

Local Board Approved	
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	050162250170001		
District Name:	Northfield Twp HSD 225	School Name:	Glenbrook North High School
Superintendent:	Dr. Michael Riggle	Principal:	Paul Pryma
District Address:	3801 W Lake Ste 203	School Address:	2300 Shermer Rd
City/State/Zip:	Glenview, IL 60026 5806	City/State/Zip:	Northbrook, IL 60062 6722
District Telephone#:	Label 8474864700 Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	8475092400 Extn: 0
District Email:	mriggle@glenbrook225.org	School Email:	ppryma@glenbrook225.org
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2010 AYP Report

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this School been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2010-11 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2010-11 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning Year 1

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		77.5			77.5			91		80	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	83.1		Yes	87.3		Yes			100.0	Yes
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	84.3		Yes	87.8		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	77.3		Yes	86.7		Yes				

Native American														
Multiracial/Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	46.4	60.0	No	42.9	61.7	No		100.0		
Economically Disadvantaged														

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

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

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

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

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

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 (%)	95.3	96.2	92.9	93.3	93.3	93.7	93.8	93.9
Truancy Rate (%)	0.4	0.3	0.8	1.1	1.2	1.1	0.6	0.5
Mobility Rate (%)	2.6	2.5	2.6	1.9	1.7	1.8	2.2	2.1
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	96.3	97.0	94.4	99.3	98.1	99.0	99.4	100.0
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	-	0.1	0.0
School Population (#)	2,085	2,102	2,094	2,128	2,089	2,118	2,102	2,104
Low Income (%)	1.8	1.9	1.5	2.1	1.8	2.1	3.3	4.6
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.8	0.9	1.3	1.6	1.5	1.4	2.0	1.3
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.2
White, non-Hispanic (%)	84.0	83.3	83.6	83.0	82.7	83.1	82.3	81.8
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.3
Hispanic (%)	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.7	2.4	2.0	2.5	2.9
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	14.6	15.0	14.6	14.6	13.5	12.9	12.7	12.4
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	0.0	0.3	0.8	1.3	1.9	2.6

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	83.8	0.2	0.8	15.1	0.1	-
	2001	84.3	0.1	0.8	14.7	0.2	-
	2002	84.0	0.2	1.0	14.7	-	-
	2003	84.0	0.3	1.1	14.6	-	-
	2004	83.3	0.3	1.3	15.0	-	-
	2005	83.6	0.5	1.3	14.6	-	-
	2006	83.0	0.4	1.7	14.6	-	0.3
	2007	82.7	0.7	2.4	13.5	-	0.8
	2008	83.1	0.6	2.0	12.9	-	1.3
	2009	82.3	0.5	2.5	12.7	-	1.9
	2010	81.8	0.3	2.9	12.4	-	2.6
D I S T R I C T	2000	79.0	1.0	2.8	17.0	0.2	-
	2001	79.6	1.0	3.2	16.0	0.3	-
	2002	79.7	1.0	3.4	15.7	0.2	-
	2003	80.0	1.1	3.6	15.0	0.1	-
	2004	79.1	1.3	4.0	15.5	0.1	-
	2005	78.6	1.6	4.1	15.5	0.1	0.1
	2006	77.2	1.6	2.8	13.2	4.8	0.3
	2007	76.3	1.7	5.4	15.5	-	1.0
	2008	77.0	1.6	4.9	15.0	0.1	1.5
	2009	76.0	1.2	5.4	15.4	0.1	1.9
	2010	75.5	0.7	5.5	15.7	0.1	2.4
	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	1.1	1.4	96.5	92.0	3.6	7	0.4	0.1	94.9
	2001	1.0	1.5	94.0	91.2	3.0	10	0.5	0.2	96.0
	2002	0.9	0.9	93.0	92.2	3.5	4	0.2	0.4	98.3
	2003	0.8	1.8	95.2	95.3	2.6	9	0.4	-	96.3
	2004	0.9	1.9	95.1	96.2	2.5	6	0.3	0.1	97.0
	2005	1.3	1.5	95.0	92.9	2.6	16	0.8	0.1	94.4
	2006	1.6	2.1	95.0	93.3	1.9	24	1.1	0.1	99.3
	2007	1.5	1.8	96.4	93.3	1.7	25	1.2	0.1	98.1
	2008	1.4	2.1	97.2	93.7	1.8	23	1.1	-	99.0
	2009	2.0	3.3	97.2	93.8	2.2	13	0.6	0.1	99.4
2010	1.3	4.6	97.2	93.9	2.1	11	0.5	-	100.0	
D I S T R I C T	2000	3.2	6.4	96.5	93.3	4.9	12	0.3	0.7	94.7
	2001	2.7	6.9	93.7	92.4	4.9	13	0.3	0.6	95.1
	2002	2.9	5.7	92.5	93.6	4.1	5	0.1	0.4	96.6
	2003	3.0	4.2	95.1	95.5	3.8	11	0.2	0.2	95.3
	2004	2.9	7.3	94.9	95.1	3.8	8	0.2	0.1	96.3
	2005	3.3	7.6	94.9	94.0	4.6	27	0.6	0.4	95.1
	2006	3.5	8.2	95.1	93.6	3.1	48	1.0	0.1	99.0
	2007	3.4	8.3	96.3	93.7	2.9	39	0.8	0.1	98.1
	2008	3.3	8.0	97.3	94.1	2.7	33	0.7	0.1	99.3
	2009	3.5	9.2	97.3	94.3	3.6	18	0.4	0.1	99.2
2010	3.2	11.0	97.3	95.0	3.3	17	0.4	-	99.9	
	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	1,931	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,992	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	2,060	-	-	-	-	-	515
	2003	2,085	-	-	-	-	-	524
	2004	2,102	-	-	-	-	-	496
	2005	2,094	-	-	-	-	-	538
	2006	2,128	-	-	-	-	-	538
	2007	2,089	-	-	-	-	-	525
	2008	2,118	-	-	-	-	-	524
	2009	2,102	-	-	-	-	-	499
	2010	2,104	-	-	-	-	-	544
D I S T R I C T	2000	4,260	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	4,382	-	-	-	-	-	1,114
	2002	4,490	-	-	-	-	-	1,145
	2003	4,585	-	-	-	-	-	1,161
	2004	4,703	-	-	-	-	-	1,157
	2005	4,759	-	-	-	-	-	1,193
	2006	4,799	-	-	-	-	-	1,261
	2007	4,773	-	-	-	-	-	1,243
	2008	4,709	-	-	-	-	-	1,178
	2009	4,628	-	-	-	-	-	1,161
	2010	4,700	-	-	-	-	-	1,189
	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	297	17	72,223	20	80	-	16	-	-
	2001	313	17	73,821	19	81	-	16	-	-
	2002	324	17	77,862	20	80	-	16	-	-
	2003	327	16	80,209	19	81	-	16	1	-
	2004	332	15	81,916	20	80	-	16	-	-
	2005	342	15	83,160	24	76	-	16	1	-
	2006	342	14	83,130	24	76	-	16	1	-
	2007	339	14	87,423	22	78	-	16	1	-
	2008	346	14	91,384	16	83	-	16	-	-
	2009	353	14	94,149	17	83	-	15	1	-
2010	352	14	97,041	18	82	-	16	-	-	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1
2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1	

	2010	132,502	13	63,296	42	57	18	18	1	1
--	------	---------	----	--------	----	----	----	----	---	---

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

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

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grade 11						
Groups	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	84.3	84.0	84.8	81.7	82.9	83.2
White	84.3	85.5	85.7	84.3	85.0	84.4
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	60.0	-	-	59.1	63.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	86.1	84.8	80.0	72.6	79.6	77.3
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	80.0	100.0
LEP	-	-	-	46.7	33.3	-
Students with Disabilities	46.1	43.3	63.5	67.2	54.2	42.6
Low Income	-	-	-	-	50.0	83.3

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

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

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grade 11						
Groups	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	85.0	84.4	87.6	85.5	85.4	87.1
White	85.6	85.3	87.7	86.0	87.1	88.0
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	60.0	-	-	63.6	81.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	84.7	89.9	88.3	87.5	87.8	86.7
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	70.0	70.0
LEP	-	-	-	66.6	58.4	-
Students with Disabilities	42.3	36.7	49.2	52.4	52.1	38.3
Low Income	-	-	-	-	50.0	72.2

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?

The school report card student performance data were analyzed with respect to all juniors as well as each of the five subgroups (White, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, LEP and Students with Disabilities) for which AYP is measured. Although reading and math assessments within the Hispanic, Multiracial/Ethnic, LEP and Low Income sub-groups demonstrated significant gains over the past year, making any major claims about performance is not statistically reliable due to the small numbers of students within each group.

Strengths:

When considering the category of ALL students, Glenbrook North High School continues to make AYP in both reading and mathematics as it has from the inception of No Child Left Behind legislation. In 2010, 83.2 % of all students met or exceeded standards in reading and 87.1 % in mathematics. These levels of performance increased over the last year and demonstrate a consistent level of academic performance over a five year period of time.

Reading

- ALL students exhibited a modest increase for the past two years in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards. Within a five year span, the scores have remained relatively consistent and at a high level of performance - above 81%.
- White students maintained a consistently high level of performance with 84.4% meeting or exceeding standards during the 2010 school year and have only experienced minor fluctuations in performance during the past five years.
- Asian/Pacific Islander maintained a consistently high level of performance with 77.3% meeting or exceeded standards in 2010 school year and have only experienced minor fluctuations in performance during the past five years.

Mathematics

- **ALL students demonstrated a modest increase in performance over the past year achieving 87.1 % meeting or exceeding standards in 2010 compared to 85.4% in 2009. This performance reflects a significantly high level of achievement.**
- White students demonstrated gains during the last two years with improvement in performance level from 86.0% in 2008 to 87.1% in 2009 and again an increase to 88.0% in 2010. This performance reflects incremental progress.
- Asian/Pacific Islander students demonstrated equivalent levels of performance to their white peers consistently over the past several years.

Additional Areas of Strength from the School Report Card Data and District Data

- Over the past five years Glenbrook North has experienced graduation rates above 98% with the last two years, 2009 and 2010, showing the highest graduation rates of 99.4% and 100% respectively.
- **Over 96% of GBN students attend college after graduation and have maintained this level of post secondary enrollment over a period of ten years.**
- Attendance rates are consistently high at a rate of 93% or above over the past eight years.
- Chronic truancy rates have been very low, 1% or below over the past eight years.

The School Report Card indicated that in 2010 our Students with Disabilities did not demonstrate adequate yearly progress in both reading and mathematics. Specifically the scores within this sub-group indicated that 46.4% of the students met the target in reading and 42.9% met the target in mathematics.

Weaknesses:

This is the second year that the Students with Disabilities sub-group did not meet standards in reading and the first year that they did not meet standards in mathematics. Student performance data in reading and mathematics for this subgroup that are of concern are summarized below.

Reading

- Students with Disabilities sub-group experienced a significant performance decline over the past two years with 67.2% meeting or exceeding in 2008 down to 54.2% in 2009 and down again with 42.6% in 2010.
- Of important note is the comparison of scores for this sub-group over a five year period with performance levels in 2005 (46.1%) and 2006 (43.3%) similar to the performance level in 2010. Again the smaller number of students (n= 45-55 students) within this cohort may account for the more varied levels of performance statistically.

Mathematics

- Students with Disabilities sub-group experienced a significant performance decline during 2010 with 38.2% meeting or exceeding standards compared to 52.1 % in 2009 and 52.4% in 2008.
- Again, variance within this sub-group over a five year period of time shows similar performance levels in 2005 (42.3%) and 2006 (36.%) as experienced in reading performance. Again we would note that a smaller number of students within this group could contribute to the larger variance in performance.

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

Special Education Eligibility:

In order for students to be identified as having a disability, they must demonstrate academic performance that is discrepant from their peers. Expecting students with disabilities to achieve similar performance levels as their general education peers on standardized tests as required by state mandates is in conflict with federal mandates for identifying students with disabilities. These achievement gaps in both reading and math may be due to the unique learning needs of students in the students with disabilities subgroup. Many of these students have moderate to severe learning disabilities and academic skills ranging from grades 2-8 - well below the typical grade 11 student for whom the PSAE was designed. These learning disabilities can be characterized as significant skill and processing deficits. In addition, a number of students with disabilities have Intelligence Quotients (IQ's) of 75 or below. As a public school we must fulfill our legal obligation to develop IEP's that address the academic remediation needs of students with disabilities.

Curricular Design: Students with disabilities may be enrolled in special education class(es) based upon least restrictive environment where instruction has a greater focus on skill development and addressing academic gaps than instruction in general education courses. Content delivery in these courses is driven by the IEP goals of the students resulting in a curricular design that may be different from the regular education content courses. Course sequencing for some students may also impact student academic performance. In mathematics, 53 % of special education students were enrolled in courses at least one year behind in sequence of their general education peers. Of those students with disabilities in Advanced Algebra classes (on track math sequence) 75 % were enrolled in lower levels of this course.

Core Curriculum: The core curriculum is developed from the school's mission statement and aligned with State Standards. Our efforts have been focused upon quality of instructional programs that successfully prepare students for higher education. **Significant emphasis on test preparation has not been part of our school culture. Our belief is that quality curricular programs with excellent instruction will result in high levels of student performance as the report card data indicates.**

Professional Development Needs: Students with disabilities are serviced in general education and special education programs throughout their academic career. General education teachers are content specialists and may not have received extensive knowledge about instructional practices for students with unique learning needs during teacher preparation programs. Special education teachers, although well educated in how to meet the needs of unique learners, may benefit from more specific professional development within the conceptual content of core disciplines of English, mathematics, science and social studies.

Test Fatigue: Since many of our students with disabilities are granted extended time on the PSAE or have the accommodation that the test is read to them, these students spend **days and days working on this test due to these accommodations. While such accommodations are appropriate for these students, the number of hours committed to working on the PSAE may lead to test fatigue which may have a significant negative effect on the students' ability to focus and perform.**

Division/Distinction of Services to Special Education Students: Students with disabilities that seek additional assistance may access academic supports in centers for reading, writing and math. Access for students with disabilities to more targeted academic support services has been isolated to resources within the special education department **with few exceptions.** In general, social/emotional (direct counseling) supports have been clearly divided between general and special education services. Specialized instructional programs (Team taught classes, special ed cross-categorical courses, reading skill development and academic support centers) have functioned to support narrowed groups of students with little over-lap or utilization of multiple supports for individual students.

Need for more Targeted Instruction for Skill Development in Reading and Mathematics: Current academic support structures (Rtl Tiers 1,2 & 3) provide limited focused and prescriptive instructional intervention for identified skill deficits for struggling learners. Student assignment to the Math Enrichment Center (MEC) has been based upon class work completion, grades, teacher referral with some piloted use of academic screeners to identify skill deficits. Prescriptive plans were executed for identified students. Within reading and writing support centers, emphasis on support for classroom content work completion is a priority over remediation of skill deficiencies.

Change in Eligibility Standards for Students with Learning Disabilities: Utilization of the Rtl model for learning disability eligibility determination should entitle only those students with significant basic skill deficits in reading, writing and math to IEPs. Prior to an eligibility determination for special education, the law requires schools to provide scientifically researched based direct instruction to students who are in need of services based upon an identified skill discrepancy. Students that were once serviced with IEP's can now receive academic intervention without the attachment of a disability label. Therefore, we may be testing a different cohort of students within this special education sub-group that have more significant needs. Past cohort groups may have had students with higher levels of performance on standardized tests.

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

The continued review of content and skill development at all instructional levels in our core curricular program is an important part of this process. Improving curriculum design in special education courses for students with disabilities to better parallel academic experience to their general education peers in higher level courses with respect to content and skill development, when appropriate, will provide for increased student performance. Evaluation of the mathematics curricular sequence and student matriculation within this program will be evaluated.

Blend responsibilities between special education and general education delivery of academic programs and specialized supports. Ownership for the success of students with disabilities needs to be shared by all staff members within the school community. Service delivery will focus on addressing specific skill deficits and matched to various and multiple academic support systems as needed to address the concerns. Evaluation of the staffing processes for our TEAM classes needs to be completed and designed to provide support in both content expertise and strategies for supporting unique learners.

Provide more prescriptive and focused support services within reading and mathematics for students with performance deficits through academic support centers and within instructional programs in special education.

Develop increased capacity among faculty for teaching reading strategies within the content areas and utilizing instructional practices that best meet the needs of diverse learners.

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?

Glenbrook North High School employs a variety of measures to analyze student performance and achievement. Below are specific local assessment data utilized:

-
- a. Terra Nova (reading and math sub-scores) This localized assessment is administered to 8th grade students who will be entering GBN the following year. Data from this assessment assists with placement into specific instructional programs and is used as a universal screener for all incoming freshmen to identify students who may be in need of specialized academic supports.
 - b. PLAN test is administered to all 10th grade students in the fall at Glenbrook North to further identify students who may need additional instructional supports. In addition, instructional leaders review data in the PLAN-ACT Linkage reports to better identify curricular gaps in general student performance across all sub-groups.
 - c. Grade reports and middle school/junior high teacher recommendations on student performance contribute to placement into instructional programs as well as identifying learners with specialized needs. Teacher recommendations are valued when making final placement decisions since the testing data is localized and student scores may not entirely capture a student's level of academic commitment. Students who meet criteria for the most rigorous coursework are placed into these programs.
 - d. Departmental Generated Placement Exams are used to supplement placement information beyond the Terra Nova or teacher recommendations. These exams are also employed in placing transfer students to appropriate instructional programs.
 - e. An algebra screener (local assessment) for all geometry students is administered to identify specific skill gaps in algebra for students who have completed Algebra 1 at GBN or in the feeder schools. Instructional Planning Forms are then developed and implemented in our Math Enrichment Center to address these academic gaps. 2010 was the first year we implemented this screener.
 - f. **Grades and Progress Reporting** - Four week progress reports, quarter and semester grades are reviewed systematically in order to identify students who may need academic assistance from specialized supports.
 - g. Attendance data is used in conjunction with academic data to determine appropriate student supports.
 - h. Qualitative data from a variety of sources (e.g. teacher, guidance counselor, student, parent) provide input into decision making related to student programming and supports.
 - i. Gates reading assessments are utilized to monitor student progress in the reading skill development program and identify freshmen TEAM students' needs with regard to reading skills.
 - j. Within special education self-contained courses, Aimsweb oral reading fluency (ORF) data is collected for benchmarking (three times per year) and progress monitoring purposes (twice per month) for the purpose of program review and to drive instructional decision-making.

k. Within the special education reading strategies course, student reading levels and student progress is measured multiple times a year with Qualitative Reading Inventories (QRI) as well as assessments that are included in the research-based Read Naturally program.

Relative Strengths:

Glenbrook North's Rtl system consistently uses the data identified above to make decisions regarding instructional supports and interventions for all students. Multiple data points are considered when making plans for individual students in need of assistance.

Review of PLAN-ACT linkage data for the class of 2010 reflected predicted positive growth from PLAN to ACT performance. Specifically, student performance increased two percent in English for students meeting benchmarks from PLAN testing to ACT testing. Increases were also observed in Mathematics (seven percent) and in Science (five percent) for students meeting the expected benchmarks for college readiness. This analysis suggests that students exposed to the GBN curriculum in English, Math and Science make expected gains from their sophomore to junior year. Continued review of this linkage data and student performance within the various score ranges is monitored each year by the leadership team to determine any area of concern regarding curricular content or skill development.

Relative Weaknesses:

Local assessment tools noted above effectively identify the lowest 25% of students who will likely need academic supports in mathematics and reading. Early interventions in academic placements, reading and math supports, study strategy supports and social/emotional assistance can be implemented effectively utilizing these local assessments. One area of need is to incorporate diagnostic tools that appropriately identify students' academic gaps compared to their local, same-age and grade level peers. Outside of self-contained special education courses assessment systems that effectively measure student progress are in early stages of development.

This was our first year using the local algebra screener to identify students who may have specific gaps in algebra skills. Forty sophomore students and 30 freshmen students were identified in need of support. Sophomore students exited supports quickly within a couple of weeks. Freshmen students received more extensive support for 3-5 weeks.

Review of PLAN-ACT linkage reports indicated that the number of students reaching Reading benchmarks from PLAN to ACT declined by two percent from 81% meeting benchmarks on the PLAN and 79% meeting benchmarks on the ACT. National Reading percentages also declined four percent from 60% meeting benchmark on the PLAN to 54% meeting benchmarks on the ACT.

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

Curricular Differences in Feeder Schools - Utilization of the algebra screener in 2010 demonstrated variation in algebra skills for incoming freshmen. GBN freshmen students come from four different public feeder schools and two private schools that have limited articulation regarding algebra curriculum and instructional strategies. Although some students are considered strong students at the middle school level, many experience academic difficulties as they transition to high school coursework. Differences can also be observed in other curricular areas in English, science and social studies.

Instructional Differences - Teacher recommendations have variance in predicting student success at the high school level. Instructional focus in our mathematics program is based upon a conceptual understanding of mathematic relationships and requires students to solve problems in novel situations. This instructional philosophy differs from some of the middle school instructional approaches. Our science program focuses on inquiry based instructional methodology. Not all middle schools utilize these instructional methodologies.

Reading Interventions - Data from the PLAN-ACT linkage reports that current reading interventions may not effectively create expected growth from the sophomore to junior year. Current course and reading supports are focused on generalized strategies and may not necessarily address individual students' reading deficits. A variety of teachers provide instruction in our reading skill development program and reading support services which may present a lack of continuity in matching instruction to student academic skills deficits.

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

Improved articulation at the township level focused on curricular content and instructional strategies is needed to support student success as freshmen transition to Glenbrook North academic programs. Joint efforts among middle school and high school teachers to identify essential knowledge and skill sets need to be established to address academic gaps experienced in the transition to high school courses.

As noted in the school report card data conclusions, improved efforts in developing focused strategies to address academic skill gaps in our reading supports and reading skill development courses are needed to improve student performance.

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?

As part of School District 225, Glenbrook North High School is a community that historically has supported quality education for all students. High expectations and high achievement exist for our students among staff members and families. A \$94,000,000 referendum was passed in November 2006, which is indicative of the exceptional level of community support for the Glenbrooks.

Attributes:

A well-educated parent base and a strong professional environment create a community conversation revolving around high educational expectations. As a result, our students consider higher education as a natural progression after they complete their high school experience. In addition, our parents possess the social capital to assist their children in navigating the post secondary environment.

GBN takes pride in its status as a balanced comprehensive high school with 96%+ of students pursuing higher education. We also maintain an outstanding program of athletics and extra-curricular participation that supports development of well rounded graduates.

National Clearinghouse data suggest that our educational programs competently prepare our graduates for success at the college level with 95% retention rate from freshmen year to sophomore year at their selected colleges and universities.

Developmental counseling curriculum is so often utilized with all students from the freshmen to senior level. Each program is designed to address specific needs for students in determining a career path and necessary steps to achieve these plans. During the junior year, a comprehensive program, "Finding the Fit", is provided to assist students/families in the college selection process.

Glenbrook North High School offers a variety of transition services to students with disabilities. Four transition classes are offered to students: Single Living, Transition for Life, STEP and Self-Determination. Students receive academic credit for job experiences (STEP class) as they develop job skills and complete career exploration. College 101 is another class offered to students that is intended to assist students with the transition to post-secondary college life. Students are able to access special education services until the day before their 22nd birthday and Glenbrook North offers a Transition Program for students from 18-21 years old. Students and families are encouraged to access Glenbrook North

transition resources available to them such as: Transitional and Vocational Coordination; Choices College Fair for Students with Disabilities; Options Fair for connecting families to adult service providers, agencies, resources and activities; and support from a job coach. Glenbrook Community Connect is another transition initiative intended to create a variety of job experiences for students.

Glenbrook North High School is comprised of high achieving students who are committed to success in their academic work, social interactions with peers and service to the broader community.

Challenges:

Academically competitive students who may over commit to academic work and extra-curricular programs. Cultural demands for high levels of performance are pervasive within the school community. Some of the outcomes of this concern result in high levels of anxiety, school avoidance/phobia and other maladaptive coping responses. Anxiety impacts student performance on high stakes testing. School avoidance/phobia contributes to educational gaps in skill and knowledge development. Success as determined by grades, gpa, curricular involvement and eventual college placement is a significant focus of our parental community and this adds to students' anxiety levels.

Expectations of performance may place personal impact upon the student that may struggle academically or have identified disabilities. Students that do not fit within the high performing norm of the school may avoid assistance or seek alternative coping mechanisms.

Although GBN provides resources for Tier 2 and 3 RtI academic supports, a more targeted process is desired for identifying students in need of skill focused assistance and strategies to monitor their progress in reducing the performance gap between them and their peers.

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

District 225 celebrates excellent facilities, highly qualified staff, high quality professional development curriculum, and a rich array of supportive services. Class sizes and resources provided within our special education program are well funded and operate successfully.

Student and parental support of education and expectation for academic achievement supports a high level of student performance as observed in the school report card data. Students, parents and the community are competitively committed to college placement. Student and parent focus on academic GPA achievement may impact instructional support that could address academic gaps.

Students not only desire to attend college, but seek enrollment in institutions that have prestigious reputations. Students with disabilities, however, may have very different educational experiences with in this high achieving culture. The unique needs of students with disabilities many times impact their perceptions regarding their ability to be successful in school. Efforts to assist students with disabilities to gain confidence in their academic skills is impacted by the highly competitive academic environment.

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

The factors noted above instill a desire for students to succeed and achieve at greater than average performance levels. Instructional programs that seek to build academic skills and address any educational gaps a student may have will be critical to our improvement processes. In addition, we will need to address the social emotional needs of students who have not always experienced a great deal of academic success in their educational programs. Capacity building and a sense of personal advocacy will need to be part of the focus of our efforts.

Facilitate discussions with our community about the importance of instruction that speaks to skill deficits in addition to academic work completion to ensure student success after they graduate Glenbrook North High School.

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?

Glenbrook North employs a highly educated and credentialed faculty/staff. Nearly 85% of the faculty hold master's degrees or higher with several others working towards master's degrees. Over 88% of our teachers have five or more years of experience and 100% of our faculty are deemed highly qualified by NCLB standards. The highly qualified status of our instructional staff indicated by this data reflects the level of professionalism that is demonstrated within the classroom and by active involvement in professional development opportunities provided by the school.

Special education teachers engage in extensive, ongoing professional development in research-based instructional practices, much of which is supported by the local special

education cooperative, North Shore Special Education District (NSSED). Specifically, nearly 100% of special education teachers have been trained in the University of Kansas reading strategies and about 50% of special education instructors have been trained in University of Kansas writing strategies. In addition, all special education faculty have been trained in the Response-to-Intervention process and data collection procedures. Teachers have been trained and have implement the research-based reading program, Read Naturally. Training is in progress for Read 180; once training is complete seven special education teachers and two general education teachers will be trained to implement and support this intensive reading program. The Wilson reading program and Lindamood-Bell learning processes have been woven into the instructional program of the special education courses.

In the area of social-emotional needs, special education instructors, building psychologists and social workers have participated in Life Space Crisis Intervention training, workshops related to a variety of adolescent emotional disabilities, including anxiety, depression, ADHD. and intensive training in organizational and group dynamics. Teachers have been trained in Assistive Technology to support struggling learners. Finally, teachers recently participated in a training by Kevin Feldman about research-based instructional strategies to increase student engagement.

Special education faculty participates in weekly team meetings to review data on student progress. Data drives instructional decision-making, along with special education students' post-high school transition plan goals.

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

The special education teachers trained in research-based instructional programs and content area enhancement strategies provide instruction to special education students placed in self-contained special education courses. There often exists a need to expand similar professional development opportunities to general education teachers who serve some special education students in general education content area courses.

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

Professional development plans will target those teaching in the co-taught **TEAM program that serves at-risk** general education students and some students already identified as needing special education programming.

Beyond these focused efforts, we will continue to provide professional development designed to assist all teachers in improved understanding of literacy within the content disciplines, support student engagement with instructional activities and differentiated instructional strategies to better meet the needs of all learners.

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?

The data indicate that over 97% of parents are involved with Glenbrook North. Some of the ways in which parents become involved in their students' education are listed below:

- District Special Education Parent Association monthly meetings
- Inclusion of parent representation on our Transition Planning Committee (transition planning influences IEP goals which impact special education planning)
- Increased parent-teacher-student (with disabilities) participation in informal conferences beyond formal IEP meetings.
- Special Education Parent Group - Parent nights are offered throughout the school year focusing on success for students with disabilities.
- Korean Parent Organization that serves to reach out to our parents and assist them on issues related to their students' success in school.
- ELL parent programs (with translation services available) to assist parents and students who are served within our ELL program.
- Dean's Advisory Committee and Curriculum Council both have parent representation.
- Glenbrook North Parent Organization collaborates with GBN Administration in addressing various educational concerns and programming.
- Specific booster parental support groups assist our extra-curricular programs in athletics, band, choir and drama.
- Our new student data system will provide parents the ability to view active grade books for their students in all classes. This will support more direct communication with teachers about student progress and areas of concern.

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

The many and varied ways in which parent invest in their childrens' education have significantly contributed to the quality of the Glenbrook North learning community. We will continue to collaborate with parents and examine opportunities to strengthen and already powerful partnership. This being said, efforts to embolden student self-advocacy is critical to this process. Parterning with parents, we seek to increase the voice of students in the design of their academic programs.

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

Parent feedback obtained via informal conferences and at student IEP meetings will serve to direct future planning. Some areas of focus include the following:

- Continue to utilize parent participation in organizational committees and advisory groups. Evaluate areas for potential expansion.
- Systemize manner in which parents/student are included in the problem-solving process with student service teams

Build upon an already healthy structure to systematic communication in which parents are informed of plans that develop from problem-solving process that include their ideas. Ensure that parents understand their rights in the problem-solving process and access to special education evaluations.

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?

Curricular Design:

Review of content and skill development at all instructional levels in our core curricular program is an important part of this process. Evaluating curriculum design within our special education course so that students with disabilities academic experiences will parallel those of their general education peers in higher level courses with respect to content and skill development will provide for better student performance. Evaluation of the mathematics curricular sequence and student matriculation within this program will be evaluated.

Shared Responsibilities:

Blending responsibilities between special education and general education delivery of academic programs and specialized supports is another key factor that our improvement plans will address. Ownership for the success of students with disabilities needs to be shared by all staff members within the school community. Service delivery will focus on addressing specific skill deficits and matched to various and multiple academic support systems as needed to address the concerns.

Professional Development:

As we work to address academic gaps, building teacher capacity will be critical. Providing more prescriptive and focused support services within reading and mathematics for students with performance deficits through our academic support centers and within instructional programs in special education will need to be a central focus of our professional development efforts. Expanding skills among teachers for teaching reading within the content areas and utilizing instructional practices that best meet the needs of diverse learners will also assist us in this goal. Specifically, we will initiate professional development with teachers in our team-taught program that serves students with greater educational needs.

Beyond these focused efforts, professional development needs to be designed to assist all teachers in improved literacy within the content disciplines, student engagement and differentiated instruction to better meet the needs of all students.

Township Collaboration:

Improved articulation at the township level focused on curricular content and instructional strategies is needed to support student success as freshmen transition to Glenbrook North academic programs. Joint efforts among middle school and high school teachers to identify essential knowledge and skill sets need to be established to address academic gaps experienced in the transition to high school courses. Current efforts for curriculum articulation within the township school districts is in progress to address transition concerns between middle schools and district high schools.

Social Emotional Supports for Students:

Instructional programs that seek to build academic skills and address any educational gaps a student may have will be critical to our improvement processes. In addition, we will need to address the social emotional needs of students who have not always experienced a great deal of academic success in their educational programs. Capacity building and a sense of personal advocacy will need to be part of our efforts. Strategies that assist students with disabilities to gain confidence in their academic skills is vital within this highly competitive academic environment.

Parent Participation:

Parent feedback obtained via informal conferences and at student IEP meetings will serve to direct future planning. As we address the needs of specific students we will work to enhance parent participation and voice in the problem solving processes within the RtI program. In addition we will need to systemize the process for communicating parent rights within the RtI tiered level of services, specifically identifying the junctures at which the interventions become more significant and parents should have an opportunity to understand their options for evaluation of their child.

We will also continue to utilize parent participation in organizational committees and advisory groups. Opportunities that increase parent voice in the learning process will assist us in improving our ability to meet student needs. In addition, this dialogue will also provide a venue where we can discuss with parents how best to meet the educational needs and specifically address academic gaps in addition to providing support for successful course completion.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Students with disabilities sub-group will make AYP by reaching the Safe Harbor Target in the 2011 and 2012 PSAE assessment in Reading.	1,
2	Students with disabilities sub-group will make AYP by reaching the Safe Harbor Target in the 2011 and 2012 PSAE assessment in Mathematics	2,

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

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Students with disabilities sub-group will make AYP by reaching the Safe Harbor Target in the 2011 and 2012 PSAE assessment in Reading.

Objective 1 Description

To address student performance in reading within our students with disabilities subgroup, we will use multiple strategies to address academic gaps. Strategies include the

following:

Within Special Education courses in Reading we will implement a scientific research based reading instruction program of *Read 180*. Teachers will complete professional development in the instructional elements of the *Read 180* program during the 2010-11 school year and full implementation with students will occur during the 2011-12 school year.

General education reading support staff members will also participate in Read 180 professional development and design strategies where this program can be utilized in our Academic Resource Center to support identified students in the remediation of academic gaps in their reading skills.

Continued reading instruction will be provided to students and staff members within the context of the content classes of science, social studies and English. Reading specialists will provide direct instruction to students during their freshmen year with additional supports provided in our TEAM program during sophomore and junior years.

Schoolwide professional development will provide reading instruction within each disciplinary context enabling students to learn distinct vocabulary associated with these curricular areas. Strategies for creating student engagement and reading in the content areas will be provided by Kevin Feldman, educational consultant during the 2010-2011 school year. Strategies for sustaining implementation of these and other scientifically researched based instructional skills will be designed by instructional leaders and the building staff development committee.

Student success is dependent upon students' ability to organize, prioritize and complete class work. Many students struggle with these important learning skills and this impacts their ability to build critical skills including reading. Rush NeuroBehavioral Center which specializes in executive functions, will train Guided Studies and Study Strategies staff members on their executive functions curriculum during the 2010-11 school year for implement of this curriculum during the 2011-12 school year for students in general and special education programs.

Continued implementation of Kansas reading and writing strategies within the special education classes will support efforts in addressing gaps in reading skills for students with disabilities.

Connections between our general education staff and special education staff in English will become a focus. Special education staff members will participate with grade level instructional teams within the English department to enhance both curricular planning and instructional delivery.

Parent participation is critical to the success of our efforts. Increased parent communication about the instructional interventions planned by our student service problem solving teams to address student needs will be provided. On-line grade access, classroom websites (Moodle) and other communication strategies will be utilized to increase parent participation and feedback on student performance and growth. Continued parent participation in the building Curriculum Council will also support our efforts for increased parent voice in the educational work of Glenbrook North.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

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

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students with disabilities sub-group will make AYP by reaching the Safe Harbor Target in the 2011 and 2012 PSAE assessment in Reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students with disabilities within the special education classes will learn the specific reading strategies in the Read 180 program to improve their reading skills	01/24/2011	06/09/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	Specifically identified general education students will learn the reading strategies in the Read 180 program to increase their reading skills	01/24/2011	06/15/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	All freshmen students in English, science and social studies classes will learn to employ active reading strategies within the content areas	09/01/2010	06/15/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	Students in our Guided Studies and Study Strategies courses will learn the orgnaizational and study strategies of the Rush NeuroBehavioral Center's Executive Functions Program curriculum	01/24/2011	01/23/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	Special education students will learn to employ the Kansas Reading strategies in reading and writing within our special education classes	08/25/2010	06/15/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	Students will learn core curriculum within their special education classes that aligns with the general education courses.	08/25/2010	06/09/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students with disabilities sub-group will make AYP by reaching the Safe Harbor Target in the 2011 and 2012 PSAE assessment in Reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Professional development for special and general education staff in the utilization of Read 180 for both instructional classes and additional reading support	09/01/2010	06/09/2011	Before School	Local Funds	
2	Continued professional development in Kansas reading and writing strategies for special education staff	09/01/2010	06/15/2012	Before School	Local Funds	
3	Professional development will be provided to all staff members for teaching reading in the content areas	03/07/2011	06/15/2012	Before School	Local Funds	
4	Professional development of Rush NeuroBehavioral Center's Executive Functions program will be completed by Guided Studies and Study Strategies teachers	01/25/2011	12/14/2012	Before School	Local Funds	
5	Special education teachers will participate in curricular discussions with general education grade level teams in English and course level math teams in our efforts to better parallel the curriculum in special education	01/24/2011	06/15/2012	Before School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students with disabilities sub-group will make AYP by reaching the Safe Harbor Target in the 2011 and 2012 PSAE assessment in Reading.

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

1	Continue to collaborate with parents beyond that which is required through the annual review process	08/25/2010	06/15/2012	After School	Local Funds	
2	Increase formal parental contact (i.e. on-line grades, use of Moodle or other classroom website)	08/25/2010	06/15/2012	Before School	Local Funds	
3	Improve parent communication and participation in our student service team meetings as staff members create plans to address students' educational needs.	01/03/2011	06/15/2012	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Students with disabilities sub-group will make AYP by reaching the Safe Harbor Target in the 2011 and 2012 PSAE assessment in Reading.

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

Reading achievement for students with disabilities:

The interventions and strategies we employ at Glenbrook North High School will be implemented and monitored by our RtI Reading Committee members, Associate Principal for Curriculum and Principal. The RtI Reading Committee consists of reading specialists in general and special education programs, a building RtI Coordinator and instructional supervisors for English and Special Education.

Specific progress monitoring within the Read 180 instructional program will provide detailed student data to progress monitor student growth and response to instruction for both special and general education students. Specific benchmarks will be developed for individual students based upon their current levels of functioning. Ideally, we would like to see students achieve grade level benchmarks that are comparable to national norms. Group data will be evaluated as to effectiveness of the program in addressing reading skill gaps for all students each semester beginning the 2011-12 school year. Feedback from classroom teachers will be reviewed and evaluated for any needed changes to instructional delivery. Evaluation will take place each semester during the 2011-12 school year.

Once the Rush NeuroBehavior Center's executive functions curriculum is in full implementation, a review of students' grades, assignment planners and curricular artifacts will provide data that can be evaluated for effectiveness of this intervention. Evaluation of individual student progress will be conducted each quarter beginning the 2011-12 school year and program evaluation will occur once each semester during the 2011-12 school year.

Student classroom performance, Aimsweb data, PLAN testing and PSAE scores will all provide important data as to effectiveness of our improvement efforts. They will be monitored on a yearly basis by the RtI Reading sub-committee, special education department and administrative leadership team.

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	Kristen McKee	RtI Coordinator and School Psychologist
2	Edward Solis	Instructional Supervisor for English
3	Kathy French	Instructional Supervisor for Special Education
4	Kris Frandson	Associate Principal for Curriculum
5	Paul Pryma	Principal
6	Eric Etherton	Assistant Principal for Student Services
7	Amy Goldsmith	Reading Specialist and English Teacher

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Students with disabilities sub-group will make AYP by reaching the Safe Harbor Target in the 2011 and 2012 PSAE assessment in Mathematics

Objective 2 Description

To address student performance in mathematics within our students with disabilities subgroup, we will use multiple strategies to address academic gaps. Strategies include the following:

Development of a new Intensified Algebra course for students that begin their studies at the pre-algebra level will be completed to better address the curricular exposure as identified as a key factor impacting student performance. Approximately 40% of students with disabilities begin their math sequence at the pre-algebra level. Currently several special education students that begin their math sequence in pre-algebra do not learn advance algebra skills until their senior year of high school. This progress is one full year

behind the level of their general education peers and impacts their ability to prepare for college acceptance. Utilizing the scientifically research based *Agile Mind* as the instructional program for Intensified Algebra will not only address educational gaps in math performance, but will address student social/emotional needs using the *Academic Youth Development* program. Development of the course will occur during the 2010-11 school year and implementation will begin with freshmen during the 2011-12 school year.

We will continue use the local algebra screener for all geometry students to identify students with any gaps in algebra skills. Prescriptive instructional interventions will be completed by staff members in the Math Enrichment Center and data will be monitored to ensure mastery of these vital skills that will support math performance throughout a student’s career at Glenbrook North. Communication with parents as to student progress will be provided by the staff members within this academic support center.

Instructional interventions will be provided to all students referred to the Math Enrichment Center by teachers, student service teams and other RtI processes. Detailed progress monitoring will be provided to ensure academic gaps are remediated and students can be successful in their courses.

Glenbrook North's instructional supervisor for mathematics will assist in co-chairing the Northfield Township mathematics articulation study and will focus the groups efforts to evaluate curricular content in pre-algebra, algebra and geometry at the middle school and high school levels. In addition, disucssions focused on instructional frameworks will be part of the study. The timeline for study completion and professional development recommdations will be in the spring of 2012.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

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

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

Objective 2 Title :

Students with disabilities sub-group will make AYP by reaching the Safe Harbor Target in the 2011 and 2012 PSAE assessment in Mathematics

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Beginning school year 2011-2012, students in the Intensified Algebra program will learn both pre-algebra and algebra 1 skills and complete course work that will keep them on track for college enrollment.	08/24/2011	06/15/2012	During School	Local Funds	

2	All students in Geometry will complete the Algebra screener local assessment to identify academic gaps in Algebra and participate in prescriptive instructional interventions in the Math Enrichment Center	09/06/2010	06/15/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	Students referred to the Math Enrichment center will attend instructional sessions and their progress will be monitored until academic gaps are remediated.	01/24/2011	06/15/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	Students in the Intensified Algebra program will participate with the Academic Youth Development program of the course and acquire critical problem solving skills for persistence when facing academic rigor.	08/24/2011	06/15/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title :

Students with disabilities sub-group will make AYP by reaching the Safe Harbor Target in the 2011 and 2012 PSAE assessment in Mathematics

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Continue articulation between general and special education staff members on curricular content materials to better parallel math curriculum in the special education math courses	10/04/2010	06/15/2012	Before School	Local Funds	
2	Provide professional development for math department staff members on RtI best practices and progress monitoring	08/25/2010	06/15/2012	Before School	Local Funds	
3	Continued coaching and collaboration between Math Enrichment Center staff members and RtI coordinator	09/01/2010	06/15/2012	Before School	Local Funds	
4	Review special education math curriculum and identify research-based pre-algebra and algebra programs to consider including in the curriculum	08/25/2010	06/15/2012	Before School	Local Funds	
5	Teachers of the Intensified Algebra class will participate in Professional Development for the course and the Agile Mind program	06/10/2011	12/16/2011	After School	Local Funds	
6	Leadership from GBN's mathematics instructional supervisor in the Northfield Township's articulation study and professional development	10/01/2010	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	

plans will continue during the next two years.				
--	--	--	--	--

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

Objective 2 Title :

Students with disabilities sub-group will make AYP by reaching the Safe Harbor Target in the 2011 and 2012 PSAE assessment in Mathematics

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Continue to collaborate with parents beyond that which is required through the annual review process	08/25/2010	06/15/2012	After School	Local Funds	
2	Increase formal parental contact (i.e. on-line grades, use of Moodle or other classroom website)	11/18/2010	06/15/2012	Before School	Local Funds	
3	Improve parent communication about and participation in our student service team meetings as staff members create plans to address students' educational needs.	12/13/2010	06/15/2012	Before School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

Students with disabilities sub-group will make AYP by reaching the Safe Harbor Target in the 2011 and 2012 PSAE assessment in Mathematics

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

Mathematics achievement for students with disabilities:

The interventions and strategies we employ at Glenbrook North High School will be implemented and monitored by our RtI Mathematics Committee members, Associate Principal for Curriculum and Principal. The RtI Mathematics Committee consists of math teachers, Math Enrichment Center (MEC) coordinator, building RtI Coordinator and instructional supervisors for Mathematics and Special Education.

Specific progress monitoring within the Intensified Algebra course will provide detailed student data to progress monitor student growth and response to instruction for both special and general education students. Group data will be evaluated as to effectiveness of the program in addressing math skill gaps for all students. Feedback from classroom teachers as to instructional delivery will be reviewed and evaluated for any needed changes as to program utilization. Evaluation will take place each semester during the 2011-12 school year.

Once the Rush NeuroBehavior Center's executive functions curriculum is in full implementation, a review of students' grades, assignment planners and curricular artifacts will provide data that can be evaluated for effectiveness of this intervention.

Student classroom performance, local algebra screener, MEC student progress data, PLAN testing and PSAE scores will all provide important data as to effectiveness of our improvement efforts and they will be monitored on a yearly basis by the RtI Mathematics sub-committee, special education department and administrative leadership team.

Monitoring of the Northfield Township mathematics articulation study will be supervised by the instructional supervisor, Robin Levine-Wissing on a monthly basis during the two year study cycle - school years 2010-2012. In addition, updates and progress reports on the study are presented to township curriculum directors on a monthly basis at their scheduled meetings. Kris Frandson, GBN Associate Principal for Curriculum and Rosanne Williamson, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services are members of this committee.

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	Kristen McKee	RtI Coordinator and School Psychologist
2	Robin Levine-Wissing	Instructional Supervisor for Mathematics
3	Kathy French	Instructional Supervisor for Special Education
4	Kris Frandson	Associate Principal for Curriculum
5	Paul Pryma	Principal
6	Eric Etherton	Assistant Principal for Student Services
7	Megan Dixon	Math Enrichment Center Coord. and 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.*)

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.

In addition to the school report card data provided by the state, a detailed data analysis of the students who performed “below” or “academic warning” levels were compiled by administrative intern (science teacher) summarized and presented to the instructional leadership core team (Instructional supervisors; Rtl support staff, Reading specialists, Math, Science and English teachers; Special Education staff and administrators) for analysis and discussion of strengths/weaknesses, contributing factors, next steps for improvement **planning. Specific review of PLAN-ACT linkage data, curricular program and Terra Nova scores were part of this analysis as well.**

The first draft of the plan was developed collaboratively by a building SIP team (members are listed below) and assistance was provided by Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services. Additional draft review was completed by administrative leaders from a neighboring high school.

After development of this draft, it was reviewed with Curriculum Council (consisting of teacher representatives from all instructional departments, parents and student representatives) for any additional perspectives. When appropriate, adjustments were made to the original draft.

Consultation was provided by Cathy Berlinger-Gustafson our RESPRO North Cook System of Support consultant. Assisting Cathy in the process was Robert Howard, retired superintendent from Elk Grove District 59.

Review of the plan was completed by the Superintendent and final approval was provided by the School Board at their December 2010 meeting.

	Name	Title
1	Paul Pryma	Principal
2	Kris Frandson	Associate Principal for Curriculum
3	John Finan	Associate Principal for Operations
4	Eric Etherton	Assistant Principal for Student Services
5	Kathy French	Instructional Supervisor for Special Education
6	Edward Solis	Instructional Supervisor for English
7	Robin Levine-Wissing	Instructional Supervisor for Mathematics
8	Robin Sheperd	Instructional Supervisor for Social Studies
9	Mary Rockrohr	Instructional Supervisor for Science
10	Kristen McKee	School Psychologist and Rtl Coordinator
11	Jenny Jordan	Assoc. Dean and Writing Program Coord.
12	Amy Goldsmith	Reading Specialist and English Teacher
13	Maureen McDonough	Science Teacher and Admin. Intern

14	Ann Tulig	Parent representative to Curriculum Council
15	Rosanne Williamson	Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services
16	Cathy Berlinger-Gustafson	North Cook System of Support RESPRO external consultant
17	Robert Howard	RESPRO team member and external consultant

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.

Specific peer review of this plan was provided by our RESPRO coach and team members in early December. Additional review was provided by Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services on December 7th, 2010. Administrators and teachers from a nearby school have also reviewed our plan and helped provided clarification. We continue to meet with other special educators within our area and with NSSED staff to discuss RtI best practices and how to coordinate instructional supports for students with disabilities who are not meeting standards in reading and mathematics.

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 two high schools within District 225 have a well established new teacher induction program that includes two years of mentoring support from veteran educators. The mentoring program at Glenbrook North begins with a formal training for our new mentors in August of each school year. New mentors join other experienced mentors from the district and receive professional development. Specific elements of the training program include:

- Current research on the effects of mentoring for teachers new to a school district
- Knowledge of adult learning characteristics and the best way to assist individuals' growth as learners and as teachers
- Instruction and practice in active listening, modeling, and problem-solving techniques to help new teachers develop their skills
- And review of how the district utilizes the Danielson Professional Practice frameworks as our model for professional growth and quality instruction.

In addition, all mentors are required to participate throughout the school year in various professional development activities within the new teacher induction program. During the new teacher orientation week in August, mentors have significant time reserved to make personal connections to their protégées as they assist them with general school procedures, course materials and departmental protocols.

Mentors also establish regular meeting times with their protégées in order to provide support and encouragement during his/her journey through the first two years of employment in the Glenbrooks. Mentors work closely with protégées on lesson design, instructional strategies, peer coaching observations, and demonstrations of their classroom instruction and management. Numerous opportunities are provided over these two years to assist new teachers in the process of reflecting upon their work and problem solving concerns as they arise. Mentors also keep a journal and log of the types of activities they have engaged in with their protégée each year.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part E. District Responsibilities

District Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that the district has provided to revise the plan and other services that the district will provide toward implementation of strategies and activities. District technical assistance should include data analysis, identification of the school's challenges in implementing professional development requirements, the resulting need-related technical assistance and professional development to effect changes in instruction, and analysis and revision of the school's budget (NCLB, Section 1116). If applicable, identify corrective actions or restructuring options taken by the district.

District 225 has designated resources and services toward the development and implementation of our RtI Plan. Our comprehensive school improvement process is guided by the principles of a quality RtI model for delivery of educational support services. Three years ago, FTE was provided for the position of RtI coordinator at our building and this support has been essential in our work towards improvement. In addition, the Northern Suburban Special Education District has provided the services of an RtI consultant to assist our efforts. IDEA funds have been identified for professional development activities related to RtI. District level leadership has also been provided to assist our building RtI team in the development, implementation and evaluation of our plan. In addition, the district has a professional development plan that addresses development of best practices and legal compliance needed for implementation. The district is working to identify specific data systems that will support our progress monitoring process and the district has funded specialized instructional programs that can support our most needy learners.

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.

Glenbrook North has benefited from consultation with Cathy Gustafson, SOS Consultant (RESPRO #1 - NCISC) Robert Howard, RESPRO team member and subsequent recommendations generated from their review of this plan. Additionally, the school has utilized data generated from state assessments and the IIRC website to inform decision making and plan development.

	Name	Title
1	Cathy Berlinger- Gustafson	RESPRO Cconsultant - North Cook
2	Robert Howard	Former Superintendent Elk Grove District #59

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

Yes No

Is the peer review process described and is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have “the greatest likelihood” of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP? [C]

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS Yes No

Is it clear how the school is ensuring that teachers are receiving the support needed for their professional growth and to retain them in the profession? [C]

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES Yes No

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

 Yes No N/A

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

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES Yes No

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

SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM Yes No N/A

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

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD Yes No

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

PART II - COMMENTS