

Local Board Approved	11/16/2011
Initial Submission	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2011 AYP Report

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	Yes	Has this School been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	Yes	2011-12 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2011-12 State Improvement Status	

	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
Student Groups	%	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		85.0			85.0			91.0		82.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	81.0		Yes	91.7		Yes	94.8	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	82.2		Yes	91.8		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian														

American Indian													
Two or More Races													
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities													
Economically Disadvantaged													

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress(AYP)

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 85% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 85% 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 85% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 91% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 82% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2010.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 85% or above are not printed.

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

applied. Safe Harbor allows schools an alternate method to meet subgroup minimum targets on achievement.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2011 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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Attendance Rate (%)	96.1	96.5	96.1	96.2	95.6	95.7	95.5	94.8
Truancy Rate (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.8	0.8	0.8
Mobility Rate (%)	15.3	8.1	39.8	41.9	12.6	12.9	13.4	15.4
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	293	324	342	365	371	349	368	383
Low Income (%)	29.4	29.6	32.7	30.4	32.1	33.8	38.3	36.3
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	1.4	0.0	0.3	0.8	0.8	0.3	0.5	0.8
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.8	13.8
White, non-Hispanic (%)	91.5	91.7	83.6	87.9	89.2	87.1	84.2	85.1
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	6.1	5.6	14.3	8.5	5.7	6.9	7.1	5.7
Hispanic (%)	1.7	1.9	1.2	1.9	2.2	2.0	2.2	1.8
Asian (%)	0.7	0.9	0.3	0.5	1.1	2.0	3.5	4.2
American Indian(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Two or More Races (%)	-	0.0	0.6	1.1	1.6	2.0	3.0	3.1
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0

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 (%)	American Indian (%)	Two Or More Races (%)	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander (%)
S C H O O L	2000	95.0	4.0	0.7	-	0.3	-	-
	2001	94.0	5.0	1.0	-	-	-	-
	2002	95.2	4.4	0.4	-	-	-	-
	2003	91.2	7.7	1.1	-	-	-	-
	2004	91.5	6.1	1.7	0.7	-	-	-
	2005	91.7	5.6	1.9	0.9	-	-	-
	2006	83.6	14.3	1.2	0.3	-	0.6	-
	2007	87.9	8.5	1.9	0.5	-	1.1	-
	2008	89.2	5.7	2.2	1.1	0.3	1.6	-
	2009	87.1	6.9	2.0	2.0	-	2.0	-
	2010	84.2	7.1	2.2	3.5	-	3.0	-
2011	85.1	5.7	1.8	4.2	-	3.1	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	89.5	8.8	0.8	0.8	0.1	-	-
	2001	89.0	9.2	1.0	0.7	0.1	-	-
	2002	89.1	9.2	1.0	0.6	-	-	-
	2003	88.5	9.7	1.0	0.6	-	-	-
	2004	88.0	10.0	1.1	0.8	0.1	-	-
	2005	87.9	9.1	1.3	0.8	0.1	0.7	-
	2006	87.2	9.7	1.1	0.8	0.2	1.1	-
	2007	87.5	8.8	1.2	0.8	0.2	1.5	-
	2008	87.3	8.4	1.2	0.8	0.1	2.2	-
	2009	86.7	8.0	1.2	0.9	0.1	3.2	-
	2010	85.5	8.4	1.3	0.9	0.1	3.9	-

	2011	84.5	8.5	1.4	1.0	0.1	4.5	-
S T A T E	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7	-
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8	-
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2	-
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7	-
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5	-
	2010	52.8	18.8	21.1	4.2	0.2	2.9	-
	2011	51.4	18.3	23.0	4.1	0.3	2.8	0.1

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truancy (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	-	27.2	100.0	96.4	15.3	1	0.4	-	-
	2001	1.0	29.9	100.0	95.6	27.2	-	-	-	-
	2002	0.4	31.7	100.0	96.1	24.3	-	-	-	-
	2003	0.4	34.9	100.0	96.2	20.3	-	-	-	-
	2004	1.4	29.4	100.0	96.1	15.3	-	-	-	-
	2005	-	29.6	100.0	96.5	8.1	-	-	-	-
	2006	0.3	32.7	100.0	96.1	39.8	-	-	-	-
	2007	0.8	30.4	100.0	96.2	41.9	-	-	-	-
	2008	0.8	32.1	100.0	95.6	12.6	1	0.3	-	-
	2009	0.3	33.8	100.0	95.7	12.9	3	0.8	-	-
	2010	0.5	38.3	100.0	95.5	13.4	3	0.8	-	-
2011	0.8	36.3	100.0	94.8	15.4	3	0.8	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	0.2	38.9	91.5	94.2	24.7	116	1.8	4.7	75.3
	2001	0.2	38.5	84.8	93.5	28.9	121	1.9	4.2	74.4
	2002	0.1	41.1	86.0	94.1	34.3	169	2.6	3.6	76.6
	2003	0.2	39.0	91.5	94.3	30.5	158	2.5	2.7	78.5
	2004	0.3	42.5	92.3	93.9	33.1	155	2.5	2.5	82.7
	2005	0.1	44.5	97.8	94.4	26.6	145	2.3	2.7	84.5
	2006	0.1	44.1	97.6	94.0	24.4	155	2.5	1.9	87.6
	2007	0.2	43.8	98.1	94.1	24.7	118	1.9	2.6	88.1
	2008	0.2	48.1	98.1	93.4	15.0	210	3.2	1.9	88.9
	2009	0.1	47.4	98.7	93.8	13.7	306	4.6	2.5	91.0
	2010	0.1	52.7	98.8	94.7	14.9	174	2.6	1.4	90.1
2011	0.3	50.6	98.3	93.8	14.4	177	2.8	1.9	87.9	

S T A T E	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	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
	2010	7.6	45.4	96.2	93.9	13.0	72,383	3.6	3.8	87.8
	2011	8.8	48.1	96.0	94.0	12.8	63,067	3.2	2.7	83.8

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	298	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	298	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	271	75	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	272	71	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	293	77	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	324	64	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	342	77	-	-	-	-	-
	2007	365	79	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	371	109	-	-	-	-	-
	2009	349	90	-	-	-	-	-
	2010	368	90	-	-	-	-	-
	2011	383	96	-	-	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	6,604	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	6,659	484	516	519	536	544	463
	2002	6,551	467	485	510	542	566	547
	2003	6,573	484	467	477	549	574	542
	2004	6,518	440	479	472	558	555	574
	2005	6,513	422	448	487	512	580	554
	2006	6,484	422	430	460	513	513	556
	2007	6,431	472	426	432	514	505	540
	2008	6,470	515	472	429	479	521	553
	2009	6,060	466	492	456	449	460	449
	2010	6,389	491	483	511	447	463	497
	2011	6,238	508	483	477	463	451	507
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-

S T A T E	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	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
	2010	2,064,312	155,468	154,389	152,681	154,465	154,982	146,919
	2011	2,074,806	153,516	153,301	154,241	153,981	153,986	151,059

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)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials (%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	414	16	39,188	46	54	18	32	-	-
	2001	415	15	40,601	50	50	18	36	-	-
	2002	428	15	41,661	53	47	17	36	-	1
	2003	417	16	41,478	49	51	17	40	1	-
	2004	375	17	44,287	45	55	19	37	-	-
	2005	418	15	43,727	50	51	17	31	1	-
	2006	432	13	41,789	54	46	18	25	2	-
	2007	438	13	42,012	50	50	18	20	2	1
	2008	460	13	43,594	48	52	18	20	2	-
	2009	449	14	45,409	45	55	15	19	1	-
	2010	436	14	47,161	46	54	19	21	1	-
2011	407	15	46,810	46	54	19	23	-	-	
	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

S T A T E	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
	2010	132,502	13	63,296	42	57	18	18	1	1
	2011	128,262	13	64,978	40	60	19	19	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, 2006-2011																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	82.6	84.0	82.7	77.9	90.8	81.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	84.4	83.0	84.1	79.1	92.1	83.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	82.3	43.8	53.9	42.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	82.4	72.4	67.8	59.4	84.6	74.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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, 2006-2011																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	98.6	96.0	90.4	90.6	95.4	92.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	98.5	96.9	91.5	91.9	97.4	92.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	88.2	75.1	92.3	85.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	94.1	89.6	80.7	75.0	92.3	91.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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 2011 data on the ISAT shows that 81.2% of Madison's Third Graders tested met or exceeded reading standards. It also shows that 91.8% met or exceeded standards in mathematics for all third graders at Madison School.

Strength: We made Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) in both subject areas, despite the challenge that many schools are experiencing on reaching the rigorous minimal target.

Note: Our scores dropped from last year's results.

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

Reading scores went down 10% due to limited Tier 2 support (i.e. the loss of Reading Recovery and cut backs in Reading/Writing interventionists). The Literacy Coach was able to take about 1 group of students (4 children) per grade-level. All students in the approaching category did not receive support, along with a few students who were in the below category, according to the Assessment Wall, which monitors student progress in reading. As for math, we did not have any math intervention in place for a Tier 2 Support. Students were receiving extra help through volunteers, at home, and what the teacher could provide in the classroom for a Tier I intervention. Thus, contributing to our scores dropping by 3%.

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

We must provide a guaranteed, viable curriculum in both core areas that embraces the workshop approach. The staff has become proficient in Reader's and Writer's Workshop and some are piloting the workshop approach in math. All staff is expected to have participated in a coaching cycle with the Literacy Coach by the end of the 2011-2012 school year.

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

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

The local assessment that is administered is the SAT 10, given in the fall. The 2010 data shows that Madison School students outperform the district and national NCE in areas tested-Reading Comprehension, Mathematics, and Spelling. We have been fortunate to keep this level of achievement for the past twelve years, which is strength.

Although our overall student performance is strong, the following areas are ones that our students scored below the 50th NCE, and we believe need some attention.

LITERACY: Genre Studies, Author's Craft, Meaning of story/details, Spelling, Phonics.

MATH: Compare and Order numbers, Problem-Solving, Interpreting tables/graphs/charts, Borrowing in subtraction, Clocks, Coins, Weight, and Shapes/Size.

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

The implementation of Reader's and Writer's Workshop, conferencing, goal-setting with students, Read Aloud, collaborative conversations among students and staff, and using the Rebecca Sitton Spelling series helps students be successful in reading and writing. Having a Literacy Coach to oversee our literacy program and having some literacy intervention has impacted student performance.

Using the Everyday Mathematics curriculum, Problem-solvers, and practicing the basic facts support student's understanding of mathematical concepts and applications. We have been unable to provide mathematics intervention beyond the classroom, except through sparse opportunities with mentors and parent volunteers.

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

We continue to implement Core Curriculum and Tier I interventions in literacy and mathematics. We are very concerned about being unable to provide Tier II interventions to students in literacy, beyond the 4 students per grade level from Kindergarten to Third grade. This year at least 8 First Grade students will have the opportunity to receive Reading Recovery, a Tier III intervention. Literacy will be monitored by running records, observations, writing samples, conference notes, Fountas and Pinell reading benchmarks, DRA's, and writing proficiencies.

We will provide Tier II intervention in mathematics by having students in need work with the Math Interventionist for 2nd Semester. Math will be monitored by quizzes and unit tests, along with problem-solver assessments and timed tests to master the basic skills. To address all the areas of weaknesses, we plan to provide mini-lessons and incorporate these concepts of concern into centers.

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

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

Madison School has a few children who are homeless, as we are located close to the Women’s shelter. We also have some areas in our school boundaries where students who are disadvantaged reside. Many of these children have academic and social-emotional needs. The rest of the population is middle to upper-middle class, white. We have an active PTA and lots of support from families. Most of our students (80%) do well in school, so when students are behind they stand out and need immediate support to be able to keep up with their class mates. We have several programs in place to support students emotional well - being: STAR behavior program (part of PBIS), 7 Habits of Highly Effective People, Love and Logic, Character Education through the Second Step Program, the CATCH Grant that promotes health and nutrition, and building leadership capacity among our students through community service projects and other opportunities.

Other Data:

School Population:	368	Students with Disabilities	9.8%
Attendance	94.8%	English as a second Language	.5%
Truancy	00.8%	Mobility	13.4%
Low Income	38.3%		
Asian	4.2%	White	84.2%

Hispanic

1.8%

Black

5.7%

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

An Attribute would be that in Kindergarten - 80%, 1st Grade - 72%, 2nd Grade - 86% and 3rd Grade - 70% of our students met and exceeded in reading benchmarks, as noted by the end of the year ESAIL Report. We use common assessments to monitor student progress on the Intervention Wall. We have seen an increase in the Social-emotional needs of all students as evidence in our SWIS data and HELPS Team Intervention.

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

The next step is to strategically use the Literacy Coach to support staff and students. All classrooms will have the Core Curriculum implemented through the workshop approach, and Tier I established for those students who need it. We must find ways to support all students in accordance with RTI. Also, we will work with local agencies and counseling services to help students and families in need to receive the appropriate support.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)

Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

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

All certified teachers are highly qualified and Para Educators are NCLB qualified. The majority of the staff is veteran teachers with many years of experience. We have had several professional development opportunities in literacy and mathematics. All teaching staff has been trained in the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People and PBIS. Currently we have Tier I & Tier II interventions in place to support positive student behavior. We continue to participate in training on ways to address social-emotional needs of children and differentiated instruction. We have a couple of teachers with Special Education Certification, one with National Board Certification, the P.E. teachers holds an

Elementary Education Degree, and several Para Educator and the Principal are trained in Child Protective Intervention.

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

Lack of funds and personnel are obstacles to positive student performance and the overall effectiveness of day-to-day operations. Staff members have many responsibilities, duties, and roles to juggle. PLCs have been established for four years. The Literacy Coach, Special Education teachers, and Principal are now available to meet with grade level teachers. This will make for more efficient PLCs. Some data has been collected on the teachers' perceptions of PLCs at Madison School and is used to hone current offerings. Agendas will be utilized to keep the groups focused on student learning and address the needs of the staff.

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

The next step is to be fiscally responsible when using funds to support professional development and purchasing professional resources and supplies. This has been cut by 20% from last year's budget. PLC time must focus around student achievement and interventions. More training is needed on the types and ways to implement Tier I in the classroom for struggling students in math and literacy. This will be done through coaching cycles and School Improvement/Institute Days.

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

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

Parent contact has been 100% at Madison School. An active PTA allows for all the "extras" that we provide for the students, especially in the area of cultural arts and curriculum opportunities like cooking, making healthy snacks, theatre workshops, guided reading books, technology and building up classroom

libraries. On special occasions/events, 60% of the parents in our school attend. PTA activities are highly attended. The PTA continues to look for ways to support student growth in academics and other areas, to produce well-rounded individuals. Parent surveys indicate the 99% of the parents are pleased with Madison school.

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

Research shows that parent involvement has a positive effect on student performance. The numbers of parents who help in the classroom, visit for lunch, and are members of the PTA show that they value education and support school. Usually the fall fundraiser of selling candy bars brings in about \$10,000. This has been ear-marked to purchase ELMOS, so that eventually every classroom will have its own. We will continue to encourage parent involvement and help make the school environment a positive community for the children and their families. We utilize a team approach with parents/guardians and school staff to insure that all children are being successful in school. We also provide education to our parents about what instructional opportunities their children are experiencing in the PTA newsletter and updates at the PTA meetings, and Curriculum Nights.

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

The next steps are to provide some parent's education for those who are not involved in the school and make sure they feel valued and respected. Monitoring of attendance continues with the HELPS/Intervention/PBIS

team known as HIP group(Ashley Aeilts, Kristi Routh, Jim Huneke, Kelle Bunch, Chancey Rodeghero, Becky Ebbing, Stephen Crowe, Brian Bangert, Sharon Troup, Stacey Cook Johnna Terwelp and Jeannie Yancey) monitoring student achievement, behavior, and problem-solving ways to assist students in need, along with supporting staff.

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?

Learn more about possible interventions in math and literacy that could be utilized at home.

Implement the STAR Club, a PBIS Tier II intervention of Check-in/Check-out.

Incorporate ways to increase student's leadership skills. (i.e. Along with continuing to have Blessings in a Back Pack, possible pilot student-led conferences and the use of data notebooks).

Educate all stake holders on the new Common Core State Standards in literacy and math, along with developing a plan for a smooth transition.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Our third grade students who Meet/Exceed in reading on the ISAT will increase from the current 81.2% to 90% in 2012 and 98% in 2013.	
2	Our third grade students who Meet/Exceed in mathematics on the ISAT will increase from the current 91.8% to 95% in 2012 and 98% in 2013.	

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Our third grade students who Meet/Exceed in reading on the ISAT will increase from the current 81.2% to 90% in 2012 and 98% in 2013.

Objective 1 Description

Students need to show improvement on state, local and classroom assessments. This will be measured by the number of students who meet and exceed on the ISAT, by an increase in scores on the SAT 10, through formal and informal grade-level assessments,

and by monitoring the Intervention Wall.

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

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

Objective 1 Title :

Our third grade students who Meet/Exceed in reading on the ISAT will increase from the current 81.2% to 90% in 2012 and 98% in 2013.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	KINDERGARTEN Create learning centers that offer more opportunities to engage in authentic tasks that support the children's current level of understanding	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Use conference notes and running records to set reading and writing goals for students	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	1st Grade Implement literature discussion groups when students display readiness	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	With new teachers, make sure all staff have Core Curriculum in place	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	2nd Grade Use mentor text for genre studies	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	Collaborate as a team for authentic literacy corners	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
7	Utilize response notebooks effectively	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
8	3rd Grade Work on eliciting quality responses in reading notebooks	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
9	Map out writing curriculum	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
10	Use writing conference notes effectively to guide instruction and notice change over time.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
11	K - 3 grades All grade levels will focus on phonics/correct spelling opportunities through Rebecca Sitton Spelling and center activities	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

Our third grade students who Meet/Exceed in reading on the ISAT will increase from the current 81.2% to 90% in 2012 and 98% in 2013.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	KDG Teachers will share resources and ideas. Literacy coach will provide new materials and ideas.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Teachers will bring information to PLC meetings to problem solve around a struggling student. Literacy coach will do running records alongside classroom teacher to add insight towards child's learning.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	1st Grade Mid-year development and possible implementation of literature discussion groups.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	After School	Local Funds	
4	Focus on Reader's and Writer's workshop. Share resources. Coaching Cycles.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	2nd Grade Make list of books for mentor texts that fit our genre studies. Make sample text maps.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	After School	Local Funds	
6	Share ideas for authentic literacy corners. Literacy coach will share ideas and resources for authentic literacy resources.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
7	Look at choices for response journal tabs. Decide what different sections need to be in their notebooks.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
8	3rd Grade Use anchor charts, modeling, and Read Aloud.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
9	Choose graphic organizers to use for each writing genre, same across the grade level. Literacy coach will assist with mini-lessons.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
10	Finish writing about reading response rubric. Literacy coach will develop writing checklists to use during conferences.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

Our third grade students who Meet/Exceed in reading on the ISAT will increase from the current 81.2% to 90% in 2012 and 98% in 2013.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Collaborated with parents at PTA meetings about the School Improvement Plan and included their feedback in the plan.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Encourage 100% of parents to attend the Parent/Teacher conferences to look at the data on their child's progress in reading, writing, and mathematics.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	After School	Local Funds	
3	Hold PTA sponsored events such as Pajamarama and Bedtime Stories.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	Have theatre workshops and cultural art activities/assemblies that support literacy works.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Our third grade students who Meet/Exceed in reading on the ISAT will increase from the current 81.2% to 90% in 2012 and 98% in 2013.

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?)

<p>To increase student achievement in reading. This will be monitored by the Intervention Wall, ESAIL document and visits, and the number of students receiving interventions, running records, DRA, Fountas and Pinell Reading, benchmarks, writing proficiencies through formal/informal grade-level assessments, and collaborative conversations about student progress.</p>		
<p>Process for Monitoring Effectiveness</p>	<p>Data to be Obtained</p>	<p>Person Responsible</p>

<p>Intervention team will analyze intervention planners and assessment wall data (e.g., benchmark assessments) to monitor progress of students receiving literacy intervention</p>	<p>Guided Reading level; Comprehension Check; Fluency Level Writing Proficiencies</p>	<p>Classroom teacher providing intervention and data to Literacy Coach and Principal (see list below)</p>
<p>Intervention team will analyze Comprehensive Literacy Assessment data/artifacts for all students, quarterly.</p>	<p>All students: Benchmark Assessment 1st & 4th quarters, plus lit artifacts Students "Below"/"Approaching: Benchmark Assessment every quarter, plus lit artifacts</p>	<p>Teacher provides data to Literacy Coach and Principal</p>
<p>Others: ESAIL, Walkthrough data, RR assessments, common Assessments</p>		

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		
2	Kelle Bunch	Principal
3	Johnna Terwelp	Literacy Coach
4	Sharon Troup	Speical Education Teacher
5	Kristi Routh	Special Education Teacher (ED)
6	Renee Blattner	Teacher (Kdg)
7	Stacey Mettemeyer	Teacher (Kdg)
8	Kathy Taylor	Teacher (Kdg)
9	Bobbi Vollrath	Teacher (Kdg)
10	Kelley Jennings	Teacher (1st)
11	Alison Merrill	Teacher (1st)
12	Debbie Million	Teacher (1st)
13	Jill Smith	Teacher (1nd)

14	Megan Phillips	Teacher (2nd)
15	Tammy Stegeman	Teacher (2nd)
16	Molly Stroot	Teacher (2nd)
17	Susie Westerman	Teacher (2rd)
18	Ashley Aeilts	Teacher (3rd)
19	Lori Biswell	Teacher (3rd)
20	Kevin Genenbacher	Teacher (3rd)
21	Cheryl Watson	Teacher (3rd)

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Our third grade students who Meet/Exceed in mathematics on the ISAT will increase from the current 91.8% to 95% in 2012 and 98% in 2013.

Objective 2 Description

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

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

Objective 2 Title :

Our third grade students who Meet/Exceed in mathematics on the ISAT will increase from the current 91.8% to 95% in 2012 and 98% in 2013.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	K - 3rd Grade Have centers that focus on compare and ordering number	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	K - 3rd Grade Utilize the problem solvers more effectively and collaborate at PLC's on the results	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	K - 3rd Grade Emphasize activities that encourage reading and interpreting graphs/charts/tables	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	K - 3rd Grade Give attention to the concept of borrowing when subtracting numbers in problem solving, math games, and through activities	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	K - 3rd Grade Provide examples with skill and drill on telling time, working with coins and weight/shapes/size of objects.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	Before School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title :

Our third grade students who Meet/Exceed in mathematics on the ISAT will increase from the current 91.8% to 95% in 2012 and 98% in 2013.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Staff will participate in training on Common Core State Standards in Math	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Math interventions will be explored during SIP days and grade-level meetings.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	

3	Staff will work as a team in PLC's to provide differentiated instruction in mathematics and various interventions.	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	After School	Local Funds
---	--	------------	------------	--------------	-------------

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

Objective 2 Title :

Our third grade students who Meet/Exceed in mathematics on the ISAT will increase from the current 91.8% to 95% in 2012 and 98% in 2013.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will be given tools to use at home (Home links and Reference book)	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Mentors and parent volunteers will work with students on their basic math facts to give them extra practice	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	After School	Local Funds	
3	Math Interventionist will work with students who are in need of Tier II support (2nd semester)	08/19/2011	05/29/2012	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

Our third grade students who Meet/Exceed in mathematics on the ISAT will increase from the current 91.8% to 95% in 2012 and 98% in 2013.

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?)

To increase student achievement in mathematics. This will be measured through assessments from the Everyday Mathematics curriculum, grade-level assessments, district assessments, and by formal and informal classroom assessments.		
Process for Monitoring Effectiveness	Data to be Obtained	Person Responsible
Classroom teachers will be	Unit Tests	Classroom teacher providing

<p>collecting this assessment information</p>	<p>Problem - Solvers</p> <p>Basic Facts quizzes</p> <p>District Math assessments</p>	<p>intervention and data to Building Coach and Principal</p> <p>(see list below)</p>
<p>Intervention team will analyze data/artifacts for all students 2 -3 times a year.</p>	<p>Math Portfolios</p> <p>Intervention planner</p>	<p>Teacher provides data to Principal</p>

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	Kelle Bunch	Prinicpal
2	Johnna Terwelp	Literacy Coach
3	Sharon Troup	Special Education Teacher
4	Kristi Routh	Special Education Teacher
5	Renee Blattner	Teacher (Kdg)
6	Stacey Mettemeyer	Teacher (Kdg)
7	Kathy Taylor	Teacher (Kdg)
8	Bobbi Vollrath	Teacher (Kdg)
9	Kelley Jennings	Teacher (1st)
10	Alison Merrill	Teacher (1st)
11	Debbie Million	Teacher (1st)
12	Jill Smith	Teacher (1st)
13	Megan Phillips	Teacher (2nd)
14	Tammy Stegeman	Teacher (2nd)
15	Molly Stroot	Teacher (2nd)
16	Susie Westerman	Teacher (2nd)
17	Ashley Aeilts	Teacher (3rd)
18	Lori Biswell	Teacher (3rd)

19	Kevin Genenbacher	Teacher (3rd)
20	Cheryl Watson	Teacher (3rd)

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.*)

All parents of Madison School had an opportunity to give input on the SIP during PTA meetings. A copy of the School Report Card is going to be sent home to each family. Notifications of goals for this year are shared in a PTA newsletter and through the local media. Test data results were also shared at a PTA meeting and staff e-mail.

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.

Staff met in the early part of August, 2011 to analyze the data from ISAT and SAT 10, along with our Intervention Wall and ESAIL Report. Goals and activities were developed by the staff. Then the goals and activities were shared with parents at a PTA meeting for input. Once the ePlan was typed up, it was shared with staff, parents, and the Curriculum Committee. It will eventually be approved by the Board of Education.

	Name	Title
1	Kelle Bunch	Principal
2	Johnna Terwelp	Literacy Coach
3	Sharon Troup	Special Education Teacher
4	Kristi Routh	Special Education Teacher
5	Renee Blattner	Teacher (Kdg)
6	Stacey Mettemeyer	Teacher (Kdg)

7	Kathy Taylor	Teacher (Kdg)
8	Bobbi Vollrath	Teacher (Kdg)
9	Kelley Jennings	Teacher (1st)
10	Alison Merrill	Teacher (1st)
11	Debbie Million	Teacher (1st)
12	Jill Smith	Teacher (1st)
13	Megan Phillips	Teacher (2nd)
14	Tammy Stegeman	Teacher (2nd)
15	Molly Stroot	Teacher (2nd)
16	Susie Westerman	Teacher (2nd)
17	Ashley Aeilts	Teacher (3rd)
18	Lori Biswell	Teacher (3rd)
19	Kevin Genenbacher	Teacher (3rd)
20	Cheryl Watson	Teacher (3rd)
21	Sheila Biggs	PTA Member
22	Erin Clayton	PTA Member
23	Michelle Collins	PTA Member
24	Maureen Crickard	PTA Member
25	Melissa Hoener	PTA Member
26	Crissie Horman	PTA Member
27	Kim Kennedy	PTA Member
28	Phonda Klesner	PTA Member
29	Kathy Oakley	PTA Member
30	Pinkey Patel	PTA Member
31	Michelle Rajkumar	PTA Member
32	Brooke Richardson	PTA Member
33	Dawn Stupavsky	PTA Member
34	Kathleen Taylor	PTA Member

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 staff and parents of Madison School reviewed this plan: Date:

9-21-11 - P.T.A. and 9-29-11 Staff

The plan was also peer reviewed by the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum/Instruction, and her suggestions were incorporated into the plan.

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.

Quincy Public Schools has an induction and mentoring program for new teachers and teachers new to the district. One of the original ten pilot sites selected for the ISBE-funded *Beginning Teacher Induction Pilot Projects* grants in 2006, the program has grown and is now a state approved program. The project goals include: developing new teachers'

understanding and implementation of the Professional Teaching Standards and relevant Content Area Standards; developing in new teachers a repertoire of effective, research-based instructional practices; developing trusting supportive and professional relationships and networks; developing reflective, analytical and self-assessment skills in new teachers; **creating an effective, smooth transition from being a student to being a teaching professional; and to improve and maximize student learning and achievement.** The project includes many components including formal mentor training, formal induction training for new teachers, monthly protégé and mentor trainings, dialogue journals, formative observations, an individual induction plan, and weekly contacts between mentors and protégés. Mentors are matched with new teachers in their first year of teaching with a ratio that is 3 to 1 or less. In most cases mentors and protégés work in the same building. Exceptions may include support staff where the number of support staff in a particular area may be small (e.g. physical education, music, psychologist, speech therapist). New teacher trainings are held once a month for the new teacher's first two years. Year one trainings include topics such as classroom management; parent involvement and communication; differentiating instruction; lesson planning tied to state standards; and, authentic assessment. Year two trainings address topics such as motivating and engaging instructional practices and assessment for learning. Ongoing mentor training occurs monthly.

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

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

The district provides key professional development funding and activities, especially in the areas addressed in each site's School Improvement Plan. **Key activities for the 2011 - 2012 year include:**

1. Building Literacy Coach and District Literacy Coach training
2. Special Education Strategic Processing Coach training;
3. **Partnerships in Comprehensive Literacy training for all new K - 6 teachers**, and other teachers as appropriate.
4. Literacy intervention training to meet Response to Intervention;
5. Training for all K - 6 teachers regarding core classroom curriculum and differentiation in math;

6. Math intervention training for targeted staff, with a focus on Tiers 1 and 2;
7. Math alignment (addressing curricular and instructional areas, including transition to new Common Core standards), K - 12.
8. Ongoing PBIS implementation training and other Social/Emotional-related training for targeted personnel.
9. Utilization of key grants (21st CCLC, Kern Foundation, Pre-AP, TAOEP, Mental Health, etc.) to provide targeted professional development within key initiative areas—including AVID and Project Lead the Way.
10. Consultation and assistance from Dr. Joseph Murphy (achievement gap and learning-centered leadership), Dr. Barbara Schubert (literacy and brain research), and Dr. Robyn Jackson (engagement and rigor at the secondary level) to improve and strengthen instructional programs.

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 State provides assessment results for the school building, subgroups, and individual students. This also provides resources and reference materials to teachers and administrators. This encourages best practice and successful instructional strategies. The Regional Office of Education provides numerous staff development opportunities for all staff, so that it can positively impact student performance.

	Name	Title
1	Trish Vinard	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum
2	Curriculum Committee	Representing the Board

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 11/16/2011

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 (OPTIONAL)

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 (OPTIONAL)

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]
MONITORING	
<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