

Local Board Approved	
Initial Submission	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	310453040260001		
District Name:	Geneva CUSD 304	School Name:	Geneva Community High School
Superintendent:	Dr. Kent D Mutchler	Principal:	Thomas Rogers
District Address:	227 N 4th St	School Address:	416 Mckinley Ave
City/State/Zip:	Geneva, IL 60134 1307	City/State/Zip:	Geneva, IL 60134 1200
District Telephone#:	Label 6304633000 Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	6304633800 Extn: 0
District Email:	kmutchler@geneva304.org	School Email:	trogers@geneva304.org
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2011 AYP Report

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this School been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2011-12 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2011-12 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning Year 1

	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
Student Groups	%	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		85.0			85.0			91.0		82.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	76.3		No	77.2		No			96.0	Yes
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	77.0	81.9	No	78.0	79.2	Yes			96.7	
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian														

American Indian														
Two or More Races														
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes										
Economically Disadvantaged														

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

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 85% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 85% 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 85% 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 82% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2010.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 85% or above are not printed.

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

applied. Safe Harbor allows schools an alternate method to meet subgroup minimum targets on achievement.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2011 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								
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Attendance Rate (%)	93.1	94.3	94.2	96.5	93.7	95.3	95.2	95.2
Truancy Rate (%)	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.9	0.2	0.1	0.2
Mobility Rate (%)	16.4	3.8	3.8	2.2	3.1	4.6	3.6	2.2
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	100.0	97.9	97.9	100.0	97.6	98.6	98.5	96.0
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	1.6	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.4
School Population (#)	1,570	1,683	1,794	1,870	1,954	1,939	1,934	1,979
Low Income (%)	2.6	2.0	3.0	2.1	2.6	2.8	3.7	5.2
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.6
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.2	10.9
White, non-Hispanic (%)	94.6	94.1	93.6	93.5	93.3	92.5	91.6	89.6
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.3	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.4
Hispanic (%)	2.7	2.9	3.3	3.0	2.7	2.9	3.3	5.9
Asian (%)	2.3	2.2	2.5	2.1	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.8
American Indian(%)	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2
Two or More Races (%)	-	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.4	2.2	3.1	2.1
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0

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 (%)	American Indian (%)	Two Or More Races (%)	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander (%)
S C H O O L	2000	96.5	0.3	1.2	2.0	-	-	-
	2001	96.7	0.4	1.3	1.6	-	-	-
	2002	96.2	0.4	1.8	1.7	-	-	-
	2003	95.0	0.3	2.1	2.4	0.1	-	-
	2004	94.6	0.3	2.7	2.3	0.1	-	-
	2005	94.1	0.6	2.9	2.2	0.2	-	-
	2006	93.6	0.6	3.3	2.5	-	-	-
	2007	93.5	0.6	3.0	2.1	0.1	0.6	-
	2008	93.3	0.7	2.7	1.9	0.1	1.4	-
	2009	92.5	0.6	2.9	1.8	0.1	2.2	-
	2010	91.6	0.4	3.3	1.7	-	3.1	-
	2011	89.6	0.4	5.9	1.8	0.2	2.1	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	96.3	0.5	1.6	1.5	-	-	-
	2001	96.1	0.6	1.8	1.4	0.1	-	-
	2002	95.4	0.6	2.2	1.8	-	-	-
	2003	94.4	0.7	2.6	2.2	0.2	-	-
	2004	93.4	0.5	3.5	2.3	0.2	-	-
	2005	92.9	0.5	3.6	2.3	0.2	0.5	-
	2006	92.2	0.4	3.9	2.2	0.1	1.2	-
	2007	91.4	0.3	3.6	2.0	0.1	2.7	-
	2008	91.1	0.3	3.3	2.1	-	3.1	-
	2009	90.0	0.5	3.8	2.1	-	3.6	-
	2010	89.0	0.3	4.3	2.3	0.1	4.0	-

	2011	87.7	0.3	6.9	2.4	0.1	2.6	-
S T A T E	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-	-
	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	-
	2011	51.4	18.3	23.0	4.1	0.3	2.8	0.1

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 Truancy (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	0.2	0.6	85.3	93.1	7.7	4	0.3	0.9	95.6
	2001	0.1	-	99.0	93.5	3.7	9	0.7	1.9	93.4
	2002	-	0.7	100.0	94.4	6.2	10	0.7	1.9	92.2
	2003	-	0.9	100.0	94.4	5.3	-	-	1.4	100.0
	2004	-	2.6	98.0	93.1	16.4	7	0.5	1.6	100.0
	2005	0.1	2.0	98.0	94.3	3.8	6	0.4	0.8	97.9
	2006	0.2	3.0	98.0	94.2	3.8	10	0.5	0.7	97.9
	2007	0.2	2.1	98.0	96.5	2.2	8	0.4	0.7	100.0
	2008	0.2	2.6	97.0	93.7	3.1	18	0.9	0.7	97.6
	2009	0.3	2.8	96.0	95.3	4.6	3	0.2	0.4	98.6
	2010	0.4	3.7	96.0	95.2	3.6	2	0.1	0.3	98.5
D I S T R I C T	2011	0.6	5.2	100.0	95.2	2.2	4	0.2	0.4	96.0
	2000	0.4	1.1	100.0	95.1	7.0	4	0.1	0.9	95.6
	2001	0.5	0.7	99.5	95.2	5.5	9	0.2	1.9	93.4
	2002	0.2	1.2	100.0	95.5	5.9	13	0.3	1.9	92.2
	2003	0.1	1.2	100.0	95.4	5.7	4	0.1	1.4	100.0
	2004	0.3	1.9	99.3	95.3	8.0	12	0.2	1.6	100.0
	2005	0.4	2.1	99.3	95.4	4.4	10	0.2	0.8	97.9
	2006	0.8	2.9	99.3	95.5	4.5	12	0.2	0.7	97.9
	2007	0.7	2.4	99.3	95.9	3.0	10	0.2	0.7	100.0
	2008	0.7	2.6	98.8	95.1	3.7	18	0.3	0.7	97.6
	2009	0.9	3.5	98.7	95.8	3.6	7	0.1	0.4	98.6
	2010	1.1	3.9	98.6	95.5	3.5	3	0.1	0.3	98.5
	2011	1.3	5.5	100.0	95.6	2.9	6	0.1	0.4	96.0

S T A T E	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
	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
	2011	8.8	48.1	96.0	94.0	12.8	63,067	3.2	2.7	83.8

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

Section I A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 6 - Enrollment Trends

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	1,188	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,294	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	1,382	-	-	-	-	-	329
	2003	1,485	-	-	-	-	-	358
	2004	1,570	-	-	-	-	-	399
	2005	1,683	-	-	-	-	-	386
	2006	1,794	-	-	-	-	-	443
	2007	1,870	-	-	-	-	-	463
	2008	1,954	-	-	-	-	-	503
	2009	1,939	-	-	-	-	-	476
	2010	1,934	-	-	-	-	-	490
	2011	1,979	-	-	-	-	-	466
D I S T R I C T	2000	4,541	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	4,811	395	434	411	382	386	315
	2002	5,037	425	396	450	424	397	329
	2003	5,358	431	458	433	447	431	358
	2004	5,505	446	446	472	480	442	399
	2005	5,636	396	472	446	456	489	386
	2006	5,768	425	418	484	478	457	443
	2007	5,900	454	444	435	454	490	463
	2008	5,962	436	471	453	503	466	503
	2009	5,963	444	450	477	460	506	476
	2010	5,923	427	454	462	481	468	490
	2011	5,910	452	439	453	502	474	466
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-

S T A T E	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	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
	2010	2,064,312	155,468	154,389	152,681	154,465	154,982	146,919
	2011	2,074,806	153,516	153,301	154,241	153,981	153,986	151,059

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)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials (%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	254	13	49,172	41	59	20	20	-	-
	2001	267	12	52,444	33	67	20	21	-	-
	2002	294	13	54,081	36	64	19	19	1	-
	2003	318	12	55,837	32	68	19	20	-	-
	2004	328	12	57,701	30	70	18	21	1	-
	2005	327	12	58,396	31	69	18	22	1	-
	2006	331	13	60,668	30	70	19	22	1	-
	2007	348	13	62,800	30	70	18	21	1	-
	2008	361	13	65,270	28	72	18	21	-	-
	2009	368	13	67,619	25	75	18	20	-	-
	2010	367	14	69,863	22	78	18	20	-	-
	2011	359	14	72,395	19	81	18	21	-	-
	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

S T A T E	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
	2011	128,262	13	64,978	40	60	19	19	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	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	71.2	72.9	76.9	79.8	78.3	76.1
White	71.4	75.0	77.4	81.5	79.8	77.4
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	38.5	63.6	36.4	58.9	56.6
Asian	-	54.6	83.4	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	63.6	-	81.8
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	17.5	31.1	29.3	43.6	29.2	37.5
Low Income	41.7	-	41.7	27.3	46.7	44.4
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-

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	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	68.9	71.3	75.1	77.1	74.0	76.1
White	68.7	72.5	75.3	79.2	76.5	77.7
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	38.5	63.6	36.4	47.1	60.0
Asian	-	72.8	75.0	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	54.6	-	63.6
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	15.0	17.7	22.0	20.5	23.0	27.5
Low Income	25.0	-	41.6	27.3	33.3	37.0
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-

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?

Our School Report Card data indicates that students in our "all" and "white" subgroups are not meeting AYP in the area of reading. Additionally, the data indicates that students in our "all" subgroup are not meeting AYP in the area of mathematics.

As our school is relatively homogeneous, the "white" subgroup is our only subgroup; this is a broad group of students encompassing 89.6% of our student population.

Historically, our students have performed relatively well in many areas. In the area of reading in 2009, 79.8% of students in the "all" subgroup met or exceeded standards; in 2010, 78.3% of "all" students met or exceeded standards; in 2011, 76.1% of "all" students met or exceeded standards.

In the area of reading in 2009, 81.5% of our "white" subgroup met or exceeded standards, in 2010, 79.8% of our "white" subgroup met or exceeded standards, and in 2011, 77.4% of our "white" subgroup met or exceeded standards.

In the area of mathematics in 2009, 77.1% of "all" students met or exceeded standards; in 2010, 74.0% of "all" students met or exceeded standards; in 2011, 76.1% of "all" students met or exceeded standards.

Despite these recent declines, these subgroups are achieving well above the levels from 2006. Since 2006, the "all" group has grown in reading by 4.9 percentage points and mathematics has grown by 7.2 percentage points. Since 2006, the "white" group has grown in reading by 6.0 percentage points and in mathematics by 9.0 percentage points.

Our attendance rate continues to be a strength. Since 2009, our attendance rate has exceeded 95%. Additionally, our graduation rate is very strong, exceeding 96% since 2009.

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

Over the last 3 years, our Hispanic student population has grown from 2.9% to 5.9% and in 2011 only 56.6% of those students met or exceeded standards. Our Low Income student population has also grown from 2.6% to 5.2% during that same time period and in 2011 only 44.4% of those students met or exceeded standards. Although there are not enough students to make an official subgroup for Hispanic or Low Income, the increasing numbers of students in these groups overlap into multiple groups and are contributing to impact the overall results in our "all" and "white" groups.

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

We will focus on improving achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics. Our strategies will concentrate on identifying deficits in these areas and providing opportunities for additional instruction in both areas. Given that there is overlap between our current and possible future subgroups, it will be important to develop strategies and interventions that are accessible to all of the groups.

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?

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

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

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)
Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

Data - Briefly describe attributes and challenges of the school and community that have affected student performance. What do these data and/or information tell you?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section I-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?

As we work to improve achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics, we will need to focus on strategies that provide additional opportunities for student instruction and guided practice in both reading and mathematics. Given the broad nature of the student groups not meeting standards, it will be important to develop strategies and interventions that are accessible to all students.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Students in all subgroups will meet or exceed AYP targets of 92.5% in Reading	1,3,
2	Students in all subgroups will meet or exceed the AYP target of 92.5% in mathematics.	2,

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

- 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 2. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 3. White students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Students in all subgroups will meet or exceed AYP targets of 92.5% in Reading

Objective 1 Description

While our current achievement in reading for "all" students is 76.1% and the achievement for "white" students is 77.4%, the "white" and "all" subgroups will make AYP of 92.5% for both 2012 and 2013.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- b 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- e 2. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- b 3. White students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students in all subgroups will meet or exceed AYP targets of 92.5% in Reading

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students in our "all" and "white" groups with identified reading deficits (as recommended by EPAS scores, course grades, and teacher recommendations) will improve their reading through participation in a new Reading Seminar program during the 2011-12 school year.	08/24/2011	06/04/2012	During School	Local Funds	5,917
2	Special education students in our "all" and "white" subgroups with identified reading deficits (as recommended by student IEPs, EPAS scores, course grades, and teacher recommendations) will improve their reading through participation in a Reading Lab program during the 2011-12 school year.	08/24/2011	06/04/2012	During School	Local Funds	14,479

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students in all subgroups will meet or exceed AYP targets of 92.5% in Reading

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Training will be provided to identified teachers on the EDGE reading curriculum for use in the Reading Seminar program.	08/10/2011	06/11/2012	After School	Local Funds	480
2	Training will be provided to identified special education teachers on the EDGE reading curriculum for use in the Reading Lab program.	08/10/2011	06/11/2012	After School	Local Funds	480

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students in all subgroups will meet or exceed AYP targets of 92.5% in Reading

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents of students in the Reading Seminar program will receive regular updates through our online reporting system on how their child is progressing as well as through bi-annual parent conferences.	08/24/2011	06/04/2012	After School	Local Funds	0
2	Parents of special education students in the Reading Lab program will receive progress updates from special education staff at bi-annual parent conferences and through the annual review process of student IEPs	08/24/2011	06/04/2012	After School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Students in all subgroups will meet or exceed AYP targets of 92.5% 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?)

Teachers involved in implementing these strategies will provide quarterly updates to our Building Leadership Team regarding the lexile point progress of students in the program. The Building Leadership Team will determine what improvement efforts need to be implemented and discussed with teachers and what further professional development is needed.

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	Tom Rogers	Principal
2	Doug Drexler	Associate Principal
3	Scott McPeak	Assistant Principal
4	Colleen Moran	Department Chair Special Education
5	Nancy Rizzo	Department Chair English
6	John Thomas	Department Chair Math
7	Kevin Gannon	Department Chair Science
8	Sue Khalaieff	Department Chair Social Studies & World Language
9	Bill Koehn	Department Chair Fine & Applied Arts
10	Dave Carli	Department Chair Physical Education
11	Mary Jane Johnson	Department Chair Counseling & Advising

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Students in all subgroups will meet or exceed the AYP target of 92.5% in mathematics.

Objective 2 Description

While our current achievement in mathematics for "all" students is 76.1%, the "all" subgroup will make AYP of 92.5% for both 2012 and 2013.

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

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

Objective 2 Title :

Students in all subgroups will meet or exceed the AYP target of 92.5% in mathematics.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students who are in need of additional help with their mathematics coursework will be referred to a new Math Resource Center after school.	01/17/2012	06/04/2012	After School	Local Funds	1,982
	Students who are seeking additional help with their Algebra I					

2	coursework will be able to receive additional assistance from the Algebra I Resource Team before or after school.	08/24/2011	06/04/2012	After School	Local Funds	0
---	---	------------	------------	--------------	-------------	---

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

Objective 2 Title :

Students in all subgroups will meet or exceed the AYP target of 92.5% in mathematics.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers staffing the Math Resource Center will collaborate regularly about how best to meet the wide range of student needs in a variety of courses.	01/17/2012	06/04/2012	After School	Local Funds	0
2	Algebra I teachers will continue to collaborate regarding best instructional practices that can help meet the needs of all of their students.	08/24/2011	06/04/2012	After School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 2 Title :

Students in all subgroups will meet or exceed the AYP target of 92.5% in mathematics.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	The new Math Resource Center will be communicated to parents through a variety of school communication channels.	01/17/2012	06/04/2012	After School	Local Funds	0
2	Algebra I teachers will communicate with the families of students enrolled in Algebra I to ensure that they are aware of the availability of the Algebra I Resource Team.	08/24/2011	06/04/2012	After School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

Students in all subgroups will meet or exceed the AYP target of 92.5% in mathematics.

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

Teachers involved in implementing these strategies will provide quarterly updates to our Building Leadership Team regarding the progress of students in the program. The Building Leadership Team will determine what improvement efforts need to be implemented and discussed with teachers and what further professional development is needed. Additionally, stakeholder feedback will be sought regarding program effectiveness at the conclusion of the school year.

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	Tom Rogers	Principal
2	Doug Drexler	Associate Principal
3	Scott McPeak	Assistant Principal
4	Colleen Moran	Department Chair Special Education
5	Nancy Rizzo	Department Chair English
6	Kevin Gannon	Department Chair Science
7	Sue Khalaieff	Department Chair Social Studies & World Language
8	Bill Koehn	Department Chair Fine & Applied Arts
9	John Thomas	Department Chair Mathematics
10	Dave Carli	Department Chair Physical Education
11	Mary Jane Johnson	Department Chair Counseling & Advising

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

Part A. Parent Notification*

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

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

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

Part B. Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder Involvement - Describe specifically how stakeholders (including parents, school staff, and outside experts) have been consulted in the development of the plan. The names and titles of the school improvement team or plan developers must be identified here.

This plan was developed based on feedback and input from a variety of stakeholders.

At the building level, we developed a new structure for our School Improvement Team that we believe is more conducive to continuous improvement. This group was consulted at multiple stages of plan development.

Our English and Math Department Chairs have been heavily involved in creating the strategies and interventions as part of this process.

At the district level, Assistant Superintendent Patty O'Neil provided guidance and assistance to help ensure that the development of this plan was aligned with the district goals in the areas of reading and mathematics.

As part of the development of this plan, we sought feedback and input from parents. Parent survey results indicated a strong desire for our school to increase the amount of support provided to students specifically in the areas of reading and math.

	Name	Title
1	Tom Rogers	Principal
2	Doug Drexler	Associate Principal
3	John Thomas	Department Chair Mathematics
4	Nancy Rizzo	Department Chair English

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.

As part of the development of this plan, we utilized a two-tiered model of peer review.

Our first stage was to identify a group of building and district administrators from within our district that could serve in this capacity. We identified two elementary principals, two middle school principals, a ROE consultant, and one district administrator to review the plan.

Our second stage was to offer the opportunity for any certified staff members from our school to review this plan. The entire plan was shared with all certified staff members and everyone had the opportunity to provide feedback.

As a result of the feedback received the plan was modified and improved.

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.

All new certified staff members hired by Geneva CUSD #304 participate in a district-wide mentoring program. As part of this program, all new certified staff are assigned a mentor. Teacher mentors assist new teachers throughout the school year with day-to-day questions, how to deal with parents, assessment procedures, and effective instructional strategies.

In addition, all new certified staff participate in a 3-day new staff induction program that provides them with a variety of orientation activities and information. Induction topics include building orientation, curriculum overview, student health issues, and expectations for their performance as staff members.

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 has been very helpful in the development and pending implementation of this plan. The district has:

- * provided a budget for implementing the strategies outlined in the plan
- * facilitated the assistance of consultants as we developed our plan
- * maintained an organized infrastructure for adopting new programs and curricula (the Staff and Curriculum Development Council)
- * supported professional development for staff involved in this plan.

Corrective Actions taken by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress for a fourth annual calculation (Corrective Action Status) should be aligned with the strategies and activities of this plan. The district must take one or more of the following actions in such a school per NCLB, Section 1116(b)(7)(C)(iv). (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Require implementation of a new research-based curriculum of instructional program;
- ☐ Extension of the school year or school day;
- ☐ Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance;
- ☐ Significant decrease in management authority at the school level;
- ☐ Replacement of the principal;
- ☐ Restructuring the internal organization of the school;
- ☐ Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school.

Restructuring Options (allowed in Illinois) selected by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress for a fifth annual calculation (Restructuring Status) should be aligned with the strategies and activities of this plan. The district must take one or more of the following options in such a school. (Please check all that apply.)

- ☐ Reopening the school as a public charter school, consistent with Article 27A of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/Art. 27A.);
- ☐ Replacing all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school's inability to make AYP;
- ☐ Entering into a contract with a private entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the school as a public school;
- ☐ Implementing any other major restructuring of the school's governance that makes fundamental reform in:
 - ☐ governance and management, and/or
 - ☐ financing and material resources, and/or
 - ☐ staffing.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation
Part F. State Responsibilities

State Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that ISBE, RESPROS, and other service providers have provided the school during the development and review of this plan and other services that will be provided during the implementation of the plan. ISBE shall provide technical assistance to the school if district fails to do so.

The state has provided a variety of resources for planning our School Improvement Plan:

- * The Illinois Interactive Report Card
- * ISBE website resources
- * ROE consultants
- * ROE County-wide Institute offerings

	Name	Title
1		

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:

A. ASSURANCES

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

B.SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS☐ Yes ☐ No

Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance? [C]

☐ Yes ☐ No

Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control? [C]

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES☐ Yes ☐ NoHas the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan? [C]☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency? [C]

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES☐ Yes ☐ No

Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement? [C]

☐ Yes ☐ No

Are the strategies and activities measurable? [C]

☐ Yes ☐ No

Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified? [C]

☐ Yes ☐ No

Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear? [C]

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students? [C]

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status or in special education non-compliance?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities for students? [C]

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

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN	
PARENT NOTIFICATION	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only) [C]
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the SIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes? [C]
PEER REVIEW	

☐ Yes ☐ NoIs the peer review process described and is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have “the greatest likelihood” of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP? [C]**TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS**☐ Yes ☐ No

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

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES☐ Yes ☐ No

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

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES☐ Yes ☐ No

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

SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD☐ Yes ☐ No

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

PART II - COMMENTS