

Stiles Investigative Learning Magnet

School Improvement Plan 2008

Local Board Approved	
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number	041012050252057		
District Name	ROCKFORD SD 205	School Name	STILES INVESTIGATIVE LRNING MAGNT
Superintendent	LINDA HERNANDEZ	Principal	GEORGE RICHARDSON
District Address	201 S MADISON ST	School Address	315 LA CLEDE AVE
City/State/Zip	ROCKFORD,IL 61104 2092	City/State/Zip	ROCKFORD,IL,61102 1222
District Telephone#	8159663000 Extn:3101	School Telephone#	8159663790 Extn:0
District Email	hernandl@rps205.com	School Email	richarg@rps205.com

Is this plan for a Title I School? True

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2008 AYP Report**

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2007-08 Federal Improvement Status	choice ses
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2007-08 State Improvement Status	academic watch status year 3

	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		62.5			62.5			90.0		75.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	39.8		No	63.4		Yes	92	Yes		
White														
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	35.0	27.6	Yes	56.7		Yes	92.4			
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities														
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	40.0	44.3	Yes	63.3		Yes	91.8			

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 62.5% 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 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 75% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2007.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 62.5% 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 - 2008 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								
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Attendance Rate (%)	91.0	91.3	91.2	90.3	89.5	90.6	92.2	92.0
Truancy Rate (%)	12.7	8.4	12.7	22.3	18.2	16.6	6.4	3.2
Mobility Rate (%)	14.4	15.5	22.6	28.2	35.0	32.8	15.2	48.3
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	233	211	241	207	218	209	245	245
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	83.3	93.4	82.6	75.4	92.2	90.0	92.2	95.5
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.9	-	-	1.0	-	0.5	2.0	0.4
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	44.6	38.9	39.4	39.6	35.3	27.3	30.6	27.3
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	49.8	55.5	52.7	54.1	54.6	62.2	55.5	56.3
Hispanic (%)	5.6	5.7	7.1	5.8	3.7	5.3	8.2	7.8
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	-	0.4	0.5	0.5	-	-	0.4
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	0.4	-	-	-	-	0.4
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	6.0	5.3	5.7	7.8

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/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
S C H O O L	1999	46.7	48.1	3.3	1.9	-	-
	2000	46.7	48.6	4.3	0.5	-	-
	2001	44.6	49.8	5.6	-	-	-
	2002	38.9	55.5	5.7	-	-	-
	2003	39.4	52.7	7.1	0.4	0.4	-
	2004	39.6	54.1	5.8	0.5	-	-
	2005	35.3	54.6	3.7	0.5	-	6.0
	2006	27.3	62.2	5.3	-	-	5.3
	2007	30.6	55.5	8.2	-	-	5.7
	2008	27.3	56.3	7.8	0.4	0.4	7.8
D I S T R I C T	1999	55.2	29.6	11.8	3.2	0.2	-
	2000	53.0	30.5	13.1	3.1	0.2	-
	2001	51.0	31.1	14.5	3.1	0.2	-
	2002	49.1	31.5	16.1	3.1	0.2	-
	2003	47.7	31.8	17.2	3.1	0.2	-
	2004	46.0	32.3	18.3	3.2	0.2	-
	2005	44.3	31.0	19.2	3.1	0.1	2.3
	2006	42.5	30.5	20.6	3.1	0.2	3.2
	2007	40.7	30.8	21.5	3.0	0.1	4.0
	2008	39.3	30.3	22.1	3.0	0.1	5.1

	Year	White(%)	Black(%)	Hispanic(%)	Asian/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
S T A T E	1999	62.0	20.8	13.9	3.2	0.2	-
	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	

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	1999	1.9	90.0	100.0	91.5	10.7	20	9.7	-	-
	2000	0.5	84.3	100.0	91.7	11.3	19	9.0	-	-
	2001	0.9	83.3	100.0	91.0	14.4	29	12.7	-	-
	2002	-	93.4	100.0	91.3	15.5	19	8.4	-	-
	2003	-	82.6	100.0	91.2	22.6	32	12.7	-	-
	2004	1.0	75.4	100.0	90.3	28.2	49	22.3	-	-
	2005	-	92.2	100.0	89.5	35.0	39	18.2	-	-
	2006	0.5	90.0	100.0	90.6	32.8	39	16.6	-	-
	2007	2.0	92.2	100.0	92.2	15.2	17	6.4	-	-
2008	0.4	95.5	100.0	92.0	48.3	8	3.2	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	1999	6.9	46.0	96.4	90.8	16.4	2938	11.7	10.9	73.6
	2000	8.2	52.6	97.0	91.4	15.8	2981	11.9	7.4	74.7
	2001	9.0	53.3	99.5	91.8	16.6	2562	10.3	6.7	73.9
	2002	10.3	56.9	95.7	93.1	16.8	2248	8.3	6.0	74.9
	2003	6.5	56.9	96.3	92.8	16.8	1717	6.2	7.8	81.3
	2004	12.2	55.1	99.8	92.7	19.0	2306	8.3	6.6	69.4
	2005	12.0	57.6	98.2	91.5	20.9	2436	9.6	8.9	73.1
	2006	12.0	65.7	99.0	92.3	18.1	2626	9.4	3.0	71.0
	2007	12.3	68.4	91.9	92.6	15.0	1868	6.6	3.2	75.0
2008	13.8	71.5	95.7	92.4	28.4	1624	5.8	2.2	71.8	

	Year	LEP(%)	Low Income(%)	Parental Involvement(%)	Attendance(%)	Mobility(%)	Chronic Truants(N)	Chronic Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
S T A T E	1999	6.4	36.1	96.1	93.6	18.1	43332	2.3	5.9	81.9
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.9	94.0	16.4	37525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40764	2.1	4.6	86.5
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49056	2.5	3.5	85.9
2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49858	2.5	4.1	86.5	

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	1999	210	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	210	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	233	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	211	37	29	20	-	-	-
	2003	241	35	37	29	-	-	-
	2004	207	30	24	30	-	-	-
	2005	218	44	27	30	-	-	-
	2006	209	30	37	26	-	-	-
	2007	245	41	39	36	-	-	-
	2008	245	35	47	34	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	1999	26547	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	26436	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	26502	2094	2177	2242	1966	2002	1170
	2002	26674	2158	2121	2118	2165	1929	1506
	2003	27330	2109	2200	2149	2221	2124	1531
	2004	27576	2083	2120	2172	2227	2164	1552
	2005	27464	2061	2107	2102	2105	2141	1483
	2006	27456	2097	2055	2053	2094	2044	1443
	2007	27787	2197	2100	2092	2072	2137	1541
	2008	27622	2293	2163	2088	2015	2076	1526

Stiles Investigative Lrning Magnt

School Improvement Plan 2008

	Year	School(N)	Grade 3(N)	Grade 4(N)	Grade 5(N)	Grade 7(N)	Grade 8(N)	Grade 11(N)
S T A T E	1999	1962026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1983991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2007170	164791	161546	162001	151270	148194	123816
	2002	2029821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2044539	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	2060048	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	2062912	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	2075277	136123	139619	146935	153566	154856	-
	2007	2077856	155356	153480	154719	162594	159038	150475
2008	2074167	155578	152895	153347	160039	161310	149710	

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, Staff Capacity and Professional Development**

	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	1999	1662	19	49181	27	73	20	23	-	-
	2000	1691	17	49048	32	68	19	23	-	-
	2001	1765	17	50543	34	66	19	22	-	-
	2002	1758	17	50685	34	66	19	22	3	1
	2003	1750	17	52459	34	66	20	23	3	2
	2004	1700	18	56305	31	69	19	24	-	3
	2005	1635	19	62144	28	72	20	25	3	1
	2006	1721	15	58512	34	66	19	22	3	5
	2007	1766	15	60203	35	65	19	22	2	3
	2008	1833	15	61177	35	65	19	21	2	6
S T A T E	1999	119718	15	45337	53	47	20	18	-	-
	2000	122671	15	45766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125735	15	47929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126544	14	49702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129068	14	51672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125702	14	54446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128079	14	55558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127010	13	56685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127010	13	58275	48	52	19	19	2	3
2008	131488	12	60871	47	53	18	18	1	1	

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	45.9	41.3	20.5	34.4	28.8	32.4	-	-	-	45.7	51.3	41.3	21.5	38.1	32.1	42.3	39.4	46.7
White	58.9	70.0	53.9	50.0	-	-	-	-	-	72.7	66.6	-	9.1	-	41.7	-	71.4	38.5
Black	35.3	18.8	4.3	17.6	20.5	43.5	-	-	-	21.1	26.4	33.3	31.3	33.3	15.4	31.3	15.0	33.3
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	45.2	40.7	20.5	32.3	30.3	32.4	-	-	-	43.8	51.4	42.2	23.0	36.9	32.0	34.7	38.2	46.4
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Stiles Investigative Learning Magnet

School Improvement Plan 2008

5/21/2009 7:47:47 AM

Page 15 of 34

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	64.8	40.0	46.2	65.7	64.4	48.5	-	-	-	71.4	69.3	64.4	35.7	43.5	53.6	46.2	71.0	72.4
White	76.4	63.6	92.3	91.7	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	93.4	-	63.6	-	58.3	-	92.8	91.6
Black	50.0	18.8	21.7	47.1	64.7	47.8	-	-	-	47.4	47.3	66.7	18.8	35.7	46.2	25.1	50.0	41.6
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	67.7	35.7	38.3	64.6	67.5	48.5	-	-	-	68.8	71.4	65.9	34.6	42.9	52.0	39.1	70.6	70.4
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Stiles Investigative Lrning Magnt

School Improvement Plan 2008

5/21/2009 7:47:47 AM

Page 17 of 34

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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 area of weakness is reading. Reading data indicates in 2008 39.8% of all our students met the benchmark. Stiles was 22.7% short of the 62.5% target. At Stiles 40% of economically disadvantaged students met the benchmark. These economically disadvantaged students are 22.5% short of the target.

46.7% of fifth grade students met the target of 62.5%.

41.3% of fourth grade students met the target of 62.5%.

32.4% of third grade students met the target of 62.5%

When we compare overall third grade scores from 06-07 to the scores received in 07-08 they increased by 12.5%.

When we compare overall fourth grade scores from 06-07 to the scores received in 07-08 they decreased by 2.8%.

We are low in all five areas: vocabulary development, reading strategies, reading comprehension, literature and reading extended response as assessed in grades three through five of ISAT.

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

- Lack of student academic background knowledge and vocabulary.
- Mobility rate has increase significantly to 48.3%.
- High staff mobility/teacher turnover in ISAT grades.
- Five out of six teachers are not tenured at ISAT grades.
- Low SES rate is 95.5% which leads to students have limited access to books and resources.
- Stiles has had three different reading coaches in five years.
- Lack of academic support from parents.
- Our Open House Attendance for 2008/09 school year was 65 parent that attended out of a total student enrollment of 247.
- Behavior and discipline issues interfere with learning, 2007/08 school year had a total of 83 discipline referrals.

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

We need to implement building wide strategies to develop consistent instructional delivery across grade levels. Focus on building academic vocabulary in grades K-5 using Marzano's Building Academic Vocabulary Program and strategies to offset the lack of academic experiences. We need to increase the amount of time students spend independently reading at school and at home. Stiles student mobility rate has increased from 15.2% in 06-07 to 48.3% in 07-08. This is an increase of 33.1%. With this trend continuing it interferes with students ability to receive reading instruction and interventions provided at Stiles. In retaining our current ISAT testing grade teachers, our students will receive consistent instruction and interventions.

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?

Relevant local assessment data in the area of reading include:

*On-the Mark assessments in grades K-5 includes, phonemic awareness, phonics inventory, figurative language, spelling inventory, sight words, record or oral reading, and extended written response.

* Fountas and Pinell reading assessment in grades K-5 includes, accuracy, fluency, reading rate and comprehension.

*Discovery Education Assessment in grades 1-5 includes, vocabulary, reading comprehension, literary elements, and writing organization.

Based on May 2008, On-the-Mark assessments of reading comprehension, Stiles has two grade levels, Kindergarten at 74% and 2nd, at 65% meeting and exceeding the district benchmark. In 1st and 3rd grades the overwhelming majority of students are not at benchmark in reading comprehension. In 1st grade 36%, 3rd grade 44%, 4th grade 49%, and 5th grade at 38% of students meeting and exceeding the district benchmark.

Based on September 2008, Fountas and Pinell reading assessment and comprehension, Stiles has two grade levels at meeting and exceeding the district benchmark, Kindergarten at 100% and 3rd grade at 55%. In 1st, 2nd, 4th and 5th grades the overwhelming majority of students are not at benchmark in reading comprehension. In 1st grade 25%, 2nd 43%, 4th 17% and 5th 23% of the students are not at benchmark.

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

- Lack of student academic background knowledge and vocabulary.
- Mobility rate has increased to 48.3%.
- High staff mobility/teacher turnover.
- Low SES rates at 95.5%, students have limited access to books at home.
- Time spent reading at school needs to be increased.

- Time spent on writing and practicing Reading Extended Response needs to be increased.
- Beginning Response to Intervention(RTI) implementation.
- Three different Reading Coaches in five years.
- Open house attendance: 65 of 247 parents attended, 26 percent.
- Behavior referral numbers: 83

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

We need to implement building wide strategies to develop consistent instructional delivery across grade levels. To increase student academic achievement we will focus on building academic vocabulary in grades K-5 using Marzano's Building Academic Vocabulary Program and additional vocabulary strategies to offset the lack of academic experiences. We need to increase the amount of the time students spend independently reading at school and at home. Teachers will monitor students reading log and chart monthly. In retaining our current ISAT testing grade teachers, our students will perform better due to more teaching experience at the grade level. We need to fully implement and train teachers in Response to Intervention. We need to improve targeting and increase the amount of intervention time provided to students. Our May 2008, Fountas and Pinell shows that students are not making significant reading gains. We need to make sure our reading groups are fluid and flexible to ensure all students are moving forward academically. Our Data Teams will continue to collect and analyze data to implement and refine instructional strategies that will increase student academic achievement. Due to the increase in the amount of time our students will be reading we need to make more reading materials readily available to both teachers and students. Additional professional development in the area of reading will be provided to the Stiles Staff. This professional development will be ongoing and job-embedded with the Reading Coach following up in the classroom with instructional strategies. Parents will be encouraged to support reading and vocabulary development through quarterly activities provided at reading nights. This is in addition to daily homework assignments reinforcing what has been taught in the classroom.

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?*

The Rockford School District continues to struggle with attendance and dropout rates. Our attendance rate decreased 0.29% from 06-07 to 07-08. Our truancy rate decreased in 07-08 by 3.2% from 06-07. Our mobility rate increased in 07-08 by 33.1%.

The use of a Rockford Attendance Initiative Caseworker and Home School Counselor were successful in improving both our attendance and truancy. Rockford School District attributes include Title I funding, district level assessments, Rockford Attendance Initiative and After School Achievement Programing. Stiles receives all of aforementioned attributes and we have a Parent Liason, funded through Title I.

Our economically disadvantaged student population remains consistently high, in the 90th percentile. Our minority student population remains consistently near the 60th percentile.

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

Our attendance rate is consistently in the lower 90th percentile even with the interventions of the use of a Rockford Attendance Initiative Caseworker and a Home School Counselor. Students who are not in attendance do not have the same amount of instructional time as their grade level peers. Title I funding has provided reading materials and tutoring hours to increase student reading achievement. Our teachers are able to drive classroom instruction using the results of District assessments in addition to other formal and informal assessments. Teachers voluntarily participate in Data Teams monthly to look at student data, analyze and refine instructional strategies.

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

At the district level, a truancy collaborative initiative has been developed within the Rockford community to help combat truancy. It is imperative for our school to have a Rockford Attendance Initiative counselor consistently assigned to our school. The staff at Stiles needs to work diligently with parents to stress the importance of daily attendance.

For Stiles to make academic gains the Rockford School District must continue to support the school by providing the funds and personnel necessary to continue with programs currently in place, as well as, adding additional programming when necessary.

It is important that Stiles staff use assessments to drive instruction including those provided by the District.

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 tell you?*

Stiles staff consists of one administrator, twelve classroom teachers, three certified support staff, three paraprofessionals, and four certified specialists (art, music and two physical education teachers). All of our teacher are highly qualified. Stiles has nine tenured teachers and ten non-tenured teachers. Five our of six ISAT testing grade teacher are in their first five years of teaching. We are lacking years of teaching experience in the ISAT testing grades. Stiles provides book-study opportunities to staff directly tied to student achievement in reading. We are specifically focusing on reading gstrategies (e.g. questioning, visualizing, inferring, connections, synthesizing and determining importance). Stiles Reading Coach then follows up either modeling, co-teaching or coaching the teachers utilizing those instructional strategies in the classroom setting. This promotes the transfer of instructional strategies to the classroom. Through our monthly data team meetings teachers analyze student data to continually improve implementation of these reading strategies. Our staff is involved in the curriculum to improve student accountability for behavior. Our staff received training for "I Can Problem Solve" at the start of the 2007-08 school year. Follow up traing for "I Can Problem Solve" will be administered through 2010.

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

Stiles professional development is designed to increase student academic achievement especially in the area of reading. We are specifically focusing on reading strategies (e.g., questioning, visualizing, inferring, connections, synthesizing, and determining importance). book studies have allowed our staff to share a common language and increase collaboration and collegiality between staff members. Frequent staff meeting focusing on professional development and regular review of student assessment data during Data Team meetings keeps Stiles' staff immersed in improving student academic acheivement. Due to the fact that our Reading Coach models and co-teaches in classrooms, teachers can more quickly implement best practices with their students. Having our staff involved in the After School Acheivement Program allows for consistency between school day and after school reading curriculum. The "I Can Problem Solve" curriculum has provided a common language for stff when helping a student redirect and/or avoid a discipline referral.

Constant change of curriculum, teacher learning curve, and differentiating instruction may contribute to lower test scores.

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

It is important for the District to continue providing the resources necessary to continue implenmenting the above-mentioned professional development opportunities. The District and Stiles need to continue to find grant funding to support and maintain programs that will increase student academic achievement (e.g., Book Study, After School Achievement Program, I Can Problem Solve). The District needs to continue its allocation of the Reading Coach position in the elementary buildings.

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?*

Parental involvement needs to improve at Stiles. We face a challenge because many of the parents lack the knowledge or resources of how best to help their child achieve academically. some of our parents are struggling to meet just the basic needs of their children. The school, including the principal, teachers, and a parent liason, attempt to reach out to parents in a variety of ways. Phone calls, newsletters, home visits, conferences, and notes sent home are some of the ways we try to involve parents. During the spring of 2006-07, 79% of students had a parent represented at conference. During the fall of 2006-07, 73% of students had a parent represented at conference. All of Stiles teachers send home communication at least monthly regarding academic instruction. Fifty percent of Stiles teacher send home a log to record student reading minutes completed at home. However, these reading logs do not come back to school on a consistent basis. Reading logs are not a priority for some of our families who are just trying to survive.

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

Our scores are reflective of the fact that we are not getting many parents involved with their child's academics. By encouraging more activities that directly involve a parent in their child's academics, we hope to increase the amount of parent involvment and there by improve student academic achievement.

Therefore, for 08-09 school year parents will be encouraged to participate in Family Reading Night. As well as that, during the 08-09 school year, parents will be offered information on reading strategies that boost comprehension.

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

From individual student conversations, our staff is aware of the many circumstances that might prevent a parent from being involved academically in their child's life. In order to understand what is keeping a parent from participating in their child's academic life, we need to continue to reach out via calls, newsletters, etc., in order to foster positive relationships. We will provide quarterly reading activity that a student can complete with their parent that will address a specific reading strategy. Students are knowledgeable of their reading ability and through conversations with their teachers know what they need to do in order to improve. We are encouraging the sharing of this important information to the parent through the child as well as the teacher.

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

Section I-D - Key Factors – *From the preceding screens (I-A, I-B, I-C-1, 2, 3) 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?*

We will use ongoing assessments to identify students who are in need of the reading interventions. One of the interventions will be place students into tutoring groups. Teachers will also use these assessments to make sure students are placed in flexible instructional reading groups. Our area of low achievement is in reading. Stiles will increase the amount of reading materials available and the time student spend independently reading. As previously stated, our students do not enroll with academic background knowledge. We will implement Marzano's Building Academic Vocabulary Program to address this need. We will continue to meet in Data Teams monthly to analyze results student data and refine instructional strategies to increase student academic achievement. Teachers will share their Data Team's work and results monthly at a staff meeting. Every staff meeting will continue to focus on reading professional development. We will continue to seek out and hire teachers with experience in the above mentioned reading strategies so that no time is lost in training and getting them up to speed. We will continue to reach out to parents and provide activities and resources to help them become involved in their child's academic life.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Reading Improvement	1,

The following deficiencies [not objectives] have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for your school.

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective: 1

Reading Improvement

Objective 1 Description:

Our current achievement in reading is 39.8% for all students. We will increase our reading scores to 70% by 2009 and 77.5% by 2010, or Safe Harbor.

Through professional development we will implement building wide reading strategies to develop consistent instructional delivery across grade levels. Focusing on building academic vocabulary in grades Kindergarten through fifth grade, we will use Marzano's Building Academic Vocabulary Program and other instructional vocabulary strategies as needed. There will be a building wide increase in the number of reading materials available to teachers and students. During guided reading we will increase the amount of time students spend reading independently. In addition to these strategies we will use our data to form and monitor fluid and flexible groups for guided reading and the reading interventions: SOAR, Early Success, Tutoring and Century 21 After School Program. We will provide parents with quarterly reading activities and resources to improve their child's academice achievement.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency	
1	School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 1 Title : Reading Improvement						
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Implement Early Success and SOAR to Success, The Reading Intervention Programs for students who are below the reading benchmark.	8/25/2008	6/5/2010	During School	Other	0
2	Teachers will increase time during guided Reading for all students to read independently in grades K-5 (30-45) minutes using the Daily 5 Structure.	8/25/2008	6/5/2010	During School	Other	0
3	All teachers will implement Marzano's Building Academic Vocabulary Program in grades K-5.	8/25/2008	6/5/2010	During School	Other	0
4	Data teams will meet at least monthly to evaluate grade level data and develop strategies to increase student achievement in reading.	8/25/2008	6/5/2010	After School	Other	0
5	All Teachers will implement core strategies; DRTA, QAR, Reciprocal Teaching, and Making Meaning.	8/25/2008	6/5/2010	During School	Other	0

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

Objective 1 Title : Reading Improvement

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Modeling and co-teaching of Marzano's Building Academic Vocabulary Program. Teacher will implement the program in all core subjects.	8/25/2008	6/5/2010	During School	Other	0
2	Teachers will be provided with professional development once per month at staff meetings with a specific focus on reading strategies, DRTA, QAR, Recipical Teaching provided by Reading Coach.	8/25/2008	6/5/2010	After School	Other	0
3	All teachers will participate in at least one professional book study that targets Reading, lead by a staff member.	8/25/2008	6/5/2010	After School	Other	0

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

Objective 1 Title : Reading Improvement

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	A reading activity will be provided to parents and students based on specific reading strategy that is taught during the Family reading nights, by a member of the staff per trimester.	8/25/2008	6/5/2010	After School	Other	0
2	Development of a school/business and parent partnership for volunteers to come read with students.	8/25/2008	6/5/2010	During School	Other	0
3	Teachers will collect student reading logs and data will be posted monthly in classroom.	8/25/2008	6/5/2010	During School	Other	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title : Reading Improvement

Monitoring - Describe the process and measures of success for the identified objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

During the first week of each month teacher will record students' current instructional reading level on an accountability grid provided by and returned to the Reading Coach. This accountability grid will assist in keeping guided reading groups fluid and flexible for the classroom teacher, as well as, monitor progress and placement of those students in tutoring or intervention groups.

Walk throughs during guided reading time and graphing of the amount of time students read per classroom will allow the principal to monitor the time student spend reading independently during the school day. Our goal is 30 minutes of independent reading in grades Kindergarten through second and 45 minutes in grades three through five.

During one of the two monthly staff meeting, teachers will share with colleagues their current grade level data team work and the unit of their current vocabulary work. Teachers will also be given time to share their quarterly at home reading activities at staff meetings.

The bookroom will be inventoried and the amount of materials will be increased. On a continuous basis, teachers will be provided a list of guided reading books by level and content area.

Monitoring Persons - List the individuals and designate the role of each person(e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

Name	Title
George Richardson	Principal
Candace Cacciatore	Reading Coach

Section III - Plan 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.*)

Notification to the parents/guardians of each student enrolled at Stiles Elementary School was sent home the fall of 2008 by the District #205 Administrative Offices and Family Resource Center. Notification was provided in the form of a letter describing the school's status and given at registration or mailed directly to each parent/guardian.

Local media, television and newspaper, have reported on the school's status to the public on several occasions.

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

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

The school staff involved in the plan were George Richardson, Hope Sutherland, First Grade Teacher, Vanessa carter, Second Grade Teacher, Casie Schroeder, Fourth Grade Teacher, Candace Cacciatore, Reading Coach. Our parent stake holders are Tori Wilburn, Diane Berogan, Char Remer, Kids Consultant, and Sue Brock, Title I Coordinator were also involved in our plan. Stakeholders have been consulted during data teams, staff meetings, and at grade level meetings regarding the direction the School Improvement Plan should take. Stakeholder will be kept informed through a monthly informational letter.

Names and titles of school improvement team or plan developers:

	Name	Title
1	George Richardson	Administrator
2	Hope Sutherland	First Grade Teacher
3	Vanessa Carter	Second Grade Teacher
4	Casie Schroeder	Fourth Grade Teacher
5	Candace Cacciatore	Reading Coach
6	Tori Wilbourn	Parent

Section III - Plan 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. Peer review and subsequent local board approval 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>.

Describe the peer review process including participants and date(s) of peer review.

The Regional Office of Education (ROE) will provide training in the SIP process in October 2008. SIP Monitoring/Scoring training will be provided to reviewers in November 2008. Ongoing support from the ROE will support the correct and effective evaluation of School Improvement Plans. Representatives of SIP Teams will meet with their tier-level's District Administrator to discuss their plans and ensure clarity on or before November 2008. SIP Teams will pair with other schools in their tier level during the next two week period to review and refine their plans. Schools will submit their final plans to the Peer Review Committee on or before November 14, 2008.

The Peer Review Committee shall consist of the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, the Assistant Superintendent for Student Services, and the Assistant Superintendent for Community Outreach and Procedures. All members of the Peer Review Committee will be trained in the SIP process by ROE and/or RESPO staff. School Improvement Plans based on 2007-2008 will be submitted to the Board of Education on 2009. Approved by the Rockford Public Schools' Board of Education.

Plans that must be revised based on 2009 data will be peer reviewed utilizing the same process. Dates will be adjusted to reflect the appropriate timeline generated based on receipt of 2009 State Assessment data, e.g. ISAT, IAA, or PSAE.

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

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

The major focus of the RPS new teacher induction program is the work of mentors trained in the Frameworks for Professional Teaching available through the New Teacher Center in Santa Cruz, California. Our Illinois partner for training and implementation is The Consortium For Educational Change (CEC). The program is based on the acquisition of Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS) taught through the use of Danielson's Frameworks Induction Program. This program incorporates Danielson's Four Domains of Professional Practice: 1)Planning and Preparation, 2)The Classroom Environment, 3)Instruction, and 4)Professional Responsibilities. These domains include methods of inquiry for content knowledge, an understanding of human development, approaches to learning that address diverse learner needs, planning for instruction, the creation of engaging and stimulating learning environments, a range of models for instructional delivery, the development of a range of communication skills, the use of formal and informal assessment strategies to support student academic development, the nurturing of collaborative relationships, and an emphasis on high standards of professional conduct.

In line with the above research and standards, this project values: 1)teaching as a career-long development process; 2) teaching as a continuous cycle of teaching, assessment, reflection, and re-teaching; 3) professional standards and a focus on student achievement as central to the improvement of practice; 4)teacher development as occurring best in collegial environment where the sharing of expertise is valued; and 5) a teacher's professional growth as central to the improvement of student achievement.

All mentors are retired teachers who complete a 12 day training program provided by CEC in the Frameworks program. In addition, mentors attend monthly support sessions to improve their practice. Mentors are assigned 3-5 new teachers to guide during the year. Mentor schedule an average of 1.5 hours of work with new teachers each week. Professional development is offered to teachers in specific grade level and subject areas during the year. Professional development is provided by the RPS curriculum department, school based coaching, the Regional Office of Education, Golden Apple Foundation, as well as, RPS induction program.

A final evaluation of the mentoring project is submitted to the Illinois State Board of education each summer. Mentors maintain time logs that document the time spent each week with each of their proteges and the topic of their sessions. The time logs are submitted to the grant manager for the tabulation and review and do not contain confidential information. Time logs will be used for formative assessment during year two of the project. An annual survey of participants is completed to inform the evaluation report.

For the first time in 2007-08 induction support was extended to second year teachers who completed the first year of the mentoring program.

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

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

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

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.

**Section III - Plan 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.

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

State Responsibilities – List the names and identify the roles (e.g., distinguished educator, district curriculum coordinator, university partner, or RESPRO consultant) of the School Support Team. If applicable, School Support Teams are assigned to schools in corrective action to provide sustained and intensive support for those schools to make adequate yearly progress. Note: School Support Teams are not the same as school improvement teams or the school planning team. Schools I academic watch, restructuring, or restructuring implementation status should have School Support Teams. Some schools in Choice, SES, or academic early warning status also have School Support Teams.

	Name	Title
--	------	-------

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:

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

	Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified?
	Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness?
	Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students?
	Does the analysis, along with other optional data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

	If included, is there evidence that the SIP team analyzed optional data to clarify the areas of weakness?
	Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?
	Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

	If included, has the SIP team analyzed other available data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities?
	Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?
	Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

	Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance?
	Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control?

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

	Has the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan?
	Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency?

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

	Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?
	Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement?
	Are the strategies and activities measurable?
	Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified?
	Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear?

	Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students?
	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?
	Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities? for students?
	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?
MONITORING	
	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?
	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

	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)
--	--

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?
	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?

PEER REVIEW

	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?
--	---

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS

	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?
--	---

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?
	If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school?

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

	Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation?
SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM	
	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?
APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD	
	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.

PART II - COMMENTS