

<b>Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring</b>	
Local Board Approved	10/13/2009
Submitted	10/15/2009
Plan Resubmitted	01/25/2010
ISBE Monitoring Completed	01/26/2010

## PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	340490600260022		
District Name:	Waukegan CUSD 60	School Name:	Waukegan High School
Superintendent:	Dr Donaldo R Batiste	Principal:	Dr Steven Hamlin
District Address:	1201 N Sheridan Rd	School Address:	2325 Brookside Ave
City/State/Zip:	Waukegan, IL 60085 2081	City/State/Zip:	Waukegan, IL 60085 3378
District Telephone#:	Label 8473363100                      Extn:	School Telephone#:	8473605621                      Extn: 0
District Email:	dbatiste@wpsd60.org	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?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2009-10 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status Year 6

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	98.9	Yes	98.9	Yes	31.2		No	21.4		No			71.4	No
White	98.8	Yes	98.8	Yes	59.2	63.2	Yes	47.9	66.3	No			85.8	
Black	99.4	Yes	99.4	Yes	31.0	27.6	No	12.2	26.5	No			71.5	
Hispanic	98.6	Yes	98.6	Yes	25.1	29.0	No	18.1	33.5	No			69.1	
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic												
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes								
Students with Disabilities	98.1	Yes	98.1	Yes	8.9	16.5	No	5.1	19.7	No		58.6
Low Income	98.4	Yes	98.4	Yes	26.5	27.2	Yes	16.7	30.9	No		89.1

**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.

<b>DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION</b>
---

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?	-

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 (%)	85.0	85.8	88.0	86.3	86.6	84.7	83.2	86.0
Truancy Rate (%)	28.7	27.0	9.3	32.1	33.7	12.7	17.5	11.6
Mobility Rate (%)	25.6	23.0	22.8	20.8	17.9	35.3	32.0	30.7
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	100.0	61.0	83.6	86.8	66.4	69.6	66.8	71.4
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	6.3	7.1	4.8	5.3	3.7	6.5	6.4	7.6
School Population (#)	2,800	2,836	2,743	2,744	2,796	4,171	4,278	4,232
Low Income (%)	50.8	53.1	42.9	41.0	60.3	48.5	35.5	61.6
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	11.7	12.7	13.5	12.8	13.8	10.7	9.0	9.2
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	15.9	14.1	13.1	12.4	11.7	10.2	10.2	7.8
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	24.8	22.8	22.5	23.7	21.8	22.1	21.2	21.4
Hispanic (%)	55.8	59.8	61.3	61.0	64.0	65.0	66.3	68.0
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	3.5	3.1	3.1	2.5	2.3	2.4	1.7	1.9
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.1	0.1	0.1	-	-	-	0.1	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.6	0.9

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 (%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	2000	18.1	27.2	51.2	3.4	0.1	-
	2001	17.3	26.0	53.4	3.2	0.1	-
	2002	15.9	24.8	55.8	3.5	0.1	-
	2003	14.1	22.8	59.8	3.1	0.1	-
	2004	13.1	22.5	61.3	3.1	0.1	-
	2005	12.4	23.7	61.0	2.5	-	0.4
	2006	11.7	21.8	64.0	2.3	-	0.2
	2007	10.2	22.1	65.0	2.4	-	0.3
	2008	10.2	21.2	66.3	1.7	0.1	0.6
	2009	7.8	21.4	68.0	1.9	-	0.9
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	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
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

<b>S T A T E</b>	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 (%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	2000	8.9	50.7	100.0	86.4	46.4	806	30.8	2.0	74.6
	2001	12.0	46.7	98.6	85.6	28.8	543	21.3	9.1	69.0
	2002	11.7	50.8	98.6	85.0	25.6	756	28.7	6.3	100.0
	2003	12.7	53.1	98.6	85.8	23.0	720	27.0	7.1	61.0
	2004	13.5	42.9	100.0	88.0	22.8	244	9.3	4.8	83.6
	2005	12.8	41.0	100.0	86.3	20.8	853	32.1	5.3	86.8
	2006	13.8	60.3	100.0	86.6	17.9	915	33.7	3.7	66.4
	2007	10.7	48.5	100.0	84.7	35.3	509	12.7	6.5	69.6
	2008	9.0	35.5	100.0	83.2	32.0	718	17.5	6.4	66.8
	2009	9.2	61.6	95.0	86.0	30.7	476	11.6	7.6	71.4
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	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
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6

S T A T E	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
	2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1

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)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	2000	3,643	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,738	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	2,800	-	-	-	-	-	817
	2003	2,836	-	-	-	-	-	785
	2004	2,743	-	-	-	-	-	814
	2005	2,744	-	-	-	-	-	803
	2006	2,796	-	-	-	-	-	832
	2007	4,171	-	-	-	-	-	902
	2008	4,278	-	-	-	-	-	1,004
	2009	4,232	-	-	-	-	-	834
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	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
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816

S T A T E	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 (%)
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	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	7	9
	2006	916	11	50,765	57	43	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	19	21	4	4	
<b>S T A T E</b>	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1

---

	2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1
--	------	---------	----	--------	----	----	----	----	---	---

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)**

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grade 11						
Groups	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>
All	34.4	37.9	33.5	29.2	24.5	30.8
White	62.8	60.2	60.9	64.6	59.4	59.7
Black	32.5	34.4	27.3	26.7	17.4	27.9
Hispanic	26.0	33.1	28.7	20.8	20.1	25.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	37.0	41.6	47.7	52.4	50.1	45.8
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	72.7
LEP	-	-	-	12.5	3.7	-
Students with Disabilities	1.8	10.6	6.0	14.7	2.3	3.9
Low Income	22.9	28.4	22.9	22.2	18.0	26.0

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)**

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grade 11						
Groups	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>
All	27.7	24.1	25.6	25.9	27.5	20.4
White	55.8	48.6	50.5	47.6	59.3	48.1
Black	21.7	13.8	16.3	20.6	16.4	9.6
Hispanic	19.8	21.3	23.1	21.5	25.2	17.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	48.1	41.7	47.6	57.2	56.3	45.8
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	27.3
LEP	-	-	-	21.9	8.5	10.4
Students with Disabilities	1.8	5.3	2.4	5.1	3.5	-
Low Income	15.7	18.3	20.7	19.3	21.7	15.8

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?

**WEAKNESS**

- The "All", "Black", "Hispanic", "Limited English Proficiency", and "Students with Disabilities" subgroups did not meet or exceed AYP in Reading on the PSAE.
- Each subgroup did not meet or exceed AYP in Math on the PSAE.
- "All" students did not meet AYP in the area of Graduation Rate during the 2009 testing year.

**STRENGTHS**

- Every subgroup has met AYP in the area of "Percentage Tested".
- The "White" and "Economically Disadvantaged" met AYP in Reading.

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

**INTERNAL**

- Administration Mobility
- Teacher Mobility
- 4% of Teaching Staff are Not Highly Qualified
- Lack of Literacy Training
- Need for Common Assessments, Curriculum, Appropriate Instructional Materials
- Students Don't Take Assessment Seriously

- Length of School Period
- Data Collection Tools
- Fidelity of Proctoring Assessment
- Need for Data to Drive Instruction
- Need for Proper Placement of Students
- Need for Cross Content Articulation
- Language Barriers

## EXTERNAL

- K-12 Articulation
- Mobility: enrollment semester, change of address w/in district, homeless
- Poverty: 43% of students throughout the district come from low-income, high poverty home, working students
- Attendance, Truancy, Graduation Rate, Junior Promotion to Senior Year
- Low Attendance for Open House and Parent-Teacher Conference Night
- **Lack of Community Involvement**

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

## Reading

- Special education curriculum is not aligned with general education curriculum
- There is a need for explicit instruction of academic vocabulary
- Culture and climate is not conducive to a proper testing environment
- Students lack the passion and value in learning

## Math

- A two year Algebra 1 course was eliminated and was replaced by a one year Algebra 1 course with options to be in a Math Academy course for struggling students
- There was a participation increase of students between between 2008 & 2009 on the PSAE
- Due to mobility the subgroups are fluid

## Graduation

- Highest graduation rate among free and reduced lunch
- LEP: large increase and decrease of students graduating
- Students with disabilities 2007 data may be incorrect
- SLC implemented 09-10
- 9th grade center: timing started 07-08, 3rd year for freshman (09-10) implemented
- Increase in inclusion of special students
- Lack of common language with graduation, mobility, dropout (vocabulary)
- No credit changes in the last few years except state changes
- AYP reporting incorrect in re: to 06:07 (2 different buildings)

## 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?

## Reading

In the Spring of 2009, 72% of freshman students that "Did Not Meet / Exceed" in Reading, as measured by the NWEA MAP Assessment.

In the Spring of 2009, 73% of sophomore students that "Did Not Meet / Exceed" in Reading, as measured by the NWEA MAP Assessment.

## Math

In the Spring of 2009, 73% of freshman students that "Did Not Meet / Exceed" in Mathematics, as measured by the NWEA MAP Assessment.

In the Spring of 2009, 68% of freshman students that "Did Not Meet / Exceed" in Mathematics, as measured by the NWEA MAP Assessment.

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

## INTERNAL

- Administration Mobility
- Teacher Mobility
- 4% of Teaching Staff are Not Highly Qualified
- Lack of Literacy Training
- Need for Common Assessments, Curriculum, Appropriate Instructional Materials
- Students Don't Take Assessment Seriously
- Length of School Period
- Data Collection Tools
- Fidelity of Proctoring Assessment
- Need for Data to Drive Instruction
- Need for Proper Placement of Students
- Need for Cross Content Articulation
- Language Barriers

## EXTERNAL

- K-12 Articulation
- Mobility: enrollment semester, change of address w/in district, homeless
- Poverty: 43% of students throughout the district come from low-income, high poverty home, working students

- Attendance, Truancy, Graduation Rate, Junior Promotion to Senior Year
- Low Attendance for Open House and Parent-Teacher Conference Night
- Lack of Community Involvement

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

## Reading

- Special education curriculum needs to be aligned with general education curriculum
- There is a need for professional development on explicit instruction of academic vocabulary
- Culture and climate needs to improve to develop proper testing environment
- Students will become more aware of their metacognitive strengths

## Math

- Incorporate freshman advisory with study skills
- Expand on tiered framework
- Look into course sequence
- Continue curriculum discussion/meetings

## Graduation

- Registrar will follow-up on missing students
- Determine what are graduation rates/what are the numbers.
- Notify stakeholders re: 100 seniors who didn't take PSAE
- Put interventions into place for f's (1,2,3 f's)
- Modified block: look into scheduling w/SLC

## 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?*

#### WEAKNESS

- The "All", "Black", "Hispanic", "Limited English Proficiency", and "Students with Disabilities" subgroups did not meet or exceed AYP in Reading.
- Each subgroup did not meet or exceed AYP in Math on the PSAE.
- "All" students did not meet AYP in the area of Graduation Rate during the 2009 testing year.

#### STRENGTHS

- Every subgroup has met AYP in the area of "Percentage Tested".
- The "White" and "Economically Disadvantaged" met AYP in Reading.

#### INTERNAL

- Administration Mobility
- Teacher Mobility
- 4% of Teaching Staff are Not Highly Qualified
- Lack of Literacy Training
- Need for Common Assessments, Curriculum, Appropriate Instructional Materials
- Students Don't Take Assessment Seriously
- Length of School Period

- Data Collection Tools
- Fidelity of Proctoring Assessment
- Need for Data to Drive Instruction
- Need for Proper Placement of Students
- Need for Cross Content Articulation
- Language Barriers

## EXTERNAL

- K-12 Articulation
- Mobility: enrollment semester, change of address w/in district, homeless
- Poverty: 43% of students throughout the district come from low-income, high poverty home, working students
- Attendance, Truancy, Graduation Rate, Junior Promotion to Senior Year
- Low Attendance for Open House and Parent-Teacher Conference Night
- Lack of Community Involvement

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

These attributes and challenges have had a direct result on the meeting and exceeding AYP targets.

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

These factors will lead to development and alignment of appropriate curriculum, teacher training, and adequate resources.

---

**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?

96% of our staff are highly qualified. 51% of our staff have a masters degree. 4+ hours are dedicated to professional development activities which our staff are required to attend.

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

By having the Ninth Grade and Upper Grade Students separated, there was an inability to have consistency with approximately 4000 students and 350 staff members spread throughout the grade levels.

Through the use of informal observations and surveys, the staff describes a need for cross grade level articulation.

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

Articulation must occur for 6-12 staff. **Development of curriculum that is in alignment with state standards and district goals.** Use of data to drive instruction.

Below is a sample list of professional development opportunities and or trainings delivered:

- Literacy Consultant (Project CRISS, CORE Strategies for Adolescent Learners, Content / Shared Academic Vocabulary)

- Math Consultant (Content / Shared Academic Vocabulary)
- Data Consultant (receiving and delivering MAP training)
- Common curriculum aligned to state standards (Lynn Erickson's model of Concept Based Curriculum and Instruction)

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

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

Data describes high participation in the Athletic Booster Club, Association of Music Parents (AMP), and Foreign Language / ELL Night.

One hundred percent of our parents have been contacted either by phone, written correspondence, or parent teacher conferences.

Sign-in sheets indicate that we need to increase the number of parents that participate in on-site school activities; such as, Open House, Parent-Teacher Conference Night, individual parent-teacher conferences, annual reviews for Individual Education Plans, House Principal meetings, and Parent Teacher Organizations (PTO).

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

Parent involvement has contributed to student performance results because there is a great need for their presence and participation in more than just our specialty programs; such as, Schuler, CSP, Options, and Phoenix.

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

Parents will be more engaged with our students' education through workshops and educational opportunities.

### 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?*

The following conclusions are the next steps that we have reached in reviewing available data to address the needs of Reading, Math, and Graduation:

1. Waukegan High School will develop a four-year course plan. With the use of this plan, a concept-based curriculum will be developed that meets Illinois State Standards and college-readiness standards. **The Special Education curriculum and General Education curriculum will be aligned by collaborating through professional development meetings.**
2. **Waukegan High School staff will learn how to teach explicit vocabulary instruction through the use of professional development.** The model used will be based on Robert Marzano's Academic Vocabulary and CORE Literacy Strategies for Adolescent Readers.
3. Waukegan High School staff will focus on using data to **problem-solve for students.** **Staff will examine school-wide, classroom, and individual student data to identify trends and differentiate in the classroom.**
4. Waukegan High School is currently working on creating a culture and climate that is conducive to student achievement through the use of the Smaller Learning Communities model.
5. Waukegan High School will incorporate a freshman advisory with mathematics study skills.
6. Waukegan High School will expand on tiered framework in order to address the needs of all student.



## Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	<a href="#">Literacy Objective - to implement scientifically based research programs that enhance instructional strategies throughout our literacy programs and curriculum.</a>	1,5,7,9,
2	<a href="#">Mathematics Objective -to implement scientifically based research programs that enhance instructional strategies throughout our math programs and curriculum.</a>	2,4,6,8,10,11,
3	<a href="#">Graduation</a>	

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. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 3. School is deficient in Graduation Rate
- 4. White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 5. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 6. Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 7. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 8. Hispanic students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 9. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 10. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 11. Low Income students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Literacy Objective - to implement scientifically based research programs that enhance instructional strategies throughout our literacy programs and curriculum.

**Objective 1 Description**

In 2009: 31.2% of all students, 59.2% White students, 31% Black students, 25.1% Hispanic students, 8.9% students with disabilities, 26.5% low income students met AYP in Reading. Our objective is for our All students and the subgroup populations will meet 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

**This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:**

- 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 2. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 3. School is deficient in Graduation Rate
- 4. White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 5. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 6. Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 7. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 8. Hispanic students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 9. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 10. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

e 11. Low Income students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Literacy Objective - to implement scientifically based research programs that enhance instructional strategies throughout our literacy programs and curriculum.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	PROJECT CRISS is a research based, national support system that increases student-centered teaching, independent learning and student achievement. Students will learn Project CRISS strategies in all content classes. 40% of our Freshman through Senior students will become independent learners using Project CRISS Strategies. Students will be monitored by walk-throughs and examination of student work.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	During School	Other	0
2	Students will receive an Illinois State standards and College readiness standard-aligned curriculum. Students will understand course expectations by use of a syllabi which will include the state-standards. Students learning will be assessed through summative and formative assessments that are aligned to the standards.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	During School	Other	0
3	Students who score a 202 or below on the MAP test will receive intensive instruction, such as Language!, Read 180, System 44 and Reading Academy. The amount of time spent on Language!, Read 180 and System 44 is a 90 minute block class, which replaces the core literature class. Reading Academy is a 45 minute support class in addition to a core literature class, which becomes a total of 135 minutes spent with English curriculum.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	During School	Other	3,000
	Students daily attendance will be 91%. Students will receive communication on their individual and school's attendance through the					

<p>4 use of bulletin boards, the WHS website, and auto dialer. School's principals will be responsible for monitoring students attendance. All students will have the opportunity to receive recognition for attendance in advisory and assemblies (PBIS team will be responsible for the celebrations and tiered incentives).</p>	<p>09/07/2009</p>	<p>09/05/2011</p>	<p>During School</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>2,200</p>
--	-------------------	-------------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Literacy Objective - to implement scientifically based research programs that enhance instructional strategies throughout our literacy programs and curriculum.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)	
<p>1 Principal, Associate Principals, House Principals, Academic Chairs, and select teaching staff will complete CRISS Level I and II training. Project CRISS will instruct our teachers and administrators on reading strategies across the curriculum. The Waukegan High School Literacy Coach will support teachers in the use of Project CRISS strategies. Academic Chairs will monitor teachers in using Project CRISS strategies on an average of 20 times a week.</p>	<p>09/26/2009</p>	<p>09/05/2011</p>	<p>After School</p>	<p>Title II</p>	<p>50,000</p>	
<p>2 During the SIP professional development/meeting times, WHS staff will be developing standard aligned course descriptions, syllabus and curriculum, and summative and formative assessments. Departmental progress will be monitored on a monthly basis by Principal, Associate Principals, House Principals, Academic Chairs, and select teaching staff.</p>	<p>09/07/2009</p>	<p>09/05/2011</p>	<p>During School</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>6,000</p>	
<p>3 Teaching staff will understand how to analyze data with the purpose of providing academic support to students, such as using MAP data to determine course placement. School Administration will help teachers monitor student annual growth.</p>	<p>09/07/2009</p>	<p>09/05/2011</p>	<p>During School</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>0</p>	
<p>Staff will learn how to coach explicit vocabulary instruction that is</p>						

4	based on Robert Marzano's Academic Vocabulary and CORE Literacy Strategies for Adolescent Readers. Staff will roll academic vocabulary instruction out to students in 2011.	09/06/2010	09/05/2011	During School	Other	0
5	All staff will be trained in accordance with PBIS expectations and principles in order to support students and teach expected behaviors. The PBIS team is responsible for developing the systems practices and evaluation tools to improve attendance through the use of behavior and attendance data. The PBIS Targeted Team will develop the systems, practices and evaluation tools for Check In/Check Out (CICO) to further improve student attendance for identified students. Administration will define and communicate the process for truancy. Review behavior and attendance data to provide appropriate level of supports and interventions.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	After School	Other	0

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Literacy Objective - to implement scientifically based research programs that enhance instructional strategies throughout our literacy programs and curriculum.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	***Revised with ROE on May 27, 2010.*** Implement plan created through United Way grant to establish stronger school-home connection. (Former strategy was not successful: Parents whose students are taught by teachers using CRISS strategies will participate in a Project CRISS "Parent Presentation" and informational meeting on how to use CRISS strategies in the home. The "Parent Presentation" will be held two times a year. Surveys and handbooks will be distributed to monitor parents understanding and use of the Project CRISS strategies.)	11/09/2009	09/05/2011	After School	Other	5,500
	***Revised with ROE on May 27, 2010.*** Implement plan created through United Way grant to establish stronger school-home connection.					

2	(Former strategy was not successful: All parents will be notified to participate in a data analysis informational meeting on how to use MAP and PSAE test scores to guide student achievement two times a year.)	09/06/2010	09/05/2011	After School	Other	1,500
3	All parents will be invited to participate in Open House to become knowledgeable of course offerings and student expectations. This happens in September and will be monitored through sign-in sheets and surveys.	09/24/2009	09/05/2011	After School	Other	1,000
4	A web page (in Spanish and English) that focuses on reading strategies to support best practices in high schools will be kept current on the WHS website on a continual basis.	09/06/2010	09/05/2011	After School	Other	0
5	Parents will understand PBIS principles through a variety of communications such as, visiting the school and reading PBIS bulletin boards, the WHS website, and auto dialer. PBIS Team will be responsible for dissemination of information.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	After School	Other	0

**Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring**

**Objective 1 Title :**

Literacy Objective - to implement scientifically based research programs that enhance instructional strategies throughout our literacy programs and curriculum.

**Monitoring** - *Include the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities for the objective and identify the person(s) responsible for overseeing the work.*

*Describe the process and measures of success of this objective. (How will school personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)*

<u>DATA</u>	<u>PROCESS</u>	<u>MEASURE OF SUCCESS</u>
MAP	Three Times a Year	NWEA Benchmarks
PSAE	Spring	Safe Harbor or Annual Yearly Progress
Surveys (student, teacher, parent, staff, community members)	Ongoing	Comparison to previous survey results
Attendance	Ongoing	Decrease in absences

Discipline	Ongoing	Decrease in referrals, suspensions, and expulsions
Professional Development Evaluations	Ongoing	Comparison to previous evaluation results, comments, identified needs

The personnel listed below are active participants in the SIP and restructuring process. The below data chart will be monitored by the principal, associate principals, house principals, academic chairs and building level team. Lesson plans will be evaluated weekly to ensure that math strategies are included and taught. Followed by walk-throughs of the literacy specialist to ensure fidelity to the reading program. The academic chairs for each content area are not listed below.

*Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.*

	Name	Title
1	Dr. Steven Hamlin	Principal
2	Ms. Amy Clyne	Mathematics Teacher
3	Mr. Patrick Cole	Mathematics Teacher
4	Mr. Rob Holton	Assessment Teacher
5	Mrs. Anna Panagakis	Literacy Specialist
6	Ms. Carol Ricker	CSP Communications Teacher
7	Ms. Donna Robinson	Special Education Teacher
8	Ms. Jacalyn Roche	CSP History Teacher
9	Ms. Elizabeth Wade	Mathematics Teacher
10	Ms. Minerva Cruz	Associate Principal
11	Mr. Luis F. Correa	Associate Principal
12	Mr. Terry McHugh	Associate Principal
13	Mr. Omar Rodriguez	House Principal 1
14	Mrs. Molly Schaefer	House Principal 2
15	Mrs. Angela Fink	House Principal 3
16	Mr. David Strawniak	House Principal 4
17	Dr. Eric Levin	House Principal 5
18	Mrs. Beth Paglia	House Principal 6
19	Mrs. Sara Infusino	House Principal 7

20	Dr. Charmaine Harris	House Principal 8
21	Mr. Romell Drake	House Principal 9
22	Ms. Margo Schmitt	RESPO Consultant
23	Dr. Harvey Perkins	Educational Consultant
24	Ms. Judy Green	Director of School Improvement
25	Ms. Christine Moulder	Special Education Teacher
26	Dr. Beverly Echols	Associate Principal
27	Mr. Marshall Ruetz	SLC Project Manager

## Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

### Objective 2

Mathematics Objective -to implement scientifically based research programs that enhance instructional strategies throughout our math programs and curriculum.

### Objective 2 Description

In 2009: 21.4% of all students, 47.9% White students, 12.2% Black students, 18.1% Hispanic students, 5.1% students with disabilities, 16.7% low income students AYP in Math. Our objective is for our All students and our subgroup students to meet 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- Ⓔ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓕ 2. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 3. School is deficient in Graduation Rate

- ⓑ 4. White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓔ 5. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 6. Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓔ 7. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 8. Hispanic students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓔ 9. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 10. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 11. Low Income students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

Mathematics Objective -to implement scientifically based research programs that enhance instructional strategies throughout our math programs and curriculum.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1) PROJECT CRISS is a research based, national support system that increases student-centered teaching, independent learning and student achievement. Students will learn Project Criss strategies in all content classes. 40% of our Freshman through Senior students will become independent learners using Project CRISS Strategies. Students will be monitored by walk-throughs and examination of student work.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	During School	Other	0
2	Students will receive an Illinois State standards and College readiness standard-aligned curriculum. Students will understand course expectations by use of a syllabi which will include the state-standards. Students learning will be assessed through summative and formative	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	During School	Other	0

	assessments that are aligned to the standards.					
3	Students who score a 211 or below on the MAP test will receive intensive instruction, such as Math Academy.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	During School	Local Funds	8,000
4	Students daily attendance will be 91%. Students will receive communication on their individual and school's attendance through the use of bulletin boards, the WHS website, and auto dialer. School's principals will be responsible for monitoring students attendance. All students will have the opportunity to receive recognition for attendance in advisory and assemblies (PBIS team will be responsible for the celebrations and tiered incentives).	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	During School	Local Funds	2,200

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

Mathematics Objective -to implement scientifically based research programs that enhance instructional strategies throughout our math programs and curriculum.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Principal, Associate Principals, House Principals, Academic Chairs, and select teaching staff will complete CRISS Level I and II training. Project CRISS will instruct our teachers and administrators on reading strategies across the curriculum. The Waukegan High School Literacy Coach will support teachers in the use of Project CRISS strategies. Academic Chairs will monitor teachers in using Project CRISS strategies on an average of 20 times a week.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	After School	Title II	50,000
2	During the SIP professional development/meeting times, WHS staff will be developing standard aligned course descriptions, syllabus and curriculum, and summative and formative assessments. Departmental progress will be monitored on a monthly basis by Principal, Associate Principals, House Principals, Academic Chairs, and select teaching staff.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	After School	Other	6,000
	Teaching staff will understand how to analyze data with the purpose of					

3	providing academic support to students, such as using MAP data to determine course placement. School Administration will help teachers monitor student annual growth.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	After School	Title II	6,000
4	Staff will learn how to coach explicit vocabulary instruction that is based on Robert Marzano's Academic Vocabulary and CORE Literacy Strategies for Adolescent Readers. Staff will roll academic vocabulary instruction out to students in 2011.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	After School	Other	5,200
5	All staff will be trained in accordance with PBIS expectations and principles in order to support students and teach expected behaviors. The PBIS team is responsible for developing the systems practices and evaluation tools to improve attendance through the use of behavior and attendance data. The PBIS Targeted Team will develop the systems, practices and evaluation tools for Check In/Check Out (CICO) to further improve student attendance for identified students. Administration will define and communicate the process for truancy. Review behavior and attendance data to provide appropriate level of supports and interventions.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	After School	Other	0

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

Mathematics Objective -to implement scientifically based research programs that enhance instructional strategies throughout our math programs and curriculum.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	***Revised with ROE on May 27, 2010.*** Implement plan created through United Way grant to establish stronger school-home connection. (Former strategy was not successful: Parents whose students are taught by teachers using CRISS strategies will participate in a Project CRISS "Parent Presentation" and informational meeting on how to use CRISS strategies in the home. The "Parent Presentation" will be held	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	After School	Other	5,500

	two times a year. Surveys and handbooks will be distributed to monitor parents understanding and use of the Project CRISS strategies.)					
2	***Revised with ROE on May 27, 2010.*** Implement plan created through United Way grant to establish stronger school-home connection. (Former strategy was not successful: All parents will be notified to participate in a data analysis informational meeting on how to use MAP and PSAE test scores to guide student achievement two times a year.)	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	After School	Other	2,500
3	All parents will be invited to participate in Open House to become knowledgeable of course offerings and student expectations. This happens in September and will be monitored through sign-in sheets and surveys.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	After School	Other	1,000
4	Parents will understand PBIS principles through a variety of communications such as, visiting the school and reading PBIS bulletin boards, the WHS website, and auto dialer. PBIS Team will be responsible for dissemination of information.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	After School	Other	0

**Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring**

**Objective 2 Title :**

Mathematics Objective -to implement scientifically based research programs that enhance instructional strategies throughout our math programs and curriculum.

**Monitoring** - Include the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities for the objective and identify the person(s) responsible for overseeing the work. Describe the process and measures of success of this objective. (How will school personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

<u>DATA</u>	<u>PROCESS</u>	<u>MEASURE OF SUCCESS</u>
MAP	Three Times a Year	NWEA Benchmarks
PSAE	Spring	Safe Harbor or Annual Yearly Progress
Surveys (student, teacher, parent, staff, community members)	Ongoing	Comparison to previous survey results

Attendance	Ongoing	Decrease in absences
Discipline	Ongoing	Decrease in referrals, suspensions, and expulsions
Professional Development Evaluations	Ongoing	Comparison to previous evaluation results, comments, identified needs

The personnel listed below are active participants in the SIP and restructuring process. The below data chart will be monitored by the principal, associate principals, house principals, academic chairs and building level team. Lesson plans will be evaluated weekly to ensure that math strategies are included and taught. Followed by walk-throughs of the literacy specialist to ensure fidelity to the reading program. The academic chairs for each content area are not listed below.

*Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.*

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
1	Dr. Steven Hamlin	Principal
2	Ms. Amy Clyne	Mathematics Teacher
3	Mr. Patrick Cole	Mathematics Teacher
4	Mr. Rob Holton	Assessment Teacher
5	Mrs. Anna Panagakis	Literacy Specialist
6	Ms. Carol Ricker	CSP Communications Teacher
7	Ms. Donna Robinson	Special Education Teacher
8	Ms. Jacalyn Roche	CSP History Teacher
9	Ms. Elizabeth Wade	Mathematics Teacher
10	Ms. Minerva Cruz	Associate Principal
11	Mr. Luis F. Correa	Associate Principal
12	Mr. Terry McHugh	Associate Principal
13	Mr. Omar Rodriguez	House Principal 1
14	Mrs. Molly Schaefer	House Principal 2
15	Mrs. Angela Fink	House Principal 3
16	Mr. David Strawniak	House Principal 4
17	Dr. Eric Levin	House Principal 5

18	Mrs. Beth Paglia	House Principal 6
19	Mrs. Sara Infusino	House Principal 7
20	Dr. Charmaine Harris	House Principal 8
21	Mr. Romell Drake	House Principal 9
22	Ms. Margo Schmitt	RESPO Consultant
23	Dr. Harvey Perkins	Educational Consultant
24	Ms. Judy Green	Director of School Improvement
25	Ms. Christine Moulder	Special Education Teacher
26	Dr. Beverly Echols	Associate Principal
27	Mr. Marshall Ruetz	SLC Project Manager

## Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

### Objective 3

Graduation

### Objective 3 Description

In 2009: 71.4% of all students, 85.8% White students, 71.5% Black students, 69.1% Hispanic students, 58.6% students with disabilities, 89.1% low income students met graduation rate. Our objective is for our All students and each subgroup students to meet 78% in 2010 and 2011.

**This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:**

- Ⓔ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 2. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 3. School is deficient in Graduation Rate

- e 4. White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- e 5. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- e 6. Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- e 7. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- e 8. Hispanic students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- e 9. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- e 10. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- e 11. Low Income students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

Graduation

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	The students will participate in one of nine smaller learning communities, which studies show an improvement in graduation rates. Students will receive advisory curriculum targeting current achievement and post-secondary success.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	During School	Other	0
2	Students will participate in study labs to support academic achievement before, during and after school. This support can be computer-based, one-on-one, or in a small student group.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	During School	Other	7,000
3	At Washington Campus, students who struggle academically can be placed in the Options House. At Brookside Campus, students who	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	During School	Other	0

	struggle in attending school can be placed in the Phoenix House.					
4	Waukegan High School will meet Safe Harbor or will meet Annual Yearly Progress in the area of graduation. 91% of our students will be in attendance for the PSAE. Students will receive communication on their individual and school's attendance through the use of bulletin boards, the WHS website, and auto dialer. School's principals will be responsible for monitoring student attendance. All students will have the opportunity to receive recognition for attendance in advisory and assemblies (PBIS team will be responsible for the celebrations and tiered incentives).	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	During School	Other	0

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

#### Objective 3 Title :

Graduation

	Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	***Revised with ROE on May 27, 2010.*** The BLT will determine how teachers will engage in, demonstrate, and measure effectiveness of best practices in teaching and learning. These practices will support academic excellence leading toward graduation. (Former strategy did not describe best practices: Teachers will be engaged in best practices in teaching and learning that support academic excellence leading toward graduation.)	08/31/2009	09/05/2011	During School	Other	15,000
2	Establish a training session for teachers on attendance, truancy and discipline.	09/07/2009	09/07/2009	During School	Other	300
3	Establish a training for counselors that foster 4-year plans that lead toward on time graduation.	10/05/2009	09/05/2011	During School	Other	1,000
4	Establish an advisory training program that monitors student progress weekly.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	During School	Other	3,000

5	Summer school classes/programs will be developed to provide rigor and support the goals and standards of the district.	10/05/2009	09/05/2011	Before School	Other	6,000
6	All staff will be trained in accordance with PBIS expectations and principles in order to support students and teach expected behaviors. The PBIS team is responsible for developing the systems practices and evaluation tools to improve attendance through the use of behavior and attendance data. The PBIS Targeted Team will develop the systems, practices and evaluation tools for Check In/Check Out (CICO) to further improve student attendance for identified students. Administration will define and communicate the process for truancy. Increase behavior and attendance data review to provide appropriate level of supports and interventions (CICO, Phoenix House, Mentoring).	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	After School	Other	0

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

Graduation

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will be provided strategies that help foster proper decision making skills within their children by participating in mentoring, education, and demonstration labs.	08/31/2009	09/05/2011	After School	Other	2,800
2	Establish four parent nights that focus on "School-Home Connections".	10/05/2009	09/05/2011	After School	Other	1,000
3	Parents will understand PBIS principles through a variety of communications such as, visiting the school and reading PBIS bulletin boards, the WHS website, and auto dialer.	09/07/2009	09/05/2011	After School	Other	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 3 Title :**

Graduation

**Monitoring** - Include the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities for the objective and identify the person(s) responsible for overseeing the work. Describe the process and measures of success of this objective. (How will school personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

<u>DATA</u>	<u>PROCESS</u>	<u>MEASURE OF SUCCESS</u>
MAP	Three Times a Year	NWEA Benchmarks
PSAE	Spring	Safe Harbor or Annual Yearly Progress
Surveys (student, teacher, parent, staff, community members)	Ongoing	Comparison to previous survey results
Attendance	Ongoing	Decrease in absences
Discipline	Ongoing	Decrease in referrals, suspensions, and expulsions
Professional Development Evaluations	Ongoing	Comparison to previous evaluation results, comments, identified needs

The personnel listed below are active participants in the SIP and restructuring process. The below data chart will be monitored by the principal, associate principals, house principals, academic chairs and building level team. Lesson plans will be evaluated weekly to ensure that math strategies are included and taught. Followed by walk-throughs of the literacy specialist to ensure fidelity to the reading program. The academic chairs for each content area are not listed below.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
1	Dr. Steven Hamlin	Principal
2	Ms. Amy Clyne	Mathematics Teacher

3	Mr. Patrick Cole	Mathematics Teacher
4	Mr. Rob Holton	Assessment Teacher
5	Mrs. Anna Panagakis	Literacy Specialist
6	Ms. Carol Ricker	CSP Communications Teacher
7	Ms. Donna Robinson	Special Education Teacher
8	Ms. Jacalyn Roche	CSP History Teacher
9	Ms. Elizabeth Wade	Mathematics Teacher
10	Ms. Minerva Cruz	Associate Principal
11	Mr. Luis F. Correa	Associate Principal
12	Mr. Terry McHugh	Associate Principal
13	Mr. Omar Rodriquez	House Principal 1
14	Mrs. Molly Schaefer	House Principal 2
15	Mrs. Angela Fink	House Principal 3
16	Mr. David Strawniak	House Principal 4
17	Dr. Eric Levin	House Principal 5
18	Mrs. Beth Paglia	House Principal 6
19	Mrs. Sara Infusino	House Principal 7
20	Dr. Charmaine Harris	House Principal 8
21	Mr. Romell Drake	House Principal 9
22	Ms. Margo Umas	RESPO Consultant
23	Dr. Harvey Perkins	Educational Consultant
24	Ms. Judy Green	Director of School Improvement
25	Ms. Christine Moulder	Special Education Teacher
26	Dr. Beverly Echols	Associate Principal
27	Mr. Marshall Ruetz	SLC Project Manager

### 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.*)

The High School is not a Title One school participant.

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.

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

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

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.

Weekly meetings held to plan, research and develop best practices to support implementation and evaluation of Waukegan High School's Plan. Consultants were secured to

validate findings. Information shared through informal and formal conversations, staff trainings, surveys and email communications. Meetings allowed team members to collect and review appropriate data to determine whether or not specific objectives could be accomplished within a given time period. Findings were revealed and recommendations shared with staff.

	Name	Title
1	Dr. Steven Hamlin	Principal
2	Ms. Amy Clyne	Mathematics Teacher
3	Mr. Patrick Cole	Mathematics Teacher
4	Mr. Rob Holton	Assessment Teacher
5	Mrs. Anna Panagakis	Literacy Specialist
6	Ms. Carol Ricker	CSP Communications Teacher, Parent
7	Ms. Donna Robinson	Special Education Teacher
8	Ms. Jacalyn Roche	History Teacher
9	Ms. Elizabeth Wade	Mathematics Teacher
10	Ms. Minerva Cruz	Associate Principal
11	Mr. Luis F. Correa	Associate Principal
12	Mr. Terry McHugh	Associate Principal
13	Mr. Omar Rodriguez	House Principal 1
14	Mrs. Molly Schaefer	House Principal 2
15	Mrs. Angela Fink	House Principal 3
16	Mr. David Strawniak	House Principal 4
17	Dr. Eric Levin	House Principal 5
18	Mrs. Beth Paglia	House Principal 6
19	Mrs. Sara Infusino	House Principal 7
20	Dr. Charmaine Harris	House Principal 8
21	Mr. Romell Drake	House Principal 9
22	Ms. Margo Schmitt	RESPO Consultant
23	Dr. Harvey Perkins	Educational Consultant

24	Ms. Judy Green	Director of School Improvement
25	Ms. Christine Moulder	Special Education Teacher
26	Dr. Beverly Echols	Associate Principal
27	Mr. Marshall Ruetz	SLC Project Manager

### 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). (Check all that apply.)

- Require implementation of a new research-based curriculum of instructional program;
- Extension of the school year or school day;
- Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance;
- Significant decrease in management authority at the school level;
- Replacement of the principal;
- Restructuring the internal organization of the school;
- Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school.

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

- Reopening the school as a public charter school, consistent with Article 27A of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/Art. 27A.);
- Replacing all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school's inability to make AYP;
- Entering into a contract with a private entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the school as a public school;
- Implementing any other major restructuring of the school's governance that makes fundamental reform in:
  - governance and management, and/or
  - financing and material resources, and/or
  - staffing.

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

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

The 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	Dr. Steve Hamlin	Principal
2	Ms. Minerva Cruz	Associate Principal
3	Mr. Luis F. Correa	Associate Principal
4	Mr. Terry McHugh	Associate Principal
5	Ms. Margo Umas	RESPO Consultant
6	Dr. Harvey Perkins	Educational Consultant
7	Ms. Judy Green	Director of School Improvement
8	Dr. Beverly Echols	Associate Principal
9	Mr. Marshall Ruetz	SLC Project Manager



---

**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]

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 RESPONSIBILITIES** Yes  No

Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]

 Yes  No  N/A

If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]

**STATE RESPONSIBILITIES** Yes  No

Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation? [C]

**SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM** Yes  No  N/A

Have the names and titles of School Support Team members been listed in the plan? Does the team appear to have the expertise to support this school in regards to the school improvement plan? [C]

**APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD** Yes  No

The plan indicates the approval date of this plan. [C]

**PART II - COMMENTS**

January 26, 2010

Please implement this plan with the assistance of district and RESPRO staff. Best wishes, Carol Diedrichsen ISBE Innovation and Improvement

---

RESPRO area comments:

Waukegan High School has completed their 2009-2011 School Improvement Plan. The peer review was approved by Carol Diedrichsen on November 16, 2009 in an email to Judy Green. Waukegan High School's School Improvement Plan is in compliance with ISBE's guidelines.

WHS plan is ready to be implemented. Keep up the good work!

RESPRO Coach: Margo Schmitt

Date: January 25, 2010

Waukegan HS SIP is in compliance.

Dr. Julie Retzlaff--Respro--January 25, 2010