

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	11/11/2009
Submitted	11/30/2009
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

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

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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2009-10 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status Year 2

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	79.5		Yes	83.4		Yes	93.0	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	86.6		Yes	89.3		Yes				
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	63.5	65.5	Yes	70.1		Yes	92.0			
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	62.4		Yes	69.4		Yes				
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	87.5		Yes	87.5		Yes		
LEP												
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	41.6	49.2	No	50.5	63.8	No	91.6	
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	69.1		Yes	74.8		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.

DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION

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 (%)	93.1	93.1	93.0	93.2	93.2	92.8	93.3	93.0
Truancy Rate (%)	4.8	3.0	3.6	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.0	3.4
Mobility Rate (%)	9.5	18.1	18.4	15.4	13.7	13.1	16.4	15.1
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	1,332	1,377	1,349	1,338	1,254	1,260	1,191	1,207
Low Income (%)	42.7	37.1	42.4	44.8	47.2	48.9	50.0	50.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	-	-	2.9	2.7	2.4	2.8	2.0	3.1
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	69.8	69.5	66.6	64.1	61.7	61.6	59.5	59.7
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	22.8	23.7	25.0	25.9	24.5	24.2	23.2	24.5
Hispanic (%)	5.0	4.6	5.4	6.7	7.5	7.2	7.8	8.0
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	2.2	2.2	3.0	3.4	2.6	2.3	2.4	2.9
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.2	-	-	-	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	3.6	4.6	6.9	4.9

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 C H O O L	2000	73.1	21.3	3.9	1.4	0.3	-
	2001	71.1	21.8	4.8	1.9	0.4	-
	2002	69.8	22.8	5.0	2.2	0.2	-
	2003	69.5	23.7	4.6	2.2	-	-
	2004	66.6	25.0	5.4	3.0	-	-
	2005	64.1	25.9	6.7	3.4	-	-
	2006	61.7	24.5	7.5	2.6	0.1	3.6
	2007	61.6	24.2	7.2	2.3	0.1	4.6
	2008	59.5	23.2	7.8	2.4	0.3	6.9
	2009	59.7	24.5	8.0	2.9	0.1	4.9
D I S T R I C T	2000	72.4	21.6	4.3	1.6	0.1	-
	2001	70.6	22.1	5.1	2.1	0.2	-
	2002	68.7	22.7	5.7	2.8	0.1	-
	2003	67.5	23.1	6.1	3.3	0.1	-
	2004	65.2	24.0	6.7	4.1	-	-
	2005	63.2	25.9	6.9	4.0	0.1	-
	2006	61.7	25.2	6.5	4.2	0.1	2.3
	2007	60.6	24.3	7.4	3.8	0.1	3.9
	2008	58.8	22.9	8.2	3.9	0.1	6.1
	2009	57.6	22.9	8.4	3.9	0.1	7.2
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

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

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	0.8	33.8	100.0	93.7	13.9	36	2.9	-	-
	2001	1.5	37.0	97.0	92.8	15.1	30	2.5	-	-
	2002	-	42.7	99.0	93.1	9.5	64	4.8	-	-
	2003	-	37.1	99.0	93.1	18.1	41	3.0	-	-
	2004	2.9	42.4	98.0	93.0	18.4	49	3.6	-	-
	2005	2.7	44.8	99.0	93.2	15.4	57	4.3	-	-
	2006	2.4	47.2	99.0	93.2	13.7	54	4.3	-	-
	2007	2.8	48.9	99.0	92.8	13.1	52	4.2	-	-
	2008	2.0	50.0	99.0	93.3	16.4	48	4.0	-	-
	2009	3.1	50.4	99.0	93.0	15.1	41	3.4	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	1.5	34.5	100.0	93.6	20.1	171	3.1	4.1	88.4
	2001	2.0	36.0	99.3	93.6	18.2	68	1.3	3.9	88.5
	2002	-	41.4	99.8	93.8	16.2	126	2.3	5.0	88.6
	2003	2.0	35.0	99.8	93.8	21.7	89	1.6	3.8	89.2
	2004	3.2	41.4	99.5	94.1	19.3	100	1.8	4.9	89.1
	2005	2.4	44.1	99.8	93.9	18.1	135	2.4	2.2	92.0
	2006	2.5	45.5	99.8	94.0	18.4	135	2.5	2.5	89.5
	2007	3.6	47.3	99.8	93.5	19.0	116	2.3	2.2	90.0
	2008	3.9	47.3	99.8	93.6	18.8	109	2.1	2.1	89.2
	2009	4.4	49.4	99.8	93.6	17.0	101	1.9	1.8	90.0
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6

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

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	1,322	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,309	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	1,332	-	-	-	433	447	-
	2003	1,377	-	-	-	469	429	-
	2004	1,349	-	-	-	469	449	-
	2005	1,338	-	-	-	410	453	-
	2006	1,254	-	-	-	448	389	-
	2007	1,260	-	-	-	413	423	-
	2008	1,191	-	-	-	404	399	-
	2009	1,207	-	-	-	397	412	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	5,611	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	5,580	474	497	455	456	426	254
	2002	5,594	484	449	475	433	447	336
	2003	5,701	442	474	445	469	429	330
	2004	5,547	436	421	476	469	449	334
	2005	5,384	408	411	417	410	453	319
	2006	5,288	411	407	421	448	389	316
	2007	5,220	394	389	398	413	423	309
	2008	5,201	386	378	386	404	399	338
	2009	5,304	419	409	377	397	412	283
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816

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

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

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

Educator Data is available only for district level

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

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

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	73.9	71.6	78.5	82.5	-	-	73.9	70.7	74.3	70.9	70.2	73.6	79.3	81.7	79.8	80.2
White	-	-	81.5	81.3	86.1	90.4	-	-	82.6	81.5	84.3	79.3	79.8	81.4	87.4	87.0	87.7	88.7
Black	-	-	56.6	44.2	60.2	67.4	-	-	50.0	44.8	56.1	50.5	43.2	52.8	57.1	67.9	64.1	62.4
Hispanic	-	-	62.1	63.2	70.4	69.3	-	-	65.4	61.7	48.4	57.7	58.3	52.6	71.4	77.8	63.1	56.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	100.0	93.8	-	-	100.0	90.9	-	91.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	80.0	81.3	86.4	73.3	-	-	81.8	75.9	68.0	100.0	-	-	81.8	83.3	82.7	88.5
LEP	-	-	63.6	-	36.4	56.3	-	-	-	45.5	18.2	40.0	-	-	-	-	-	54.5
Students with Disabilities	-	-	38.6	27.0	35.3	34.6	-	-	31.3	34.7	33.4	32.0	19.1	35.3	31.3	32.8	48.0	44.9
Low Income	-	-	60.5	57.0	64.0	74.6	-	-	55.8	53.4	63.7	55.7	49.4	56.7	62.0	68.4	66.3	70.5

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	82.4	83.4	82.2	88.2	-	-	78.4	81.2	81.3	78.0	59.8	60.9	80.1	82.5	81.9	79.9
White	-	-	90.6	89.4	86.5	92.6	-	-	87.0	87.6	87.1	87.3	71.8	70.4	88.6	90.6	89.9	88.3
Black	-	-	63.7	66.6	70.4	79.8	-	-	57.5	65.7	66.3	60.6	24.7	36.8	55.0	61.9	62.2	59.0
Hispanic	-	-	75.9	73.7	81.5	75.0	-	-	61.5	76.4	74.2	62.9	58.4	35.0	85.7	74.1	73.7	63.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	92.3	100.0	-	-	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	84.6	93.8	86.3	93.3	-	-	81.8	82.8	84.0	83.4	-	-	72.7	91.7	82.7	92.3
LEP	-	-	81.8	-	63.6	61.1	-	-	-	90.9	90.9	35.7	-	-	-	-	-	54.5
Students with Disabilities	-	-	46.0	53.1	55.9	59.0	-	-	34.4	42.1	56.2	43.0	12.9	21.5	32.8	35.9	52.6	44.9
Low Income	-	-	71.8	72.8	74.0	81.0	-	-	62.6	68.9	71.1	65.8	33.1	33.5	62.4	67.0	70.1	70.9

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Data - *What do the School Report Card data tell you about student performance in your school? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are indicated?*

School report card trends data indicate that BJHS students are performing at or above schools with similar demographics within the state of Illinois.

ISAT data indicates that students with disabilities are specifically weak in the areas of reading strategies (25.8% meeting/exceeding), comprehension (21.6% meeting/exceeding) and vocabulary development for sixth graders (18.2% meeting/exceeding).

ISAT data indicated that students with disabilities are specifically weak in the areas of number sense (15% meeting/exceeding), measurement (12.3% meeting/exceeding) and algebra (11.8%) in mathematics.

Areas of strength designated by ISAT performance are vocabulary (7th & 8th) grades and literature in reading and geometry and data analysis in mathematics.

Student performance has improved over all in reading and math as verified by five year trend data analysis. Achievement subgroups has improved significantly for student with disabilities in math and reading. The percentage of students with disabilities meeting and exceeding in math was 34.9% in 2004 compared to 50.5% in 2009. The percentage of students with disabilities meeting and exceeding in reading was 23.3% in 2004 compared to 41.6% in 2009.

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

It is probable that students with disabilities lack of real-world activities in both number sense and measurement within mathematics instruction contributes to the lowered performance in mathematics for students with disabilities.

Lack of emphasis in vocabulary development across all subject areas is the probable contributor to lowered performance in vocabulary for students with disabilities development in reading. Lack of reinforcing comprehension/use of reading strategies across the curriculum may have contributed to the low performance at some grades.

Improved achievement is due to increased alignment of all curricular in grade six through eight with the Illinois Learning Standards, professional development for teachers and increase services to students.

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

These factors imply (1) a need for inservice with special and regular-ed co-teaching pairs on number sense, measurement, vocabulary development, and reading strategies and (2) because MAPS is correlated with the ISAT data. The content areas weaknesses in the September MAPS testing will be used to analyze and adjust both curriculum and instruction for the '09-'10 and for the '10-'11 school year.

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

The data will be used to re-align curriculum to make sure the curriculum used in the special education classroom aligns with all the regular classroom, and adjust instruction to improve the academic achievement of special education students.

In the ISAT '09 results, measurement, number sense and algebra in mathematics and vocabulary development (6th grade only), reading strategies and comprehension for reading, require increased curriculum emphasis and instructional interventions.

Areas of strength in reading: Vocabulary (7th and 8th grades) and literature
Mathematics: Geometry and data analysis

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

It is probable that lack of real-world activities in both number sense and measurement within mathematics instruction contributes to the lowered performance for students with disabilities in mathematics. These are the same areas one might expect to see as low-performance in a high poverty population. Instruction can provide experience and change performance.

Lack of emphasis in vocabulary development (sixth grade only) across the subject areas is the probable contributor to lowered performance in vocabulary development in reading. Lack of reinforcing comprehension skills/reading strategies across the curriculum may be a contributing factor to lower performance in comprehension/ reading strategies.

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

Reading teachers along with special education teachers, as well as all BJHS staff, will continue to work on vocabulary development, improving comprehension and emphasizing the use of reading strategies across the curriculum and increasing especially for students with disabilities.

Mathematics teachers along with special education teachers will continue to work with students in the application of measurement to the real world. Mathematics, science and special education teachers will emphasize estimation in the real world and the importance of number sense when using technology to ascertain realistic answers especially for students with disabilities. Special education and mathematics teachers will continue to work on algebraic thinking and representation with students with disabilities.

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?*

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

2. Challenge: Experience of staff in identifying and serving a wider range of student abilities, experiences and needs
3. **Attribute and Challenge:** As the Illinois Standards fo rmeets/exceeds rise, the challenge is to help all students meet the standards. The staff is the key attribute to helping meet that challenge. The staff has experienced much success in helping reach those standards as evidenced by the growth in mathematics in the students with disabilities subgroup from 20.6% in 2004 to 50.5% in 2009 and by the growth in reading from 23.3% to 41.6% from 204 to 2009 in the same subgroup.
4. **Attribute and Challenge:** Student engagement for the majority our students is high. They participate in school activities and are engaged in classroom instructional activities; however, previously low promotion standards probably contributed to low student engagement for some students.
5. **Challenge:** Organization and structure of BJHS include consistency in assessment. Consistency in assessment (using the same exit exams or major tests in each course will drive both curriculum and instruction).

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

These attributes and challenges have caused BJHS to place increased emphasis on providing assistance and intervention to students who struggle. The increasing diversity of the student population has made differentiated instruction a necessity. The school has responded by providing professional development for teachers and by updating and aligning curriculum and instruction to better meet the needs of students.

Five year trend data from ISAT shows that student performance has improved significantly, overall in mathematics and reading. Achievement of subgroups has also improved although an achievement gap still exists. The greatest area of weakness in reading scores for students with IEPs include comprehension and reading strategies. The greatest area of weakness mathematics scores for students with IEPs include measurement, number sense and algebra.

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

BJHS staff must continue to find ways to meet the varied needs of students. Focus needs to be placed on providing high quality intervention for students who struggle and ensuring that students with disabilities have access to the general curriculum with all necessary supports. Staff should work to continue to improve daily instruction and to differentiate in order to meet the needs of all students.

Special education teachers in conjunction with the BJHS mathematics department will continue to stress best practices based on national and state standards for student achievement in both content knowledge and process skills. Several department-wide initiatives will be utilized to ensure continued student growth, such as: the availability of a PTO-supported summer skills incentive programs, Strengthen Your Armour, for incoming sixth, seventh, and eighth graders; grade-wide daily questions focusing on computation, number sense, geometry and measurement; use of multiple sources in curriculum planning; the use of Progressive Instruction at each grade level, and weaving of district-generated essential vocabulary terms within the curriculum.

The reading teachers especially those who are responsible for the students with disabilities subgroup will concentrate on building knowledge and vocabulary skills and on improving the use of reading strategies. The Prentice Hall literature series and novels will be utilized to increase students' abilities to read and to comprehend all types of written and to increase their use of reading strategies. Specific reading strategies, such as predicting, context clues, making inferences, drawing conclusions, compare/contrast, summarizing, main ideas, asking questions and utilizing graphic organizers will be used by the reading, language arts and special education teachers. Also, at all grade levels, teachers will use the Illinois Assessment Frameworks to prepare students for ISAT.

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 BJHS staff members and program assistants are highly qualified. as determined by NCLB.

All teachers participate in school-based professional development in areas such as assessment, differentiated instruction and reading and

mathematics.

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

ISAT, 5 year trend data shows marked improvement in student performance in the year that staff development focused upon the curriculum area.

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

BJHS should continue with all measures that have been implemented. In addition, more work must be done to accelerate the learning of students with IEPs in reading and mathematics by providing the students with laboratory/real-world experiences in vocabulary use, and number sense and measurement applications.

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

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

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

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

BJHS has been successful in reaching out to parents by being proactive and willing to reach out to parents.

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

Because BJHS staff have communicated openly with parents regarding school policies and behavioral and academic standards, student achievement has risen significantly over the last 5 years. Parents have encouraged their children to participate fully in classes and to challenge themselves to take higher level courses.

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

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

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

From the factor pages (I-A, I-B, and I-C), identify key factors that are within the school's capacity to change or control and which have contributed to low achievement. What conclusions about next steps have you reached from reviewing available data and information and about all the factors affecting student achievement?

Overall achievement at BJHS is high; however, additional progress must be made in helping students with disabilities and other students who struggle with meeting the Illinois Learning Standards. **Key factors that must be addressed are: access to the general curriculum for students with disabilities, curriculum articulation and alignment between general education and special education, comprehension and vocabulary instruction for students with disabilities, and math problem solving instruction for students with disabilities.**

The next steps will be as follows:

1. Aid the staff in identifying and serving a wider range of student abilities within the building.

2. Department chairs or their representatives serve on district committees to begin curriculum articulation K-12.
3. Develop common departmental assessments to strengthen the curricular and instructional focus.
4. All departments within BJHS will focus curricular time on remediation of reading deficiencies as identified by ISAT (2009) and MAPS, in the disabled population.
5. Monthly, mathematics, reading and special education departments will monitor progress toward reaching the targeted areas in reading and mathematics. 2009 ISAT results indicate that BJHS met the standards in all sub groups except for the disabled in reading and mathematics.
6. Over the next, 3-5 years, reading, writing, and math will become goals to be truly integrated across the content areas as evidenced by questions on exit exams or major departmental tests.

School

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Based on the 2009 data, students with disabilities did not make AYP/Safe Harbor in reading. Only 41.6% of the IEP students met/exceeded the state standards in reading. Disabled students will meet AYP in reading.	1,
2	Based on the 2009 data, students identified as disabled did not make AYP/Safe Harbor in mathematics. Only 50.5% of the students with disabilities obtained a meet or exceeds. Disabled students will make safe harbor in mathematic on the 2010 ISAT.	2,

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

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Based on the 2009 data, students with disabilities did not make AYP/Safe Harbor in reading. Only 41.6% of the IEP students met/exceeded the state standards in reading. Disabled students will meet AYP in reading.

Objective 1 Description

Based on 2009 data, 41.6% of students identified as disabled did not make AYP/Safe Harbor in reading. . All teachers will address these

goals within the context of lessons. BJHS will make AYP/Safe Harbor by achieving at least 47.5% meets or exceeds for students with disabilities in 2010 and 52.8% meets or exceeds in 2011..

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

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

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

Objective 1 Title :

Based on the 2009 data, students with disabilities did not make AYP/Safe Harbor in reading. Only 41.6% of the IEP students met/exceeded the state standards in reading. Disabled students will meet AYP in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students with disabilities in reading will receive additional instruction in reading with their special needs teachers during the reteaching period. Reading instruction for each student will be based on his/her deficit area(s). The Boys Town Reading Program, FAME, and Comprehension Reading Plus. These programs address decoding skills, vocabulary, comprehension, and reading strategy.	08/24/2009	05/23/2011	During School	Local Funds	1,000
	All students will receive specific reading strategy instruction in all classes. Each comprehension strategy identified by the Illinois Learning Standards will be directly taught throughout the day in all core					

2	classrooms. Focused instruction will continue will continue for four to six weeks with teachers monitoring progress weekly. Progress will be monitored using comprehension strategy observation checklist as well as assessment options:multiple choice, interview, and short answer.	08/24/2009	05/23/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Students with disabilities who struggle with reading will participate in an after school intensive reading program, Knights of Knowledge Academy, designed to increase ISAT scores.	11/02/2009	03/21/2011	After School	Other	20,000
4	A Comprehensive Reading Curriculum will be implemented for all students. Students with disabilities will be included in regular reading classes due to the extent possible. (A) Comprehension Fluency--direct instruction;precise practice; English and/or core classrooms. Ongoing formative and summative assessments to accelerate students' academic progress. All students; (B) Vocabulary Acquisition: school-wide approach; ongoing formative and summative assessments to monitor growth; all students. (C) Phonemic awareness and Phonics-critical reading course; systematic articulation carefully monitored; identified reading delayed students.	09/04/2009	05/23/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
5	Students with disabilities who struggle in reading will participate in an intensive reading intervention class, Techniques of Reading during the school day. This class addresses areas of weakness for disabled students. Programs and skills used in this class include FAME, Lexia, 6 Minute Solutions, Reading Plus and Read, Reflect and Respond.	11/02/2009	05/23/2011	During School	Other	10,000

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

Objective 1 Title :

Based on the 2009 data, students with disabilities did not make AYP/Safe Harbor in reading. Only 41.6% of the IEP students met/exceeded the state standards in reading. Disabled students will meet AYP in reading.

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

1	A comprehensive reading curriculum will be implemented by the regular education and special education teachers at all grade levels. Teachers will be trained and will plan together.	08/24/2009	05/23/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Reading and special education teachers will continue to participate in intensive training in teaching reading strategies and meeting the needs of students with disabilities.	08/24/2009	05/23/2011	During School	Title II	12,000
3	General and special education teachers will collaborate to focus on aligning and reading instruction at all grade levels to ensure access to the general curriculum.	08/24/2009	05/23/2011	During School	Local Funds	500
4	Teachers at each level will be trained to differentiated instruction to ensure access to the general curriculum for students with disabilities.	08/24/2009	05/23/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
5	Teachers participated in data training with consultants from the Northwest Evaluation Association. During the in-service teachers learned how to access, interpret and apply the information from the MAPS results. They planned together to use the data to inform their instruction to improve the academic achievement of students.	10/16/2009	05/23/2011	During School	Local Funds	3,000
6	Teachers will participate in Illini Data training throughout the school year. During the in-service, the teachers learn how to interpret data from ISAT, SAT 10 and MAPS for each of their students so they can design their instruction to improve the academic achievement of students.	08/19/2009	05/23/2011	During School	Other	0

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

Objective 1 Title :

Based on the 2009 data, students with disabilities did not make AYP/Safe Harbor in reading. Only 41.6% of the IEP students met/exceeded the state standards in reading. Disabled students will meet AYP in reading.

Strategies and Activities	TimeLine		Budget	
	Start Date	End Date	Fund Source	Amount(\$)
Hosted orientation nights for 6th, 7th, and 8th grades parents to share				

1	information about promoting students achievement and expectations for success	04/12/2010	04/12/2011	After School	Local Funds	400
2	A transition program is provided for incoming sixth grade students prior to the opening of school. Focuses on building positive relationships with staff, developing study and organizational skills and providing family support.	08/10/2009	08/09/2010	Summer School	Other	5,000
3	Guidance counselors and administrators will make personal contact with parents of students who receive one or more F's.	10/16/2009	05/31/2011	During School	Local Funds	300
4	Special education parents receive quarterly updates on their students' progress.	10/16/2009	05/23/2011	During School	Local Funds	200

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Based on the 2009 data, students with disabilities did not make AYP/Safe Harbor in reading. Only 41.6% of the IEP students met/exceeded the state standards in reading. Disabled students will meet AYP in reading.

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

School personnel will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities by analyzing student performance data from the mid-year MAPS assessment (to make mid-year corrections) and the ISAT data from the 2010 year. Individual student growth will be monitored using the MAPS. Data will also be analyzed by team, grade level, subgroup and by school.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	Name	Title
1	Dr. Susan Silvey	Building Principal
2	Dr. Teresa Hill	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction
3	Mrs. Sandra Graham	Mathematics Department Chair
4	Mrs. Debbie Davis	Language Arts Department Chair
5	Mrs. Lynn Stege	Special Education Department Chair

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Based on the 2009 data, students identified as disabled did not make AYP/Safe Harbor in mathematics. Only 50.5% of the students with disabilities obtained a meet or exceeds. Disabled students will make safe harbor in mathematic on the 2010 ISAT.

Objective 2 Description

Based on the ISAT data, 49.5% of the students identified as disabled did not make AYP/Safe Harbor in mathematics. Special education, mathematics and science teachers will address these goals with in the context of their lessons. BJHS will make safe harbor by achieving at least 54.6% meets and exceeds for students with disabilities.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

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

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

Objective 2 Title :

Based on the 2009 data, students identified as disabled did not make AYP/Safe Harbor in mathematics. Only 50.5% of the students with disabilities obtained a meet or exceeds. Disabled students will make safe harbor in mathematic on the 2010 ISAT.

Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
Students with disabilities in mathematics and/or who are on the cusp of meeting state standards as determined by the 2009 ISAT results and					

1	fall MAPS assessments will be give intensive instruction in mathematics in the areas of number sense, measurement and algebra in the after school Knights of Knowledge Academy Program.	11/30/2009	03/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	20,000
2	In addition to the regular mathenatics curriuclum, students with disabilities will receive additonal practice and instruction using math minutes at least three days a week. Math Minutes use age and developmenatally appropriate math problems to improve math skills in the areas of number sense, algebraic thinking, measurement, data analysis and patterning.	08/24/2009	05/23/2011	During School	Other	0
3	BJ mathematics and special education teachers will use the results of the Spring 2009 ISAT and Fall MAPS assessment to identify disabled students in need of growth to meet the state standards on the ISAT in 2010. These students will be given additional feedback and opportunities for correcting and resubmitting work as appropriate. In mathematics, this is to include, but not be limited to, the consistent use of calculators and an iconic formula card; a mixture of short answer and extended response questions in each unit; and the use of instructional problem-solving models.	08/24/2009	05/24/2011	During School	Other	0

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

Objective 2 Title :

Based on the 2009 data, students identified as disabled did not make AYP/Safe Harbor in mathematics. Only 50.5% of the students with disabilities obtained a meet or exceeds. Disabled students will make safe harbor in mathematic on the 2010 ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Special education teachers and regular education mathematics teachers will colloborate to focus on aligning instuction in the special ed. classroom with the regualr ed classrooms at all grade levels.	09/30/2009	05/23/2011	After School	Local Funds	100
	Mathematics teachers and their special ed, co-teachers will participate					

2	in a workshop modeling strategies for effectively co-teaching mathematics content. The workshop will be supported with follow-up observations by the mathematics consultant, Dr. Sandra Spalt Fulte.	11/30/2009	05/02/2011	During School	Local Funds	1,400
3	Special education and regular education teachers at each grade level will be trained to differentiate instruction to ensure access to the general curriculum for students with disabilities.	08/21/2009	03/28/2011	After School	Local Funds	500
4	Special education and regular education teachers will participate in Illini Data Training throughout the school year. During the in-service, the teachers learn how to interpret data from ISAT and SAT 10 for each of their students. Teacher identify the strengths and weaknesses so they can design their instruction to improve the academic achievement of disabled students.	08/20/2009	04/29/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
5	Special education and regular education teachers participated in data training with consultants from the Northwest Evaluation Association. During the in-service, teachers learned how to access, interpret and apply the information from the MAPS results. Using the data, team (regular ed and special ed) teachers worked together to plan their instruction to improve the reading and mathematics skills of special needs students.	08/21/2009	03/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	3,000

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

Objective 2 Title :

Based on the 2009 data, students identified as disabled did not make AYP/Safe Harbor in mathematics. Only 50.5% of the students with disabilities obtained a meet or exceeds. Disabled students will make safe harbor in mathematic on the 2010 ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Hosted orientation nights for 6th, 7th and 8th grade parents in August to share information about promoting student achievement and expectations for success.	08/17/2009	04/12/2011	After School	Other	300

2	Orientation for incoming sixth grade students to share information about promoting student achievement and expectations for success.	08/17/2009	04/12/2011	After School	Other	300
3	A transition program is provided for incoming sixth grade students prior to the opening of school. Focuses on building positive relationships with staff, developing studu and organizational skills and providing family support.	08/10/2009	08/15/2011	Before School	Other	5,000

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

Based on the 2009 data, students identified as disabled did not make AYP/Safe Harbor in mathematics. Only 50.5% of the students with disabilities obtained a meet or exceeds. Disabled students will make safe harbor in mathematic on the 2010 ISAT.

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?)*

Disabled students will make safe harbor in mathematic on the spring 2010 ISAT.

School personnel will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities by analyzing student performance data from the mid-year MAPS assessment (to make mid-year corrections) and the ISAT data from 2010.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	Name	Title
1	Dr, Susan Silvey	Principal
2	Dr. Teresa Hill	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction
3	Mrs. Sandra Graham	Mathematics Department Chair
4	Mrs. Debbie Davis	Language Arts Department Chair
5	Mrs, Lynn Stege	Special Education Department Chair

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

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

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

The school report card is sent to all parents and is available for review by the community on the school and district website. The parent teacher organization also receives a presentation on student achievement and interventions.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part B. Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder Involvement - Describe specifically how stakeholders (including parents, school staff, and outside experts) have been consulted in the development of the plan. The names and titles of the school improvement team or plan developers must be identified here.

The department chairpersons, Dr. Teresa Hill, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, BJHS administrators and reading and math consultants were consulted in the development of the plan. These individuals participated in planning meetings focused on each of the content areas discussed in the school improvement plan. They reviewed student achievement data for the last several years and made recommendations based on the progress that has been made and continuing areas of concern.

Gretchen Courtney & Associates, Ltd., a literacy engineering firm, made recommendations for the 2008 School Improvement Plan which will continue to be implemented in 2009-2010. Plans are based on the most current research and best practices in the area of reading.

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

	Name	Title
1	Dr. Teresa Hill	Asst. Supt. Curriculum
2	Dr. Sandra Spalt Fulte	Mathematics Consultant
3	Dr. Gretchen Courtney	Reading Consultant
4	Dr. Susan Silvey	Building Principal
5	Mrs. Sandra Graham	Mathematics Department Chair
6	Mrs. Debbie Davis	Reading/Language Arts Dept. Chair
7	Mrs. Lynn Stege	Special Education Dept. Chair
8	Dr. Lynetter Mehall	Principal Kingsley Junior High School

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

Part C. Peer Review Process

Peer Review - Describe the district's peer review and approval process. Peer review teams should include teachers and administrators from schools and districts similar to the one in improvement, but significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students. As appropriate, peer reviewers may be teachers from other schools, personnel from other districts, Regional Office of Education staff, Intermediate Service Center staff, RESPRO staff, university faculty, consultants, et al., or combinations thereof. RESPRO staff serving on a School Support Team should not serve on a peer review team in the same district. The peer review should precede the local board approval and must be completed within 45 days of receiving the school improvement plan. For further description of the peer review process see LEA and School Improvement: Non-Regulatory Guidance, July 21, 2006, at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

Description of peer review process including participants and date(s) of peer review.

Dr. Teresa Hill, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, Dr. Gretchen Courtney, Reading Consultant, Dr. Sandra Spalt Fulte, Mathematics Consultant and Dr. Lynette Mehall served as our peer review team.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part D. Teacher Mentoring Process

Teacher Mentoring Process - Describe the teacher mentoring program. Mentoring programs pair novice teachers with more experienced professionals who serve as role models and provide practical support and encouragement. Schools have complete discretion in deciding what else the teacher mentoring program should provide.

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

New teacher orientation is provided by building level administration. A new teacher breakfast is held for new teachers and the District Level Administration provide information and support.

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

Dr. Spalt Fulte follows up with observations, discussions and individual goal-setting conferences to monitor and help the new mathematics teachers chart their growth as professional teachers.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part E. District Responsibilities

District Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that the district has provided to revise the plan and other services that the district will provide toward implementation of strategies and activities. District technical assistance should include data analysis, identification of the school's challenges in implementing professional development requirements, the resulting need-related technical assistance and professional development to effect changes in instruction, and analysis and revision of the school's budget (NCLB, Section 1116). If applicable, identify corrective actions or restructuring options taken by the district.

The district has provided and/or will provide the following: (1) technical assistance including the analysis of local standardized achievement test scores, state test scores, subgroup performance (disaggregated data); (2) data management including the preparation of requested reports on individual students and groups of students; (3) access to student data on the

IIRC system; (4) professional development and support on the use of IIRC for administrators and school teams; (5) professional development for teachers on the Illinois Learning Standards, Performance Descriptors and Assessment Framework; (6) workshop on the changes in the ISAT for administrators and school teams; (7) professional development for for teachers on differentiated instruction; (8) assistance in identifying students who performance falls below the standard through the use of MAPS, ISAT and SAT 10 data in the Illini Data system; (9) resources to support new teacher development, curriculum initiatives and the services of a math consultant; (10) other assistance at the request of and in collaboration with the building administrators;

(11) opportunities for all teachers to participate in a variety of reading related district courses.

Corrective Actions taken by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress for a fourth annual calculation (Corrective Action Status) should be aligned with the strategies and activities of this plan. The district must take one or more of the following actions in such a school per NCLB, Section 1116(b)(7)(C)(iv). (Check all that apply.)

- Require implementation of a new research-based curriculum of instructional program;
- Extension of the school year or school day;
- Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance;
- Significant decrease in management authority at the school level;
- Replacement of the principal;
- Restructuring the internal organization of the school;
- Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school.

Restructuring Options (allowed in Illinois) selected by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress for a fifth annual calculation (Restructuring Status) should be aligned with the strategies and activities of this plan. The district must take one or more of the following options in such a school. (Please check all that apply.)

- Reopening the school as a public charter school, consistent with Article 27A of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/Art. 27A.);
- Replacing all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school's inability to make AYP;
- Entering into a contract with a private entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the school as a public school;
- Implementing any other major restructuring of the school's governance that makes fundamental reform in:
 - governance and management, and/or
 - financing and material resources, and/or
 - staffing.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part F. State Responsibilities

State Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that ISBE, RESPROS, and other service providers have provided the school during the development and review of this plan and other services that will be provided during the implementation of the plan. ISBE shall provide technical assistance to the school if district fails to do so.

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

Dr. Hill is providing staff development on inservice days on the implementation of differentiated instruction.

Dr. Sandra Spalt Fulte, Mrs. Sharla Heightman and Mrs. Eryn Beswick will provide inservice to special education and regular -ed teachers on co-teaching models in the mathematics classroom.

Dr. Gretchen Courtney, reading consultant, review the SIP and make suggestions for additional in-service if appropriate.

Northwest Evaluation Association consultants provided data training for the BJ teachers . The teachers worked with essential reports and resources available after the fall MAPS testing session. The teachers learned how to access, interpret and apply these reports and resources and plan together to use the data to inform their on-going instruction.

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

	Name	Title
1	Dr. Susan Silvey	Building Principal
2	Dr. Teresa Hill	Asst. Supt. for Curriculum and Instruction
3	Dr. Sandra Spalt Fulte	ISAT Mathematics Consultant
4	Dr. Gretchen Courtney	ISAT Reading Consultant
5	Mrs. Diane Stempinski	ROE

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: **11/11/2009**

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

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]

Yes No 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?

Yes No

Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]

MONITORING

Yes No

Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]

Yes No

Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers? [C]

PART I - COMMENTS

The Area IV RESPRO review has been completed. Readers of the plan noticed that Bloomington Junior High School is in status at the Academic Watch 2 level. The district must be writing a Restructuring Plan for BJHS due to ISBE on February 17, 2010. Please consult your local RESPRO immediately for information and/or assistance.

This plan seems to place a strong emphasis on Reading deficiencies. Math deficiencies should receive the same importance. The plan also focuses on the general population rather than the subgroup, Students with Disabilities. The plan needs to be written to address the specific deficiencies that prevented the school from making AYP.

Analysis of Data: Language in plan is very general. Plan needs specific data (numbers) and description of analysis specific to areas of deficiency.

Local Assessment Data: Language in plan is very general. Plan needs specific data (numbers) and description of analysis specific to areas of deficiency. It is unclear if local data (MAPS) has already been or will be correlated with ISAT data. Reported data should have already been correlated to be included in this document.

Data & Analysis-Other Data:

This section appears to be a collection of unrelated statements that aren't always relevant to the prompts of the SIP. There is a lack of alignment among the data, factors, and conclusions.

It is unclear which statements are meant to be attributes and which are meant to be challenges.

Parent Involvement Section is not optional.

Key Factors section is weak. The "factors" provided are conclusions. Key Factors are aspects of a school that are "within the district's capacity to change or control and which have contributed to low achievement".

Clarity of Objectives: Two separate objectives are required. A school is required to create an objective for each identified deficiency. Objective must be written for two years and must include current achievement levels and required levels for 2010 and 2011.

Strategies and Activities: This section must include activities for two years, include budget amounts, and must be written specifically to address the deficiencies of identified subgroup, Students with Disabilities.

Monitoring Section is weak and vague. A description of the monitoring process and the instruments used should be included. The monitoring of activities/strategies is assigned to two administrators, one of whom is not housed in the school. Perhaps School Improvement Team could assist with monitoring process.

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 NoIs 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

Stakeholder Involvement: The section would be stronger if parents and community members were included.

Peer Review-Plan requires involvement of educators from other schools, preferably outside the district. Peer Review teams and School Improvement teams should not share members.

State Responsibilities: No state level providers are listed.

School Support teams and School Improvement teams should not share members. School Support Teams must include individuals from outside the district.

Approval of local board is not indicated.

October 27, 2009

The Area IV RESPRO review has been completed. Readers of the plan noticed that Bloomington Junior High School is in status at the Academic Watch 2 level. The district must be writing a Restructuring Plan for BJHS due to ISBE on February 17, 2010. Please consult your local RESPRO immediately for information and/or assistance.