

Local Board Approved	12/20/2010
Submitted	12/21/2010
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	01/03/2011



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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	<b>No</b>	Has this School been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	<b>Yes</b>
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	<b>No</b>	2010-11 Federal Improvement Status	Choice
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	<b>No</b>	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	62.4		No	71.1		No	94.8	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	62.9	66.7	No	72.0		Yes	95.1			
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American													
Multiracial/Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	39.6		No	50.0		No			
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	56.6	60.5	Yes	67.0	76.2	No	94.3		

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

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

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

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

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

**2010 DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION**

The Differentiated Accountability classification for the School is:	Comprehensive
Is this School making AYP in the "ALL" subgroup in reading?	No
Is this School making AYP in the "ALL" subgroup in math?	No

In 2008, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) was one of 6 states to be chosen by the US Department of Education to participate in the Differentiated Accountability Pilot Program. The Differentiated Accountability classification **applies only to schools in federal improvement status that do not make AYP**.

The classification is a descriptor (i.e., focused or comprehensive) that is added to a school's improvement status. Current Title I requirements do not change. The classification assists in distinguishing between schools that need focused support versus more comprehensive interventions.

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

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

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

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

School Information	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Attendance Rate (%)	94.1	95.1	93.7	94.5	94.3	94.7	94.6	94.8
Truancy Rate (%)	0.0	0.3	1.0	1.6	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Mobility Rate (%)	19.2	16.0	28.1	14.7	29.5	30.4	20.5	23.7
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	314	319	350	339	295	322	318	309
Low Income (%)	57.3	52.7	62.0	58.1	0.0	73.3	70.8	73.5
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29.8
White, non-Hispanic (%)	97.8	95.9	96.6	97.3	96.6	96.0	96.5	94.2
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	2.2	4.1	2.0	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.6	1.0
Hispanic (%)	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	1.0
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	0.6	1.8	2.0	3.7	2.8	3.6

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	98.2	1.8	-	-	-	-
	2001	98.2	1.8	-	-	-	-
	2002	97.6	2.4	-	-	-	-
	2003	97.8	2.2	-	-	-	-
	2004	95.9	4.1	-	-	-	-
	2005	96.6	2.0	0.9	-	-	0.6
	2006	97.3	0.6	0.3	-	-	1.8
	2007	96.6	0.3	0.3	-	0.7	2.0
	2008	96.0	0.3	-	-	-	3.7
	2009	96.5	0.6	-	-	-	2.8
	2010	94.2	1.0	1.0	0.3	-	3.6
D I S T R I C T	2000	98.7	1.0	-	0.3	-	-
	2001	98.5	1.2	-	0.3	-	-
	2002	98.5	1.4	-	0.2	-	-
	2003	98.2	1.6	-	0.2	-	-
	2004	97.6	2.2	-	0.2	-	-
	2005	97.3	1.1	0.5	0.2	-	1.0
	2006	97.8	0.7	0.2	-	-	1.3
	2007	97.3	0.7	0.2	-	0.4	1.4
	2008	96.4	0.4	0.2	-	0.2	2.9
	2009	97.2	0.4	0.2	-	0.2	2.1
	2010	95.4	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.2	2.7
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-



<b>S T A T E</b>	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5
	2010	52.8	18.8	21.1	4.2	0.2	2.9

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 5 - Educational Environment

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	-	59.4	92.0	94.7	19.6	9	2.6	-	-
	2001	-	56.5	100.0	93.9	24.5	10	3.1	-	-
	2002	-	57.8	100.0	94.9	22.3	-	-	-	-
	2003	-	57.3	98.9	94.1	19.2	-	-	-	-
	2004	-	52.7	92.0	95.1	16.0	1	0.3	-	-
	2005	-	62.0	92.0	93.7	28.1	3	1.0	-	-
	2006	-	58.1	98.6	94.5	14.7	5	1.6	-	-
	2007	-	-	98.6	94.3	29.5	3	1.0	-	-
	2008	-	73.3	95.6	94.7	30.4	-	-	-	-
	2009	-	70.8	99.0	94.6	20.5	-	-	-	-
2010	-	73.5	97.4	94.8	23.7	1	0.4	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	-	54.0	92.3	93.9	14.7	18	3.0	17.4	75.0
	2001	-	49.3	95.5	93.3	18.6	26	4.5	6.4	61.4
	2002	-	52.9	97.4	94.2	21.5	10	1.8	8.9	77.3
	2003	-	52.9	96.6	94.0	20.9	12	2.2	4.9	64.9
	2004	-	48.7	94.3	94.6	15.1	9	1.6	5.4	80.0
	2005	-	57.1	94.0	93.2	23.1	14	2.4	3.4	86.8
	2006	-	53.8	97.1	93.6	16.3	15	2.7	5.3	64.7
	2007	-	-	97.5	93.0	27.1	33	6.0	7.2	75.6
	2008	-	63.3	95.9	93.8	29.6	10	2.0	10.8	81.0
	2009	-	63.9	98.1	93.9	19.1	1	0.2	6.0	84.1
2010	-	66.1	97.2	93.8	20.2	4	0.8	7.2	86.5	
	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

<b>S T A T E</b>	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	326	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	333	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	332	53	53	54	-	-	-
	2003	314	31	52	49	-	-	-
	2004	319	35	36	44	-	-	-
	2005	350	29	40	42	-	-	-
	2006	339	45	34	43	-	-	-
	2007	295	44	47	37	-	-	-
	2008	322	37	45	46	-	-	-
	2009	318	38	38	42	-	-	-
	2010	309	44	42	42	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	594	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	590	54	50	47	51	53	40
	2002	590	53	53	54	50	39	37
	2003	567	31	52	49	50	41	46
	2004	624	35	36	44	54	83	52
	2005	624	29	40	42	47	53	30
	2006	604	45	34	43	49	46	45
	2007	557	44	47	37	46	50	46
	2008	559	37	45	46	41	39	48
	2009	529	38	38	42	30	32	31
	2010	546	44	42	42	49	35	41
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-

<b>S T A T E</b>	2003	2,044,539	164,413	157,570	159,499	160,924	156,451	138,559
	2004	2,060,048	161,329	160,246	158,367	162,933	160,271	139,504
	2005	2,062,912	156,370	158,622	160,365	162,047	162,192	142,828
	2006	2,075,277	155,155	154,372	158,822	160,362	160,911	147,500
	2007	2,077,856	155,356	153,480	154,719	162,594	159,038	150,475
	2008	2,074,167	155,578	152,895	153,347	160,039	161,310	149,710
	2009	2,070,125	156,512	152,736	152,820	155,433	158,700	144,822
	2010	2,064,312	155,468	154,389	152,681	154,465	154,982	146,919

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 7 - Educator Data

\*\*Educator Data is available only for district level\*\*

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	41	17	34,330	95	5	19	14	-	-
	2001	42	17	35,748	95	5	18	14	-	-
	2002	41	15	35,822	95	5	18	15	2	-
	2003	42	16	37,324	95	5	17	15	-	-
	2004	43	14	37,627	95	5	20	15	-	-
	2005	42	13	38,178	88	12	20	16	-	-
	2006	43	13	38,991	84	16	19	16	-	-
	2007	43	13	39,625	81	19	18	15	2	-
	2008	42	14	39,641	76	24	17	16	-	-
	2009	43	14	38,752	78	22	15	13	-	-
2010	43	13	41,203	76	20	16	14	-	-	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1
2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1	

---

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

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2005-2010																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	83.3	57.8	70.7	70.3	65.8	66.7	-	80.5	56.5	67.5	62.2	51.2	40.0	48.9	62.9	58.3	45.2	55.8
White	86.2	58.1	70.0	70.6	67.6	67.5	-	82.9	56.8	67.5	63.6	52.4	38.5	48.9	66.7	60.8	46.4	56.4
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	25.0	-	-	-	55.0	-	-	-	-	-	20.0	-	9.1	-	-	-	-
Low Income	75.0	42.9	76.9	69.2	54.2	60.6	-	76.0	37.0	67.9	53.3	44.8	26.9	41.7	65.2	48.2	42.9	54.3



	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	-	65.0	57.2	90.6	72.3	74.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	64.1	57.2	93.5	71.2	74.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	7.7	-	-	20.0	50.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	52.0	39.1	92.0	69.0	66.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2005-2010																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	83.3	77.8	90.2	78.4	81.5	83.3	-	77.8	78.2	80.0	78.4	67.4	57.5	57.1	82.8	70.9	78.6	60.4
White	86.2	79.1	90.0	76.4	83.8	82.5	-	80.0	77.3	80.0	75.8	66.6	56.4	57.1	84.9	71.7	80.5	64.1
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	50.0	-	-	-	85.0	-	-	-	-	-	20.0	9.1	10.0	-	-	-	9.1
Low Income	80.0	71.4	88.4	80.8	79.1	81.9	-	76.0	70.4	78.5	73.4	58.6	46.1	50.0	82.6	55.1	71.4	60.0

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	-	67.5	61.9	87.6	74.5	76.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	66.7	61.9	90.4	75.5	76.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	15.4	-	-	10.0	30.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	56.0	52.1	88.0	68.9	73.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

**AREAS OF WEAKNESS**

- School scores do not meet AYP or Safe Harbor for either reading or mathematics.

	<u>School</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>AYP</u>	
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Reading	66.7	73.7	77.5	
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading	51.2	73.7	77.5	
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading	55.8	74.7	77.5	
6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading	74.4	81.2	77.5	
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Mathematics	Meets			
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Mathematics	67.4	86.0	77.5	
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Mathematics	60.5	83.4	77.5	
6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Mathematics	76.7	84.6	77.5	
	<u>Reading</u>	<u>AYP</u>	<u>Math</u>	<u>AYP</u>
All group	62.4	77.5	71.1	77.5
White students	62.9	77.5	NA	77.5
Students w/ disabilities	39.6	77.5	50.0	77.5
Economical disadvantaged	56.6	77.5	67.0	77.5

\*\*The above data is from the spring 2010 ISAT results.

The time devoted to teaching mathematics at the 3rd grade level is 60 minutes per day: at the 6th grade students receive 45 minutes per day of mathematics instruction. When compared to the State average, Sandoval Elementary School teaches one minute per day longer and the 3rd grade level. However, in the 6th grade the school teaches 9 minutes less per day.

The time devoted to English / Language Arts at the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade level for the school is 115 minutes per day; at the 6<sup>th</sup> grade it is only 85 minutes per day. When compared to the State average, Sandoval Elementary teaches the subject area 30 minutes less per day at the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade and 18 minutes less per day at the 6<sup>th</sup> grade.

Overall performance on all State tests for the school went down 2.2% from 2008-09 to 2009-10 (from 68.4% to 66.2%).

When compared to the State, overall performance-all State tests were 10.2% lower in 2009-10, and 7.1% lower in 2008-09.

Overall ISAT performance for the school went down 2.2% from 2008-09 to 2009-10 (from 68.8% to 66.0%).

When compared to the State, the Sandoval overall ISAT performance was 14.9% lower in 2009-10 and 11.0% lower in 2008-09.

#### **AREAS OF STRENGTH**

Third grade math students met AYP standards with a score of 83.3% meets and exceeds.

All Sandoval Elementary School teachers are "highly qualified"; in addition, no teachers utilize "emergency or provisional certifications to teach their class.

---

The 2010 ISAT scores indicate that low income students performed only 4 percentage points lower (71% for all students and 67% for low income students) in mathematics than did all Sandoval Grade School students. The same dynamic occurred in reading with low income student performing only 5 percentage points lower (62% for all students and 57% for low income students) in reading than did all Sandoval Elementary School students.

From 2002 to 2008, the percentage of student (composite score) that met or exceeded ISAT standards trended upward in a positive manner. *(NOTE: That upward trend line declined in both 2008-09 and again in 2009-10.)*

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

#### EXTERNAL FACTORS:

Unemployment within the district continues to impact the overall community climate and the percentage of low income students enrolled at Sandoval Elementary School (72% in FY 08, 72% in FY09, 76% in FY10, and 76% in FY11).

The number of homeless students has increased over the past three years (16 homeless students in 2008-09, 19 homeless students in 2009-10, and 25 homeless students in 2010-11).

The percent of students that are classified as low-income is 73.5%, which is excessive when compared to the State average of 45.4%.

The number of limited English proficient students (0%), the school chronic truancy rate (0.4%), and the school attendance rates (94.8%) are all favorable in support of student performance.

**INTERNAL FACTORS:**

Over the last two years, Sandoval Elementary School had experienced significant changes (due to retirements) in the key personnel assigned to student instruction in grades 3 to 6 (5 of 12 teachers have retired).

The percentage of IEP students is over twice the State average. Sandoval Elementary School has 29.8% of the student body identified in this category, compared to the State average of 13.1%.

A review of the core curriculum for reading has demonstrated that the current reading series contains critical gaps in research-based reading content.

Internal instructional review indicate a lack of fidelity in terms of vertical and horizontal articulation and instruction.

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

**FACTOR IMPLICATIONS:**

Sandoval Elementary School will conduct a self-analysis regarding instructional time devoted to both reading and mathematics.

Sandoval Elementary School will conduct a self-analysis regarding the number of classroom transitions and the amount of time required for classroom transitions.

Sandoval Elementary School will continue to develop the RtI model as a means for identifying and impacting student deficiencies in the areas of reading and mathematics and to decrease the percentage of students eligible for special education services, through intervention strategies.

- Further empower the RtI Leadership Team to work toward the standardization of effective teaching practices within the Sandoval model.
- Continue to identify research-based intervention strategies that will support specific student instructional deficits (reading and math).
- Implement progress-monitoring initiatives for Tier II and Tier III students. Train and support teachers on the use of running records for both core and

intervention students.

- Formalize a problem-solving model that will assure student deficits are promptly identified and addressed with fidelity.
- Continue to provide whole school and individual staff training as necessary to support the implementation of the RtI model.

Sandoval Elementary School will continue to utilize the PBIS program as a means for impacting student behaviors in an effort to support student classroom performance.

Sandoval Elementary School will continue to utilize the Professional Learning Community model as an operational strategy for teacher involvement and teacher empowerment.

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?

Sandoval Elementary School utilizes the AimsWeb assessment tool for universal screening and for progress monitoring of individual student and grouping of students in reading. Current benchmark data is provided below:

AimsWeb Data - Sandoval Elementary

	Reading CBM 2009 Winter	Reading CBM 2009 Spring	Reading CBM 2009 Fall	Reading CBM 2010 Winter	Reading CBM 2010 Spring	Reading CBM 2010 Fall	Reading Maze 2009 Fall	Reading Maze 2010 Winter	Reading Maze 2010 Spring	Reading Maze 2010 Fall	Math C & A 2010 Spring	Math C & A 2010 Fall
--	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------



1st	41	30		40	48							
2 <sup>nd</sup>	27	30	22	27	35	39					22	41
3 <sup>rd</sup>	16	26	35	29	29	16	46	23	15	32	7	20
4 <sup>th</sup>	28	31	33	29	32	38	45	51	25	38	30	23
5 <sup>th</sup>	28	23	31	23	21	31	71	30	30	55	19	29
6 <sup>th</sup>	43	52	49	43	54	28	38	40	49	47	15	28

Percentage meeting or above the national target

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

**FACTORS:**

A weak core curriculum in the area of reading.

A less than average amount of instructional time is devoted to student reading instruction.

An emerging student intervention model combined with emerging progress-monitoring techniques has limited the impact of the RtI initiative.

A lack of fidelity in the utilization of research-based instructional materials has been a limiting factor.

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

**CONCLUSIONS:**

More staff training and support of the RtI model is needed.

Consideration of adopting a new reading series for grades K-6 should be a priority.

A better and more systemized set of procedures to check for the fidelity of instruction is needed.

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?

The impact of high unemployment (11.5% as reported in September, 2010 on the Illinois Department of Employment Security & Economic Information and Analysis Division) has resulted in a high percentage of low income students (73.5%) enrolled within Sandoval Elementary School.

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

A significant amount of research has consistently demonstrated a direct link between poverty and curtailed student performance.

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

School leaders, faculty, staff and parents need to work in a close and collaborative manner in an attempt to offset the counterproductive forces brought on by the community poverty/unemployment.

---

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

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

All Sandoval Elementary School teachers are "highly qualified"; in addition, no teachers utilize "emergency or provisional" certificates to teach their classes.

Due to an abnormal level of teacher retirements, 5 of 12 teachers delivering instruction in grade 3 to grade 6, have been replaced over the past two years.

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

Because of the dramatic loss of experienced teachers, a change in the teaching culture has occurred. These changes can have both positive and negative consequences.

The data related to our faculty indicates that we have a highly qualified staff, but a staff that is less experienced than it was a few years ago. This indicates that our school needs to continue to invest in meaningful professional development to assist teachers in the design and implementation of a twenty-first century curriculum.

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

The implication here is a need to provide meaningful professional development for our teachers. This is especially true for those self-contained classroom teachers that are new to our school.

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?

*These results are taken from the Parent Involvement Analysis completed by parents and teachers on October 20, 2010.*

- The size of the school generally enhances effective communication.
- School officials and PTO leaders should meet in an effort to jointly develop a series of strategies that will enhance parent support of the educational mission.
- Consideration should be given to greater utilization of the parent bulletin board for a variety of educationally supportive news items.
- Place a link to the Illinois Learning Standards on the school website.
- Utilize the current parent/school coordinator to serve as a clearinghouse for the collection of books, videos, and other school materials that support effective parenting strategies.
- Consideration should be given to developing a section of the existing school library as a central location for a "Family Resource Library".
- Long-range planning should be given to an enhanced role for parent volunteers.
- Future professional development should consider teacher training that focuses on parent outreach efforts.

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

- The current level of parent involvement is informal and incidental.
- The current level of parent involvement is more reactive than proactive.
- The current level of parent involvement focuses on involving parents working children on the learning process in conjunction with responsibilities for fund raising.

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

The consensus of the Parent Involvement Analysis was that increased parent communication and increased parent involvement in a coordinated manner (coordinated with the school improvement team and the administration) has great potential for improving student performance and the overall climate of the school building.

#### 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?

The percentage of IEP students is over twice the State average. Sandoval Elementary School has a 29.8% identified within this category as compared to the State average of 13.1%.

The quality of instruction has been affected by a drastic change in the staff pattern (5 of 12 teachers have changed within the past two years) for Sandoval Elementary School.

Horizontal and vertical alignment of the curriculum is an area that needs to be addressed in a systematic manner.

The training and commitment of staff and students is necessary in order to meet the high expectations set forth within the school improvement plan.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	<a href="#">Students at Sandoval Elementary School will meet AYP standards and/or Safe Harbor (85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012) in reading.</a>	1,3,4,
2	<a href="#">All students will meet AYP and/or Safe Harbor in mathematics for the 2011 (85%) and 2012 (92.5%) school years.</a>	2,5,6,

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

- 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 2. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 3. White students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 4. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 5. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 6. Low Income students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Students at Sandoval Elementary School will meet AYP standards and/or Safe Harbor (85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012) in reading.

Objective 1 Description

Staff will determine weaknesses in target interventions using the AimsWeb, which will assist the students to improve ISAT scores. The current levels of students that are below meets/exceeds is significant in reading. It is the goal of the school to help students achieve AYP in 2011 and 2012.

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

- ⓑ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓐ 2. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 3. White students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 4. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓐ 5. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓐ 6. Low Income students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Students at Sandoval Elementary School will meet AYP standards and/or Safe Harbor (85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012) in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All students who are below benchmark will participate in an extra 30 minutes of reading interventions multiple times a week.	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	10,000
2	All students will participate in a minimum of 120 minute block of reading instruction	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	100,000
3	All students, at a given grade level, will have reading instruction at the same time to allow for more effective/flexible grouping.	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

4	All students in grades K-6 will be assessed using AimsWeb three times per year.	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	2,500
5	As a means of improving reading scores, all students will develop writing skills for effective extended response question/answers. Writing responses in grades 3-6 will be contained in portfolios.	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	10,000
6	All staff will use results from universal screenings to establish baseline data for student goals. Individual student performance records will be used to ascertain completion of this activity	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	10,000
7	Staff will develop intervention strategies for the designated intervention time to address individual student needs. Individual student records will demonstrate the scope of intervention strategies being utilized.	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	40,000

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Students at Sandoval Elementary School will meet AYP standards and/or Safe Harbor (85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012) in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All staff will receive professional development on each of the components of balanced literacy. Staff development records will be used to ascertain completion of this activity.	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	After School	Title I	10,000
2	All staff will receive staff development on how to interpret and utilize results from universal and bench mark screenings. Training agendas and training materials will be available to document completion of this activity.	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	After School	Title I	10,000
3	All staff will receive information and training on the Common Core Standards as they impact instruction at Sandoval Elementary School. Training agendas and training materials will be available to document completion of this activity.	08/23/2011	06/01/2012	During School	Title II	5,600



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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Students at Sandoval Elementary School will meet AYP standards and/or Safe Harbor (85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012) in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will have an opportunity to discuss their students' academic performance and behavior with teachers. Parent teacher conferences will be documented.	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	After School	Local Funds	5,000
2	Parents will have an opportunity to review results of AimsWeb data and how their students' learn best at parent teacher conferences. Parent-teacher conferences will be documented.	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	After School	Local Funds	5,000
3	Place a link to the Illinois Learning Standards on the school website so parents understand and reference the requirements of student learning.	08/23/2011	06/01/2012	After School	Local Funds	0
4	Professional development should consider teacher training that focuses on parent outreach efforts.	08/23/2010	06/01/2010	Before School	Title I	5,000
5	A Family Reading Night occurs each school year to provide an opportunity for parents to work with their children.	02/10/2011	04/19/2012	After School	Title I	500

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 1 Title :**

Students at Sandoval Elementary School will meet AYP standards and/or Safe Harbor (85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012) 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?)

The Title I teacher will maintain a log that documents her work in support of classroom teachers on a periodic basis to insure that balanced literacy is being implemented with fidelity.

The building principal will conduct periodic walk-throughs using a fidelity checklist to insure that the reading block is a solid 120 minutes, that interventions are in place, and that the instructional level is appropriate.

The effectiveness of the reading program can be monitored though AimsWeb benchmark results.

Additional means to monitor students include - attendance, truancy, academic course grades, and grade point averages.

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	David Schulte	Building Principal
2	Leslie Smith	Title I Teacher
3	Rhonda Benjamin	RtI Coordinator
4	Jennifer Garrison	Superintendent

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

All students will meet AYP and/or Safe Harbor in mathematics for the 2011 (85%) and 2012 (92.5%) school years.

Objective 2 Description

Staff will determine weaknesses in target interventions using the AimsWeb, which will assist the students to improve ISAT scores. The current levels of students that are below meets/exceeds is significant in mathematics. It is the goal of the school to help student achieve AYP in 2011 and 2012.

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

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

- e 3. White students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- e 4. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- b 5. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- b 6. Low Income students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

All students will meet AYP and/or Safe Harbor in mathematics for the 2011 (85%) and 2012 (92.5%) school years.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All students will participate in universal screening in mathematics for formative assessment. Student data will verify completion of this activity.	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	10,000
2	All students will receive math instruction through a balanced math program that includes: instruction in number-sense, measurement, algebra, geometry, and data analysis/probability statistics. Teacher lesson plans will be used to document completion of this activity.	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	2,500
3	All students that are performing below benchmark will receive 30 minutes of interventions multiple times per week. Individual student schedules will document this activity.	08/22/2011	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	100,000
4	A system of progress monitoring for mathematics will be developed and implemented. Both AimsWeb and running records documents will be utilized to demonstrate completion of this activity.	08/22/2011	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	10,000

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

All students will meet AYP and/or Safe Harbor in mathematics for the 2011 (85%) and 2012 (92.5%) school years.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All staff will receive staff development on how to interpret and utilize results from universal and bench mark screenings. Staff development records and materials will be used to document completion of this activity.	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	After School	Local Funds	5,000
2	All staff will receive professional development on the mathematics ISAT components. Staff training notes and materials will document completion of this activity.	08/22/2011	06/01/2012	After School	Local Funds	5,000
3	All staff will receive information and training on the Common Core Standards as they impact instruction at Sandoval Elementary School. District staff development records and copies of materials used for training will document completion of this activity.	08/22/2011	06/01/2012	Summer School	Title II	5,600

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

All students will meet AYP and/or Safe Harbor in mathematics for the 2011 (85%) and 2012 (92.5%) school years.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will have an opportunity to discuss their students' academic performance and behavior with teachers. All parent-teacher conferences will be documented.	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	After School	Local Funds	1,500
	Parents will have an opportunity to review results of AimsWeb data and					

2	how their students' learn best at parent teacher conferences. Copies of materials shared with parents will be available within individual student folders.	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	After School	Local Funds	3,500
3	Place a link to the Illinois Learning Standards on the school website so parents understand and reference the requirements of student learning.	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	Before School	Local Funds	0
4	Professional development should consider teacher training that focuses on parent outreach efforts.	08/23/2010	06/01/2012	Before School	Title I	5,000

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 2 Title :**

All students will meet AYP and/or Safe Harbor in mathematics for the 2011 (85%) and 2012 (92.5%) school years.

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

The building principal will conduct periodic walk-throughs using a fidelity checklist to insure that the mathematics block is a solid 60 minutes, that interventions are in place, and that the instructional level is appropriate.

The effectiveness of the mathematics program can be monitored though AimsWeb benchmark results.

Additional means to monitor students include - attendance, truancy, academic course grades, and grade point averages.

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	David Schulte	Building Principal
2	Rhonda Benjamin	RtI Coordinator
3	Jennifer Garrison	Superintendent

---

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.*)

A letter to parents was sent home with each student that detailed the results of the 2010 NCLB status. A copy of the Illinois School Report Card was included along with each child's ISAT scores.

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.

Teachers were notified of AYP status.

The School Improvement Team reviewed and endorsed this document on December 7, 2010.

The plan was approved by the Sandoval District #501 Board of Education on December 20, 2010.

The parental involvement analysis was completed on October 20, 2010.

Copies of the school improvement plan were shared with faculty and staff after board approval.

The System of Support consultants through the Regional Office of Education #13 provided technical assistance and support.

	Name	Title
1	Jennifer Garrison	Superintendent
2	David Schulte	Building Principal
3	Rhonda Benjamin	RtI Coordinator
4	Leslie Smith	Title I Instructor
5	Debbie Conrad	2nd grade instructor
6	Donya Jett	4th grade instructor
7	Maribeth Detmer	Speech Therapist
8	Kristi Holland	6th grade instructor
9	Julie Crippen	Parent
10	Amy Johnson	Parent
11	Emily Heinzmann	Parent

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.

Mr. Kevin Meyer and Mrs. Wendy Davis reviewed on December 8, 2010. Mr. Meyer commented on the external factors of the high number of students who qualify for free and reduced lunch as well as the high percentage of special education students. Mrs. Davis commented that the plan meets all of the requirements.

---

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.

A New Teacher Induction Program has been implemented since 2009-2010. This is a State approved program that will move a teacher from initial to standard certificate. Teachers are assigned a mentor based on grade level or content area, if possible. They are required to meet several times throughout the school year for collaboration, reflection, and analysis of student work. The new teachers keep a portfolio of documentation for the two years of the induction and mentoring program.

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

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

The district is providing materials for targeted interventions. Professional Learning Community time has been incorporated into the master schedule beginning in the 2009-2010 school year. The district is working in conjunction with the Regional Office of Education through the System of Support and Kaskaskia Special Education District. Title I funds are expended at the elementary school to support early intervention.



---

**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.

Sandoval Elementary School receives Systems of Support services through the Regional Office of Education. These services include technical assistance in writing the plan, monitoring for compliance and assistance in providing professional development activities. In addition, the Regional Office of Education #13 provides assistance through programs such as RAP, Truancy and Safe School options. In addition, the ROE provides professional development activities that are appropriate for enhancing Sandoval Elementary teachers professional skills. The Innovation Improvement Division of ISBE provides technical assistance and access to IIRC.

	Name	Title
1	Dennis Fancher	System of Support Consultant
2	Ken Hill	System of Support Consultant
3	Keri Garrett	Regional Superintendent - ROE #13

## Section IV-A Local Board Action

**DATE APPROVED** by Local Board: 12/20/2010

**A. ASSURANCES**

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

**B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION**

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

**IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS**

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

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

**CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES**

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

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

**ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No

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

**MONITORING**

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

**PART I - COMMENTS**

Happy New Year!

**January 3, 2011**

Overall, you have provided sufficient guidance to plan implementers. I hope that as you implement this plan you can collect data that will guide your next steps. Your plan fosters confidence that you will implement your plan and that you have a system to monitor progress. I would encourage you to establish clear indicators defining success for those who will implement and monitor this plan that help them know not only “that” they are implementing the plan but also “how well.” (How much progress will be regarded as “good” and prompt you to continue a strategy or activity or abandon it?) Best wishes during implementation.

Respectfully, Carol Diedrichsen ISBE Innovation and Improvement

-----  
ROE comments: Sandoval Elementary School's SIP team spent considerable time and effort to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses within the school's academic setting. They developed appropriate strategies and activities, along with monitoring processes, to address their academic weaknesses.

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

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**

Sandoval Elementary School's SIP team contains a very nice cross-section of individuals (including parents).

The plan was reviewed and comments were made by very professional people in the field of education in ROE #13