

Local Board Approved	
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2009 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	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2009-10 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status Year 2

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		70.0			70.0			90.0		78.0	
All	99.8	Yes	99.8	Yes	77.6		Yes	79.9		Yes	93.7			
White	99.7	Yes	99.7	Yes	89.4		Yes	90.4		Yes				
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	65.3		Yes	66.7		Yes				
Hispanic	98.7	Yes	98.7	Yes	67.2		Yes	79.7		Yes				
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	80.0		Yes	83.3		Yes		
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes								
Students with Disabilities	99.4	Yes	99.4	Yes	54.7	39.0	Yes	57.1	40.6	Yes	92.9	
Low Income	99.6	Yes	99.6	Yes	67.1		Yes	72.3		Yes		

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress

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

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

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

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

DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION

The Differentiated Accountability classification for the school is:

Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in reading?

Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in math?

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2009 AMAO Report**

Schools are not accountable for AMAO. This is a district level requirement only.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 3 - School Information

School Information								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	92.9	92.7	92.4	92.0	91.4	92.3	93.2	93.7
Truancy Rate (%)	5.9	2.8	1.3	2.9	4.7	5.1	2.0	0.5
Mobility Rate (%)	19.0	33.0	33.3	16.1	26.1	19.9	18.5	15.4
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	1,055	998	1,017	1,033	1,000	932	817	806
Low Income (%)	43.9	46.7	50.7	55.6	60.2	64.9	66.2	62.7
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	2.6	5.0	2.6	2.9	4.6	6.4	7.0	6.5
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	58.9	55.7	52.6	50.1	47.8	44.6	41.0	40.4
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	31.9	33.6	37.9	33.4	36.3	38.1	37.8	38.1
Hispanic (%)	2.4	3.2	3.2	4.5	3.6	6.8	8.3	9.4
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	6.5	7.2	6.0	5.6	5.1	5.2	5.5	3.7
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)		0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	-	0.1
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	6.1	6.9	5.2	7.3	8.2

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 (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	1999	64.6	27.6	1.1	6.3	0.4	-
	2000	62.2	29.9	1.7	6.0	0.3	-
	2001	61.3	30.5	1.8	6.2	0.2	-
	2002	58.9	31.9	2.4	6.5	0.3	-
	2003	55.7	33.6	3.2	7.2	0.3	-
	2004	52.6	37.9	3.2	6.0	0.3	-
	2005	50.1	33.4	4.5	5.6	0.2	6.1
	2006	47.8	36.3	3.6	5.1	0.3	6.9
	2007	44.6	38.1	6.8	5.2	0.2	5.2
	2008	41.0	37.8	8.3	5.5	-	7.3
2009	40.4	38.1	9.4	3.7	0.1	8.2	
D I S T R I C T	1999	62.2	28.2	2.2	7.2	0.3	-
	2000	59.9	29.6	2.5	7.6	0.3	-
	2001	59.3	30.7	2.5	7.3	0.3	-
	2002	56.8	32.7	3.0	7.3	0.2	-
	2003	55.4	33.3	3.2	7.9	0.2	-
	2004	52.4	36.5	4.3	6.6	0.2	-
	2005	50.1	33.3	4.3	6.1	0.2	6.0
	2006	49.6	33.6	4.5	5.7	0.3	6.3
	2007	48.1	35.1	5.6	5.7	0.3	5.3
	2008	45.4	33.8	6.3	6.2	0.4	7.9
2009	43.6	34.4	7.3	5.9	0.2	8.6	
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	-

A T E	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truancy (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	1999	3.1	39.4	90.6	92.8	38.7	4	0.4	-	-
	2000	2.6	37.2	85.4	93.4	32.5	8	0.8	-	-
	2001	2.5	39.7	100.0	93.4	21.5	14	1.4	-	-
	2002	2.6	43.9	100.0	92.9	19.0	62	5.9	-	-
	2003	5.0	46.7	100.0	92.7	33.0	28	2.8	-	-
	2004	2.6	50.7	100.0	92.4	33.3	13	1.3	-	-
	2005	2.9	55.6	100.0	92.0	16.1	30	2.9	-	-
	2006	4.6	60.2	100.0	91.4	26.1	46	4.7	-	-
	2007	6.4	64.9	100.0	92.3	19.9	47	5.1	-	-
	2008	7.0	66.2	100.0	93.2	18.5	17	2.0	-	-
2009	6.5	62.7	100.0	93.7	15.4	4	0.5	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	1999	6.2	41.2	97.0	93.4	25.5	59	1.4	5.5	89.2
	2000	6.2	40.7	92.5	93.1	22.7	107	2.3	2.2	92.2
	2001	5.6	40.1	100.0	93.0	21.9	68	1.5	4.6	92.4
	2002	4.9	40.4	99.9	93.1	21.8	185	4.2	6.1	79.7
	2003	6.5	43.7	100.0	93.1	27.1	120	2.8	3.8	81.0
	2004	5.5	47.2	99.8	92.4	28.3	184	4.3	4.6	97.8
	2005	5.5	51.6	99.7	93.0	21.6	234	5.6	2.4	85.6
	2006	7.3	55.3	100.0	92.7	24.9	237	5.9	4.2	86.9
	2007	8.5	58.9	100.0	92.7	22.9	251	6.3	2.2	85.1
	2008	9.2	60.3	100.0	93.8	20.7	84	2.2	2.0	92.0
2009	9.8	60.8	100.0	93.8	20.3	57	1.5	0.4	92.5	
S T A T	1999	6.4	36.1	96.1	93.6	18.1	43,332	2.3	5.9	81.9
	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

E	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	-

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	998	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1,068	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,016	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	1,055	-	-	-	328	361	-
	2003	998	-	-	-	344	321	-
	2004	1,017	-	-	-	328	357	-
	2005	1,033	-	-	-	328	341	-
	2006	1,000	-	-	-	355	322	-
	2007	932	-	-	-	315	330	-
	2008	817	-	-	-	267	266	-
2009	806	-	-	-	278	251	-	
D I S T R I C T	1999	4,371	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	4,551	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	4,410	348	335	368	379	339	327
	2002	4,424	361	344	324	328	361	339
	2003	4,369	343	351	340	344	321	317
	2004	4,309	324	332	345	328	357	324
	2005	4,264	313	319	322	328	341	286
	2006	4,128	313	292	305	355	322	248
	2007	4,054	322	313	293	315	330	274
	2008	3,752	265	293	282	267	266	243
2009	3,765	334	262	287	278	251	252	
S T A T E	1999	1,962,026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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	

E	2006	2,075,277	155,155	154,372	158,822	160,362	160,911	147,500
	2007	2,077,856	155,356	153,480	154,719	162,594	159,038	150,475
	2008	2,074,167	155,578	152,895	153,347	160,039	161,310	149,710
	2009	2,070,125	156,512	152,736	152,820	155,433	158,700	144,822

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

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

Educator Data is available only for district level

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	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	355	14	39,591	37	63	16	16	-	-
	2000	359	15	40,364	38	62	16	18	-	-
	2001	366	14	40,868	40	60	15	18	-	-
	2002	359	15	44,308	38	62	16	18	-	-
	2003	356	15	46,348	38	62	16	18	0	-
	2004	330	16	49,719	35	65	17	19	-	-
	2005	317	16	50,858	38	62	17	20	1	-
	2006	329	16	51,684	40	60	16	18	1	-
	2007	326	15	53,545	42	58	15	18	3	-
	2008	337	14	52,350	44	56	14	16	2	-
2009	340	14	54,058	47	53	14	15	1	0	
S T A T E	1999	119,718	15	45,337	53	47	20	18	-	-
	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	14	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	2	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	12	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1	

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
% Meets + Exceeds																		
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark																		
% Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	69.0	63.6	69.2	78.4	-	-	61.1	68.2	73.0	72.2	70.0	63.5	67.6	76.0	74.8	75.7
White	-	-	83.1	79.2	83.6	92.8	-	-	69.5	80.5	91.4	82.7	81.5	78.7	79.1	82.5	80.2	92.5
Black	-	-	54.6	46.3	52.6	65.4	-	-	41.9	51.6	62.1	54.3	44.5	39.1	46.2	62.9	66.3	66.1
Hispanic	-	-	-	64.7	71.5	59.2	-	-	-	-	60.7	68.8	-	66.7	-	-	64.2	63.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	88.2	91.0	53.9	-	-	-	100.0	100.0	78.6	80.0	88.2	82.3	90.9	100.0	94.2	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	42.1	53.3	70.9	85.2	-	-	59.1	55.5	56.3	90.4	80.0	63.1	85.0	70.5	81.0	61.1
LEP	-	-	-	-	41.7	46.2	-	-	-	-	45.5	35.7	92.0	-	-	-	-	38.5
Students with Disabilities	-	-	25.0	18.5	22.8	50.0	-	-	24.0	24.5	42.0	45.5	27.3	23.8	33.3	30.6	31.4	46.8
Low Income	-	-	55.8	50.9	55.4	68.7	-	-	47.5	57.2	63.5	60.2	51.3	50.6	53.6	66.5	67.2	65.1

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																			
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5						
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
AYP Benchmark	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	
% Meets + Exceeds																			
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark																		
% Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	76.3	68.2	73.8	77.3	-	-	68.7	72.5	69.5	79.0	47.2	48.4	68.4	71.4	71.9	77.0
White	-	-	87.5	82.1	90.1	91.8	-	-	75.8	86.5	78.8	89.3	62.3	64.0	81.8	81.0	83.0	87.1
Black	-	-	62.5	51.0	53.5	61.6	-	-	55.9	56.2	56.1	63.1	17.6	21.0	50.0	55.3	56.4	66.0
Hispanic	-	-	-	76.4	81.0	70.4	-	-	-	-	78.6	81.3	-	44.4	-	-	85.7	72.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	94.1	100.0	77.0	-	-	-	90.9	93.3	92.8	76.9	82.4	88.9	81.8	90.0	94.1	100.0
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	65.0	60.0	66.7	81.5	-	-	54.6	57.9	68.8	90.5	20.0	38.9	70.0	58.8	61.9	83.4
LEP	-	-	-	-	66.7	75.0	-	-	-	-	72.7	68.4	60.0	-	-	-	-	60.0
Students with Disabilities	-	-	40.3	33.4	36.8	44.0	-	-	20.0	27.5	36.7	53.7	19.7	11.3	35.2	18.0	22.4	42.6
Low Income	-	-	66.0	55.7	60.4	69.3	-	-	60.0	61.7	60.4	70.4	26.9	28.0	55.0	59.7	61.1	69.4

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?*

Question 1: What do your School Report Data tell you about student performance in your school?

2009 Report Card Data show that student achievement is improving at Urbana Middle School (UMS). The percentage of students meeting or exceeding the required benchmark of 70 percent on the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) has increased across the board for all groups at all grade levels as shown in a comparative analysis.

A comparison between 2008 and 2009 data shows overall gains of 4.3 percentage points in reading and 7.3 percentage points in math. For the Reading ISAT, disaggregated data analysis of sub groups during 2008 and 2009 indicate percentage point gains of 3.2 for African-American students, 4.1 for low socioeconomic status (SES) students, 5.2 for white students, and most notably, 22.5 for individualized education plan (IEP) students. Similarly, for the Math ISAT, the data show percentage point gains of 11.8 for African-American students, 12 for SES students, 5.1 for white students, and another appreciable gain of 23.1 percentage points for IEP students. Thus, the IEP sub group moves to Safe Harbor status due to the significant gains in percentage points on the Reading and Math ISATs.

UMS exceeds the state average in attendance rate. A multi-year analysis shows notable changes in demographics within the school population. Over a seven-year span the number of white students decreased by 14.7 percent, black students increased by 4.2 percent, Hispanics increased by 5.1 percent, and low SES students increased by 19.5 percent. Interestingly, mobility data show a decrease in this category by 14.5 percent over a seven-year span.

Question 2: What areas of weakness are indicated by these data?

Disparity in achievement scores continues to be an area of weakness at UMS. A seven-year comparison of reading and math score data show evidence that the achievement gap has narrowed between white students and sub group categories. However, a significant disparity remains, especially in light of school demographics for UMS. 40 percent of the school population is white, 38.1 percent is black, 9.4 percent is Hispanic, 3.7 percent is Asian / Pacific Islander, 8.2 percent is multiracial, and .1 percent is Native American. 2009 data show that black students scored below white students on the Reading ISAT by 24.1 points and on the Math ISAT by 23.7 points.

Question 3: What areas of strengths are indicated?

A consistent trend toward improvement in student learning is clearly the course for Urbana Middle School. Students are meeting standards that exemplify world-class achievement. The most remarkable area of strength is shown in the appreciable score increases for IEP students. The IEP sub group met the Safe Harbor target by virtue of the 23.1 gain in percentage points. Data show that all groups progressed in math and reading skills. Furthermore, the high percentage in test attendance is also deemed as a strength.

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

This continuous improvement trend indicates that the rigorous practices and interventions in place at Urbana Middle School have impacted student learning profoundly across demographics. A multitude of internal and external factors can be attributed to the trend. All factors listed can be deemed as positive, with the exception of three external factors relative to population shifts.

External Factors:

- Population shifts--mobility rate remains high (18.5 percent) despite a consistent decrease in mobility over a seven-year span
- Population shifts--consistent increase in low socioeconomic status (SES) students (60.3 percent in 2008)
- Population shifts--consistent decrease in enrollment (813 in 2008)
- Reauthorization in 2004 of *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) that provides support for Response to Intervention (Rtl)
- Collaborative assistance from Regional System of Support Providers (RESPRO) for school improvement
- Collaborative assistance from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC)—Center for Education in Small Urban Communities
- Professional development opportunities provided by UIUC Center for Education in Small Urban Communities

Internal Factors:

- Ongoing professional development for reading and math
- All staff trained in Ruby Payne's *A Framework for Understanding Poverty*
- All staff trained in the application of *Creating Independence through Student-Owned Strategies* (CRISS)
- Ongoing analysis of quarterly exams during weekly early release time
- Monthly seminars on the application of differentiated instruction facilitated by UIUC Chancellor's Academy-trained UMS faculty
- Professional development workshops sponsored by the American History Teachers' Collaborative (AHTC), a federally funded American history grant
- Professional development workshops on the implementation of Professional Learning Communities (PLC) presented by RESPRO consultant, Erica Uskali, and national consultant, Eric Twadell
- Increase in thoughtful, collaborative discussions on student learning by virtue of the PLC model
- State-of-the-art technology and expert technology coordination
- Library services, collection, and programming
- Increase in the number of faculty pursuing and receiving advanced degrees

-
- Adoption of new curricula for Reading Connections, Math Connections, and Content Area Literacy
 - Implementation of commercially developed, scientifically based literacy interventions, *Language!*, *Read Naturally*, and *REWARDS* for special education (SPED) students
 - Change in service delivery model for (SPED) students
 - Inclusion of (SPED) students in regular reading and math classes
 - Improved identification of students who qualify to participate in the *Illinois Alternative Assessment (IAA)*
 - Implementation of scientifically based instructional support models: Response to Intervention (RtI), Differentiated Instruction, and Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
 - Extended learning activities, (e.g., Summer sessions: Summer Academy and Summer Achievement)
 - 21st Century Learning grant programs, Jump-Start, Students Playing and Learning after School Hours (SPLASH), Homework Lab, and Saturday Recapture
 - One-to-One Mentoring and Tutoring, America Reads and America Counts
 - Hiring of four certified teachers with interdisciplinary subject backgrounds to serve as differentiated instructional coaches
 - Teacher mentoring and peer observation initiatives
 - Spanish math and language arts classes for bilingual students
 - Use of the benchmark testing instrument, *Discovery Education Assessment*, three times during the school year to identify learning deficits in reading and math
 - Use of *AIMSWeb* prompts by SPED teachers for progress monitoring of targeted students placed in Tier II and Tier II levels of the RtI hierarchy
 - Implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)
 - Implementation of the Social Emotional Learning (SEL) standards
 - Implementation of a School Improvement Team
 - Family access to Skyward provides more opportunities for parent involvement

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

Research literature states, "Fair benchmark tests provide an accurate assessment of diverse subgroups." Specifically, the DEA benchmark tests hold authentic diagnostic value to the extent that they provide useful feedback for instructional planning for individual students and groups. A test with high diagnostic value indicates not only whether students are performing well, but also why students are performing at certain levels and what to do about it (Herman and Baker, 2005). DEA tests are designed to provide instant, detailed feedback on student performance in a format that is intended for use by teachers, parents, and students (National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 2006; Schrage and Smith, 2006).

Professional development activities constitute an integral part of the use and interpretation of formative assessment such as benchmarks tests, and other local assessments such as quarterly exams, as a means to improve student learning. Teachers recognize the need to participate in a professional dialogue within their learning communities about the value of formative testing and its impact on student learning. For example, discuss ways to focus on item analysis information from local assessments. Are there a consistent number of questions for all standards? Do growth scores reflect an accurate record of progress? Are easy, medium, and hard questions equally balanced? What are the best ways to share data with parents and students? How do teachers empower students to take ownership of their learning through information in data format?

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data

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

UMS administers the commercially developed Discovery Education Assessment (DEA), formerly *ThinkLink*, during the months of September, November, and January. DEA provides predictive benchmark data aligned with Illinois proficiency requirements as well as the IDEA RtI federal guidelines. Detailed diagnostic results are summarized for every state objective and subskill at the class and student level. Reporting categories reflect those reported for the ISAT. Reading reporting categories are *Vocabulary Development / Reading Strategies, Reading Comprehension, Literary Elements / Literary Works, Grammar, Usage and Structure, Writing Organization / Purpose, Acquire, Assess, and Communicate Information, Reading Strategies, and Variety of Literary Works*. Math reporting categories are *Number, Measurement, Algebra, Geometry, and Data Analysis and Probability*. The DEA predictive benchmark model is founded upon scientifically based research endorsed by the U.S. Department of Education (Smith, 2006).

This data analysis is based on composite scores from tests administered in September, November, and January of the 2008-2009 school year.

Question 1: What do these data tell you?

Interestingly, composite scores for math and reading tests A and B for the DEA are inconsistent, thus they do not reflect accurate growth data. Likewise, the DEA scores are inconsistent with counterpart scores on the ISAT. The ISAT scores are higher across all reporting categories. The drop in both reading and math score percentages between tests A and B for the DEA is the case in point and brings to light the need to review test implementation procedures to ensure consistent and accurate measurement. On the positive end, overall scores for reading indicate that between 58 to 81 percent of students are meeting or exceeding benchmarks. For math, scores indicate that between 82 to 91 percent of students are meeting or exceeding benchmarks.

Question 2: What areas of weakness are indicated by these data?

Inconsistency of DEA results, as reported in the diagnostic summaries, is deemed an area of weakness. A broad analysis of diagnostic summaries per grade level for tests and A and B reveals incongruity among test scores across all reporting categories. For sixth grade, *Vocabulary and Reading Strategies* scores dropped the highest percentage and *Data Analysis and Probability* scores started on the high end then dropped during test B. Seventh grade scores for *Acquire, Assess, and Communicate Information* dropped to the low end and *Measurement* scores dropped to a lesser degree. Eighth grade *Vocabulary* and *Writing Organization* scores dropped slightly, whereas *Grammar* scores dropped significantly.

Question 3: What areas of strength are apparent?

As reported under Question 1 above, overall scores for reading indicate that between 58 to 81 percent of students are meeting or exceeding benchmarks. For math, scores indicate that 82 to 91 percent of students are meeting or exceeding benchmarks. Sixth grade scores hover around 77.5 percent with the exception of *Vocabulary*. Seventh grade reading and math scores increased for the categories of *Reading Comprehension, Writing Organization, Literary Elements, Algebra, and Geometry*. Eighth grade excelled in the categories of *Reading Comprehension, Acquire, Assess, and Communicate Information, and Literary Elements*.

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

External Factors:

- Population shifts—mobility rate remains high (18.5 percent) despite a consistent decrease in mobility over a seven-year span
- Population shifts—consistent increase in low SES students (60.3 percent in 2008)
- Population shifts—consistent decrease in enrollment (813 in 2008)

Internal Factors:

- Online test format is distinctly different from traditional paper and pencil tests and presents new challenges for a sector of the school population
- Timing of test B is difficult for a sector of the population
- Developmental maturity levels are widely varied within the middle level population
- Test preparation for the DEA is inconsistent
- Teacher monitoring of the DEA is inconsistent
- Monitoring of progress toward curriculum goals is inconsistent
- Skill in the interpretation of DEA diagnostic summaries is inconsistent
- Collaborative interpretation of DEA diagnostic summaries is inconsistent

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

Research literature states, "Fair benchmark tests provide an accurate assessment of diverse subgroups." Specifically, the DEA benchmark tests hold authentic diagnostic value to the extent that they provide useful feedback for instructional planning for individual students and groups. A test with high diagnostic value indicates not only whether students are performing well, but also why students are performing at certain levels and what to do about it (Herman and Baker, 2005). DEA tests are designed to provide instant, detailed feedback on student performance in a format that is intended for use by teachers, parents, and students (National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 2006; Schrage and Smith, 2006).

Professional development activities constitute an integral part of the use and interpretation of formative assessment such as benchmarks tests, and other local assessments such as quarterly exams, as a means to improve student learning. Teachers recognize the need to participate in a professional dialogue within their learning communities about the value of formative testing and its impact on student learning. For example, discuss ways to focus on item analysis information from local assessments. Are there a consistent number of questions for all standards? Do growth scores reflect an accurate record of progress? Are easy, medium, and hard questions equally balanced? What are the best ways to share data with parents and students? How do teachers empower students to take ownership of their learning through information in data format?

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

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

Student Attributes / Challenges:

- Population shifts—mobility rate remains high (18.5 percent) despite a consistent decrease in mobility over a seven-year span
- Population shifts—consistent increase in low SES students (60.3 percent in 2008)
- Lack of parent involvement
- High number of students receiving SPED services

School Attributes / Challenges:

- Mobility of staff
- Finite resources

-
- Focus on behavioral issues takes away from instructional time
 - Limited faculty collaboration time
 - Inconsistent use of formative assessment data
 - Implementation of RtI is costly and places constraints on district's resources
 - Magnitude of work load

Proactive Attributes:

- Professional development opportunities (e.g., PLCs, differentiated instruction, RtI implementation, support for restructuring)
- Implementation of PBIS and SEL standards
- Instructional Practices Inventory (IPI)
- 21st Century Learning
- School-based health center
- Food bank
- Peer mediation
- Content area literacy curricula
- SPED service delivery model
- Mentoring and tutoring programs
- Connections and Dimensions classes
- Daily team meetings
- Variety of elective choices enhances educational opportunities
- Collaborative opportunities with the University of Illinois
- Outreach worker monitors attendance
- Parent liaisons for Latino and African-American populations
- Summer session programming
- State-of-the art technology and expert technology coordination
- Library services, collection, and programming

NCLB standards-based reform is designed to produce higher student achievement. The most controversial topic is the question of how the financial resources of a community relate to student academic achievement. Attributes and challenges are largely based in large measure on economic issues. Concerns over the strength of the economy, the incomes of parents, and the gap between standards of living for different sub groups are grounded in questions about the quality of public schools and the academic quality (Herman and Baker, 2005).

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

Economic factors are at the forefront of challenges. As stated in Section I-A, the population shifts within the Urbana School District profoundly affect student learning. UMS demographics in particular show that the percentage of low SES students has increased from 40 percent in 2000 to 60 percent in 2008. The percentage of students who are now deemed "at-risk" outnumbers those who are not based on economic indicators. Though consistently declining, the current mobility rate for UMS is 18.5 percent, slightly higher than the state average. Highly mobile student populations limit the effectiveness of curricular programs. Likewise, the increase in the percentage of low SES students has increased the number of sub groups within the UMS population. The population shift, coupled with the mobility rate, has placed unprecedented constraints on the school's finite resources in order to serve a larger at-risk population. The increase in the number of sub groups directly correlates with the disparity in achievement scores across the UMS population.

The proactive attributes are wide-ranging and contribute to the remarkable progress in student achievement as revealed in the ISAT data.

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

Section I-A, the marked and continuous improvements in student learning at Urbana Middle School are a direct result of the school-wide practice of data-driven decision-making. UMS provides high-quality learning environments that are thoughtful and engaging.

Based on the attributes and challenges listed above, UMS needs to provide varied delivery of content methods such that all students can learn meaningful content that is aligned with the Illinois Learning Standards as well as national standards delineated in the NCLB Act. UMS needs to view and analyze multiple sources of data (formative and summative assessments, attendance, discipline, et al) in order to make decisions about instruction, student learning, and progress. All UMS faculty need to learn and use the DEA diagnostic summaries consistently as universal screening tools in reading and math. UMS needs to ensure that core curriculum and interventions are supported through professional development and monitoring of implementation. Service delivery models for SPED students need to be refined in order to best meet the educational needs of students (USD 116, 2008).

Teachers are advocating for the provision of more curriculum resources and training for new teachers. In addition, an increase in the amount of staff collaboration time is necessary in order to deepen collaborative discussions, apply lesson studies and descriptive review practices, and ultimately to strengthen the PLC concept.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data

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

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

The NCLB Act launched rigorous requirements for teacher certification. UMS holds exemplary status on the number of highly qualified teachers on its faculty. Over 95% of the faculty is CRISS trained. Blogs and collaboration time help to prompt lesson plan sharing and descriptive reviews. Teachers are pursuing advanced degrees and National Board Certification more than ever before.

The *Restructuring Plan* calls for substantial changes in staffing by focusing on the need to restructure the service delivery model for special education students. This involves the creation of a department model approach to staffing special education (as opposed to team-based). This plan allows more focused direct instruction in the deficit areas of reading, math, and writing. This change will increase the efficiency of service by assigning students to teachers who specialize in certain content areas (UMS, 2009).

UMS teachers have access to a wide variety of professional development opportunities sponsored by the school district, the Regional Office of Education, and through UIUC sponsored partnerships. During the 2008-2009 school year, UMS received sixteen hours of district inservice time, seventy-one hours of building inservice time, and early release time one day per week for collaboration activities. Professional development is provided for restructuring initiatives including Rtl, differentiated instruction, and PLCs to foster teacher discussion on student achievement and instructional practices as outlined in the UMS *Restructuring Plan* (UMS, 2009).

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

All professional development activities have contributed exponentially to student performance results, as evidence shows in the 2009 ISAT data.

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

As stated in the *Restructuring Plan*, UMS will not dispose of all previous initiatives, nor will it create more initiatives, but rather put in place a sustainable system that focuses on student learning, an increase in support for students, and more provisions for measuring and monitoring accountability of teaching and learning. Professional development activities will continue along the same line, however, a deeper and more profound focus will be placed on student learning and data-driven decision-making (UMS, 2009).

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

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

Currently, a data model for documenting parent involvement does not exist. The school does routinely use parent contact initiatives such as mid-quarter progress reports, bi-annual parent conferences, Friday folders, and a provision for parent access to Skyward, a secure, web-based student data management system. Via Skyward, parents are granted access to their child's attendance, grades, and progress reports.

As part of the *Restructuring Plan*, UMS will recruit a yearly Parent Advisory Committee that will meet quarterly with the building principal and two members of the School Improvement Team. The concept behind the Parent Advisory Committee is to have a forum where a diverse group of parents can suggest ideas, voice concerns, and be an active part of the school improvement process (UMS, 2009).

On the district level, a survey of parents was conducted in November 2008. Parents perceived themselves as being "very involved" in all aspects of their child's education. Detailed results are presented in the *District Improvement Plan 2008*. Parent involvement has helped student performance throughout the district. The district attributes parent involvement with increased attendance rates and decreased drop out and truancy rates. District policy mandates that teachers notify parents when students are struggling, and the parents are invited to participate in problem solving meetings when the student needs intensive interventions. Families are notified in writing when students' schedules are modified to provide intervention services. The district employs two full time positions at UMS to act as liaisons among the community, families, and the schools. In addition, the district employs an outreach worker and community volunteer coordinator to support the positive relationships within the community. The Center for Education in Small Urban Communities at the UIUC is developing a proposal to create a family academy that will connect families with community resources (USD 116, 2008).

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

A data model does not exist at present. UMS is working with district administrators, to formulate a valid data model to measure parent involvement and respective contributions to student performance.

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

The district maintains a strong commitment to strengthening home and school partnerships both at the district and school levels as reported in this section. UMS, in collaboration with the district and the UIUC partnerships, will enact a thoughtful plan during the next two years. Effective parent involvement strategies and activities are delineated in *Section II—Action Plan*.

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?

Key factors that are within the school's capacity to change or control that have contributed to low achievement are:

- Inconsistent monitoring of progress toward curriculum goals in core and support services areas
- Inconsistent testing procedures
- Timing and duration of DEA tests
- Lack of central database for storage and retrieval of student achievement data with the capacity to correlate local assessments (e.g., DEA) to state mandated assessments
- Lack of collaboration time for deeper dialogue on student learning (e.g., understanding and use of DEA and ISAT data)

The conclusions that will drive the next steps are:

- Data-driven decision making for higher accountability
- Professional development activities that foster deeper understanding and application of restructuring initiatives (Rtl, differentiated instruction, differentiated instructional coaching, collaborative discussions via the tenets of the PLC model)
- Professional development activities that foster deeper understanding and application of DEA and ISAT data

- Professional development activities that foster deeper understanding and application of the curricula for Reading Connections, Math Connections, and Content Area Literacy
- Implementation of PBIS
- Implementation of a Parent Advisory Committee, comprised of a diverse group of parents, with the purpose of providing direct input to the school improvement process

References:

Herman, J. L., and Baker, E. L. (2005). Making Benchmark Testing Work. *Educational Leadership*, 63, 3, 48-54.

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2006). *Curriculum Focal Points for Prekindergarten through Grade 8 Mathematics: A Quest for Coherence*. Reston, VA: NCTM.

Shrago, J. B., and Smith, M. (2006). Online Assessments in the K-12 Classroom: A Formative Assessment Model for Improving Student Performance on Standardized Tests. In S. L. Howell and M. Hricko (Eds.), *Online Assessment and Measurement: Case Studies from Higher Education, K-12, and Corporate* (p. 181-194). Hershey, PA: Information Science Publishing.

Smith, M. K. (2006). *How Can a Large Scale Formative Assessment Be Research-based and Valid?* Paper presented at the CCSSO Conference, San Francisco, CA.

© 2009 Urbana Middle School Library, Urbana School District 116

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Reading	
2	Mathematics	
3	Climate and Student Learning	

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Reading

Objective 1 Description

While our current achievement in reading for grades 6,7, and 8 is 77.6% meeting/exceeding for ISAT, this group will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.

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

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

Reading

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)	
1	PREFACE: Strategies and activities listed in the Action Plan are drawn from the 2009 Content Area Literacy Curriculum for Grades Six through Eight. The curriculum provides rubrics, assessment frameworks, and correlating strategies and activities for English/Language Arts, Social Studies, Math, and Science. The overlying tenet of the curriculum is: Students will learn strategies and participate in activities designed to foster their ability to communicate effectively, think critically, and express complex ideas in all content areas: listening, speaking, reading, writing skills, and strategies. Sub categories, along with a sampling of activities, are delineated in the text boxes below.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	Students will identify key vocabulary encountered in context. Examples of activities include vocabulary discussions, word-wall, vocabulary booklets, and vernacular vocabulary books.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	Students will learn reading strategies that can be used before, during, and after reading to increase comprehension. Examples of activities include graphic organizers, Venn diagrams, and prompted writing,	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	Students will conduct research and communicate findings related to a specific topic. Examples of activities include note cards, reading logs, cause/effect organizer, and summative research project presented in a creative format such as podcast, PowerPoint, web design, comic life, iMovie, or traditional research paper.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	Students will differentiate between facts and opinions in a piece of writing. Examples of activities include small group discussions and pre and post reading entries.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
6	Students will read and summarize a piece of writing. Examples of activities include Reading Spotlight (book review bulletin board), note passing, exit cards, family Read-In night, and book clubs.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
	ENDNOTE: The IRRRC e-Plan editor allows for only one funding source per Strategy/Activity entry. Please note that UMS receives funding in the amount of \$83,800 from the 21st Century Learning grant to support					

<p>7 applicable programs including Jump-Start, SPLASH, Homework Lab, and Saturday Recapture. These programs support all Student Strategies/Activities and take place before school, after school, and during Saturday School. Also note that zero dollar amounts for Local Funds appear as "0" on the e-Plan editor, but do not transfer to the PDF format.</p>	<p>08/15/2009</p>	<p>06/30/2011</p>	<p>During School</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>83,800</p>
---	-------------------	-------------------	----------------------	--------------	---------------

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

Reading

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will participate in monthly seminars on differentiated instruction under the direction of the four instructional coaches.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	Teachers will participate in training on the interpretation and application of Discovery Education Assessment data.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
3	Teachers will participate in discussions, descriptive reviews, and lesson studies via the tenets of the Professional Learning Community (PLC) model.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
4	Teachers will participate in training on the rubrics and assessment framework of the content area literacy curriculum.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
5	New teachers will participate in training on Creating Independence through Student-owned Strategies (CRISS).	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
6	New teachers will receive top professional mentoring support	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
7	ENDNOTE: The IRRC e-Plan editor allows for only one funding source per Strategy/Activity entry. In addition to Local Funds, UMS receives applicable professional development funding from Title II in the amount of \$25,000 and from the American History Teachers' Collaborative (AHTC) in the amount of \$35,000. Also note that zero dollar amounts for Local Funds appear as "0" on the e-Plan editor, but do not transfer to the PDF format.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Other	60,000

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

Reading

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will serve on an Advisory Committee as a means to encourage parent participation in the school improvement process.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	Parents will receive outreach and parent liaison supports.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
3	Parents will be informed about school resources and initiatives via PTSA, attendance office displays, UMS library and UMS websites, blogs, and family Read-In night.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
4	Parents with limited English proficiency will have access to information about school resources and initiatives in their native languages.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Other	500
5	Parents will attend workshops to learn about school resources and initiatives, (e.g., Skyward, content area literacy, Connections, Rtl, differentiated instruction, PBIS, and assessments).	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
6	ENDNOTE: Zero dollar amounts for Local Funds appear as "0" on the IRRRC e-Plan editor, but do not transfer to the PDF format.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Reading

The School Improvement Team and the District Monitoring Team will monitor and ensure the success of this objective by analyzing the academic and behavioral data relative to school improvement initiatives as specified in this document and the 2009 *Restructuring Plan*.

	Name	Title
1	Nancy Clinton	Principal
2	Donna Oakes-Novak	Assistant Principal
3	Patrick Russell	Assistant Principal

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Mathematics

Objective 2 Description

While our current achievement in mathematics for grades 6, 7, and 8 is 79.9% meeting/exceeding for ISAT, this group will continue to meet this goal in 2010, and increase to at least 89.9% or Safe Harbor in 2011.

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

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

Mathematics

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	<p>PREFACE: Strategies and activities listed in the Action Plan are drawn from the 2009 Content Area Literacy Curriculum for Grades Six through Eight. The curriculum provides rubrics, assessment frameworks, and correlating strategies and activities for English/Language Arts, Social Studies, Math, and Science. The overlying tenet of the curriculum is: Students will learn strategies and participate in activities designed to foster their ability to communicate effectively, think critically, and express complex ideas in all content areas: listening, speaking, reading, writing skills, and strategies. Sub categories, along with a sampling of activities, are delineated in the text boxes below.</p>	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	

2	Students will identify key mathematical vocabulary encountered in context. Examples of activities include vocabulary journals, problem of the week, and word problem process notes.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	Students will learn reading strategies that can be used before, during, and after reading to increase comprehension of math related content. Examples of activities include graphic organizers, Venn diagrams, summaries, and outlines.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	Students will conduct research and communicate findings on a math related topic. Examples of activities include: note cards, reading logs, and summative research project presented in a creative format such as podcast, PowerPoint, web design, comic life, iMovie, or traditional research paper.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	Students will differentiate between facts and opinions in a piece of mathematical writing. Examples of activities include small group discussions, pre and post reading entries, group discussions, transforming, and organizing information.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
6	Students will read and summarize a piece of mathematical writing. Examples of activities include Reading Spotlight (book review bulletin board), note passing, and exit cards.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
7	ENDNOTE: The IRRC e-Plan editor allows for only one funding source per Strategy/Activity entry. Please note that UMS receives funding in the amount of \$83,800 from the 21st Century Learning grant to support applicable programs including Jump-Start, SPLASH, Homework Lab, and Saturday Recapture. Also note that these programs support all Student Strategies/Activities and take place before school, after school, and during Saturday School.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Other	83,800

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

Mathematics

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will participate in training on the rubrics and assessment framework of the content area literacy curriculum for math.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	

2	Teachers will participate in ongoing seminars on differentiated math instruction under the direction of the four instructional coaches.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
3	Teachers will participate in training on the interpretation and application of Discovery Education Assessment data relative to math benchmarks.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
4	Teachers will participate in ongoing discussions, descriptive reviews, and lesson studies via the tenets of the Professional Learning Community (PLC) model.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
5	New teachers will participate in training on Creating Independence through Student-owned Strategies (CRISS).	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
6	New teachers will receive top professional mentoring support.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
7	ENDNOTE: The IRRC e-Plan editor allows for only one funding source per Strategy/Activity entry. In addition to Local Funds, UMS also receives applicable professional development funding via Title II in the amount of \$25,000 and from the American History Teachers' Collaborative (AHTC) in the amount of \$35,000.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Other	60,000

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

Mathematics

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will serve on an Advisory Committee as a means to encourage parent participation in the school improvement process.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	Parents will receive outreach and parent liaison supports.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
3	Parents will be informed about school resources and initiatives via PTSA, attendance office displays, UMS library and UMS websites, blogs, and family Read-In night.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
4	Parents with limited English proficiency will have access to information about school resources and initiatives in their native languages.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Other	500
5	Parents will attend workshops to learn about school resources and initiatives, (e.g., Skyward, content area literacy, Connections, RtI, differentiated instruction, PBIS, and assessments).	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Mathematics

The School Improvement Team and the District Monitoring Team will monitor and ensure the success of this objective by analyzing the academic and behavioral data relative to school improvement initiatives as specified in this document and the 2009 *Restructuring Plan*.

	Name	Title
1	Nancy Clinton	Principal
2	Donna Oakes-Novak	Assistant Principal
3	Patrick Russell	Assistant Principal

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3

Climate and Student Learning

Objective 3 Description

Urbana Middle School will experience higher student academic achievement and increased student self-efficacy as a result of the use of Positive Behaviors, Interventions and Supports (PBIS). There will be decreased numbers of discipline referrals and truants, whereas the attendance rate and achievement levels will increase.

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

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

Climate and Student Learning

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will study the PBIS and Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) standards via weekly classroom instruction in all core subjects. Examples of activities include group discussions and projects that highlight the PBIS and SEL standards, (e.g., personal essay, journal writing, podcast, PowerPoint, web design, comic life, and/or iMovie).	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Other	2,200
2	Students will adhere to PBIS and SEL standards during instructional and non-instructional time at UMS. Examples of activities include school assemblies, special recognition rewards, and extra-credit projects that focus on the PBIS and SEL standards.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Other	2,200
3	Students will benefit from a school focused on student learning, as revealed over time in their academic and behavioral assessment data. Examples of activities include student access to their personal academic and behavioral data via Skyward and DEA assessments. Students will learn to interpret and reflect upon their personal data via personal essays and journal entries.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Other	2,200
4	Students will participate in after-school and extra-curricular activities at increasing rates. Examples of activities include surveys via surveymonkey.com, the 21st Century Learning programs (Jump-Start, SPLASH, and Homework Lab) and other programs such as school clubs, music, and organized sports.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Other	2,200
5	Students will feel a sense of camaraderie during instructional and non-instructional time at UMS. Examples of activities include surveys via surveymonkey.com and projects that showcase their sense of camaraderie. Projects are in the form of a personal essay, journal writing, podcast, PowerPoint, web design, comic life, and/or iMovie).	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Other	2,200

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

Climate and Student Learning

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will participate in training on the rubrics, assessment framework, and interpretation of assessment data relative to PBIS and SEL instruction.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Other	2,200
2	Teachers will participate in monthly seminars, under the direction of the four instructional coaches, with emphasis on PBIS and SEL instruction.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Other	2,200
3	Teachers will participate in ongoing discussions, lesson studies, and descriptive reviews relative to PBIS and SEL instruction via the tenets of the Professional Learning Community (PLC) model.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Other	2,200
4	New teachers will participate in training on Creating Independence through Student-owned Strategies (CRISS) with emphasis on PBIS and SEL instruction.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Other	2,200
5	New teachers will receive top professional mentoring support and opportunities for peer observations, with emphasis on PBIS and SEL instruction.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Other	2,200

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

Climate and Student Learning

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will serve on an Advisory Committee as a means to encourage parent participation in the school improvement process.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Other	2,200
2	Parents will receive outreach and parent liaison supports.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Other	2,200
3	Parents will be informed about school resources and initiatives via PTSA, attendance office displays, UMS library and UMS websites, blogs, and family Read-In night.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Other	2,200

4	Parents with limited English proficiency will have access to information about school resources and initiatives in their native languages.	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Other	500
5	Parents will attend workshops to learn about school resources and initiatives, (e.g., Skyward, content area literacy, Connections, RtI, differentiated instruction, PBIS, and assessments).	08/15/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Other	2,200

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Climate and Student Learning

The School Improvement Team and the District Monitoring Team will monitor and ensure the success of this objective by analyzing the academic and behavioral data relative to school improvement initiatives as specified in this document and the 2009 *Restructuring Plan*.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Name	Title
1	Nancy Clinton	Principal
2	Donna Oakes-Novak	Assistant Principal
3	Patrick Russell	Assistant Principal

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.*)

N/A

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.

As part of the *Restructuring Plan*, Urbana Middle School practices a new framework for decision-making. Comprised of elected representatives from each of thirteen different academic groups, the School Improvement Team (SIT) is the main decision-making body at UMS beginning in the 2009-2010 school year. The primary purpose of the SIT is to revise and evaluate school improvement initiatives. The SIT reviews task force recommendations, monitors the progress of school improvement initiatives, addresses issues brought from the Parent Advisory Committee and building administration, and develops and writes the *School Improvement Plan*.

	Name	Title
1	Nancy Clinton	Principal
2	Donna Oakes-Novak	Assistant Principal
3	Patrick Russell	Assistant Principal
4	Dionne Webster	Dean of Students
5	Angela Schoonover	Dean of Students
6	Kathleen Cearlock	Team Facilitators
7	Charles Crawmer	Social Studies
8	Melanie Ferchow	Special Education
9	Rachel Hurliman	Mathematics

10	Laura Jackson	Language Arts
11	Melissa Kearns	Science
12	Priscilla Kron	ESL and Bilingual
13	Karen Moss	Foreign Language
14	Jason Pound	Curriculum Coordinators
15	Martha Rinne	Art / Family and Consumer Science / Library / Technology
16	Bethany Schmitt	Music
17	Patrick Zimmerly	Physical Development / Health

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation
Part C. Peer Review Process

Peer Review - Describe the district's peer review and approval process. Peer review teams should include teachers and administrators from schools and districts similar to the one in improvement, but significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students. As appropriate, peer reviewers may be teachers from other schools, personnel from other districts, Regional Office of Education staff, Intermediate Service Center staff, RESPRO staff, university faculty, consultants, et al., or combinations thereof. RESPRO staff serving on a School Support Team should not serve on a peer review team in the same district. The peer review should precede the local board approval and must be completed within 45 days of receiving the school improvement plan.

For further description of the peer review process see LEA and School Improvement: Non-Regulatory Guidance, July 21, 2006, at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

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

The School Improvement Team conducts the first review. Following suggestions made and instituted, a panel of principals, teachers, Regional Office of Education staff, and RESPRO consultants conducts a Peer Review. The Urbana Middle School Administrative Team and district level administrators conduct the next review. Following suggested revisions, the plan is presented to the Board of Education.

Peer Review--September 22, 2009--ROE Schoolworks, Rantoul, IL

Urbana School District 116 Board of Education--October 6, 2009--Urbana, IL

Submission to IRRC--On or before October 18, 2009

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

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

UMS follows an ISBE approved mentoring induction program called ICE 21 (Induction for the 21st Century Educator). Mentors are selected within the building and then trained for four days in the areas of state legislation, the coaching cycle and formative assessment. All teachers new to the profession, as well as to our district, are offered and encouraged to accept a veteran teacher from UMS as a mentor. The UMS mentor-protégé relationship provides the new teacher support and professional development opportunities to chart growth within the first year of teaching. New teachers are observed three times during the year, participate in a planning and reflecting meeting with their mentors within each observation cycle and write a quarterly written reflection, which the mentors also provide a written response. In addition, the protégés are provided sub release time to observe their mentors, other veteran teachers, or even other new teachers like themselves to support growth. Although completing this program fulfills the necessary requirement for a new teacher to move from an initial to a standard teaching certificate through the ISBE, many of our teachers have chosen to participate for the support, camaraderie, and collaboration.

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.

RESPRO, district funds, and current local funds will cover the cost professional the development initiatives of the Restructuring Plan. The district provides funds, expertise, and other resources to revise and implement this School Improvement Plan. The district also conducts continual needs assessment in the forms of local assessment data, surveying principals and teachers, students and parents, and continuing to conduct reviews and revisions of district curriculum. The district pursues competitive grants to support improvement initiatives, (e.g., 21st Century Learning and American History Teachers' Collaborative (AHTC)).

Urbana Middle School, 2009 Restructuring Plan

Urbana School District 116, District Improvement Plan 2008

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

Require implementation of a new research-based curriculum of instructional program;

Extension of the school year or school day;

Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance;

Significant decrease in management authority at the school level;

Replacement of the principal;

Restructuring the internal organization of the school;

Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school.

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

Reopening the school as a public charter school, consistent with Article 27A of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/Art. 27A.);

Replacing all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school's inability to make AYP;

Entering into a contract with a private entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the school as a public school;

Implementing any other major restructuring of the school's governance that makes fundamental reform in:

governance and management, and/or

financing and material resources, and/or

staffing.

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

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

The Regional Office of Education #09 has provided technical assistance in the creation of RESPRO plans and spending of RESPRO funds at Urbana Middle School. The district utilizes regional support assistance from the PBIS support network to provide professional development and leadership for the PBIS, RtI, and SEL initiative implementation. The district receives technical and professional development assistance from the University of Illinois Center for Education in Small Urban Communities and Chancellor's Academy.

Urbana School District 116, *District Improvement Plan 2008*.

	Name	Title
1	Erica Uskali	Consultant--RESPRO--Regional Office of Education 09
2	Lizanne DeStefano	Consultant--University of Illinois College of Education
3	NOTE: RESPRO consultants from the ROE 09 are compiling an official list of academic specialists who will serve on the UMS School Support Team.	
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		

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

Yes	No	Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified? [C]
Yes	No	Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness? [C]
Yes	No	Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students? [C]
Yes	No	Does the analysis, along with other optional data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities? [C]

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Yes	No	N/A	If included, is there evidence that the SIP team analyzed optional data to clarify the areas of weakness?
Yes	No	N/A	Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?
Yes	No	N/A	Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

OTHER DATA

Yes	No	N/A	If included, has the SIP team analyzed other available data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities?
Yes	No	N/A	Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?
Yes	No	N/A	Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yes No N/A Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?

Yes No Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]

MONITORING

- Yes No Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]
- Yes No Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers? [C]

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

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

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

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

PEER REVIEW

- Yes No Is the peer review process described and is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have "the greatest likelihood" of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP? [C]

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS

- Yes No Is it clear how the school is ensuring that teachers are receiving the support needed for their professional growth and to retain them in the profession? [C]

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITES

Yes No Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]

Yes No N/A If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]

STATE 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