

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	11/09/2009
Submitted	11/25/2009
Plan Resubmitted	12/22/2009
ISBE Monitoring Completed	01/14/2010

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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	Restructuring Implementation
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2009-10 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status Year 6

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		70.0			70.0			90.0		78.0	
All	99.7	Yes	99.7	Yes	27.0		No	13.6		No			88.1	Yes
White														
Black	99.5	Yes	99.5	Yes	24.6	28.7	No	13.1	19.1	No			87.7	
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	25.4	29.4	No	13.1	26.2	No			88.7	
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American													
Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	15.6		No	15.6		No			
Low Income	99.6	Yes	99.6	Yes	23.5	27.6	No	12.8	22.2	No		84.7	

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 70% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 70% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. ***
3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 70% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 78% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2008.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 70% 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.

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 on the Differentiated Accountability Pilot Program. The Differentiated Accountability classification applies only to schools in federal improvement status.

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 will assist in distinguishing between schools that need focused supports versus more comprehensive interventions.

Focused-School does not make AYP overall, but does make AYP in the "ALL" students subgroup in both reading and math.

Comprehensive-School does not make AYP overall and does not make AYP in the "ALL" students subgroup in either reading or math.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2009 AMAO Report

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

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

School Information								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	87.0	88.6	87.8	88.3	86.1	86.6	87.6	86.0
Truancy Rate (%)	8.9	8.0	10.0	7.1	8.6	9.2	9.3	14.1
Mobility Rate (%)	13.8	25.5	21.4	20.6	22.1	21.2	18.2	18.6
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	100.0	75.0	76.2	77.5	94.7	78.5	76.0	88.1
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	6.8	10.9	8.6	8.4	6.0	7.6	12.5	8.3
School Population (#)	1,357	1,399	1,487	1,542	1,562	1,655	1,669	1,697
Low Income (%)	50.6	55.0	53.5	67.5	71.0	74.0	74.1	75.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	5.2	2.7	5.1	7.0	4.5	5.3	4.3	3.7
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	16.1	14.5	12.6	11.6	10.2	9.4	8.6	7.2
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	49.8	50.5	51.6	51.6	55.1	55.6	56.1	55.8
Hispanic (%)	32.2	33.4	34.7	35.2	34.4	34.4	33.9	34.0
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.3
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	1.5	0.9	0.7	0.8	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.1
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	0.5	-	0.2	1.0	2.5

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	22.1	49.7	28.0	-	0.2	-
	2001	17.6	52.2	29.3	0.1	0.9	-
	2002	16.1	49.8	32.2	0.4	1.5	-
	2003	14.5	50.5	33.4	0.6	0.9	-
	2004	12.6	51.6	34.7	0.3	0.7	-
	2005	11.6	51.6	35.2	0.3	0.8	0.5
	2006	10.2	55.1	34.4	0.3	0.1	-
	2007	9.4	55.6	34.4	0.1	0.4	0.2
	2008	8.6	56.1	33.9	0.2	0.2	1.0
	2009	7.2	55.8	34.0	0.3	0.1	2.5
D I S T R I C T	2000	34.9	45.5	18.5	0.3	0.7	-
	2001	33.4	46.2	19.1	0.2	1.0	-
	2002	31.7	46.2	20.5	0.3	1.3	-
	2003	30.0	47.2	21.4	0.4	0.9	-
	2004	27.3	49.0	22.7	0.2	0.8	-
	2005	24.1	51.3	23.3	0.2	0.9	0.2
	2006	21.8	54.5	23.1	0.1	0.3	0.2
	2007	19.5	55.5	23.1	0.2	0.3	1.5
	2008	18.7	56.4	22.1	0.2	0.4	2.3
	2009	16.9	57.1	21.5	0.3	0.4	3.8
	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

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	0.8	42.9	100.0	85.2	42.3	113	9.5	13.2	59.8
	2001	4.9	47.0	65.0	86.1	17.1	222	17.6	8.1	69.9
	2002	5.2	50.6	68.0	87.0	13.8	109	8.9	6.8	100.0
	2003	2.7	55.0	72.0	88.6	25.5	113	8.0	10.9	75.0
	2004	5.1	53.5	85.0	87.8	21.4	151	10.0	8.6	76.2
	2005	7.0	67.5	98.0	88.3	20.6	110	7.1	8.4	77.5
	2006	4.5	71.0	98.0	86.1	22.1	138	8.6	6.0	94.7
	2007	5.3	74.0	98.0	86.6	21.2	149	9.2	7.6	78.5
	2008	4.3	74.1	98.0	87.6	18.2	152	9.3	12.5	76.0
	2009	3.7	75.4	98.0	86.0	18.6	240	14.1	8.3	88.1
D I S T R I C T	2000	0.4	39.3	95.3	88.3	28.6	210	8.3	9.9	66.8
	2001	2.4	39.7	62.4	88.6	16.2	357	13.4	8.4	70.0
	2002	2.5	41.7	74.5	88.1	14.1	225	8.3	6.6	86.6
	2003	1.4	47.4	77.5	88.1	22.4	308	10.9	8.2	75.2
	2004	2.6	48.0	84.5	87.6	22.5	286	9.6	7.6	76.1
	2005	3.6	60.6	98.0	88.4	21.3	279	8.7	7.5	77.2
	2006	2.3	62.0	98.0	86.9	23.5	305	9.9	5.4	91.6
	2007	2.7	64.0	98.0	87.5	21.4	277	8.8	5.9	78.4
	2008	2.2	68.7	98.0	87.0	19.7	302	9.4	9.5	75.8
	2009	1.9	72.4	98.0	87.4	19.3	395	11.7	8.1	88.1
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6

S T A T E	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	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

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	1,254	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,263	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	1,357	-	-	-	-	-	289
	2003	1,399	-	-	-	-	-	303
	2004	1,487	-	-	-	-	-	297
	2005	1,542	-	-	-	-	-	337
	2006	1,562	-	-	-	-	-	327
	2007	1,655	-	-	-	-	-	388
	2008	1,669	-	-	-	-	-	345
	2009	1,697	-	-	-	-	-	375
D I S T R I C T	2000	2,573	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,580	-	-	-	-	-	516
	2002	2,774	-	-	-	-	-	631
	2003	2,812	-	-	-	-	-	624
	2004	2,955	-	-	-	-	-	638
	2005	3,012	-	-	-	-	-	648
	2006	3,074	-	-	-	-	-	628
	2007	3,215	-	-	-	-	-	747
	2008	3,272	-	-	-	-	-	654
	2009	3,387	-	-	-	-	-	725
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816

S T A T E	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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

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	189	16	56,639	48	52	-	17	-	-
	2001	194	15	56,612	53	47	-	17	-	-
	2002	198	14	59,021	55	46	-	18	1	-
	2003	209	12	56,881	61	39	-	17	3	1
	2004	200	11	59,317	56	45	-	18	3	-
	2005	182	12	63,322	50	50	-	20	2	-
	2006	167	11	64,799	49	52	-	23	1	-
	2007	169	12	67,926	52	48	-	23	1	1
	2008	174	11	68,489	34	66	-	22	-	1
2009	175	11	72,078	36	64	-	24	1	1	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1

	2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1
--	------	---------	----	--------	----	----	----	----	---	---

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

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

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grade 11						
Groups	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	30.8	29.4	29.8	27.1	23.7	24.5
White	51.3	63.9	65.5	44.5	48.5	48.4
Black	32.4	21.3	21.3	21.1	20.8	20.4
Hispanic	18.1	30.5	32.3	29.8	21.1	24.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	10.0	-	6.3	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	7.1	5.3	-
Low Income	25.0	23.8	29.2	24.1	20.3	21.4

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

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

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grade 11						
Groups	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	19.2	17.6	23.7	19.6	14.9	11.6
White	35.1	50.0	58.6	41.7	30.3	16.1
Black	14.9	13.0	9.9	13.6	9.9	10.4
Hispanic	16.7	13.7	33.0	19.0	18.5	11.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	40.0	-	6.3	-
Students with Disabilities	7.7	-	-	-	2.6	-
Low Income	12.5	14.9	22.4	14.6	13.8	11.3

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?

Scores indicate that the areas of weakness in our school are reading and mathematics. According to the 2009 Report Card Data, neither AYP nor Safe Harbor was met in the areas of Reading and Mathematics for all students. Additionally, the subgroups tested; Black, Hispanic, Low Income and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP or Safe Harbor.

A major strength is that attendance exceeded state requirements, over 99% of students were in attendance. Additionally, it is important to note that the percentage of students meeting the standards did increase from the 2008 Report Card Data. The following areas showed improvement:

Reading-

All students increased 3.7%

Black students increased 4.3%

Hispanic students increased 3.3%

Low Income students increased 4.1%

Math-

Black students increased 3.4

Other data has indicated the following strengths and weaknesses;

Strengths include a decrease in our mobility rate. In 2006 our mobility rate was 22.1%, in 2009 our mobility rate decreased to 18.6%.

Our attendance rate has remained stable.

Our weaknesses include an increase in our economically disadvantaged sub group. In 2006 the rate was 71%. In 2009 our rate of economically disadvantaged subgroup was 75.4%.

Our truancy rate has increased from 8.6% in 2006, to 14.1% in 2009.

Our dropout rate has increased from 6% in 2006 to 8.3% in 2009.

Our graduation rate has decreased from 94.7% in 2006 to 88.1% in 2009.

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

External factors include:

- deficient incoming scores
- high mobility rates
- language barriers with LEP students
- community issues (low income, gang issues, etc.)
- limited communication from the feeder schools
- minimal parent involvement
- limited parent support regarding attendance and tardy issues

Internal factors include:

- limited communication with feeder schools**
- inadequate staff development to address teaching on a block schedule and effective time management**
- need to increase peer-coaching to allow more time for teachers to collaborate and make better use of the mentoring program
- inconsistent staff expectations of student performance**
- lack of rigor in order to sufficiently prepare students for the next grade level/subject
- improve alignment with College Readiness Standards (CRS), Illinois Learning Standards (ILS) and Prairie State Achievement Exam (PSAE) goals and standards
- lack of departmentalized common learning outcomes across the curriculum
- inconsistent classroom management throughout the school
- ineffective use of data to improve instruction and increase teacher collaboration
- a school-wide intervention system is needed in order to identify and assist struggling students
- absence of common formative assessments

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

Our students are deficient in reading and math, at their entry and throughout their years at Bloom High School.

In order to improve student achievement we will:

- update existing curriculum maps to ensure student readiness for post-secondary plans (alignment with College Readiness Standards and Illinois Learning Standards)
- address behavior management issues that may interfere with the learning environment
- continue to implement research-based programs for staff development which address the best practices in reading and math instruction such as CRISS (CReating Independent Student-owned Strategies), 4MAT(diverse learning styles), and Bloom's Taxonomy (higher order thinking skills)
- provide support services for students who are not meeting state standards.
- increase articulation with the feeder schools
- provide workshops to encourage parents to support their children in academics and attendance at school.
- provide the teachers with meaningful data and training to analyze the data effectively in order to adjust and customize instructional delivery addressing the needs of subgroups and individuals.

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data

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?

In 2007-2008, our local assessments included EXPLORE and PLAN. In 2008-2009, our local assessments include EXPLORE, PLAN and STAR diagnostic scores.

READING

In 2007-2008, EXPLORE data shows that out of 472 students tested, 129 (27.33%) scored 15 (ACT benchmark) or higher.

In 2008-2009, EXPLORE data shows that out of 414 students tested, 69 (17.19%) scored 15 (ACT benchmark) or higher.

In 2007-2008, PLAN data shows that out of 401 students tested, 89 (22.19%) scored 17 (ACT benchmark) or higher.

In 2008-2009, PLAN data shows that out of 456 students tested, 102 (22.37 %) scored 17 (ACT benchmark) or higher.

MATH

In 2007-2008, EXPLORE data shows that out of 474 students tested, 79 (16.66%) scored 17 (ACT benchmark) or higher.
In 2008-2009, EXPLORE data shows that out of 414 students tested, 66 (15.94%) scored 17 (ACT benchmark) or higher.
In 2007-2008, PLAN data shows that out of 405 students tested, 28 (6.91%) scored 19 (ACT benchmark) or higher.
In 2008-2009, PLAN data shows that out of 435 students tested, 151 (34.71%) scored 19 (ACT benchmark) or higher.

ENGLISH

In 2007-2008, EXPLORE data shows that out of 474 students tested, 250 (52.74%) scored 13 (ACT benchmark) or higher.
In 2008-2009, EXPLORE data shows that out of 410 students tested, 192 (46.83%) scored 13 (ACT benchmark) or higher.
In 2007-2008, PLAN data shows that out of 405 students tested, 171 (42.22%) scored 15 (ACT benchmark) or higher.
In 2008-2009, PLAN data shows that out of 435 students tested, 252 (57.93%) scored 15 (ACT benchmark) or higher.

STAR Testing (reading level test)

In spring of 2008-2009, special education freshmen students' average reading level was 4.2 grade equivalent. General education students' reading level averaged 6.1 grade equivalent. Freshmen Honors average reading level was 10.0 grade equivalent.
Sophomore special education students' average reading level was 3.8 grade equivalent. Sophomore general education students' reading level average was 6.7 grade equivalent.
Sophomore honors students' reading level average was 9.0 grade equivalent.

Our weaknesses include a deficiency in reading and math scores on the standardized tests. In addition, the reading levels of the freshmen and sophomores, with the exception of honors-level students, are far below grade level.

It is important to note that our students did better (over 40% met or exceeded the benchmark) in English. Moreover, some improvement in math was noted from the 2007-2008 EXPLORE to 2008-2009 PLAN scores.

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

External factors include:

- deficient incoming scores
- high mobility rates
- language barriers with LEP students
- community issues (low income, gang issues, etc.)
- limited communication from the feeder schools
- minimal parent involvement
- limited parent support regarding attendance and tardy issues

Internal factors include:

- limited communication with feeder schools
- inadequate staff development to address teaching on a block schedule and effective time management
- need to increase peer-coaching to allow more time for teachers to collaborate and make better use of the mentoring program
- inconsistent staff expectations of student performance
- lack of rigor in order to sufficiently prepare students for the next grade level/subject
- improve alignment with College Readiness Standards (CRS), Illinois Learning Standards (ILS) and Prairie State Achievement Exam (PSAE) goals and standards
- lack of departmentalized common learning outcomes across the curriculum
- inconsistent classroom management throughout the school
- ineffective use of data to improve instruction and increase teacher collaboration
- a school-wide intervention system is needed in order to identify and assist struggling students
- absence of common formative assessments

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

Our students are deficient in reading and math, at their entry and throughout their years at Bloom High School.

In order to improve student achievement we will:

- update existing curriculum maps to ensure student readiness for post-secondary plans (alignment with College Readiness Standards and Illinois Learning Standards)
- address behavior management issues that may interfere with the learning environment
- continue to implement research-based programs for staff development which address the best practices in reading and math instruction such as CRISS (CReating Independent Student-owned Strategies), 4MAT(diverse learning styles), and Bloom's Taxonomy (higher order thinking skills)
- provide support services for students who are not meeting state standards.
- increase articulation with the feeder schools
- provide workshops to encourage parents to support their children in academics and attendance at school.
- provide the teachers with meaningful data and training to analyze the data effectively in order to adjust and customize instructional delivery addressing the needs of subgroups and individuals.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data

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?*

Attributes

Smaller Learning Communities (SLC) provide for a positive school climate, increased teacher collaboration, and opportunity to work on interdisciplinary units. Through the SLC, we have created a more focused emphasis on college-readiness.

-A post-secondary planning counselor was hired (in the 2008-2009 school year) to meet with students to create personalized learning plans and provide direction for planning beyond high school.

-In the spring of 2009, 90% of the freshman class participated in a college visit field trip to give them a visual representation for goal setting.

-In the spring of 2009, 85% of the student body attended the college and career fair to learn more about requirements for post-secondary plans.

-In the spring of 2009, 47% of the junior class attended a pilot program for PSAT/ACT practice during spring break.

This data shows an increase in exposure to post-secondary planning activities and more specific commitment to improvement.

Challenges

Students enter below grade-level in reading and math.

-The average score for the Class of 2012 on the EXPLORE placement test is 9.7 in reading (ACT benchmark is 15) and 10.6 in math (ACT benchmark is 17)

-The average score for the Class of 2013 on the EXPLORE placement test is 12.3 in reading (ACT Benchmark is 15) and 12.8 in math (ACT Benchmark is 17).

High failure rates in English and math classes.

As of April 2008, there are 300+ students needing credit recovery in reading and/or math at basic levels.

Courses offered: English I, English II, Pre Algebra, Algebra 1A, Algebra I, and Geometry.

Consistent behavior management is needed to allow for emphasis on student learning.

In 2007-2008, 802 students (52%) were in ISS (In-School Suspension) 2,547 times and OSS (Out of School Suspension) 1,421 times, resulting in loss of classroom instruction time.

In 2008-2009, 857 students (53%) were in ISS 2,590 times and OSS 2,084 times, resulting in loss of classroom instruction time.

A high mobility rate has a significant correlation to deficiencies in basic skills. At Bloom High School our mobility rate in 2007 was 21.2%. In 2008 it dropped to 18.2%. In 2009 there

was slight increase to 18.6%. This data shows the mobility rate is stabilizing; however it is still above the state average.

The truancy rate has been on a steady increase. The data shows the truancy rate in 2007 was 9.2%, in 2008 9.3%, and in 2009 a sharp increase to 14.1%.

There is a lack of parental involvement.

While a parent is required for annual registration (100%), only 40% of parents attended our fall open house. Despite numerous outreach activities, there are only 40 parents involved in our Parent Advisory Committee (PAC).

Student attendance is below desired expectations.

Absences: 08-09 Average Attendance 87% monthly. Attendance has declined slightly since the previous school year.

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

Attributes

Using current local data for the SLC experiences, research shows that providing a supportive, structured foundation helps students understand the importance of setting goals. One indication that our students were committed to post-secondary planning was the high participation for the spring break practice sessions for the ACT/PSAE. Our goal is to foster a climate of college-readiness.

Another attribute is that we are beginning to communicate with feeder schools to improve articulation and bridge the gap for student success.

Challenges

The deficiencies in incoming math and reading abilities have increased the amount of improvement needed to meet or exceed standards. This challenge is further demonstrated by our high failure rates in English and math classes. Courses offered: English I, English II, Pre Algebra, Algebra 1A, Algebra I, and Geometry

Negative student behavior and inconsistent staff development in behavior management have both contributed to ineffective use of instruction time.

The high percentage of students transferring in and out of school causes inconsistencies in basic skills which adversely impacts performance on assessments.

Strategies implemented during the school day are often not reinforced at home, after school hours which greatly supports the need for increased parent communication and

awareness.

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

- SLCs (Small Learning Communities) provide focused college-readiness and interdisciplinary planning to better prepare students for post secondary plans.
- ACT/PSAE practice will expand with practice tests and tutoring throughout the school year for our junior students.
- A school-wide behavior management plan will be implemented to address negative student behavior. Staff development will be provided for consistency in teacher implementation.
- Support will be provided both in-school and after-school to help students with deficient skills. Students will be targeted through data and teacher discussion.
- Bloom High School will provide parent workshops to increase knowledge of instructional resources to improve student performance and maintain consistency outside the school day.
- Incentives will be offered to students to encourage better attendance. The school truant officer is working with the Regional Office of Education to follow up on chronic truants.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data

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?*

The average years of teaching experience in 2002 was 14 years; the average years of teaching experience in 2009 was 11 years.

In 2002, 46% of district teachers had a master's degree; in 2009 32% of teachers have master's degrees.

All teachers in the core areas are highly qualified in 2009.

Pupil to teacher ratio has increased from 18 to 1 in 2002 to 23 to 1 in 2009. There were 198 teachers in the District in 2002; there are 176 teachers in 2009, a 12% decrease in professional staff.

The district has offered CRISS and 4MAT professional development to improve instruction in reading across the curriculum and with diverse learning styles. However, staff development has not been ongoing in regards to teaching on the block and differentiating instruction.

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

Factors such as recent teacher retirements, a decrease in years of teaching experience, and fewer postgraduate degrees in the current staff, may have caused difficulties for the current teaching staff. Teachers may experience difficulties with classroom management, with addressing the needs of diverse learners, and with incorporating academic rigor into the curriculum. Teachers have had many challenges teaching on the flexible-block schedule. There are also fewer teachers available to work with an increasing student population.

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

Data has shown that the percentage of experienced teachers has decreased. As a result, teachers require additional support and increased professional development to effectively impact student achievement. Additional staff to provide academic support is needed for students who are deficient in reading and math.

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

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

Data for Parent Participation for the School Year 2008-2009 includes the following:

Fall Open House parent attendance 900 (60%)

Spring Open House parent attendance 600 (40%)

8th grade Open House parent participation 383 (90%)

Semi-annual Family reading nights had an average of 75 parents/children attend

School Registration parent attendance 1600 (100%)

Home Language survey 1600 (100%)

Special education review meetings 70% parent/guardian participation

PAC(Parent Advisory Committee) - 7 meetings, an average of 10 parents participate in each meeting (40 parent members are on the roster).

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

Although parents attend registration, open houses, and contact teachers regarding student performance, there is a need for more parent involvement in the daily instructional program of each student. Teacher and parent communication should improve student performance by keeping the parents informed about student progress and working with the parents to motivate the students to be accountable.

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

Parent involvement will continue to improve due to the active participation of the PAC members and the conscientious efforts for recruitment. Meaningful workshops and information will be shared with parents to help them feel confident in continuing our efforts outside the school day by providing the necessary support at home.

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?

After reviewing Section One, the following factors will be addressed in our Action Plan:

- limited communication with feeder schools
- ineffective staff development to address teaching on a block schedule and effective time management
- need to increase peer-coaching to allow more time for teachers to collaborate and make better use of the mentoring program
- lack of rigor in order to sufficiently prepare students for the next grade level/subject
- improve alignment with College Readiness Standards (CRS), Illinois Learning Standards (ILS) and Prairie State Achievement Exam (PSAE) goals and standards
- lack of departmentalized common learning outcomes and assessments across the curriculum
- inconsistent classroom-management throughout the school
- ineffective use of data to improve instruction and increase teacher collaboration
- a school-wide intervention system is needed in order to identify and assist struggling students
- limited parental support

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Improve reading skills for all students, including the black subgroup, Hispanic subgroup, student with disabilities subgroup, and low income student subgroup. While our current achievement in reading for the school is 27.0%, the black subgroup is 24.6%, Hispanic subgroup is 25.4%, student with disabilities subgroup is 15.6%, and low income student subgroup is 23.5%, we will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.	1,3,5,7,9,
2	Improve math skills for all students, including the black subgroup, Hispanic subgroup, student with disabilities subgroup, and low income student subgroup. While our current achievement in math for the school is 13.6%, the black subgroup is 13.1%, Hispanic subgroup is 13.1%, student with disabilities subgroup is 15.6%, and low income student subgroup is 12.8%, we will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.	2,4,6,8,10,

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. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 4. Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 5. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 6. Hispanic students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 7. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 8. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 9. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 10. Low Income students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives**Objective 1**

Improve reading skills for all students, including the black subgroup, Hispanic subgroup, student with disabilities subgroup, and low income student subgroup. While our current achievement in reading for the school is 27.0%, the black subgroup is 24.6%, Hispanic subgroup is 25.4%, student with disabilities subgroup is 15.6%, and low income student subgroup is 23.5%, we will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

Objective 1 Description

In order to address the deficiencies in reading for the entire school and all subgroups, Bloom High School is providing students with more opportunities to raise their reading level through:

- Additional reading programs
- Additional support staff to assist students and teacher with reading strategies
- Additional professional development for teachers to keep them up to date with best practices
- Offer resources at the school for parents to become more involved with their child's education
- Promoting an effective learning environment through behavior management
- Staff development to increase student performance
- Activities to enhance parent participation to improve student progress in school

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. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓔ 4. Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 5. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓔ 6. Hispanic students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 7. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓔ 8. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 9. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓔ 10. Low Income students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improve reading skills for all students, including the black subgroup, Hispanic subgroup, student with disabilities subgroup, and low income student subgroup. While our current achievement in reading for the school is 27.0%, the black subgroup is 24.6%, Hispanic subgroup is 25.4%, student with disabilities subgroup is 15.6%, and low income student subgroup is 23.5%, we will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
Incoming students who score 11 or below on the EXPLORE placement test in reading will be encouraged to enroll in the REFS (Reading					

3/26/2010 11:26:11 AM

1	Ensures Future Success) program which focuses on reading comprehension and reading ability in order to raise their reading level before beginning high school.	06/15/2009	07/14/2011	Summer School	Other	35,000
2	Junior and senior students who did not pass core courses will be provided opportunities to recover credits to remain on track for graduation (through a computer based credit recovery program.)	06/15/2009	07/14/2011	After School	Other	15,000
3	Students will use reading strategies to promote high order thinking skills through Bloom's Taxonomy.	08/17/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Other	50,000
4	Students in need of additional assistance will be provided with extended learning time throughout the school year with after school tutoring 4 days per week 1 - 2 hours per day.	08/17/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Other	50,000
5	Students will be held accountable for appropriate classroom behavior by signing the behavior log, and accepting consequences as prescribed by the Bert Simmons Behavior Management Model.	08/17/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Other	20,000
6	Students will be engaged in reading activities such as CRISS strategies in all courses as part of reading across the curriculum.	08/17/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Title I	5,000
7	The students will work with Literacy Facilitators who will aid in increasing reading comprehension by using best practices and differentiated instruction.	08/17/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Title I	120,000
8	Read 180-Sophomore students with an EXPLORE reading score of 11 or below will be enrolled in the Read 180 program which has been shown to improve reading level and comprehension.	08/17/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Title I	90,000
9	ACT/PSAE Workshop-Junior students will participate in various ACT practice tests and tutoring sessions.	08/17/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Other	15,000
10	The junior level English students will participate in Key Train to increase reading for information skills.	08/17/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Other	0
11	Students who fail English their freshman year will enroll in a freshman to sophomore Summer Program utilizing the Reading Navigator Program software.	06/07/2010	07/28/2011	Summer School	Title I	130,000
12	Students identified as at-risk will participate in the BIC (Behavior Intervention Classroom) program.	08/17/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Title I	75,000

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improve reading skills for all students, including the black subgroup, Hispanic subgroup, student with disabilities subgroup, and low income student subgroup. While our current achievement in reading for the school is 27.0%, the black subgroup is 24.6%, Hispanic subgroup is 25.4%, student with disabilities subgroup is 15.6%, and low income student subgroup is 23.5%, we will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Ongoing professional development workshops will be provided targeting differentiated instruction, Bloom's Taxonomy and reading comprehension.	08/13/2009	06/01/2011	Before School	Title I	15,000
2	All staff will be trained and will implement the Bert Simmons Behavior Model with follow-up training available.	06/01/2009	08/08/2011	During School	Title I	80,000
3	Provide professional development in best practices by offering CRISS training to all staff in order to teach a variety of reading strategies for diverse learning styles on a block schedule.	06/01/2009	08/08/2011	Before School	Title II	10,000
4	Provide professional development in best practices by offering 4MAT training to all staff in order to teach effectively to diverse learning styles on a block schedule.	06/01/2009	08/08/2011	Before School	Title II	15,000
5	New teachers will be mentored by experienced teachers.	06/01/2009	08/08/2011	Before School	Local Funds	0
6	Teachers will receive additional support in the classroom regarding best practices and reading strategies from the Literacy Facilitators.	08/17/2009	08/08/2011	Before School	Other	0
7	The staff will continue updating curriculum maps to ensure relevancy and alignment with Illinois State Standards and CRS benchmarks.	06/01/2009	08/08/2011	Summer School	Local Funds	50,000
8	The staff will receive in-service training on specific interventions as mandated in the RTI model.	06/01/2009	08/08/2011	Before School	Other	0
9	Select staff will meet with feeder school principals and necessary staff to collaborate and articulate student expectations to coordinate efforts on staff development.	08/17/2009	08/08/2011	Before School	Other	5,000
	Teachers will analyze data from local pre, mid, interim, and post					

10	assessments along with Quality Core assessments (developed by ACT) to provide effective instruction.	08/17/2009	08/08/2011	During School	Title I	195,000
11	Co-teachers will participate in seminars that address co-teaching models and implent strategies in the classroom.	06/01/2009	08/08/2011	During School	Title I	5,000
12	Using Reading Navigator, teachers will develop an effective freshman to sophomore summer program for students failing English.	06/01/2009	01/11/2010	Summer School	Title I	30,000

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improve reading skills for all students, including the black subgroup, Hispanic subgroup, student with disabilities subgroup, and low income student subgroup. While our current achievement in reading for the school is 27.0%, the black subgroup is 24.6%, Hispanic subgroup is 25.4%, student with disabilities subgroup is 15.6%, and low income student subgroup is 23.5%, we will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will have the opportunity to plan school improvement activities and programs by participating in the Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) and the Parent Academy.	08/17/2009	08/08/2011	After School	Other	0
2	Parents will be provided opportunities to attend career and college planning seminars such as Financial Aid Night and Senior Success meetings.	08/17/2009	08/08/2011	After School	Other	0
3	Parents will be given the opportunity to attend computer literacy training for IGPro, so they can monitor student academic and attendance performance.	08/17/2009	08/08/2011	After School	Other	0
4	Parents will be invited to semi-annual Family Reading night and receive information on reading strategies to use at home.	08/17/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Other	2,000
5	Parents will be informed about student and staff initiatives as well as newsworthy events in the school through the quarterly Principals Newsletter, and the school's website.	08/17/2009	08/08/2011	After School	Other	8,000
	A semi-annual parent academy will be offered which will be modeled					

6	after the small learning communities. Topics at academy will include: how to help your student with homework, computer skills, how to use community resources, and post-secondary planning.	08/17/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Other	11,000
7	Parents will be contacted by the school staff regarding any behavior problems or student successes to encourage parental support of the Bert Simmons Behavior Model.	08/17/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Other	0
8	English classes will be provided to non-English speaking families in order to assist them in building English language skills, and to encourage parents to be a part of the school community.	08/17/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Title III	10,000

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Improve reading skills for all students, including the black subgroup, Hispanic subgroup, student with disabilities subgroup, and low income student subgroup. While our current achievement in reading for the school is 27.0%, the black subgroup is 24.6%, Hispanic subgroup is 25.4%, student with disabilities subgroup is 15.6%, and low income student subgroup is 23.5%, we will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

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

The school will monitor the effectiveness of increasing the number of all students including the Black, Hispanic, Students with Disabilities, and Low Income subgroups meeting and exceeding on the PSAE reading to 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or safe harbor through analyzing student grades, EXPLORE, PLAN, ACT and PSAE scores. We will also examine the district course assessments (pre, interim, mid, post) and Quality Core Assessments in the area of English I, English II, English III. The district will also continue to analyze and interpret data and have meaningful discussions with the faculty in an effort to improve instruction.

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	Dr. Lenell Navarre	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction
2	Mrs. Rhona Israel	Principal
3	Mr. Gregory Horak	Assistant Principal of Activities
4	Mrs. Susan Woodyatt	Assistant Principal of Pupil Personnel Services
5	Ms. Gail Hartsough	District Math Coordinator
6	Ms. Elizabeth Orr	Communications Division Coordinator

7	Mrs. Donna Zuidema	District Science Coordinator
8	Mrs. Wanda Murphy-Fulford	Special Ed Division Coordinator
9	Mr. Robert Belzeski	Career and Tech Ed Coordinator

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Improve math skills for all students, including the black subgroup, Hispanic subgroup, student with disabilities subgroup, and low income student subgroup. While our current achievement in math for the school is 13.6%, the black subgroup is 13.1%, Hispanic subgroup is 13.1%, student with disabilities subgroup is 15.6%, and low income student subgroup is 12.8%, we will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

Objective 2 Description

In order to address the deficiencies in math for the entire school and all subgroups, Bloom High School is providing students with more opportunities throughout the entire school community to raise their mathematic achievement through:

- Additional math programs
- Additional support staff to assist students and teacher with math strategies
- Additional professional development for teachers to keep them up to date with best practices
- Offering resources at the school for parents to become more involved with their child's education
- Promoting an effective learning environment through behavior management
- Staff development to increase student performance

- Activities to enhance parent participation to improve student progress in school

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. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓕ 4. Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 5. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓕ 6. Hispanic students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 7. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓕ 8. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 9. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓕ 10. Low Income students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 2 Title :

Improve math skills for all students, including the black subgroup, Hispanic subgroup, student with disabilities subgroup, and low income student subgroup. While our current achievement in math for the school is 13.6%, the black subgroup is 13.1%, Hispanic subgroup is 13.1%, student with disabilities subgroup is 15.6%, and low income student subgroup is 12.8%, we will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

	TimeLine	Budget
--	----------	--------

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Incoming students who test 11 and below on the EXPLORE in math will be targetted to enroll in the REFS program which focuses on math comprehension and math ability in order to raise math level before beginning high school.	06/15/2009	07/14/2011	Summer School	Other	35,000
2	ACT/PSAE-Students will do daily ACT and Work Keys review in all math classes, and be assessed twice per semester.	08/17/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Other	15,000
3	Junior and senior students who did not pass core courses will be provided opportunities to recover credits through a computer program so they may stay on track to graduate.	06/15/2009	07/14/2011	After School	Other	15,000
4	Students in need of additional assistance in mathematics will be provided extended learning time throughout the school year with after school tutoring 4 days per week 1-2 hours per day.	08/17/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Other	50,000
5	Students will be held accountable for appropriate classroom behavior by signing the behavior log, and accepting consequences as prescribed by the Bert Simmons Behavior Management Model.	08/17/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Other	20,000
6	The students will work with Math Coaches who will aid in math skills by using best practices and differentiated instruction.	08/17/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Title I	120,000
7	The Junior level math students will participate in Key Train to increase math skills.	08/17/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Other	0
8	A freshman to sophomore summer program will be available for students who failed math and will incorporate the Succeed in Math program.	06/07/2010	07/28/2011	Summer School	Title I	130,000
9	Students identified as at-risk will participate in the BIC (Behavior Intervention Classroom) program.	08/17/2009	06/01/2011	Before School	Title I	75,000
10	7th and 8th grade students that that meet or exceed the standards on the district math assessment will participate in early morning high school level Algebra I and Algebra I Honors level classes.	08/17/2009	06/01/2011	Before School	Other	15,000

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

Objective 2 Title :

Improve math skills for all students, including the black subgroup, Hispanic subgroup, student with disabilities subgroup, and low income student subgroup. While our current achievement in math for the school is 13.6%, the black subgroup is 13.1%, Hispanic subgroup is 13.1%, student with disabilities subgroup is 15.6%, and low income student subgroup is 12.8%, we will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

	Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Ongoing professional development workshops will be provided targeting differentiated instruction, Bloom's Taxonomy and higher order thinking skills.	08/17/2009	08/08/2011	During School	Title I	15,000
2	All staff will be trained and will implement the Bert Simmons Behavior Model and follow-up training will also be provided.	06/01/2009	08/08/2011	During School	Title I	80,000
3	Provide professional development in best practices by offering CRISS training to all staff in order to enhance math curriculum for diverse learning styles.	06/01/2009	08/08/2011	Before School	Title II	10,000
4	Provide professional development in best practices by offering 4MAT training to all staff in order to teach effectively to diverse learning styles on a block schedule.	06/01/2009	08/08/2011	Before School	Title II	15,000
5	New teachers will be mentored by experienced teachers.	06/01/2009	08/08/2011	Before School	Local Funds	0
6	Teachers will receive additional support in best practices and math strategies from the Math Coaches.	08/17/2009	08/08/2011	Before School	Other	0
7	The staff will continue updating curriculum maps to ensure relevancy and alignment with Illinois State Standards and CRS benchmarks.	06/01/2009	08/08/2011	Summer School	Local Funds	50,000
8	The staff will receive in-service training on specific interventions as mandated in the RTI model.	06/01/2009	08/08/2011	Before School	Other	0
9	Select staff will meet with feeder school principals and necessary staff to collaborate and articulate student expectations.	08/17/2009	08/08/2011	Before School	Other	0
10	Teachers will analyze data from local pre, mid, interim, and post assessments along with Quality Core assessments (developed by ACT) to	08/17/2009	08/08/2011	Before School	Other	5,000

	provide effective instruction.					
11	Teachers will implement an intensive freshman to sophomore summer school program for students failing math.	01/12/2009	06/30/2011	Before School	Title I	130,000

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

Objective 2 Title :

Improve math skills for all students, including the black subgroup, Hispanic subgroup, student with disabilities subgroup, and low income student subgroup. While our current achievement in math for the school is 13.6%, the black subgroup is 13.1%, Hispanic subgroup is 13.1%, student with disabilities subgroup is 15.6%, and low income student subgroup is 12.8%, we will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will have the opportunity to plan school improvement activities and programs by participating in the Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) and Parent Academy.	08/17/2009	08/08/2011	After School	Other	0
2	Parents will be provided opportunities to attend career and college planning seminars such as Financial Aid Night and Senior Success meetings.	08/17/2009	08/08/2011	After School	Other	0
3	Parents will be given the opportunity to attend computer literacy training for IGPro, so they can monitor student academic and attendance performance.	08/17/2009	08/08/2011	After School	Other	0
4	Parents will be informed about student and staff initiatives as well as newsworthy events in the school through the quarterly Principals Newsletter and school website.	08/17/2009	08/08/2011	After School	Other	8,000
5	A semi-annual parent academy will be offered which will be modeled after the small learning communities. Topics at academy will include: how to help your student with homework, computer skills, how to use community resources, and post-secondary planning.	08/17/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Other	11,000
6	Parents will be contacted by the school staff regarding any behavior problems or student successes to encourage parental support of the	08/17/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Other	0

	Bert Simmons Behavior Model.					
7	English classes will be provided to non-English speaking families in order to assist them in building English language skills, and to encourage parents to be a part of the school community.	08/17/2009	06/03/2011	After School	Title III	10,000

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

Improve math skills for all students, including the black subgroup, Hispanic subgroup, student with disabilities subgroup, and low income student subgroup. While our current achievement in math for the school is 13.6%, the black subgroup is 13.1%, Hispanic subgroup is 13.1%, student with disabilities subgroup is 15.6%, and low income student subgroup is 12.8%, we will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

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

The school will monitor the effectiveness of increasing the number of all students including the Black, Hispanic, Students with Disabilities, and Low Income subgroups meeting and exceeding on the PSAE mathematics to 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2001 or safe harbor through analyzing student grades, EXPLORE, PLAN, ACT and PSAE scores. We will also examine the district course assessments (pre, interim, mid, post) and QualityCore assessments in the areas of Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II. The district will also continue to analyze and interpret data and have meaningful discussions with the faculty in an effort to improve instruction.

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	Dr. Lenell Navarre	Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction
2	Mrs. Rhona Israel	Principal
3	Mr. Gregory Horak	Assistant Principal of Activities
4	Mrs. Susan Woodyatt	Assistant Principal of Pupil Personnel Services
5	Ms. Gail Hartsough	District Math Coordinator
6	Ms. Elizabeth Orr	Communications Division Coordinator
7	Mrs. Donna Zuidema	District Science Coordinator
8	Mrs. Wanda Murphy-Fulford	Special Ed Division Coordinator
9	Mr. Robert Belzeski	Career and Tech Ed Division Coordinator

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.*)

The District sends out information in a letter about our academic status to all of our parents, and in Spanish when necessary. Information is also provided about various supplemental services for our students to use for their improvement.

Bloom offers several venues for parent participation to assist in the improvement of our academic status as listed below:

- Bloom High School's SIP team involves parent volunteers to be a part of the school improvement process. The SIP team works in conjunction with the Parent Advisory Committee for input and with the Principal's Student Leadership Team for student input. Both attend meetings once a month during the school year.
- Important communications are translated into Spanish for any Hispanic families, to encourage their participation as well.
- Parents and students participate in various surveys that require their input during parent conferences/ open houses. Surveys ask questions concerning communications sent home, computer literacy, and day/ time availability for meetings/ trainings. Data is collected and reviewed by the teams to enhance student performance.

A parent involvement policy and compact was developed to include administration, staff and parents of Bloom High school. This document outlines how parents, the entire school staff, and the students will share the responsibility for improved student academic achievement. In addition, school board members are invited and informed once a month regarding the SIP process and progress of the SIP activities. Board members have provided continual support for all the school initiatives that have a positive impact on student performance.

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.

Bloom Township faculty, staff, parents, community members, and educational consultants are invited and encouraged to assist/participate in the review and the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. Student representatives also participate in the SIP process. In addition, all members are also invited to attend the monthly Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) meetings, where the SIP process is discussed. Also, parents are informed during parent conferences, and open houses. They are able to ask questions regarding the school process/activities. Also, parents participate in school workshops to partner in the educational process. Parent/community surveys are conducted on an on-going basis to receive input regarding the plan. Bloom High School's community members work closely with our school to enhance the educational program.

	Name	Title
1	Mrs. Rhona Israel	Principal
2	Ms. Diana Anderson	Special Ed Social Studies Teacher
3	Mrs. Kim Bateast	Discipline Dean
4	Mr. Bernard Bishop	Student Representative
5	Ms. Ashley Howe	Student Representative
6	Ms. Terry Krueger	Special Ed Social Studies Teacher
7	Mrs. Elizabeth Hawkins	Paraprofessional
8	Mrs. Nora Farabaugh	Paraprofessional
9	Mrs. Susan Woodyatt	Assistant Principal
10	Mr. Greg Horak	Assistant Principal
11	Mrs. Heather Mason	Special Ed Science Teacher
12	Mrs. Wanda Murphy-Fulford	Special Ed Division Coordinator
13	Ms. Susan Messaglia	Literacy Facilitator
14	Mr. John Neubauer	Community Representative

15	Mr. John Billingsley	Assistant Principal Alternative Program
16	Ms. Gail Hartsough	District Math Coordinator
17	Ms. Elizabeth Orr	Communications Division Coordinator
18	Ms. Nadima Zegar	English Teacher
19	Mrs. Sarah Alford	Math teacher
20	Mrs. Donna Zuidema	District Science Coordinator
21	Mrs. Mariba Woods	Student Assistance Coordinator
22	Mrs. Andrea Stone	Parent Representative
23	Mrs. Sunandha Taylor	Parent Representative
24	Mrs. Helen Norton	District Consultant
25	Ms. Tatiyana Hinton	Student Representative
26	Ms. Racheal Daniels	Student Representative
27	Mr. Rick Rapp	Rich Central High School Internal Review Chairperson for SIP
28	Ms. Sharon Negri	Paraprofessional
29	Mrs. Deborah Filbin	School Internal Review Chairperson for SIP for Bloom High School, and Faculty member
30	Mr. William Tucker	Physical Education Teacher
31	Mr. Robert Boldt	Paraprofessional

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

Part C. Peer Review Process

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

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

The School Improvement Plan was developed with input from faculty, staff, students, parents, and community members. Consultation was also provided by our Peer Review Team from Rich Central High School, Distric 227. Items in the Action Plan were discussed with other area high school districts such as Crete Monee and the Thornton School District to ensure or goals and timelines were attainable and measurable.

The plan was submitted after consultation from our RESPRO team, Mr. Jerry Vrshek, Mr. Bill Wilson, and Dr. Kenneth Freeman and the staff of South Cook Intermediate Service Center. The RESPRO team has met on several occasions with the school and district leadership teams and has provided invaluable assistance in the process. South Cook Intermediate Center has provided workshops on writing and revising School Improvement Plans. The SCISC4 has also provided grant assistance for several school improvement initiatives, including funding for team preparation for the smaller learning communities in the summer of 2007. All of the individuals that we have worked with have been most responsive to individual questions throughout the process and have provided information in a timely and comprehensive manner.

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.

Novice teachers participate in several days of orientation before the start of the school year. This includes some workshops and also mentoring time with an experienced teacher (usually from their respective department). The mentor shares his/her knowledge of the policies and procedures of the school and the role of the new teacher in implementing them. The relationship is ongoing throughout the year and allows for observations and reflections on novice teacher classroom success. New teachers also participate in monthly informational meetings about pertinent topics (classroom management techniques, strategies for constructive parent contact, all-school testing, etc.) and share any concerns/ideas they have in their daily experiences. This partnership continues through their tenure at Bloom. As part of the mentoring program, all new teachers are required to attend IGPro, CRISS and 4MAT training during their first year of teaching to be more effective in the classroom. New teachers are also included in department discussions concerning curriculum-mapping updates and are involved in making changes to the pre, mid, and post-term assessments to make sure that they are aligned with Illinois State Standards.

Bloom also recently developed a state approved mentoring program under the guidance of Governors' State University to further assist teachers in moving from initial to standard certificate. Bloom High School also provides teachers a workshop and one-on-one assistance in moving from initial to standard certification.

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 206 has committed local funding resources in conjunction with Title I and III grant funds to support the School Improvement Plan initiatives, such as CRISS, 4MAT, curriculum-mapping, and parent education. Other grants, such as technology grants to improve student achievement through the use of technology, and the 21st Century Grant provide after school tutoring and Credit Recovery programs. We were also recently awarded a \$475,000.00 SIP-G 1003 grant to allow for various programs that we listed in our action plan. Bloom Alumni Foundation mini-grants also provide classroom teachers with individual resources and supplemental materials to enhance instruction. The district has also applied for a federal Small Learning Community Grant to help with the development of our small learning communities. The District Administration has provided leadership to all stakeholder committees in identifying best practices (CRISS and 4MAT) to raise student performance and has adhered to a collaborative model of leadership in determining strategies to meet the needs of learners. The district has provided technical assistance for the process of data analysis, professional development for all teachers to prepare them to meet school goals, qualified staff to teach in all programs, and close monitoring of all Title funds. The district has supervised compliance with all state procedures and mandates for district and school improvement. The district has required that all initiatives be research-based and supported by data. The district has worked closely with the RESPRO team and the South Cook Intermediate Service Center to assure that all requirements for the School Improvement Plan have been met and that all strategies and activities are within the capacity of the district for effective implementation.

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.

Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) has provided technical assistance to assist Bloom High School in analyzing our academic performance in the areas of mathematics and English through the IIRC website. SCISC4 has assigned Dr. Kenneth Freeman, Mr. Jerry Vrshek and Mr. Bill Wilson, as RESPRO representatives to assist the school meeting the Annual Yearly

Progress (AYP). RESPRO has provided the following services:

- Assisted with the format of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and District Improvement Plan (DIP)
- Provided some funding for implementation of small learning communities
- Assisted the school in targeting research based approaches to assist with raising standardized test scores
- Provided clarity on effective data analysis through IIRC
- Provided training sessions on revising SIP

RESPRO will have a committee of four to five members to provide walkthroughs during the 2009-2010 school year. Dr. Freeman (RESPRO representative) has been willing to assist the administration and staff with the review of the SIP.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part G. School Support Team

	Name	Title
1	Dr. Lennell Navarre	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction
2	Mrs. Helen Norton	District Consultant
3	Mr. Jerry Vrshek	RESPRO Consultant
4	Dr. Kenneth Freeman	RESPRO Consultant
5	Mr. Bill Wilson	RESPRO Consultant

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: **11/09/2009**

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

OTHER DATA

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yes No N/A

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

 Yes No

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

MONITORING Yes No

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

 Yes No

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

PART I - COMMENTS

January 14, 2010

The area RESPRO has completed the review of this plan: please implement this plan with their assistance.

Do not hesitate to contact me. Best wishes during implementation. Carol Diedrichsen ISBE Innovation and Improvement cdiedric@isbe.net

RESPRO area comments:

The School Improvement Plan provides an excellent analysis of data at the state, local and other data levels. Classroom management is addressed. Factors and next steps are appropriate, manageable and can be measured. The objectives are clear and measurable. The monitoring of the strategies/activities is detailed and designed to funnel the result to the classroom.

Posted 12/17/09 L. Ross ISC#4

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]

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

The in-area RESPRO review has been completed. All areas of concern in previous reviews were addressed satisfactorily. The District 206 Bloom HS School Improvement Plan is recommended for implementation with the assistance of your area RESPRO. No further updates to your improvement plan are necessary at this time.

If you choose to revise or update your plan, you may request that your area RESPRO update the ISBE monitoring prompt as this is the official state monitoring record.

Posted 12/21/09 L. Ross ISC#4