Reagan Middle School
Annual School Improvement Report
2010-2012

This report is a summary of Reagan Middle School's 2010-2012 School Improvement Plan. It highlights the following areas of focus: summary of progress, performance of students, identified areas of greatest strength and areas of needed improvement, and focus areas for 2010-2012 efforts.

Summary of Progress/Emphasis for 2010-2012:
Overall, state assessment scores have shown some growth over the past few years but have not shown significant enough growth to meet the 85% meets and exceeds benchmark for all students in the areas of reading and math.

Improvement in Student Achievement:
Growth in Reading Achievement has been documented in the areas of: All Students (2.8%) in a two year period and Free and Reduced Lunch (3.1%) in a two year period. Growth in the area of Math Achievement has been documented in ; All Students (5.8%) in a two year period, Individualized Education Plan- IEP (9.4%) in a two year period and Free and Reduced Lunch (10.1%) in a two year period

Continued Areas of Concern:
Unfortunately, achievement for students with disabilities in the area of Reading has declined over a two year period leaving our building still unable to reach state AYP expectations or show desired growth within this subgroup content area.

2010-2012 Areas of Focus:
Increase opportunities for staff collaboration to further refine expected student outcomes, make instructional decisions based on frequent and consistent monitoring of student achievement data and increase opportunities and efficiency of strengthening specific student skill deficits.

Improve access to the genuine school curriculum for students with disabilities by increasing professional development for staff in the area of co-teaching and by aligning instructional materials in the special education classroom with those utilized in the regular education classroom.

Score Data:

(ATTACHED)

* For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 85% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.

Local Board Approved	
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	470521700221001		
District Name:	Dixon USD 170	School Name:	Reagan Middle School
Superintendent:	Michael A Juenger	Principal:	Andrew Bullock
District Address:	1335 Franklin Gr Rd	School Address:	620 Division St
City/State/Zip:	Dixon, IL 61021 9257	City/State/Zip:	Dixon, IL 61021 4103
District Telephone#:	Label 8152847722 Extn: 5114	School Telephone#:	8152847725 Extn: 3429
District Email:	mjuenger@dixonschools.org	School Email:	abullock@dixonschools.org
Is this plan for a Title I School?	Yes No		

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2010-11 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2010-11 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status Year 2

	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
Student Groups	%	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	99.9	Yes	99.9	Yes	76.3		Yes	78.7		Yes	93.9	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	78.0		Yes	80.7		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

Native American														
Multiracial/Ethnic	98.5	Yes	98.5	Yes	75.9		Yes	72.2		Yes				
LEP														
Students with Disabilities	99.3	Yes	99.3	Yes	36.6	44.0	No	37.2	44.3	No	91.3			
Economically Disadvantaged	99.7	Yes	99.7	Yes	67.8	66.4	Yes	67.4	63.8	Yes	91.9			

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 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

School Information								
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Attendance Rate (%)	95.4	95.8	95.7	95.7	95.2	94.4	94.1	93.9
Truancy Rate (%)	-	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.9	1.1	14.2	0.6
Mobility Rate (%)	8.5	-	9.0	10.2	12.0	11.1	15.8	11.5
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	949	966	898	880	849	835	820	792
Low Income (%)	29.0	31.9	34.9	35.3	27.8	40.1	40.4	44.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	0.5	0.1
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16.7
White, non-Hispanic (%)	90.0	89.4	88.9	86.7	85.2	87.1	83.2	81.8
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	3.8	3.5	4.2	2.5	4.0	2.9	3.8	3.8
Hispanic (%)	3.7	4.1	3.9	4.3	4.1	3.1	4.5	4.8
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	2.5	2.9	3.0	1.8	1.6	1.2	1.6	1.6
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.2	0.0
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	4.9	5.3	6.7	8.0

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

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
SCHOOL	2000	89.7	4.2	3.7	2.2	0.2	-
	2001	91.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	0.1	-
	2002	89.5	3.9	3.6	3.0	-	-
	2003	90.0	3.8	3.7	2.5	-	-
	2004	89.4	3.5	4.1	2.9	-	-
	2005	88.9	4.2	3.9	3.0	-	-
	2006	86.7	2.5	4.3	1.8	0.2	4.4
	2007	85.2	4.0	4.1	1.6	0.1	4.9
	2008	87.1	2.9	3.1	1.2	0.5	5.3
	2009	83.2	3.8	4.5	1.6	0.2	6.7
	2010	81.8	3.8	4.8	1.6	-	8.0
DISTRICT	2000	91.1	3.4	3.3	2.2	0.1	-
	2001	91.1	3.3	3.3	2.2	0.2	-
	2002	90.5	3.7	3.5	2.4	-	-
	2003	89.9	3.8	3.9	2.3	-	-
	2004	88.7	4.5	4.3	2.4	0.1	-
	2005	88.2	4.4	4.3	2.4	0.1	0.6
	2006	86.8	3.3	4.2	2.2	0.1	3.3
	2007	85.6	3.6	4.1	2.0	0.1	4.4
	2008	86.5	2.6	3.8	1.7	0.2	5.1
	2009	85.2	2.6	4.4	1.8	0.1	5.8
	2010	84.4	2.7	4.2	1.5	0.1	7.1
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

STATE	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.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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 (%)
SCHOOL	2000	0.2	24.8	94.7	94.9	10.6	3	0.3	-	-
	2001	-	28.3	100.0	95.6	8.1	2	0.2	-	-
	2002	-	28.0	100.0	95.5	8.6	2	0.2	-	-
	2003	-	29.0	100.0	95.4	8.5	-	-	-	-
	2004	-	31.9	100.0	95.8	-	3	0.3	-	-
	2005	-	34.9	100.0	95.7	9.0	4	0.4	-	-
	2006	0.1	35.3	100.0	95.7	10.2	3	0.3	-	-
	2007	-	27.8	100.0	95.2	12.0	8	0.9	-	-
	2008	-	40.1	100.0	94.4	11.1	9	1.1	-	-
	2009	0.5	40.4	100.0	94.1	15.8	115	14.2	-	-
	2010	0.1	44.4	100.0	93.9	11.5	5	0.6	-	-
DISTRICT	2000	0.2	23.2	94.6	94.7	15.1	28	0.9	4.3	75.5
	2001	0.1	23.7	95.8	94.9	12.4	34	1.1	6.6	75.7
	2002	-	24.3	92.0	95.8	13.0	23	0.8	5.0	79.1
	2003	-	26.7	94.1	94.6	11.4	37	1.2	2.3	85.5
	2004	-	31.4	94.4	93.6	12.2	41	1.3	4.7	95.5
	2005	0.1	34.5	90.5	93.7	12.0	48	1.6	1.8	94.0
	2006	0.1	34.2	93.9	94.7	11.7	11	0.4	2.5	79.1
	2007	0.3	32.8	94.5	94.5	15.0	147	5.1	1.9	91.3
	2008	0.3	38.4	93.3	93.9	15.2	90	3.2	1.7	90.0
	2009	0.6	39.3	97.4	94.0	12.1	163	6.2	2.0	79.1
	2010	0.4	41.1	98.1	94.2	17.3	13	0.5	1.6	85.3
	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

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

STATE	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.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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)
SCHOOL	2000	985	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	975	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	946	-	-	229	224	226	-
	2003	949	-	-	226	273	226	-
	2004	966	-	-	220	229	280	-
	2005	898	-	-	209	235	236	-
	2006	880	-	-	219	214	228	-
	2007	849	-	-	189	224	217	-
	2008	835	-	-	186	233	224	-
	2009	820	-	-	202	194	232	-
	2010	792	-	-	211	193	189	-
DISTRICT	2000	3,159	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	3,084	238	212	259	227	251	235
	2002	3,034	197	225	229	224	233	239
	2003	2,988	208	196	226	275	230	225
	2004	2,992	214	200	220	229	280	253
	2005	2,999	192	218	210	235	236	222
	2006	2,929	184	204	219	214	228	221
	2007	2,885	203	175	189	224	217	269
	2008	2,929	202	208	186	233	224	212
	2009	2,870	209	198	202	194	232	212
	2010	2,859	187	210	211	193	189	180
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

STATE	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.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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 (%)
DISTRICT	2000	197	16	43,929	40	60	18	23	-	-
	2001	197	16	46,490	39	61	17	22	-	-
	2002	194	15	46,315	37	63	17	23	-	1
	2003	189	15	48,800	39	61	17	22	-	-
	2004	174	16	51,978	32	68	19	24	-	-
	2005	166	16	54,435	27	73	19	25	-	-
	2006	169	15	56,543	28	72	19	22	-	-
	2007	176	14	54,746	30	70	17	23	-	-
	2008	182	13	55,001	35	65	17	21	-	1
	2009	180	14	57,220	32	68	17	20	-	-
	2010	179	15	60,172	30	70	17	20	-	-
STATE	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 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

	2010	132,544	13	63,283	42	57	18	18	-	1

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

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2005-2010

	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	**47.5**	**47.5**	**55.0**	**62.5**	**70.0**	**77.5**	**47.5**	**47.5**	**55.0**	**62.5**	**70.0**	**77.5**	**47.5**	**47.5**	**55.0**	**62.5**	**70.0**	**77.5**
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70.6	77.2	68.8	80.1	70.7	69.4
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	71.5	76.3	70.5	80.8	73.5	71.8
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50.0	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	66.7	-	-	-	53.3	46.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80.0	81.9	92.3	66.6	50.0
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21.4	28.0	22.2	52.0	20.0	33.4
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	54.9	70.6	56.7	70.7	56.3	59.6

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	**47.5**	**47.5**	**55.0**	**62.5**	**70.0**	**77.5**	**47.5**	**47.5**	**55.0**	**62.5**	**70.0**	**77.5**	**47.5**	**47.5**	**55.0**	**62.5**	**70.0**	**77.5**
All	-	76.1	74.4	73.5	70.5	72.9	-	72.8	72.1	73.1	70.3	76.9	83.8	80.0	71.8	74.0	75.8	78.5
White	-	75.4	75.4	74.2	70.2	75.9	-	74.4	72.9	73.6	70.4	79.5	86.0	79.6	72.4	74.0	76.6	79.7
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80.0	-	40.0	60.0	-	-	-	60.0	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	40.0	69.2	-	81.3	50.0	-	-	-	63.6	-	78.5	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90.9	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	66.7	81.8	87.5	66.7	-	60.0	90.0	57.1	83.4	81.3	-	-	-	90.0	64.3	83.3
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	12.5	27.3	37.5	44.8	30.0	-	22.7	16.0	22.9	31.3	41.9	46.7	38.2	22.2	18.2	40.0	29.0
Low Income	-	59.7	65.5	67.5	60.6	65.3	-	61.9	60.2	64.0	55.3	59.4	83.1	61.2	64.6	53.5	65.9	71.0

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

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2005-2010

	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	**47.5**	**47.5**	**55.0**	**62.5**	**70.0**	**77.5**	**47.5**	**47.5**	**55.0**	**62.5**	**70.0**	**77.5**	**47.5**	**47.5**	**55.0**	**62.5**	**70.0**	**77.5**
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	74.0	88.2	86.5	86.0	77.2	73.6
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	74.8	89.0	89.2	87.1	82.0	77.0
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40.0	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	83.3	-	-	-	73.4	38.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90.0	90.9	92.3	61.2	68.8
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25.0	44.0	63.0	64.0	36.0	43.6
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	62.5	75.7	77.1	77.0	60.2	65.2

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	**47.5**	**47.5**	**55.0**	**62.5**	**70.0**	**77.5**	**47.5**	**47.5**	**55.0**	**62.5**	**70.0**	**77.5**	**47.5**	**47.5**	**55.0**	**62.5**	**70.0**	**77.5**
All	-	88.9	80.4	82.8	76.0	81.6	-	78.4	82.1	78.7	80.4	81.8	52.0	79.4	80.0	78.0	67.5	74.1
White	-	87.8	81.3	84.8	78.7	85.4	-	79.5	82.9	80.3	82.6	83.7	52.1	78.9	80.6	79.0	71.2	75.5
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50.0	-	20.0	45.5	-	-	-	30.0	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	60.0	76.9	-	81.3	70.0	-	-	-	36.4	-	78.6	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	72.8	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	58.3	90.9	76.5	66.6	-	60.0	100.0	71.4	76.9	93.8	-	-	-	100.0	42.8	58.3
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	58.3	31.8	50.0	46.7	40.0	-	22.7	24.0	45.8	38.7	41.9	6.7	41.2	38.9	33.3	31.0	28.1
Low Income	-	83.4	71.3	75.0	55.9	69.9	-	74.1	71.6	69.0	68.3	62.5	43.5	61.7	74.7	66.3	53.6	63.6

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

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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?*

Report card data shows that although Reagan Middle School met AYP benchmarks in many categories, students with disabilities are still not meeting state expectations for achievement in the areas of reading and math. Although some progress across grade levels for student achievement in math is evident, similar progress in the area of reading was unobserved. In both areas, the rate of progress remained deficient of state expectation. Report card data also showed that due to a rate of significant achievement by low income students, this subgroup was able to reach or surpass the safe harbor target to achieve AYP in both the areas of math and reading.This subgroup had not reached the AYP target in the previous year (2009).

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

Lack of exposure to the genuine curriculum is one likely factor that has lead to students with disabilities to be unable to achieve at appropriate levels. In addition, absence of a structure to frequently and consistently monitor student achievement may also be a factor in lack of progress for students with disabilities.

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

An emphasis on the use of common curriculum and student outcomes will benefit all students and allow the achievement gap for students with disabilities to be closed in relation to their non-disabled peers. Providing teachers training in the area of co-teaching will allow greater immersion for students with disabilities into to general classroom which will further enhance access to the genuine curriculum. Frequent and consistent use of assessments to monitor the progress of student skill development in the areas of reading and math will also show evidence of academic growth and help drive instructional needs for individual students. Creation and monitoring of curriculum based assessments will allow teachers to ensure that essential student outcomes are reached and specific skills are mastered.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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?*

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

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

Section I-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?*

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

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

Section I-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?*

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

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

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

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

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

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

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

From the factor pages (I-A, I-B, and I-C), identify key factors that are within the school's capacity to change or control and which have contributed to low achievement. What conclusions about next steps have you reached from reviewing available data and information and about all the factors affecting student achievement?

Key factors include; Lack of consistent opportunities for professional collaboration with grade level and curriculum area staff, Lack of use of student achievement data to make informed decisions to drive instruction, Lack of exposure to the genuine building curriculum by students with special needs and Lack of appropriate intervention strategies for all students who are not achieving at a level that reflects academic success.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	While our current achievement in reading for the students with disabilities subgroup is 36.6% meeting/exceeding for ISAT reading and 37.2% meeting/exceeding for ISAT math, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2011 and 85% in 2012 or Safe Harbor.	1,2,
2	Office Referrals and student suspensions will be reduced by 10% in 2010-2011 from 2009-2010 totals and an additional 10% in 2011-2012 from 2010-2011 totals.	

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

1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

While our current achievement in reading for the students with disabilities subgroup is 36.6% meeting/exceeding for ISAT reading and 37.2% meeting/exceeding for ISAT math, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2011 and 85% in 2012 or Safe Harbor.

Objective 1 Description

In order to increase the rate of success and mastery of outcomes for students, greater emphasis regarding student learning needs to be embraced. By frequently and consistently assessing student learning, modification of instructional direction can be made to assure that learning and mastery are taking place. By providing staff with time to collaborate instructional ideas, create common curriculum based assessments, analyze assessment data, plan activities based on the data received, staff will be able to more efficiently monitor

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

progress and ensure the support is in place to ensure student achievement.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- 1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in reading for the students with disabilities subgroup is 36.6% meeting/exceeding for ISAT reading and 37.2% meeting/exceeding for ISAT math, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2011 and 85% in 2012 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	**Start Date**	**End Date**		**Fund Source**	**Amount($)**
1	Academic Skill Development in the areas of reading and math	08/26/2010	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Summer School- Academic Support and Remediation	06/06/2011	07/01/2011	Summer School	Local Funds	12,320
3	Summer School- Academic Support and Remediation	06/04/2012	06/29/2012	Summer School	Local Funds	12,320

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

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in reading for the students with disabilities subgroup is 36.6% meeting/exceeding for ISAT reading and 37.2% meeting/exceeding for ISAT math, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2011 and 85% in 2012 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	**Start Date**	**End Date**		**Fund Source**	**Amount($)**
1	Progress Monitoring Training	10/26/2010	12/17/2010	After School	Local Funds	0
2	Guided Reading Training	10/08/2010	01/27/2010	After School	Title I	300

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

3	Teacher Leader Training	09/17/2010	09/17/2010	During School	Other	400
4	Common Assessment Training	11/19/2010	05/31/2011	After School	Other	0
5	Data Analysis Training	01/17/2011	05/31/2012	After School	Other	0
6	Co-Teaching Strategies and Best Practices	01/10/2011	12/16/2011	After School	Other	0
7	Modification of Essential Outcomes	01/09/2012	05/31/2012	During School	Other	0
8	Professional Learning Community-Collaboration Meetings	09/07/2010	05/31/2012	After School	Other	0
9	Small Group Academic Intervention Training	01/10/2011	12/16/2011	After School	Other	0

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

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in reading for the students with disabilities subgroup is 36.6% meeting/exceeding for ISAT reading and 37.2% meeting/exceeding for ISAT math, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2011 and 85% in 2012 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	**Start Date**	**End Date**		**Fund Source**	**Amount($)**
1	Understanding Student Assessment Scores Training	11/30/2010	11/30/2010	After School	Other	0
2	Parenting the Middle School Student Training	02/17/2011	02/17/2011	After School	Other	0
3	Summer Reading and Math Activities to Prevent Regression of Skills	05/19/2011	05/19/2011	After School	Other	0
4	Understanding Student Assessment Scores Training	10/06/2011	10/06/2011	After School	Other	0
5	Summer Reading and Math Activities to Prevent Regression of Skills	05/24/2012	05/24/2012	After School	Other	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

While our current achievement in reading for the students with disabilities subgroup is 36.6% meeting/exceeding for ISAT reading and 37.2% meeting/exceeding for ISAT math, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2011 and 85% in 2012 or Safe Harbor.

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?)*

School personnel will monitor the effectiveness of strategies by examining student assessment data (Aimsweb, Measure of Academic Progress) to determine if the activities have

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

been appropriate and are allowing students to achieve at a higher rate than what they had achieved before.

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	Andy Bullock	Principal
2	Susan Johnson	Assistant Principal
3	Matt Magnafici	Assistant Principal
4	Greg Noack	Teacher
5	JoAnn Hamer	Teacher
6	Rita Gillespie	Teacher
7	Ann Bean	Teacher

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Office Referrals and student suspensions will be reduced by 10% in 2010-2011 from 2009-2010 totals and an additional 10% in 2011-2012 from 2010-2011 totals.

Objective 2 Description

Building climate and the overall learning environment will be improved through activities and initiatives to promote more positive student behavior. This objective will improve the quality of instructional minutes and reduce the amount of time that students spend away from the instructional setting.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- 1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

Objective 2 Title :

Office Referrals and student suspensions will be reduced by 10% in 2010-2011 from 2009-2010 totals and an additional 10% in 2011-2012 from 2010-2011 totals.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	**Start Date**	**End Date**		**Fund Source**	**Amount($)**
1	Continue Participation in PBIS Tier 1 Activities to strengthen overall building expectations	08/25/2010	06/01/2012	During School	Other	0
2	Participate in Social and Emotional Learning Activities	08/24/2011	06/01/2012	During School	Other	0

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

Objective 2 Title :

Office Referrals and student suspensions will be reduced by 10% in 2010-2011 from 2009-2010 totals and an additional 10% in 2011-2012 from 2010-2011 totals.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	**Start Date**	**End Date**		**Fund Source**	**Amount($)**
1	Continue PBIS Tier 1,2 and 3 profesiional development opportunities for existing and new certified staff	08/25/2010	06/01/2012	After School	Other	0
2	Train non-certified building staff and transportation employees related to student expectations and techniques for working with students	08/22/2011	08/24/2011	Before School	Other	0
3	Train and re-train all certified and non-certified staff in (CPI) student de-escalation techniques.	09/06/2010	05/31/2012	After School	Other	0

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

Objective 2 Title :

Office Referrals and student suspensions will be reduced by 10% in 2010-2011 from 2009-2010 totals and an additional 10% in 2011-2012 from 2010-2011 totals.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	**Start Date**	**End Date**		**Fund Source**	**Amount($)**
1	Improve Communication with parents regarding student behavior and remediation strategies through conferencing, phone correspondence and electronic communication.	08/25/2010	05/31/2012	During School	Other	0
2	Provide parent information activities to help support parenting and school expectations.	02/07/2011	03/30/2012	After School	Other	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

Office Referrals and student suspensions will be reduced by 10% in 2010-2011 from 2009-2010 totals and an additional 10% in 2011-2012 from 2010-2011 totals.

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?)*

Student discipline and suspension data will be reviewed on a monthly basis. Modifications for individual students and the student body as a whole will be made based on found areas of need. Expectations will be re-taught as needed and intensive programming for students will be put in place as the need arises.

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	Matt Magnafici	Assistant Principal
2	Shayne Prange	Social Worker
3	Deanne Droege	Counselor
4	JoAnn Hamer	Teacher
5	Reni Whitcombe	Teacher
6	Diane Conklen	Teacher
7	Suzanne Weaver	Teacher

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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.)*

Reagan Middle School is not a Title I school, therefore, this written notice has not been provided.

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.*

School Improvement Plan stakeholders have been involved through either the creation, implementation, evaluation of the school improvement plan. The plan was created by utilizing after school meeting times to look at data, prioritize needs and set forth a plan of action for improvement. Activities embedded in the action plan will take place during the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years. The plan and its activities will be monitored by the team and its effectiveness will be evaluated twice each year.

	Name	Title
1	Andy Bullock	Principal
2	Susan Johnson	Assistant Principal
3	Matt Magnafici	Assistant Principal
4	JoAnn Hamer	Teacher
5	Greg Noack	Teacher
6	Ann Bean	Teacher
7	Anji Garza	ROE Consultant

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

8	Brenda Drezen	Parent / PTO President

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 Peer Review will be conducted through the leadership of ROE Consultant Mary Francis. The Peer Review will take place during the week of October 18, 2010. As needed adjustments are made to the plan, such adjustments will be presented to the peer review team and to the Dixon #170 Board of Education for approval.

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.*

Dixon #170 requires that all first year teachers participate in its two year, state-approved program with a mentor who has received three days of mentor training through Lee/Ogle ROE. First year teachers with prior experience work with a trained mentor for one year only. Administrators are also given training based on the same Induction for the 21st Century Educator Model. On-going professional development of mentors and beginning teachers is facilitated by the Ideal District Mentoring Program Director with the assistance of the local Regional Office of Education. It is also the District Program Director's responsibility to manage the implementation and evaluation of the program.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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.*

It is the District's responsibility to provide funding for the completion of current district initiatives (Curriculum Mapping, Response to Intervention, Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports, Professional Learning Communities,etc.). It is also the District's responsibility to provide funds and resources for professional development that are unable to be covered through other funding. Finally, the District must provide approval and support for the activities set forth in this plan.

Corrective Actions taken by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet AdequateYearly 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.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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.*

Reagan Middle School will be provided funding and guidance in the creation, funding, and implementation of the 2010-2012 School Improvement Plan. Mary Francis, RESPRO Consultant, will continue to provide services and support for the life of the plan.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

	Name	Title
1	Margo Empen	Assistant Superintendent
2	Corena Steinmeyer	LCSEA Director
3	Mary Francis	ROE Consultant
4	Bill Peters	Project Choices Consultant

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:

A. ASSURANCES

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

B.SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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?

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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]

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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	

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

Yes No	Is the peer review process described and is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have "the greatest likelihood" of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP? [C]
TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS	
Yes No	Is it clear how the school is ensuring that teachers are receiving the support needed for their professional growth and to retain them in the profession? [C]
DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITES	
Yes No	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]
Yes No N/A	If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]
STATE RESPONSIBILITES	
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

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University