

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

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	010011720222016		
District Name:	Quincy SD 172	School Name:	Monroe Elementary School
Superintendent:	Lonny B Lemon	Principal:	Julie Stratman
District Address:	1416 Maine St	School Address:	3211 Payson Rd
City/State/Zip:	Quincy, IL 62301 4261	City/State/Zip:	Quincy, IL 62305 6441
District Telephone#:	Label 2172238700 Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	2172238871 Extn: 0
District Email:	lemonlo@qps.org	School Email:	stratmju@qps.org
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

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	

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		85.0			85.0			91.0		82.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	80.9		Yes	100.0		Yes	96.1	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	81.0		Yes	100.0		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 (%)	96.6	96.4	96.8	96.6	95.9	96.1	95.8	96.1
Truancy Rate (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mobility Rate (%)	8.1	25.0	10.3	9.8	6.7	4.9	4.7	4.4
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	194	194	240	274	271	266	283	264
Low Income (%)	24.2	20.1	22.1	24.1	24.7	30.8	32.5	30.7
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.3	12.1
White, non-Hispanic (%)	93.8	96.4	94.6	94.9	94.8	94.7	95.8	94.7
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	4.1	0.0	0.4	0.7	1.1	2.3	1.8	1.5
Hispanic (%)	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.4	0.4
Asian (%)	1.0	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.4	0.0	0.0
American Indian(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Two or More Races (%)	-	2.6	4.6	4.0	3.3	1.9	2.1	3.0
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	97.0	0.4	-	2.6	-	-	-
	2001	97.0	2.1	0.4	0.4	-	-	-
	2002	96.8	2.3	0.5	0.5	-	-	-
	2003	94.4	4.7	0.5	0.5	-	-	-
	2004	93.8	4.1	1.0	1.0	-	-	-
	2005	96.4	-	0.5	0.5	-	2.6	-
	2006	94.6	0.4	-	0.4	-	4.6	-
	2007	94.9	0.7	-	0.4	-	4.0	-
	2008	94.8	1.1	-	0.7	-	3.3	-
	2009	94.7	2.3	0.8	0.4	-	1.9	-
	2010	95.8	1.8	0.4	-	-	2.1	-
2011	94.7	1.5	0.4	-	0.4	3.0	-	
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	-	11.1	100.0	97.0	10.3	-	-	-	-
	2001	-	12.8	100.0	96.1	7.8	1	0.5	-	-
	2002	-	17.1	100.0	96.2	9.3	-	-	-	-
	2003	-	18.2	100.0	96.5	11.6	-	-	-	-
	2004	0.5	24.2	100.0	96.6	8.1	-	-	-	-
	2005	-	20.1	100.0	96.4	25.0	-	-	-	-
	2006	-	22.1	100.0	96.8	10.3	-	-	-	-
	2007	-	24.1	100.0	96.6	9.8	-	-	-	-
	2008	-	24.7	100.0	95.9	6.7	-	-	-	-
	2009	-	30.8	100.0	96.1	4.9	-	-	-	-
	2010	-	32.5	100.0	95.8	4.7	-	-	-	-
2011	0.8	30.7	100.0	96.1	4.4	-	-	-	-	
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	234	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	235	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	216	51	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	214	58	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	194	59	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	194	48	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	240	54	-	-	-	-	-
	2007	274	80	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	271	69	-	-	-	-	-
	2009	266	65	-	-	-	-	-
	2010	283	71	-	-	-	-	-
2011	264	73	-	-	-	-	-	
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	80.0	82.6	86.1	73.0	72.8	80.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	83.0	82.7	85.5	72.9	72.4	80.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	36.4	45.5	60.0	36.4	53.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	64.2	55.0	80.0	52.6	52.4	66.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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	92.8	95.1	97.2	93.6	91.5	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	92.5	94.7	97.1	93.3	91.3	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	90.9	63.7	90.0	81.8	84.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	85.8	85.0	93.3	84.2	80.9	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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?

Our third graders met Adequate Yearly Progress again in 2010-2011. Our 3rd graders achieved 80.9% meeting and **exceeding in reading**. **In math, our 3rd grade students had 100% meeting or exceeding.** The number of meeting and exceeding students in reading and in math is higher than the previous year by a significant amount, 6.9% in reading and 9% in math. **One area of weakness at Monroe School is the area of reading; the extended response writing was difficult for our students.** Our strengths at Monroe include all areas of math, except measurement and extended response explanation.

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

At Monroe School, we are virtually without reading personnel at our school which is a huge concern for staff. We are still implementing the Comprehensive Intervention Model and Comprehensive Literacy Model.

We have very limited staff for Math support or Writing support.



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

Additional support is needed to support our intervention students. Staff will continue to collaborate during weekly team meetings focusing on more mini-lessons and direct instruction that includes: reading comprehension strategies, comprehension skills, language strategies, and strategic reading behaviors. We will also focus on extended response opportunities in all grade levels. During writer's workshop we will include focused mini-lessons on conventions and organization. We will assess through our Writing Proficiency, when we are looking at a portfolio of writing opportunities. **The literacy coach will continue to provide coaching cycles in K-3 classrooms in order to fully implement the Comprehensive Literacy Model and Comprehensive Intervention Model. Math Intervention Support will be provided for one quarter during 2011-2012 school year. Options such as literacy support staff, mentor support, and additional tutoring will be explored for our struggling readers.**

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?

At Monroe, the 2nd and 3rd graders were assessed using the SAT 10 (Stanford Achievement Test) in the fall of 2010. In 2nd grade, math procedures was a strength. Math problem solving and spelling were weaknesses for 2nd grade. In 3rd grade, math procedures was a strength and reading comprehension. Math problem solving and spelling were areas of weakness.

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

Lack of personnel for tiers of intervention for struggling students is our main concern for our students. We are still implementing the Comprehensive Intervention Model and Comprehensive Literacy Model. Also, we have limited personnel for Tier II math interventions and no support for Tier III.

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

Additional personnel are needed to support our Tier II and Tier III students needing intervention. Staff will continue to implement the Comprehensive Intervention Model and Comprehensive Literacy Model.

In the area of math, we need personnel to help with Tier II or III interventions for those students that are struggling.

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?

Attributes of the school: Common assessment measures are used to ensure that our students' strengths and challenges are identified on a timely basis to provide sufficient information on which to base effective instructional decisions. Teachers meet in grade level teams four times a month to discuss regularly collected data and assessments. This time is also used to analyze curricular practices by reviewing strategic monthly plans at grade level team meetings and discussing best practices. A collaborative environment among staff ensures that the children served at Monroe receive a quality education. The intervention team meets regularly to monitor student progress on our **assessment wall and provides the necessary interventions to ensure the success of all students. We will now have a minimum of 12 one-on-one Reading Recovery slots for this year. Monroe has a part time quarterly math interventionist for the 2011-2012 school year too. Monroe is also fortunate to have strong parental involvement lead by an active PTA.** The Monroe PTA has donated funds to expand individual classroom libraries and has given money to expand the school library, and implement various educational events throughout the school year. In addition, Monroe is a literacy rich environment supported by a literacy coach. All classrooms have access to the literacy coach and are considered **learning labs. Monroe school is in year 5 of implementation of the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People and year 3 implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention Support.**

Challenges of the school: Wide ranges of academic ability exist within a single classroom, which creates a need for additional support for struggling learners. Our class sizes have continued to increase. The percentage of low income families continues to increase.

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

Significant parental involvement, common assessments, teacher collaboration, and the intervention team highly impacts student performance in a positive way. However, lack of intervention personnel does not allow us to fully meet the instructional needs of all of our students.

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

At Monroe, we strive to meet the instructional needs of all of our students through universal classroom instruction and Tier I intervention provided by the classroom teacher, with the assistance of the literacy coach. Our literacy coach is training in Reading Recovery along with a part time reading recovery teacher as well. This will give us a minimum of 12 one-on-one intervention slots.

For math we have a part time interventionist for a quarter to help with Tier II math interventions.

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?

Two of Monroe's 12 general education classroom teachers is non-tenured. All of our teachers are highly qualified as well. We are working toward Comprehensive Literacy Model and Comprehensive Intervention Model full implementation, which requires the literacy coach to provide continuous professional development. Due to financial obstacles, Monroe has .75 personnel for Reading Recovery, no Literacy Intervention Support and .5 Math Intervention Support for one quarter. We have three teachers that are trained in the Number Worlds Intervention for math.

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

All teachers will continue to have professional development aligned with the Comprehensive Intervention Model and the Comprehensive Literacy Model. They will have professional development for Tier I and Tier II in math as well.

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

We will continue to provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate and receive professional development aligned with Comprehensive Literacy Model and Comprehensive Intervention Model. In order to address significant challenges, classroom teachers along with the intervention team will collaborate extensively on universal classroom instruction, successful strategies, and Tier I interventions.

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?

Monroe has an active and supportive PTA that organizes a number of family involvement events each year including: fall festival, curriculum night, special persons day, literacy week, special guests, ISAT meeting, and book fair.

We also review the parent surveys from the parent/teacher conferences to see if they have any suggestions.

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

Our parental involvement demonstrates the value that education has on students to develop successful lifelong learners.

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

At Monroe we continue to encourage strong parental involvement in the student's academic career. Our staff supports being members of our PTA as well, and we continue to add parents to our PTA all year long.

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?

Although Monroe School again achieved Adequate Yearly Progress in all designated areas, there continues to be a need to fully implement the Comprehensive Literacy Model and Comprehensive Intervention Model in order to increase student achievement in reading comprehension and writing. Due to the lack of intervention personnel, which is out of our control, our teachers and literacy coach will emphasize universal classroom instruction and Tier I intervention to meet the needs of all students. This is also a focus for Math as well.



Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	To improve performance of all students in reading.	

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

To improve performance of all students in reading.

Objective 1 Description

Monroe will increase by 10% the number of students meeting/exceeding state reading standards as measured by the ISAT.

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

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

Objective 1 Title :

To improve performance of all students in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will participate in reader's workshop, phase one and phase two of the Comprehensive Literacy model in all classrooms. Phase one is guided instruction and independent literacy opportunities. Phase two envelopes language studies	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Significant time will be devoted to providing students opportunities for independent reading and each will receive individual conferencing designed to scaffold his/her achievement.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	Students will be given opportunities to develop skills in questions similar to the extended response items on ISAT.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	A small number of identified students will receive Tier II support from the building Literacy Coach.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	Teachers will implement a comprehensive literacy assessment system in each grade level and administer common assessments to all students.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	Writing will be embedded across the curriculum as students are asked to explore, problem solve, and respond to their reading.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	

7	Teachers will continue to design curriculum guides and genre studies for each grade level aligned with core standards.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
8	Teachers will continue to implement individual assessment portfolios for all students to document change over time in student performance.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
9	A small number of students will receive Reading Recovery Literacy Lessons.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

To improve performance of all students in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	A Literacy Coach will coach all teachers to implement coaching cycles.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Teachers will meet weekly to confer regarding students' literacy progress; weekly meetings will be devoted to sharing strategies and expertise, especially regarding individual student progress and data assessment.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	A Literacy Intervention Team will analyze student data with high concern and set up proper interventions for them. For example, Assisted Writing, Guided Reading Plus groups, reading and Writing conferences. We will document these on the Intervention Planner.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	Before School	Local Funds	
4	All teachers evaluate and set a goal for themselves through the Environmental Scale for Assessing Implementation Levels. The literacy coach and Principal will provide training in the identified areas of need.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	The literacy coach will have ongoing professional development through National Lewis University.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	Teachers will have ongoing professional development for the comprehensive interventional model and the partnerships in	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	

	comprehensive literacy.					
7	All teachers, principal, and literacy coach will participate in a book study of Interventions That Work by Dorn and Soffas.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

To improve performance of all students in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will be involved in Curriculum Night to be informed about their child's curriculum and ways they can be involved.	09/13/2011	09/13/2011	After School	Other	
2	100% of parents will participate in parent teacher conferences to be involved and informed regarding their child's individual progress and ways they can support their child's learning.	10/19/2011	10/28/2011	After School	Other	
3	Parents will help foster their child's reading growth by helping their child read at home daily.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Other	
4	Parents will be involved in developing Monroe School's SIP plan.	08/15/2011	08/17/2011	Summer School	Other	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

To improve performance of all students in reading.

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?)

At Monroe School, the classroom teachers will closely monitor their students' reading progress and collaborate with the literacy coach regarding strategies for intervention.

The building principal will review assessment data through the assessment wall and data collection charts with the building literacy coach to follow the students' progress.

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	Julie Stratman	Principal
2		

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.*)

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 literacy coach and Principal monitor the school improvement process at Monroe School. We meet weekly to discuss the progress that our students are making using our assessment data and wall. All Monroe staff and PTA parents are included in the development of the plan and the instructional activities. At weekly team meetings, we discuss the items. The Assistant Superintendent and the Quincy School Board review Monroe's building plan.

	Name	Title
1	Julie Stratman	Principal
2	Erica Maynard	Literacy Coach
3	Pat Arnold	Kindergarten Teacher
4	Michelle Herman	Kindergarten Teacher
5	Amy Quincy	Kindergarten Teacher
6	Deb Banks	1st Grade teacher
7	Karilyn Lipcamon	1st Grade Teacher
8	Linda Rodemich	1st Grade Teacher
9	Cheryl Burghart	2nd Grade Teacher
10	Patty McGlothlin	2nd Grade Teacher
11	Lisa Taylor	2nd Grade Teacher
12	Alyssa Boburka	3rd Grade Teacher
13	Marci Keller	3rd Grade Teacher
14	Amy Jones	3rd Grade Teacher
15	Penny Garner	Physical Education Teacher
16	Debbie Olson	Special Education Teacher
17	Tawnya Sparrow	Reading Recovery/Math Interventionist
18	Linda Hermens	PTA Mom
19	Amy Summers	PTA Mom

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.

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 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.

	Name	Title
1		

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