

## PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number	190220200021001		
District Name	KEENEYVILLE SD 20	School Name	SPRING WOOD MIDDLE SCHOOL
Superintendent	DR CAROL AUER	Principal	CRAIG BARRINGER
District Address	5540 ARLINGTON DR E	School Address	5540 ARLINGTON DR E
City/State/Zip	HANOVER PARK,IL,60133 5569	City/State/Zip	HANOVER PARK,IL,60133
District Telephone#	6308942250 Extn:0	School Telephone#	6308938900 Extn:0
District Email	cauer@esd20.org	School Email	cbarringer@esd20.org

Is this plan for a Title I School? True

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 1 - 2008 AYP Report**

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	Yes	2007-08 Federal Improvement Status	choice
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2007-08 State Improvement Status	academic early warning year 1

	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		62.5			62.5			90.0		75.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	78.9		Yes	77.8		Yes	95.6	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	85.7		Yes	83.5		Yes				
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	58.7		Yes	58.7		Yes				
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	67.5		Yes	70.7		Yes				
Asian/Pacific Islander	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	93.3		Yes	86.7		Yes				
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	46.2	47.8	Yes	40.7	46.6	No				
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	62.5		Yes	63.2		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 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 62.5% 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 62.5% 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 75% graduation rate for high schools.

\* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2007.

\*\* Safe Harbor Targets of 62.5% or above are not printed.

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

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data**  
**Item 2 - 2008 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**

<b>School Information</b>								
	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
Attendance Rate (%)	95.7	96.2	96.3	96.6	96.1	95.9	95.3	95.6
Truancy Rate (%)	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.4
Mobility Rate (%)	12.1	8.5	8.1	10.1	9.5	13.0	9.0	13.6
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
School Population (#)	536	557	565	584	564	570	568	540
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	13.8	12.9	15.9	20.5	21.1	24.6	26.4	31.3
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	4.7	5.7	4.8	10.4	8.7	12.3	12.1	3.5
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	64.9	62.1	58.1	58.7	54.8	50.2	47.0	47.8
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	10.3	10.4	10.4	9.9	12.8	16.5	17.4	13.9
Hispanic (%)	13.6	16.0	17.7	19.2	19.7	20.5	22.9	24.8
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	11.0	11.0	13.5	11.8	12.4	12.5	12.1	11.7
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.4
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	0.2	0.2	0.5	1.5

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/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	1999	68.8	9.4	11.2	10.7	0.0	-
	2000	68.1	9.0	13.0	9.7	0.2	-
	2001	64.9	10.3	13.6	11.0	0.2	-
	2002	62.1	10.4	16.0	11.0	0.5	-
	2003	58.1	10.4	17.7	13.5	0.4	-
	2004	58.7	9.9	19.2	11.8	0.3	-
	2005	54.8	12.8	19.7	12.4	0.2	0.2
	2006	50.2	16.5	20.5	12.5	0.2	0.2
	2007	47.0	17.4	22.9	12.1	0.0	0.5
	2008	47.8	13.9	24.8	11.7	0.4	1.5
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	1999	66.2	9.6	11.9	12.2	0.1	-
	2000	63.4	10.0	14.1	12.3	0.2	-
	2001	60.1	11.8	15.3	12.7	0.2	-
	2002	58.8	10.7	16.9	13.4	0.2	-
	2003	56.2	10.6	19.0	13.8	0.4	-
	2004	53.8	11.3	21.2	13.4	0.3	-
	2005	50.7	12.1	22.9	14.1	0.2	0.1
	2006	46.8	14.2	24.2	14.0	0.4	0.4
	2007	44.3	14.2	27.3	12.9	0.3	1.1
	2008	45.1	12.6	25.4	14.1	0.8	2.0

	Year	White(%)	Black(%)	Hispanic(%)	Asian/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
<b>S T A T E</b>	1999	62.0	20.8	13.9	3.2	0.2	-
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7	

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

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

	Year	LEP(%)	Low Income(%)	Parental Involvement(%)	Attendance(%)	Mobility(%)	Chronic Truants(N)	Chronic Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	1999	9.2	12.9	89.3	95.5	8.0	3	0.5	-	-
	2000	6.8	14.4	89.5	95.8	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2001	4.7	13.8	100.0	95.7	12.1	0.0	0.0	-	-
	2002	5.7	12.9	100.0	96.2	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2003	4.8	15.9	100.0	96.3	8.1	1	0.2	-	-
	2004	10.4	20.5	100.0	96.6	10.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2005	8.7	21.1	100.0	96.1	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2006	12.3	24.6	100.0	95.9	13.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2007	12.1	26.4	100.0	95.3	9.0	3	0.5	0.0	0.0
	2008	3.5	31.3	100.0	95.6	13.6	2	0.4	0.0	0.0
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	1999	12.6	9.9	98.1	95.5	11.7	29	1.8	-	-
	2000	12.3	12.4	100.0	95.7	16.5	14	0.9	0.0	0.0
	2001	12.8	13.3	100.0	95.8	15.5	11	0.7	-	-
	2002	12.7	13.6	100.0	96.1	11.7	4	0.3	-	-
	2003	9.1	15.8	100.0	96.0	10.0	1	0.1	0.0	0.0
	2004	13.5	20.7	99.7	95.8	12.0	3	0.2	0.0	0.0
	2005	15.2	21.6	100.0	95.7	13.1	1	0.1	0.0	0.0
	2006	15.0	24.1	100.0	96.2	14.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2007	15.0	26.3	100.0	95.2	10.6	3	0.2	0.0	0.0
	2008	10.9	30.0	100.0	95.8	12.6	5	0.3	0.0	0.0

Spring Wood Middle School

School Improvement Plan 2008

	Year	LEP(%)	Low Income(%)	Parental Involvement(%)	Attendance(%)	Mobility(%)	Chronic Truants(N)	Chronic Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
<b>S T A T E</b>	1999	6.4	36.1	96.1	93.6	18.1	43332	2.3	5.9	81.9
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.9	94.0	16.4	37525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40764	2.1	4.6	86.5
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49056	2.5	3.5	85.9
2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49858	2.5	4.1	86.5	

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)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	1999	544	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	555	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	536	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	557	-	-	-	168	191	-
	2003	565	-	-	-	201	168	-
	2004	584	-	-	-	212	208	-
	2005	564	-	-	-	167	205	-
	2006	570	-	-	-	195	175	-
	2007	568	-	-	-	193	196	-
	2008	540	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	1999	1681	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1695	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1675	169	210	197	199	176	-
	2002	1616	173	157	198	168	193	3
	2003	1619	192	178	161	202	168	1
	2004	1727	164	204	189	215	210	1
	2005	1713	194	173	201	170	207	2
	2006	1708	168	185	180	195	175	0.0
	2007	1699	184	175	164	193	196	0.0
	2008	1691	-	-	-	-	-	-

Spring Wood Middle School

School Improvement Plan 2008

	Year	School(N)	Grade 3(N)	Grade 4(N)	Grade 5(N)	Grade 7(N)	Grade 8(N)	Grade 11(N)
<b>S T A T E</b>	1999	1962026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1983991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2007170	164791	161546	162001	151270	148194	123816
	2002	2029821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2044539	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	2060048	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	2062912	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	2075277	136123	139619	146935	153566	154856	-
	2007	2077856	-	-	-	-	-	-
2008	2074167	-	-	-	-	-	-	

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, Staff Capacity and Professional Development**

	Year	Total Teacher FTE(N)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary(\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree(%)	Teachers with Master's Degree(%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials(%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers(%)
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	1999	110	15	45335	55	46	18	-	-	-
	2000	110	14	43307	59	41	19	-	-	-
	2001	111	14	45981	61	39	18	-	-	-
	2002	114	15	48185	58	42	17	-	1	0.0
	2003	114	15	49751	59	41	17	0.0	1	0.0
	2004	111	14	50570	52	48	19	0.0	1	0.0
	2005	110	14	52373	39	61	18	0.0	1	0.0
	2006	110	13	54372	45	56	18	0.0	1	0.0
	2007	109	13	56908	39	61	18	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2008	111	13	58379	41	59	18	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>S T A T E</b>	1999	119718	15	45337	53	47	20	18	-	-
	2000	122671	15	45766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125735	15	47929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126544	14	49702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129068	14	51672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125702	14	54446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128079	14	55558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127010	13	56685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127010	13	58275	48	52	19	19	2	3
2008	131488	12	60871	47	53	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, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark   % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark   % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	68.1	71.6	80.7	-	-	-	70.1	70.9	74.9	69.4	68.2	70.7	78.3	83.2	77.6
White	-	-	-	73.0	82.7	87.4	-	-	-	79.3	71.6	86.5	78.4	71.4	76.3	82.9	86.5	83.1
Black	-	-	-	51.5	35.7	55.0	-	-	-	52.5	56.7	56.7	37.5	53.8	54.2	52.9	75.0	54.5
Hispanic	-	-	-	70.6	59.3	74.5	-	-	-	60.0	72.2	57.5	57.7	65.4	51.6	76.9	84.2	72.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	68.9	90.0	88.2	-	-	-	81.8	81.5	83.3	70.8	69.5	88.5	76.5	84.2	96.1
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

# Spring Wood Middle School

## School Improvement Plan 2008

12/11/2008 3:19:50 PM

Page 14 of 34

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	40.5	44.4	46.6	-	-	-	22.2	34.4	37.9	23.1	37.5	36.0	39.1	38.5	43.2
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	56.5	41.7	72.8	-	-	-	55.1	61.0	55.8	48.1	57.9	46.4	42.5	77.1	61.2

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark   % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark   % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	71.3	78.6	78.3	-	-	-	70.2	77.5	77.6	51.6	50.7	52.8	84.4	82.6	74.9
White	-	-	-	74.1	86.4	83.7	-	-	-	83.9	79.6	90.1	58.4	53.8	55.7	88.9	91.0	75.0
Black	-	-	-	54.3	46.4	55.0	-	-	-	45.0	70.0	50.0	31.3	15.4	20.9	53.0	63.9	66.6
Hispanic	-	-	-	61.7	77.8	74.5	-	-	-	54.3	66.7	67.5	26.9	38.4	39.4	80.7	79.0	70.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	93.1	90.0	82.3	-	-	-	86.3	92.6	83.4	66.7	86.9	88.5	94.1	89.5	92.3
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

# Spring Wood Middle School

## School Improvement Plan 2008

12/11/2008 3:19:50 PM

Page 16 of 34

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	40.5	29.6	40.0	-	-	-	29.6	50.0	34.4	15.3	16.6	11.5	52.2	42.3	32.4
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	63.0	61.1	71.2	-	-	-	46.9	65.9	59.0	25.9	34.2	21.5	57.5	66.7	63.0

### 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?*

The School Report Card data shows that in every NCLB subject area and almost every subgroup, Spring Wood Middle School is making adequate yearly progress.

The area of weakness, as shown by the data, is students with disabilities in the area of Math with a score of 40.7% meets or exceeds. This is the second year in a row that this occurred. We have investigated the specific math standards to determine which area(s) caused the most difficulty for the students. What we found was that in all the standards the scores showed that students with disabilities were answering less than 50% of the items correctly. In addition, we observed from the data that the students with disabilities were able to explain their reasoning (scoring 3s and 4s) on the math extended response but in the knowledge area, their scores were 1s or 2s.

The areas of strength that are indicated by the School Report Card are overall scoring in Math and Reading. In math the school has consistently scored about 77% (75% in 05-06; 77% in 06-07; and 78% in 07-08). In reading over the past three years the school has made consistent gains, 73.5% in 05-06, 76% in 06-07, and 78.9% in 07-08.

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

----

External Factors:

- Most of our students with disabilities come to us already identified as needing special education services. Spring Wood enrolled a total of thirteen new students with disabilities in FY08. Spring Wood identified, for the first time, only 3 students as needing special education services.
- As many school districts are experiencing an increase in autistic children so has Spring Wood. In 2007-08 two more autistic children were enrolled in Spring Wood.
- Two additional students were enrolled at Spring Wood with emotional disabilities.

#### Spring Wood Special Education Student Enrollment

Total	ED	OHI	LD	MR	Autism	Speech	Multi D
-------	----	-----	----	----	--------	--------	---------

12/11/2008 3:19:50 PM

2005-06	85	22	9	35	5	3	10	0
2006-07	80	17	5	38	5	3	8	1
2007-08	95	19	10	41	3	5	13	2

### Spring Wood Special Education Move-In Students

	Total	ED	OHI	LD	MR	Autism	Speech	Multi D
2005-06	8	4	1	2	0	0	1	0
2006-07	9	4	1	2	1	0	0	0
2007-08	13	6	1	4	0	1	1	0

- The low income population has increased from 24.6% in 06-07 to 31.3% in 2007-08.

#### Internal Factors:

- Delivery of Instruction- In 2007-08, self-contained special education math classes were established for students with disabilities.
- Delivery of Instruction- The mathematics curriculum (CMP) was designed around 60 minute periods while the school's periods are 40 minutes.
- Delivery of Instruction- Special education staff may not have had sufficient preparation for the change in math instruction, i.e., instructional practices, content, and co-teaching.
- Testing- Testing locations were often unfamiliar to the students.
- Administration- 5 students that were identified as students with disabilities that were incorrectly labeled.

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

Examine delivery of math instructional practices to determine which will be most effective for our students. This may include scheduling classes for students with disabilities differently

Examine our math curriculum to make certain it is aligned with the Illinois Assessment Framework and the Illinois Learning Standards.

Examine the pacing maps to determine the placement of learning opportunities in conjunction with ISAT testing.

Provide staff development for special education teachers to increase their skills in teaching math.

Provide time for regular education math teachers and special education teachers to work collaboratively and cooperatively.

Testing locations for students with disabilities need to be re-examined as a factor that may interfere with student success.

Review administrative procedures for correct data entry.

### Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data (Optional)

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

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

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

### Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional) Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

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

Surveys completed by staff provided the following data:

Math Teachers Survey completed by 100% staff (6 math teachers)

- 0% use current approved math materials (CMP) with all their students
- 17% stated they had adequate materials to use with their low performing students
- 33% collaborate with other grade level teachers to design lessons
- 50% collaborate with special education teachers about their students with IEP's

- 50% know the learning targets students need to know by the end of the school year.

Special Education Teachers Survey completed by 100% staff (7 special education teachers)

- 0% feel they have adequate materials to use with their low performing students
- 57% know where to begin to fill in conceptual gaps with their low performing students
- 43% use the current math program (CMP) with all their students
- 71% use pre-post assessments with all of their students
- 71% apply differentiation techniques within their lessons
- 57% apply differentiation techniques at least three times per week
- 71% use a paraprofessional (teacher's aide) to work with struggling students in their classes
- 71% use some form of assessment on a daily basis to inform they which students are struggling on a given concept
- 43% have the confidence to meet the needs of their student
- 57% know the learning targets their students need to master by the end of the school year

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

Factors to consider as contributing to student performance results in math may include the following:

- Math teachers and special education teachers have not received professional development that supports collaboration to problem-solve, design lessons and develop materials in order to best meet the needs of their students
- Math teachers and special education teachers have not identified mastery target in math for their students at each grade levels
- Core math curriculum is not fully aligned to the Illinois Assessment Framework
- Special education teachers have received limited professional development in models of math delivery and proven instructional math strategies including differentiation.
- Math teachers and special education teacher have not received on-going professional development in use of math curricular materials (CMP).

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

To increase skills for staff in the areas of mathematics and special education so future surveys show an increase in identified areas of need. The identified factors imply that we should:

- Develop and implement core math curriculum and analyze local assessments so they are aligned to the Illinois Assessment Framework
- Provide professional development in models of math delivery and proven instructional strategies that support learning for all students in math

- Provide professional development in inclusion and co-teaching practices that support collaboration and problem-solving strategies that support student learning

**Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)**  
**Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development**

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

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

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

**Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)**  
**Item 3 - Parent Involvement**

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

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

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

**Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors**

**Section I-D - Key Factors** – From the preceding screens (I-A, I-B, I-C-1, 2, 3) 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?

We have identified the following as key factors that are within our capacity to change or control and which have contributed to low achievement of our subgroup of students with disabilities not making AYP:

- 1.) Access to math curriculum aligned with the Illinois Assessment Framework and the Illinois Learning Standards.
- 2.) Math instruction designed to effectively meet the needs of all students, especially instructional practices that meet the needs of students with disabilities.
- 3.) Special education and regular education math teachers with skills in math content and pedagogy needed to deliver differentiated math instruction that meets the needs of all students.
- 4.) Special education and regular education math teachers with skills in collaborative, problem solving practices designed to support the needs of all students.
- 5.) Misidentification of non-special education students as students with disabilities on the State rosters.
- 6.) Inadequate testing environments.

Our action plans will need to address each of these areas to equalize and improve achievement of students in our subgroups as well as raise the achievement of all students.

**Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies**

Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Improve Math Learning for Students With Disabilities	1,

The following deficiencies [not objectives] have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for your school.		
1	Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds	

**Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives**

**Objective: 1**

Improve Math Learning for Students With Disabilities

**Objective 1 Description:**

While our current achievement in mathematics for the students with disabilities subgroup is 40.7% meeting/exceeding for ISAT, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 70% in 2009 or Safe Harbor and 77.5% in 2010 or Safe Harbor.

<b>This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency</b>		
1	Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds	

### Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 1 Title : Improve Math Learning for Students With Disabilities						
	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
1	Students will learn problem solving strategies to respond successfully on short answer and extended response ISAT math items.	10/6/2008	5/30/2010	During School	Title I	500
2	All students will have access to a core math curriculum and learning targets that are assessed on the ISAT.	11/12/2008	5/30/2010	During School	Other	0
3	Students will be supported in developing an understanding of math concepts where weaknesses have been identified in the analysis of local and state data.	11/12/2008	5/30/2010	During School	Other	0
4	All students will learn math through a variety of instructional delivery models designed and differentiated to meet individual student needs and improve their understanding of math concepts.	11/12/2008	5/30/2010	During School	Other	0
5	Students will benefit from a co-teaching model which will increase instructional support.	1/12/2009	5/30/2010	During School	Other	0
6	Students will participate in individual conferences with teachers to review progress and set math goals.	12/12/2008	5/30/2010	During School	Other	0
7	Student information will be correctly entered into SIS.	11/13/2008	1/9/2009	During School	Other	0
8	Students will be provided adequate testing environments.	11/13/2008	2/27/2009	During School	Other	0

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

Objective 1 Title : Improve Math Learning for Students With Disabilities						
	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
1	The math curriculum will focus on alignment to the Illinois Assessment Framework with the expectation that curriculum content and pacing will be adjusted to meet the needs of all students.	10/8/2008	1/30/2009	During School	State Funds	500
2	Plan and provide on-going staff development for special education and regular education math teachers in inclusion and co-teaching practices with the expectation that staff will have the skills they need to collaborate and problem-solve in order to meet the needs of all students.	8/20/2008	5/30/2010	During School	State Funds	500
3	Plan and provide on-going staff development for special education and regular education classroom math teachers on models of math delivery and proven instructional strategies for the purpose of improving math achievement for students with disabilities.	8/20/2008	5/30/2010	During School	State Funds	1000
4	Local math assessments will be analyzed, aligned to the standards and reformatted so these assessments can be used to make instructional decisions with the expectation that student achievement on the ISAT in math will improve.	10/4/2008	5/30/2010	During School	State Funds	1000
5	Teachers will collaborate in order to observe and share best practices.	10/20/2008	5/30/2010	During School	State Funds	500

	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
6	Teachers will determine what materials they need to meet the needs of their low performing students.	12/10/2008	1/20/2009	During School	Local Funds	600

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

#### Objective 1 Title : Improve Math Learning for Students With Disabilities

	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
1	Spring Wood staff will communicate with parents in a variety of formats focusing on school improvement efforts in math.	10/8/2008	5/30/2010	After School	Local Funds	8000
2	Special education staff, in collaboration with regular education staff, will communicate with the parents concerning specific skills and strategies to improve math that can be accomplished at home.	8/20/2008	5/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Special education staff, in collaboration with regular education staff, will develop and disseminate a math flier for parents containing 5 strategies to help their child to improve number sense.	1/10/2009	1/10/2009	After School	Other	0
4	The Spring Wood SIP team will invite parent representative(s) to be a member of the SIP team or convene a parent focus group to review and provide feedback on the SIP plan.	11/15/2008	1/9/2009	During School	Other	0
5	Spring Wood staff will design forms of school-to-home and home-to-school communications about school programs and children's progress, including annual conferences with language translators to assist families as needed and a variety of notices.	11/15/2008	5/30/2010	After School	Other	0

### Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

#### Objective 1 Title : Improve Math Learning for Students With Disabilities

**Monitoring** - Describe the process and measures of success for the identified objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

In order to monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities in our plan, the administrator(s) with the SIP team will meet quarterly to review the timeline, evidence of completion of activities and effectiveness of implementation for each action item in all three areas of our plan - student, professional development, and parent involvement.

As we monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the action items in our plan, we will review available local data (student/staff, parent) to assess progress and make changes to the plan as warranted by the data.

We will monitor our progress with the continued support of our RESPRO consultant.

**Monitoring Persons** - List the individuals and designate the role of each person (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

Name	Title
Craig Barringer	Principal
Mark Bocian	Assistant Principal

### Section III - Plan 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.*)

Results of the ISAT tests will be included in the school's newsletter, which will be mailed to every family that does not have an email address. The newsletters will be emailed to every family having an email address and will also be posted on the school's website. The newsletter, with the published ISAT results, will be translated into Spanish for our Spanish-speaking parents.

The minutes from the School Board meeting where this plan is shared will be posted on the District's website. This will be provided in both English and Spanish.

The School Report Card is posted on the District's website.

The individual student/school state report card will be mailed out in late October.

The choice/SES letter was mailed out in early October.

### Section III - Plan 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 following stakeholders have been consulted in the development of this plan:

Spring Wood Math teachers - Mrs. Sluga, Mr. Aliano, Ms. Josefik, Ms. Madeck, Mrs. Younker, and Mrs. Struyk

Involvement: Looked at the data and contributed ideas for the action plan

12/11/2008 3:19:50 PM

Spring Wood Special Education teachers - Ms. Kammes, Mrs. Lyons, Ms. Krengel, Mrs. Buesing, Mrs. Haught, Mrs. Friedman, and Mrs. Flores  
Involvement: Looked at the data and contributed ideas for the action plan

Spring Wood School Improvement Team - Craig Barringer, Danielle Benefiel, Terry Karner, Greg Stout, Linda Pfeffer, Tiffani Haught, Kathy Stuckey, Chris Ryan, Phyllis Wempe, and Amy Traversone.  
Involvement: Looked at the data, contributed ideas for the action plan and coordinated staff development

RESPRO consultants - Marjorie Cave and Fern Tribbey  
Involvement: Looked at the data and the school's improvement plan, contributed ideas, and provided staff development

District Office staff - Dr. Dorothy Dirks, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction  
Involvement: Analyzed the data, assisted with this plan, and provided staff development

Special Education Director - Ms. Mary Iwema  
Involvement: Analyzed the data and provided staff development.

Focus Group - Parents (Leslie Montalbano, Susan Smith, Danene Bloch, Vicky Stewart, Kathy Hayward, Laura Lair, Scott Williams) who meet with SIP team members Terry Karner and Greg Stout  
Involvement: Discussed issues and concerns shared by parents.

PTO  
Involvement - Discuss parts of the plan and concerns.

Peer Review School - Percy Julian Middle School, Principal Dr. Victoria Sharts  
Involvement - Examined the plan, made recommendations, and approved the plan.

#### **Names and titles of school improvement team or plan developers:**

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
1	Craig Barringer	Principal
2	Danielle Benefiel	Computer Teacher
3	Terry Karner	8th Grade Social Studies Teacher
4	Greg Stout	8th Grade Social Studies Teacher
5	Linda Pfeffer	School Librarian
6	Tiffani Haught	8th Grade Special Educator
7	Kathy Stuckey	Physical Education Teacher

## Spring Wood Middle School

## School Improvement Plan 2008

12/11/2008 3:19:50 PM

Page 27 of 34

8	Chris Ryan	Gifted Teacher
9	Phyllis Wempe	Title I Reading Teacher
10	Amy Traversone	7th Grade Language Arts Teacher
11	Tammy Sluga	6th Grade Math Teacher
12	Phil Aliano	6th Grade Math Teacher
13	Michelle Madeck	7th Grade Math Teacher
14	Katie Josefik	7th Grade Math Teacher
15	Sue Younker	8th Grade Math Teacher
16	Marisa Struyk	8th Grade Math Teacher
17	Colleen Flores	6-8 Grade Special Education Teacher
18	Jodie Kammes	6th Grade Special Education Teacher
19	Christine Lyons	6th Grade Special Education Teacher
20	Karen Kregel	7th Grade Special Education Teacher
21	Pat Buesing	7th Grade Special Education Teacher
22	Marisa Struyk	8th Grade Special Education Teacher
23	Dr. Dorothy Dirks	Assistant Supt for Curriculum and Instruction
24	Marjorie Cave	REPRO Support
25	Fern Tribbey	Math Consultant
26	Mary Iwema	Special Education Director
27	Dr. Victoria Sharts	Principal- Percy Julian Middle School
28	Mrs. Leslie Montalbano	Parent
29	Mrs. Susan Smith	Parent
30	Mrs. Danene Bloch	Parent
31	Mrs. Vicky Stewart	Parent
32	Mrs. Kathy Hayward	Parent and PTO President
33	Mrs. Laura Lair	Parent
34	Mr. Scott Williams	Parent
35	Mrs. Kate Shah	Parent

**Section III - Plan 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. Peer review and subsequent local board approval 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>.

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

The Peer Review Team is made up of educators from Percy Julian Middle School in Oak Park which is similar to Spring Wood Middle School in the percentage of African-American students, but significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students with disabilities. The Peer Review team members have demonstrated effectiveness and have recognized expertise in school improvement. They were able to evaluate the plan's quality and the likelihood of its successful implementation, and made suggestions for revisions. The Peer Review Team used the ISBE monitoring prompt as they reviewed the plan. The DuPage ROE/RESPRO staff assisted Spring Wood Middle School in identifying possible Peer Review members. The Board of Education approved the Peer Review team and process. The team consisted of Dr. Victoria Sharts, principal and her assistant principals. The Peer Review was completed on December 5, 2008.

**Section III - Plan 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.

Keeneyville Elementary School District 20 has a state approved mentoring program that incorporates ETS's Pathwise Mentoring Program with the Induction for 21st Century Educator (ICE21) state program. Over the course of two years, several classroom observations and focused mentor/mentee activities promote professional dialogue between mentor and mentee. Strategic instructional planning and implementation are the result of these observations and activities. Self-reflection on the part of both staff members is a key component to making the program successful.

The lead mentor teacher is certified by the state having completed the ICE21 training. The lead mentor teacher meets throughout the year with mentors to develop their skills as mentors and to support them in their work with new staff members.

### Section III - Plan 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 services and the resources that the district has provided in the writing of this plan include assistance from the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction in terms of data analysis, assistance with professional development activities, development of evaluation efforts for student achievement and effects of professional development activities, and the development of budgets for school improvement activities.

The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction will continue to meet with the building administration to support and monitor school improvement progress.

**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).

**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.

### Section III - Plan 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.

The DuPage County RESPRO consultants have provided support services during the development of this plan by reviewing the plan and locating a peer review

school for us.

Marjorie Cave, our consultant, will continue to meet with us to support and monitor the implementation of the school improvement plan. She will also provide assistance with professional development activities as well as evaluation efforts to determine the effectiveness for student achievement. RESPRO has been very helpful to us to date. We anticipate a continuing relationship with them throughout this process.

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

State Responsibilities – List the names and identify the roles (e.g., distinguished educator, district curriculum coordinator, university partner, or RESPRO consultant) of the School Support Team. If applicable, School Support Teams are assigned to schools in corrective action to provide sustained and intensive support for those schools to make adequate yearly progress. Note: School Support Teams are not the same as school improvement teams or the school planning team. Schools I academic watch, restructuring, or restructuring implementation status should have School Support Teams. Some schools in Choice, SES, or academic early warning status also have School Support Teams.

	Name	Title
1	Marjorie Cave	RESPRO consultant
2	Fern Tribbey	Math and Special Education Consultant

---

**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

	Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified?
--	--

	Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness?
--	--

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

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

## LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

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

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

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

## OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

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

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

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

## IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

	Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance?
--	---

	Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control?
--	--

## CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

	Has the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan?
--	--

	Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency?
--	--

## ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

	Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?
--	---

	Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement?
--	--

	Are the strategies and activities measurable?
--	---

	Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified?
--	--

	Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear?
--	---

	Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students?
	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?
	Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities? for students?
	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?
<b>MONITORING</b>	
	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?
	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?

**PART I - COMMENTS**

**PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN**

**PARENT NOTIFICATION**

	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? <font color="red">(Title I Schools Only)</font>
--	--

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?
	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?

**PEER REVIEW**

	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?
--	---

**TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS**

	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?
--	---

**DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES**

	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?
	If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school?

**STATE RESPONSIBILITIES**

	Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation?
SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM	
	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?
APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD	
	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.

**PART II - COMMENTS**