

Local Board Approved	
Initial Submission	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

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?	Yes	2010-11 State Improvement Status	

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		77.5			77.5			91		80	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	78.1		Yes	91.2		Yes	95.6	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	84.9		Yes	91.8		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American													
Multiracial/Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities													
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	69.1		No	87.7		Yes			

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.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2010 AMAO Report

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

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

School Information	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Attendance Rate (%)	96.3	96.1	95.0	95.5	96.1	95.0	95.6	95.6
Truancy Rate (%)	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.0	0.3	0.6	0.0	0.0
Mobility Rate (%)	8.6	21.9	13.6	18.8	12.0	14.4	12.6	6.4
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	439	435	440	443	373	357	368	341
Low Income (%)	23.2	46.4	51.1	42.2	41.0	54.1	50.0	51.0
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.0	9.4	8.9	5.4	3.2	7.8	0.0	0.0
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.0
White, non-Hispanic (%)	86.6	63.0	60.2	59.1	59.8	59.4	57.6	62.5
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	2.7	3.0	1.6	3.6	5.1	6.7	6.0	2.9
Hispanic (%)	9.1	32.0	29.1	27.5	23.1	21.0	19.6	17.3
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	1.4	1.6	0.9	0.7	0.8	0.0	0.5	0.6
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.0
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	7.7	9.0	11.0	12.6	16.0	16.7

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

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	2000	89.4	2.2	7.4	1.0	-	-
	2001	88.2	3.5	7.6	0.7	-	-
	2002	88.4	3.1	8.3	0.2	-	-
	2003	86.6	2.7	9.1	1.4	0.2	-
	2004	63.0	3.0	32.0	1.6	0.5	-
	2005	60.2	1.6	29.1	0.9	0.5	7.7
	2006	59.1	3.6	27.5	0.7	-	9.0
	2007	59.8	5.1	23.1	0.8	0.3	11.0
	2008	59.4	6.7	21.0	-	0.3	12.6
	2009	57.6	6.0	19.6	0.5	0.3	16.0
	2010	62.5	2.9	17.3	0.6	-	16.7
D I S T R I C T	2000	74.5	3.7	20.4	1.0	0.4	-
	2001	73.9	3.7	21.0	1.0	0.3	-
	2002	73.4	3.9	21.4	0.9	0.4	-
	2003	73.0	4.4	21.5	0.8	0.3	-
	2004	71.2	4.3	23.5	0.8	0.3	-
	2005	67.9	2.7	21.5	0.6	0.3	7.0
	2006	66.3	3.0	21.8	0.6	0.1	8.2
	2007	64.4	3.2	21.7	0.5	0.1	10.1
	2008	63.9	3.4	21.3	0.5	0.2	10.7
	2009	62.3	3.4	21.4	0.6	0.2	12.1
	2010	62.2	3.3	21.4	0.3	0.2	12.5
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

S T A T E	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	-	22.5	100.0	95.6	7.7	1	0.2	-	-
	2001	-	19.0	100.0	96.0	10.8	-	-	-	-
	2002	-	23.7	100.0	95.6	8.4	3	0.7	-	-
	2003	-	23.2	100.0	96.3	8.6	2	0.4	-	-
	2004	9.4	46.4	100.0	96.1	21.9	1	0.2	-	-
	2005	8.9	51.1	100.0	95.0	13.6	2	0.5	-	-
	2006	5.4	42.2	100.0	95.5	18.8	-	-	-	-
	2007	3.2	41.0	100.0	96.1	12.0	1	0.3	-	-
	2008	7.8	54.1	100.0	95.0	14.4	2	0.6	-	-
	2009	-	50.0	100.0	95.6	12.6	-	-	-	-
2010	-	51.0	100.0	95.6	6.4	-	-	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	2.2	27.2	98.4	93.5	9.9	57	1.6	7.1	78.6
	2001	2.7	30.1	98.2	93.3	14.0	41	1.2	7.9	77.2
	2002	3.4	33.0	98.4	94.1	14.3	46	1.3	4.3	78.5
	2003	2.1	35.1	97.5	94.3	14.9	127	3.5	6.9	75.4
	2004	1.5	36.2	99.2	94.5	16.4	33	1.0	8.0	74.2
	2005	1.7	40.6	99.3	94.6	15.2	53	1.6	4.0	80.8
	2006	1.7	34.1	100.0	94.4	16.5	69	2.1	4.0	82.6
	2007	2.3	37.0	100.0	94.6	14.2	75	2.3	4.8	81.5
	2008	3.5	42.6	100.0	94.6	15.5	84	2.6	4.9	83.1
	2009	3.0	45.4	100.0	94.9	14.5	52	1.6	3.3	82.2
2010	4.0	50.2	100.0	94.9	12.4	60	1.8	4.2	86.6	
	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	489	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	458	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	447	61	89	85	-	-	-
	2003	439	68	65	91	-	-	-
	2004	435	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	440	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	443	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2007	373	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	357	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2009	368	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2010	341	-	-	-	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	3,558	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	3,563	266	296	269	268	253	248
	2002	3,529	252	269	290	285	275	270
	2003	3,505	257	250	269	283	293	290
	2004	3,556	249	232	233	294	275	257
	2005	3,457	246	247	231	259	286	265
	2006	3,612	254	250	262	227	248	281
	2007	3,362	269	257	250	222	223	249
	2008	3,269	237	256	260	244	227	246
	2009	3,225	256	244	263	238	248	209
	2010	3,308	272	257	236	255	248	204
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-

S T A T E	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	222	17	43,592	64	36	18	19	-	-
	2001	231	17	45,075	66	35	17	20	-	-
	2002	233	17	49,593	66	34	17	19	1	-
	2003	225	17	50,031	66	34	18	20	2	-
	2004	202	17	51,768	63	37	19	23	2	-
	2005	189	17	53,133	66	35	20	22	1	-
	2006	199	15	51,314	70	30	19	23	1	-
	2007	215	14	52,031	72	28	17	21	2	-
	2008	206	14	53,405	69	31	19	21	1	-
	2009	215	13	54,954	53	47	19	18	1	-
2010	219	12	54,789	51	49	19	19	1	-	
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)

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

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

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

There were 335 students at Franklin School for the 2010-2011 school year. This a decrease from 368 students for the 2009-2010 school year.

Challenges: We continue to see an increase in the number of students from low income homes. For the 2010-2011 school year, 51% of the students qualified as low income. Broken down by grade level, there was a LSES rate of 46% in 2nd grade, 52% in 1st grade, and 57% in kindergarten.

Strengths: Our school is multi-cultural with 17.3% of our students reporting an ethnicity of Hispanic and 16.7% reporting an ethnicity of Multi-racial. We have maintained an attendance rate at or above 95% since before 2003. Nearly half (49%) of the teachers in our district have a master's degree. Our parental involvement is at 100%, we have no chronic truants, and our mobility decreased this year to 6.4% from 12.6% the year prior.

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

Our challenges may be contributed to changes in the world, national, and local economy.

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

According to Ruby Payne's research, The Framework for Understanding Poverty, our school needs to continue to address the educational and social/emotional needs of our low income students through various methods including differentiated instruction and RTI processes of screening, tiering, and intervention.

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

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

The local assessment data used in this plan includes reading benchmarking data, the PBIS Benchmarks of Quality Assessment, and school discipline data.

During the 2010-2011 school year, 72.3% of the students at Franklin School met or exceeded quarterly benchmarks in reading. This is an increase from 65.1% during the 2009-2010 school year.

Kindergarten 2010-2011 Data: There were 19 kindergarten students in tier 2 or 3. Of the 12 students in tier 3, 50% had an IEP, 83% were LSES, 67% were male, 58% were Caucasian, and 33% were Hispanic/Multi-Racial.

1st Grade 2010-2011 Data: There were 38 first grade students in tier 2 or 3. Of the 22 students in tier 3, 36% had an IEP, 64% were LSES, 55% were male, 73% Caucasian, and 23% were Hispanic/Multi-Racial.

2nd Grade 2010-2011 Data: There were 35 second grade students in tier 2 or 3. Of the 23 students in tier 3, 43% had an IEP, 74% were LSES, 43% were male, 43% were Caucasian, and 52% were Hispanic/Multi-Racial.

During the 2010-2011 school year, Franklin School scored an 80% on the PBIS Benchmarks of Quality Rubric, indicating a strong Tier 1 PBIS base in the school. 87% of the students at Franklin School had 0 or 1 office referrals, meeting our school improvement goal. There were 28 students (10.1% of the school) in tier 2 and 13 students (4.7% of the school) in tier 3. 56% of the total number of referrals was from 2nd grade students. The overall number of referrals increased from 113 in 2009-2010 to 235 in 2010-2011.

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

The overall demographics of the school are changing, with an increasing number of students coming from low income families. Our school did not may AYP due to the academic scores of students who are economically disadvantaged, while other subgroups did may the AYP goals. We also notice that in all grades, our students in tier 3 are predominately male and LSES. Many are also students with special needs.

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

Our conclusion is that we need to continue implementing RTI so that we can address the specific learning needs of each individual student who does not meet grade level benchmarks. We also need to consider poverty and Assets research when creating intervention plans.

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?

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?

Our staff had the benefit of several staff development opportunities during the 2010-2011 school year including training in DRA2, PBIS, Guided Reading, Math Common Core, Calm Classroom, and behavior modification.

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

The staff development provided helped our teachers to implement RTI and the related curricular programs in our school with integrity. This contributed to an improvement in student performance.

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

We need to continue providing training opportunities in these key areas.

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?

Franklin School held parent/teacher conferences before school in August and again in November. 88% of our students had parents attend the November conferences. Additionally several teachers held informational events and open houses during the school to acquaint parents to their classrooms and address issues of what parents could do at home to help their child at school.

PTO Meetings are held on the first Thursday of each month alternating between Washington and Franklin Schools. These meetings are marginally attended as noted by the PTO minutes. Newsletters are sent home monthly with school and PTO information.

PTO hosted numerous events throughout the school year including a grandparent's day in September with 257 students having grandparents in attendance, a book fair that was held in conjunction with Open House in the fall (195 students with parents in attendance), a family carnival that was held for Franklin and Washington families at Sterling High School, and a pumpkin make and take event in October.

We also added for the 2010-2011 school year, a "Mornings with Moms" breakfast in the fall and a "Donuts with Dads" breakfast in the spring.

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

Franklin School Staff and PTO work to provide many opportunities during the school year for parents and grandparents to attend Franklin School in order to make connects with our school and staff. We believe that our student's families are a critical part of the educational process. By building strong relationships, we have great opportunities to improve student performance.

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

We believe that we must continue to seek out parental involvement in a variety of ways.

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?

We are able to change our processes, through the implementation of RTI, to address the specific needs of our students. We can also change our teaching methods to provide for the needs of our growing LSES population.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	During the 2011-2012 school year, 80% or more of the students at Franklin School will meet quarterly benchmark goals in reading and math.	1,
2	During the 2011-2012 school year, 80% Jor more of the students at Franklin School will have less than 3 office referrals for disciplinary reasons.	1,

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

- 1. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

During the 2011-2012 school year, 80% or more of the students at Franklin School will meet quarterly benchmark goals in reading and math.

Objective 1 Description

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- 1. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 1 Title :

During the 2011-2012 school year, 80% or more of the students at Franklin School will meet quarterly benchmark goals in reading and math.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Implement grade level meetings to analyze grade level data, tier 1 student progress, and tier 1 curriculum implementation integrity.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Establish overall and subgroup literacy smart goals for each grade level.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Implement a Tier 1 Rigby implementation integrity checklist through principal walkthroughs.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
4	Create and implement a Tier 1 Envision Math implementation integrity checklist.	08/18/2011	12/31/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
5	Create student specific growth goals using AIMSweb rates of improvement.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
6	Progress monitor Tier 2 students twice monthly using AIMSweb.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
7	Progress monitor Tier 3 students weekly using AIMSweb.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 1 Title :

During the 2011-2012 school year, 80% or more of the students at Franklin School will meet quarterly benchmark goals in reading and math.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide staff development on implementation of Rigby guided reading.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Provide staff development on the implementation of new math curriculum, Envision.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Provide staff development on the implementation of AIMSweb.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 1 Title :

During the 2011-2012 school year, 80% or more of the students at Franklin School will meet quarterly benchmark goals in reading and math.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide parents with AIMSweb screening data and letter of data and tiering explanation after each screening date.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

During the 2011-2012 school year, 80% or more of the students at Franklin School will meet quarterly benchmark goals in reading and math.

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?)

This objective will be measured through benchmarking and tiering data. We will also collect meeting agendas and notes, copies of smart goals created, copies of implementation integrity checklists, implementation integrity data, and student progress monitoring graphs.

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	Suzzette Hesser	Principal
2	Melanie Selmi	Interventionist
3	Brooke Emmerson	School Counselor
4	Becki Edmondson	Kindergarten Teacher
5	Peg Wills	1st Grade Teacher
6	Brian Lobdell	1st Grade Teacher

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

During the 2011-2012 school year, 80% or more of the students at Franklin School will have less than 3 office referrals for disciplinary reasons.

Objective 2 Description

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- B 1. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 2 Title :

During the 2011-2012 school year, 80% or more of the students at Franklin School will have less than 3 office referrals for disciplinary reasons.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Administer the PBIS BoQ (Benchmarks of Quality) Assessment with a goal of 85%.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Administer the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire to kindergarten parents as a social/emotional universal screener.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Administer the AIMSweb social/emotional screener to all K-2 students.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
4	Align classroom rules with the 3 PBIS school-wide expectations: Be Respectful, Be Responsible, Use Self-Control.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
5	Create PBIS site specific expectation posters.	06/01/2011	06/25/2011	Before School	Local Funds	0

6	Create a PBIS/RTI orientation folder for new students, staff, and parents.	06/01/2011	06/25/2011	Before School	Local Funds	50
7	Create a banner or flag or our 3 PBIS expectations for display outside the school.	06/01/2011	06/25/2011	Before School	Local Funds	150
8	Develop additional PBIS lessons for expected behaviors in both classroom and non-classroom settings.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
9	Continue implementing Calm Classroom by using a consistent morning calming routine along with teacher led activities as needed.	08/18/2011	05/18/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
10	Create and implement a system for social/emotional tier identification.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 2 Title :

During the 2011-2012 school year, 80% Jor more of the students at Franklin School will have less than 3 office referrals for disciplinary reasons.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide a Magic 3 Discipline refresher presentation to staff.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Provide a PBIS/Tier 2 smiley chart intervention presentation to staff.	08/18/2011	05/18/2011	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 2 Title :

During the 2011-2012 school year, 80% Jor more of the students at Franklin School will have less than 3 office referrals for disciplinary reasons.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Conduct a parent 40 Developmental Assets survey during before school conferences to determine family needs.	08/11/2011	08/12/2011	Before School	Local Funds	0

2	Create a 40 Developmental Assets team to address needs from the survey.	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Create a parental notification letter explaining tier status adn the smiley face chart (PBIS check and connect).	08/18/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

During the 2011-2012 school year, 80% Jor more of the students at Franklin School will have less than 3 office referrals for disciplinary reasons.

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?)

This objective will be monitor through the PBIS BoQ Assessment, discipline data, tiering data, copies of lesson and letters created, agendas and meeting notes, and Assets survey data.

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	Suzzette Hesser	Principal
2	Melanie Selmi	Interventionist
3	Brooke Emmerson	School Counselor
4	Becki Edmondson	Kindergarten Teacher
5	Peg Wills	1st Grade Teacher
6	Brian Lobdell	1st Grade Teacher

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.*)

Parents are informed about the school's academic status through information posted on our district website. Parents are informed about their child's academic progress through quarterly report cards and letters describing screening and tiering data.

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.

Parents are invited, through monthly newsletters, to attend school improvement meetings. All staff, certified and non-certified, were asked to provide feedback about school improvement progress through surveys conducted throughout the school year. Survey data collected was then shared. Certified and non-certified staff members were each members of a school committee tied to a school improvement goal. Committees met on a regular basis throughout the school year. All staff were also involved in creating school improvement goals through a collaborative process used during an early dismissal school improvement day and subsequent staff meetings. Staff were asked to choose an area of interest and work with that committee of individuals to review current data and complete an RTI action plan survey as a guide in revealing our school's strengths and needs. The group then created a recommended list of school improvement actions that were shared with the school improvement team. Once action items were reviewed and edited by our school improvement team, the final plan was shared through email and faculty meeting.

	Name	Title
1	Suzzette Hesser	Principal
2	Jay Van Horn	School Board Member
3	Melanie Selmi	Interventionist
4	Brooke Emmerson	School Counselor
5	Becki Edmondson	Kindergarten Teacher
6	Peg Wills	1st Grade Teacher
7	Brian Lobdell	1st Grade Teacher

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part C. Peer Review Process

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

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

Each building SIP team, or a designated peer review team, is encouraged to complete an internal review process using the ISBE scoring rubric. Adjustments to the SIP will be made if necessary. During the months of June, July and August, the school improvement plan is presented to the Board of Education's Education Committee. The Education Committee members will provide feedback to each school. The school SIP members will review the feedback and make any necessary changes.

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.

Purpose of the Program

So that Sterling Schools may enhance student learning, as well as provide its teachers with instructional teaching methods, it has contractually created a Teacher Induction and Mentoring Program. The purpose of the Induction program is to provide ongoing support and assistance to all novice teachers, with the outcome being that each staff member moves from an Illinois Initial Teaching Certificate, to an Illinois Standard Teaching Certificate. Within this Induction Program is our two-year Mentoring Program that is required of each beginning and new teacher to the district.

Details of the Program

Every novice and new teacher that comes to the district is provided with a mentor. This mentor is selected by principals, but must meet district criteria, as well as participate in the district's Mentoring Training Program. Then, throughout the school year, the mentor and mentee meet regularly with one another. On a monthly basis, the mentor/mentee team will meet with the building principal to communicate progress and future strategies.

Sterling School's uses Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching as a guide and a model for its Mentoring Program. This researched-based framework, which each mentor is trained in, helps to lead discussions between mentors and mentees that focus on student achievement and effective classroom strategies.

Goals of the Program

The program has three major goals. First and foremost, it is to improve the quality of classroom instruction of the participating teacher by ensuring that he/she is provided with researched-based, best-practices for teaching. Secondly, Sterling Schools strives to provide not just academic support, but also personal support to those in its Mentor Program. Lastly, it is our desire to acquaint each mentee with tools and information that will assist them "on the job." These items include, the prevailing culture of our school, the District evaluation procedure, the union contract, and district policies affecting teachers and teaching,

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 district resources required for this plan are mainly related to staff development with the implementation of Rigby, Envision, and AIMSweb.

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.

ISBE has not been directly involved in the creation of this plan. However, there are state supported resources, including IIRC, which are helpful in plan development.

	Name	Title
1		

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.

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

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

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

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

PEER REVIEW

<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]
STATE RESPONSIBILITES	
<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]
SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM	
<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]
APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan. [C]

PART II - COMMENTS