

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	10/15/2009
Submitted	10/16/2009
Plan Resubmitted	01/04/2010
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	140161300022011		
District Name:	Cook County SD 130	School Name:	Lincoln Elem School
Superintendent:	Dr Raymond A Lauk	Principal:	Samuel Berrios
District Address:	12300 S Greenwood Av	School Address:	2140 Broadway St
City/State/Zip:	Blue Island,IL 60406 1558	City/State/Zip:	Blue Island,IL 60406 3051
District Telephone#:	Label 7083856800 Extn:	School Telephone#:	7083855370 Extn: 0
District Email:	rlauk@district130.org	School Email:	sberrios@district130.org
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status Choice	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	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	99.5	Yes	99.5	Yes	55.1		No	81.8		Yes	95.9	Yes		
White														
Black														
Hispanic	99.4	Yes	99.4	Yes	52.7	50.5	Yes	79.3		Yes	96.4			
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	32.1	32.8	Yes	62.8		Yes	96.7		
Students with Disabilities													
Low Income	99.4	Yes	99.4	Yes	52.4	54.4	Yes	80.4		Yes	96.0		

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress

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

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

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

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

DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION

The Differentiated Accountability classification for the school is:	Comprehensive
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in reading?	No
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in math?	Yes

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 (%)	96.1	96.2	95.7	95.4	95.5	95.6	95.8	95.9
Truancy Rate (%)	7.6	3.8	1.1	5.3	4.4	2.5	3.8	0.2
Mobility Rate (%)	18.4	18.5	24.4	27.8	28.9	27.5	7.7	20.4
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	609	586	594	651	633	666	578	500
Low Income (%)	76.0	79.9	81.0	72.8	83.4	79.3	87.5	90.8
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	40.6	37.5	49.5	37.9	51.0	36.9	45.0	43.8
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	15.4	13.3	11.4	12.7	13.0	11.3	8.0	6.8
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	9.5	6.5	7.7	8.9	9.2	10.4	9.3	11.8
Hispanic (%)	74.9	80.2	80.8	77.9	76.8	75.5	79.9	78.0
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	0.5	1.1	2.9	2.8	3.4

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	29.2	5.8	65.0	-	-	-
	2001	21.7	5.2	73.0	-	-	-
	2002	15.4	9.5	74.9	0.2	-	-
	2003	13.3	6.5	80.2	-	-	-
	2004	11.4	7.7	80.8	-	-	-
	2005	12.7	8.9	77.9	-	-	0.5
	2006	13.0	9.2	76.8	-	-	1.1
	2007	11.3	10.4	75.5	-	-	2.9
	2008	8.0	9.3	79.9	-	-	2.8
	2009	6.8	11.8	78.0	-	-	3.4
D I S T R I C T	2000	36.0	26.1	37.6	0.2	0.1	-
	2001	33.0	25.7	40.7	0.5	-	-
	2002	29.8	26.7	43.3	0.3	-	-
	2003	28.3	25.6	45.7	0.4	-	-
	2004	25.8	25.0	48.7	0.4	-	-
	2005	24.5	24.4	50.1	0.4	0.1	0.5
	2006	22.4	25.3	50.8	0.5	-	1.1
	2007	20.0	25.0	53.3	0.5	0.1	1.2
	2008	17.3	25.9	53.7	0.5	0.1	2.5
	2009	15.5	27.4	53.4	0.5	0.1	3.0
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

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

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	38.0	74.5	99.5	96.1	15.1	-	-	-	-
	2001	40.9	80.0	97.0	96.4	18.8	-	-	-	-
	2002	40.6	76.0	96.0	96.1	18.4	41	7.6	-	-
	2003	37.5	79.9	98.0	96.2	18.5	21	3.8	-	-
	2004	49.5	81.0	98.0	95.7	24.4	6	1.1	-	-
	2005	37.9	72.8	99.0	95.4	27.8	27	5.3	-	-
	2006	51.0	83.4	99.0	95.5	28.9	23	4.4	-	-
	2007	36.9	79.3	99.0	95.6	27.5	14	2.5	-	-
	2008	45.0	87.5	86.0	95.8	7.7	22	3.8	-	-
	2009	43.8	90.8	89.0	95.9	20.4	1	0.2	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	15.5	59.2	92.7	95.0	20.2	28	0.8	-	-
	2001	14.4	62.9	97.5	94.6	17.5	72	2.1	-	-
	2002	16.9	70.6	98.0	95.4	17.8	114	3.4	-	-
	2003	15.9	64.9	99.7	95.3	19.0	66	2.0	-	-
	2004	19.7	74.2	99.7	95.6	16.4	29	0.8	-	-
	2005	18.7	73.0	99.9	95.3	18.6	54	1.5	-	-
	2006	22.0	76.2	99.9	95.2	21.9	56	1.6	-	-
	2007	21.7	77.6	99.8	94.7	18.9	29	0.8	-	-
	2008	22.1	76.5	97.5	95.2	15.2	47	1.3	-	-
	2009	24.3	82.5	98.2	94.9	16.5	26	0.7	-	-
	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	137	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	115	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	609	165	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	586	122	46	-	-	-	-
	2004	594	157	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	651	144	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	633	122	-	-	-	-	-
	2007	666	148	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	578	167	21	-	-	-	-
	2009	500	155	52	-	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	3,509	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	3,507	399	389	412	381	380	-
	2002	3,613	429	397	387	398	369	-
	2003	3,544	382	416	393	403	385	-
	2004	3,569	425	389	396	375	409	-
	2005	3,645	420	409	386	380	381	-
	2006	3,707	397	396	430	427	401	-
	2007	3,649	372	383	385	408	403	-
	2008	3,649	400	374	369	438	426	-
	2009	3,743	410	404	386	377	446	-
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816

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

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

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

Educator Data is available only for district level

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	228	14	40,155	60	40	19	-	-	-
	2001	242	13	40,513	63	38	19	-	-	-
	2002	250	13	40,793	65	35	20	-	1	-
	2003	260	14	41,987	65	35	18	-	1	-
	2004	253	15	46,844	58	42	18	-	2	-
	2005	245	13	44,363	56	44	18	-	3	-
	2006	240	13	45,928	57	43	19	-	3	-
	2007	249	13	43,169	54	46	18	-	1	1
	2008	258	13	49,538	52	48	18	-	1	2
2009	280	13	51,655	48	52	16	-	1	2	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1

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

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	47.6	57.9	58.2	61.9	53.0	55.2	-	-	-	-	30.0	49.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	57.1	50.0	70.0	76.5	93.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	33.3	50.0	-	47.1	52.0	57.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	48.1	62.9	55.5	64.8	46.8	52.2	-	-	-	-	30.0	50.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	23.6	34.4	-	-	-	-	30.0	15.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	35.0	20.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	46.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	44.0	50.0	57.1	62.5	50.0	52.7	-	-	-	-	33.3	46.6	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	67.9	85.2	81.5	87.0	79.1	83.5	-	-	-	-	42.9	75.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	78.6	91.7	90.0	88.3	93.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	41.7	68.2	-	70.6	72.0	92.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	70.2	90.7	78.1	90.7	78.1	80.9	-	-	-	-	42.9	72.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	71.0	67.2	-	-	-	-	42.9	42.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	75.0	93.3	94.7	100.0	90.9	77.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	66.6	82.8	79.4	87.5	77.8	81.4	-	-	-	-	44.4	76.7	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

Based on the 2008/2009 School Report Card data, the following are indicated as areas of weakness in reading. A total of 55.1% of all students made AYP in reading, which is below the 70% requirement in every area in reading. The areas of weakness are on the Hispanic, LEP students and the economically disadvantaged subgroups. A total of 52.7% of Hispanic students met AYP by Safe Harbor (50.5%). LEP students also reached AYP by safe harbor, with 32.1% of students meeting AYP (Safe Harbor target of 32.8%). Similarly, 52.4% of low income students met AYP, with a Safe Harbor percentage of 54.4%. The school is meeting AYP in Math.

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

There was an increase of 3.3% of students who live in poverty. The mobility rate increased from 7.75 to 20.4%. At the district level, there was an increase of new teachers of 7%. Individual schools have just initiated curriculum mapping in the content areas, so there is a lack of consistent curriculum and pacing guides on all subject areas districtwide. Tier I and Tier II (RtI) interventions need to be implemented more consistently at the school and district level. Students who speak another language at home have a limited academic vocabulary. The district requires minimal expectations for promotion, and there is a limited application of in depth comprehension strategies in reading. The school has not had a consistent practice of collecting data and analyzing data to change classroom instruction or professional development. Universal screening of all students needs to be completed, and students who need additional progress monitoring need to receive additional support.

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

The lack of a district curriculum needs to be addressed, thereby resulting in a pacing system and agreed upon outcomes by grade levels that can be used for formative assessments that measure student progress and redirect classroom instruction. Curriculum mapping needs to be developed at the district level, producing a pacing system and formative assessments that measure student progress and are also used to improve classroom instruction.

The school will analyze student assessment data and identify strengths and areas for improvement for students. The school will establish a leadership team that will collect and analyze local assessment and universal screening data to identify students who need additional academic interventions. This information will be clearly communicated to all staff members to guide classroom instruction.

The school will establish an RtI team to identify, based on assessment data, the students in need of Tier II and Tier III interventions. Tier II and Tier III interventions systems will be in place for those students needing support to meet academic achievement goals.

The school will provide professional development for staff members in the areas of vocabulary and reading comprehension. Additionally, the school will provide professional development for staff members working with struggling readers. The reading coach will conduct monthly literacy meetings to provide professional development for teachers on effective strategies for teaching reading comprehension for all students.

The school will also provide opportunities to receive professional development on best practices for instructing English Language Learners.

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?

Spring 2009 ITBS (Iowa Test of Basic Skills) and Logramos outcome data were reviewed as a measure for students to meet local criteria for achievement. ITBS/Logramos data shows and high number of students in the unacceptable (ST9 1-4) range for achievement in the area of reading: 29% for first grade, and 38% for second, third, and fourth grades. The ITBS data indicates that a high percentage of students who speak a language other than English at home score in the unacceptable (ST9 1-4) range for reading: 39% for first grade, 35%

for second grade, 43% for third grade, and 34% for fourth grade. One strength was that Logramos scores overall were higher than the ITBS results. Vocabulary ITBS results demonstrate a weakness in the area of vocabulary.

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

The ITBS and Logramos have been used for seven years in the district. The district policy includes ITBS, Logramos as part of the promotion criteria. The benchmark assessments are not sufficiently monitored or adequate to measure student learning aligned to the state standards.

The lack of a set curriculum in all subject areas districtwide and no pacing guides provide for an inconsistent application and delivery of the curriculum. Students who speak another language at home have limited academic vocabulary in English. Teachers need staff development in the application of deeper comprehension strategies in reading. We have had an inconsistent implementation of vocabulary instruction at all grade levels.

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

Professional development is needed for teachers who work with ELL students and with students who speak other languages at home. The school will provide opportunities (outside speakers, conferences) for staff development in these areas.

Professional development to support vocabulary instruction is needed for all grade levels. The school will implement a consistent approach to academic vocabulary instruction in alignment with the district. The school needs to select key academic vocabulary and develop a consistent approach to teaching vocabulary across grade levels. Grade level meetings will be used for teachers to work on the selection and strategic teaching of academic vocabulary.

Professional development to support a consistent approach for teaching reading comprehension strategies is needed for teachers at all grade levels. The school will provide teachers with childrens books that will be used to teach specific reading comprehension strategies. The reading coach will have monthly meetings with teachers to provide staff development in reading strategies.

At the district level, new local assessments aligned to state standards will be identified. The district will incorporate these new local assessments into their promotion policy.

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?

Lincoln School is a Kindergarten through Fourth Grade School with a student population that is 78% Hispanic, 11.8% Black, and 6.8% White. The majority of our students (90.8%) fall into the low income category, an increase of 3% from 2008. A total of 43.8% of our students are limited-English proficient. The school enrollment averaged around 500 students for the 2008-2009 school year. The truancy rate at Lincoln School is low (0.2%); however, the mobility rate is high (20.4%), an increase of about 13% from the previous year.

Attributes

Student diversity in the school is an important attribute that provides a diverse educational experience for all. The school can also count on a dedicated staff with an average of 13 years of experience at the district level. Teachers meet frequently with their peers to discuss student progress and to develop common strategies to increase student performance. In addition, the school has used a PBIS system for behavior management.

Challenges

The district does not have a current district wide content map in each subject area that is aligned to state standards and has a district-wide pacing guide. The percentage of LEP students has consistently increased over the years. The percentage of low income students served by the school remains high.

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

Increased mobility rates and the number of low income students are factors that affect student performance. The high mobility rate contributes to a lack of continuity in the delivery of educational services. The increased mobility complicates the development of an effective parent communication. Parents have difficulty establishing meaningful contacts with the school, and communication between teachers and parents on school matters is affected.

Low income students frequently lack enough background knowledge and exposure to reading before coming to school. Parents need additional support on strategies to help students at home with school work. Because many parents work long hours to support their families, they find it difficult to attend school functions and to support students with

homework. In addition, many students lack enough support in English at home to assist them with school work.

Our teachers offer consistency and experience from one grade to the next which positively contributes to student performance results. Co-plan time meetings help teachers identify students who need interventions and develop lessons and activities. However, the lack of a district content map for each subject area makes it difficult to plan units and lessons consistently. In addition, several of our teachers also need specific staff development training on working with ELL students.

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

To improve student performance, the school will systematically monitor students to determine progress in reading and the results of that monitoring will be used to plan classroom instruction and interventions. The school will use DIBELS and AIMSweb to provide benchmark assessments for all students and progress monitoring assessments for students in need of interventions. Tier II and Tier III intervention RtI (Response to Intervention) systems need to be in place for those students needing support to meet academic goals. Students in need of additional assistance and support will be enrolled in after school programs to target their academic needs. In addition, reading resource teachers will work during the school day with students identified as needing targeted reading interventions.

The school will improve parent communication by: using the school web site to provide information to parents, increasing the promotion of school activities, administering surveys to gain additional information on parents needs, and using the generated data to organize parent activities according to their needs. The school will continue to publish a monthly school newsletter in both English and Spanish to inform parents of school activities and to promote parent involvement and participation in those activities. The school will provide support to parents on how to help students with reading and homework, during parent information nights, reading nights, and grade level coffee meetings.

The school will provide staff development for teachers on strategies for ELL students. At the district level, the district will expand its support for teachers who serve the ELL population of the district through professional development focused on the delivery of reading instruction aligned to state standards and student needs identified through the monitoring and analysis of data.

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?

Lincoln School has 25 classroom teachers, one special education cross categorical classroom teacher, 1 special education resource teacher, 3 fine arts/PE teachers, one media specialist, a Principal, one Assistant Principal, one social worker, one speech therapist, one bilingual speech assistant, and 4 reading specialists. The district has a student to teacher ratio of 16. At the district level the average teacher experience is 13 years and 53% of the teachers have Master's Degrees. All the teachers are highly qualified. The district sponsors a mentoring program for new teachers, through Governor's State University. Teachers who are new to the district but have teaching experience are paired with an experienced teacher from the district for one school year. The school has a reading coach who provides support and staff development to teachers. Lincoln school also has 12 highly qualified paraprofessionals.

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

At the district level, salary constraints challenge the district's ability to recruit and retain teachers with advanced degrees. However, the school counts on a dedicated staff with an average of 13 years of experience. The staff needs additional professional development to work with ELL students and on vocabulary development for all students. The staff also needs to be more involved in analyzing student data to monitor student progress and the success of classroom interventions. Additional staff development in data analysis is needed and teachers need to be more involved in using data to guide instruction.

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

Professional development is needed for teachers who work with ELL students and with students who speak other languages at home. The school will provide staff development for teachers on strategies for ELL students. In addition, at the district level, the district will expand its support for teachers who serve the ELL population of the district through professional development. Furthermore, professional development is needed in the areas of vocabulary and reading comprehension instruction for all students at all grade levels. The school will provide monthly literacy meetings, organized by the reading coach, to provide staff development on effective reading strategies, targeting vocabulary instruction and reading comprehension strategies. Teachers will also receive additional staff development on using data analysis to guide instruction. The school improvement team

will analyze ISAT, DIBELS, and AIMSweb data, as well as local assessments and will provide specific recommendations to classroom teachers to guide instruction.

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

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

The student attendance rate for 2009 is 95.9% and the Parent involvement rate is 89%, an increase of 3% from the previous year, but still below the 99% rate that the school had in previous years. Lincoln School organizes many activities throughout the year to bring parents to school to get them involved in school activities. The school organizes an Open House at the beginning of the school year, several Parent Information Nights, and Parent Coffees for each grade level that take place during the day. Parents attend more of the activities that take place in the evening and parent turnout is lower for activities during the day.

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

An increase in parental involvement will translate into a stronger partnership with the community. At the current time, the school does not have relevant information on parental involvement as it relates to student performance.

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

The school will prepare surveys to gather information on parental needs and ways in which the school can support them. The data generated by those surveys will be analyzed to determine areas in which the school could support parents. The school needs to develop a clear, consistent parental involvement policy which emphasizes parent involvement and facilitates communication between school and the community. Communication with parents will also be promoted through meetings with the principal, parent coffees, newsletters, and frequent updates of the school's web site to provide information on school functions and curriculum. The site will also include a staff list, so parents can contact teachers, with phone calls and email.

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?

The following factors are within the district's capacity to change or control and are contributing to low achievement. The factors that most likely contributed to these results are: no set curriculum in all subject areas districtwide, no pacing guide, limited vocabulary, poor support for ELL students and for teachers, inadequate professional development, minimal expectations for promotion, and limited application of deeper comprehension strategies in reading. Professional development is needed to provide consistent research-based differentiated classroom instruction to meet the learning needs of all students. All students need to be systematically monitored for student progress and the results used to redirect classroom instruction and intervention needs. **The achievement gap of all subgroups needs to be reduced by 25% while continuing to meet and exceed annual targets. Increased mobility rates and the number of low income students are factors that affect student performance. The high mobility rate contributes to a lack of continuity in the delivery of educational services. Many parents find it difficult to attend school functions and to support students with homework. Many students lack enough support in English at home to assist them with school work.**

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	While our current achievement in reading for all of grades 3rd and 4th shows 55.1% of our students in the meet and exceed categories, the 3rd and 4th grades will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or meet safe harbor. Other subgroups, such as economically disadvantaged, Hispanic, and LEP will be included in the strategies and activities for this objective.	1,

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

- 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

While our current achievement in reading for all of grades 3rd and 4th shows 55.1% of our students in the meet and exceed categories, the 3rd and 4th grades will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or meet safe harbor. Other subgroups, such as economically disadvantaged, Hispanic, and LEP will be included in the strategies and activities for this objective.

Objective 1 Description

To support this objective, the school will implement before and after school student activities: benchmark assessments, intensive small group reading and writing instruction, extended day reading program, and reading recovery activities. For professional development, the reading coach will provide professional development activities, and teachers will also work collaboratively during the day. The school will sponsor several parent involvement activities during the year.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- B 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in reading for all of grades 3rd and 4th shows 55.1% of our students in the meet and exceed categories, the 3rd and 4th grades will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or meet safe harbor. Other subgroups, such as economically disadvantaged, Hispanic, and LEP will be included in the strategies and activities for this objective.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All K-3 students including Hispanic, LEP, and economically disadvantaged will be administered DIBELS/IDEL benchmark assessments three times a year in September, January and May, to identify the students in need of intensive reading interventions.	09/01/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
2	All fourth grade grade students including Hispanic, LEP, and economically disadvantaged will be administered AIMSWEB benchmark assessment three times a year in September, January, and May to identify the students in need of intensive reading interventions.	09/01/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Intensive small group reading and writing instruction for first through fourth grade students.	09/01/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	0
4	Intensive one on one reading and writing instruction for struggling students on Kg through fourth grade	10/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	0
5	After school reading program, based on biggest needs, determined by DIBELS/AIMSWEB scores	10/05/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Title I	0
6	Extended Day programs for 3rd and 4th graders	12/01/2009	03/11/2011	After School	Other	3,290
7	Reading recovery (RR)and descubriendo la lectura (DLL)for first grade struggling readers	09/01/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	0

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

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in reading for all of grades 3rd and 4th shows 55.1% of our students in the meet and exceed categories, the 3rd and 4th grades will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or meet safe harbor. Other subgroups, such as economically disadvantaged, Hispanic, and LEP will be included in the strategies and activities for this objective.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	The reading coach will collaborate with K-3 classroom teachers to provide training on how to interpret DIBELS/IDEL results and how to use those results to inform classroom instruction. This collaboration will take place during a regularly scheduled grade-level collaboration meeting.	10/12/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	The reading coach will collaborate with fourth grade classroom teachers to provide training on how to interpret AIMSWEB results and how to use those results to inform classroom instruction. This collaboration will take place during a regularly scheduled grade-level collaboration meeting.	10/12/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	Regular and special education teachers will participate in monthly professional development activities provided by the reading coach related to implementing consistent reading strategies, focusing on reading comprehension.	10/01/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Title I	
4	Weekly Collaboration time for teachers of each grade	09/14/2009	05/27/2011	Before School	Local Funds	
5	Literacy meetings	09/01/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Title I	
6	Intervention Wall meetings	09/21/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in reading for all of grades 3rd and 4th shows 55.1% of our students in the meet and exceed categories, the 3rd and 4th grades will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or meet safe harbor. Other subgroups, such as economically disadvantaged, Hispanic, and LEP will be included in the strategies and activities for this objective.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Staff will communicate with parents regarding student progress on local and state assessments at scheduled meetings, such as grade level coffees, report card time, and parent information nights. Staff will discuss the results and will answer questions.	09/04/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	Parents will participate in an Open House activity to receive information on classroom rules, curriculum and promotion criteria.	09/10/2009	09/16/2011	After School	Local Funds	
3	Meetings with Administration- school administrators will organize two meetings after school to discuss school activities and to answer questions from parents.	09/01/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Local Funds	
4	Administrators will sponsor four Parent Information Nights that will concentrate mainly in providing information on curriculum and assessments	09/11/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Local Funds	
5	The school will have one Grade level coffee meeting for each grade level to discuss reading strategies	09/04/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	
6	One Family Reading Night to increase home/school connection in the development of literacy	09/04/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Local Funds	
7	One Title I Parent meeting to provide parents with information on Title I programs	09/04/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Title I	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in reading for all of grades 3rd and 4th shows 55.1% of our students in the meet and exceed categories, the 3rd and 4th grades will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or meet safe harbor. Other subgroups, such as economically disadvantaged, Hispanic, and LEP will be included in the strategies and activities for this objective.

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

The school SIP team will meet monthly during the year to analyze student data and to monitor if the objectives and activities of this plan are being accomplished.

Staff meetings will be used for teachers to work in teams to monitor student progress by focusing on assessment results and RtI interventions.

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	Samuel Berrios	Principal
2	Alma Cano	Assistant Principal
3	Joy Natanek	Fourth Grade Teacher
4	Sharon Jones	Kindergarten Teacher
5	Deanna King	Reading Coach

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.*)

Parents were notified using a letter, in both English and Spanish, distributed during registration. Parents were given the choice to register students at other schools within the district that are meeting AYP. The school report card is available to the public from the school office throughout the year. The report card is also posted on the school's web site. At registration, parents receive a copy of the district calendar (in English or Spanish) that contains promotion criteria and other pertinent information about the district. During Open House, parents receive information on AYP status and promotion criteria. All parents are requested to attend the first Parent/Teacher conference. Teachers also request a second quarterly conference if there is a concern regarding retention, behavior, or other academic issues. During the year, parents receive mid-quarter progress reports and quarterly report cards.

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.

A team of teachers and administrators from the school collaboratively analyzed ISAT results and local assessments to identify the needs of our students and develop SIP objectives. Once objectives were developed, the professional development and parent involvement pieces of the action plan were developed to support our objectives. The RESPRO team from South County Intermediate Service Center 4 provided support and revised the plan. The RESPRO team also assisted with revising the RESPRO grant application.

	Name	Title
1	Samuel Berrios	Principal
2	Alma Cano	Assistant Principal
3	Deanna King	Reading Coach
4	Joy Natanek	Fourth Grade Teacher
5	Sharon Jones	Kindergarten Teacher
6	Consuelo Ramirez	Third Grade Teacher
7	Nina Carroll	Media Center Teacher
8	Bridget Gainer	Reading Teacher
9	Violeta Martinez	Social Worker
10	Enid Alvarez	Second Grade Teacher
11	Praxedes J. Lagunas	Parent
12	Josefina Lagunas	Parent
13	Maria Sanchez	Parent
14	Patricia Alvarez	Parent
15	Esperanza Gonzalez	Parent
16	Sharon A. McGuire	RESPRO South Cook County ISC4
17	Bernie Ferreri	RESPRO South Cook County ISC4
18	Gerald Lauritsen	RESPRO South Cook County ISC4

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.

An administrator from another school within the district reviewed this plan and submitted recommendations. Robert Hildreth, principal at Paul Revere Intermediate School in Blue Island, reviewed the plan and submitted recommendations. This review was completed on September 28, 2009.

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.

The district sponsors a mentoring program for new teachers, through Governor's State University. New teachers are given a mentor who supports the new teacher for two years. Teachers who are new to the district but have teaching experience are paired up with an experienced teacher within the school for one school year. The school has a reading coach that provides support and staff development to teachers.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SIP team from the school attended two workshops provided by the South Cook County Intermediate Service Center that provided information on the preparation of the school's SIP plan. The RESPRO team from South Cook Intermediate Service Center provided assistance in the development of this program. The team visited the school and worked with the SIP team, providing suggestions on how to prepare the program.

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

	Name	Title
1	Bernie Ferreri	RESPRO Consultant
2	Sharon A. McGuire	RESPRO Consultant
3	Gerald Lauritsen	RESPRO Consultant

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: **10/15/2009**

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

OTHER DATA

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yes No N/A

Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?

Yes No

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

MONITORING

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

PART I - COMMENTS

MONITORING IS NOT COMPLETE - 12/14/09 @ 8:48 A.M.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Pg. 20 - Expand on details. P. 20 - Spell out internal/external factors any others? Review DIP. Specify next steps --- very global. How will the school move the school to the next level related to - reading and sub groups. P. 21 - Additional info related data and factors very global response - related to. P. 22 - Need to be more practical in the responses under conclusions. Data - what do this data/information tell you about students performance - include an analysis some with factors/conclusions. P. 24 - very general responses under factors/conclusions not targeted.

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

P. 24 - Parent Data - what else does this data tell you? How will parental involvement help with addressing student performance issues? (same with conclusions). P. 30 - For each strategy/activity precede activity, hold open houses (2) times during school year, parent meetings with admin. - open door policy, any other strategies or activities.

OTHER DATA

See DIP - P. 32 - RESPRO team assisted with grant revisions. Parent notifications - expand as they progress. P. 33-34 - Peer review process needs to be spelled out.

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

Yes No N/A

Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only) [C]

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

Yes No

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

Yes No

Does the SIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes? [C]

PEER REVIEW

Yes No

Is the peer review process described and is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have "the greatest likelihood" of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP? [C]

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS

Yes No

Is it clear how the school is ensuring that teachers are receiving the support needed for their professional growth and to retain them in the profession? [C]

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITES

Yes No

Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]

Yes No N/A

If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]

STATE RESPONSIBILITES

Yes No

Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation? [C]

SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM

Yes No N/A

Have the names and titles of School Support Team members been listed in the plan? Does the team appear to have the expertise to support this school in regards to the school improvement plan? [C]

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD

Yes No

The plan indicates the approval date of this plan. [C]

PART II - COMMENTS

APPROVED

The District / School Improvement plan for Lincoln #130 is recommended for implementation with the assistance of your area RESPRO. No further updates to your improvement plan are necessary at this time.

If you choose to revise or update your plan, you may request that your area RESPRO update the ISBE monitoring prompt as this is the official state monitoring record.