M+E in all race subgroups are above the Illinois Benchmarks.
  - White (75%), Black (80%), and Hispanic (75%)
- In 5<sup>th</sup> grade Reading the percentages are White (75%), Black (50%), and Hispanic (41.7%).

**By Grade and Income:**

- In Math, the percentages of students M+E in Low Income and Not Low Income subgroups in all grades are above the Illinois Benchmarks. All the percentages of students M+E in Reading Not Low Income subgroups are above the Illinois Benchmarks.
- 88.9% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 65.2% of the Low Income students. (Gap = 23.7%) In Math, 94.4% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 85.4% of Low Income students. (Gap = 9%)
- 100% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 67.5% of the Low Income students. (Gap = 32.5%) In Math, 100% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 77.5% of Low Income students. (Gap = 22.5%)
- 71.4% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 64.7% of the Low Income students. (Gap = 6.7%) In Math, 85.7% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 73.5% of Low Income students. (Gap = 12.2%)

**By Grade and IEP Status:**

- In Reading, significant gaps exist in the percentage of students M+E in the Not IEP and IEP subgroups in 5<sup>th</sup> grade. Significant gaps also exist in the percentage of students M+E in Math in 5<sup>th</sup> grade. The N of IEP students is 21 (6,8,7)
  - Reading Gaps: (0% 5<sup>th</sup> grade IEP M+E)
    - 3<sup>rd</sup> gr = 74.1% v 50% (24.1%), 4<sup>th</sup> gr = 79.2% v 75% (4.2%), 5<sup>th</sup> gr = 77% v 0% (77%)
  - Math Gaps (100% of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade IEP M+E)
    - 3<sup>rd</sup> gr = 86.7% v 100% (-13.3%), 4<sup>th</sup> gr = 86.8% v 75% (11.8%), 5<sup>th</sup> gr = 87.5% v 14.3% (73.2%)

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

Several external factors have had a significant impact on Bent School's capacity. The student body has increased by 25% since 2003. During this same time period, the low income population has risen from 49% to 64%. Other factors include a mobility rate of 19.5%, and 27% of Bent School's population is identified as Limited English Proficient (LEP). This growth has challenged the staff in the areas of maintaining a positive building climate, space, availability of non-consumable resources, building movement, and the need for additional building staff. Due to the changing demographics and fluctuating scores, the staff has adapted the following internal resources in order to respond to the background knowledge and language experiences brought into the classroom. Therefore, the teachers focused on these curricular areas:

Reading: vocabulary, reading strategies, comprehension, literature, fluency.

Math: measurement, number sense, algebra, geometry, and data analysis.

Writing: Elementary Writing Guidelines were established by our district. Bent School adopted "The Writing Workshop" in Grades K-5.

The following research-based programs are being implemented school-wide at Bent with integrity.

Scholastic Reading Inventory

Michael Heggerty

Discovery Education

Discovery Assessment

Soliloquy

Lexia

Road to the Code

6 Minute Solutions

Leveled Readers (Guided Reading)

Houghton-Mifflin Small Group Intervention Kit

Language for Learning

Intervention Support for English Language Learners

Reading Counts

Drops in the Bucket for Language Arts and Math

Great Leaps LNF, ISF, NWF

DIBELS

Symphony

Estrellita

Language for Thinking

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

Bent Staff will continue to focus on measurement and number sense in Math. In Reading, vocabulary and comprehension will continue to be the focus. The Writing Guidelines will continue to be implemented in grades K-5.

In addition, the intervention program at Bent School is continuously reviewed and improved based on data analysis.

**Professional Development continues to be based on Bent School's school improvement plan.**

### Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data

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

The Stanford Achievement Test, SAT 10, provides annual measures of performance in language/reading, math, science, and social studies. This data assists teachers in instructional planning and program/curriculum evaluation.

A post test measure of reading and math is administered in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> grades in the spring to determine individual student growth, to determine the need for extended year services, and for program evaluation.

Bent School staff reviewed the Fall 2009 SAT 10 data and identified the following:

**Reading: The percentage of students that M+E increased significantly in 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades and decreased in 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> grades**

35.3% of 1<sup>st</sup> Grade students M+E (-15.7%).

62% of 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade students M+E (-.2%).

51.2% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade students M+E (-7.5%).

55.9% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (+13.5%).

59.3% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (+15.5%).

**Math: The percentage of students that M+E increased significantly in 4<sup>th</sup> grade, and decreased slightly in all other grades:**

35.3% of 1<sup>st</sup> Grade students M+E (-2%).

56% of 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade students M+E (-1.8%)



























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

Analysis of student achievement is discussed in detail in Section 1, Part A of this plan.

Three years of DIBELS data was available for analysis. Classroom teachers and Interventionists provided research based instruction with emphasis on student weaknesses in phonemic awareness and fluency.

Progress Monitoring occurred every 2 weeks to assure continued progress of each child receiving intervention services. Intervention Teams reviewed data in order to make intervention changes as necessary.

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

DIBELS and intervention services will be continued with integrity.

K, 1, 2 receive additional intervention services for early literacy intervention.

3, 4, and 5<sup>th</sup> grade students also receive intervention services for continued achievement.

Classroom teachers continue to provide Tier I and II instruction and intervention services.

**Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data**  
**Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges**

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

Bent Elementary School is one of six elementary schools in District 87. Our 423 students are served in kindergarten through grade five serving both English and Spanish speaking populations. Bent School reflects a rich cultural mix of families, staff, and community volunteers. Our staff of over 40 professionals provide a safe and enriching environment for all students. Bent School services students with special education needs, speech and language services, English Language Learner Services, and Academically Talented opportunities. The percentage of economically disadvantaged students continue to rise. In addition, Bent School has a mobility rate of 19.5%. Bent students have the opportunity for weekly instruction in music, art, and physical education by a certified teacher/specialist. Interventionists and a full time Counselor/Social Worker serve students who need additional educational and emotional/behavioral support. Every student spends time weekly in the Bent Learning Center, which is fully equipped with state of the art technology, instruction, and an extensive collection of books and other resources.

Bent School students continue to make Adequate Yearly Progress on the Illinois Standards Assessment Test (ISAT) in the curricular areas of Reading, Math, and Science according to the benchmarks of No Child Left Behind. Bent students made AYP which included ISAT scores of English Language Learners (representing 27% of the population) who were previously held accountable through IMAGE.

With the availability of IlliniData, the Bent Staff has immediate access to testing data. Data is used for directing instruction and improving school performance. School Task Forces examine various test scores to identify target instructional areas for improvement. Teachers identify improvement strategies at each grade level to create a school wide plan that is used as a framework for decision making throughout the year. Staff development efforts are focused toward the School Improvement Plan to meet the needs of all students.

Due to the challenges and changes of the district and community, Bent Staff continues to initiate improvements for ongoing achievement of our diverse student population.

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

An ongoing increase in the percentage of economically disadvantaged students has affected the way teachers deliver instruction and intervention. Research shows that students from low income homes often need enhanced reading readiness skills, more exposure to enriching life experiences, and explicit oral language and vocabulary development which are the building blocks of reading comprehension. In addition, the mobility rate has limited the continuity of curriculum which created learning gaps.

A school wide initiative was developed in order to follow the Tier Model of Response to Intervention. Tier interventions were implemented school wide due to the analysis of our data. These interventions included the special, regular, and bilingual populations.

**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 to refine the current system for the process of student identification for intervention services. Training needs to continue for all staff members with an emphasis on new teachers joining our Bent Staff.**

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

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

All certified teachers are highly qualified as defined by the No Child Left Behind Act.

All program assistants are highly qualified as defined by the No Child Left Behind Act.

Professional development focuses on the defined needs of our learners.

All staff has the opportunity for technology training.

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

**Training in data analysis and intervention methods have been the focus for staff development which has contributed to student performance.**

**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 activities will continue to train staff in the RtI process finding materials that will allow special, regular, and bilingual teachers to function as interventionists.

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

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

The involvement and support of programs sponsored by parents of Bent School has had a positive impact on student learning. Families are involved in various ways including: PTO Membership, Family Reading Night, Family Math Night, Bilingual/ESL Family Workshops, Title I Fall Housing Meeting, Meet the Teacher Night, Carnival, Weiner Roast, Book Fair, Recess Readers, Field Trips, Chess Club, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Fine Arts, Field Day, Web Site Support, School Store, GED Bilingual/ESL Courses.

Curricular content and student progress are communicated through Meet the Teacher Night, parent conferences, curriculum nights, and teacher web sites. Communication is translated into a student's native language.

In all grades, take home folders with student work samples and other communications are sent home weekly. A required parent signature confirms proper delivery.

Our school makes contact with 100% of our families.

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

Individual and groups of parent volunteers have contributed to the enhancement of student performance. Volunteers provide individual and small group tutoring.

The PTO supported the purchase of several SmartBoards and professional teacher training that resulted in increased student engagement.

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

Effort to involve families in the school through a combination of social and educational events will be continued. Surveys will be conducted to review families' perceptions of Bent School with the purpose to enhance school climate.

**Continued effort to communicate with families regarding the curriculum and grade level expectations is a priority. Building relationships with families enhances support for student success.**

### 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?*

Teachers routinely review data and improve their own instructional practices through the ongoing professional development activities that are identified by this data analysis. This commitment to excellence and continuous professional development is based on best practices and research proven programs. We focus on teaching academic areas measured through NCLB and strive to improve the school climate which we know has a significant impact on student learning.

An ongoing process of data analysis allows us to identify areas of students need and challenge. These are then used to guide professional development focus areas to improve the instructional practices that lead to increased student achievement.

Continued efforts to meet the needs of students and families is a priority of Bent School.

### Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

| Objective Number | Title<br>(click the link to edit any objective)   | Deficiencies Addressed |
|------------------|---|------------------------|
| 1                | <a href="#">All students will read proficiently by increasing comprehension in a variety of contexts.</a> |                        |
| 2                | <a href="#">Students will improve number sense and measurement skills.</a>                                |                        |
| 3                | <a href="#">All students will write to communicate for a variety of purposes.</a>                         |                        |

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

### Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

#### Objective 1

All students will read proficiently by increasing comprehension in a variety of contexts.

#### Objective 1 Description

The purpose of this objective is to improve student performance in reading comprehension in a variety of contexts through the use of various assessments, activities and interventions.

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

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

All students will read proficiently by increasing comprehension in a variety of contexts.

|   |  | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities  | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | All students will increase comprehension through vocabulary activities incorporated into other content instruction, as well as Music, Art, PE, and Learning Center time.   | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 1,000      |
| 2 | Students in grades 3-5 will use Discovery Assessment. This option is available for all grade levels.   | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 1,000      |
| 3 | 1st grade students will use Reading A-Z benchmark assessments.   | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0          |
| 4 | Students in grades 1-5 will increase their comprehension and fluency by use of 6 Minute Solutions. Students will be benchmarked 3 times per year using DIBELS/MIDE.  | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0          |
| 5 | Students in grades K-5 will increase their reading strategies by using H-M Core Curriculum and leveled readers.  | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 500        |
| 6 | All students will increase comprehension through differentiated instruction including flexible grouping and guided reading activities determined by students' instructional needs. H-M Assessment tests will monitor student progress. | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 500        |
| 7 | Students in grades 1-5 will increase comprehension by using Scholastic Reading Inventory to determine appropriate book levels.   | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 1,000      |
| 8 | Students in grades K-2 will increase comprehension through phonemic awareness by using Heggerty Phonemic Awareness Activities on a daily basis.  | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0          |

|    |   |            |            |               |             |     |
|----|---|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|-----|
| 9  | Students in grades K-2 will increase comprehension through phonics activities by using H-M Core Curriculum. | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 500 |
| 10 | Students in grades 3-5 will increase comprehension by participating in the Reading Counts program.          | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0   |

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

All students will read proficiently by increasing comprehension in a variety of contexts.

|   |  | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities  | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | All staff will continue to focus on specific intervention strategies that are implemented in the classroom.                    | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 500        |
| 2 | All staff will continue to focus on computer technology interventions.   | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 500        |
| 3 | All staff will continue to analyze data to direct instruction using IlliniData, DIBELS/MIDE website, and Discovery Assessment. | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 500        |
| 4 | All staff will continue to increase their knowledge of Discovery Education in all curricular areas.                            | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | After School  | Local Funds | 500        |
| 5 | Teachers will continue SmartBoard training.  | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | After School  | Local Funds | 500        |
| 6 | All staff will receive training on differentiating the curriculum.   | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | After School  | Local Funds | 500        |

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

All students will read proficiently by increasing comprehension in a variety of contexts.

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

|   |  |            |            |              |             |     |
|---|--|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-----|
| 1 | Meet the Teacher Night will include information for parents on how to help their child increase reading comprehension.                   | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | After School | Local Funds | 0   |
| 2 | During Parent/Teacher Conferences, parents will receive information to further understand and support grade level content and standards. | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | After School | Local Funds | 0   |
| 3 | A themed Family Reading Night will provide an opportunity for parents and children to engage in reading comprehension activities.        | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | After School | Local Funds | 200 |
| 4 | Reading comprehension activities are communicated through classroom and school websites and newsletters.                                 | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | After School | Local Funds | 0   |

### Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

#### Objective 1 Title :

All students will read proficiently by increasing comprehension in a variety of contexts.

**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 following assessment measures will be used in order to monitor the strategies and activities of Objective 1 by using H-M Core Curriculum, Discovery Assessment, DIBELS/MIDE Benchmark, Scholastic Reading Inventory, Reading Counts Quizzes, Reading A-Z Quarterly Assessment, H-M Assessment Tests, Soliloquy, and Lexia.

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 | Vickie Slagell | Interim Principal   |
| 2 | Terri Matlock  | Reading Chairperson |

### Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

#### Objective 2

Students will improve number sense and measurement skills.

#### Objective 2 Description

The purpose for this objective is to improve student performance in number sense and measurement in math through the use of various assessments, activities, and interventions.

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

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

#### Objective 2 Title :

Students will improve number sense and measurement skills.

|   |  | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities  | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Teachers will increase the use of math manipulatives, graphic organizers, calculators and technology in math instruction.    | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 1,500      |
| 2 | Basic facts will be taught (grades K-3) and reviewed (grade 4-5).  | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0          |
| 3 | Customary and Metric Measurement will be incorporated into other content area instruction, as well as in Music, Art, and PE. | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0          |
| 4 | Students will complete a weekly activity related to all math strands.  | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 500        |
| 5 | Focus will be on key math vocabulary and their related operations.   | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0          |
| 6 | Discovery Assessment and Symphony Math will be used to provide math intervention.  | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2009 | During School | Local Funds | 2,000      |

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

Students will improve number sense and measurement skills.

|   |   | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|---|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities   | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Discovery Assessment and intervention training.                                     | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 600        |
| 2 | Exploration of other math resources and interventions.                              | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | After School  | Local Funds | 500        |
| 3 | District level technology training for math intervention software programs.         | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | After School  | Local Funds | 600        |
| 4 | District level training for improving math instruction with the use of SmartBoards. | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | After School  | Local Funds | 1,000      |

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

Students will improve number sense and measurement skills.

|   |   | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|---|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities   | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Meet the Teacher Night will include information about all grade level curriculum standards and expectations.                    | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | After School  | Local Funds | 0          |
| 2 | School activities will increase parent/child opportunities to read and learn together including Family Math Night.              | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | After School  | Local Funds | 0          |
| 3 | School and classroom newsletters/websites will include information about all grade level curriculum standards and expectations. | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0          |

### Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

#### Objective 2 Title :

Students will improve number sense and measurement skills.

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

The following assessment measures will be used in order to monitor the strategies and activities of Objective 2: ISAT, SAT-10, Discovery Assessment, Symphony, and classroom assessments.

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 | Vickie Slagell      | Interim Principal |
| 2 | Amanda R. Rodriguez | Math Chairperson  |

### Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

#### Objective 3

All students will write to communicate for a variety of purposes.

#### Objective 3 Description

All students will write to communicate for a variety of purposes through the use of the district-wide writing guidelines, process-oriented writing and school-wide activities such as "Everybody Has A Story." Teachers will participate in workshops and study groups to improve student writing. Parents will be invited to attend an event celebrating writing. Teachers, students, and parents will work together to improve student writing.

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

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

All students will write to communicate for a variety of purposes.

|   |  | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities  | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Teach grammar lessons/skills presented in the H-M Reading Curriculum and/or Writers' Workshop. | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 2,500      |
| 2 | Teach the editing marks designated for each grade level.                                       | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0          |
| 3 | Teach students to use the writing process in a developmentally appropriate way.                | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 1,000      |
| 4 | Teach district-wide writing vocabulary according to district guidelines                        | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 500        |

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

All students will write to communicate for a variety of purposes.

|   |   | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|---|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities   | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Sentence Strategies Workshop by Phyllis Phostmeyer                    | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 1,000      |
| 2 | Writers' Workshop-Lucy Caulkins (Local Trainers)(School study groups) | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 2,500      |

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

All students will write to communicate for a variety of purposes.

|   |   | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|---|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities   | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Meet the Teacher Night will include information about all grade level curriculum standards and expectations.                    | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | After School  | Local Funds | 0          |
| 2 | School activities will increase parent/child opportunities to read and learn together such as "Everybody Has A Story."          | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | After School  | Local Funds | 1,000      |
| 3 | School and classroom newsletters/websites will include information about all grade level curriculum standards and expectations. | 09/01/2009 | 05/26/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0          |

## Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 3 Title :**

All students will write to communicate for a variety of purposes.

**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 following assessments will be used to determine the effectiveness of the strategies and activities: Houghton-Mifflin Reading Theme Tests, ISAT, ACCESS, and SAT-10.

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 | Vickie Slagell | Interim Principal   |
| 2 | Lisa Wills     | Writing Chairperson |

### 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.*)

Bent School provides the families access to the School Report Card information through the district website, the school newsletter, teacher classroom newsletters, and copies are available upon request. Copies are also available at the Parent Resource Center in our lobby. Parents are given individual student results at conferences.

### 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 Bent community. It is an ongoing process which includes the following to enhance development:

Parent Surveys; Teacher School Improvement Days (two per year)

PTO Meetings with ongoing presentation, input and updates

Meet the Teacher Night

Administrative Meetings

Elementary Principal Meetings

Title 1 Parent Meeting

Building Leadership Team Input

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

|   | Name                     | Title             |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Building Leadership Team |                   |
| 2 | Vickie Slagell           | Interim Principal |

### 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.

Not Applicable

### 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 Illinois Learning 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. A "helping" teacher is assigned to each new teacher to provide a basic orientation to the school.

### 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 Illinois Learning Standards, Performance Descriptors, and Assessment Frameworks
- Workshop on the changes in the ISAT for administrators and school teams
- Opportunities for all teachers to participate in IlliniData for access to individual, class, and group data
- 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

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part G. School Support Team

|   | Name             | Title                    |
|---|------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Vickie Slagell   | Interim Principal        |
| 2 | Lisa Wills       | Writing Task Force Chair |
| 3 | Terri Matlock    | Reading Task Force Chair |
| 4 | Amanda Rodriguez | Math Task Force Chair    |

---

**Section IV-A Local Board Action**

**DATE APPROVED** by Local Board:

**A. ASSURANCES**

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

**B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION**

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

OTHER DATA

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

**IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS**

Yes  No Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance? [C]

Yes  No Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control? [C]

**CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES**

Yes  No Has the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan? [C]

Yes  No  N/A Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency? [C]

**ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES**

Yes  No Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?

Yes  No Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement? [C]

Yes  No Are the strategies and activities measurable? [C]

Yes  No Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified? [C]

Yes  No Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear? [C]

Yes  No  N/A Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students? [C]

Yes  No  N/A Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status or in special education non-compliance?

Yes  No  N/A Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities? for students? [C]

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No                              | Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]   |
| <b>MONITORING</b>   |   |
| <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**