

Local Board Approved	10/13/2009
Submitted	10/15/2009
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	340490600262007		
District Name:	Waukegan CUSD 60	School Name:	Clearview Elem School
Superintendent:	Dr Donaldo R Batiste	Principal:	Jose Lara
District Address:	1201 N Sheridan Rd	School Address:	1700 Delaware Rd
City/State/Zip:	Waukegan,IL 60085 2081	City/State/Zip:	Waukegan,IL 60087 4622
District Telephone#:	Label 8473363100 Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	8473605467 Extn: 0
District Email:		School Email:	
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	Restructuring Implementation
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2009-10 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status Year 5

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	46.7		No	73.4		Yes	94.2			
White														
Black	98.3	Yes	98.3	Yes										
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	47.8	65.0	No	77.2		Yes	95.2			
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American													
Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	46.4	63.3	No	76.7		Yes	95.4		
Students with Disabilities	98.1	Yes	98.1	Yes	13.3	25.3	No	40.0	52.5	No	91.5		
Low Income	99.7	Yes	99.7	Yes	45.5	62.5	No	74.3		Yes	94.4		

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:	Comprehensive
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in reading?	No
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in math?	Yes

In 2008, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) was one of 6 states to be chosen by the US Department of Education to participate on the Differentiated Accountability Pilot Program. The Differentiated Accountability classification applies only to schools in federal improvement status.

The classification is a descriptor (i.e., focused or comprehensive) that is added to a school's improvement status. Current Title I requirements do not change.

The classification will assist in distinguishing between schools that need focused supports versus more comprehensive interventions.

Focused-School does not make AYP overall, but does make AYP in the "ALL" students subgroup in both reading and math.

Comprehensive-School does not make AYP overall and does not make AYP in the "ALL" students subgroup in either reading or math.

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

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

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

School Information								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	94.5	94.3	94.7	94.0	94.6	93.7	94.2	94.2
Truancy Rate (%)	3.5	4.6	5.5	5.8	5.8	7.8	6.7	8.3
Mobility Rate (%)	22.6	23.6	25.3	18.1	18.0	21.1	16.9	18.5
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	878	870	855	781	756	694	722	685
Low Income (%)	59.9	45.9	70.3	78.4	90.1	66.9	52.6	90.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	51.7	54.0	51.6	49.4	51.2	53.0	54.0	54.7
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	2.5	3.1	2.7	3.2	2.9	2.2	1.8	2.9
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	14.5	13.8	11.2	11.7	12.3	12.1	12.9	16.5
Hispanic (%)	82.2	82.5	84.9	84.1	83.5	84.1	82.3	76.5
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.7	1.0
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.1	-	0.5	0.4	0.1	-	-	0.0
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	0.1	0.5	1.2	2.4	3.1

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 4 - Student Race/Ethnicity

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	1999	7.7	24.2	67.4	0.8	-	-
	2000	6.9	18.3	73.5	1.3	-	-
	2001	4.8	15.5	78.5	1.2	-	-
	2002	2.5	14.5	82.2	0.7	0.1	-
	2003	3.1	13.8	82.5	0.6	-	-
	2004	2.7	11.2	84.9	0.7	0.5	-
	2005	3.2	11.7	84.1	0.5	0.4	0.1
	2006	2.9	12.3	83.5	0.7	0.1	0.5
	2007	2.2	12.1	84.1	0.4	-	1.2
	2008	1.8	12.9	82.3	0.7	-	2.4
2009	2.9	16.5	76.5	1.0	0	3.1	
D I S T R I C T	1999	16.6	26.9	53.8	2.7	0.1	-
	2000	15.0	26.2	56.3	2.4	0.1	-
	2001	13.4	24.7	59.4	2.4	0.1	-
	2002	11.9	23.1	62.6	2.3	0.1	-
	2003	10.6	22.1	64.9	2.3	0.1	-
	2004	9.7	20.9	67.1	2.2	0.1	-
	2005	8.9	20.6	68.0	2.0	0.1	0.3
	2006	8.2	19.4	69.5	2.1	0.1	0.8
	2007	7.2	18.3	71.0	1.8	0.1	1.5
	2008	6.9	18.0	71.6	1.6	0.1	1.8

	2009	6.2	17.9	71.8	1.6	0.1	2.4
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
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	1999	36.0	63.0	100.0	93.3	55.3	6	1.0	-	-
	2000	42.4	64.6	100.0	94.0	44.5	20	3.5	-	-
	2001	52.5	63.7	100.0	94.3	25.4	42	6.1	-	-
	2002	51.7	59.9	100.0	94.5	22.6	27	3.5	-	-
	2003	54.0	45.9	100.0	94.3	23.6	36	4.6	-	-
	2004	51.6	70.3	100.0	94.7	25.3	42	5.5	-	-
	2005	49.4	78.4	100.0	94.0	18.1	45	5.8	-	-
	2006	51.2	90.1	100.0	94.6	18.0	44	5.8	-	-
	2007	53.0	66.9	100.0	93.7	21.1	54	7.8	-	-
	2008	54.0	52.6	100.0	94.2	16.9	46	6.7	-	-
2009	54.7	90.4	100.0	94.2	18.5	57	8.3	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	1999	22.3	53.8	100.0	90.9	36.0	1,633	13.2	10.2	81.6
	2000	19.7	56.4	100.0	92.2	33.0	1,656	13.1	2.0	74.6
	2001	24.4	56.6	96.6	92.1	19.6	2,017	14.3	7.5	69.0
	2002	23.9	54.8	95.8	91.9	20.4	1,585	10.9	4.9	100.0
	2003	25.9	54.0	98.6	92.3	17.3	1,501	10.4	6.5	61.0
	2004	23.4	58.1	100.0	92.7	18.2	1,257	8.6	4.2	83.6
	2005	23.9	62.2	99.1	92.4	17.0	1,674	11.4	4.6	86.8
	2006	23.3	71.2	99.7	92.5	18.6	1,822	12.6	3.4	66.4
	2007	30.5	57.4	99.3	91.5	20.5	1,218	7.8	6.5	69.6
2008	31.6	42.9	99.3	91.1	18.3	1,577	10.1	6.4	66.8	

	2009	31.0	73.9	96.6	91.8	17.6	1,306	8.3	7.6	71.4
S T A T E	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
	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	625	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	627	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	753	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	878	141	116	116	-	-	-
	2003	870	143	91	116	-	-	-
	2004	855	156	118	87	-	-	-
	2005	781	178	181	107	-	-	-
	2006	756	153	177	170	-	-	-
	2007	694	123	143	169	-	-	-
	2008	722	130	139	137	-	-	-
	2009	685	163	100	126	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	1999	13,655	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	14,391	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	14,972	1,338	1,289	1,269	1,119	1,044	705
	2002	15,713	1,383	1,375	1,342	1,144	1,094	852
	2003	15,482	1,434	1,328	1,269	1,207	1,094	811
	2004	15,758	1,418	1,376	1,320	1,226	1,157	857
	2005	15,176	1,358	1,385	1,354	1,184	1,198	863
	2006	14,819	1,273	1,331	1,389	1,231	1,129	869
	2007	16,224	1,344	1,287	1,312	1,231	1,206	902
	2008	16,185	1,421	1,310	1,257	1,344	1,187	1,004
	2009	16,007	1,336	1,328	1,290	1,224	1,283	834

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

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

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

Educator Data is available only for district level

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	1999	660	14	42,585	53	47	26	27	-	-
	2000	845	12	42,324	58	42	22	21	-	-
	2001	890	12	44,578	57	43	22	21	-	-
	2002	855	12	45,805	58	42	24	22	8	6
	2003	844	12	46,591	57	42	23	22	8	14
	2004	874	12	48,737	57	43	22	24	9	8
	2005	903	11	49,607	61	39	22	22	6	9
	2006	916	11	50,765	57	42	20	22	5	2
	2007	941	11	51,657	54	46	21	22	5	4
	2008	975	11	54,145	50	50	20	22	4	4
2009	1,064	11	54,785	49	51	18	20	4	4	
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 % 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	36.9	42.1	42.8	40.0	62.3	42.7	-	-	56.5	56.9	59.4	41.9	32.8	49.0	35.9	47.2	47.5	50.4
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	27.2	27.2	42.9	33.3	37.5	18.1	-	-	40.7	39.1	27.3	43.5	23.5	28.5	19.0	25.0	47.1	-
Hispanic	37.0	47.4	50.0	38.5	68.1	45.0	-	-	62.4	70.8	63.3	43.3	34.7	54.7	39.7	51.8	48.4	50.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	71.4	37.5	-	-	-	-	60.2	25.9	-	-	-	-	31.7	29.0
Students with Disabilities	0.0	5.6	0.0	-	23.8	-	-	-	23.5	17.6	30.8	0.0	-	13.6	8.7	0.0	13.0	6.7
Low Income	40.7	40.0	42.8	41.9	62.3	43.2	-	-	53.7	54.2	57.9	36.5	31.5	47.1	37.1	44.1	47.4	48.7

	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
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	54.6	62.3	71.9	48.6	81.2	66.5	-	-	86.1	72.2	79.7	70.4	71.4	54.0	70.9	80.5	73.8	74.2
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	21.7	30.3	61.9	26.7	50.0	27.2	-	-	63.0	62.5	45.5	56.5	52.9	28.6	47.6	50.0	58.8	-
Hispanic	71.7	76.3	78.8	69.2	91.3	72.1	-	-	95.3	84.0	82.9	75.4	79.6	61.3	76.9	87.9	76.6	76.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	89.7	68.8	-	-	-	-	85.2	65.6	-	-	-	-	69.6	68.1
Students with Disabilities	33.3	22.2	26.7	-	52.4	-	-	-	53.0	35.0	30.8	33.3	-	13.6	47.8	26.7	56.5	33.3
Low Income	56.7	62.0	71.9	48.4	81.1	67.8	-	-	84.9	70.6	78.9	68.4	74.1	53.0	69.7	79.6	74.1	74.1

	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Data - What do the School Report Card data tell you about student performance in your school? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are indicated?

A careful analysis of our student data trends from recent school report cards was conducted by the Clearview Building Leadership Team, and the following points were noted as we analyzed data trends:

In 2009, Clearview did not make AYP in Reading (All - 46.7%, Hispanic - 47.8%, LEP - 46.4%, IEP students - 13.3%, and economically disadvantaged - 45.5%). Although our “All” subgroup met AYP in Math at 73.4%, our IEP subgroup did not meet the safe harbor target, scoring at 40%. All other subgroups met targets in Math during 2009.

Our reading performance for the “all” subgroup decreased from 59% to 47% from 2008 to 2009.

Clearview ISAT READING 2009 Item Analysis Summary - % Meet or Exceeds

READING	3 rd School	3 rd District	4 th School	4 th District	5 th School	5 th District
Vocabulary Development	51%	55%	53%	59%	54%	61%
Reading Strategies	51%	54%	57%	64%	46%	53%
Reading Comprehension	49%	50%	49%	55%	56%	61%
Literature	49%	53%	47%	55%	53%	61%

Our Reading ISAT performance shows weaknesses in all areas. In 3rd and 4th grade the lowest areas of weakness are Reading Comprehension and Literature. In 5th grade, the lowest areas are Reading Strategies and Literature.

Clearview ISAT MATH 2009 Item Analysis Summary- % Meets or Exceeds

Math	3 rd School	3 rd District	4 th School	4 th District	5 th School	5 th District
------	------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

Number Sense	56%	59%	51%	57%	44%	51%
Measurement	62%	64%	46%	51%	47%	52%
Algebra	71%	73%	65%	75%	58%	64%
Geometry	58%	60%	60%	62%	69%	66%
Data Analysis , Statistics, and Probability	66%	63%	58%	63%	54%	57%

Although our “All” subgroup met AYP in Math at 73.4%, our IEP subgroup did not meet the safe harbor target, scoring at 40%. All other subgroups met targets in Math during 2009.

Our students with disabilities showed the lowest percentage of proficiency and remains at risk for not meeting AYP in the future. The lowest area of weakness in 3rd and 5th grade is Number Sense. In 4th grade the area of weakness is measurement.

All groups are at risk of not meeting AYP due to targets rising above 77%.

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

Professional development activities have targeted best practices for instruction of students, and this has resulted in positive growth in math the past several years. Factors that may be contributing to low achievement for the special education and LEP subgroups are:

54% of our students are Limited English Proficient, but required to take ISAT in English

- Lack of appropriate interventions for bilingual students
- High student mobility rate

- Lack of specialized instructional interventions to target students with more complex disabilities
- The need for more strategies to differentiate instruction in the regular classroom for students with special needs
- Scheduling needs have sometimes conflicted with time needed for specialized individual instruction with students who lack a foundation in academic skill, i.e., insufficient time allocated for students with the most intensive needs
- Lack of consistency of implementing curriculum across teachers and grade levels
- 70% of our students receive free or reduced lunch

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

Conclusions regarding Reading

Need to create common assessments for reading that are aligned to the Illinois Frameworks

Need an increase in reading nonfiction material along with explicitly teaching one comprehension strategy per month

Need to consistently teach Academic Vocabulary

We need to continue to identify and use research supported programs for tier 2 (e.g., Voyageur, Corrective Reading, Read 180) for the lowest 11-25% of our students who need **additional teaching time beyond core instruction.**

Need interventionists to teach Tier 3 students, scoring below the 10th percentile (e.g., Language! Reading Mastery)

Need to continue to ensure faithful implementation of the core reading instructional program.

Continue professional development in SRA Open Court that includes more modeling and coaching the teachers in need

Use local assessment tool, NWEA-MAP, to identify students' and their needs, focusing mostly on reading comprehension, vocabulary, and literature.

Teachers need to continue to consistently implement guided reading in each classroom. A monitoring tool will help ensure fidelity.

Conclusions Regarding Math:

Need to provide professional development for Special Education instruction in math

Need to focus on number sense and measurement in math instruction

Continue to implement Scott Foresman math series with fidelity

Creating common pre- and post-assessments at all grade levels

Based on current MAP data, students who need more explicit instruction will participate in differentiated instruction during math centers

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?

Clearview uses the DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency probes as a general outcome measure for Reading performance. These measures are administered three times during the school year. Results are then reviewed by grade level teams as part of our universal screening for reading. The following data summarizes student performance using AIMSWEB aggregate norms.

In Kindergarten, the current 2009 fall data on letter naming fluency and initial sounds show that 78% of our students are below target.

In first grade, the current 2009 fall data for letter naming fluency shows that 83% are below target. The data for phoneme segmentation shows that 72% are below target. The

data for nonsense word fluency shows that 76% of the first graders are below target.

In second and third grade, the current 2009 fall data for DIBELS oral reading fluency shows that 61% are below the fall benchmark.

In fourth grade, the current 2009 fall data for DIBELS oral reading fluency shows that 64% of fourth graders are below the fall benchmark.

In fifth grade, the current 2009 fall data for DIBELS oral reading fluency shows that 72% of fifth graders are below the fall benchmark.

The NWEA MAP Assessments system is administered to students in 3rd through 5th grade three times per year in order to provide on-going data on Reading and Math achievement.

The following data summarizes percentages of students meeting or exceeding in reading according to their Fall 2009 MAP RIT scores. These scores are a predictor for meeting standards on the upcoming ISAT.

NWEA MAP Reading	3 rd	4 th	5 th
Word Analysis Vocabulary	16%	22%	31%
Reading Strategies/Comprehension	19%	21%	23%
Literature	21%	24%	38%
Literary Works	21%	23%	33%

These current scores are a predictor of ISAT performance. Based on these scores, we have significant deficits in the area of reading and will focus on all reading strategies.

The following data summarizes percentages of students meeting or exceeding in math according to their Fall 2009 MAP RIT scores. These scores are a predictor for meeting standards on the upcoming ISAT.

NWEA MAP Math	3 rd	4 th	5 th
Number Sense	26%	32%	23%
Algebra	33%	37%	16%
Geometry	36%	51%	38%

Measurement	23%	43%	34%
Data Analysis & Probability	27%	27%	22%

These current scores are a predictor of ISAT Math performance. Based on these scores, we have significant deficits in the area of math. We will focus on all areas in Math.

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

- Inconsistency with implementing core reading curriculum
- Inconsistent use of supplemental reading instructional methods at Tier 1
- Lack of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventionists

MAP Test

- Students often aren't familiar with format of MAP
- High percentage of students performing below grade level
- Difficult questioning methods

DIBELS

- Lack of supplemental teaching of fluency
- Lack of opportunity to provide independent reading during the day
- Students have weak phonemic awareness and phonics skills

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

- Future school improvement efforts will be focused on reading comprehension, literature, and vocabulary.
- Teachers need to increase opportunities for reading during class (choral, guided, poetry, rereading, independent level, workshop)
- There is a need to dedicate grade level team time to analyzing MAP and DIBELS data to determine students or groups who need supplemental instruction or more intensive intervention
- Grade level team topics need to be focused
- Common assessments need to be developed and implemented across grade levels
- More nonfiction reading across all grade levels, making sure to teach a strategy a month
- Early identification and intervention for students who are not meeting grade level expectations
- Allow for at least 30 minutes of intervention time daily (guided reading, workshop, etc)
- In math, we will focus on number sense and measurement
- Use supplementary materials to explicitly teach math concepts to special needs students

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?*

Attributes: Our "All" subgroup met AYP in Math at 74.3%, however our IEP subgroup did not meet the safe harbor target, scoring at 40%. All other subgroups met targets in Math during 2009.

Challenges: 54% of our students have limited English proficiency. This often requires a higher degree of differentiation in the classroom. According to Fall 2009 NWEA MAP scores, the mean RIT score for 3rd grade is 176.8 compared to the target of 192. In 4th grade the mean RIT score is 188.1 compared to the target of 200. In 5th grade the mean RIT score is 193 compared to the target of 207. In grades K, 1, and 2, our Fall DIBELS data of 2009 shows that: In Kindergarten 78% are below target in letter naming fluency and 78% are below target in initial sounds fluency. In 1st grade, 72% are below target in phoneme segmentation fluency, 83% are below target in letter naming fluency, and 76% are below target in nonsense word fluency. In 2nd grade, 61% are below target in oral reading fluency. After looking at the data we know our staff and students need support in implementation of targeted and intensive instruction.

With our Special Education subgroup, the AYP results were significantly low and the students did not meet the safe harbor target. There is also a need for highly qualified Tier 3 interventionists to address the bottom 10% (intensive) students.

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

After assessing the needs of students, teachers find that it is often necessary to teach skills which are below grade level expectations while still striving to meet state standards. Due to the challenges outlined above, many students show skill loss over the summer months or after extended school vacations, and this requires specialized instructional approaches with a high level of professional development for all staff.

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

Although teachers continue to be involved in on-going professional development activities, this will continue to be necessary to increase our repertoire of instructional interventions to ensure success for all students at all tiers, especially students with disabilities and LEP students.

The Building Leadership Team will review the performance data for new students at Clearview. Our school improvement action plan strategies will also be reviewed in light of this data to ensure that strategies selected are addressing the needs of our student population.

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?*

Clearview has 41 highly qualified staff members. One staff member is not highly qualified, but is currently working towards completing her certification. Overall, 98% of our staff is

highly qualified. Over 50% of teachers have education beyond their Bachelors.

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

There is a high mobility of teachers within and across grade levels. Because of this, teachers need to implement new curriculums. It is difficult to provide effective instruction when the mobility is so high.

During the past five years, the number of teachers who are highly qualified has increased significantly, which corresponds to the increase in student overall MAP and DIBELS scores from Fall to Spring of 2008-2009.

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

Current teacher qualifications lead to the conclusion that Clearview must focus on continuing to provide coaching for teachers in the core curriculum and guided reading and provide coaching to grade level teams.

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

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

In the past, Clearview has had low parental involvement due to students not attending their neighborhood schools. Beginning with the 2009-10 school year, Clearview students will be attending their neighborhood school. There will be more opportunity for parent involvement.

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

Increasing parent involvement will result in greater interaction between family and school activities. There will be more opportunity for parents to promote a better home/school relationship.

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

Clearview will conduct Title I Parent Information and Training Sessions and Family Reading Nights with a focus on teaching parents reading strategies.

Using Accelerated Reader as a motivational tool, students will engage in reading at home for 20-30 minutes a day. Parents will monitor reading and sign reading logs daily.

Parent/Teacher conferences will be conducted.

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 for Reading

Need to create common assessments for reading that are aligned to the Illinois Frameworks

Need an increase in reading nonfiction material along with explicitly teaching one comprehension strategy per month

Need to consistently teach Academic Vocabulary

We need to continue to identify Tier 2 students and use research supported programs (e.g., Voyageur, Corrective Reading, Read 180) in the 11-24.9%.

Need interventionists and curriculum to teach Tier 3 students, scoring below the 10th percentile (e.g., Language! Reading Mastery)

Need to continue to ensure implementation of the core reading instructional program with fidelity.

Provide ongoing professional development in SRA Open Court

Use local assessment tools, NWEA-MAP and DIBELS, to identify students' and their needs, focusing mostly on reading comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, and literature.

Teachers need to continue to consistently implement guided reading in each classroom. A monitoring tool will help ensure fidelity.

Next Steps for Reading

Create common reading assessments targeting reading strategies

Implement a reading strategy per month with an emphasis of nonfiction text

Teach and assess Academic Vocabulary

Ongoing progress monitoring of Tier 2 students every other week

Ongoing progress monitoring of Tier 3 students every week

Administrative walkthrough of core reading instructional program

Provide ongoing professional development in SRA with follow up support

Identify students after benchmarking to monitor growth

Administrative walk through of guided reading instruction

Key Factors for Math

Need to provide professional development for Special Education instruction in math

Need to focus on number sense and measurement in math instruction

Continue to implement Scott Foresman math series with fidelity

Creating common pre- and post-assessments at all grade levels

Based on current MAP data, students who need more explicit instruction will participate in differentiated instruction during math centers

Next Steps for Math

Provide ongoing professional development support for special education math instruction

Implement Fastt Math







Use Scott Foresman math series and supplementary materials to reteach math skills

Professional development in math centers

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	In reading, all subgroups will increase by at least 10% or meet safe harbor requirements.	1,2,3,4,6,
2	In math, all subgroups, including IEP students, will increase by at least 10% or meet safe harbor requirements.	5,
3	The Building Leadership Team will restructure to improve decision making processes.	1,2,3,4,6,5,

The following deficiencies have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for your school.

-  1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
-  2. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
-  3. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
-  4. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
-  5. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
-  6. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives**Objective 1**

In reading, all subgroups will increase by at least 10% or meet safe harbor requirements.

Objective 1 Description

While 46.7% of our students met AYP in Reading for 2009 (48% of Hispanic, 46% of LEP students, 13% of IEP students, and 46% of low income students) our objective is for all students to increase their score by no less than 10% and/or meet safe harbor requirements in 2010 and 2011.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- ⓑ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 2. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 3. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 4. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 5. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 6. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

In reading, all subgroups will increase by at least 10% or meet safe harbor requirements.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will be taught Reading using the Open Court Reading Program as a viable research-based program to meet the needs of all students	09/01/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	Teachers will meet with guided reading groups for 30-40 minutes daily and differentiate their reading instruction.	10/01/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	In order to assess reading progress on a regular basis, students will participate in assessments using Oral Reading Fluency, and MAP (3-5).	09/01/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	Using benchmark and progress data, students performing in the 10th to 25th percentile will be matched with tier 2 interventions (Voyager Reading, Corrective Reading (3-5), Read 180 (4-5) to focus on word analysis, fluency, and comprehension and be progress monitored biweekly	09/01/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Title I	
5	Using benchmark and progress monitoring data, students performing below the 10th percentile will be matched with intensive tier 3 interventions (Reading Mastery, Language!) to focus on word analysis, fluency, and comprehension and be progress monitored weekly	10/01/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Title I	
6	Students will be taught vocabulary using the Marzano 6 step academic vocabulary program using curriculum words identified at each grade level. In addition, students will maintain vocabulary notebooks containing words that have been taught.	10/01/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
7	Economically disadvantaged students will attend the SES after Tutoring Program	09/01/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	
8	Students will be explicitly taught one comprehension strategy per month	10/01/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

In reading, all subgroups will increase by at least 10% or meet safe harbor requirements.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Grade level teams will review and analyze Reading benchmark data (Oral Reading Fluency, and MAP Scores) in the fall, winter and spring in order to plan instructional changes for struggling students and to determine students who need tier 2 or 3 Reading intervention.	09/14/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	Grade level teams will review the 6 Step Academic Vocabulary Program at least 3 times per year in order to ensure consistency with instruction and procedures for managing student vocabulary notebooks in Reading.	10/01/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	
3	RtI external coach will provide professional development on how to analyze benchmark data (AIMSWEB, MAP) in the fall, winter and spring.	09/21/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	
4	RtI external coach will provide staff development on tier 2 and 3 interventions and instruction to review procedures for frequent progress monitoring students receiving interventions.	09/28/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	Based on data results from benchmark assessment and progress monitoring, the Building Leadership Team will identify professional development needs in Reading.	09/28/2009	06/03/2011	Before School	Title I	
6	Classroom teachers will receive coaching and training in SRA Open Court, Guided Reading, and monthly comprehension strategies.	09/22/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	

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

In reading, all subgroups will increase by at least 10% or meet safe harbor requirements.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Clearview Elementary will hold at least two Title I Parent Reading Nights in order to increase literacy support in the home setting.	10/26/2009	04/01/2011	After School	Title I	
2	One Family Reading Night will be held each year (for both parents and children) to teach reading strategies.	11/19/2009	11/17/2011	After School	Title I	
3	Parents will monitor daily reading and sign student reading logs.	09/01/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Other	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

In reading, all subgroups will increase by at least 10% or meet safe harbor requirements.

Clearview administrative staff and the RTI internal coach will be responsible for collecting and documenting progress towards achieving this goal through the following artifacts and data:

- Walkthrough forms and identified areas of need
- pre and post test results for students
- rubric used to conduct integrity checks of classroom, targeted and intensive interventions
- review the percentage of students at each grade level meeting ISAT standards as predicted on NWEA MAP for fall, winter, and spring
- review the percentage of students at each grade level meeting ISAT standards cut offs on AIMSWEB fall, winter, and spring benchmark assesments

	Name	Title
1	Jose Lara	Principal
2	Carol May	Assistant Principal
3	Kathy Meyer	Read 180 teacher
4	Katherine Notargiovanni	EAS teacher

5	Eufemia Rodriguez	5th grade teacher
6	Sofia Garcia	4th grade teacher
7	Alisa Van Blake	1st grade teacher
8	Leslie Barbre	Curriculum Specialist
9	Min Owens	RTI coach
10	Amy Welton	Special Education teacher
11	JoAnne Lewis	Title 1

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

In math, all subgroups, including IEP students, will increase by at least 10% or meet safe harbor requirements.

Objective 2 Description

While 73.4% of our students met AYP in Math in 2009, only 40% of IEP students made AYP. Considering the new population and current 2009 fall MAP results, our objective is for all students (including students with disabilities) to increase by 10% or meet safe harbor requirements.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- Ⓔ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 2. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 3. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 4. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓕ 5. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 6. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

In math, all subgroups, including IEP students, will increase by at least 10% or meet safe harbor requirements.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will participate in pre-assessments prior to Math units in order to design instructional groups based on need	10/01/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	Students will be taught at each grade level using common instructional units and assessments developed at each grade level in a pre-determined sequence.	09/01/2009	06/03/2011	Before School	Title I	
3	Students will receive instruction using visual models and manipulatives in order to increase conceptual understanding (including number sense) in mathematics, and meet the needs of IEP students.	10/01/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	Students will continue using Math Vocabulary Journals in order to increase vocabulary and background knowledge for understanding Math concepts. Students will be encouraged to utilize "Math Talk" to apply the concepts.	10/01/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	IEP students will use Fastt Math computer program to address their needs in computation and number sense.	10/01/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
6	Using the Scott Foresman math series, students will be taught the math curriculum aligned with state standards.	09/01/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

In math, all subgroups, including IEP students, will increase by at least 10% or meet safe harbor requirements.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will receive training in Fastt Math, strategies, and activities for teaching number sense.	01/01/2010	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	Each grade level team will develop common instructional units and matching assessments using a pre-determined sequence.	10/01/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	Teachers will participate in training sessions on the use of manipulatives and visual representation in order to effectively teach math concepts and problem-solving skills.	11/02/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	
4	Teachers will participate in professional development in Scott Foresman math series	11/02/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	
5	Grade level teams will use meeting times to maintain consistent implementation of the Academic Vocabulary instruction and the use of student vocabulary notebooks for Math	09/28/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

In math, all subgroups, including IEP students, will increase by at least 10% or meet safe harbor requirements.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Clearview Elementary will hold Math and Science Night (community business partnership) to provide hands-on experience and demonstration of real-life Math and Science applications.	01/04/2010	04/22/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	Clearview will hold at least one Family Math Night to help parents understand the essential Math skills and ways they can support	01/04/2010	04/29/2011	After School	Local Funds	

reinforce Math instruction at home.					
-------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

In math, all subgroups, including IEP students, will increase by at least 10% or meet safe harbor requirements.

In order to ensure sufficient progress on the Math strategies in our school improvement team, the following procedures will be implemented:

- The Building Leadership Team will review and analyze the percentage of students by grade level who are meeting ISAT targets on the MAP assessment (3-5), following each assessment period (fall and spring). These data will be summarized and reviewed at grade level team meetings.
- As each grade level team completes an outline of the Math units, sequence of instruction and common assessments to be used, copies will be provided to the Principal. Progress on this strategy will be reviewed periodically by the Building Leadership Team.
- The Building Leadership Team will collect data in January and April on the percentage of teachers who are implementing one problem per week using the 8 Step Model Drawing Procedure (2009-10).
- The Building Leadership Team will collect data in November, January and April on the percentage of teachers who are implementing the 8 Step Model Drawing Procedure into Math lessons on a daily basis (2010-11).

The Building Leadership Team will collect data on the percentage of students by grade level who are passing Math unit assessments as designed by grade level teams (fall, winter and spring).

	Name	Title
1	Jose Lara	Principal
2	Carol May	Assistant Principal

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives**Objective 3**

The Building Leadership Team will restructure to improve decision making processes.

Objective 3 Description

While currently 47% of our students are making AYP in Reading and 73% in Math, our objective is for all students, including subgroups, to gain 10% in all areas in 2010 and 2011.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- ↳ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ↳ 2. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ↳ 3. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ↳ 4. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ↳ 5. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ↳ 6. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

The Building Leadership Team will restructure to improve decision making processes.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Building Leadership Team will consist of 10 highly qualified tenured teachers.	09/01/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	The curriculum specialist and RTI coach were added to the Building Leadership Team.	09/01/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	
3	The Building Leadership Team will coordinate data collection, communicate results to the staff, and support implementation of necessary adjustments to curriculum instruction.	09/01/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	

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

The Building Leadership Team will restructure to improve decision making processes.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	The Building Leadership will work with RESPRO and/or district curriculum and Rtl coaches to provide targeted professional development to support strategies outlined for Reading, Math and Academic Vocabulary.	09/01/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	A representative from the Building Leadership Team will participate on the District Oversight Committee which meets on a monthly basis to facilitate reform strategies between Clearview and Waukegan District.			Before School	Title I	

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

The Building Leadership Team will restructure to improve decision making processes.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Clearview will involve parents with the Building Leadership Team process through both membership and strategic communication.	01/04/2010	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	Community liaison - A spokesperson from the Building Leadership Team will communicate with and educate students, parents and community stakeholders regarding the school improvement process at Clearview. This may be through face to face meetings, newsletters, and/or web publishing.	01/04/2010	06/03/2011	After School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

The Building Leadership Team will restructure to improve decision making processes.

Waukegan District will monitor the implementation of the restructuring plan at Clearview. A district oversight committee will meet on a regular basis (monthly) to coordinate school improvement and district improvement initiatives. The District Oversight Committee will also hear progress reports from each restructuring school team to ensure that support and resources are provided for implementation of strategies.

Building Leadership and grade level teams will monitor academic progress with frequent local assessments and reading and writing CBMs as well as other progress monitoring data. Student data on AIMSWEB, MAP and common assessments will be reviewed in Math and Reading to identify professional development activities needed. Feedback will be processed through the building leadership structure. Each grade level team agenda will invite issues to be considered by the Building Leadership Team.

	Name	Title
1	Jose Lara	Principal
2	Carol May	Assistant Principal
3	Kathy Meyer	Read 180 teacher
4	Katherine Notargiovanni	EAS teacher

5	Sofia Garcia	4th grade teacher
6	Eufemia Rodriguez	5th grade teacher
7	Alisa Van Blake	1st grade teacher
8	Amy Welton	Special Education teacher
9	Lesley Barbre	Curriculum Specialist
10	Min Owens	RTI Coach
11	JoAnne Lewis	Title 1 Teacher
12		

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part A. Parent Notification*

This section describes how the plan has been developed and reviewed and identifies the support in place to ensure implementation.

Parent Notification - Describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand. (**Requirement for Title I Schools only.*)

All NCLB status notifications are sent via the district office of school improvement. CHOICE, SES, Corrective Action and Restructuring notices are first approved through the Illinois State Board of Education, translated into Spanish and sent to all appropriate students and families per the timeline set by our Illinois Board of Education in accordance with No Child Left Behind legislation. These letters and required information and response forms are sent via the U.S. postal service.

AMAO reports when applicable are sent to parents through the district English Language Learner Department.

Parents are also provided a letter of notification when the state report cards become available and posted on our district web site. This letter is sent home with each child from their school in English and Spanish.

Title One notice of service letter and the student/ parent/ teacher learning compacts, using the templates provided by the Illinois Board of Education are sent home via the Title One teacher at each of our K-8 schools participating in the Title One regular program.(in English and Spanish)

Parent Right to Know letters regarding Highly Qualified status are mailed to parents through our district human resource office in English and Spanish.

Our school also provides additional notification of instructional reform efforts through our newsletters, school web site, and individual teacher correspondence with our parents in English and Spanish.

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.

This school improvement plan was developed through a collaborative process which included the Clearview Building Leadership Team, the Clearview Principal and Assistant Principal, and a RESPRO consultant from the Lake County Regional Office. Meetings were held from May 12, 2009 through August, 2009 in order to review data, study best practice, and update school improvement planning based on identified needs of students at Clearview Elementary. The Clearview School Improvement Plan will be presented to faculty and the school community during the first two weeks of September, 2009. The Clearview Parent-Teacher Organization will also receive a copy of the plan.

	Name	Title
1	Jose Lara	Principal
2	Carol May	Assistant Principal
3	JoAnne Lewis	Title 1
4	Sofia Garcia	4th grade
5	Eufemia Rodriguez	5th grade
6	Alisa Van Blake	1st grade
7	Katherine Notargiovanni	EAS
8	Kathy Meyer	Read 180
9	Amy Welton	Special Education
10	Min Owens	RTI Coach
11	Lesley Barbre	Curriculum Specialist
12	Tom Dempsey	RESPRO coach

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.

Each School Improvement/ Building Leadership Team should score their plan using the most current rubric before submitting the plan to the district external review process. Each SIP/ BLT team has been instructed to use both the most current version of the rubric and appropriate SIP template to guide the revision process, in hopes that all required data will be included before submission for evaluation.

All 20 District School Improvement Plans will be scored by an external peer review committee, plans are returned for corrections, then each plan is presented to the Waukegan Board of Education for their approval with 45 days of plan submission. Each review team will be comprised of not fewer than three members with administration, teacher and special program representation when subgroups issues or content issues are present, who will first be trained on use of the scoring rubric. Then each member independently scores each plan assigned. Then as a team they will come to consensus and complete the final score sheet for each plan reviewed. No team members will score their own SIP plan. The score sheets must have both score and comments to guide improvement for each plan scored. It is important that the internal teams use the new state rubric and score their plan to make sure that the plan being submitted to the district office and the ROE is an approvable plan—scoring a minimum of pass (yes) in each of the State Compliance categories and in the Local Compliance categories. If the NCLB Status school plans do not have passing scores after the district review, the plans must be corrected, and then be re-scored by an expert panel prior to submission to our local board of education. All district schools will house a local board of education approvable plan on the IIRC website. Schools who are in NCLB or State status will also submit their plan once approved by our local board of education via the IIRC website for the system of support monitoring.

The peer review process is conducted as a workshop, for the 2009-2011 SIP plan submission it will take place on September 18, 2009 and the teams score section by section following opportunity for clarification as to intent and district as well as state requirements in each section. The district is thus proposing the following two-year cycle for district level SIP review, which will be funded through Title One. During the 2009-2010 school year, 10 district schools were identified as needing to submit due to AYP data and

status changes. Schools newly added to the CHOICE status will submit a two-year plan, written to align to the most current rubric, including interventions that address the subject area or subgroup not meeting AYP. Schools who have state approved plans that are not due to expire, and added to the SES status, will revise the approved plan to include new test data, SES service targeted at the subgroup and /or subject area still not meeting AYP and will submit either to the ROE or ISBE based on directions provided by the Illinois State Board of Education. Schools that have been newly added to the Corrective Action NCLB status will re-write under the guidance of the district a one year plan aligned to the most current the rubric, include SES services to identified sub groups/ subject areas and the corrective action or restructuring determined after a meeting with District Administration beginning in 2008- 2009. All schools identified for Restructuring I begin the process of working with the District Restructuring Oversight Committee in development of their restructuring plan. All schools whether on or off the NCLB status will re-write their School Improvement Plan aligned to the most current rubric once their plan expires. These plans will be subject to local peer review and presented and approved by the Board of Education. The next step in the process will be determined by their AYP status. If the plan submission is required by the Illinois State Board of Education, it is then sent electronically via the IIRC website. NCLB entitlement funds will be budgeted to support the peer review process.

Whether a year for new plans or not, each SIP/ BLT team must revisit their SIP plan each June through August. The SIP/ BLT leadership team will analyze new test data, prepare to work with whole faculty on SIP plan revisions/ updates based on new data and information. Each team must revise and modify as needed to keep their SIP focus purposeful and meeting learning needs of their students.

For plans due to ISBE, a timeline is prepared so that peer review takes place prior to the presentation to the board of education for approval, to ensure that plans are submitted by due date established by the Illinois School Board of Education.

All schools who are meeting AYP will submit a three-year plan and update annually using the most current test data and make any modifications necessary. The updates are not subject to peer review unless the plan has expired.

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.

All School probationary teachers participate in the district's New Teacher Academy, which provides a variety of peer coaching, and mentoring programs. Procedural manuals exist for both programs and can be located at central office.

A week long new teacher boot camp is provided the week prior to the start of a new school year for new teachers. A combination of local and national workshop presenters provide support with district curriculum and reform initiatives. Each new teacher is assigned a mentor for the first year and on an as needed basis during their non-tenure period. Teachers have an opportunity to learn about our community, the district and their new school during this week of preparation.

A teacher facilitator oversees the New Teacher Academy and New Teacher Support/Mentoring meetings that take place quarterly. Mentors also meet with their protégé throughout the year to participate in a variety of professional developmental programs to assist new teachers in their first year. Highly qualified veteran teachers are selected to serve as mentors meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers as defined by NCLB requirements. (Brophy, 1999). Each school also provided mentoring and support to new staff with particular focus on the reform initiatives particular to their school improvement plan. Teacher also meet during their years 2-4 for additional professional support, but usually do not have mentors assigned during this timeframe.

Peer coaching is an alternate evaluative program in which tenured teachers that meet the necessary qualifications can participate. Teachers receive training in pre-conferences, observations, and post-conferencing. Meetings are held regularly during the school year and are based on Illinois Professional Standards for Teachers.

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.

District 60 provides professional development opportunities to all District School supporting the development of building leadership teams who in turn create, implement and revise their School Improvement Plans. Outside consultants have worked with our schools and district level leaders to shift toward data driven distributed leadership.

We have contracted with Urban Learning and Leadership Center to work with the school leadership as the corrective action / restructuring to provide support in change of governance to the Distributed Leadership Model. ULLC also provides professional development to all schools in data analysis to support data driven decision making at the BLT level to implement the SIP plan. We have also contracted with CORE, ASCD and SDE to provide support to our staff in reform strategies that improve instruction. RESPRO works with this school both with technical support and monitor implementation of this plan. Outside consultant has been appointed in to provide expertise that address identified needs and issues facing this individual school and district as a whole. Professional development is overseen by a district professional development committee and includes district wide full day

in-service opportunities, on site coaching support, and half day workshops focused on the District and School Improvement plans and instructional improvement.

Central Office provides support both in data analysis (state and local benchmark/progress monitoring data) and research in selection of Core/ Tier I curriculum, Tier II interventions and Tier III intervention programs, including support for bilingual, gifted and special education programs. Program Directors work directly with the principal, building leadership team and teachers to support reform initiatives established in this plan. Building leadership teams receive technical support in School Improvement Plan design, implementation, monitoring, and revision process from both District leadership and RESPRO/ ROE consultants. District level professional development opportunities are provided to support the initiatives in this plan. NCLB funding prioritizes support for major reform initiatives.

District Directors, Coordinators and Cabinet level evaluators support their school's BLT team in monitoring the implementation process which is part of the District Oversight Committee support. The District Restructuring Oversight Committee works with schools implementing either the Corrective Action or Restructuring Plan. This provides additional support and technical guidance from both district and community experts in plan design, implementation and evaluation of impact of the reform measures identified. District 60 provides support to ensure that multiple data points are provided including state, district wide benchmark and local assessments, which are disaggregated and disseminated to building leadership teams through a new student information system. These data are triangulated and drive decisions on research based interventions that are aligned to student needs. **District 60 provides professional development opportunities to help support their SIP reform. Focus groups are formed to study issues and concerns.** Long standing committees such as the: Education Progress Committee, Reading Committee, Math Committee, Technology Committee, meet with representation from all district schools served to provide an avenue for two way communication and support of this school's **improvement effort.**

District funds are prioritized to support the District Improvement plan (RTI) and school improvement initiatives. The district allocates NCLB funds to each school, empowering each school BLT to assume the leadership role in implementing and monitoring the school improvement process. SIP coordinators act as a link between school and central office and provide guidance and support for the school improvement process. Bilingual Coordinators, Special Education Coordinators, Reading Coordinator and Math Coordinator work with administrators and teachers to research best practice strategies and research-based resources to support reform efforts identified in the school improvement plan. The leadership team must align all expenditures to support the reform measures in this plan. The Bilingual Department provides services to all bilingual centers, Special Education Department provides services to all students with IEPs, as well as professional development for teachers working with these populations and developing intervention programs when needed. **These funds provide support to student instruction initiatives, professional development and parent involvement opportunities that support each SIP plan.**

The district leadership oversees submission of a SIP plan for all schools to our board of education regardless of NCLB or State Status. All plans are peer reviewed by the district **peer review process.** All schools meeting AYP will submit three-year plans and update annually the most current test data and any modifications made, the updates are not subject to peer review unless the plan has expired. All schools not meeting AYP for two or more consecutive years write, implement and monitor a two year plans which is also then submitted to the Illinois State Board of Education through the office of the Director of School Improvement.

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 Illinois State Board of Education provides training and technical assistance to each school in the writing and scoring / review of the plan once completed through a variety of mediums: face to face meetings, phone and on site conferences, workshops, the technical guide for school improvement, corrective action and restructuring, as well as, regional consultants through the RESPRO system of support.

The RESPRO team from Lake County provides guidance in the plan creation and also monitors the plan implementation. They also provide professional development and support in strategy development to support full implementation of the reforms measures identified in the plan.

RESPRO also provides guidance in the analysis of state testing data, as well as, support for local benchmarking with tools such as DIBELS and NWEA MAP.

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

	Name	Title
1	Jose Lara	Principal
2	Carol May	Assistant Principal
3	Kathy Meyer	Read 180 teacher
4	Katherine Notargiovanni	EAS teacher
5	Sofia Garcia	4th grade teacher
6	Eufemia Rodriguez	5th grade teacher
7	JoAnne Lewis	Title 1

8	Alisa Van Blake	1st grade teacher
9	Amy Welton	Special education teacher
10	Tom Dempsey	RESPRO Consultant
11	Judy Green	Central Administration
12	Lesley Barbre	Curriculum Specialist
13	Min Owens	RTI Coach
14		
15		
16		

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: **10/13/2009**

A. ASSURANCES

1. The district has provided written notice in a timely manner about the improvement identification to parents of each student enrolled in the school, in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand (NCLB, Section 1116(c)(6)).
2. Strategies and activities have been founded in scientifically based research as required by NCLB, Section 1116(b)(3)(A)(i) and as defined in NCLB, Section 9101(37).
3. Technical assistance provided by the district serving the school is founded on scientifically based research (NCLB, Section 1116(b)(4)(C)) as defined in NCLB, Section 9101 (37).
4. The plan includes strategies and activities that support the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards and ensures alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessments with the Illinois Learning Standards.
5. The school will spend at least 10 percent of the funds made available under Section 1113 of NCLB for the purpose of providing teachers and the principal high-quality professional development. (Title I schools only.)

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

By submitting the plan on behalf of the school the district superintendent certifies to ISBE that all the assurances and information provided in the plan are true and correct and that the improvement plan has been duly approved by the local school board. By sending e-mail notification of the plan completion from the **Submit Your Plan** page (Section IV-C) the plan shall be deemed to be executed by the superintendent on behalf of the school.

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified? [C]

Yes No

Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness? [C]

Yes No

Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students? [C]

Yes No

Does the analysis, along with other optional data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities? [C]

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Yes No N/A

If included, is there evidence that the SIP team analyzed optional data to clarify the areas of weakness?

Yes No N/A

Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?

Yes No N/A

Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

OTHER DATA

Yes No N/A

If included, has the SIP team analyzed other available data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities?

Yes No N/A

Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?

Yes No N/A

Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]
MONITORING	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers? [C]

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

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

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

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

PEER REVIEW

<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Is the peer review process described <u>and</u> 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]</p>
<p>TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>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]</p>
<p>DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITES</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	<p>If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSIBILITES</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>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]</p>
<p>SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	<p>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]</p>
<p>APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The plan indicates the approval date of this plan. [C]</p>

PART II - COMMENTS