

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

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	67.1		Yes	69.1		Yes	94.3	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	69.0		Yes	75.9		Yes				
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	67.6		Yes	63.5		Yes				
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic												
LEP												
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes								
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	63.5		Yes	67.8		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 (%)	93.6	94.2	94.1	94.2	93.6	93.8	94.3	94.3
Truancy Rate (%)	2.3	2.4	3.1	5.9	3.0	3.0	3.1	2.4
Mobility Rate (%)	24.3	23.9	13.9	34.1	27.1	34.6	25.5	28.5
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	542	502	480	444	501	421	409	478
Low Income (%)	80.8	72.5	82.3	78.2	79.8	78.6	79.5	77.0
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	-	-	-	-	2.6	0.7	-	-
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	46.9	46.6	49.0	48.9	40.1	39.7	36.4	37.4
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	45.6	45.8	43.1	42.6	45.5	48.0	46.7	45.2
Hispanic (%)	7.0	7.0	7.5	8.1	11.6	8.3	8.3	4.8
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	-	1.0
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	2.2	3.3	8.6	11.5

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	51.7	43.1	4.8	0.4	-	-
	2001	46.8	45.9	6.6	0.7	-	-
	2002	46.9	45.6	7.0	0.6	-	-
	2003	46.6	45.8	7.0	0.6	-	-
	2004	49.0	43.1	7.5	0.4	-	-
	2005	48.9	42.6	8.1	0.5	-	-
	2006	40.1	45.5	11.6	0.6	-	2.2
	2007	39.7	48.0	8.3	0.7	-	3.3
	2008	36.4	46.7	8.3	-	-	8.6
	2009	37.4	45.2	4.8	1.0	-	11.5
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	-	75.9	100.0	94.3	28.0	15	2.8	-	-
	2001	-	73.9	100.0	94.0	24.1	6	1.1	-	-
	2002	-	80.8	100.0	93.6	24.3	13	2.3	-	-
	2003	-	72.5	100.0	94.2	23.9	12	2.4	-	-
	2004	-	82.3	100.0	94.1	13.9	15	3.1	-	-
	2005	-	78.2	100.0	94.2	34.1	27	5.9	-	-
	2006	2.6	79.8	100.0	93.6	27.1	15	3.0	-	-
	2007	0.7	78.6	100.0	93.8	34.6	13	3.0	-	-
	2008	-	79.5	100.0	94.3	25.5	13	3.1	-	-
	2009	-	77.0	100.0	94.3	28.5	11	2.4	-	-
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	561	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	560	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	542	82	93	96	-	-	-
	2003	502	81	88	85	-	-	-
	2004	480	72	85	81	-	-	-
	2005	444	64	72	82	-	-	-
	2006	501	70	73	83	-	-	-
	2007	421	75	59	67	-	-	-
	2008	409	73	71	55	-	-	-
	2009	478	72	75	79	-	-	-
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	62.0	64.0	76.9	59.5	59.5	62.5	-	-	50.7	64.0	65.7	61.1	60.8	51.3	52.5	49.2	79.3	69.2
White	68.5	68.5	93.1	54.8	55.5	74.1	-	-	58.4	84.0	55.5	69.5	62.8	52.9	61.2	48.7	85.7	61.3
Black	59.4	61.9	60.0	62.1	62.2	58.8	-	-	40.0	48.4	73.5	56.1	52.8	55.3	43.6	46.2	76.0	77.8
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	31.6	33.3	50.0	16.7	13.3	33.3	-	-	7.1	36.4	17.3	11.8	28.6	10.0	5.9	11.1	-	19.0
Low Income	56.1	58.8	75.5	55.3	55.7	62.1	-	-	42.1	56.2	63.1	56.6	58.5	50.0	50.8	45.8	77.1	64.5

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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	75.0	73.8	86.2	83.8	68.5	70.9	-	-	71.0	75.0	80.6	57.0	60.1	63.8	68.8	69.6	73.6	79.5
White	84.2	71.0	96.5	77.4	66.6	81.5	-	-	77.8	92.0	77.7	73.9	74.3	67.6	75.0	69.2	90.5	67.7
Black	63.7	76.2	76.7	89.2	69.5	64.7	-	-	63.4	61.3	85.3	43.9	43.2	68.4	61.6	69.2	60.0	86.1
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	52.6	58.3	70.0	58.3	53.4	53.3	-	-	35.7	45.5	56.5	23.5	24.1	45.0	29.4	33.3	-	42.9
Low Income	68.9	68.6	83.0	82.1	65.3	68.9	-	-	68.4	70.8	78.2	56.6	56.0	61.0	65.6	66.1	68.6	79.1

	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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 & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

Overall academic performance continues to improve. The achievement gap between racial subgroups at Sheridan has narrowed and in some cases been eliminated. The performance levels of the low income subgroup (which still makes AYP) continues to lag behind their non-low income peers. Reading scores have steadily improved over the last six years, while math performance has leveled off. A significant discrepancy used to exist between the number of students meeting and exceeding in math and reading. Reading performance is now comparable to math performance. Attendance has improved, but still is an area of concern.

Sheridan School made AYP targets for the sixth year in a row.

STRENGTHS

Student performance in reading has continued to exceed the state AYP targets.

Black students are now performing as well (if not better) as white students.

Sheridan School has been named a Spotlight School for the last three years based upon the high performance levels of our low income student population.

WEAKNESSES

Fourth grade math scores have dropped in the last year.

Reading performance is improving slowly. Targets for the next several years are increasing at a higher rate.

Attendance rates are still lower than district averages.

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

LONG TERM STRATEGIES AND INTERVENTIONS CONTRIBUTING TO SUCCESS

1. Early Start – 2002 to 2009
2. Increased Home / School Connections
3. After School Opportunities for Intervention
4. Support from Outside Agencies / Community
5. Early Intervention Emphasis
6. Response to Intervention
7. PBIS Behavior Program
8. Use of SRI and Reading Counts
9. Michael Haggerty Phonemic Awareness Curriculum
10. Discovery Education
11. Discovery Assessment
12. Use of Six Minute Solutions as a School-wide Tier 1 Intervention
13. Additional Tier 2 Interventions (Great Leaps, Road to the Code, Language for Learning, and computer based programs)
14. All Day Kindergarten

SHORT TERM STRATEGIES AND INTERVENTIONS CONTRIBUTING TO SUCCESS

1. Use of IlliniData / IIRC Data Analysis
2. After School Intervention for Students in Grades Three, Four, and Five.
3. Creative Test Scheduling
4. Student Rewards

FACTORS THAT HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED AS “ROADBLOCKS”

INTERNAL

1. Student Attendance Focus
2. Student Behavior
3. Limited Access to Rtl Curriculum and Online Tools

EXTERNAL

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

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 continued need for programs that provide additional instruction (ie. summer programs / intervention during the day / after school programs).
- Students who attend regularly perform at a higher level than students with sporadic attendance.
- Regular measures of student progress, shared with students and staff, result in higher achievement.

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

Third, fourth, and fifth grade reading scores have remained fairly stable over the last two years. First and second grade scores have shown a marked improvement over the same time period.

Students who have not transitioned between elementary schools and have attended Sheridan School for their entire elementary career perform better than students with multiple transitions.

An achievement gap is still indicated between racial subgroups.

The gap between low income and non-low income students has increased.

Math scores have been stable over the last several years.

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

Early grade skills continue to show dramatic improvement. Kindergarten and first grade students are increasingly on track when monitored.

Oral reading fluency for second, third, fourth, and fifth grade students is a previously noted weakness. The percentage of students at benchmark in this area has risen from Fall 2008 (32.8%) to Fall 2009 (41.3%). Preliminary benchmark numbers in December 2009 appear to indicate the number of students who will exceed the benchmark for oral reading fluency will exceed 54%.

Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) allows for a reading lexile to be obtained for all of our students and facilitates students reading appropriate material. Students are tested periodically throughout the year. A measure is obtained at least four times a year. Reading Counts is used in conjunction with SRI and allows students to read books and be tested to determine their understanding of what was read. Students receive points for correctly completing quizzes and a word count for successfully completed quizzes is maintained.

The percentage of readers reading at the appropriate level as measured by the SRI has increased from 56% in Fall of 2007 to 59% in Fall of 2008 to 62% in Fall of 2009.

Identifying each student's lexile has allowed for independent reading to occur at the correct level and increased library readership. Students have read over 23 million words between August and December of 2009. This is a 10% increase in relation to reading levels in 2007.

The number of words read by third, fourth, and fifth grade students as measured by Reading Counts has increased each year:

- 2005 – 2006 = 26 million words
- 2006 – 2007 = 32 million words
- 2007 – 2008 = 36 million words
- 2008 – 2009 = 49 million words

Our goal for Reading Counts words read for 2009 – 2010 is 60 million words.

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

The factors discussed in Section 1, Part A of this plan are same factors that would have contributed to many of these results. Additionally, specific intervention curriculum aligned to the DIBELS assessment has contributed to the success of lower grade students. Students reading appropriate material at their reading level (thanks to SRI measures) has led to increased library circulation and increased lexile scores.

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

Multiple measures of student achievement assure an accurate estimate of each student's potential is acquired. Accurate information allows for appropriate and targeted interventions. Students who have the need for curriculum extensions are identified earlier and provided alternate activities when appropriate.

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?

Sheridan School is one of six elementary schools in Bloomington District 87. Our 420 students are served in grades kindergarten through five and reflect a rich cultural mix. Title I services are available at Sheridan School and this results in extra support in reading, all day kindergarten, and after school tutorial programs. Student mobility is quite high, and several strategies are in place to help acclimatize new students and families. Attendance rates and tardiness are a concern and efforts have been made to increase attendance. Our staff of over 40 professionals includes art, music, and physical education specialists, a full-time social worker / counselor, a school nurse, teachers trained to work with academically talented students, and many caring educators. Sheridan School provides services for students with learning disabilities, mild mental handicaps, and speech and language disorders. Many innovative programs have been initiated over the years, and teachers have the freedom (and are encouraged) to embrace new strategies. Climate builders such as the Annual Back to School Parade, walk-in registration, and other community activities have established a positive and caring tone in the school that encourages participation, learning, and success. Sheridan School has made substantial progress in improving test scores during the last six school years. Reading scores have increased dramatically and Sheridan was able to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in all areas tested. Sheridan has narrowed, and in some cases eliminated, the achievement gap for low-income and African-American students.

LONG TERM STRATEGIES / INTERVENTIONS

1. Early Start 2002 – 2009
2. Increased Home / School Connections
3. After School Opportunities for Intervention
4. Support from Other Agencies / Community
5. Early Intervention Emphasis

6. Use of SRI and Reading Counts

7. All Day Kindergarten

SHORT TERM STRATEGIES / INTERVENTIONS

1. Increased Test & Data Analysis

2. After School Intervention for Grades 3 / 5 in January and February

3. Increased Use of On-line Tools for Students

4. Creative Test Scheduling

5. Student Rewards

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

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

There are a number of factors (both long term and short term) that created Sheridan's improved student performance. The first and foremost is an incredibly talented, creative, and dedicated staff. Sheridan teachers have worked long and hard to make good things happen for students. A second factor that must be considered is the remarkable attitude and positive spirit of our students. These powerful factors combined with strategies and interventions listed in the Data section have resulted in success for many more students.

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

Our efforts need to focus on continuing to provide reading and math instruction that is effective and utilize interventions that are research based and scientifically proven. Renewed efforts to increase attendance rates are needed.

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 staff at Sheridan School were determined to be "highly qualified" by NCLB guidelines.

School-based professional development focused on meeting the needs of a wide range of learners.

With the exception of some technology training, all professional development funds were used for training, workshops, and conference attendance related to reading, writing, and math problem solving.

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

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

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

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

We will continue to strive for 100% of our staff to be highly qualified.

Material will be obtained to allow more instructors to provide appropriate interventions.

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

Parent signatures are obtained to verify handbook receipt and understanding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

We will continue to encourage parent involvement in a variety of ways. Every opportunity for a positive parent contact results in increased student learning.

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

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

Sheridan School made AYP and no deficiencies have been noted by the state of Illinois. Our teachers continually strive to improve instructional practices. Our focus will continue to be using new information and best practices to improve our students reading and math skills.

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

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

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	While our current achievement in reading for Sheridan School is 67.1% either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan will make AYP (allowing for the confidence interval) of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.	
2	While our current achievement in math for Sheridan School is 69.1% either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan will make AYP (allowing for the confidence interval) of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.	
3	The Sheridan School attendance rate for 2008 - 2009 was 94.3%. Our objective is to increase this number in each of the next two years.	

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

While our current achievement in reading for Sheridan School is 67.1% either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan will make AYP (allowing for the confidence interval) of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.

Objective 1 Description

Reading is a multi-faceted skill. Vocabulary development, word recognition, and phonemic awareness all lead to fluency. Fluent reading does not

automatically result in reading comprehension - instruction and interventions may be necessary. Understanding that reading comprehension is our final goal, Sheridan School teachers will work with each student to give them the skills (and if needed, the prerequisites) to be successful.

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

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

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

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in reading for Sheridan School is 67.1% either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan will make AYP (allowing for the confidence interval) of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Targeted intervention using research based materials will be provided by Title I reading teachers.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Title I	180,000
2	Short term interventions for students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will focus on skills to make them successful in reading for junior high school and test situations.	01/11/2010	05/25/2011	During School	Other	8,500
3	Students will increase reading skills by increasing the amount of independent reading as measured by Reading Counts.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	5,000
4	Students who are significantly behind will participate in Early Start Summer program to develop reading skills.	07/23/2010	05/25/2011	Summer School	Other	22,000
5	Students who are significantly behind will participate in after school reading small groups to develop skills.	01/12/2010	05/25/2011	After School	Other	6,500

6	The number of students scoring at grade level using the Scholastic Reading Inventory in grades 3, 4, and 5 will increase.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Other	2,000
7	Use Haggerty Phonemic Awareness materials to increase PALS scores and DIBELS Phoneme Segmentation Fluency.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Title I	400
8	Utilize other research based curriculum at Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III levels to provide remediation and support for students who have not met benchmarks.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Title I	1,000
9	Students in grades 2-5 will increase their comprehension and fluency by use of 6 Minute Solutions. Students will be benchmarked 3 times per year using DIBELS/MIDE.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	1,000
10	Students in grades 3-5 will increase comprehension by participating in the Reading Counts program.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	1,000

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

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in reading for Sheridan School is 67.1% either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan will make AYP (allowing for the confidence interval) of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide multiple training opportunities planning times through year to access, interpret, and plan using various data sources including IIRC, Illinidata, Discovery Assessment, and DIBELS.	08/17/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Curriculum trainings for research based reading materials will be attended. Material will be shared during staff follow-up training.	08/17/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Title I	1,000
3	Provide ongoing training opportunities to use instructional technology to further engage students in the learning process.	08/17/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	1,000
4	Staff will continue to focus on specific intervention strategies that are implemented in the classroom.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	500

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

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in reading for Sheridan School is 67.1% either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan will make AYP (allowing for the confidence interval) of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Conduct parent / child reading activities on a regularly scheduled basis. Activities would include Family Reading Night, Read Across America, and the PACER project.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	500
2	Use reading motivation programs (Pizza Hut Book-It / Reading Counts) to encourage reading at home with parents.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	After School	Local Funds	0
3	Conference with parent to share SAT-10, SRI, and ISAT results.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in reading for Sheridan School is 67.1% either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan will make AYP (allowing for the confidence interval) of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.

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

	Name	Title
1	Jim Cooper	Principal, Sheridan Elementary School

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

While our current achievement in math for Sheridan School is 69.1% either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan will make AYP (allowing for the confidence interval) of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.

Objective 2 Description

Number Sense, Measurement, Geometry, Probability, Statistics, and Data Analysis will all continue to be evaluated each year. Sheridan has continued to make AYP, however scores have not shown improvement in the last year. We will continue to identify relative weaknesses and work to improve those areas. Based upon 2009 ISAT data, the areas of measurement, graphs, geometry, and computation appear to be relative weaknesses.

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

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

Objective 2 Title :

While our current achievement in math for Sheridan School is 69.1% either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan will make AYP (allowing for the confidence interval) of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Math vocabulary will be emphasized at all grade levels.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	0

2	Teachers will increase the use of math manipulatives, graphic organizers, calculators and technology in math instruction.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	Before School	Local Funds	0
3	Discovery Assessment and Symphony Math will be used to provide math intervention.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	Before School	Local Funds	1,000
4	Increase oportunities for students to solve problems individually and in cooperative work groups.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	Before School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 2 Title :

While our current achievement in math for Sheridan School is 69.1% either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan will make AYP (allowing for the confidence interval) of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Attend ROE trainings to obtain strategies to develop math skills.	08/17/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	1,000
2	Discovery Assessment and intervention training.	08/17/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
3	District level technology training for math intervention software programs.	08/17/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 2 Title :

While our current achievement in math for Sheridan School is 69.1% either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan will make AYP (allowing for the confidence interval) of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Conduct evening activities that give parents opportunities to learn how best to help their children with math skills.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	500

2	Parent orientation and open house will provide information to parents concerning math expectations.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	500
---	---	------------	------------	---------------	-------------	-----

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

While our current achievement in math for Sheridan School is 69.1% either meeting or exceeding on the ISAT, Sheridan will make AYP (allowing for the confidence interval) of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.

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	Jim Cooper	Principal, Sheridan Elementary School

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3

The Sheridan School attendance rate for 2008 - 2009 was 94.3%. Our objective is to increase this number in each of the next two years.

Objective 3 Description

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

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

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

Objective 3 Title :

The Sheridan School attendance rate for 2008 - 2009 was 94.3%. Our objective is to increase this number in each of the next two years.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students who attend on a consistent basis will be recognized and rewarded.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	200
2	Students and families that struggle to attend regularly will receive support services.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	200
3	Students and families that refuse to comply after appropriate encouragement will be referred to the ROE truancy program.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	400

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

Objective 3 Title :

The Sheridan School attendance rate for 2008 - 2009 was 94.3%. Our objective is to increase this number in each of the next two years.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Emphasis and idea sharing will be a focus of faculty meetings.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	200

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

Objective 3 Title :

The Sheridan School attendance rate for 2008 - 2009 was 94.3%. Our objective is to increase this number in each of the next two years.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Letters and phone calls will encourage parents in their efforts to improve student attendance. Data will be shared regularly to increase awareness of concerns.	08/20/2009	05/25/2011	During School	Local Funds	200

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 3 Title :

The Sheridan School attendance rate for 2008 - 2009 was 94.3%. Our objective is to increase this number in each of the next two years.

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?)

Attendance rate will rise from the 2008 - 2009 rate of 94.3%.

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

	Name	Title
1	Jim Cooper	Principal, Sheridan Elementary School
2	Teresa Fisher	Administrative Assistant

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Parent Surveys

Staff PBIS Surveys

Teacher School Improvement Days (two per year)

PTA Meetings with ongoing presentations, input and updates

Meet the Teacher Open House/Orientation

Title I Town Meeting

Administrative meetings

Elementary principal meetings

IIRC staff training

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

	Name	Title
1	Jim Cooper	Principal, Sheridan School
2	Jaye Finerd	Social Worker, Sheridan School
3	Sonja Huddleston	1st Grade Teacher, Sheridan School
4	Messina Lambert	5th Grade Teacher, Sheridan School
5	Carol Roehrig	Reading Intervention Teacher, Sheridan 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.

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.

Teacher Mentoring Process

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.

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 Framework
- Workshop on the changes in the ISAT for administrators and school teams
- Opportunities for all teachers to participate in the Standards Aligned Classroom project and assessment training
- 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		

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]

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

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

Yes No 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

Yes No

Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]

Yes 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

1/19/2010 1:30:32 PM

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