

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	10/15/2009
Submitted	09/29/2009
Plan Resubmitted	10/16/2009
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

## PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	140161300022010		
District Name:	Cook County SD 130	School Name:	Whittier Elementary School
Superintendent:	Dr Raymond A Lauk	Principal:	Joseph V Talluto
District Address:	12300 S Greenwood Av	School Address:	13043 Maple Ave
City/State/Zip:	Blue Island,IL 60406 1558	City/State/Zip:	Blue Island,IL 60406 2338
District Telephone#:	Label 7083856800                      Extn:	School Telephone#:	7083856170                      Extn: 0
District Email:	rlauk@district130.org	School Email:	
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	Corrective Action
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2009-10 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status 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	62.3		No	79.1		Yes	96.6	Yes		
White														
Black														
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	61.9	62.7	Yes	82.6		Yes	97.1			
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic												
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	53.2	51.0	Yes	79.0		Yes	97.2	
Students with Disabilities												
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	62.1	62.3	Yes	78.4		Yes	96.7	

**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.

<b>DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION</b>
---

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 (%)	95.7	95.4	95.7	96.1	95.9	95.9	96.1	96.6
Truancy Rate (%)	7.2	12.1	1.5	-	4.7	-	-	-
Mobility Rate (%)	16.5	10.3	12.7	12.5	14.2	24.2	18.9	14.3
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	238	224	261	243	268	254	241	234
Low Income (%)	80.7	81.7	74.3	90.1	86.9	90.2	79.7	88.9
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	25.2	19.2	20.3	11.5	32.8	34.3	19.1	26.9
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	21.0	21.9	15.7	12.3	10.1	10.2	12.9	11.1
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	9.7	14.7	12.3	7.4	12.3	13.4	14.9	16.2
Hispanic (%)	68.9	63.4	72.0	80.2	77.6	76.4	70.1	69.7
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.1	3.0

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	21.8	20.4	57.3	-	0.4	-
	2001	26.4	23.6	50.0	-	-	-
	2002	21.0	9.7	68.9	0.4	-	-
	2003	21.9	14.7	63.4	-	-	-
	2004	15.7	12.3	72.0	-	-	-
	2005	12.3	7.4	80.2	-	-	-
	2006	10.1	12.3	77.6	-	-	-
	2007	10.2	13.4	76.4	-	-	-
	2008	12.9	14.9	70.1	-	-	2.1
	2009	11.1	16.2	69.7	-	-	3.0
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	-



<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 (%)
S C H O O L	2000	12.9	69.3	98.5	95.5	19.7	2	0.9	-	-
	2001	15.6	70.4	100.0	94.9	19.9	19	7.6	-	-
	2002	25.2	80.7	100.0	95.7	16.5	17	7.2	-	-
	2003	19.2	81.7	100.0	95.4	10.3	27	12.1	-	-
	2004	20.3	74.3	100.0	95.7	12.7	4	1.5	-	-
	2005	11.5	90.1	100.0	96.1	12.5	-	-	-	-
	2006	32.8	86.9	100.0	95.9	14.2	13	4.7	-	-
	2007	34.3	90.2	100.0	95.9	24.2	-	-	-	-
	2008	19.1	79.7	100.0	96.1	18.9	-	-	-	-
	2009	26.9	88.9	100.0	96.6	14.3	-	-	-	-
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	225	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	250	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	238	-	131	107	-	-	-
	2003	224	-	99	125	-	-	-
	2004	261	-	122	139	-	-	-
	2005	243	-	128	115	-	-	-
	2006	268	-	126	142	-	-	-
	2007	254	-	124	130	-	-	-
	2008	241	-	119	122	-	-	-
	2009	234	-	98	136	-	-	-
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

<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 (%)
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
<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>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	67.1	57.4	59.8	62.7	39.2	48.3	42.8	58.2	55.0	61.3
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	73.3	73.3	85.7	39.1	77.8	66.6	90.0	66.6	72.8
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	58.8	50.0	55.6	57.2	42.1	20.0	5.3	33.3	50.0	63.1
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69.4	55.0	60.0	58.4	38.4	45.0	46.6	60.4	54.6	61.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	45.8	35.0	-	-	10.0	-	32.1	35.5
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23.6	13.6	44.5	20.0	11.1	10.5	13.3	23.6	34.6	26.7
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	64.5	57.5	60.6	59.0	41.4	42.9	41.9	53.3	52.8	63.3



	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	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
<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>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	88.1	85.1	80.3	81.1	45.8	54.0	53.2	63.9	68.6	76.7
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	93.4	85.8	39.1	72.2	77.8	80.0	86.6	90.9
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70.6	66.7	83.4	50.0	42.1	40.0	26.3	55.6	43.8	68.4
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	95.9	85.0	78.8	86.4	49.2	51.7	53.4	63.8	69.7	79.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70.9	71.5	-	-	10.0	-	82.8	71.9
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76.5	72.7	44.5	46.7	11.1	10.5	23.3	35.3	42.3	40.0
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	85.5	86.3	82.8	79.6	48.2	48.6	48.6	60.0	67.9	78.0

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	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?

The School ISAT 2009 Report Card data shows that:

- \* 100% of all students took the test.
- \* 62.0% of all students tested in reading met or exceeded the standard, an increase of 4%
- \* 79.% of all students tested in math met or exceeded the standard, an increase of 5%

Our three subgroups are Hispanic, LEP, and Economically Disadvantaged

**READING:**

- \* 62% of Hispanic students met or exceeded the standard in Reading, increasing by 3% and meeting Safe Harbor Target
- \* 51% of LEP students met or exceeded the standard in Reading, increasing by 5% and meeting Safe Harbor Target
- \* 62% of Economically Disadvantaged students met or exceeded the standard in Reading, increasing by 4% and meeting Safe Harbor Target

**MATH:**

- \* 83.0% of Hispanic students met or exceeded the standard in Math, an increase of 10%
- \* 80.3% of LEP students met or exceeded the standard in Math, an increase of 2%
- \* 78.4% of Economically Disadvantaged students met or exceeded the standard in Math, an increase of 4%

All subgroups met Safe Harbor or exceeded in the areas of reading and math

This data indicates that work is still needed to show continued growth in targeted areas, especially our LEP subgroup.

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

The increase in after school tutoring and homework help, as well as a before school tutoring program, likely contributed to the results. Monitoring of IIRC data allowed for more effective grouping of students with similar needs within the respective classroom

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

The Students with Disabilities is one targeted group in Reading, with Limited English Proficiency students being the next targeted subgroup.

An increase in these areas was also determined:

Increase professional development in the areas of data analysis to improve instruction, strategies and adaptations/modifications for students with disabilities and 2nd language learners.

Teacher collaboration time/parental involvement

Communication with the community

Publicizing our school's events and successes

Develop a better decision-making process that allows for a better flow of communication between staff and administration.

### 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?*

At the present time, local assessments have not given enough data for a complete analysis. However, progress is being made in acquiring improved assessment through additional testing software and tracking capabilities.

Currently IIRC data is being utilized for tracking of students with specified needs. During the school year, AIMSWEB data will be used to further track students' progress. Formative assessments will be utilized in order to progress monitor students at at least three times during the school year.

Currently, the data informs the school that additional reading strategies need to be implemented, student deficiencies exist in vocabulary and comprehension.

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

Some of the factors that may have led to these results are increased student populations in English as Second Language learners, students who have come to the school with little or no support from home in terms of language acquisition.

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

Increased use of local data, increased use of building level tracking.

## 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?

Whittier Intermediate School is located in the South Suburban area of Chicago in Blue Island, Illinois. It is one of thirteen schools that service over 4100 students district wide.

Whittier School serves approximately 234 students, 69.7% of which are Hispanic, 16.2% are Black, and 11.1% are White

88.9% of the students are classified as free or reduced lunch students

We have a Limited English Proficient (LEP) rate of 26.9% .

Student attendance rate is 96.6%, with a student mobility rate of 14.3%

### Attributes

In 2002, 40% of all students met or exceeded state standards

In 2004, 46% of all students met or exceeded state standards

In 2006, 62% of all students met or exceeded state standards

In 2008, 66% of all students met or exceeded state standards.

This data shows that as a whole, the school has improved 26% in six years, and continued growth is expected.

Parent/Teacher conferences are held twice a year sharing information regarding district criteria for promotion, and state criteria for meeting adequate yearly progress.

---

Teacher Professional development is carried out through inservice by administration and outside resources.  
Open house brings approximately 60% of our parents to the school.  
DARE graduation attendance is increasing.  
PBIS program assists in behavioral changes and an increase in instructional time. PBIS data indicates that our Students with Disabilities are NOT targeted as high at-risk students for behavior.  
Computer programs are targeted at students identified as at-risk.  
Academy of Reading focuses on helping students with their comprehension and fluency.

#### Challenges

19% Students with Disabilities  
Teacher schedules make collaboration time difficult  
14% mobility rate of students  
Need to create parental awareness of reading difficulties and what can be done in the home to promote reading.  
High poverty rate contributes to lack of literacy in the home.  
Demographic shifts in student population, with an increase in LEP students and Students with Disabilities.

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

**Student performance continues to increase, despite high numbers of at-risk students.** All of our staff are Highly Qualified teachers, and have worked very hard to incorporate technology into their lessons and to use the Illinois Learning Standards to direct instruction

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

Implications of this data include the continued and increased use of data for instructional analysis and use. Data can be used from informal assessments, formal assessment and progress monitoring assessment, previous ISAT data and current IIRC 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?

100% of all certified staff at Whittier School are highly qualified based on the criteria of the Illinois State Board of Education. All non-tenured staff participate in a mandatory mentoring program for two years. This program ensures that teachers will move from an initial to a standard certificate. All tenured teachers must have a formal professional growth plan that is reviewed twice a year. Data and artifacts are collected and reviewed by the building administrator. The focus of professional growth plans is to improve teacher effectiveness and improve student achievement.

The average teacher's experience at Whittier is 13.4 years.

All teachers have bachelor's degrees, more than half the staff have masters degrees, with two teachers working on a second masters degree.

The data suggests that Whittier has a highly educated and experienced staff, motivated towards student achievement and success.

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

The increase in highly qualified teachers, as well as an increase in teachers' professional development in reading, writing, and assessment analysis have positively contributed to the increase in student performance from the previous year to the current.

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

These factors indicate that the teachers at Whittier are fully capable of handling the challenges presented by the uniqueness of the student population, and their dedication to student achievement and professional growth is readily seen by the advanced degrees earned by the majority of the staff.



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

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

60% of our parents attend the Open House at the beginning of the school year. Certainly attendance would be higher in a perfect school/community setting.

Our teachers therefore make 100% contact with parents by phone or in person.

Interim grade reports are sent out to parents four times a year, and approximately 10-12% of these parents respond to these written reports.

Approximately 75% of our parents attend Parent teacher Conferences which are held twice a year. Teachers share information regarding district criteria for promotion and state criteria for meeting adequate yearly progress. Report cards are distributed four times a year. For two of these report card times, parents of at-risk students are requested to attend; however, 25% of our parents of at-risk students do not physically attend.

4th grade teachers hold a Parent Orientation Night, and approximately 30% of our fourth grade parents attend. Child care is provided for this event as well as others.

Our staff includes bilinugal aides and a bilingual secretary who are able to assist with communication. Written communication is sent home both in English and in Spanish. All events are held in both languages.

This data tells us that we work to increase the degree of parental involvement in our school to positively impact their child's academic achievement

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

It is our belief that our parents have become more knowledgeable of the promotion criteria and the Illinois Learning Standards. Books which are displayed during Open House, Family Reading Night, and Parent/Teacher conferences inform parents of appropriate books thier child should be reading for their grade level.

Challenges:

Due to our low income population, our families may not have access to transportation and at-home resouces for education.

Families may have both parents working and may be unable to attend dur to lack of time.

Families may not be aware of the importance of attending school functions.

Parents may not have enough information /knowledge/training to assist their children at home with academics.

Lack of parental involvement, lack of parental knowledge, and family circumstances can adversely affect academic achievement

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

Whittier Staff feels more parental involvement is needed and is working toward increased parent education and different ways to include parents in the education of their children. It is important that all teachers continue to review the work that has been done and tailor instruction, where needed, based on changes in student performance or the needs of the school.

### 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?*

It has been determined that the core academic program will be strengthened by:

Students participating in the Reading Buddy Tutor Program (Elbaum, Vaughn, Hughes, & Moody, 2000)

Students participating in read-alouds using picture books (Fountas & Pinnell, 2005)

Students will select research and writing topics to improve reading comprehension (Guthrie and Humenick, 2004)

Continue direct instruction using strategies such as summarizing, identifying text structures and visual clues, and using graphic organizers to improve comprehension (NICHD, 2000 and Pressly, 2000)

Continue direct instruction for improvement of vocabulary skills (Blachowicz & Fisher 2002) and (Marzano 2005)

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	<a href="#">While our current achievement in reading overall was 62% meeting or exceeding, the school will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.</a>	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 overall was 62% meeting or exceeding, the school will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

Objective 1 Description

- Utilize RtI (Response to Intervention)to determine strategies which provide teachers with additional instructional activities to increase student success
- Improve background knowledge and information .
- Improve vocabulary
- Address individual students' learning strengths through Differentiated Instruction
- Improve fluency and reading comprehension
- Address the need for improved Extended Response
- Improve fluency and comprehension through reading with a partner
- Utilize technology for instruction

- Increase teacher collaboration time

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**

While our current achievement in reading overall was 62% meeting or exceeding, the school will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Rtl will be used to determine strategies which provide teachers with additional instructional activities	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	Through scaffolding prior knowledge, provide a variety of learning experiences in order to expand the student's background of knowledge	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	Through the creation of picture dictionaries students will match/draw vocabulary words with pictures representing the words	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	
4	Differentiated instruction techniques will be utilized in the classroom to address students individual strengths and learning styles.	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Other	
5	Improve fluency and comprehension through reading with a partner and using Reading Buddies, a program where community volunteers come in to read with students.	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Other	
6	Students will practice writing extended responses at grade level in both reading and math to improve performance and comprehension for all students	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	
7	Students' fluency and comprehension of reading will be enhanced through weekly sustained through school-wide sustained silent reading	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Other	

8	A laptop laboratory will be made available for students to utilize either in the media center or in their classrooms for online activities and instruction.	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	State Funds	
9	Teachers will receive 30 minutes each week to collaborate and discuss relevant topics to instruction and plan for future activities and units	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Other	
10	Teachers will utilize AIMSWEB testing to track students' progress through reading and math, and adjust their strategies according to students' needs.	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	
11	As a result of balanced literacy instruction, flexible grouping, and differentiated instruction, students will gain five to ten percent meeting or exceeding the requirements or safe harbor.	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	
12	As a result of utilizing a new math curriculum, adopted in 2009, providing modeling and utilizing math concepts, students will meet or exceed current testing scores or reach safe harbor by five to ten percent.	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

While our current achievement in reading overall was 62% meeting or exceeding, the school will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Staff will participate in professional development activities pertaining to increasing student writing skills.	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	Staff will use Developmental Reading Assessment for data-driven decisions regarding student reading achievement	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	
3	Teachers will utilize diagnostic assessment to help determine individual student needs in the classroom.	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	
4	Teachers will increase collaboration time to exchange strategies, ideas and resources to improve reading, writing, and math achievement.	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Other	
5	Staff will increase use of technology for instruction delivery.	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	Before School	Local Funds	

6	Teachers will utilize AIMSWEB testing to track students' progress through reading and math, and adjust their strategies according to students' needs	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds
---	--	------------	------------	---------------	-------------

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

While our current achievement in reading overall was 62% meeting or exceeding, the school will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will be invited to participate in the Open House, Parent/Teacher Conferences, other school events, and pre-arranged parent visits to view strategies	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Other	
2	Open house held within the first two weeks of school to acquaint parents with school expectations and activities.	09/02/2009	09/02/2009	After School	Other	
3	Title I Parent In-Services with emphasis on literacy	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Title I	
4	Parent-Teacher conferences held twice a year	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Local Funds	
5	Parent Awareness Night to facilitate 4th grade transition to Whittier School	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Other	
6	Parent Awareness Night with 5th Grade Step-up to facilitate transition to Kerr Middle School	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Other	
7	Increase parent knowledge of Whittier through newsletters and newspaper articles	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Other	
8	Parents will be made aware of student progress through AIMSWEB reports.	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	
9	Parents will have a Parent/Teacher Organization to increase parent involvement in school activities.	08/19/2009	05/27/2011	After School	Other	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

While our current achievement in reading overall was 62% meeting or exceeding, the school will make Ayp of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

The Whittier School administration will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities implemented for reading and math. By collecting educator planbooks and performing formal/informal classroom observations on a regular basis, methods of implementation of strategies in daily instruction will be noted. Administrators, along with faculty will analyze student work samples, report cards, local assessment data, and the previous year's ISAT data to determine which students are at risk, which students are below meeting or exceeding, and which students are meeting.

	Name	Title
1	Joseph	Talluto

### 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 are notified regarding Whittier's AYP status at the beginning of the school year. In the fall of 2008, choice letters were sent to all parents informing them that their child is eligible to attend a school within the district that has made AYP and is not "In Status." Parents were notified at the beginning of the 2009-10 school year regarding scores on the 2009 test and will be so notified, per state direction, at the beginning of the 2010-11 school year.

Parents are informed of the school's academic status in several ways. Open House is held within the first fourteen days of school and all parents are invited. At this time information is shared regarding NCLB and promotion criteria. Questions are answered and handouts are given. Spanish interpreters are utilized during this event. The school newsletter (distributed in both English and Spanish) also informs parents regarding the school's academic status. The School Report Card is available to the public from the school office throughout the year.

At registration, parents receive a district calendar (either English or Spanish) that has all the information regarding promotion criteria and other pertinent information about the district. Specific information regarding Whittier School is also distributed. Parents, teachers, and students are required to sign a Title I Contract acknowledging their participation in their child's academic progress.

Whittier's Staff keeps an open line of communication with its parents. Periodically, the teachers send home individual notes referring to the positive qualities of their students in addition to students' academic progress. Dissemination of information to local news agencies, cable companies, community invitations to visit, and staff appearances at city council meetings are additional ways that are used to publicize events.

Staff contacts parents about students' progress on a regular basis as evident through Call Logs

Parents receive Mid-Quarter Progress Reports and Quarterly Report Cards.

All parents are requested to attend the first Parent/Teacher conference. Teachers request a second quarterly conference if there is a concern regarding retention, behavior, or other academic issues. Teachers also request additional conferences as the need arises.



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

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

The school improvement team has been in place for the last eight years. It consists of the building-level administration of Whittier School, representative teachers from each of the two grade levels (4th and 5th grade bilingual and gifted), and a special education teacher. Representatives are responsible for relaying the ideas between the school improvement team and the remainder of the Whittier faculty. Activities and strategies are included in this plan and implemented by school staff. The school staff is given an opportunity to review the plan and offer input. Activities are based on "Best Practices" as well as documented activities that the building staff have shown to work. The School Improvement Team consists of:

Joseph Talluto, Principal

Anne Cahill, Special Education Teacher

Maria Loudes Esparza, 5th grade Bilingual Education teacher

Sandee Clark, 4th grade Regular Education Teacher

Sandy Miltzow, 4th grade regular Education Teacher

Jacqueline Tostado, 4th grade Bilingual Education Teacher

Kathleen Sawyer, Music Education Teacher.

Kathy Haskell, Parent Representative

For the last five years, Whittier has supported and implemented the PBIS initiative. The implementation of PBIS building-wide has improved the school climate, allowed for less disruption in the classroom environment, and increased time on task. Upon completion of the school improvement plan, Superintendent Dr. Ray Lauk and the School Board of District 130 review and approve of the plan created by the aforementioned team.

	Name	Title
1		

**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 Peer Review Team will consist of Phyllis Graham (Principal of George Washington School-Alsip), Kathy Haskell (Parent of student at Whittier), and Gail Johnson (Retired Principal and mentor of Joseph Talluto)

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

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

Each new teacher (1st year in the profession) participates in the Governor State university mentoring Program. They attend four sessions provided through the GSU program and four in-house district mentoring programs.

Second year teachers participate in the GSU second year program and attend one in-house district mentoring session. The second year teacher is encouraged to attend more of the in house sessions.

A newly certified teacher is assigned an experienced mentor who will assist in the development of that teacher. Any teacher who is new to the district (but is not a newly certified teacher) is offered the opportunity to attend any of the in-house district mentoring sessions and are also assigned a veteran "buddy teacher".

### 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.

#### Recieved from District:

Funding has been provided from the District for after-school programs. The funding has allowed approximately 45 students to receive an extended day, two times a week, and supports students identified as at-risk.

#### Requested by Whittier School:

- Additional funding for professional development which are related to SIP goals
- Consultants whocan model "best practices" in the individual classrooms.
- Additional funding for professional development opportunities for teachers.

---

**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).

- Ⓔ 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.

- Ⓔ 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.

SES services for after school tutoring

Additional funding for reading specialist position

Reading intervention specialist

Smaller class sizes

Additional professional development

Received:

SCISC consultant who conducted inservice on Extended response

DRA development for staff

RESPRO workshops through IPA

SES services for after school tutoring

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

---

	Name	Title
1	SCISC 4	Consultants
2	Karen Peterson	GSU Mentor Program
3	Kathleen Duba	Curriculum Director
4	Marge Crivellone	TBE/Gifted Director

---

**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]

<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**

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

**PARENT NOTIFICATION**

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only) [C]
---	---

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the SIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes? [C]

**PEER REVIEW**

Yes  No

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

**TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS**

Yes  No

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

**DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES**

Yes  No

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

**STATE RESPONSIBILITIES**

Yes  No

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

**SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM**

Yes  No  N/A

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

**APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD**

Yes  No

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

**PART II - COMMENTS**