

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	12/08/2009
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	Yes	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?	Yes	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2009-10 State Improvement Status	

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		70.0			70.0			90.0		78.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	73.9		Yes	71.7		Yes			93.8	
White														
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION

The Differentiated Accountability classification for the school is:	-
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in reading?	-
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in math?	-

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 (%)	95.3	94.1	94.2	94.0	94.1	94.2	94.9	94.7
Truancy Rate (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mobility Rate (%)	13.3	10.6	9.5	10.5	12.0	12.6	12.0	9.5
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	89.4	84.6	94.9	91.4	93.9	100.0	100.0	93.8
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	1.2	1.3	1.3	0.9	0.5	2.4	1.5	1.0
School Population (#)	353	357	345	328	312	312	307	209
Low Income (%)	15.0	19.3	12.5	20.4	20.5	23.7	21.5	19.6
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	5.1	4.2	4.9	1.8	3.5	1.3	1.6	2.4
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	91.8	89.6	89.3	93.0	92.0	93.3	92.5	91.4
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.6	1.4	1.2	0.6	0.6	-	-	-
Hispanic (%)	7.4	8.1	9.3	5.5	6.4	5.4	5.2	6.2
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.9	0.6	0.6	0.3	0.5
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	0.3	-	-	-	0.3	0.3	0.5
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	0.3	0.3	1.6	1.4

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	1999	90.1	0.3	9.3	0.3	-	-
	2000	88.3	-	11.2	0.5	-	-
	2001	88.0	0.5	10.9	0.5	-	-
	2002	91.8	0.6	7.4	0.3	-	-
	2003	89.6	1.4	8.1	0.6	0.3	-
	2004	89.3	1.2	9.3	0.3	-	-
	2005	93.0	0.6	5.5	0.9	-	-
	2006	92.0	0.6	6.4	0.6	-	0.3
	2007	93.3	-	5.4	0.6	0.3	0.3
	2008	92.5	-	5.2	0.3	0.3	1.6
2009	91.4	-	6.2	0.5	0.5	1.4	
D I S T R I C T	1999	91.3	0.3	8.2	0.3	-	-
	2000	89.5	0.4	9.9	0.3	-	-
	2001	87.2	0.6	11.4	0.7	-	-
	2002	90.5	0.3	9.1	0.1	-	-
	2003	88.4	0.6	10.1	0.6	0.1	-
	2004	87.8	1.1	10.8	0.3	-	-
	2005	90.7	0.3	6.6	0.5	-	1.9
	2006	90.4	0.4	6.8	0.3	0.1	2.0
	2007	90.6	0.1	7.5	0.3	0.1	1.4
	2008	91.4	0.1	6.2	0.1	0.1	1.9

	2009	92.0	0.1	5.5	0.3	0.1	2.0
S T A T E	1999	62.0	20.8	13.9	3.2	0.2	-
	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

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	1999	4.9	11.8	99.4	95.3	18.4	-	-	1.2	86.2
	2000	4.9	13.8	97.2	95.6	20.6	-	-	1.9	93.2
	2001	4.3	15.2	90.0	95.6	18.8	-	-	2.6	91.5
	2002	5.1	15.0	100.0	95.3	13.3	-	-	1.2	89.4
	2003	4.2	19.3	100.0	94.1	10.6	-	-	1.3	84.6
	2004	4.9	12.5	100.0	94.2	9.5	-	-	1.3	94.9
	2005	1.8	20.4	100.0	94.0	10.5	-	-	0.9	91.4
	2006	3.5	20.5	100.0	94.1	12.0	-	-	0.5	93.9
	2007	1.3	23.7	100.0	94.2	12.6	-	-	2.4	100.0
	2008	1.6	21.5	100.0	94.9	12.0	-	-	1.5	100.0
2009	2.4	19.6	100.0	94.7	9.5	-	-	1.0	93.8	
D I S T R I C T	1999	5.8	13.9	100.0	95.9	18.6	2	0.3	1.2	86.2
	2000	4.7	16.5	100.0	95.9	21.0	1	0.1	1.9	93.2
	2001	6.3	18.0	95.2	96.1	19.5	-	-	2.6	91.5
	2002	5.1	17.6	100.0	95.9	15.9	-	-	1.2	89.4
	2003	3.6	24.3	100.0	94.9	13.6	-	-	1.3	84.6
	2004	5.7	19.9	100.0	95.1	12.9	-	-	1.3	94.9
	2005	3.0	22.8	100.0	94.8	13.4	1	0.1	0.9	91.4
	2006	2.3	22.8	100.0	95.2	12.9	-	-	0.5	93.9
	2007	1.5	23.5	100.0	95.2	14.3	-	-	2.4	100.0
	2008	2.1	20.9	100.0	95.1	11.4	1	0.1	1.5	100.0

	2009	2.5	20.5	100.0	95.3	11.1	1	0.1	1.0	93.8
S T A T E	1999	6.4	36.1	96.1	93.6	18.1	43,332	2.3	5.9	81.9
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	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	1999	364	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	385	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	375	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	353	-	-	-	-	-	60
	2003	357	-	-	-	-	-	61
	2004	345	-	-	-	-	-	59
	2005	328	-	-	-	-	-	47
	2006	312	-	-	-	-	-	49
	2007	312	-	-	-	-	-	51
	2008	307	-	-	-	-	-	54
	2009	209	-	-	-	-	-	47
D I S T R I C T	1999	760	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	781	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	807	44	47	55	59	53	62
	2002	739	67	51	47	53	57	60
	2003	770	57	67	51	53	54	61
	2004	757	46	56	60	54	47	59
	2005	732	50	41	57	50	55	47
	2006	706	52	52	43	56	48	49
	2007	724	60	49	54	60	56	51
	2008	721	54	59	49	45	59	54
	2009	747	57	57	56	54	46	47

S T A T E	1999	1,962,026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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

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	1999	45	16	38,732	70	30	20	13	-	-
	2000	47	16	38,163	72	28	19	13	-	-
	2001	49	15	38,964	74	26	19	13	-	-
	2002	49	15	41,030	76	24	17	13	-	4
	2003	51	14	41,227	77	23	17	12	-	-
	2004	51	14	43,697	71	29	17	11	-	-
	2005	49	15	46,467	72	28	18	11	-	-
	2006	47	15	48,567	68	32	18	11	-	-
	2007	47	15	51,776	52	48	18	11	-	-
	2008	48	14	53,475	44	56	17	11	-	-
2009	48	13	55,410	42	58	18	12	-	-	
S T A T E	1999	119,718	15	45,337	53	47	20	18	-	-
	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	14	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	2	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	12	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	60.3	67.4	63.3	70.8	71.7	71.8
White	58.8	68.2	62.6	71.1	70.4	71.5
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

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	58.5	65.2	46.9	64.6	71.7	67.4
White	58.8	65.9	48.0	64.4	70.5	69.1
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

The School Report Card data shows while PHS has made AYP in both reading and math, we have seen a decline in the number of students meeting/exceeding State standards in math and science. We also see a gender achievement gap as female students are outperforming male students. Areas of strength would include the overall increase in the number of students meeting/exceeding standards in reading.

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

Reading meets/exceeds level has improved this past year due the strong instructional strategies being used by the PHS teachers, additional reading practice for students during homeroom time, additional textbook purchases, the continued use of Keytrain software, improved communication between students and staff, and significant attention that has focused on accountability and excellence for students and staff. Student apathy, financial demands and responsibilities leading to increased work hours by students and lack of reading materials of interest to male students are additional factors contributing to our current results.

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

Students and staff of Princeville High School have demonstrated that when they focus in on an area of concern and work to implement strategies to improve, they are very successful. While we will continue our focus on content area reading, we must also look to address some of the additional issues having a negative impact on student achievement including student apathy, social and emotional issues and gender issues.

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?

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
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
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 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?

The factors that are within the school's capacity to change would include professional development in the area of student apathy, development of our school library and literature course selections to include more relevant reading materials for all of our students, and the development, implementation and evaluation of a freshman transition program to help students understand the routines and expectations of high school.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	While our current READING achievement level is 71.7% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to stride to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better.	
2	While our current MATH achievement level is 67.4% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to stride to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better.	
3	While our current SCIENCE achievement level is 65.2% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to stride to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better	

No deficiencies have been identified in the most recent AYP Report for your school

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

While our current READING achievement level is 71.7% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to stride to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better.

Objective 1 Description

The entire PHS staff will continue to maximize its efforts toward the reading level of all students with focusing on content area reading instruction and maintaining a language arts curriculum that is aligned to the Illinois State Learning Standards.

No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AYP Report.

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

While our current READING achievement level is 71.7% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to stride to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	The English Department will continue to teach the state standards and investigate new strategies to enhance the reading level of the high school students.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	All junior students will complete the 20+ hours Keytrain computer program and ACT Online in preparation for the ACT/PSAE.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	All curricular classes in PHS will emphasize content area reading and knowledge retention strategies.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	PHS will continue to offer its evening ACT preparation courses in the spring semesters to enhance the students ability in the reading comprehension area.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
5	PHS will continue to give specific ACT preparation instruction during language arts classes in the spring semesters.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
6	PHS will continue build our literature selections to increase student interest in reading.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
7	PHS will build a vocabulary list help guide their instruction in the respective discipline areas and improve reading comprehension.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

While our current READING achievement level is 71.7% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to stride to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	PHS staff will have opportunities to attend professional development in their certification areas.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	PHS staff will attend multiple in-service trainings during school improvement day activities and teachers' institutes.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	PHS staff will have opportunities to attend professional development in research-based best practices for reading instruction.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
4	PHS staff will continue to attend professional development in the area of incorporating technology into regular instruction.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

While our current READING achievement level is 71.7% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to stride to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	PCUSD #326 will continue to hold annual State of the Schools meetings for parents and community members.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	The PHS Principal and Guidance Counselor will continue to send quarterly newsletters to all parents regarding strategies to remain active in their students' education.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	PHS will continue to encourage all parents of PHS students to attend the fall and spring parent-teacher conferences.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
4	PHS will regularly update its web page for enhanced parent and community communication.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	

5	The PHS Guidance Counselor will continue to offer a Financial Aid Night for parents.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds
---	--	------------	------------	--------------	-------------

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

While our current READING achievement level is 71.7% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to strive to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better. The PHS Principal will continuously monitor the efforts towards meeting this objective. Staff meetings, Building Leadership Team meetings, and individual departmental team meetings will take place regularly to determine progress and future strategies. Success will be measured by the local assessments, students' final exams, students' grades, and Keytrain assessments that are completed regularly.

	Name	Title
1	Rich Thole	Principal
2	Sara Scott	Guidance Counselor
3	Sue Mercer	Building Leadership Team
4	Mike Rinella	Building Leadership Team
5	Barb Kratzer	Building Leadership Team

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

While our current MATH achievement level is 67.4% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to strive to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better.

Objective 2 Description

The entire PHS staff will continue to maximize its efforts in incorporating math instruction into all classes while the PHS Math Department continues to enhance its quality instruction strategies with its new textbooks and newly designed curriculum that is aligned to the Illinois State Learning Standards. A Math Lab has been designed and implemented during the school day to maximize the math instruction to the students. Student math performance will be assessed regularly and used to provide specific interventions to increase their ability.

No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AYP Report.

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

While our current MATH achievement level is 67.4% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to stride to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	The PHS Math department will implement a Math Lab during the homeroom time to assist any/all students in need of more detailed math instruction and assistance.	08/20/2007	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	All junior students will complete the 20+ hours Keytrain and ACT Online in preparations for the ACT/PSAE.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	PHS will continue to offer its evening ACT preparation courses in the spring semesters to enhance the students ability in mathematics.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
4	PHS will continue to give specific ACT preparation instruction during mathematics classes in the spring semesters.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	PHS and PGS teachers will conduct math articulation meetings on a regular basis to monitor curricular and assessment needs to enhance student preparation for high school.	08/20/2008	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

While our current MATH achievement level is 67.4% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to stride to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	PHS staff will have opportunities to attend professional development in their certification areas, classroom management areas, and in other areas of student interest.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	PHS staff will attend multiple in-service trainings during school improvement day activities and teachers' institutes.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	PHS staff will have opportunities to attend professional development in research-based best practices for math instruction.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
4	All PHS Math staff will receive training in the use of newly installed Smart Boards to enhance instruction.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

While our current MATH achievement level is 67.4% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to stride to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	PCUSD #326 will continue to hold annual State of the Schools meetings for parents and community members.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	The PHS Principal and Guidance Counselor will continue to send quarterly newsletters to all parents regarding strategies to remain active in their students' education.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	PHS will continue to encourage all parents of PHS students to attend the fall and spring parent-teacher conferences.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	

4	PHS will regularly update its web page for enhanced parent and community communication.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
---	---	------------	------------	---------------	-------------	--

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

While our current MATH achievement level is 67.4% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to stride to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better. The PHS Principal will continuously monitor the efforts towards meeting this objective. Staff meetings, Building Leadership Team meetings, and individual departmental team meetings will take place regularly to determine progress and future strategies. Success will be measured by the local assessments, students' final exams, students' grades, and Keytrain assessments that are completed regularly.

	Name	Title
1	Rich Thole	Principal
2	Sara Scott	Guidance Counselor
3	Sue Mercer	Building Leadership Team
4	Mike Rinella	Building Leadership Team
5	Barb Kratzer	Building Leadership Team

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3

While our current SCIENCE achievement level is 65.2% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to stride to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better

Objective 3 Description

The PHS Science Department continues to enhance its quality instruction strategies with its new textbook purchases and a newly designed 4-year curriculum that is aligned to the Illinois State Learning Standards which includes additional course offerings for the third year of science instruction.

No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AYP Report.

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

While our current SCIENCE achievement level is 65.2% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to stride to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will continue to be exposed to an innovative and comprehensive Science curriculum that has been redesigned to better emphasize the Illinois State Learning Standards.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	All junior students will complete the 20+ hours of Keytrain and ACT online in preparation for the ACT/PSAE.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	PHS will continue to offer its evening ACT preparation courses in the spring semesters to enhance the students ability in science.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
4	PHS will continue to give specific ACT preparation instruction during science classes in the spring semesters.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	PHS will build a vocabulary list help guide their instruction in the respective discipline areas and improve reading comprehension.	10/20/2008	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

While our current SCIENCE achievement level is 65.2% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to stride to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	PHS staff will have opportunities to attend professional development in their certification areas, classroom management areas, and in other	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	

	areas of student interest.					
2	PHS staff will attend multiple in-service trainings during school improvement day activities and teachers' institutes.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	PHS staff will have opportunities to attend professional development in research-based best practices for science instruction.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	All PHS Science staff will receive training in the use of newly installed Smart Boards to enhance instruction.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

While our current SCIENCE achievement level is 65.2% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to stride to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	PCUSD #326 will continue to hold annual State of the Schools meetings for parents and community members.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	The PHS Principal and Guidance Counselor will continue to send quarterly newsletters to all parents regarding strategies to remain active in their students' education.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	PHS will continue to encourage all parents of PHS students to attend the fall and spring parent-teacher conferences.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	After School	Local Funds	
4	PHS will regularly update its web page for enhanced parent and community communication.	08/20/2009	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

While our current SCIENCE achievement level is 65.2% meets/exceeds, the PHS staff will continue to stride to achieve 80% meets/exceed or better

The PHS Principal will continuously monitor the efforts towards meeting this objective. Staff meetings, Building Leadership Team meetings, and individual departmental team meetings will take place regularly to determine progress and future strategies. Success will be measured by the local assessments, students' final exams, students' grades, and Keytrain assessments that are completed regularly.

	Name	Title
1	Rich Thole	Principal
2	Sara Scott	Guidance Counselor
3	Sue Mercer	Building Leadership Team
4	Mike Rinella	Building Leadership Team
5	Barb Kratzer	Building Leadership Team

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.*)

This School Improvement Plan has been developed collaboratively between the Principal and the PHS Building Leadership Team. PHS has notified the parents and community members of the school's academic status through monthly newsletters, quarterly reports, newspaper publicity on excellent performance, web page publications, and a quarterly newspaper that the district provides to all community members.

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.

Community stakeholders consist of Superintendent, PHS Principal, Building Leadership Team members, Student Council members, Winning Communities Organization, Princeville Library Board, Princeville Village Board and many members of the community that have participated in our Annual State of the Schools meetings and in the development of our District Strategic Plan.

	Name	Title
1	Rich Thole	Principal
2	Sara Scott	Guidance Counselor
3	Chris Delbridge	PHS Staff
4	Diana Williams	PHS Staff
5	Erik Walles	PHS Staff
6	Mike Rinella	PHS Staff
7	Lisa Twidwell	PHS Staff
8	Jon Carruthers	PHS Staff
9	Mike Isaacson	PHS Staff
10	Tony Johnson	PHS Staff
11	Jeff Kratzer	PHS Staff
12	Dan Sullivan	PHS Staff
13	Mary Scheirer	PHS Staff
14	Joe Chovan	PHS Staff
15	Bill Phelps	PHS Staff
16	Tait Sennett	PHS Staff
17	Like Bonomo	PHS Staff
18	Barb Kratzer	PHS Staff
19	Sue Mercer	PHS Staff
20	Laura Walcott	PHS Staff
21	Monica Grant	PHS Staff
22	Joe House	PHS Staff

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 District's review and approval process will be discussion of the School Improvement Plan by the PHS Staff, discussions of the plan with the District Superintendent, and the presentation of the plan to the District Board of Education.

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.

Upon employment, each novice teacher meets with the building principal regarding professional expectations, professional development opportunities, annual routine business of the school, purchase orders and budgeting, the scheduling of the classes, student behaviors, and other miscellaneous requirements of being a district teacher.

Each PHS non-tenured teacher is evaluated twice annually by the building principal. The first evaluation is completed by November 1st and the second completed by March 1st. Each evaluation consists of a pre-evaluation meeting, the actual observation, and the post-evaluation meeting.

PHS staff members complete a process of peer evaluation every two years to offer other professional suggestions and an opportunity to gather new instructional ideas.

During selected School Improvement Days throughout the year, teachers have the opportunity to work in departments as well as grade level meetings to discuss the current progress of the students, curricular information, and school based programs. Also, teachers are annually involved in the school improvement peer projects to assist in the development of the school improvement plan.

During staff meetings and building leadership team meetings, teachers are given input on all decisions made in PHS. Site based management has been established with all stakeholders having a voice in the structure of the school and programs.

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.

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).

- é Require implementation of a new research-based curriculum of instructional program;
- é Extension of the school year or school day;
- é Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance;
- é Significant decrease in management authority at the school level;

12/2/2009 5:36:27 PM

- é Replacement of the principal;
- é Restructuring the internal organization of the school;
- é 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.

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

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

	Name	Title
1		

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: **12/08/2009**

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]

<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

12/2/2009 5:36:27 PM

Yes No

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

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS

Yes No

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

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No

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

Yes No N/A

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

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No

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

SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM

Yes No N/A

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

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD

Yes No

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

PART II - COMMENTS