

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	12/21/2009
Submitted	12/07/2009
Plan Resubmitted	12/10/2009
ISBE Monitoring Completed	12/18/2009



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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	Yes	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2009-10 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning Year 1

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators				
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate		
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		70.0			70.0				90.0		78.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	66.5		Yes	44.5		No				98.3	
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	70.7		Yes	47.1	56.7	No				98.8	
Black															
Hispanic															
Asian/Pacific Islander															
Native American															



**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 (%)	93.9	93.9	93.6	94.0	94.4	94.2	93.8	95.0
Truancy Rate (%)	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2	-	-	0.4	0.1
Mobility Rate (%)	4.8	8.0	6.6	8.2	5.2	4.5	4.9	4.6
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	89.7	97.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.6	96.7	98.3
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	0.7	0.4	1.0	1.0	1.1	0.5	0.5	0.3
School Population (#)	550	570	577	575	623	645	664	661
Low Income (%)	2.2	4.0	4.7	-	7.2	8.2	8.9	12.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	97.1	96.7	96.0	95.1	94.5	93.2	92.6	91.2
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.8	1.1	1.1
Hispanic (%)	1.6	2.3	3.1	3.3	3.5	5.0	5.4	6.8
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.9	0.7	0.5	0.9	1.1	0.9	0.8	0.8
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2

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	96.6	-	2.6	0.6	0.2	-
	2001	96.6	0.4	1.8	0.9	0.4	-
	2002	97.1	0.2	1.6	0.9	0.2	-
	2003	96.7	0.2	2.3	0.7	0.2	-
	2004	96.0	0.2	3.1	0.5	0.2	-
	2005	95.1	0.5	3.3	0.9	0.2	-
	2006	94.5	0.6	3.5	1.1	0.2	-
	2007	93.2	0.8	5.0	0.9	0.2	-
	2008	92.6	1.1	5.4	0.8	0.2	-
	2009	91.2	1.1	6.8	0.8	-	0.2
D I S T R I C T	2000	96.7	0.2	1.9	0.9	0.3	-
	2001	96.5	0.9	1.4	1.1	0.2	-
	2002	97.2	0.3	1.5	0.9	0.1	-
	2003	96.8	0.5	2.0	0.7	0.1	-
	2004	95.9	0.5	2.6	0.9	0.1	-
	2005	94.6	0.8	3.4	0.9	0.1	0.3
	2006	93.3	1.0	4.0	1.2	0.1	0.5
	2007	91.1	0.8	5.7	1.1	-	1.3
	2008	89.7	1.1	6.6	1.0	-	1.5
2009	88.8	1.5	7.0	1.1	-	1.6	
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

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

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	2000	-	1.2	81.1	92.9	3.9	4	0.8	1.4	94.4
	2001	-	1.1	82.0	93.3	3.5	-	-	1.6	95.9
	2002	-	2.2	90.0	93.9	4.8	2	0.4	0.7	89.7
	2003	0.2	4.0	92.0	93.9	8.0	1	0.2	0.4	97.8
	2004	-	4.7	93.4	93.6	6.6	1	0.2	1.0	100.0
	2005	-	-	94.0	94.0	8.2	1	0.2	1.0	100.0
	2006	-	7.2	93.0	94.4	5.2	-	-	1.1	100.0
	2007	-	8.2	94.4	94.2	4.5	-	-	0.5	98.6
	2008	-	8.9	96.5	93.8	4.9	3	0.4	0.5	96.7
	2009	-	12.4	98.0	95.0	4.6	1	0.1	0.3	98.3
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	2000	-	3.0	97.0	94.2	9.8	9	0.5	1.4	94.4
	2001	-	3.7	94.0	94.1	7.2	5	0.3	1.6	95.9
	2002	-	4.1	97.0	94.5	5.2	8	0.5	0.7	89.7
	2003	0.1	5.0	97.5	94.8	9.6	4	0.2	0.4	97.8
	2004	-	5.5	97.8	94.1	8.4	3	0.2	1.0	100.0
	2005	-	5.3	98.0	94.5	7.7	5	0.3	1.0	100.0
	2006	-	5.1	97.7	94.8	7.0	2	0.1	1.1	100.0
	2007	-	8.3	98.1	94.7	6.8	-	-	0.5	98.6
	2008	0.1	6.2	98.8	94.4	6.1	3	0.1	0.5	96.7
	2009	0.1	11.5	99.3	95.3	5.4	1	-	0.3	98.3
	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	500	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	565	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	550	-	-	-	-	-	141
	2003	570	-	-	-	-	-	158
	2004	577	-	-	-	-	-	137
	2005	575	-	-	-	-	-	146
	2006	623	-	-	-	-	-	143
	2007	645	-	-	-	-	-	157
	2008	664	-	-	-	-	-	177
	2009	661	-	-	-	-	-	162
D I S T R I C T	2000	1,655	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,752	118	154	139	145	136	115
	2002	1,720	120	119	152	129	145	141
	2003	1,775	126	127	129	151	132	158
	2004	1,839	127	129	140	157	151	137
	2005	1,868	150	137	137	148	161	146
	2006	1,999	128	162	158	152	152	143
	2007	2,106	158	142	168	144	157	157
	2008	2,129	143	157	149	173	152	177
	2009	2,133	157	149	161	178	177	162
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816

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

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

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

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

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	2000	89	14	37,096	66	34	19	18	-	-
	2001	99	15	39,001	70	30	20	20	-	-
	2002	110	14	40,749	74	26	17	19	-	1
	2003	112	15	42,830	69	31	18	20	-	1
	2004	105	15	44,017	66	34	20	20	-	-
	2005	118	13	44,232	59	41	18	18	-	-
	2006	127	13	45,643	58	42	17	19	1	-
	2007	129	13	46,764	61	39	18	20	-	-
	2008	130	13	44,002	62	38	18	20	-	-
2009	132	12	49,285	62	38	17	19	-	-	
<b>S T A T E</b>	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)**

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grade 11						
Groups	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>
All	56.0	58.8	59.0	53.2	55.7	65.0
White	56.6	60.3	59.4	53.0	56.7	69.9
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	28.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	14.3	6.3	-	-	15.0	21.1
Low Income	-	36.4	-	31.3	25.0	33.3

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)**

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grade 11						
Groups	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>
All	51.1	60.1	58.2	53.8	51.1	43.7
White	53.1	61.8	56.2	55.1	52.5	46.9
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	21.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	14.3	6.3	10.0	-	5.0	15.8
Low Income	-	36.4	-	37.6	33.3	28.6

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?*

- In 2009, in the subject of math, in the all student group, 44.5% of students scored in the meets/exceeds category.
- In 2009, the subject area of math, in the White sub-group, 47.1% of students scored in the meets/exceeds category.
- Students in the White sub-group did not make the safe Harbor target of 56.7%.
- While the reading score for 2008 was 56.4%, Peotone High School achieved a significant increase of 10.1% in 2009 from last year with a score of 66.5% meets/exceeds. In addition, writing made a positive gain of 2% raising the score from 56% meets/exceeds to 58% in 2009.
- Our math score did not make the AYP target of 70%. Upon reviewing the the data, an increase in our math WorkKeys scores showed an average score of 5 (63.1% averaged a 5 or higher on the WorkKeys).
- The trend data shows the number of students making AYP since 2006 on the PSAE in all math has gone down each year.
- 21.8% of juniors are meeting the ACT benchmark of 22.
- The number of students in the low income group has continued to increase every year since 2002 has gone up by 10.2%. In addition, 28% of our low income group is Hispanic.
- December 10, 2009 - Additions and revisions
- Our 2009 ACT data indicates that 23% of the students who scored in the 13-15 range need further instruction in the math sub-skills Probability, Statistics, & Data Analysis to move to the next score range of 16-19.
- In addition the 2009 ACT data indicates that 46% of the students who scored in the 16-19 range could benefit from further instruction in the math sub-skills Probability, Statistics, & Data Analysis to move to the next score range of 20-23.
- From our 2009-2010 EXPLORE data for freshman, 67% of students respond correctly to questions in the sub-skill of Pre-Algebra; 64% in the sub-skill of Algebra I; 48% in the sub-skill Geometry; and 70% in the sub-skill of Statistics and Probability. This could be the results of our scope and sequence change in the junior high school and high school curriculum design.

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

- Reading continues to meet the needs of students; however, we will need to raise the level of achievement for students to meet the AYP benchmark score.
- A significant number of junior students had not received core curriculum of math instruction necessary to take the ACT.
- The scope and sequence were not adequate to reach skill levels.
- There was a lack of exposure to practice WorkKey problems.
- Freshmen entering did not have Pre-Algebra skills needed for 9th grade level.
- Most special education students struggle and do not meet standards.
- Students who began high school at the Pre-Algebra level, by the time they take the PSAE their junior year, have not been exposed to some of the content/topics covered on the ACT and WorkKeys math tests; thus, they have not mastered the requisite skills.

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

- Scope and sequence of math curriculum needs to be restructured to offer all students the opportunity for exposure to rigorous curriculum.
- Students need to be exposed to WorkKey problems and the high level of ACT assessment.
- We need to articulate and collaborate with junior high and high school departments to raise the level of student performance on the EXPLORE math assessment in 9th grade.
- We need to continue our process of aligning our math curriculum to state standards, IL assessment frameworks, and the College Readiness standards in identifying our core math curricular skills.
- We will continue to use Rubicon Atlas curriculum mapping software to drive our alignment process.
- We will continue to increase reading skills and achievement levels of all students so that students can meet the demands of post high school career choices.

**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?

- Practice ACT mathematics - 16% of students met the benchmark score of 22 in mathematics. Over the past five years, our ACT scores have shown improvement. In 2005, we had a 19.7 composite score and in 2009 we are at a 21.5 composite score. We have shown improvement over the past 5 years.
- EXPLORE 8th grade - 44% of students met the benchmark score of 17 in mathematics.
- EXPLORE 9th grade - 34.8% of students met the benchmark score of 18 in mathematics.
- PLAN 10th grade - 32% of students met the benchmark score of 19 in mathematics (if you include the special population in the percentage it is 28.3%)
- AIMSweb 9th grade level- 23% were benchmarking at the below & well below average.

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

- The time spent aligning curriculum to state standards, IL assessment frameworks, and College Readiness Standards at an evolving stage.
- Students need to be exposed to rigorous math curriculum.
- Core curriculum skills needed to be successful on the ACT are lacking and exposure to test strategies need to be improved.
- Students failing core courses in mathematics during the 2008-2009 school year: 1st Semester- (Pre-Algebra 3, Algebra I 2, Geometry 3, and Algebra II 4) 2nd Semester - (Pre-Algebra 4, Algebra I 6, Geometry 7, and Algebra II 8).
- Nineteen students in special education tested with accommodations and only 3 met standards
- Fifteen of our low-income students tested below standards.

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

- Improve scope and sequence so all students receive core and essential skills needed.
- The state standards, IL assessment frameworks, and College Readiness standards need to be more aligned for improved scope and sequence of math curriculum.
- We need to continue our process of aligning our math curriculum in identifying our core math curriculum skills.
- We will continue to use Rubicon Atlas curriculum mapping software to drive our alignment process.
- We will continue with AIMSweb benchmarking to drive school wide discussions to focus on analyzing school assessment data.
- System days are held three times a year.
- We will continue our process of analyzing school assessment data from the EXPLORE, PLAN, and practice ACT.
- While implementing and delivering a rigorous standards aligned math curriculum courses must be designed to meet the needs of all students using differentiated instruction.
- **Our Rtl action plan should be used to drive discussion and decision making instructional practices.**
- We are in the process of aligning our math curriculum to state standards, IL assessment frameworks, and the College Readiness Standards.
- The process is not yet complete for identifying gaps and repetitions.

### 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?*

- Graduation rate is at a high level of 98.3%.
- Attendance rate is at a high level of 95.0%
- Truancy rate is very low at 0.1%
- **Mobility is at 4.6%**
- Continue our efforts to provide math exposure for our students to be successful on the ACT. Identify where students are performing, so we can provide rigorous curriculum for these students to be successful. For the past two years, the percentage of students who meet/exceed has declined in mathematics.

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

The Peotone School District is presently observing a trend that reflects a moderate growing student population; however, over the past couple of years the population has been constant. Uncertainty in the economy makes it difficult to project future growth and needs of students transferring into our district. Although the majority of our students can be grouped within the middle income bracket, the district is witnessing an increase in the number of special needs students, 504 plans, and those qualifying for free and reduced lunch. The challenge has created a greater demand on the district's finances, staff development offerings, and the need to hire additional staff. Physical space is not available to expand curricular offerings. Special needs students continue to perform in the bottom percentile group; therefore, we need to create curriculum that addresses our concern with the number of special needs students struggling to meet standards. Developing and implementing a RtI action plan with a focus on strengthening our core curriculum using differentiated instruction is one important attribute. We continue to investigate research-based interventions to assist those students in improving performance in reading and mathematics. The AIMSweb software program will incorporate benchmark testing three times per year, while progress monitoring others on a more frequent basis.

**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 our efforts on monitoring our graduation and attendance rates.
- We will continue identifying level of math skills for all students through the EXPLORE, PLAN, ACT, and AIMSweb benchmarking in 9th grade.
- Effort will be made to align curriculum to state standards, so all kids are receiving a rigorous curriculum.
- **Implementing and delivering a rigorous standards-aligned curriculum must be designed to meet the needs of all students using differentiated instruction strategies.**
- Our RtI action plan will be used to drive discussion and decision making for instructional practices.
- We will continue our work on parental communication, emphasizing the importance of attendance, motivation, and successful completion of course requirements.

### 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?*

- A 100% of our teachers are highly qualified.

- We have a very dedicated staff.
- We have over 60% of our staff involved in extracurricular activities.
- We have 38% of our staff holding a master's degree.
- **86.3% of PHS staff have 5 or more years of teaching experience.**
- All staff are afforded opportunities for staff development.

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

Presently, all educators employed at Peotone High School are highly qualified and state certified according to state standards. These records are maintained, verified, and documented each year. The Peotone Community School District offers internal and external opportunities for professional growth. The district provides an incentive in the form of financial reimbursement for college courses to faculty, which encourages growth. In addition, professional development is encouraged and requested by the curriculum director. These incentives have been implemented for the purpose of improving and enhancing instruction across the curriculum. Professional development activities have focused on differentiated instruction, instructional delivery methods, aligning the curriculum with Illinois Learning Standards, and curriculum mapping. Highly qualified instructors, with a broad range of certification, allow us the opportunity to update and revise our course offerings. The faculty is informed of test results and make adjustments to the students' needs. Staff development has also enhanced our instructional practices. The professional development activities have assisted our teachers in refining existing skills, acquiring new skills, and identifying best practices.

**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 encourage faculty members to take advantage of professional development opportunities, such as college courses and instructional workshops related to PSAE. Growth opportunities are evident through examination of daily lessons, collection of academic artifacts, and classroom observations, which are conducted periodically.
- Peotone High School will continue to employ highly qualified teachers and provide professional development opportunities as warranted.

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

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

In the fall of 2009, our Open House had approximately 316 parents/guardians in attendance.

We have 137 parents active in our Booster club.

We have 7 local businesses contributing to our Educational Foundation.

In the fall of 2009, Parent/Teacher Conferences were well attended. There were a total of 469 conferences held during Parent/Teacher Conferences.

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

The data reflects that parents have a desire to actively participate in their child's education. This is evident during school functions such as open house, parent/teacher conferences, board meetings, financial aide meetings, to name a few. In addition, parent/school interaction has been enhanced through district website, posting of classroom assignments, listserv, newsletter, and individual letters, when necessary. Furthermore, parents will be able to access their student's grade via the Power School gradebook portal.

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

Peotone High School needs to continue involving parents through outreach efforts. We will continue to address all parental concerns and encourage parents to be active and informed. Parental support is essential to the overall school improvement initiative as well as their student's education.

Some possible areas of parental improvement include: writing a monthly administrative newsletter for parents, using the automated phone call system for important dates/information, providing parent training on specific topics/programs, and inviting parents for participation on committee work.

### 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?*

- Students need to be exposed to Work Key problems and the high level of ACT assessment
- We need to articulate and collaborate with junior high and high school departments to raise the level of student performance on the EXPLORE math assessment in 9th grade
- We need to continue our process of aligning our math curriculum to state standards, IL assessment frameworks, and the College Readiness Standards in identifying our core math curricular skills
- We will continue to use Rubicon Atlas curriculum mapping software to drive our alignment process
- Improve scope and sequence so all students receive core and essential skills needed
- We will continue with AIMSweb benchmarking to drive schoolwide discussions to focus on analyzing school assessment data as well as hold three system days each year to discuss students' growth
- We will continue identifying level of math skills for all students through the EXPLORE, PLAN, ACT and AIMSweb benchmarking in 9th grade
- We will continue our work on parental communication and emphasizing the importance of attendance, motivation, and successful completion of course requirements
- Our RtI action plan will be used to drive discussion and decision-making instructional practices

## Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	<a href="#">Increase Mathematics Achievement for all students</a>	1,2,

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

- 1. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 2. White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

## Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

## Objective 1

Increase Mathematics Achievement for all students

## Objective 1 Description

- In the school year 2009-2010, our goal is to increase our mathematics score from 44.5% (2009) to 77.5% (2010) to maintain adequate yearly progress (AYP status).
- In the subgroup of white students, our goal will be to reach the benchmark of 77.5% or the safe harbor target of 61% for 2010.
- In the school year 2010-2011, we will meet/exceed the PSAE benchmark of 85% for mathematics.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- b 1. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- b 2. White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Increase Mathematics Achievement for all students

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will participate in two mini-workshops to review Work Keys Applied Mathematics problems and testing strategies.	01/19/2010	04/23/2010	During School	Other	
2	Students will continue with the implementation of AIMSweb to measure student growth in benchmark assessment three times a year for 9th grade students.	09/14/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	900
3	All students will be provided access to Key Train interactive software program, which allows students to start at their readiness level and proficiency to higher levels.	11/30/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Title I	6,000
4	Students progress is guided by a set of essential questions that defines and targets the learning outcomes for the unit of study/course	08/24/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Other	
5	Students will experience instruction and course work that is designed around differentiated instruction components	08/24/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Other	
6	The utilization of daily class time to practice sample Work Key problems.	08/24/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	250
7	Implementation of PHS RtI plan in the classroom to meet the needs of all students through differentiated instruction.	08/24/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Other	
8	Students will use a common scientific calculator. They will be used not only in math classes, but also in other subject areas as well as on standardized testing.	08/24/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	300

9	Students will be provided tutoring before and after school to help improve mathematics scores.	11/30/2009	05/31/2010	Before School	Title I	10,000
---	--	------------	------------	---------------	---------	--------

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Increase Mathematics Achievement for all students

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will attend workshop on testing interpretation and testing strategies.	11/18/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Other	
2	Provide professional development for teachers for interpreting and using AIMSweb results by accessing via website and other data to improve student achievement.	10/21/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Other	
3	Training for tutoring expectations for before and after school tutoring program.	11/30/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Title I	300
4	Provide staff with binder of practice Work Keys problems to be used in the classroom.	08/31/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	300
5	Provide instruction on how to solve Work Key problems (formulas, reading strategies).	08/20/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Other	
6	Entire staff participates in differentiated workshop each year.	08/20/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	2,000
7	Three math teachers will attend the BER Best, Current Strategies for mathematics and bring back information to share at monthly department meeting.	11/13/2009	11/13/2009	During School	Local Funds	398
8	Two math teachers will attend the PDA 12 strategies to improving mathematics achievement for special education and bring back information to share at monthly department meeting.	11/05/2009	11/05/2009	During School	Title I	
9	December 10, 2009- Provide training and collaborative time for teachers to develop assessments and benchmark scores that will measure student progress.	01/15/2010	07/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	200

10	December 10, 2009 - Provide training and collaborative time for the development of formative assessments that will address the sub-skill of Probability, Statistics, & Data Analysis.	01/15/2010	07/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	200
----	---	------------	------------	---------------	-------------	-----

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Increase Mathematics Achievement for all students

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parent/Teacher meetings will provide opportunities to discuss student progress and report card grades.	11/24/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Other	
2	Increase communication via the listserve, posting assignments, progress reports, bi-weekly reports, assignment notebooks, and PowerSchool gradebook portal.	08/24/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Other	
3	Parents are encouraged to contact teachers via phone and email to stay informed on their student's progress.	08/24/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Other	
4	An information forum for parents/guardians on EXPLORE/PLAN/ACT held in the second quarter.	11/24/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Other	
5	Host a curriculum night in the spring for parents to learn more about the programs and curriculum offered at Peotone High School.	03/24/2010	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	300
6	December 10, 2009 - To assist parents our course syllabus and essential vocabulary will be listed on our website for Pre-Algebra and Algebra I. Parents are encourage to call and ask questions.	03/24/2010	07/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	200

## Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 1 Title :**

Increase Mathematics Achievement for all students

**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?)

- Math department members - monthly meetings, aligning curriculum to state standards, IL Assessment Frameworks, and College Readiness Standards
- School Improvement Team - structuring/organizing quarterly meeting to review the action plan of the school improvement plan.
- Curriculum Director - monthly meetings for test interpretation, goal setting, professional development
- RtI team members - AIMSweb and system day monitoring 3 times per year
- Principal's & Asst. Principal team - monthly department meetings

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	Doyle Owens	Principal
2	Paul Preuss	Curriculum Director
3	Scott Maupin	Asst. Principal
4	Amy Maupin	Math Facilitator
5	Michelle Lighty	SIP Team/RtI Team
6	Jody Andriano	SIP Team
7	Marc DeWit	SIP Team
8	Heather Kalich	Guidance Director

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

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

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

The Illinois State Report Card website via Open House, Parent/Teacher Conferences, listserve, etc.  
This affords parents the opportunity to locate information about the academic progress of Peotone High School.

### 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.

- This school improvement plan was developed through a collaborative process that included key stakeholders in our school district. During the 2009-2010 school year, our school will hold four SIP team meetings to address AYP performance issues. Our district will continually maintain school improvement plans whether they are in status under NCLB or not. During the fall of 2009, our school met with RESPRO support staff to assist in the writing of the School Improvement Plan. The high school Principal will continue to lead the school improvement process in collaboration with school improvement for submission to the Board of Education and ISBE. Regular meetings with the school improvement team and RESPRO consultant will occur during the two year time frame of this plan. Parents had the opportunity to review the school improvement plan and offer input.

	Name	Title
1	Doyle Owens	Principal
2	Paul Preuss	Curriculum Director
3	Chris McAfee	RESPRO consultant
4	Jody Andriano	SIP team member
5	Michelle Lighty	RtI team member
6	Amy Maupin	SIP team member
7	Brenda Eberle	Parent
8	Lori Slattery	Parent
9	Marc DeWit	SIP team member
10	Scott Maupin	Assistant Principal
11	Heather Kalich	Guidance Director

### 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.

- The process will be held on Thursday, November 12, 2009 at 3:45 p.m. in the Peotone Junior High School media center.
- The Curriculum Director will review each page of the plan, so constructive discussions and recommendations can be made for the plan.
- In addition, two parents will offer insight and input about the plan.

- The participants include: Ann Lavazza- Teacher, Rose Kramer- Special Education Teacher, Earl Welsh - Teacher, Ginger Saliba - Teacher, Amber Lokanc - Teacher
- The parents participating are: Brenda Eberle and Lori Slattery

### 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.

Peotone High School recognizes how critical the initial experiences in a new school can be. The long and short-term impacts of these experiences have bearing on teacher success and effectiveness as well as on student learning. Peotone CUSD 207U has a strong interest and obligation to see that teachers who are new to the system are supported and assisted. The first two teaching years within the district will be shared with a veteran colleague and enhanced by shared developmental experiences, including: monthly meetings and conferencing, new teacher inservice and trainings, observation of mentees by veteran teachers and observation of veteran teachers by mentees.

### 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.

- Professional development is provided by the district throughout the school year and also opportunities are available during the summer months.
- Provisions to send teachers to workshops through curriculum development budget are provided.
- District provides 4 institute days, 10 common plan days and 5 school improvement days each year.
- District provides financing for software to align curriculum using Rubicon Atlas.
- District provides financing for software to benchmark students in 9th grade math, reading, and comprehension using AIMSweb.

12/18/2009 3:45:49 PM

- District provides budgets for purchasing textbooks and resources.

**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

e 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.

We have received assistance through the Professional Development Alliance in Joliet. Consultants have been provided to us to assist in writing of the school improvement plan - Chris McAfee - RESPRO consultant

Cheri Leveling and Jim Harvey provided workshops on differentiated instruction from the Professional Development Alliance.

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

	Name	Title
1	Doyle Owens	Principal
2	Paul Preuss	Curriculum Director 6-12
3	Amy Maupin	Math Teacher
4	Jody Andriano	SIP team member
5	Chris McAfee	RESPRO consultant
6	Michelle Lighty	RtI member
7	Scott Maupin	Assistant Principal
8	Marc DeWit	SIP team member
9	Heather Kalich	Guidance Director



---

**Section IV-A Local Board Action**

**DATE APPROVED** by Local Board:                    **12/21/2009**

**A. ASSURANCES**

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

**B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION**

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

OTHER DATA

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

**IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS**

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

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

**CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES**

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

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

**ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]
<b>MONITORING</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers? [C]

**PART I - COMMENTS**

November 24, 2009

You have done a nice job of beginning your work on your Plan. Some observations: Further analysis of your data could provide more specific curriculum and instructional targets. What math skill areas need the most attention? Taking the data apart will give you clearer information on what specific areas need to be addressed. As a result of deeper data analysis, how would you further define student strategies and activities? What areas in the WorkKeys Math would you want to focus your attention on? It would be helpful if the rationale for the use of AIMSweb is articulated in the plan, since it is designed to work up to 8th grade. Have you considered using your own Curriculum Based Measures or other instruments that would give you more valuable longitudinal data? \* Signifigant gains may be made when school teams identify the instruments that will be used to measure progress - the target benchmarks that indicate progress is being made. \* How are parents involved in supporting the school's learning objectives? What training programs are in place for parents so that they can provide support to their son/daughter as they grow to meet the State Standards and School Improvement Goals?

December 15, 2009

**Additional information and clarification**

**Part 1: Sections 1 & 2: All sections are in compliance**

A deeper analysis of the data - ISBE/IIRC/PSAE and ACT - was conducted. Identification of the specific math skill areas have been included in the Report Card data statements. Clear and concise commitment goals are prioritized in the Key Factors. The Action Plan strategies and activities are aligned to the data and Key factors. The School Improvement Team's work and priorities are focused on curriculum refinement, instruction, and assessment and the continual involvement of all stakeholders in the learning process. The School Improvement Team is to be commended for the fine job of designing an academic plan that can be used by all teams, departments, and staff members to drive student achievement.

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN	
<b>PARENT NOTIFICATION</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only) [C]
<b>STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the SIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes? [C]
<b>PEER REVIEW</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Is the peer review process described <u>and</u> 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]
<b>TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 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]
<b>DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITES</b>	

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]
<b>STATE RESPONSIBILITIES</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 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]
<b>SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> 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]
<b>APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan. [C]

**PART II - COMMENTS**

November 24, 2009

Stakeholder Involvement: What steps might you take to widen and expand the circle of stakeholder involvement on all levels?

December 15, 2009

Additional Information and Clarifications

Part 2: Sections 3 & 4

All sections of this plan are in compliance. The school Improvement Team will continue to design and develop more avenues for parents and stakeholders to be involved in the SIP process. Thanks you very much for all of your hard work in developing this plan, and good luck in all the stages of implementation.

