

**District/School
Improvement Plan
2010/2011**

Illini West HSD #307



Local Board Approved	11/23/2010
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	260343070160001		
District Name:	Illini West H S Dist 307	School Name:	Illini West High School
Superintendent:	Mrs. Kim Schilson	Principal:	Mr. Brad Gooding
District Address:	96 S Madison St	School Address:	600 Miller St
City/State/Zip:	Carthage, IL 62321 1331	City/State/Zip:	Carthage, IL 62321 1129
District Telephone#:	Label 2173579607 Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	2173572136 Extn: 0
District Email:		School Email:	
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No			

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2010 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	2010-11 Federal Improvement Status	Choice
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2010-11 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning Year 1

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		77.5			77.5			91		80	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	52.1		No	51.2		No			100.0	Yes
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	52.9	57.3	No	52.1	58.0	No			100.0	
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American													
Multiracial/Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities													
Economically Disadvantaged													

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. ***
3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 91% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 80% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2009.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 77.5% or above are not printed.

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

2010 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?	No

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 in the Differentiated Accountability Pilot Program. The Differentiated Accountability classification applies only to schools in federal improvement status that do not make AYP.

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 assists in distinguishing between schools that need focused support versus more comprehensive interventions.

If a school does make AYP in ALL-student group in both reading and math, this school will be classified as a focused school; otherwise, the school will be identified as a comprehensive school.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2010 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	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Attendance Rate (%)					0.0	94.8	95.2	95.7
Truancy Rate (%)					0.0	3.4	0.9	0.7
Mobility Rate (%)					0.0	10.5	8.2	5.9
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)					-	100.0	100.0	100.0
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)					-	2.3	2.6	2.2
School Population (#)					-	478	459	451
Low Income (%)					0.0	33.5	31.4	31.3
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)					0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2
Students with Disabilities (%)					-	-	-	14.2
White, non-Hispanic (%)					-	99.0	98.7	98.2
Black, non-Hispanic (%)					-	0.4	0.4	0.9
Hispanic (%)					-	0.0	0.2	0.7
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)					-	0.0	0.0	0.0
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)					-	0.4	0.4	0.0
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)					-	0.2	0.2	0.2

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

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	2007	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	99.0	0.4	-	-	0.4	0.2
	2009	98.7	0.4	0.2	-	0.4	0.2
	2010	98.2	0.9	0.7	-	-	0.2
D I S T R I C T	2007	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	99.0	0.4	-	-	0.4	0.2
	2009	98.7	0.4	0.2	-	0.4	0.2
	2010	98.2	0.9	0.7	-	-	0.2
S T A T E	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7	

	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5
	2010	52.8	18.8	21.1	4.2	0.2	2.9

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	2007	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	0.2	33.5	98.5	94.8	10.5	16	3.4	2.3	100.0
	2009	-	31.4	96.2	95.2	8.2	4	0.9	2.6	100.0
	2010	0.2	31.3	100.0	95.7	5.9	3	0.7	2.2	100.0
D I S T R I C T	2007	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	0.2	33.5	98.5	94.8	10.5	16	3.4	2.3	100.0
	2009	-	31.4	96.2	95.2	8.2	4	0.9	2.6	100.0
	2010	0.2	31.3	100.0	95.7	5.9	3	0.7	2.2	100.0
S T A T E	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1	

	2010	7.6	45.4	96.2	93.9	13.0	72,383	3.6	3.8	87.8
--	------	-----	------	------	------	------	--------	-----	-----	------

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	2007	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	478	-	-	-	-	-	105
	2009	459	-	-	-	-	-	129
	2010	451	-	-	-	-	-	121
D I S T R I C T	2007	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	478	-	-	-	-	-	105
	2009	459	-	-	-	-	-	129
	2010	451	-	-	-	-	-	121
S T A T E	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
2010	2,064,312	155,468	154,389	152,681	154,465	154,982	146,919	

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	2007	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	28	14	38,518	89	11	-	21	-	-
	2009	31	14	41,177	87	13	-	17	-	-
	2010	32	15	43,964	91	9	1	17	-	-
S T A T E	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
	2010	132,502	13	63,296	42	57	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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	-	-	-	38.9	50.8	49.6
White	-	-	-	38.0	50.8	50.4
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	11.1	14.3
Low Income	-	-	-	23.5	43.2	36.4

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	-	-	-	52.5	50.8	48.0
White	-	-	-	52.0	51.7	48.8
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	7.1	11.1	7.1
Low Income	-	-	-	38.2	37.8	30.3

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?

Illini West High School/District is in its fourth year of existence. The school did not make AYP in 2010, resulting in Academic Early Warning Year 1. Students took the PSAE, the state assessment instrument, in 2010. Although 126 students took the writing portion of the PSAE, 125 students took the reading, mathematics, and science portions. This is the third year in a row that the school has not made AYP.

The following data reveal the Reading scores from the 2010 test as well as three-year trend data.

Grade 11 Reading scores are below the state benchmark.

Grade 11 Reading—49.6% met or exceeded, which constitutes a 1% decrease as compared to last year's scores.

Grade 11 Reading—56.9% of females met or exceeded standards, and 43.3% of males met or exceeded.

Grade 11 Reading—36.4% low income students met standards (0% exceeded).

Grade 11 Reading—14.3% of IEP students met (0% exceeded).

The three-year trend data show that the percentage exceeding standards rose slightly (2%), and the percentage meeting standards rose 12% from 2008 to 2009 but fell 4% in 2010. The percentage of students in the "below" category fell from 53% to 38% during the time period, but the percentage in the "warning" category rose 4%. Significant subgroup data include the increase during the three-year time period of those students designated as academic warning; the percentage has increased each year: 6%, 16%, and 27% for low income students and 10%, 13%, and 18% for males.

Grade 11 Mathematics scores are below the state benchmark.

Grade 11 Mathematics—48.0% met or exceeded, which constitutes a 2.8% decrease as compared to last year's scores and a 4.5% decrease from 2008.

Grade 11 Mathematics—51.7% of females met or exceeded standards, and 44.8% of males met or exceeded.

Grade 11 Mathematics—30.3% of low income met (0% exceeded).

Grade 11 Mathematics—7.1% of IEP students met (0% exceeded).

The three-year trend data shows that the percentage of students exceeding standards is stable but low at 5%, and the percentage of students meeting standards has fallen slightly, from 48% to 43%. The percentage of students in the “below” category has increased 5% in the past three years, and the percentage in the “warning” category remains fairly stable at 10%. Students designated as low income have increased in the warning category: 18%, 11%, and 21%; the increase was especially high from 2009 to 2010.

The graduation rate has remained consistently very high, 100% as compared to the state rate of 87.1%.

The dropout rate is low (2.6%—2009/10 and 2.3%—2008/09) as compared to the state rate of 3.5%.

Truancy levels have improved (0.9%—2009/10 and 3.4%—2008/09) the past two years. The state’s rate was 3.5% for 2009/10 and 4.1% for 2008/09.

The attendance rate of 95.2% (94.8%—2008/09) is slightly better than the state’s rates of 93.7% for 2009/10 and 93.3% for 2008/09.

The mobility rate is low (8.2%—2009/10 and 10.5%—2008/09), which is below the state’s average of 13.5% for 2009/10 and 14.9 for 2008/09.

Low income (31.4%—2009/10 and 33.5%—2008/09) is below the state average of 42.95%—2009/10 and 41.1%—2008/09.

The low income group has remained fairly stable and is approximately 10% less than the state average.

Parental involvement parallels that of the state average. Parental involvement at Illini West High School was 96.2%—2009/10 and 98.5%—2008/09, and the parental involvement statewide was 96.7%—2009/10 and 96.8%—2008/09.

The number of students tested is above the state target level for percentage tested on state tests.

All teachers at Illini West High School are highly qualified to teach in their areas. In 2009/10 average teacher experience was 14.3 years, which is slightly higher than the

state average of 12.5%. However, 87.2% hold a bachelor's degree. The percentage of teachers at Illini West High School holding a master's degree (12.8%) is significantly lower than the state's average of 55.8%. Illini West has one teacher who is certified through the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards.

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

External Factors:

Students enter Illini West High School from three different schools from three different districts.

Data from the feeder schools has not been typically shared with the high school.

Internal Factors:

Curricula are not directly aligned to Illinois Learning Standards.

Teachers have not started to use data to drive their curricula and inform their instructional decisions.

Teachers of content areas receive few opportunities for professional growth to improve instruction in the areas of reading weakness identified through data.

Reading instruction is not offered in any of the content areas.

Data reveal that a significant percentage of students do not take Algebra II and, therefore, do not have an opportunity to learn all the skills that are tested on state mathematics assessments.

A large percentage (85.7%) of IEP students have not met or exceeded standards in Reading, and 100% of IEP students have not met or exceeded standards in Mathematics. The curricula for IEP students has not paralleled the curricula of regular education students.

Students do not receive instruction in study skills and test-taking skills.

The physical facility, which is leased from the elementary district, does not lend itself to technology.

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

Illini West needs to form a team to share data with administrators and teachers from the feeder schools.

Illini West will facilitate confidential sharing of student achievement, dispositions to learning, behaviors, parental involvement, and other relevant data with the feeder schools.

Illini West needs to form a committee to gather data and study the impact of transportation on student learning.

All departments will create curricular documents aligned with the Illinois Learning Standards.

Data needs to be used to drive curricula, class instruction, and professional development. Curricular mapping needs to continue.

Teachers of content areas need additional professional growth opportunities to improve instruction in the areas of reading weakness identified through data.

There are two options for addressing the problem of students not prepared for the Prairie State (PSAE) in Mathematics: 1) change the content of all the Mathematics courses or 2) increase the number of courses that at-risk students take in their freshman and/or sophomore years.

Additional learning opportunities need to be implemented for students identified through data as students at risk for not meeting standards in the areas of English and Mathematics.

Teachers and administrators will discuss and determine the feasibility of developing and adding new courses/classes to the English and Mathematics departments.

Both regular and special education teachers need professional development in the art of team teaching.

A committee needs to be formed to study the feasibility of implementing study skills and test-taking skills instruction.

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data (Optional)

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

The PLAN is given to sophomores in October of each year. The EXPLORE is administered to ninth-grade students in the fall. Both tests are intended to predict the expected performance on the ACT. The data from these tests indicate that a significant percentage of students at Illini West High School are scoring below readiness levels. The PLAN shows 45.5% predicted readiness, and the EXPLORE shows 45.8% predicted readiness in the area of Reading.

The PLAN indicates that 36 students in Reading and 14 students in Mathematics were close to achieving readiness status and have been designated as at-risk students.

The AIMS Web is given to eighth, ninth, and tenth graders. Analysis shows that results of the AIMS Web do not align closely with results from the Prairie State.

In the area of Mathematics, 11 students' (9.3%) scores did not change from the EXPLORE to the PLAN, and 19 students' (16.1%) scores decreased from the EXPLORE to the PLAN. Twelve students' (9.6%) scores did not change from the PLAN to the ACT; 24 students (19.2%) scores decreased on the ACT as compared to the PLAN.

There is not a high correlation between course grades and scores on the PSAE in English and Mathematics.

When data from PSAE English scores are compared with data from English grades in grade 11, nine students exceeded standards; of those nine, seven received an A in class, one a B+, and one a B. In the "meets" designation, 14 received an A, 2 a B+, 13 a B, 4 a C+, 7 a C, 1 a D, and 1 a D-. Of the 49 students scoring in the "below" range, 1 received an A, one a B+, 10 a B, 4 a C+, 10 a C, 3 a D+, 4 a D, and 1 a D-.

When data from PSAE Mathematics scores are compared with data from Mathematics grades in grade 11, six students exceeded standards; of those six, 5 received an A in class and one a C+. In the "meets" designation, 17 received an A, 7 a B+, 10 a B, 8 a C+, 5 a C, 2 a D+, and 1 a D. Of the 54 students scoring in the "below" range, 3 received an A, 3 a B+, 6 a B, 13 a C+, 8 a C, 6 a D+, 7 a D, and 3 a D-. Eight students fell into the "warning" category, with three receiving C+, 2 a C, 1 a D+, 1 a D, and 1 a D-.

Data from the PSAE scores over the last three years indicate a significant number of students (45) were within three-to-five points of meeting standards in the areas of Reading and Mathematics on the PSAE.

Data from the Instructional Practices Inventory, conducted between March 30, 2010, and April 15, 2010, reveal that a large percentage of instructional time is spent in teacher-led instruction: 44.5% in core classes and 23.08% in non-core classes. Complete disengagement occurred 6.9% of the time in core classes and 2.56% in non-core

classes. Students working independently, disengaged from the teacher, occurred 12.87% of the time in core classes and 12.82% in non-core classes. Students were actively engaged in learning 13.66% of the time in core classes and 42.31% in non-core classes. Student-learning conversations were evident 3.96% of the time in core classes and 5.13% in non-core classes.

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

External Factors:

Students enter Illini West High School from three feeder schools in three different districts with which there is minimal communication.

A significant amount of instruction is teacher-led; student engagement and student-learning conversations take place to a much lesser extent.

Internal Factors:

Courses do not prepare approximately 50% of the students to be successful when taking the next test in the EPAS sequence.

There is a lack of rigor in Mathematics and Reading curricular; and courses do not align to the EPAS college readiness standards to prepare students in time for assessments.

The curricula in the English department emphasizes literature and is weak in other genres, such as technological, business reports, and other nonfiction genres.

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

A team needs to be formed for the purpose of collecting and studying data to drive decisions concerning curricula, instruction, and assessment.

One way to generate valuable data for decision-making would be to have common assessments in courses from the English and Mathematics departments.

No learning in Mathematics is evident from the scores in the EPAS sequence of 25-30% of freshmen and sophomores, suggesting a need for more effective instruction, a need for different curricula, or both.

No learning in English is evident from the scores in the EPAS sequence of 24-29% of freshmen and sophomores, suggesting a need for more effective instruction, a need for different curricula, or both.

The emphasis in the reading curricula needs to shift from literature to informational reading.

Supplementary help with a highly qualified interventionist needs to be implemented for freshmen, sophomores, and juniors whose results on the PLAN and EXPLORE indicate they are at risk. Different, but appropriate, interventions will be implemented for students whose PLAN and EXPLORE results were well below standards.

Clearly identified core academic expectations for freshmen students need to be provided to the three feeder schools, particularly in the areas of reading and mathematics.

Professional development in the area of student-engaged learning is needed for all staff. After strategies are implemented, additional data needs to be collected from classroom observations.

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

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

Illini West High School, located in Carthage, Illinois, the County seat of Hancock County, Illinois, is a recently converged district in its fourth year of existence. Students from Carthage, Dallas City, and LaHarpe elementary districts attend Illini West. The district comprises a large geographical region of 460 square miles; some students spend three hours a day traveling to and from school.

The high school building and grounds have been leased from the Carthage Elementary District. The high school campus consists of one main building, six portable units that house ten classrooms, and an athletic complex (football field, weight/fitness center and a track). Baseball and softball fields are located off campus.

The high school enrollment is approximately 418 students. Illini West has remained extremely homogeneous since its inception in 2007 with 98.7% of its students being white, 0.4% African American, 0.2% Hispanic, 0% Asian, 0.4% Native American, and 0.2% multi-racial in 2009-2010. The mobility rate is fairly low, 8.2%, which also contributes to the homogeneous nature of the school.

The high school offers varied curricula on campus, as well as opportunities off campus, including auto mechanics and heavy equipment operation at a nearby district. Dual credit classes are also available through Carl Sandburg Community College in the areas of sociology, composition, psychology, speech, certified nursing assistant, and criminal justice. Courses for students with IEPs are provided through the special education department as well as through team teaching with the general education and special education teachers.

The school schedule continues to provide forty-three instructional minutes per class.

The number of students with special needs is significant (approaching 30%) in lower-level core courses, which increases the challenges for instructors to help students in those classes to meet and/or exceed standards.

The percentage of low-income students is 31.4. This may be an under-representation of low-income students since the three feeder schools show low-income percentages of 32% (Carthage Middle School), 39% (Carthage Primary School), 43% (LaHarpe Elementary School), and 48% (Dallas City Elementary School). Additionally, Methode, Carthage's main employer, reduced its working staff from approximately 1,400 to 40 this past year, causing many families in the district to experience unemployment thereby reducing family income. Students from families thus affected may be feeling financial stress. Another local employer, Carthage Veterinary Services, has hired several people of Hispanic ethnicity. Although the number of Spanish-speaking students is not enough to constitute a group at this time, continual growth of this population is likely.

Due to an increase in the school's enrollment since the convergence, cafeteria space is limited. Consequently, students are allowed to leave campus for lunch. This open-campus feature may create adjustment problems for some students, especially freshmen who have been accustomed to a small, rural, closed-campus setting.

Illini West receives tremendous support from its communities. Sports booster and music booster organizations are very active and provide the school and students with many extras. Success in sports makes identification with Illini West High School an area of community pride.

Local businesses also support the school. Specifically, Carson Ford participates in Driving for Dollars and donates \$3,000.00 to sports boosters and \$3,000.00 to music boosters annually. First State Bank uses a cash-back, credit card promotion, which benefits the school. Marine Trust sponsors a Senior of the Month program and gives a scholarship to one senior each year. The hospital sponsors a job shadowing day. Approximately twenty-five businesses participate in the Cooperative Work Program; seniors in this program are released for two periods a day for on-the-job training and employment.

The LaHarpe Education Foundation, the Carthage Foundation, and the Illini West Foundation have created local scholarships for students. In addition to the foundations, many local scholarships have been established and given to seniors; in 2010, forty-five different students received over one hundred scholarships, totaling over \$350,000.

The PBIS program, which focuses on student attendance, behavior, grades, and health, has shown improvements in student attendance and behavior. PBIS data reveals a significant trend in student behavior issues. During the 2008-2009 school year, 169 students served 676 days of in-school suspension for 549 infractions. Seventeen students served 59.5 days of out-of-school suspension for 20 different infractions. During the 2009-2010 school year, 10 students served 58 days of in-school suspension for 20 infractions, and 9 students served 46 days of out-of-school suspensions for 10 different infractions. Two major areas of infractions have been tardies and technology (cell phone) misuse. In three years there has been a significant decline in tardies, from 380 (2007-2008), to slightly below 100 (2008-2009), to approximately 50 (2009-2010).

There are 82 desktop computers and 80 laptop computers in the district. Five wireless access points exist. In the high school building, there are 17 network printers and 9 personal printers. Teachers also have access to 5 scanners, 17 LCD projectors, 6 TV/VCR/DVD sets, 5 overhead projectors, 5 cameras, 2 camcorders, 1 laser disc, 2 Elmos, and 4 Smartboards. A needs assessment survey is currently being conducted; it will be given to all teachers and will reveal level of competence of various technologies and need for professional growth. A student survey is being created as well.

Perceptual data resulting from an online survey conducted by the counselor reveals a perceived overemphasis on sports and an under emphasis on academics at Illini West. This survey was sent to 350 former students of Illini West; of those who received it, 33 alumni responded, 26 are attending college, 4 are employed either full- or part-time, 2 are enlisted in the military, and 1 is neither employed nor attending school. Thirty-one students felt safe "most of the time" while in high school; thirty felt there was an "excessive" or "somewhat excessive" emphasis on athletics. Fourteen felt the emphasis on academics was "about right," and 13 felt it was "too little"; no one felt emphasis on academics was "excessive." In the area of academics, 25 respondents felt they worked "very hard" or "fairly" hard. When asked how well English classes prepared them for writing in college or employment, 13 responded "poorly" or "not at all" and 9 responded "adequately." Reading in English classes prepared 2 students "very well," 7 students "well," 8 students "adequately," 9 students "poorly," and 2 students "not at all." When asked how well Mathematics classes prepared them for Mathematics in college or employment, 5 responded "very well," 7 "well," 10 "adequately," 10 "poorly," and 1 "not at all."

There is a three-part freshmen orientation program: the first part occurs in December when the administrator takes current high school students to the feeder schools to present information on programs and curriculum and answer questions of eighth graders. The eighth graders are brought to Illini West in February to take placement tests, tour the building, and hear about expectations for Illini West students. Nearly all (95%) of incoming freshmen and their parents attend this event. Another freshman orientation program is held a week before school begins; 60 students accompanied by parents attended this event. These programs are designated to help incoming freshmen make a smooth transition from middle school and to foster the attitude that they are entering a learning community. These efforts have resulted in a smoother transition to the large high school environment.

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

Because Illini West is in its fourth year of convergence, most growing pains are over; students are adapting to the building, the schedule, and the teachers.

The travel time of some students affects their ability to receive support services before and after school; it also affects their extra-curricular activities, study time, and fatigue.

The implementation of PBIS is a factor in student achievement.

The extensive freshmen orientation should facilitate student acclimation to the high school.

Lack of availability to certain technologies and lack of proficiency with certain hardware and software affect the extent to which it is used in the classroom.

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

The continued improvement of the school climate and culture should result in higher academic achievement.

There is a need to reduce the amount of time that students spend commuting.

Improvement of behavior as noted in the PBIS data should positively influence the learning environment.

The freshmen orientation program needs to continue to be fully implemented. Technology needs, both for teachers and students, should be determined through surveys. Areas for improvement as noted in the Technology Plan should be followed.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)
Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

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

Illini West employs 31 full-time teachers, all of whom are highly qualified. The average teacher experience is 14.3 years, which has increased slightly since the convergence. This percentage is slightly above the state average.

Of the 31 teachers on staff, 12.8% have master's degrees or higher, and there is one National Board Certified teacher. The percentage of teachers who have their master's degrees has increased slightly the past three years. This average is significantly below the state average of 55.8%.

Pupil-to-teacher ratio has dropped from 20.5% to 17.1% and remains slightly below the state average of 18%. Teacher turnover rates have been very low the past three years.

Data was not kept concerning the number of teachers taking advantage of professional development in the form of conferences and workshops for the 2009-2010 school year. All teachers were involved with professional development in the form of in-house workshops and meetings on each of 9 SIP half-day release opportunities.

One reading specialist was hired in 2009-2010 and continues to be employed for the 2010-2011 school year.

In 2009-10 a new principal and assistant principal were employed, and in 2010 a new superintendent was employed. These administrators have made a commitment to school improvement and professional growth by implementing new programs, among them being Teachers Observing Teachers, Student Mentoring, Charger Challenge Boot Camp, Teaching Tip of the Day, and ACT Question of the Day, and Check in Check Out.

The level of technology of each teacher is currently being assessed.

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

The data shows teachers at Illini West have the experience needed to manage and monitor student learning. Pupil-to-teacher ratio and teacher stability indicate a positive impact on student achievement.

The low number of teachers with master's degrees reflects the lack of opportunity to refine their instructional skills.

Although professional development has been encouraged, it has not always been data driven and may not be meeting the needs of teachers as they prepare all students to meet and/or exceed standards.

The reading specialist is in charge of administering the Reading 180 program; after the first year of the program data is being collected but is not sufficient to determine impact on student achievement.

Research shows that the programs implemented by the administrators increase student achievement.

Although current technology meets the demands of some teachers, a needs assessment will determine how to best use what is available and what new technologies need to be pursued.

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

There is a need for collaboration between new and experienced teachers.

Encouragement needs to be provided for teachers to continue their professional growth by attending conferences, working on master's degree programs, and becoming National Board Certified Teachers.

A needs assessment for professional development should be given. The professional development plan needs to be data driven. An organized professional development plan must be fully implemented to provide in-house learning opportunities for teachers to meet the needs of students.

The reading specialist needs to continue with the Reading 180 program in order to collect trend data to determine impact on student achievement.

Administrators need to continue to support newly implemented building programs and collect trend data to determine the impact of those programs on student achievement.

When completed, the needs assessment for technology should drive professional growth in this area and the acquisition of additional technologies.

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

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

Parents can now access website assignments. Through Power School parents can keep abreast of assignments, check if their student is absent, needs additional help at home, or says he or she does not have homework. They can also find grades-in-progress for timely intervention. From August 1, 2009, to June 1, 2010, a total number of 19,605 hits were registered on the site.

Progress reports are sent upon request and for those students receiving a D or an F at that time. They are sent via U.S. mail at the midterm of each quarter.

School Reach, an automated parent notification communication system used for important information, keeps parents informed and increases parent involvement.

Daily announcements are emailed to parents and community members and are on the school's website.

Parent/teacher conferences are another opportunity for face-to-face discussions about student achievement. They are held in October and January of each year. The number of students whose parent(s) attended conferences was 134 out of 418, or 32%. The number of parents of lower-achieving students continues to remain well below the number of parents of high-achieving students.

Parent volunteers help with fine arts and extra-curricular events.

The close connection to Carl Sandburg College offers parents opportunities to take “continuing education” courses, courses in technology, and GED classes.

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

Power School allows parents timely access to assignments. However, Power School may result in more emails and phone calls showing concern about a student’s current grade, but it does not significantly impact student performance on standardized tests.

Although parent volunteers spend much time helping students and the school community, for the most part volunteerism remains confined to extra-curricular events. Consequently, student achievement is not directly impacted by the positive influence of parent involvement in this area. However, research shows that interest and encouragement influences student performance in a positive way. Consequently, through increased parental involvement, parents are able to better understand ways to help their children be successful at school.

Parent involvement of low-achieving and low-income students continues to remain much lower than parental involvement of high-achieving and average-to-high-income students.

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

After analysis of the data, parental involvement in students’ activities and classroom grades is an area of strength. However, parental involvement could be focused to encourage more participation in the area of academic achievement.

Student-led conferences need to be considered since the parents of low-achieving and low-income students may be encouraged to attend parent-teacher conferences if their child has a role in the conference.

More parental involvement on the school SIP committee needs to occur.

The school needs to create a Parent Involvement instrument to determine methods for increasing meaningful parental involvement.

Parents of students designated as “at-risk” students and parents of students who have been identified as low-achieving need to be involved in interventions affecting their children.

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?

Data between elementary districts and Illini West district have not been shared.

The curricula are not directly aligned to the Illinois Learning Standards.

Teachers have not started to use data to drive their curricula and inform their instructional decisions.

Teachers of content areas receive few opportunities for professional growth to improve instruction in the areas of reading weakness identified through data.

Data reveal that a significant percentage of students do not take Algebra II and, therefore, do not have an opportunity to learn all the skills that are tested on the PSAE.

Courses do not prepare approximately 50 of the students to be successful when taking the next test in the EPAS sequence.

There is a lack of rigor in Mathematics and Reading curricula, and courses do not align to the EPAS College Readiness Standards to prepare students in time for assessments.

The curricula in the English department emphasizes literature and is weak in other genres, such as technological, business reports, and other nonfiction genres.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	To make AYP in the areas of Mathematics	2,
2	To make AYP in the area of reading.	1,

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. White students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 4. White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

To make AYP in the areas of Mathematics

Objective 1 Description

While our current achievement in Mathematics for grade 11 is 50% meeting/exceeding for PSAE, 85% of all eleventh graders will meet or exceed by 2012 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. White students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 4. White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 1 Title :

To make AYP in the areas of Mathematics

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	The minimal path for students will change to the following: Algebra 1A freshman year, Alg 1B and Basic Geometry sophomore year, Algebra II junior year.	08/15/2011	05/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	10,000
2	A new policy will be implemented for students who fail a semester in a Mathematics course. The policy will designate whether students should be allowed to go on, take credit recovery, attend summer school, or use other options.	12/01/2010	05/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	15,000
3	A Mathematics lab will be available for students who need interventions.	12/01/2010	05/30/2012	During School	Other	50,000
4	Students will be involved in higher-level thinking and engagement due to increased technology use in the classroom.	09/12/2011	05/27/2011	Before School	Other	5,000
5	An ACT/PSAE preparation will be available in Mathematics to students.	12/01/2010	05/25/2012	After School	Local Funds	1,000

6	Students will have Mathematics skill builders and/or test-prep problems integrated across all content areas weekly.	12/01/2010	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	200
7	Students will strengthen Mathematics performance with ACT-released items and PSAE Work Keys items integrated into their Mathematics lessons.	12/01/2010	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	200
8	Students will strengthen their Mathematics skills through interventions and strategies provided by RTI.	08/23/2010	05/25/2012	Before School	Title I	2,500
9	Students will receive instruction in core Mathematics courses that align with College Readiness Standards.	08/22/2011	05/25/2012	Before School	Title I	1,000
10	Students will receive instruction on identified skills they need to master based on EXPLORE, PLAN, and common assessments.	12/01/2010	05/25/2012	Before School	Title I	1,000

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

Objective 1 Title :

To make AYP in the areas of Mathematics

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All Mathematics teachers should be teaching Mathematics all the time.	08/23/2010	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	45,000
2	A Mathematics lab should be established in which each of the four Mathematics teachers spend one hour per day (when they used to be mentoring and in study hall) and hire a 0.5 person with expertise in teaching Mathematics using a variety of interventions.	08/22/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	45,000
3	Teachers need to be using technology to teach Mathematics. Graphing calculators, smart boards, clickers, websites, software and more can all promote higher level thinking and more student engagement.	12/01/2010	05/25/2012	During School	Other	30,000
4	Teachers need collaboration time. It is evident that there needs to be written policies concerning calculator use, grading, homework, review practices, professional development and more.	09/13/2010	05/25/2012	After School	Other	10,000

5	Whenever possible more than one teacher should be teaching the same course. Now no one has a collaboration partner.	08/15/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	45,000
6	With different teachers teaching the same course, common assessments will produce valuable data about student learning and teacher practice.	08/15/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	45,000
7	Data from the courses Business Math, Algebra 1A, Algebra 1B, Senior Review need to be analyzed and studied to determine the value of the classes in light of Illini West's failure to make AYP.	11/01/2010	05/07/2012	After School	Other	2,500
8	All teachers should be involved in professional development individually, as teams and as a complete faculty team, including Standards-Aligned Classroom, Math Across the Curriculum, Differentiated Instruction, and Engaged Learning.	09/13/2010	05/25/2012	After School	Title II	2,500
9	Teachers need time to observe and debrief with other teachers in their content areas.	01/10/2011	05/30/2012	After School	Local Funds	2,500
10	The Mathematics curriculum needs to be revised.	12/06/2010	08/10/2011	After School	Other	50,000

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

Objective 1 Title :

To make AYP in the areas of Mathematics

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	A Parent Involvement Analysis tool will be used to determine areas of strength and weakness regarding parental involvement at Illini West.	04/13/2011	05/13/2011	After School	Title I	250
2	Parents of incoming freshmen will attend an orientation prior to the start of school in the fall.	08/09/2011	08/11/2011	Before School	Title II	500
3	Parents will have greater access to information about their students' education through Power School, daily announcements on email, School Reach, and teacher websites.	08/23/2010	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	2,500

4	Parents will serve on the committee that monitors the progress of the School Improvement Plan.	09/13/2010	05/15/2012	After School	Title I	500
5				Before School	Title I	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

To make AYP in the areas of Mathematics

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?)

The principal, assistant principal, educational consultant, and representatives from the building leadership team and school improvement committee will monitor the strategies and activities for implementation and effectiveness. Staff will analyze data quarterly from EXPLORE, PLAN, ACT/PSAE, and local assessments.

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	Kim Schilson	Illini West Superintendent
2	Brad Gooding	Illini West Principal
3	Joey Dion	Illini West Assistant Principal
4	Ann Logan	Counselor
5	Elaine Dion	Consultant
6	Debbie Murphy	Building Leadership Team--Teacher
7	Theresa Twaddle	Building Leadership Team--Teacher
8	M.J. Palmer	Building Leadership Team--Teacher
9	Peggy Latherow	Building Leadership Team--Teacher
10	Debbie Murphy	Building Leadership Team--Teacher
11	Rhonda Miller	PBIS--Teacher
12		

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

To make AYP in the area of reading.

Objective 2 Description

While our current achievement in reading in grade 11 shows 49.6% of our students meet/exceed, the eleventh grade will make AYP of 85% in 2012 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. White students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 4. White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 2 Title :

To make AYP in the area of reading.

Strategies and Activities	TimeLine		Budget	
	Start Date	End Date	Fund Source	Amount(\$)

1	Students will have reading skill builders and/or test-prep problems integrated across all content areas weekly.	12/01/2010	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Students will strengthen reading performances by ACT-released items and PSAE Work Keys items being integrated into weekly English lessons.	12/01/2010	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	Students will strengthen their reading skills through interventions and strategies provided by the RTI program.	09/13/2010	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	Students will be given the opportunity to participate in ACT-Preparation sessions.	03/05/2011	03/26/2011	After School	Other	
5	Students will receive instruction in all English courses that align with the College Readiness Standards.	08/15/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	Students will use reading strategies daily in all content areas.	12/01/2010	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
7	Students will receive instruction on identified skills they need to master based on EXPLORE, PLAN, and common assessments.	01/10/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title :

To make AYP in the area of reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will use data to refer students for special assistance with the reading specialist.	12/01/2010	05/25/2012	During School	Other	
2	Selected teachers will participate in a data analysis training.	11/15/2010	05/25/2012	After School	Other	
3	Student engagement strategies will be introduced at monthly staff meetings, and teachers will select and implement a strategy in the classroom. Success of strategies will be discussed in small groups.	12/01/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Local Funds	
4	Teachers will be trained to integrate ACT/PSAE-released items in their respective courses.	12/01/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Local Funds	
5	English teachers will align English curricula to the skills tested on the ACT/PSAE.	09/20/2010	05/20/2011	After School	Other	

6	Teachers will receive training in team teaching strategies.	01/10/2011	05/20/2011	After School	Other	
7	Teachers will receive professional development in differentiated instruction.	01/10/2011	05/20/2011	After School	Other	
8	Teachers will participate in Standards Aligned Classroom Initiative.	01/10/2011	05/20/2011	After School	Other	

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

Objective 2 Title :

To make AYP in the area of reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will be encouraged through phone calls by teachers to take an active role in their child's educational process, including parent-teacher conferences and access to Power School.	12/01/2010	05/25/2012	After School	Other	
2	Parents of incoming freshmen will attend an orientation prior to the start of school in the fall.	08/08/2011	08/19/2011	Before School	Other	
3	Parents will have greater access to information about their students' education through Power School, daily announcements on email, School Reach, and teacher websites.	11/15/2010	05/25/2012	After School	Other	
4	Parents will serve on the committee that monitors the progress of the School Improvement Plan.	09/13/2010	05/15/2012	After School	Other	
5	A Parent Involvement Analysis tool will be used to determine areas of strength and weakness regarding parental involvement at Illini West.	04/04/2011	05/13/2011	During School	Other	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

To make AYP in the area of reading.

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

The principal, assistant principal, educational consultant, and representatives from the building leadership team and school improvement committee will monitor the strategies and activities for implementation and effectiveness. Staff will analyze data quarterly from EXPLORE, PLAN, ACT/PSAE, and local assessments.

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	Brad Gooding	Illini West Principal
2	Joey Dion	Illini West Assistant Principal
3	Ann Logan	Counselor
4	Elaine Dion	Consultant

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.)*

Copies of the school report card were given to parents at parent-teacher conferences, and a copy was available on the school's website.

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.

Illini West High School's School Improvement Team was responsible for the development and review of the School Improvement Plan. Stakeholders were involved in the creation of the SIP. Student achievement data was collected and analyzed by the team of Mathematics teachers and a team of English teachers. The reports from those teams were compiled and presented to the developers of the plan.

The Plan was presented for peer review to West Prairie High School.

After peer review, the plan was presented to the Board of Education for their approval.

	Name	Title
1	Kim Schilson	Superintendent
2	Brad Gooding	Principal
3	Sue Owens	ROE Representative
4	Elaine Dion	Educational Consultant
5	Ann Logan	Counselor
6	Barb Wilmot	Math Consultant
7	M.J. Palmer	Building Leadership Team--Teacher
8	Debbie Murphy	Building Leadership Team--Teacher
9	Theresa Twaddle	Building Leadership Team--Teacher
10	Peggy Latherow	Building Leadership Team--Teacher
11	Rhonda Miller	Building Leadership Team--Teacher
12	Melissa Sturlic	Building Leadership Team--Teacher
13	Vicki Black	Building Leadership Team--Teacher
14	Kristen Cook	Building Leadership Team--Teacher

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

Part C. Peer Review Process

Peer Review - Describe the district's peer review and approval process. Peer review teams should include teachers and administrators from schools and districts similar to the one in improvement, but significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students. As appropriate, peer reviewers may be teachers from other schools, personnel from other districts, Regional Office of Education staff, Intermediate Service Center staff, RESPRO staff, university faculty, consultants, et al., or combinations thereof. RESPRO staff serving on a School Support Team should not serve on a peer review team in the same district. The peer review should precede the local board approval and must be completed within 45 days of receiving the school improvement plan. For further description of the peer review process see LEA and School Improvement: Non-Regulatory Guidance, July 21, 2006, at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

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

The following consultants provided assistance to Illini West High School as they developed their SIP:

Sue Owens, ROE 26 SSOS coach
Dr. Barb Wilmot, Math consultant
Dr. Elaine Dion, retired English teacher and English consultant.

The ROE coach facilitated the peer review process between the Illini West leadership team and a team from a neighboring high school on December 8, 2010. Teams used the monitoring prompt to guide them through the process.

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.

Illini West High School does not have an official mentoring program in place at this time. However, several teachers are on staff who have been trained through the ROE 26 mentoring program, Induction for the 21st Century Educator. Illini West plans to develop an official mentoring program and submit it to ISBE for approval. This process will be completed by May 2011.

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.

Kim Schilson, Superintendent, and Brad Gooding, Principal, provided support to Illini West staff in the following ways:

1. Created a timeline for Mathematics and English curricular revisions and alignment and data analysis.
2. Provided support for curriculum work through hiring substitute teachers for English and Mathematics teachers as they analyzed data and revised and aligned curricula.
3. Requested a ROE consultant to be present to guide teachers through the data and curriculum work.
4. Hired a part-time staff person to collect data from curricular teams and input data into the SIP. This staff person is also an English consultant and is available to staff for assistance.
5. Requested a Mathematics consultant via ARRA ROE grant to assist the Mathematics department with curricula and data analysis.
6. Opportunities for professional development aligned to the SIP will be supported by the district administration.
7. Resources will be provided, as needed for the implementation of the SIP.

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 Regional Office of Education #26 ARRA grant coordinator, assisted Illini West with the development of their SIP. The coordinator also assisted the Mathematics and Reading committees. The ARRA grant will provide funding to hire a Mathematics consultant to assist the Mathematics department with data analysis and curriculum work. The ARRA grant will also provide substitute reimbursement and stipends for teachers completing data analysis and curriculum work. The ARRA grant will also assist with the funding of professional development activities aligned with the SIP.

	Name	Title
1	Sue Owens	RESPRO consultant
2	Barb Wilmot	Math consultant

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 11/23/2010

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

 Yes No

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

 Yes No

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

 Yes No

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

 Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

 Yes No N/A

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

 Yes No N/A

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

 Yes No N/A

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

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

 Yes No N/A

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

 Yes No N/A

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

 Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS	
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance? [C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control? [C]
CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES	
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Has the SIP team stated <u>measurable objectives</u> that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan? [C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> N/A	Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency? [C]
ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES	
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement? [C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Are the strategies and activities measurable? [C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified? [C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear? [C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> N/A	Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students? [C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> 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?
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> N/A	Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities for students? [C]

<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> 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="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]
MONITORING	
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> 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="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> 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="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> 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