

Local Board Approved	12/21/2009
Submitted	12/22/2009
Plan Resubmitted	01/19/2010
ISBE Monitoring Completed	02/01/2010

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	350502800170001		
District Name:	Mendota Twp HSD 280	School Name:	Mendota Twp High School
Superintendent:	Jeff Prusator	Principal:	Denise Aughenbaugh
District Address:	2300 W Main St	School Address:	2300 W Main St
City/State/Zip:	Mendota,IL 61342 1061	City/State/Zip:	Mendota,IL 61342 1061
District Telephone#:	Label 8155397446 <b>Extn:</b>	School Telephone#:	8155397446 <b>Extn: 0</b>
District Email:	jprusator@mendotahs.org	School Email:	
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this School been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	Choice
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2009-10 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		70.0			70.0			90.0		78.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	63.0		No	62.3		No			87.5	Yes
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	70.4		Yes	71.3		Yes				
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 70.0% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 70.0% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. \*\*\*
3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 70.0% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 78% graduation rate for high schools.

\* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2008.

\*\* Safe Harbor Targets of 70.0% 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.

**2009 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 - 2009 AMAO Report

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

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

School Information	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	94.8	94.9	95.7	95.0	94.7	94.8	95.5	95.6
Truancy Rate (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.6	0.6	1.4	1.5
Mobility Rate (%)	14.8	21.5	10.0	16.6	16.7	8.5	12.5	11.4
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	84.1	84.5	85.2	98.5	89.0	81.1	82.7	87.5
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	1.5	2.7	1.9	0.9	1.3	1.4	3.5	1.8
School Population (#)	595	600	635	632	635	640	627	618
Low Income (%)	17.1	18.2	20.3	22.2	25.5	25.3	29.7	32.2
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	3.0	3.2	2.5	2.1	1.3	0.9	0.0	7.4
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White, non-Hispanic (%)	81.7	79.7	79.7	76.7	74.8	74.4	72.4	72.5
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.5	1.2	0.8	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.3
Hispanic (%)	17.1	18.5	18.6	20.9	21.1	21.9	24.2	24.6
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.9	0.5	0.2	0.3
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.2
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	0.6	1.7	1.9	2.1	2.1

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

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	2000	83.4	0.2	15.7	0.5	0.2	-
	2001	82.7	0.5	16.1	0.5	0.2	-
	2002	81.7	0.5	17.1	0.5	0.2	-
	2003	79.7	1.2	18.5	0.5	0.2	-
	2004	79.7	0.8	18.6	0.6	0.3	-
	2005	76.7	0.5	20.9	0.6	0.6	0.6
	2006	74.8	0.6	21.1	0.9	0.8	1.7
	2007	74.4	0.6	21.9	0.5	0.8	1.9
	2008	72.4	0.6	24.2	0.2	0.5	2.1
	2009	72.5	0.3	24.6	0.3	0.2	2.1
	2010	71.7	0.2	25.2	0.5	-	2.5
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	2000	83.4	0.2	15.7	0.5	0.2	-
	2001	82.7	0.5	16.1	0.5	0.2	-
	2002	81.7	0.5	17.1	0.5	0.2	-
	2003	79.7	1.2	18.5	0.5	0.2	-
	2004	79.7	0.8	18.6	0.6	0.3	-
	2005	76.7	0.5	20.9	0.6	0.6	0.6
	2006	74.8	0.6	21.1	0.9	0.8	1.7
	2007	74.4	0.6	21.9	0.5	0.8	1.9
	2008	72.4	0.6	24.2	0.2	0.5	2.1
	2009	72.5	0.3	24.6	0.3	0.2	2.1
	2010	71.7	0.2	25.2	0.5	-	2.5
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

<b>S T A T E</b>	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5
	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	2000	3.2	14.4	91.0	94.8	9.7	1	0.2	6.4	72.8
	2001	2.2	15.8	99.0	93.8	13.0	-	-	4.8	79.7
	2002	3.0	17.1	99.0	94.8	14.8	-	-	1.5	84.1
	2003	3.2	18.2	97.0	94.9	21.5	-	-	2.7	84.5
	2004	2.5	20.3	97.5	95.7	10.0	-	-	1.9	85.2
	2005	2.1	22.2	97.4	95.0	16.6	8	1.3	0.9	98.5
	2006	1.3	25.5	98.0	94.7	16.7	4	0.6	1.3	89.0
	2007	0.9	25.3	98.2	94.8	8.5	4	0.6	1.4	81.1
	2008	-	29.7	95.0	95.5	12.5	8	1.4	3.5	82.7
	2009	7.4	32.2	95.0	95.6	11.4	9	1.5	1.8	87.5
2010	9.8	34.7	95.0	95.5	12.3	11	1.8	1.3	86.2	
D I S T R I C T	2000	3.2	14.4	91.0	94.8	9.7	1	0.2	6.4	72.8
	2001	2.2	15.8	99.0	93.8	13.0	-	-	4.8	79.7
	2002	3.0	17.1	99.0	94.8	14.8	-	-	1.5	84.1
	2003	3.2	18.2	97.0	94.9	21.5	-	-	2.7	84.5
	2004	2.5	20.3	97.5	95.7	10.0	-	-	1.9	85.2
	2005	2.1	22.2	97.4	95.0	16.6	8	1.3	0.9	98.5
	2006	1.3	25.5	98.0	94.7	16.7	4	0.6	1.3	89.0
	2007	0.9	25.3	98.2	94.8	8.5	4	0.6	1.4	81.1
	2008	-	29.7	95.0	95.5	12.5	8	1.4	3.5	82.7
	2009	7.4	32.2	95.0	95.6	11.4	9	1.5	1.8	87.5
2010	9.8	34.7	95.0	95.5	12.3	11	1.8	1.3	86.2	
	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

S T A T E	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	2000	592	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	584	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	595	-	-	-	-	-	142
	2003	600	-	-	-	-	-	149
	2004	635	-	-	-	-	-	151
	2005	632	-	-	-	-	-	147
	2006	635	-	-	-	-	-	165
	2007	640	-	-	-	-	-	161
	2008	627	-	-	-	-	-	159
	2009	618	-	-	-	-	-	144
	2010	611	-	-	-	-	-	145
D I S T R I C T	2000	592	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	584	-	-	-	-	-	143
	2002	595	-	-	-	-	-	142
	2003	600	-	-	-	-	-	149
	2004	635	-	-	-	-	-	151
	2005	632	-	-	-	-	-	147
	2006	635	-	-	-	-	-	165
	2007	640	-	-	-	-	-	161
	2008	627	-	-	-	-	-	159
	2009	618	-	-	-	-	-	144
	2010	611	-	-	-	-	-	145
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-

<b>S T A T E</b>	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	2000	41	16	47,890	37	63	-	17	-	-
	2001	41	17	49,588	37	63	-	18	-	-
	2002	39	17	52,247	41	59	-	19	-	-
	2003	40	16	52,269	41	59	-	18	-	-
	2004	40	15	52,524	50	50	-	19	3	-
	2005	39	16	55,793	49	52	-	20	3	-
	2006	38	14	53,124	48	52	-	20	5	-
	2007	41	15	56,741	43	57	-	19	-	-
	2008	41	15	59,118	46	54	-	18	-	-
	2009	40	16	63,792	49	51	-	18	-	-
2010	41	15	65,490	54	46	-	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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	63.7	57.3	59.8	52.8	46.4	62.4
White	69.0	61.8	66.1	57.2	53.1	70.1
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	36.3	41.4	31.8	38.2	30.3	32.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	27.3	-	20.0	11.1	14.3	16.7
Low Income	42.9	39.1	30.7	37.5	23.8	45.5

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

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

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grade 11						
Groups	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	60.2	51.1	60.4	54.1	47.0	61.6
White	67.3	57.8	63.5	60.2	52.2	71.1
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	22.7	27.6	54.5	41.2	36.3	28.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	18.2	7.7	20.0	5.6	7.1	8.3
Low Income	23.8	30.4	50.0	40.6	28.6	39.4

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

## Section I-A Data &amp; 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?

All juniors failed to make AYP in Reading. Three subgroups with noted weaknesses were the Hispanic population, students with disabilities, and low income students in Reading. The Hispanic subgroup met or exceeded at 32.1%, students with disabilities met or exceeded at 16.7%, and low income met or exceeded at 45.5%. By comparison, a strength was the white subgroup that showed 70.1% meeting or exceeding in Reading. Our overall Reading for all students meeting and exceeding was 62.4%, which was a significant increase of 16%.

All juniors failed to make AYP in Math. Three subgroups with noted weaknesses were the Hispanic population, students with disabilities, and low income students in Math. The Hispanic subgroup met or exceeded at 28.6%, students with disabilities met or exceeded at 8.3%, and low income met or exceeded at 39.4%. By comparison, a strength was the white subgroup that showed 71.1% meeting or exceeding in Math. Our overall Math for all students meeting and exceeding was 61.6%, which was a significant increase of 14.6%.

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

Our most highly qualified staff, two Reading Specialists, were assigned to teach our at-risk language arts students in Basic English courses. These courses were also co-taught by certified Special Education teachers. Another factor that contributed to the overall score of 62.4% meeting and exceeding in Reading was the addition of enhanced summer school web-based English curriculum. This also allowed students to remain on track to enroll in appropriate junior level English courses. Additional factors noted that prohibited student success included the limited ELL services without a Bilingual program or full-time ELL instructor, lack of additional Reading support for students with disabilities, and lack of additional Reading support and interventions throughout the school. An additional factor is the minimal Reading strategies implemented across the curriculum, such as Project CRISS strategies or other interventions.

The Math curriculum was articulated, reviewed, and revised over the summer of 2008. This was the first year we had all students enrolled in a math course as juniors with the inclusion of Practical Geometry. An additional factor that contributed to the overall score of 61.6% meeting and exceeding was the addition of enhanced summer school web-based math curriculum. This allowed students to remain on track to enroll in appropriate junior level math courses. Additional factors noted that prohibited student success include the following: limited ELL services without a Bilingual program or full-time ELL instructor; lack of sufficient math support for students with disabilities, and a general lack of additional math support and interventions throughout the school. One external factor is the challenge of meeting the needs of more low income students.

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

Next steps for Reading includes providing direct Reading instruction to identified low-performing Reading students. Additional professional development will include Reading strategies across the curriculum, in particular Science and other core academic areas. The ELL population will be better served with the inclusion of Bilingual Spanish Language Arts curriculum and ELL support.

Next steps for math imply we will continue with the enhanced web-based math curriculum during both the school year and summer offerings. We will offer additional math curriculum offerings that focus on ACT College Readiness Math Sequence coursework. An Algebra I Standards and Algebra II Standards course will be implemented, and the two-year Algebra I course will be eliminated. The math department will continue to meet with outside math consultants to refine their current curriculum and course offerings. Math tutoring opportunities will be increased throughout the school day. Additional ELL support will be offered. An increase in the contact time with at-risk students will provide additional academic support.

#### 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?

Locally, the district uses EXPLORE, PLAN, and PSAE data with the linkage report. Freshmen EXPLORE data reveals the Reading, Math, and Science scores are below benchmark. There is not sufficient growth between the EXPLORE year and PLAN sophomore year and ACT junior year testing within the district and among the same class of students. The district does not see consistent growth between the ACT based assessments. Additional data is AimsWeb, STAR Reading, and ISAT data from feeder districts. This data reveals approximately three percent of our students are reading below the 8th grade level. The RtI team also collects data that includes information on students with disabilities, Hispanic, and low-income data. Local assessment data correlates to the School Report card data and correlates the same weaknesses. Common assessments and pre-test/post-test assessments are being reviewed to assist the math and science departments. The data tells us there is a need to incorporate more differentiated instruction to meet the needs of our challenged learners.

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

A lack of articulation between elementary and MHS curriculum as well as among teachers in MHS is one factor. The current curriculum is not rigorous enough to meet the college readiness standards. Internally, departments need to align and rewrite curriculum. There is a lack of curriculum alignment.

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

MHS needs to schedule articulation meetings and curriculum mapping opportunities within and outside the school district. A next step would also include creating a freshmen transition program for at-risk students identified by local assessment data. Additional professional development and differentiated instruction activities will be incorporated at the classroom level. Internally, departments need to align and rewrite curriculum.

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?

Changing demographics have affected student performance. The school and community has noted an increase in the low income population. This increased subgroup has impacted student performance overall. The school and community has also seen an increase in its Hispanic population. Students are entering our school with limited English proficiency. Students need to have more targeted assistance and instructional methods that engage more students in different ways.

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

The diverse student population has created additional challenges to the school to meet the varying needs of all learners. Students are entering the high school significantly below benchmark, and with less external support outside of the school. Therefore, student performance has decreased.

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

Students need to have more targeted assistance available. Teachers need to offer more differentiated instruction to actively engage all students. Additionally, the school will try to bridge the gap of external support by encouraging more school-home communication and participation. This will include more bilingual opportunities. Additional transition planning will be scheduled.

#### 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?

All of our teachers are highly qualified and endorsed by the Illinois State Board of Education. Through grants and local funds, professional development activities will continue to be offered for Reading, math, and science. Additional professional development will continue to enhance curriculum alignment. Data tells us we have highly qualified staff but need to schedule and incorporate more professional development.

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

With additional grant money, more professional development opportunities have been utilized; therefore, staff are better prepared to meet the performance needs of our at-risk population. Staff capacity indicates additional professional development activities need to be scheduled that includes but is not limited to differentiated learning..

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

We will contact core academic consultants to provide guidance in curriculum alignment and mapping in Math, English/Reading, and Science content areas. We will continue to assist our teachers to maintain best instructional practices while building teacher capacity.

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?

Parent-teacher conferences are attended by 60-65% of our parents. They are held twice a year. A parent advisory committee and a Hispanic parent advisory committee reveals that parents would appreciate providing more input and communication.

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

Research and observation indicates increased parental involvement contributes to student performance results. Participation at parent-teacher conferences and in the parent advisory groups supports this result. Parent conferences typically result in 60% of families in attendance. Parent advisory groups meet regularly. There are approximately a dozen parents in the parent advisory group, which represent the cross-section of student population. An additional Hispanic Parent Advisory group has been established and meets quarterly to analyze the Bilingual grant and curriculum.

Parents provide feedback on school performance. The advisory groups develop new ideas that contribute to improved student achievement.

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

MHS will continue to utilize on-line grades, AlertNow phone system, electronic email, and other forms of communication. Additional parent meetings will be scheduled for identified, at-risk students.

#### 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?

Factors that we can control are articulation and alignment of curriculum, professional development, maintain highly qualified staff, parent communication, quality of instruction, and a safe learning environment. Our conclusions are we need to continue to focus our efforts on improving the instructional practices that meet the needs of the at-risk students identified.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	<a href="#">Using a growth model, MHS will see a minimum of two points of annual growth from EXPLORE to EXPLORE, EXPLORE to PLAN, and PLAN to ACT in Reading to reach AYP/NCLB objectives. MHS will raise meeting/exceeding PSAE reading scores from the current level of 62.3% to achieve Safe Harbor or meet NCLB targets of 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011. (amended 1-18-10)</a>	1,
2	<a href="#">Using a growth model, MHS will see a minimum of two points of annual growth from EXPLORE to EXPLORE, EXPLORE to PLAN, and PLAN to ACT in Math to reach AYP/NCLB objectives. MHS will raise meeting/exceeding PSAE math scores from the current level of 61.6% to achieve Safe Harbor or meet NCLB targets of 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011. (amended 1-19-10)</a>	2,

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Using a growth model, MHS will see a minimum of two points of annual growth from EXPLORE to EXPLORE, EXPLORE to PLAN, and PLAN to ACT in Reading to reach AYP/NCLB objectives. MHS will raise meeting/exceeding PSAE reading scores from the current level of 62.3% to achieve Safe Harbor or meet NCLB targets of 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011. (amended 1-18-10)

Objective 1 Description

Our objective is to raise Reading scores to meet AYP targets using strategies and activities as outlined in our Action Plan, and implement a continuous cycle of school improvement to improve the curriculum, instruction, and student achievement in all content areas across the curriculum. Below is a description of the benchmark assessments to be used to measure progress towards meeting AYP. (amended 1-18-10)

All 8th graders take the EXPLORE test. 9th graders take the EXPLORE test again to measure growth. 10th grade students take the PLAN assessment. All 11th graders take the ACT assessment.

Trend data indicates Reading students gain less than two points on average between the EXPLORE, PLAN, to ACT assessments.

The class of 2011, 9th grade EXPLORE Reading data was 15.8. 10th grade Reading PLAN data was 17. The ACT has not been administered yet to this class. The Reading results reveal that a growth of 1.2 was achieved between the freshmen and sophomore years.

The class of 2012, 9th grade EXPLORE Reading data was 15.4. Students will take the PLAN in the spring of 2010 and the ACT in the spring of 2011.

The class of 2013, 8th grade EXPLORE Reading data was 14. Students will take the EXPLORE in the spring of 2010 and the PLAN in the spring of 2011.

The class of 2014, 8th grade EXPLORE Reading data was 14.5. Students will take the EXPLORE in the spring of 2011.

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

- ⓑ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 2. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Using a growth model, MHS will see a minimum of two points of annual growth from EXPLORE to EXPLORE, EXPLORE to PLAN, and PLAN to ACT in Reading to reach AYP/NCLB objectives. MHS will raise meeting/exceeding PSAE reading scores from the current level of 62.3% to achieve Safe Harbor or meet NCLB targets of 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011. (amended 1-18-10)

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Implement SRA Direct Reading intervention for 21 identified at-risk 9th and 10th grade students. Students who score below a 12 on the EXPLORE Reading assessment and in the bottom 25th percentile of the AIMSWeb screener will qualify for SRA Direct Instruction. Three percent of the student body qualify for this service, and our goal is to reach 3 to 5 percent of our most at-risk Reading students. AIMSWeb progress monitoring, SRA curriculum embedded assessments, and AIMSWeb benchmarking is used to monitor student progress and success. The same assessments are used to determine exit criteria for students from the SRA Program. Students are screened in the fall and the intervention is implemented during their Period 8 Intervention time. Students may reach exit criteria at any point during the school year. (amended 1-18-10)	08/24/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	62,000
2	Implement reading strategies across the curriculum to all students utilizing CRISS and other research-based strategies to focus on vocabulay development and reading comprehension. Implementation will be measured by collecting samples of student work each semester, acquiring teacher lesson plans that utilize CRISS strategies each semester, administrator observation gained through walk-throughs, and teacher feedback gained through collaborative planning time activities. (amended 1-18-10)	08/17/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Title I	0
	English Language Learner students utilize Irlen Reading Strategies for					

3	Reading needs. These strategies will be implemented in both ELL Resource classes and content-area courses. Implementation will be measured by monitoring student use of the Irlen Overlay Resources, and a monitoring checklist of use will be gathered by teachers each semester. (amended 1-18-10)	08/17/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Title III	0
4	Bilingual students are enrolled in Spanish Language Arts, and Bilingual Science and Bilingual Health courses to enhance reading comprehension and biliteracy. Student enrollment numbers will be used to monitor the number of students enrolled, and grade distribution will be collected to measure student achievement and performance each semester. (amended 1-18-10)	08/17/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Title III	60,000

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Using a growth model, MHS will see a minimum of two points of annual growth from EXPLORE to EXPLORE, EXPLORE to PLAN, and PLAN to ACT in Reading to reach AYP/NCLB objectives. MHS will raise meeting/exceeding PSAE reading scores from the current level of 62.3% to achieve Safe Harbor or meet NCLB targets of 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011. (amended 1-18-10)

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Train staff to provide SRA Direct Reading Instruction for identified at-risk 9th and 10th grade students. Professional development provided to approximately 30 certified staff.	07/29/2009	07/29/2011	Summer School	Title I	5,000
2	Professional development based upon reading strategies that are research based such as Project CRISS and utilized across the curriculum by expecting teachers to implement CRISS strategies monthly during the remainder of the school year. Teacher lesson plans and administrative observation will monitor implementation. (amended 1-18-10)	09/16/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Title II	20,000
	Provide staff training to English Language Learner staff to assess and					

3	teach Irlen Reading methods to students. Teachers are expected to implement Irlen Reading strategies once a month with students. Teacher lesson plans and administrative observation will monitor implementation. (amended 1-18-10)	08/17/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Title III	500
4	Bilingual certified teachers will continue to attend professional development workshops focused on the needs of bilingual students. Bilingual teachers will be expected to attend the annual bilingual educator conference and provide a summary of their new information during a professional development in-service. (amended 1-18-10)	08/17/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Title III	500

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Using a growth model, MHS will see a minimum of two points of annual growth from EXPLORE to EXPLORE, EXPLORE to PLAN, and PLAN to ACT in Reading to reach AYP/NCLB objectives. MHS will raise meeting/exceeding PSAE reading scores from the current level of 62.3% to achieve Safe Harbor or meet NCLB targets of 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011. (amended 1-18-10)

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parent teacher conferences are scheduled twice a year for all students and families. Parent communication to create a partnership to improve student learning with Spanish translation available to serve all families. (amended 1-18-10)	11/05/2009	03/18/2011	After School	Local Funds	500
2	On-line grade communication is available through Edline software to promote parental involvement. Approximately 75% of parents utilize Edline on-line grades. Our goal is reach 100 percent usage with our families. Parent and teacher use is monitored by the software program, and teachers are asked to update grades at least weekly for parents. Translation is available to explain Edline grades upon request. Training for English speaking and Spanish speaking parents is available at school in their native language. (amended 1-19-10)	08/17/2009	05/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	2,300

3	The parent advisory committee meets bi-annually as partners with teachers in educating students and participate in decision making. The district is attempting to improve parental relationships and involvement in the schools. We hope to obtain current information regarding student needs to guide future decision and school improvement. (amended 1-19-10)	08/17/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	0
4	The Hispanic parent advisory committee meets bi-annually as partners with teachers in educating students and participate in decision making. The district is attempting to improve parental relationships and involvement in the schools. We hope to obtain current information regarding student needs to guide future decision and school improvement. (amended 1-19-10)	11/05/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 1 Title :**

Using a growth model, MHS will see a minimum of two points of annual growth from EXPLORE to EXPLORE, EXPLORE to PLAN, and PLAN to ACT in Reading to reach AYP/NCLB objectives. MHS will raise meeting/exceeding PSAE reading scores from the current level of 62.3% to achieve Safe Harbor or meet NCLB targets of 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011. (amended 1-18-10)

**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 district School Improvement team (SIP) will meet monthly to monitor the effectiveness of strategies and activities. Using a growth model, MHS will see a minimum of two points of annual growth from EXPLORE to EXPLORE, EXPLORE to PLAN, and PLAN to ACT in Reading to reach AYP/NCLB objectives. (amended 1-19-10) Test data will be provided by the Curriculum Director and analysis will be completed by the SIP team. Individual and cohort data (class data, subgroup data) will be reviewed and analyzed by team members to measure the effectiveness of activities.

Core curriculum representatives from the School Improvement team will share the appropriate data with their departments for review and analysis. Ongoing collaboration between individual departments and the SIP team will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities in measuring appropriate growth based on goal criteria.

Attendance at parent teacher conferences and parent advisory committee meetings will be utilized to measure effectiveness.

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	Jayne Barnes	Internal Chair, Math Teacher

2	Kevin W Ehrley	Math Teacher
3	Jennifer Masini	English Teacher
4	Stephanie Haskell	English Teacher
5	John Holzman	Science Teacher
6	Susan House	Science Teacher
7	Shawn Le Rette	Business Teacher
8	Rachel Henkel-Tarr	Guidance Counselor
9	Elaine Sawin	Special Needs Teacher
10	Scott Horsch	Curriculum Director
11	Jeff Prusator	Superintendent
12	Denise Aughenbaugh	Principal

### Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

#### Objective 2

Using a growth model, MHS will see a minimum of two points of annual growth from EXPLORE to EXPLORE, EXPLORE to PLAN, and PLAN to ACT in Math to reach AYP/NCLB objectives. MHS will raise meeting/exceeding PSAE math scores from the current level of 61.6% to achieve Safe Harbor or meet NCLB targets of 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011. (amended 1-19-10)

#### Objective 2 Description

Our objective is to raise Math scores to meet AYP targets using strategies and activities as outlined in our Action Plan, and implement a continuous cycle of school improvement to improve the curriculum, instruction, and student achievement in all content areas across the curriculum. Below is a description of the benchmark assessments to be used to measure progress towards meeting AYP. (amended 1-19-10)

All 8th graders take the EXPLORE test. 9th graders take the EXPLORE test again to measure growth. 10th grade students take the PLAN assessment. All 11th graders take the ACT assessment.

Trend data indicates math students gain less than two points on average between the EXPLORE, PLAN, to ACT assessments.

The class of 2011, 9th grade EXPLORE math data was 16.9. 10th grade math PLAN data was 18.8. The ACT has not been administered yet to this class. The math results reveal that a growth of 1.9 was achieved between the freshmen and sophomore years.

The class of 2012, 9th grade EXPLORE math data was 16.6. Students will take the PLAN in the spring of 2010 and ACT in spring of 2011.

The class of 2013, 8th grade EXPLORE math data was 14.8. Students will take the EXPLORE in the spring of 2010 and PLAN in spring of 2011.

The class of 2014, 8th grade EXPLORE math data was 16.2. Students will take the EXPLORE in the spring of 2011.

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

- Ⓔ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓑ 2. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

Using a growth model, MHS will see a minimum of two points of annual growth from EXPLORE to EXPLORE, EXPLORE to PLAN, and PLAN to ACT in Math to reach AYP/NCLB objectives. MHS will raise meeting/exceeding PSAE math scores from the current level of 61.6% to achieve Safe Harbor or meet NCLB targets of 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011. (amended 1-19-10)

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All 9th grade students are enrolled in at least a year-long Algebra I level course to meet local and state graduation requirements. (amended 1-19-10)	08/17/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
	All 10th grade students are enrolled in at least a year-long Geometry					

2	level course to meet local and state graduation requirements. (amended 1-19-10)	08/16/2010	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Majority of 11th grade students are enrolled in at least year-long Algebra II level course to meet local and state graduation requirements. (amended 1-19-10)	08/17/2009	06/30/2011	Before School	Local Funds	0
4	On-line credit retrieval is available to at-risk students to ensure they maintain the appropriate math level as their peers. Effectiveness will be measured by the number of credits earned compared to number of students enrolled. (amended 1-19-10)	08/17/2009	06/30/2011	Summer School	Title I	3,000
5	On-line credit retrieval is available to at-risk students to ensure they maintain the appropriate math level. Effectiveness will be measured by the number of credits earned compared to number of students enrolled. (amended 1-19-10)	08/17/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	1,500
6	All students have access to a certified Math teacher who serves as a math tutor during the school day. The math teacher is available three days a week, and student attendance is monitored. (amended 1-19-10)	08/17/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Title I	18,000
7	Additional web-based math curriculum and programs will serve as supplemental instruction to students during the school day. ALEKS software is available in the NCLB computer lab, media center, and general use lab. Student access and use is monitored by collecting software data management. (amended 1-19-10)	08/17/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	1,500

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

Using a growth model, MHS will see a minimum of two points of annual growth from EXPLORE to EXPLORE, EXPLORE to PLAN, and PLAN to ACT in Math to reach AYP/NCLB objectives. MHS will raise meeting/exceeding PSAE math scores from the current level of 61.6% to achieve Safe Harbor or meet NCLB targets of 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011. (amended 1-19-10)

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

1	Math Consultants are retained to provide ongoing professional development and data analysis to the math department.	07/13/2009	06/30/2011	During School	State Funds	5,000
2	Consultation and articulation with elementary districts and within the department to review and align 6-12 math curriculum. The shared K-12 curriculum director meets daily with math teachers to review and align K-12 math curriculum. (amended 1-19-10)	08/17/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Professional development activities that focus on differentiated instruction and other best practices that utilizes technology. Differentiated instruction professional development was scheduled four days in the spring of 2010 for a full faculty of 45 teachers and small subgroups of 10 teachers. The district goal is to provide professional development in differentiated instruction three times a year. (amended 1-19-10)	08/17/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	3,000

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

Using a growth model, MHS will see a minimum of two points of annual growth from EXPLORE to EXPLORE, EXPLORE to PLAN, and PLAN to ACT in Math to reach AYP/NCLB objectives. MHS will raise meeting/exceeding PSAE math scores from the current level of 61.6% to achieve Safe Harbor or meet NCLB targets of 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011. (amended 1-19-10)

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parent teacher conferences are scheduled twice a year for all students and families. Parent communication to create a partnership to improve student learning with Spanish translation available to serve all families. (amended 1-19-10)	11/05/2009	03/18/2011	After School	Local Funds	500
	On-line grade communication is available through Edline software to promote parental involvement. Approximately 75% of parents utilize Edline on-line grades. Our goal is reach 100 percent usage with our					

2	families. Parent and teacher use is monitored by the software program, and teachers are asked to update grades at least weekly for parents. Translation is available to explain Edline grades upon request. Training for English speaking and Spanish speaking parents is available at school in their native language. (amended 1-19-10)	08/17/2009	05/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	2,300
3	The parent advisory committee meets bi-annually as partners with teachers in educating students and participate in decision making. The district is attempting to improve parental relationships and involvement in the schools. We hope to obtain current information regarding student needs to guide future decision and school improvement. (amended 1-19-10)	08/17/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	0
4	The Hispanic parent advisory committee meets bi-annually as partners with teachers in educating students and participate in decision making. The district is attempting to improve parental relationships and involvement in the schools. We hope to obtain current information regarding student needs to guide future decision and school improvement. (amended 1-19-10)	11/05/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 2 Title :**

Using a growth model, MHS will see a minimum of two points of annual growth from EXPLORE to EXPLORE, EXPLORE to PLAN, and PLAN to ACT in Math to reach AYP/NCLB objectives. MHS will raise meeting/exceeding PSAE math scores from the current level of 61.6% to achieve Safe Harbor or meet NCLB targets of 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011. (amended 1-19-10)

**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 district School Improvement team (SIP) will meet monthly to monitor the effectiveness of strategies and activities. Using a growth model, MHS will see a minimum of two points of annual growth from EXPLORE to EXPLORE, EXPLORE to PLAN, and PLAN to ACT in Math to reach AYP/NCLB objectives. (amended 1-19-10) Test data will be provided by the Curriculum Director and analysis will be completed by the SIP team. Individual and cohort data (class data, subgroup data) will be reviewed and analyzed by team members to measure the effectiveness of activities.

Curriculum representatives from the School Improvement team will share the appropriate data with their department for review and analysis. Ongoing collaboration between

individual departments and the SIP team will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities in measuring appropriate growth based on goal criteria.

Attendance at parent teacher conferences and parent advisory committee meetings will be utilized to measure effectiveness.

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	Jayne Barnes	Internal Chair, Math Teacher
2	Kevin Wohrley	Math Teacher
3	Jennifer Masini	English Teacher
4	Stephanie Haskell	English Teacher
5	John Holzman	Science Teacher
6	Susan House	Science Teacher
7	Shawn Le Rette	Business Teacher
8	Rachel Henkel-Tarr	Guidance Counselor
9	Elaine Sawin	Special Needs Teacher
10	Scott Horsch	Curriculum Director
11	Jeff Prusator	Superintendent
12	Denise Aughenbaugh	Principal

---

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

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

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

Parent choice notification was mailed to all families in the summer of 2009. The 2009 School Report Card data was distributed to parents through the parent teacher conferences and was posted on the school website. Additionally, copies are given to the local media for distribution. Upon request, the school will provide translation services for parent notification of the school's academic status.

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.

Stakeholders that have been consulted in the development of this plan include the School Improvement team members, Curriculum Committee team members, Rtl team members, parent advisory members, hispanic parent advisory members, and external consultants. The school improvement team members include the following: Jayne Barnes, Kevin W Ehrley, Jennifer Masini, Stephanie Haskell, John Holzman, Susan House, Rachel Henkel-Tarr, Elaine Sawin, Shawn Le Rette, Scott Horsch, Jeff Prusator and Denise Aughenbaugh. Members of the Curriculum Committee include the following: Scott Horsch, Mitch Landgraf, Leon Mosier, Sandy Mosier, John Holzman, Liz Tucker, Virjean Haywood, Lori Schrock, Sherry Engstrom, Mary Ann Roedl, Tim Dessing, Jeff Landers, Jason Artman, Jeff Prusator, Denise Aughenbaugh, Jeff Simonton (parent), Celine Garza (parent), Rachel Simonton (student), Joe Foulk (student), and Darlene Ayers (board of education member) . External consultants utilized in plan development include Ronnie Uebel and Phl Wasilewski from the Regional Office of Education. The Response to Intervention team includes: Jayne Barnes, Stephanie Haskell, Amy Wilson, Holly Beals, Tammy Guerrero, Denise Aughenbaugh, Jeff Prusator, Scott Horsch. The parent advisory committee members include the following: Nancy Holland, Richard Lowers, Sonia D'Arteaga, Sara Escatel, Karen Waido, Dena Pakenham, Cheri Barth, and Rudy Arteaga. The Hispanic/Bilingual parent advisory members include the following: Ofelia Luna, Martha Felix, Manuel Felix, Francisca Martinez, Mario Espinoza, Frank Arteaga, and Margarita Hermosillo.

	Name	Title
1	Shawn Le Rette	Business Teacher
2	Jayne Barnes	Math Teacher
3	Jeff Prusator	Superintendent
4	Scott Horsch	Curriculum Director
5	Denise Aughenbaugh	Principal

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.

Regional Office of Education staff will be asked to serve as peer reviewers. Mrs. Uebel reviews on-line completion and met with MHS staff on November 13th. Members of the Stillman Valley SIP team will also be asked to serve as peer reviewers. The MHS plan will be submitted to Stillman Valley for peer review on December 7, 2009. The feedback received will be integrated into the district plan.

---

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.

The Mendota High School program is a two year induction and mentoring program. The MHS program provides a trained individual mentor for every first-year teacher and each second year teacher who holds an initial secondary certificate. The main goal is to insure and sustain educational excellence through a program of collegial support provided by mentors to new teachers in an atmosphere of confidentiality and trust. Based on the professional publication *Mentoring New Teachers* by Hall Porter and *The First Days of School: How to be an effective teacher* by Harry Wong and Rosemary T. Wong, the new teachers will attend monthly group meetings. Topics include but are not limited to Classroom Management, Curriculum Requirements, parent/Teacher Conferences, student Motivation andn Professional development. The second year of the program will include two group meetings per semester continuing on topics necessary to provide an avenue of success for these teachers.

New teachers to MHS are invited to attend an orientation meeting prior to the onset of the school year. During this day, teachers meet their mentors and are guided through many necessary plans that are unique to our school system. The day's agenda include topics such as our discipline plan, crisis manual, attendance, student handbook, faculty handbook, and our special needs plan.

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.

The services and resources the district has provided include state funds, local funds, Title monies, RESPRO, and REAP. The ROE DIP Planning workshop was a service attended by team members. A district challenge in implementing professional development requirements is time constraints. District technical assistant includes consultation with the district's technology director and technology coordinator. The district's curriculum director is also frequently consulted to analyze and revise activities where necessary.

Corrective actions might include implementing additional professional development meeting times and opportunities. Another corrective action is offering school choice. It is

anticipated in the future, supplemental educational services could be offered.

**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 ROE provided an inservice on preparing for the DIP. RESPRO funds will be available this year and allow the district to hire external consultants, offer additional curriculum alignment opportunities and professional development.

	Name	Title
1		

## Section IV-A Local Board Action

**DATE APPROVED** by Local Board: 12/21/2009

**A. ASSURANCES**

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

**B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION**

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

OTHER DATA

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

**IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS**

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

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

**CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES**

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

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

**ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yes  No  N/A

Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?

 Yes  No

Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]

**MONITORING** Yes  No

Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]

 Yes  No

Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers? [C]

**PART I - COMMENTS****February 1, 2010****Multiple good revisions to this plan bring it into compliance. You have provided clearer guidance for plan users. Best wishes during implementation! Carol Diedrichsen ISBE Innovation and Improvement cdiedric@isbe.net****January 4, 2010**

I have completed the review of this improvement plan. Several revisions are required. Objectives must identify the current and required performance for the two years of the plan for areas of AYP deficiency. Objectives and the action plan overall must cover two years as required. This year the plan must span from 2009-2011. The action plan must include strategies and activities that have the greatest likelihood of ensuring that all subgroups will make AYP. I will complete the review of this plan after you have completed revisions. Strategies and activities must be measurable and provide sufficient detail to guide plan implementers. Please further identify what you expect plan implementers to do. What do you want students, staff, and parents to do to implement this plan? What role do you expect each to play? Classroom expectations for students are especially critical. Please address each "no" on this checklist, dating each revision, and resubmit. These revisions are required to bring this plan to compliance. Please contact your area RESPRO for assistance.

Please date your revisions to document the changes and resubmit the plan on or before February 4.

Carol Diedrichsen ISBE Division of Innovation and Improvement

[cdiedric@isbe.net](mailto:cdiedric@isbe.net)

217-524-1086

---

RESPRO area comments:

December 21, 2009

Ronnie Uebel/Phil Wasilewski

**Your plan is now in compliance. The Area II review of your plan is complete.**

November 19, 2009

Ronnie Uebel/Phil Wasilewski

Clear, concise, meaningful, doable, and measurable.

Your plan is now ready to be peer reviewed. Once this process is completed, please let us know so that we can sign off on it and you can have it Board approved and submitted to ISBE.

---

November 13, 2009  
Ronnie Uebel

Meeting with recommended SIP changes at Mendota Township High School. In attendance - Scott Horsch, Denise Aughenbaugh, Jeff Prusator

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN	
PARENT NOTIFICATION	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school’s academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only) [C]
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the SIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes? [C]
PEER REVIEW	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Is the peer review process described <u>and</u> is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have “the greatest likelihood” of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP? [C]
TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 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	

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

**PART II - COMMENTS**