

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	11/11/2009
Submitted	11/12/2009
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	77.7		Yes	87.2		Yes	95.6	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	77.7		Yes	87.2		Yes				
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 (%)	96.3	95.2	91.1	95.7	96.0	95.2	95.7	95.6
Truancy Rate (%)	-	0.8	-	-	-	-	-	0.7
Mobility Rate (%)	12.7	11.7	10.2	7.8	-	13.0	12.0	15.1
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	161	149	147	135	132	126	178	177
Low Income (%)	34.8	43.6	50.3	51.1	56.1	47.6	41.6	42.9
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	-	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.9	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	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 4 - Student Race/Ethnicity

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	2000	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	99.4	0.6	-	-	-	-
	2002	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2007	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	98.9	-	-	-	-	1.1
	2009	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	99.7	0.3	-	-	-	-
	2002	99.1	-	0.6	0.3	-	-
	2003	99.4	-	0.3	0.3	-	-
	2004	99.3	-	0.3	0.3	-	-
	2005	99.0	-	0.7	0.3	-	-
	2006	99.3	-	-	0.7	-	-
	2007	98.9	-	-	-	-	1.1
	2008	99.2	-	-	-	-	0.8
	2009	99.2	-	0.8	-	-	-
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

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

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	-	16.6	94.8	96.5	31.4	-	-	-	-
	2001	-	34.5	94.8	95.1	14.5	-	-	-	-
	2002	-	34.8	98.0	96.3	12.7	-	-	-	-
	2003	0.7	43.6	100.0	95.2	11.7	1	0.8	-	-
	2004	-	50.3	100.0	91.1	10.2	-	-	-	-
	2005	-	51.1	100.0	95.7	7.8	-	-	-	-
	2006	-	56.1	100.0	96.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2007	-	47.6	100.0	95.2	13.0	-	-	-	-
	2008	-	41.6	100.0	95.7	12.0	-	-	-	-
	2009	-	42.9	100.0	95.6	15.1	1	0.7	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	-	23.0	88.6	94.8	24.8	-	-	-	90.3
	2001	-	33.2	89.5	95.0	14.0	4	1.3	4.6	75.0
	2002	-	34.9	73.9	95.1	11.1	7	2.1	-	96.7
	2003	0.3	38.7	95.6	94.6	11.6	1	0.4	3.4	90.5
	2004	-	44.4	92.3	90.2	11.6	-	-	-	100.0
	2005	-	43.4	97.7	95.5	8.0	-	-	-	100.0
	2006	-	47.6	97.2	95.0	8.2	-	-	1.2	100.0
	2007	-	36.2	97.9	95.0	9.8	-	-	2.4	95.8
	2008	-	37.8	100.0	94.9	10.7	-	-	1.3	100.0
	2009	-	37.1	100.0	95.1	12.9	3	1.4	1.6	92.9
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6

S T A T E	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
	2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	151	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	168	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	161	28	23	26	-	-	-
	2003	149	17	26	23	-	-	-
	2004	147	24	16	25	-	-	-
	2005	135	20	26	12	-	-	-
	2006	132	11	17	23	-	-	-
	2007	126	17	11	20	-	-	-
	2008	178	29	16	10	18	17	-
	2009	177	13	27	15	15	17	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	339	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	331	-	-	-	-	-	30
	2002	332	28	23	26	33	24	20
	2003	315	17	26	23	24	31	17
	2004	306	24	16	25	19	25	18
	2005	297	20	26	12	23	16	23
	2006	273	11	17	23	24	21	19
	2007	265	17	11	20	12	24	25
	2008	254	29	16	10	18	17	15
	2009	240	13	27	15	15	17	12
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816

S T A T E	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2,044,539	164,413	157,570	159,499	160,924	156,451	138,559
	2004	2,060,048	161,329	160,246	158,367	162,933	160,271	139,504
	2005	2,062,912	156,370	158,622	160,365	162,047	162,192	142,828
	2006	2,075,277	155,155	154,372	158,822	160,362	160,911	147,500
	2007	2,077,856	155,356	153,480	154,719	162,594	159,038	150,475
	2008	2,074,167	155,578	152,895	153,347	160,039	161,310	149,710
	2009	2,070,125	156,512	152,736	152,820	155,433	158,700	144,822

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

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

Educator Data is available only for district level

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	35	13	30,084	74	26	13	9	-	-
	2001	33	12	30,969	79	21	16	7	-	-
	2002	32	12	32,076	68	32	16	8	-	-
	2003	29	13	33,386	72	28	15	9	-	1
	2004	30	12	32,252	74	27	12	12	-	-
	2005	29	10	32,318	76	24	12	12	-	-
	2006	28	12	35,420	71	29	12	10	-	-
	2007	27	13	36,789	67	33	12	11	-	-
	2008	27	12	36,707	62	38	12	11	-	-
2009	26	13	37,823	49	51	11	11	-	-	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1

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

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	62.5	79.0	100.0	76.5	61.3	85.7	-	-	70.6	90.9	82.3	69.0	68.0	76.9	73.9	77.8	-	66.7
White	62.5	79.0	100.0	76.5	61.3	85.7	-	-	70.6	90.9	82.3	69.0	68.0	75.0	73.9	77.8	-	66.7
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	58.3	-	-	81.8	58.3	-	-	-	-	-	83.4	-	-	-	66.7	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	-	-	72.2	83.4	-	-	-	-	72.3	70.6	-	-	-	-	81.3	83.4
White	-	-	-	-	72.2	83.4	-	-	-	-	72.3	70.6	-	-	-	-	80.0	83.4
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)

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	79.2	84.2	100.0	88.2	76.7	100.0	-	-	88.3	90.9	100.0	79.3	76.0	92.3	91.3	94.4	-	86.7
White	79.2	84.2	100.0	88.2	76.7	100.0	-	-	88.3	90.9	100.0	79.3	76.0	91.7	91.3	94.4	-	86.7
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	83.3	-	-	91.0	66.7	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	91.7	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	-	-	83.4	91.7	-	-	-	-	77.8	70.5	-	-	-	-	87.6	88.9
White	-	-	-	-	83.4	91.7	-	-	-	-	77.8	70.5	-	-	-	-	86.6	88.9
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 data indicates that we need to make progress in the areas of reading and math, especially in grades 4, 5 and 7. The scores are close to the AYP score, but with the bar set higher this year, we will need to make great strides. Our greatest weakness is reading. The strengths of our building are the ability to quickly make changes as needed. The changes to make could include tweaking the curriculum, implementing interventions with both individuals and classrooms.

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

Our small classroom size can impact scores if one or two students do not perform well on the tests. Also, our poverty rate of 42.9% and our mobility rate of 15.1% are additional factors that impact our students and scores. Both of these rates have increased from last year. Our attendance rate of 95.6% is high, which may offset the above.

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

We will continue to academically engage our students in the classroom while providing additional instruction to the lower 20-25%; provide both classroom and individual interventions; provide Title I services; continue the after-school program for grades 2-8 and continue to monitor absences and truancy.

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?

We are in the second year of our guided reading program. The teachers have developed many literacy centers and they have "tweaked" the centers this year to provide more student-centered learning. The Title I program has adopted a series entitled "Soar to Success" and is already noticing improvements in student success. All of the above is tracked with the AIMSweb progress monitoring system. We have implemented and are using various teachers as interventionists both with individuals and small groups. The after-school program is in place to help with academic success.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Increase reading scores in grades 4,5,and 7.	

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Increase reading scores in grades 4,5,and 7.

Objective 1 Description

The reading scores in grades 4 and 5 did not meet the minimum of 70% and the 7th grade just barely made it at 70.6%. We need to move more students into the meet/exceeds categories in order to meet the target score of 77% this year.

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

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

Objective 1 Title :

Increase reading scores in grades 4,5,and 7.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Leveled/guided reading is used in grades K-5. Reading is benchmarked and progress monitored with AIMSweb.	08/24/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	5,000
2	Grades 6-8 read across the curriculum. AIMSweb is used to benchmark and progress monitor.	08/24/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	200
3	An after-school program is in place for grades 2-8 to obtain academic support.	09/15/2009	05/27/2010	After School	Title I	2,000
4	RtI interventions used with grades K-8, using teachers already on staff.	08/24/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Other	

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

Objective 1 Title :

Increase reading scores in grades 4,5,and 7.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will attend workshops on guided reading, writing, RtI and use of centers.	08/24/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	2,000
2	Teachers in K-8 will request RtI services for those needing help with individual or classroom interventions.	08/24/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Other	

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

Objective 1 Title :

Increase reading scores in grades 4,5,and 7.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All families receive a monthly newsletter entitled Home/School Connection. It contains hints and strategies for working at home with children.	09/01/2009	05/03/2010	After School	Title I	220
2	Parents sign a contract for the after-school program to ensure the academic success of the student.	09/15/2009	05/27/2010	After School	Other	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Increase reading scores in grades 4,5,and 7.

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 classroom teachers, SPED teacher, Title I teachers and the principal will monitor the progress of the students. Through the use of AIMSweb, progress monitoring will be done on a continual basis for targeted students, and all students will be assessed three times a year. ISAT scores will be used with grades 3-8. Success will be measured with increased scores.

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	Alice King	Elementary Principal

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.*)

Each year all families will receive a copy of the Illinois School Report Card for our school.

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.

The school staff reviews our school data annually at the beginning of the school year. With this data in hand all certified staff is assigned to a curriculum oversight committee in which they review the numbers and report the strengths and weaknesses of that particular curricular area. These committees also make recommendations for improvements. Parents give input on desired improvements, too. As a result of last year's reports, it was determined that we needed a specific manner in which to address the area of phonics. We adopted the Michael Heggerty Phonics Program into grades K-2 to improve phonics knowledge. This program was selected after attendance at several workshops in which this program was recommended highly.

	Name	Title
1	Alice King	Elementary Principal
2	Tina Stier	MS/HS Principal
3	Sarah Brahmstedt	teacher
4	Tara DeWitt	teacher
5	Alica Ferry	teacher
6	Nikki Sloan	teacher
7	Naydeen Mahr	teacher
8	Alicia Rogers	teacher
9	Robyn Olson	teacher
10	Michelle Dunbar	teacher
11	Sarah Shamblin	teacher
12	LouAnne Rhoads	teacher
13	Sarah Bainter	teacher
14	Lynn Anderson	teacher
15	Jessica Travis	teacher
16	Marty Hoffman	teacher
17	Bonnie Frakes	parent
18	Norma Walsh	parent
19	Marlene Abbott	parent

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part C. Peer Review Process

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

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

The district does not currently have a peer review team but will develop one as needed.

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.

New teachers are paired with a more experienced teacher who is in the same curricular area, if possible, or someone who is also teaching a similar grade level. With such a small district, this is not always possible. The mentor is the main "go to" person, but all staff is approachable and willing to aide the new teacher. The mentor assists with learning the SDS system, entering grades and attendance, helps the new teacher locate district forms and learn protocols, etc.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

Part E. District Responsibilities

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

The district has provided numerous opportunities for staff to attend conferences and workshops that are necessary to improve teaching. The district has also provided new technology in several of the classrooms to bring us more in line with advanced methods of teaching/reaching our students.

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.

We currently are not in need of services from ISBE or RESPROS.

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: **11/11/2009**

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

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