

Local Board Approved	12/20/2010
Submitted	12/21/2010
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	12/22/2010

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

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

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		77.5			77.5			91		80	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	63.3		No	61.9		No			82.8	Yes
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	64.1	66.5	Yes	62.8	55.4	Yes			83.8	
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American													
Multiracial/Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities													
Economically Disadvantaged													

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

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

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

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

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

2010 DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

School Information	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Attendance Rate (%)	96.4	96.4	96.8	96.6	96.5	95.4	95.8	95.8
Truancy Rate (%)	0.7	0.7	0.6	2.7	0.9	1.0	2.3	3.8
Mobility Rate (%)	5.6	10.9	7.5	4.4	4.9	5.3	5.3	8.3
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	89.8	90.4	83.9	82.1	91.3	89.8	98.4	82.8
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	3.6	2.5	2.5	1.8	1.4	1.8	2.9	2.4
School Population (#)	588	599	604	608	584	599	586	581
Low Income (%)	17.7	16.4	15.7	14.3	1.4	15.7	10.1	17.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.7	1.7	2.8
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.5
White, non-Hispanic (%)	99.3	99.2	98.7	98.2	97.6	97.3	97.1	97.6
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hispanic (%)	0.3	0.3	0.7	1.3	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.1
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.3
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	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 (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	2000	99.1	-	0.7	0.2	-	-
	2001	99.3	0.2	0.2	0.4	-	-
	2002	99.6	-	0.4	-	-	-
	2003	99.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	-	-
	2004	99.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	-	-
	2005	98.7	0.3	0.7	0.3	-	-
	2006	98.2	-	1.3	0.5	-	-
	2007	97.6	-	2.1	0.3	-	-
	2008	97.3	-	2.3	0.3	-	-
	2009	97.1	-	2.4	0.5	-	-
	2010	97.6	-	2.1	0.3	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	99.1	-	0.7	0.2	-	-
	2001	99.3	0.2	0.2	0.4	-	-
	2002	99.6	-	0.4	-	-	-
	2003	99.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	-	-
	2004	99.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	-	-
	2005	98.7	0.3	0.7	0.3	-	-
	2006	98.2	-	1.3	0.5	-	-
	2007	97.6	-	2.1	0.3	-	-
	2008	97.3	-	2.3	0.3	-	-
	2009	97.1	-	2.4	0.5	-	-
	2010	97.6	-	2.1	0.3	-	-
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

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

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	-	15.2	60.7	94.8	4.5	13	2.4	4.6	89.7
	2001	-	15.4	57.0	95.5	4.6	4	0.7	4.8	81.6
	2002	-	18.2	62.0	96.0	9.1	6	1.1	3.3	87.6
	2003	-	17.7	68.5	96.4	5.6	4	0.7	3.6	89.8
	2004	-	16.4	70.0	96.4	10.9	4	0.7	2.5	90.4
	2005	-	15.7	75.0	96.8	7.5	4	0.6	2.5	83.9
	2006	0.5	14.3	75.0	96.6	4.4	16	2.7	1.8	82.1
	2007	0.5	1.4	89.0	96.5	4.9	5	0.9	1.4	91.3
	2008	1.7	15.7	89.0	95.4	5.3	6	1.0	1.8	89.8
	2009	1.7	10.1	89.0	95.8	5.3	13	2.3	2.9	98.4
2010	2.8	17.4	89.0	95.8	8.3	22	3.8	2.4	82.8	
D I S T R I C T	2000	-	15.2	60.7	94.8	4.5	13	2.4	4.6	89.7
	2001	-	15.4	57.0	95.5	4.6	4	0.7	4.8	81.6
	2002	-	18.2	62.0	96.0	9.1	6	1.1	3.3	87.6
	2003	-	17.7	68.5	96.4	5.6	4	0.7	3.6	89.8
	2004	-	16.4	70.0	96.4	10.9	4	0.7	2.5	90.4
	2005	-	15.7	75.0	96.8	7.5	4	0.6	2.5	83.9
	2006	0.5	14.3	75.0	96.6	4.4	16	2.7	1.8	82.1
	2007	0.5	1.4	89.0	96.5	4.9	5	0.9	1.4	91.3
	2008	1.7	15.7	89.0	95.4	5.3	6	1.0	1.8	89.8
	2009	1.7	10.1	89.0	95.8	5.3	13	2.3	2.9	98.4
2010	2.8	17.4	89.0	95.8	8.3	22	3.8	2.4	82.8	
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2

S T A T E	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
	2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1
	2010	7.6	45.4	96.2	93.9	13.0	72,383	3.6	3.8	87.8

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	540	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	560	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	571	-	-	-	-	-	148
	2003	588	-	-	-	-	-	138
	2004	599	-	-	-	-	-	143
	2005	604	-	-	-	-	-	157
	2006	608	-	-	-	-	-	162
	2007	584	-	-	-	-	-	157
	2008	599	-	-	-	-	-	137
	2009	586	-	-	-	-	-	132
	2010	581	-	-	-	-	-	151
D I S T R I C T	2000	540	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	560	-	-	-	-	-	143
	2002	571	-	-	-	-	-	148
	2003	588	-	-	-	-	-	138
	2004	599	-	-	-	-	-	143
	2005	604	-	-	-	-	-	157
	2006	608	-	-	-	-	-	162
	2007	584	-	-	-	-	-	157
	2008	599	-	-	-	-	-	137
	2009	586	-	-	-	-	-	132
	2010	581	-	-	-	-	-	151
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

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

Educator Data is available only for district level

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	34	21	47,801	74	27	-	18	-	-
	2001	34	22	50,998	68	32	-	19	-	-
	2002	35	21	53,440	69	31	-	18	-	-
	2003	35	18	52,762	66	34	-	19	-	-
	2004	37	18	54,350	57	43	-	19	-	-
	2005	38	17	55,983	57	43	-	19	-	-
	2006	38	16	57,913	55	45	-	18	-	-
	2007	38	16	59,386	58	42	-	18	-	-
	2008	39	15	59,834	59	41	-	19	-	-
	2009	39	15	62,973	59	41	-	18	-	-
2010	38	15	64,711	55	45	-	18	-	-	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1
2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1	

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

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

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

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grade 11						
Groups	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	57.9	54.7	54.2	64.1	64.3	63.3
White	58.0	55.0	54.0	65.1	63.6	64.6
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	5.3	9.1	7.1	10.5	7.7
Low Income	40.9	20.0	45.8	64.3	47.3	62.5

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

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

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grade 11						
Groups	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	53.7	59.9	57.4	61.1	50.4	61.2
White	53.8	60.3	57.3	62.0	51.3	62.5
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	10.5	9.1	14.3	-	-
Low Income	40.9	40.0	41.7	28.5	26.4	58.3

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?

STRENGTHS:

1. One hundred percent of CCHS students were tested in both reading and mathematics; this is 5% higher than the State AYP minimum target of 95% in each subject area.
2. In “Overall Performance - All State Tests” the performance of CCHS students increased from 2008-09 to 2009-10; the percentage in 2009 was 56.7% and rose to 62.3% in 2010.
3. In “Overall Prairie State Achievement Examination” performance, CCHS student performance increased from 2008-09 to 2009-10; the percentages were 57.2% in 2009 and rose to 63.2% in 2010.
4. Also in “Overall PSAE” performance, students at CCHS had higher percentages than the State-wide averages in 2008-09 and 2009-10. In 2008-09 the school had 57.2% compared to the State’s average of only 53%; in 2009-10 the school had 63.0% compared to the State’s average of 53.0%.
5. When comparing 2009-10 school and State reading performance on the PSAE, CCHS had 63.3% meeting or exceeding, compared to the State’s average for meeting or exceeding at only 54.0%.
6. When comparing 2009-10 school and State reading subgroup performance on the PSAE, CCHS students exceeded State scores in “female”, “non-IEP”, and “free/reduced lunch” subgroups.
7. From 2008-09 to 2009-10, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding state standards in mathematics on the PSAE for CCHS increased from 50.4% to 61.2%.

8. When comparing 2009-10 school and State mathematics performance on the PSAE, CCHS had 61.2% meeting or exceeding compared to the State's average of only 52.7%.
9. When comparing 2009-10 school and State mathematics performance on the PSAE, CCHS students exceeded State average scores in the subgroups for "males", "females", "non-IEP", and "free/reduced lunch" students.
10. In 2009-10 for both reading and mathematics, CCHS "white" subgroup populations met Safe Harbor standards (64.1% and 62.8%, respectively).
11. Since 2006, the composite percents of "meets and exceeds" for CCHS students has been higher than the State-wide composite percentage; in addition, the 2010 composite "meets and exceeds" is the highest in the schools AYP history.
12. ACT assessment (graduating class of 2010) showed CCHS students outperforming the State-wide averages in the "Composite", "English", "Reading" and "Science" portions of the test. In "Mathematics", CCHS students were only 0.2% lower than the State-wide average.

WEAKNESSES:

1. In both reading and mathematics in the "All" category, CCHS students did not meet AYP (63.3% in reading and 61.9% in mathematics); the AYP standard for 2010 was 77.5%.
2. Traditionally, CCHS has a low percentage of students that score in the "exceeds" category (in 2010 reading results for CCHS was 3.4% compared to the State average of 9.9%) (in 2010 mathematics results for CCHS was 3.4% compared to the State average of 10.3%).
3. CCHS needs to improve the percentage of students moving from the "does not meet" (34% in reading and 35.4% in mathematics) to the "meets" category.
4. Continued attention to the performance of IEP students is critical to overall school testing performance. While 13 IEP students were tested in 2010, 12 of those 13 students scored in the "Does Not Meet or Warning" categories.

5. **Gender performance is an area that will continue to be monitored.** In 2010 “females” out performed their “male” counterparts by significant margins (Reading - “meets and exceeds for females was 77.5% and males only 46.3%. In mathematics “meets and exceeds” for females was 66.3% compared to 55.2% for the male test takers). Although in previous years there has been a fluctation in gender performance where males have outperformed females.
6. Results of the “Parent Involvement Survey” indicated a desire for more teacher initiated communication, especially as it relates to student performance.

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

EXTERNAL FACTORS:

1. The percent of students at CCHS that are classified as “low-income” is 17.4%; this is significantly less than the State average.
2. The percent of students that are classified as “limited English-proficient” is 2.8%; this is significantly less than the statewide average of 7.6%.
3. CCHS has a low “mobility rate” of only 8.3%, compared to the statewide rate of 13.0%.
4. CCHS is a single building high school district that receives students from 7 separate public elementary school districts and another 1 private/parochial schools.

INTERNAL FACTORS:

1. CCHS has a “drop out rate” of only 2.4%.
2. The average class size for CCHS is small, approximately 15.8 students per class period.
3. The disparity in comparing ISAT (feeder school assessment results) with PSAE (high school state assessment) results leads to communication difficulties for curriculum articulation and in many cases a false sense of preparation for high school coursework.
4. Although parental support for the overall school program is high, parental involvement and participation in academic student success is not at the level desired.
5. CCHS has a long held value for their internal school improvement efforts. This dynamic is supported by a collaborative environment and culture that values excellence.
6. The number of students taking a core curriculum (as defined by ACT designation) is low and has a negative impact on preparation for PSAE success.

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

1. The CCHS school improvement team will develop a series of strategies to review the following:
 - An analysis of student coursework within the mathematics department.
 - Review the standards (Illinois Learning Standards and Common Core Standards) by departments (at least in Language Arts and Mathematics) and conduct an analysis to determine where standards are taught, if duplication exists, and to identify curriculum gaps.
 - Identify some means to determine the level of research-based teaching methods that are being employed within CCHS classrooms.
2. Curriculum content, instructional materials, student placement procedures, and teaching methods will be reviewed with an eye toward higher expectations for

those students that traditionally fall within the “meets” category.

3. Curriculum content, instructional materials and teaching methods will be reviewed with an eye toward higher expectations for IEP students.
4. The CCHS school improvement team will continue to monitor student gender performance in order to make determinations regarding the need for...
 - Curriculum adjustments
 - Adjusted teaching methods
 - Gender related staff development
5. The CCHS school improvement team will consider the results of the November 16, 2010 “Parents Self-Study” with an eye toward...
 - Improving parent/school/teacher communication.
 - The formation of a “School Community Council”.
 - The development of formal parent training and parent support activities.

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?

Central Community High School uses the ACT testing program for grades 9 to 11. All 9th grade students are administered the EXPLORE assessment in October of each year. Tenth grade students take the PLAN assessment in October of each year, and the ACT is administered in April of each year as a part of the PSAE testing battery. CCHS has implemented a Response to Intervention program to assist at-risk students.

The data from these assessment tools indicate how well our students are doing within their grade level on both local and national norms in the fields of English, math, reading and science. The EXPLORE exam provides a predictive score for the PLAN exam. In turn, the PLAN test results, along with the student's coursework, provides a predictive score on the ACT exam.

The school also receives an item analysis for each subject area. This information is shared with department teams along with a copy of sample test items. This information is used to exam the curriculum validity. Another benefit of the EXPLORE and PLAN testing experience is that familiarizes students with the ACT testing format.

EXPLORE ANALYSIS: 2009-10 (Class of 2013) - 156 tested

STRENGTHS:

English

- Sixty-one percent scored above the 50th percentile in English. Twenty-six percent scored at the 75th percentile or above in English.
- Sixty-nine percent scored above the 50th percentile in Usage/Mechanics.
- Thirty-eight students scored above 20 in English (highest possible score is 25) on the EXPLORE English test.

Mathematics

- Sixty-three percent scored above the 50th percentile in mathematics. Twenty-two percent scored at the 75th percentile or above in mathematics.
- Twenty-seven students scored above 20 in mathematics.

WEAKNESSES

- Twenty-nine percent scored between the 25th and the 49th percentile in English.
- Only 56% of the students scored above the 50th percentile in rhetorical skills.
- Only 56% of the student scored above the 50% in reading.
- Females were equal to males in mathematics, but scored higher on all other testing areas.
- Thirty (30) of the 156 students in the Class of 2013 have an IEP placement.

PLAN ANALYSIS: 2009-10 (Class of 2012) - 152 tested

STRENGTHS

- Sixty-five percent of the students scored above the 50th percentile for a "composite score".

English

- Sixty-seven percent of the students scored at or above the 50th percentile in usage/mechanics.
- Seventy-five percent of the students scored at or above the 50th percentile in rhetorical skills.

Mathematics

- Sixty-four percent of the students scored above the 50th percentile in mathematics.
- Seventy-five percent of the students scored above the 50th percentile in geometry skills.

WEAKNESSES

- Only 56% of students scored above the 50th percentile in English
- Only 58% of students scored above the 50th percentile in reading.
- Thirty percent of the students scored between the 25th and the 49th percentile in pre-algebra/algebra skills.
- Compared to the previous year, all sub-group scores were lower than the preceding year.

ACT 2009 ANALYSIS: (Class of 2010) - 156 tested

- Students are above state averages in all subject areas except college algebra.
- The five-year trend line is down slightly in all areas except science
- Core students dropped from 2008 in all subject areas except science
- The math score was at an all time low of 22.4, which compares the highest in 2005 of 23.8.
- Non-core students improved their reading scores to 19.2 which is an increase from the 17.4 score recorded in 2005.

RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION (RtI) PROGRAM ANALYSIS

- CCHS utilizes a Response to Intervention program to address students not meeting in the areas of reading and math.
- The deficits are identified through the results of the Explore & Plan assessments

- There are currently 21 ninth graders that have been identified as not meeting in reading and/or math

- * 7 out of the 21 were identified in both reading and math
- * 12 out the 21 are receiving instruction only in math skills
- * 2 out of the 21 are receiving additional instruction exclusively in reading skills
- * 15 out of the 21 are males

31 Sophomores have been identified as not meeting in the areas of reading and/or math

- * 4 students are receiving additional instruction exclusively in reading skills
- * 27 students are receiving additional instruction in only math skills
- * 13 out the 31 have been identified with deficits in both reading and math
- * 13 out of the 31 are males

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

- When tested at the freshman level students have only been taught by CCHS teachers for two months. Therefore, test scores primarily reflect knowledge learned in grade schools. Central Community High Schools receives students from 8 different (7 public and 1 parochial) feeder school organizations.
- The increase in the English sub-components on the PLAN test is a result of one full year of instruction within the CCHS English curriculum.
- The lower than desired reading scores has been an on-going problem - especially with comprehension skill attainment.
- The majority of "at-risk" students at CCHS are male (34 males compared to only 12 females), which has some impact on the gender disparity concerns.
- The current sophomore class (Class of 2013) has an unusually high number (30) of students with IEP placements.
- When sophomores take the PLAN test for pre-algebra/algebra skills, those students enrolled in Algebra A or B may not have been taught the content at the time of testing.
- Too many CCHS students are taking a "non-core" high school schedule, which negatively impacts their potential to score well throughout the ACT (Explore, Plan, & ACT) test series.
- Currently, 31 Sophomores have been identified through the Plan assessment of being in danger of not meeting in reading and/or math on the ACT
- 21 Freshmen have been identified through the Explore assessment of being in danger of not meeting in reading and/or math on the ACT

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

- Continue to refine reading instruction and reading supports in order to improve student performance.
- Utilize all mathematics assessment tools and conduct data analysis in order to ascertain specific student weaknesses.
- Continue to analyze language arts assessment results in order to make informed decisions regarding individual specific skill set performance with an emphasis on rhetorical skills.
- CCHS will continue reading and/or math supports along with tutorial services to ensure student success on assessments and in core classes
- CCHS will continue curriculum reviews to ensure scientifically researched teaching methods and materials
- CCHS will use these results to address students' deficits in reading and math in order to assist students in meeting in the areas of math and reading on the PSAE/ACT.

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?

Central Community High School is blessed to be supported by a viable school community. A review of the parent section of this document will share results of the recently completed (November 16, 2010) Parent Involvement Analysis process. Most indicators from the review were very positive. Central High School lies within the community of Breese, Illinois which is also home to private parochial high school. The proximity of two very competitive (academics, athletics and other extra-curriculars) high schools within the same small community does cause a unique dynamic, perspective for decision-making, and view in the eyes of community members.

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

Community support for the local public high school is not always the same as enjoyed within most small southern Illinois communities.

The EAV behind each student at Central High School is greater than average, which provides for a very adequate level of local financial support. The instructional expenditure per pupil is \$4,345 and the operating expenditure per pupil is \$11,117.

The scope of the school curriculum in the arts and in some advanced levels of science, math, and technology is impacted by the small school enrollment (it is not economically feasible to justify classes with 12 or fewer student enrolled in the class).

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

The need for Central Community High School to be as proactive as possible in parent and community outreach is critical in order to gain/maintain the support of our patrons. The implications for renewed efforts at parent communication, parent involvement, and parent support for the educational development of their child(red) is imperative.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)

Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

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

All Central Community High School teachers are "highly qualified". In addition, no teachers utilize "emergency or provisional" certificates to teach their classes.

The average teacher at CCHS has 14.6 years of teaching experience. This exceeds the statewide average of only 12.7 years of experience.

Currently, 44.7 % of CCHS teachers have a Masters Degree or above. Due to a recent employments and youthful infusion of retirement replacements, this is 12.7% below the statewide average of 57.4% of teachers with Masters Degree or above.

Recent staff development programs have emerged from the leadership of the School Improvement Team. However, those staff development efforts have tended to be delivered in a manner that provides new information, but little follow-up in terms of changes to the teaching and learning culture at Central Community High School.

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

A review of the staff qualifications provides no apparent lack of capacity for the faculty and staff to be able to address school improvement in a systemic and focused manner. The current staff has demonstrated, over the past several years, the ability to make improvements in student performance through the leadership of the School Improvement Team. It is noteworthy that those improvements have been accomplished in both reading and in mathematics scores. The formula for the previous school improvement efforts has been based on professional learning communities dialogue focused on specific problems and then supported by a focused staff development program. Those efforts should be continued, yet be ever-responsive to changes in our knowledge base (research-based materials and methods) and to changes in the data results.

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

The School Improvement Team will set into place a series of self-reflection strategies to assess the current materials and instructional methods utilized to teach reading (language arts) and mathematics.

Based upon the findings from the above reflection strategies, the School Improvement Team and the faculty members will collaborate on the development of very specific strategies to impact improved student performance, especially as it relates to ...

- * a greater percentage of students moving into the exceeds category;
- * a greater percentage of students with IEP's being able to perform as a "meets" student in reading and mathematics;
- * a greater percentage of students moving into "meets" category from "does not meet" category.

The building administration will continue to place a high priority on providing direction and support for the efforts of the school improvement team. Moreover, the administration will review their supervisory roles to assure that (a) effective teaching methods/practices are being evaluated/supported, and (b) that they are aware of the

specified curriculum content for each class and monitor that said content is being taught with fidelity.

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

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

These results were taken from the Parent Involvement Analysis completed by teachers and parents on November 16, 2010.

STRENGTHS:

1. The level of parental support is an overall asset at Central Community High School. Student character, respect, and civility are all assets that reflect that support.
2. A wide-range of curricular offerings for college bound and vocational students are available within the curriculum. In addition, a viable school improvement team has been in place for several years and has had a positive impact on student performance.
3. There is a sense of pride in the physical plant and in the level of school spirit within Central Community High School.
4. The leadership displayed by teachers and administrators sets a positive tone for high school student performance.
5. The school has demonstrated the capacity to provide special support to students that are facing classroom challenges.

WEAKNESSES:

1. Parents would like to see more teacher-initiated communication (both positive comments and negative concerns) provided in a variety of forms (email, telephone calls, hand written notes, etc.).

2. The existing culture at Central Community High School is one where both parents and teachers are very responsive to student needs. However, during the self-study process, both teachers and parents recognized a need for all parties to become more proactive (rather than reactive) in support of students.
3. The School Improvement Team, along with parent representatives, should further explore Wise Ways and other resources as a means of encouraging additional parent involvement.
4. The school administration, the School Improvement Team, and the Title I staff at Central Community High School, should collaborate in the development of a set of parental training/support programs aimed at improved parent involvement in support of their child's school performance.
5. The School Improvement Team should give serious consideration to the use of peer tutors as a means of developing additional tutoring manpower for individual and small groups of students.
6. The School Improvement Team should periodically examine the necessity for greater standardization regarding homework and study skills procedures.

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

Generally the parents and homes of CCHS students have been very supportive of education in general. However, expanded parent involvement strategies beyond general communication (ie. Handbook Committee, Open House, Title I program, PAWS Organization, Committee to Support Central, etc.) are desired.

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

A more proactive effort to increase parental support has the potential to increase student performance within specific skill sets that students must attain in order to be successful.

Providing parent training and parent support activities has potential for impacting "at-risk" students.

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?

1. The CCHS school improvement team will develop a series of strategies to review the following:

- An analysis of student coursework within the mathematics department.
- Review the standards (Illinois Learning Standards and Common Core Standards) by departments (at least in language arts and mathematics) and conduct an analysis to determine where standards are taught, if duplications exist, and to identify curriculum gaps.
- Identify some means to determine the level of research-based teaching methods that are being employed within CCHS classrooms.

2. Curriculum content, instructional materials, student placement procedures, and teaching methods will be reviewed with an eye toward higher expectations for those students that traditionally fall within the "meets" category.

3. Curriculum content, instructional materials and teaching methods will be reviewed with an eye toward higher expectations for IEP students.

4. The CCHS school improvement team will continue to monitor student gender performance in order to make determinations regarding the need for...

- Curriculum adjustments
- Adjusted teaching methods
- Gender related staff development

5. The CCHS school improvement team will consider the results of the November 16, 2010 "Parents Self-Study" with an eye toward...

- Improving parent/school/teacher communication.
- The formation of a "School Community Council".
- The development of formal parent training and parent support activities.

6. Continue to refine reading instruction and reading supports in order to improve student performance.
7. Utilize all mathematics assessment tools and conduct data analysis in order to ascertain specific student weaknesses.
8. Continue to analyze language arts assessment results in order to make informed decisions regarding individual specific skill set performance with an emphasis on rhetorical skills.
9. The School Improvement Team will set into place a series of self-reflection strategies to assess the current materials and instructional methods utilized to teach reading (language arts) and mathematics.
10. Based upon the findings from the above reflection strategies, the School Improvement Team and the impacted faculty members will collaborate on the development of very specific strategies to impact improved student performance, especially as it relates to ...
 - * a greater percentage of students moving into the exceeds category;
 - * a greater percentage of students with IEP's being able to perform as a "meets" student in reading and mathematics;
 - * a greater percentage of students moving into "meets" category from "does not meet" category.
11. The building administration will continue to place a high priority on providing direction and support for the efforts of the school improvement team. Moreover, the administration will review their supervisory roles to assure that (a.) effective teaching methods/practices are being evaluated/supported, and (b.) that they are aware of the specified curriculum content for each class and monitor that said content is being taught with fidelity.
12. A more proactive effort to increase parental support has the potential to increase student performance within specific skill sets that students must attain in order to be successful.
13. Providing parent training and parent support activities has potential for impacting "at-risk" students.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Students at Central Community High School will meet AYP standard (85% in 2011, and 92.5% in 2012) and/or Safe Harbor guidelines in reading.	1,
2	All students will meet AYP standards (85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012) or Safe Harbor guidelines in mathematics for 2011 and 2012.	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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Students at Central Community High School will meet AYP standard (85% in 2011, and 92.5% in 2012) and/or Safe Harbor guidelines in reading.

Objective 1 Description

Students at Central Community High School will meet AYP standard (85% in 2011, and 92.5% in 2012) and/or Safe Harbor guidelines in reading.

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

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students at Central Community High School will meet AYP standard (85% in 2011, and 92.5% in 2012) and/or Safe Harbor guidelines in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	The CCHS SIT will develop and implement a series of strateiges designed to emphasize reading/writing response strategies throughout the school facility. Completion of this activity will be verified by artifacts developed by the SIT.	01/03/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
2	The CCHS SIT will identify and initiate the use of a reading diagnostic instrument that will help make informed decisons regarding student mastery of individual student reading skills. The assessment results will be used to verify completion of this activity.	01/03/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	4,500
3	Review the Common Core Standards against existing school curriculum maps in order to anticipate changes that will be required as those new standards come online. Departmental and SIT team records will verify completion of this activity.	01/03/2011	05/31/2012	During School	State Funds	5,000
4	The CCHS SIT will continue to utilize existing templates for the language arts curriculum cycle. SIT and departmental records will verify completion of this activity.	08/17/2011	05/31/2012	After School	Local Funds	0
5	The CCHS SIT will develop a set of guidelines and training activities necessary to proactively integrate higher order thinking skills within all CCHS classrooms. Teacher records submitted to the SIT will be used to document this activity.	01/03/2011	05/31/2012	Before School	Local Funds	0

6	The CCHS SIT will develop formalized assessment strategies (ie. Auto Skills) designed to measure the effectiveness of existing, and the need for additional, student support services. Assessment data will be used to verify completion of this activity.	08/18/2010	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	3,000
7	The CCHS SIT will conduct a joint "language arts curriculum cycle review" with regular and special education areas. This should ensure that special education students are prepared for success on the PSAE. Departmental records will be used to verify this work.	08/17/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students at Central Community High School will meet AYP standard (85% in 2011, and 92.5% in 2012) and/or Safe Harbor guidelines in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All staff will receive information and training on the Common Core Standards as they impact reading/writing instruction at Central Comm. High School. Training agendas and training materials will be available to document completion of this activity.	06/06/2011	05/31/2012	After School	State Funds	5,000
2	The SIT will develop materials and provide specific training strategies that will support individual teacher implementation of the writing/reading response and higher order thinking skills within all classrooms.	01/03/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Selected staff members will be trained on the administration and analysis of the selected diagnostic reading assessment tool.	01/03/2011	05/31/2012	After School	Local Funds	3,000

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students at Central Community High School will meet AYP standard (85% in 2011, and 92.5% in 2012) and/or Safe Harbor guidelines in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will be provided with written communication regarding results of pre-test and post-test reading assessments. The administering teacher will be responsible for sending out said communication. Copies will be maintained for monitoring purposes.	08/17/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Parents will be offered opportunities designed to provide insights regarding reading achievement levels for their child. Copies of parent programs and log-in sheets will be maintained in order to verify completion of this activity.	08/17/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Language Arts Common Core Standards will be communicated to parents via the school website. A review of the school website will verify this activity.	08/17/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Students at Central Community High School will meet AYP standard (85% in 2011, and 92.5% in 2012) and/or Safe Harbor guidelines in reading.

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

The members of the School Improvement Team will monitor each initiative set forth within this objective by applying the specific criteria included within the strategy and activity description. Generally this includes artifacts, communications, and other products necessary to evaluate effectiveness. In some cases teacher and student products will also be utilized.

The building principal will conduct periodic walk-throughs and will conduct periodic conference with language arts teachers to monitor that the core reading curriculum is being taught in a consistent manner and with fidelity.

Additional means to monitor student reading process will include - attendance, truancy, academic course grades in all subjects, office discipline referrals, and grade point averages.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	Name	Title
1	Kevin Meyer	Superintendent
2	Kent Jones	Principal
3	Trisha Lohman	Guidance
4	Kurt Peters	Social Science
5	Cris Toennies	Special Education
6	Nathan Rueter	Physical Education/Health/Driver Education
7	Angela Kohlbrecher	Mathematics
8	Katie Florczyk	Language Arts
9	Jim Falconio	Fine Arts/Foreign Language
10	Ken Schonhoff	Vocational Education
11	Karrie Kujawa	Science

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

All students will meet AYP standards (85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012) or Safe Harbor guidelines in mathematics for 2011 and 2012.

Objective 2 Description

All students will meet AYP standards (85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012) or Safe Harbor guidelines in mathematics for 2011 and 2012.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

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

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

Objective 2 Title :

All students will meet AYP standards (85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012) or Safe Harbor guidelines in mathematics for 2011 and 2012.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	The CCHS SIT will meet with the mathematics department faculty in order to develop enhanced strategies for PSAE test preparation. Notes from the departmental meetings and the implementation notes for the enhanced test preparation practices will be used to verify completion of this task.	01/03/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Review the Common Core Standards against existing school curriculum maps in order to anticipate changes that will be required as those new standards come online. Departmental and SIT team records will verify completion of this activity.	01/31/2011	05/31/2012	After School	State Funds	5,000
3	The CCHS SIT will continue to utilize existing templates for the mathematics curriculum cycle. SIT and departmental records will verify completion of this activity.	08/16/2010	05/31/2012	After School	Local Funds	0
4	The CCHS SIT will develop a set of guidelines and training activities necessary to proactively integrate higher order thinking skills within all CCHS classrooms. Teacher records submitted to the SIT will be used to document this activity.	01/03/2011	05/31/2012	After School	Local Funds	0
	The CCHS SIT will develop formalized assessment strateiges (ie. Auto					

5	Skills) designed to measure the effectiveness of existing, and the need for additional, student support services. Assessment data will be used to verify completion of this activity.	08/18/2010	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	3,000
6	The CCHS SIT will conduct a joint "mathematics" curriculum cycle review" with regular and special education areas. This should ensure that special education students are prepared for success on the PSAE. Departmental records will be used to verify this work.	01/03/2011	05/31/2012	After School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 2 Title :

All students will meet AYP standards (85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012) or Safe Harbor guidelines in mathematics for 2011 and 2012.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All staff will receive information and training on the Common Core Standards as they impact mathematics instruction at Central Comm. High School. Training agendas and training materials will be available to document completion of this activity.	06/06/2011	05/31/2012	Before School	Local Funds	5,000
2	The SIT will develop materials and provide specific training strategies that will support individual teacher implementation of the higher order thinking skills within all classrooms.	01/03/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 2 Title :

All students will meet AYP standards (85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012) or Safe Harbor guidelines in mathematics for 2011 and 2012.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Mathematics Common Core Standards will be communicated to parents via the school website. A review of the school website will verify this activity.	01/03/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

All students will meet AYP standards (85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012) or Safe Harbor guidelines in mathematics for 2011 and 2012.

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 members of the School Improvement Team will monitor each initiative set forth within this objective by applying the specific criteria included within the strategy and activity description. Generally this includes artifacts, communications, and other products necessary to evaluate effectiveness. In some cases teacher and student products will also be utilized.

The building principal will conduct periodic walk-throughs and will conduct periodic conference with mathematics teachers to monitor that the core mathematics curriculum is being taught in a consistent manner and with fidelity.

Additional means to monitor student math process will include - attendance, truancy, academic course grades in all subjects, office discipline referrals, and grade point averages. Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	Name	Title
1	Kevin Meyer	Superintendent
2	Kent Jones	Principal

3	Trisha Lohman	Guidance
4	Cris Toennies	Special Education
5	Kurt Peters	Social Studies
6	Nathan Rueter	Physical Education/Health/Driver Education
7	Karrie Kujawa	Science
8	Angela Kohlbrecher	Mathematics
9	Katie Florczyk	Language Arts
10	Jim Falconio	Fine Arts/Foreign Language
11	Karrie Kujawa	Vocational Education
12	Tina Winkeler	Parent
13	Ann Schroeder	Parent
14	Alicia Strieker	Parent
15	Joanna Rakers	Parent

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation
Part A. Parent Notification*

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

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

A letter was mailed home to the parents of each student attending CCHS on November 29, 2010 that explained the results of the 2010 NCLB status. In that same letter parents were notified that the school's 2010 school report card was accessible via the school website.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation
Part B. Stakeholder Involvement

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

Teachers were notified of the AYP status of Central Community High School at the beginning of the 2010-11 school term.

The Parent Involvement Analysis was completed on November 16, 2010.

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

The School Improvement Team reviewed and endorsed this School Improvement Plan on December 10, 2010.

The School Improvement Plan was approved by the Central Community High School District #71 on December 20, 2010.

Copies of the School Improvement Plan will be shared with faculty and staff in January, 2011.

	Name	Title
1	Kevin Meyer	Superintendent
2	Kent Jones	Principal
3	Trisha Lohman	Guidance
4	Cris Toennies	Special Education
5	Kurt Peters	Social Studies
6	Nathan Rueter	Physical Education/Health/Driver Education
7	Karrie Kujawa	Science
8	Angela Kohlbrecher	Mathematics
9	Katie Florczyk	Language Arts
10	Jim Falconio	Fine Arts/Foreign Language
11	Ken Schonhoff	Vocational Education
12	Ami Shanafelt	Language Arts/Title I Director
13	Tina Winkeler	Parent
14	Ann Schroeder	Parent
15	Alicia Strieker	Parent
16	Joanna Rakers	Parent
17		
18		
19		
20		

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.

Mrs. Jennifer Garrison and Mrs. Wendy Davis reviewed the School Improvement Plan on December 7, 2010. Both individuals are practicing superintendent within ROE #13. Mrs. Garrison is an unit district superintendent, while Mrs. Davis is a high school district superintendent.

Comments from Mrs. Garrison:

"The Central Community High School plan is well written and fulfills the requirements of the I.S.B.E. I noted that CCHS students had higher scores than the state averages in several areas. You have identified that there is an achievement gap between males and females in the plan and have addressed it with target area goals in the plan."

Comments from Mrs. Davis:

"Subsequent to a request to peer review Central Community High School's School Improvement Plan, I found the plan to be well-written with a focus on targeting the needs of students. Upon completion of the review, the plan looks to be complete and fulfills the requirements of the Illinois State 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.

Central Community High School has developed a mentoring program as a means to guide and direct teachers through their first year(s) at the school. A selection process for a mentor is an important step in this process. The administration attempts to match first-year teachers with an individual from the same department but also considers proximity in the building and other factors such as personal dynamics and interaction. We attempt to match people who will build a close professional relationship, who are respected among other staff members, and able to devote time on a daily, weekly, and monthly basis in order to be effective.

The role for the new teacher is to accept and actively peruse professional development and growth as an educator. It is of the utmost importance for the new teacher to take part in self-analysis and peer-analysis as well as training for any professional growth can take place. The individual must be willing to identify their own needs and areas of concern so that they may benefit from the experience of those at the school in a manner that can achieve the ultimate goal in providing the best possible education to students. This includes attending regular meetings, perceiving the mentoring program as an opportunity for professional growth, working cooperatively with mentor and administrator, and keeping a reflective journal for future reference.

The role for the mentor teacher is to provide continual support and encouragement to the new teacher offering counsel to assist that person in having a succesful start to their career and work at C.C.H.S. This includes assisting in understanding responsibilities inherent in the profession, maintaining confidentiality, meeting regularly, serving as a role model, completing peer observations, helping to maintain effective classroom management, and offering constructive feedback regarding classroom practices.

The administration also serves as the backbone of the mentoring program by offering support and guidance for everyone involved. Although daily involvement is not necessary, the administration must provide close collaboration between mentor and helps to foster an attitude of teamwork and support. This involvement includes assigning the mentor/teacher relationship, offering time for collaboration, providing assistance to them as needed, evaluating the effectiveness of the program, and refraining from inquiring on information from the mentor teacher without the new teacher's knowledge.

It is our objective to help everyone at C.C.H.S. be a part of a positive educational team making sure that individual success translates into success as an organization. By providing a teacher mentoring program, Central Community High School is committed to providing the best possible educational experiences for our teachers and students.

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.

Central Community High School District #71 level administration and Board of Education are very active in supporting school improvement efforts and professional development activities. These support mechanisms include:

Designated school improvement days,

Scheduled professional development days coordinated by the SIT,

On-going school improvement team is in place and highly functional,

Provide technology to support instruction,

Provide staff developmet activities to support the instructional program and required substitute teachers to support these activities.

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.

Central Community High School receives System of Support services through the Regional Office of Education. The Innovation and Improvement Division of the Illinois State Board of Education has provided technical assistance and access to the IIRC.

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

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 12/20/2010

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<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

December 22, 2010

Overall, you have provided sufficient guidance to plan implementers. I hope that as you implement this plan you can collect data that will guide your next steps. Throughout the plan, you have discussed work that matters, that is focused, and shows oversight.

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

Respectfully, Carol Diedrichsen ISBE Innovation and Improvement

ROE consultant comments:

The Central Community High School SIP is the product of an engaged school improvement team. This group has a clear understanding of their areas of deficiency and has developed and articulated specific strategies designed to provide direction for school improvement. The school improvement plan is a result of the analysis for both state and local assessment data combined with a realistic appraisal of the factors affecting the instructional processes at Central Community High School.

Central Community High School benefits from a long-standing culture of administrative - teacher - community collaboration. This school improvement plan emerged from the foundation provided by previous school improvement plan efforts that were developed prior to this required school improvement plan.

One of the special elements of this school improvement plan was the "value added" by the school's decision to complete the ISBE parent involvement analysis. The products of that process have been incorporated throughout the school improvement planning process. Moreover, true (not teachers who also happen to be parents) parent representatives were involved in the plan development.

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

Yes No 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

Yes No

Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]

Yes No

Does the SIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes? [C]

PEER REVIEW

Yes No

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

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS

Yes No

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

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]

Yes No N/A If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation? [C]

SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM

Yes No N/A Have the names and titles of School Support Team members been listed in the plan? Does the team appear to have the expertise to support this school in regards to the school improvement plan? [C]

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD

Yes No The plan indicates the approval date of this plan. [C]

PART II - COMMENTS

Central Community High School is not under any level of restructuring requirements. All of the elements included within this section of the monitoring process have been fully addressed within this school improvement plan. Moreover both the administration (superintendent and principal) and the full membership of the Central Community High School Improvement Team have taken responsibility for conducting this school improvement process in a very professional and spirited manner. It is anticipated that genuine school improvement will result from these efforts.