

Local Board Approved	
Initial Submission	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	170640870252013		
District Name:	Bloomington SD 87	School Name:	Washington Elem School
Superintendent:	Dr. Barry Reilly	Principal:	Jeffrey T Lockenvitz
District Address:	300 E Monroe St	School Address:	1201 E Washington St
City/State/Zip:	Bloomington, IL 61701 4028	City/State/Zip:	Bloomington, IL 61701 4243
District Telephone#:	Label 3098276031 Extn: 221	School Telephone#:	3098297034 Extn: 0
District Email:	reillyb@district87.org	School Email:	
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	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	2011-12 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2011-12 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		85.0			85.0			91.0		82.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	86.7		Yes	93.1		Yes	95.6	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	88.8		Yes	94.7		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian														

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

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

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 85% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 85% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. ***
3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 85% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 91% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 82% graduation rate for high schools.

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

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

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

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2011 AMAO Report

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

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

School Information	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Attendance Rate (%)	96.5	95.8	96.4	95.6	95.7	95.4	95.5	95.6
Truancy Rate (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Mobility Rate (%)	13.3	11.0	14.4	10.5	12.0	12.5	8.8	15.2
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	434	406	386	388	377	397	425	477
Low Income (%)	14.5	16.5	16.3	19.3	19.4	24.4	28.2	28.3
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.8
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.1	10.9
White, non-Hispanic (%)	83.6	80.8	81.1	79.6	79.3	77.6	76.9	75.9
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	7.1	11.3	9.6	10.1	7.4	7.8	8.5	8.0
Hispanic (%)	3.5	3.0	2.8	3.1	3.7	2.8	2.4	4.8
Asian (%)	5.8	4.9	4.9	5.9	5.6	4.8	5.2	5.9
American Indian(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
Two or More Races (%)	-	0.0	1.6	1.3	4.0	6.8	7.1	5.5
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 4 - Student Race/Ethnicity

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	American Indian (%)	Two Or More Races (%)	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander (%)
S C H O O L	2000	89.6	5.9	1.9	2.6	-	-	-
	2001	88.6	6.3	2.3	2.1	0.7	-	-
	2002	88.8	5.5	2.1	3.4	0.2	-	-
	2003	86.6	6.4	2.7	4.1	0.2	-	-
	2004	83.6	7.1	3.5	5.8	-	-	-
	2005	80.8	11.3	3.0	4.9	-	-	-
	2006	81.1	9.6	2.8	4.9	-	1.6	-
	2007	79.6	10.1	3.1	5.9	-	1.3	-
	2008	79.3	7.4	3.7	5.6	-	4.0	-
	2009	77.6	7.8	2.8	4.8	0.3	6.8	-
	2010	76.9	8.5	2.4	5.2	-	7.1	-
2011	75.9	8.0	4.8	5.9	-	5.5	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	72.4	21.6	4.3	1.6	0.1	-	-
	2001	70.6	22.1	5.1	2.1	0.2	-	-
	2002	68.7	22.7	5.7	2.8	0.1	-	-
	2003	67.5	23.1	6.1	3.3	0.1	-	-
	2004	65.2	24.0	6.7	4.1	-	-	-
	2005	63.2	25.9	6.9	4.0	0.1	-	-
	2006	61.7	25.2	6.5	4.2	0.1	2.3	-
	2007	60.6	24.3	7.4	3.8	0.1	3.9	-
	2008	58.8	22.9	8.2	3.9	0.1	6.1	-
	2009	57.6	22.9	8.4	3.9	0.1	7.2	-
	2010	55.8	23.4	9.0	3.7	0.1	8.1	-

	2011	54.8	22.4	10.5	4.0	0.3	7.9	0.1
S T A T E	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7	-
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8	-
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2	-
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7	-
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5	-
	2010	52.8	18.8	21.1	4.2	0.2	2.9	-
	2011	51.4	18.3	23.0	4.1	0.3	2.8	0.1

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truancy (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	-	11.6	95.8	96.1	18.0	-	-	-	-
	2001	-	10.7	100.0	96.2	11.2	-	-	-	-
	2002	-	13.0	100.0	96.0	11.2	-	-	-	-
	2003	-	14.6	100.0	95.5	11.7	-	-	-	-
	2004	-	14.5	100.0	96.5	13.3	-	-	-	-
	2005	-	16.5	100.0	95.8	11.0	-	-	-	-
	2006	-	16.3	100.0	96.4	14.4	-	-	-	-
	2007	-	19.3	100.0	95.6	10.5	-	-	-	-
	2008	-	19.4	100.0	95.7	12.0	-	-	-	-
	2009	0.5	24.4	100.0	95.4	12.5	-	-	-	-
	2010	0.5	28.2	100.0	95.5	8.8	-	-	-	-
2011	0.8	28.3	100.0	95.6	15.2	1	0.2	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	1.5	34.5	100.0	93.6	20.1	171	3.1	4.1	88.4
	2001	2.0	36.0	99.3	93.6	18.2	68	1.3	3.9	88.5
	2002	-	41.4	99.8	93.8	16.2	126	2.3	5.0	88.6
	2003	2.0	35.0	99.8	93.8	21.7	89	1.6	3.8	89.2
	2004	3.2	41.4	99.5	94.1	19.3	100	1.8	4.9	89.1
	2005	2.4	44.1	99.8	93.9	18.1	135	2.4	2.2	92.0
	2006	2.5	45.5	99.8	94.0	18.4	135	2.5	2.5	89.5
	2007	3.6	47.3	99.8	93.5	19.0	116	2.3	2.2	90.0
	2008	3.9	47.3	99.8	93.6	18.8	109	2.1	2.1	89.2
	2009	4.4	49.4	99.8	93.6	17.0	101	1.9	1.8	90.0
	2010	5.0	52.5	99.8	93.7	16.3	118	2.3	2.1	91.4
2011	4.7	53.4	99.8	94.1	16.4	127	2.4	1.6	76.4	

S T A T E	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
	2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1
	2010	7.6	45.4	96.2	93.9	13.0	72,383	3.6	3.8	87.8
	2011	8.8	48.1	96.0	94.0	12.8	63,067	3.2	2.7	83.8

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	423	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	429	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	437	90	68	74	-	-	-
	2003	439	73	90	65	-	-	-
	2004	434	73	73	86	-	-	-
	2005	406	71	69	73	-	-	-
	2006	386	74	71	65	-	-	-
	2007	388	65	66	72	-	-	-
	2008	377	55	70	67	-	-	-
	2009	397	68	59	66	-	-	-
	2010	425	66	75	61	-	-	-
	2011	477	74	78	75	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	5,611	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	5,580	474	497	455	456	426	254
	2002	5,594	484	449	475	433	447	336
	2003	5,701	442	474	445	469	429	330
	2004	5,547	436	421	476	469	449	334
	2005	5,384	408	411	417	410	453	319
	2006	5,288	411	407	421	448	389	316
	2007	5,220	394	389	398	413	423	309
	2008	5,201	386	378	386	404	399	338
	2009	5,304	419	409	377	397	412	283
	2010	5,250	403	407	384	399	370	324
	2011	5,414	441	428	384	380	397	306
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-

S T A T E	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2,044,539	164,413	157,570	159,499	160,924	156,451	138,559
	2004	2,060,048	161,329	160,246	158,367	162,933	160,271	139,504
	2005	2,062,912	156,370	158,622	160,365	162,047	162,192	142,828
	2006	2,075,277	155,155	154,372	158,822	160,362	160,911	147,500
	2007	2,077,856	155,356	153,480	154,719	162,594	159,038	150,475
	2008	2,074,167	155,578	152,895	153,347	160,039	161,310	149,710
	2009	2,070,125	156,512	152,736	152,820	155,433	158,700	144,822
	2010	2,064,312	155,468	154,389	152,681	154,465	154,982	146,919
	2011	2,074,806	153,516	153,301	154,241	153,981	153,986	151,059

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

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

Educator Data is available only for district level

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials (%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	358	16	47,672	59	41	19	20	-	-
	2001	362	17	49,099	60	41	18	20	-	-
	2002	367	17	51,757	60	40	18	20	1	-
	2003	379	16	52,473	56	44	18	20	-	-
	2004	356	16	52,932	53	47	19	19	1	-
	2005	351	15	53,460	52	48	19	19	1	-
	2006	352	15	54,373	55	46	19	19	1	-
	2007	355	15	55,946	54	46	18	19	1	-
	2008	360	15	57,758	52	48	18	18	-	-
	2009	362	15	58,651	52	48	18	18	-	-
	2010	370	15	60,364	49	49	18	18	1	-
	2011	355	15	61,612	49	51	19	19	1	-
	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2

S T A T E	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1
	2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1
	2010	132,502	13	63,296	42	57	18	18	1	1
	2011	128,262	13	64,978	40	60	19	19	1	1

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2006-2011																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	79.7	88.1	85.2	90.3	90.9	90.7	82.4	81.7	88.6	84.6	86.5	86.3	83.4	74.1	87.5	88.9	90.5	85.3
White	82.5	90.9	88.1	94.2	94.5	95.0	78.6	83.9	87.9	91.7	89.0	88.9	91.7	74.1	89.3	88.1	90.4	88.9
Black	-	-	-	70.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	70.0	-	-	50.0	-	-	-	60.0
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	40.0	-	-	-	-	45.5	47.1	30.8	20.0	66.7	-	58.3	30.0	35.3	40.0	40.0	60.0	-
Low Income	58.3	73.4	72.7	73.4	81.3	75.0	-	-	80.0	68.8	61.9	80.0	66.7	30.0	58.3	86.7	81.3	58.9
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2006-2011																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	97.3	92.5	94.4	97.2	94.0	90.7	87.8	93.0	92.9	93.8	94.5	96.3	90.3	90.8	93.1	93.1	93.7	92.0
White	98.3	94.6	95.2	98.1	98.2	96.7	85.7	91.0	93.1	97.9	96.4	96.8	95.0	94.8	94.6	93.2	94.2	94.4
Black	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	80.0	-	-	60.0	-	-	-	70.0
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	80.0	-	-	-	-	45.5	64.7	69.3	50.0	75.0	-	75.0	40.0	76.5	60.0	60.0	80.0	-
Low Income	91.7	86.7	81.8	86.7	87.5	75.0	-	-	80.0	87.6	81.0	92.0	83.3	60.0	83.3	86.6	81.3	76.5
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

- Reading: The percentage of students that M+E decreased slightly in all grades (All grades are above the Illinois Benchmarks):**
 - o 90.7% of 3rd Grade students M+E (-.2%).
 - o 86.3% of 4th Grade students M+E (-.2%).
 - o 85.3% of 5th Grade students M+E (-5.2%).
- Math: The percentage of students that M+E decreased in 3rd and 5th grades and increased in 4th grade (All grades above the Illinois Benchmarks):**
 - o 90.7% of 3rd Grade students M+E (-3.2%).
 - o 96.3% of 4th Grade students M+E (+1.7%).
 - o 92% of 5th Grade students M+E (-1.7%).
- By Grade and Race: (* = low N)**
 - o In 3rd grade Reading, the percentages are White (95%), Black (60%), Hispanic (50%), Multiracial (66.7%) and Asian (100%).
 - o In 3rd grade Math, the percentages of students M+E are White (96.7 %) Black (40%), Hispanic (50%), Multiracial (66.7%) and Asian (100%).
 - o In 4th grade Reading, the percentages are White (88.9%), Black (66.7%), *Hispanic (33.3%), Multiracial (100%) and Asian (100%).
 - o In 4th grade Math, the percentages of students M+E are all above the Illinois Benchmarks, except Hispanic.
§ White (96.8%), Black (100%), *Hispanic (66.7%), Multiracial (100%) and Asian (100%).
 - o In 5th grade Reading, the percentages are White (88.9%), Black (60%), *Hispanic (66.7%), Multiracial (100%) and Asian (100%).
 - o In 5th grade Math, the percentages of students M+E in all subgroups are above the Illinois Benchmarks, except Black.
§ White (94.4%), Black (70%), *Hispanic (100%), Multiracial (100%) and Asian (100%).
- By Grade and Income:**
 - o In Reading, the percentages of students M+E in Not Low Income subgroups of all grades are above the Illinois Benchmarks. In Math, the percentages of students M+E in Not Low Income in all grades and the Low Income subgroup in 4th grade are above the Illinois Benchmarks. Income gaps are significant in 3rd and 5th grade Reading and Math.
 - o 98% of 3rd Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 75% of the Low Income students (Gap = 23%). In Math, 98% of Not Low Income

students M+E compared to 75% of Low Income students (Gap = 23%).

- o 89.1% of 4th Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 80% of the Low Income students (Gap = 9.1%). In Math, 98.2% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 92% of Low Income students (Gap = 6.2%).
- o 93.1% of 5th Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 58.8% of the Low Income students (Gap = 34.3%). In Math, 96.6% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 76.5% of Low Income students (Gap = 20.1%).

By Grade and IEP Status:

- o In Reading and Math, significant gaps exist in the percentage of students M+E in the Not IEP and IEP subgroups. The N of IEP students is 30 (11, 12, 7).

§ Reading Gaps:

3rd gr = 98.4% v 45.5% (52.9%), 4th gr = 91.2% v 58.3% (32.9%), 5th gr = 91.2% v 28.6% (62.6%)

§ Math Gaps:

3rd gr = 98.4% v 45.5% (52.9%), 4th gr = 100% v 75% (25%), 5th gr = 95.6% v 57.1% (38.5%)

Subscores:

Reading:

	<u>Vocabulary</u>		<u>Reading Strategies</u>		<u>Comprehension</u>		<u>Literature</u>	
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Washington	68	78.3	69	76.1	75.4	67.4	79.8	72.6
3rd	92.4	92	51.5	70.7	74.2	58.7	87.9	78.7
4th	60.8	68.8	81.1	67.5	67.6	72.5	79.7	82.5
5th	50.8	74.7	73	90.7	85.7	70.7	71.4	56

-	<u>Number Sense</u>		<u>Measurement</u>		<u>Algebra</u>		<u>Geometry</u>		<u>Data Analysis</u>	
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011

Washington	67	67.8	74.4	68.7	87.7	80.4	70.9	73.5	79.8	74.8
3rd	81.8	73.3	90.9	76	89.4	82.7	71.2	76	84.8	81.3
4th	66.2	78.8	71.6	70	91.9	88.8	66.2	73.8	78.4	78.8
5th	52.4	50.7	60.3	60	81	69.3	76.2	70.7	76.2	64

Math is a strength across grade levels. Growth in reading for reading strategies and reading comprehension is noted. We will challenge primary grades to focus on growth in comprehension. Vocabulary has been an area of focus for a long time and it continues to be an area of strength overall.

Our percentages are above the expectation of No Child Left Behind. The general trend at Washington is to exceed AYP Benchmarks each year at each grade level for Math, Science and Reading. We need to continue to find ways to assist students with disabilities, from low income households, and our Black student population to show growth over time.

While the overall scores in both reading and math have continued to remain high at high levels, we believe, based on changing demographics and the general history of student performance that we will need to improve over time at Washington School. Student performance in the areas of math and reading has been exceptional with 91% of all students meeting or exceeding the standards. Although Washington School met AYP in all categories, we are concerned about and committed to the progress of all students. We target intervention based on a broad collection of individual student data and we continue to focus on the performance and improvements of students in our subgroups. The number of Black students and Multiracial students at each grade level are very small and therefore does not actually qualify as a measurable subgroup as determined by the state.

However, we continue to monitor this data due to the observable achievement gap between Black and White students. Performance of students in the low income category has generally trended upward. Students in special education have performed well below their non-disabled peers. Subtest analysis was conducted to reveal specific instructional strengths and targets for improvement. The areas most in need of improvement are comprehension in Reading and Measurement as well as Number Sense in Math. Performance gaps for Low Income are significant in 3rd and 5th grade in both Reading and Math. While the total number of students with an IEP is low, performance gaps are significant in all grades in Reading and Math.

In summary, according to our ISAT data our strengths are in vocabulary and reading strategies in Reading.

In summary, according to our ISAT data our weaknesses are measurement and number sense in Math.

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

Several external factors have had a significant impact on Washington School's capacity. The student body has increased by 36% since 2008. During this same time period, the number of low income students has doubled and risen to 31%. This growth has challenged the staff in the areas of maintaining a positive building climate, space, availability of non-consumable resources, student movement in the building, and the need for additional classroom teachers. Typically, we have had three sections of each grade from kindergarten through fifth grade but this year we have four sections of kindergarten, first and second grade and three sections of grades three-five. Limited space has been a frustration of staff and may prove a challenge if growth continues.

Due to the changing demographics and fluctuating scores, the staff has adapted the following internal resources in order to respond to the background knowledge and language experiences brought into the classroom. Therefore, the teachers focused on these curricular areas:

Reading: vocabulary, reading strategies, comprehension, fluency.

Math: measurement, number sense.

Writing: Washington School didn't fully implement the District Writing Curriculum and Guidelines until the beginning of the 2011-12 school year.

Since the elimination of Reading Improvement State Grant dollars forced us to lose a .5 FTE Reading Intervention teacher. This interventionist was utilized to assist with Tier II RtI instruction.

The implementation of RtI, and building initiatives focusing on specific areas subscore percentages in Vocabulary increased from 68% to 78% M+E and Reading Strategies went up from 69% to 76% M+E.

The following research-based programs are being implemented school-wide at Washington with integrity.

Scholastic Reading Inventory

Michael Heggerty

Discovery Education

Discovery Assessment

Soliloquy

Lexia
Symphony Math
Fast Math
Rocket Math

Factors contributing to our strengths are the implementation of successful RtI practices including screening measures, data analysis, small group and individual students interventions, and differentiation of instruction based on documented need.

Factors contributing to our challenges are the increase in enrollment, decrease in intervention staff, and limited space.

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

DIBELS Next and RtI services will be continued with integrity.

Classroom teachers continue to provide RtI Tier I and II instruction and intervention services.

Response to intervention for reading must continue to target identified students using research-based, skill-specific instruction. Increased use of classroom tools will be encouraged including training for all teachers interested in implementing at Tier I or Tier II.

Analysis of data at all grade levels, including specific item analysis, must be a focus of work sessions to guide instructional planning.

Professional development activities will focus on differentiated instruction, and Tier I and Tier II intervention for reading, writing, and math achievement.

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?

Students in grades 1-5 are administered the Stanford Achievement Test-10 (SAT-10) in the fall of each year. Students are tested in Reading, Mathematic, Language Arts, Spelling, Science and Social Studies. Students in grades 1 and 2 also participate in a SAT-10 post test in the spring. This data assists teachers in instructional planning and program/curriculum evaluation. A post-test measure of reading is administered in the 1st and 2nd grades to determine individual student growth, to determine the need for extended year services, and for program evaluation. This data has also been used to predict ISAT success and is used to identify students for our before school ISAT preparation program. The SAT 10 data is less specific than ISAT, however, it is a more timely picture of current student performance. Both contribute to instructional planning. Grade level and building staff reviewed the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 SAT 10 data. Our SAT-10 2011 data indicates:

SAT-10 2011 Summary

Fall Scores

- Reading: The percentage of students that M+E increased in 1st and 5th grades, and decreased in 2nd - 4th grades:**
 - o 62.8% of 1st Grade students M+E (+0.6%)
 - o 65.3% of 2nd Grade students M+E (-8.7%)
 - o 65.8% of 3rd Grade students M+E (-8.8%)
 - o 66.7% of 4th Grade students M+E (-2.2%)
 - o 74.7% of 5th Grade students M+E (+4.2%)
- Math: The percentage of students that M+E decreased in all grades:**
 - o 54.7% of 1st Grade students M+E (-4.8%)
 - o 61.1% of 2nd Grade students M+E (-10.1%)
 - o 56.8% of 3rd Grade students M+E (-15.5%)
 - o 67.9% of 4th Grade students M+E (-2.8%)
 - o 58.7% of 5th Grade students M+E (-15.1%)
- By Grade and Race (* = Low N):**
 - o In 1st grade Reading, the percentages are White (62.5%), Black (37.5%), Hispanic (66.7%), *Asian (100%) and Multiracial (33.3%).
 - o In 1st grade Math, the percentages are White (56.3%), Black (12.5%), Hispanic (66.7%), *Asian (75%) and Multiracial (66.7%).
 - o In 2nd grade Reading, the percentages are White (68.5%), Black (50%), Hispanic (33.3%), *Asian (100%) and Multiracial (60%).
 - o In 2nd grade Math, the percentages are White (64.8%), Black (25%), Hispanic (33.3%), *Asian (66.7%) and Multiracial (80%).
 - o In 3rd grade Reading, the percentages are White (72.4%), Asian (80%) and Multiracial (66.7%).
 - o In 3rd grade Math, the percentages are White (62.7%), Asian (80%) and Multiracial (33.3%).
 - o In 4th grade Reading, the percentages are White (70.3%), Black (40%), *Asian (100%), and Multiracial (57.1%).
 - o In 4th grade Math, the percentages are White (67.2%), Black (60%), *Asian (100%), and Multiracial (85.7%).
 - o In 5th grade Reading, the percentages are White (76.4%), Black (44.4%), Hispanic (66.7%), *Asian (100%) and *Multiracial (100%).
 - o In 5th grade Math, the percentages are White (61.8%), Black (22.2%), Hispanic (33.3%), *Asian (100%) and Multiracial (66.7%).
- By Grade and Income:**
 - o 65.6% of 1st Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 56% of the Low Income students (Gap = 9.6%). In Math, 62.3% of Not Low Income

students M+E compared to 36% of Low Income students (Gap = 26.3%).

- o 74.5% of 2nd Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 42.9% of the Low Income students (Gap = 31.6%). In Math, 68.6% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 42.9% of Low Income students (Gap = 25.7%).
- o 79.2% of 3rd Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 40% of the Low Income students (Gap = 39.2%). In Math, 69.4% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 32% of Low Income students (Gap = 37.4%).
- o 74.5% of 4th Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 47.8% of the Low Income students (Gap = 26.7%). In Math, 72.7% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 56.5% of Low Income students (Gap = 16.2%).
- o 87.7% of 5th Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 33.3% of the Low Income students (Gap = 54.4%). In Math, 71.9% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 16.7% of Low Income students (Gap = 55.2%).

By Grade and IEP Status:

- o In Reading, 63.3% of 1st Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 57.1% of IEP students (Gap = 6.2%). In Math, 57% of 1st Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 28.6% of IEP students (Gap = 28.4%).
- o In Reading, 69.7% of 2nd Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 16.7% of IEP students (Gap = 53%). In Math, 66.7% of 2nd Grade Not IEP students M+E. (No Math scores for IEP students in 2nd Grade.)
- o In Reading, 71.9% of 3rd Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 22.2% of IEP students (Gap = 49.7%). In Math, 64.1% of 3rd Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 10% of IEP students (Gap = 54.1%).
- o In Reading, 73.9% of 4th Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 11.1% of IEP students (Gap = 62.8%). In Math, 73.9% of 4th Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 22.2% of IEP Students (Gap = 51.7%).
- o In Reading, 79.7% of 5th Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 16.7% of IEP students (Gap = 63%). In Math, 63.8% of 5th Grade Not IEP students M+E. (No Math scores for IEP students in 5th Grade.)

Spring Scores

Reading: The percentage of students that M+E decreased from Fall in 1st grade and 2nd grade:

- o 54.8% of 1st Grade students M+E (-8% from Fall)
- o 64.2% of 2nd Grade students M+E (-1.1% from Fall)

Math: The percentage of students that M+E increased from Fall in 1st and 2nd grades:

- o 63.3% of 1st Grade students M+E (+8.6% from Fall)
- o 65.7% of 2nd Grade students M+E (+4.6% from Fall)

By Grade and Race (* = Low N):

- o In 1st grade Reading, the percentages are White (53.2%), Black (14.3%), *Asian (100%) and Hispanic (80%).
- o In 1st grade Math, the percentages are White (61.5%), Black (22.2%), *Asian (100%), Hispanic (80%) and *Multiracial (100%).
- o In 2nd grade Reading, the percentages are White (68.6%), Black (16.7%), *Asian (100%), Hispanic (33.3%) and Multiracial (80%).
- o In 2nd grade Math, the percentages are White (68.6%), Black (50%), *Asian (100%), Hispanic (33.3%) and Multiracial (60%).

By Grade and Income:

- o 60% of 1st Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 41.7% of the Low Income students (Gap = 18.3%). In Math, 66.1% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 57.1% of Low Income students (Gap = 9%).
- o 72% of 2nd Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 41.2% of the Low Income students (Gap = 30.8%). In Math, 74% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 41.2% of Low Income students (Gap = 32.8%).

By Grade and IEP Status:

- o In Reading, 57% of 1st Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 20% of IEP students (Gap = 37%). In Math, 63.9% of 1st Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 57.1% of IEP students (Gap = 6.8%).
- o In Reading, 69.4% of 2nd Grade Not IEP students M+E. (No Reading scores for IEP students in 2nd Grade.) In Math, 69.4% of 2nd Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 20% of IEP students (Gap = 49.4%).

Fall Subscores:

Reading:

	<u>Word Study Skills</u>		<u>Vocabulary</u>		<u>Comprehension</u>		<u>Language</u>		<u>Mechanics</u>		<u>Expression</u>		<u>Spelling</u>		<u>Listening</u>		<u>Sentence Reading</u>		<u>Sounds and Letters</u>		<u>Word Reading</u>	
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
1 st															64.9	55.8	66.2	60.5	51.4	46.5	66.2	58.1
2 nd	54.8	65.3		77.8	78.1	68.1	63	61.1					76.7	63.9			82.2	77.8				
3 rd	65.1	63.5	76.6	78.1	73.8	75.7	67.7	52.7					57.8	56.8								
4 th	75.7	48.7	64.9	56.4	76	74.4	71.6	67.9					62.7	66.7								
5 th	67.2	66.7	75.4	74.7	68.9	70.7	77	81.1	77	74.3	73.8	74.3	70.5	66.7								

Math:

-	<u>Problem Solving</u>		<u>Procedures</u>	
	2010	2011	2010	2011
1 st				
2 nd	69.9	59.7	68.5	59.7
3 rd	75.4	64.9	52.3	47.3
4 th	73.3	71.8	66.7	53.8
5 th	73.8	72	72.1	52



Spring Subscores:

Reading:

	<u>Word Study Skills</u>		<u>Vocabulary</u>		<u>Comprehension</u>		<u>Language</u>		<u>Spelling</u>		<u>Sentence Reading</u>	
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
1 st	59.7	54.7			59.7	51.1	58.3	47.2	55.6	52.2	61.1	62.2
2 nd	56.9	53.7	69.4	64.2	75	65.7	38.9	49.3	54.2	53.7		

Math:

-	<u>Problem Solving</u>		<u>Procedures</u>	
	2010	2011	2010	2011
1 st	66.7	68.9	61.1	42.2
2 nd	66.7	71.6	54.2	52.2

SAT-10 Testing Fall and Spring 2011 confirmed areas of strength in Reading vocabulary and Math problem solving. Challenge areas noted also in the SAT-10 testing were word study

skills and comprehension, especially in the primary grades.

SCHOLASTIC READING INVENTORY is conducted five times during the school year to measure student progress on inferential comprehension. This tool also provides students with a Lexile score that correlates to reading levels of tens of thousands of books in our school learning media center and throughout the classrooms. Students select books at or near their Lexile to provide successful reading experiences and to challenge and promote increased reading skills. Growth data from the baseline August assessment to the mid-year and then end of year assessments are evaluated.

The percentage of students increasing thier reading level has demonstrated significant improvement. Seventy percent of the students have demonstrated at least a proficient reading level with only 10% of the students designated as below a basic level of proficiency.

Proficiency Summary	September2009		September 2010		September 2011	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Advanced	47	17	11	5	84	25
Proficient	134	49	80	37	148	45
Basic	58	21	63	29	67	20
Below Basic	36	13	61	28	32	10

In summary, the data indicates that this year's students has a greater percentage of students in the proficient and advanced categories. This data indicates that we should have fewer students who would require intervention to be in the meets category.

SCHOLASTIC READING COUNTS is a program that allows students to track the number of books they read, the Lexiles of these books, the words in each book, the points awarded for each book and their performance on a computer generated comprehension quiz for each book read. This program has been very motivational for students and has increased reading as evidenced by circulation data from the school library as well as by tracking the data from year to year. Students were challenged to meet schoolwide reading goals of 100,000,000 words last year and 110,000,000 words this year. They easily surpassed the goal last year and by this October have already read 37,809,462 words. This compares to 19,322,814 words at the same point last year. The students in 4th grade have typically outpaced other grades and account for 15,968,767 words. Increased reading leads to increased reading skills. The widespread participation in Reading Counts supports this finding. Each year we increase our schoolwide goal and our students rise to the challenge.

DIBELS Next

This is the first year that we have moved to Dibels Next. The DIBELS Next benchmarking system is used to measure the impact of Response to Intervention programs across the grade levels. This table shows the beginning benchmark data for Oral Reading Fluency. Benchmark testing is the process of screening all students on essential skills predictive of

later reading performance. We test 3 times per year: Beginning-of-year, Middle-of-year, and End-of-year. DIBELS are criterion-referenced because each measure has an empirically established goal (or benchmark) that changes across time to ensure students skills are developing in a manner predictive of continued progress. From the end of first grade on, a student's Instructional Recommendation (Intensive, Strategic, or Benchmark) directly corresponds to that student's status on the ORF assessment: At Risk->Intensive, Some Risk->Strategic, Low Risk->Benchmark

Once students begin receiving additional instructional support, performance is monitored related to the instructional objectives of the intervention (e.g., phonological awareness, fluency, etc.). Changes in intervention are determined based on student performance. Our school wide goal is to have 90% of all students in 2nd-5th grade be at or above their benchmark by the end of the year.

DIBELS (Next) BEGINNING ORF

	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
2008	73.3%	57.4%	NA	NA
2009	68.1%	76.4%	69.2%	NA
2010	77.0%	78.8%	68.0%	72.1%
2011	70%	86%	68%	69%

Data indicates that at the beginning of the 2012 school year, 86% of third grade students were at benchmark in oral reading fluency, but in grade 4 and 5 only 68% and 69% were at benchmark along with only 70% of 2nd grade students were at benchmark.

DISCOVERY ASSESSMENT

Discovery Education provides assessments that measure student achievement and predict performance on the ISAT, Discovery Education Assessment is used to quickly and accurately measure knowledge, identify weaknesses, and predict student performance with 80 to 90% accuracy. Teachers access data organized in a variety of formats. Those reports are most useful in the instructional planning process include standard's based proficiency with individual student data and item analysis with individual student data. After using the program and evaluating data from last year we have high confidence in the correlation of Meets on Discovery Assessment compared to Meets on the ISAT.

64.6% of grade 2, 92% of grade 3, 80% of grade 4, and 95% of grade 5 students were meeting benchmarks in Reading in the Fall 2012 testing.

68.8% of grade 2, 94% of grade 3, 58% of grade 4, and 95% of grade 5 students were meeting benchmarks in Math in the Fall 2012 testing.

Strengths were evident in Reading vocabulary and Geometry (except for a decline in 4th grade from last year).

Weaknesses were evident as Reading comprehension and Math measurement showing a significant decreases from the prior year.

RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION

New research-based intervention curricula were selected to provide prescriptive instruction based on analysis of individual student weaknesses.

Interventionists implement each tool with integrity.

Classroom teachers in grades K- 2 fully implemented the Heggerty phonemic awareness program with all students.
Classroom teachers in all grades K-5 **are committed to the implementation of the Tier I intervention process in their classrooms.**
Frequent data collection occurred every 2-3 weeks to assure continued progress of each child receiving intervention services.
The intervention team regularly reviewed students who lacked adequate progress and made recommendations for programmatic changes

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

Several factors impact these results in student scores. Teachers use the state standards as their guide for teaching. Formative and summative assessments are used. Grade levels use a consistent approach in implementing all objectives expected, in addition to enrichment and intervention. Teachers provide support for parents to actively participate in their child's learning. Commitment to excellence is achieved through a team approach with all staff striving to enrich every academic area. Every staff member holds the expectation that all children will succeed.

Analysis of student achievement is discussed in detail in Section I, Part A of this plan.

- *New research-based intervention curricula were selected to provide prescriptive instruction based on analysis of individual student weaknesses. *Interventionists and classroom teachers are committed to implementing each tool with integrity.
- *Classroom teachers in grades K- 2 **fully implemented the Heggerty phonemic awareness program with all students.**
- *Frequent data collection occurred every 2 weeks to assure continued progress of each child receiving intervention services. The intervention team reviewed students who lacked **adequate progress and made recommendations for programmatic changes.**
- *Tier II Interventions are being added and professional development is offered to assist in the integrity of the delivery of instruction.
- *DIBELS Next and intervention services will be continued with integrity.
- *Response to intervention for reading must continue to target identified students for research-based, skill-specific instruction.

Challenges still exist in providing the same level of intervention for math as in reading. The adoption of new math curricula will provide additional diagnosis and intervention materials, along with more technology and strategies for differentiation.

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

Continued analysis of data allows us to determine areas of strength and need. Based on the data, intervention and enrichment are tailored to maximize the strengths and address **the needs. Our local assessment results mirror the state assessment (ISAT) suggesting a continued emphasis on low income and the non-white subgroups** in both math and reading. Differentiated instruction is vital to meet the needs of all learners.

Classroom teachers continue to provide RtI Tier I and II instruction and intervention services.

Analysis of data at all grade levels, including specific item analysis, must be focus of work sessions giving teachers detailed information on which to base instructional planning.

Secure acquisition of additional approved materials to meet the needs of students who fail to respond to basic tools.

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?

Washington Elementary School is one of six elementary schools in District 87. Our 512 students are served in kindergarten through grade five. While having the least diverse ethnic and economic populations, Washington School is becoming more heterogeneous. Our staff of over 40 professionals provides a safe and enriching environment for all students. Washington School provides services for students with special education needs. The percentage of economically disadvantaged students continues to rise. Washington students have the opportunity for weekly instruction in music, art, and physical education by a certified teacher/specialist. Interventionists and a full time Counselor serve students who need additional educational and emotional/behavioral support. Every student spends time weekly in the Washington Learning Center, which is fully equipped with state of the art technology and an extensive collection of books and other resources.

Washington School students continue to make Adequate Yearly Progress on the Illinois Standards Assessment Test (ISAT) in the curricular areas of Reading and Math, according to the benchmarks of No Child Left Behind. In addition, our school ranks at or above both district and state scores in the meets and exceeds categories. Washington students made AYP.

With the availability of IlliniData, the Washington Staff has immediate access to testing data. Data is used for directing instruction and improving school performance.

School Task Forces examine various test scores to identify target instructional areas for improvement. Teachers identify improvement strategies at each grade level to create a school wide plan that is used as a framework for decision making throughout the year. Staff development efforts are focused toward the School Improvement Plan to meet the needs of all students.

The student population at Washington School has grown significantly over the past two years. In that time we have added over 100 + students and the school has grown from a little over 400 to over 500 students. With this increase, we have added classroom sections in kindergarten, first grade and second grade. Last year the growth was a little over 50

students. This year we added students from three other District 87 elementary schools as a result of NCLB Choice.

The general makeup of the student population is also changing to a more diverse population. The number and percent of ethnic subgroups continue to increase as well as the number and percent of students who receive financial assistance.

Due to the challenges and changes of the district and community, Washington Staff continues to initiate improvements for ongoing achievement of our increasingly diverse student population based on assessment data.

Response to Intervention (RtI) services provide supplemental instruction for children in all grades.

Our School Improvement Plan (SIP) is based upon the state and district goals with particular emphasis on Reading and Math.

The teachers analyze test data routinely through a newly developed data base system (Illinidata). This assists our staff in monitoring the progress of their entire grade level and subgroups. A new two year plan has been developed which will focus on improving scores in two sub groups: low income and special education students. This plan is based upon a variety of test scores and student observations. Response to Intervention, After School Reading/Math programs, and community volunteers assist our teachers in achieving these goals for students.

Our student achievement is attributed to the school, parents and community working together to assure student success. We are fortunate to have supportive parents helping children and a caring PTO providing learning opportunities and fun activities for families. Many community partners assist Washington School including the Ecology Action Center, Rotary Club, Kiwanis, State Farm, Junior Achievement, McLean County Farm Bureau, Big Buddy program, Challenger Learning Center, Discovery Museum, YWCA, United Way, Beyond the Books Foundation, local universities and many others who care about the future of children. The learning opportunities at Washington School can be reviewed through teacher newsletters and websites, PTO meetings, our Wolf Newsletter and the Washington website. The aforementioned attributes are evidenced in the School Report Card.

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

An ongoing increase in the percentage of economically disadvantaged students has impacted the way teachers deliver instruction and intervention. Research shows that students from low income homes often need enhanced reading readiness skills, more exposure to enriching life experiences, and explicit oral language and vocabulary development which are the building blocks of reading comprehension. A school wide initiative was developed to follow the Tier Model of Response to Intervention.

Schoolwide interventions were implemented. There are a number of factors (both long term and short term) that contribute to Washington's improved student performance. The first and foremost is the highly qualified dedicated staff. The staff strives to create a culture where students, teachers, parents and community work together to build a community of lifelong learners.

A second factor that must be considered is the remarkable attitude and positive spirit of our students. These powerful factors combined with strategies and interventions listed in the Data section have resulted in success for many more students.

As previously indicated Washington School has seen an increase in their low income population over the past several years. This will be our challenge since low income tends to correlate with lower achievement and Washington School will need to monitor achievement data and respond to the needs as they arise. The trend data for Washington School indicates a need to continue monitoring our sub groups as the achievement gap is not decreasing or in some cases widening.

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

We are currently developing better methods and a process to identify students for Tier II services and also increasing the types and amount of additional support for the students. As we anticipate a significant number of retirements in the next few years, teacher training will be vital to carry forward our goals. Data Days have been implemented to review progress monitoring data for small groups of students receiving Tier II interventions. From these meetings, Instructional planning forms will be updated and used record and monitor prescriptions for improved instruction. Changes to curriculum and interventions will be made if sufficient progress is not being made. Washington School will continue to focus on analysis of data with an emphasis on the translation to instructional planning, training in the targeted intervention materials, differentiated instruction, training to meet diverse needs is necessary for improvement. Greater improvement in scores will be noted when teachers have increased understanding of the data available and increased time to analyze and plan instruction. The detail in data available increases the ability to precisely differentiate instruction, a process that often creates the need for increased materials and planning time.

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 certified teachers are highly qualified as defined by the No Child Left Behind Act.

All program assistants are highly qualified as defined by the No Child Left Behind Act.

Professional development focuses on the defined needs of our learners.

All staff has the opportunity for technology training.

% of the staff have a Master's Degree

Several of the Washington School teacher leaders provide professional development to other teachers both at Washington and District wide.

Numerous teachers attend Regional and District level professional development.

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

Training in data analysis and intervention methods have been the focus for staff development which has contributed to student performance. Our efforts to build lifelong learners are evidenced by our staffs continued pursuit of professional development. Washington School has several teachers who participate on District Level Committees, teach District sponsored courses and are recognized for their expertise or leadership. As a whole the staff is highly motivated to increase achievement and take pride in their achievements. With over 90% of the student meeting/exceeding state standards, the staff has demonstrated their capacity for school improvement and contributions toward student achievement.

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

Professional development activities will continue to train staff in the Rtl process finding materials that will allow special education and general education teachers to function as interventionists. We need additional training in differentiation of instruction to meet the needs of all learners as our student population continues to diversify.

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?

The involvement and support of programs sponsored by parents of Washington School has had a positive impact on student learning. Families are involved in various ways including: PTO Membership, Family Reading Night, Carnival, Back to School Picnic, Book Fairs, Reading Wolves, Junior Great Books, Field Trips, Chess Club, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Field Day, Web Site Support, School Store and PBIS activities.

Curricular content and student progress are communicated through Parent Orientations, parent conferences, newsletters, and school or teacher web sites.

In the primary grades, take home folders with student work samples and other communications are sent home weekly. A required parent signature confirms proper delivery. Older students use a daily planner for homework, reminders and communication.

Our school makes contact with 100% of our families.

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

Individual and groups of parent volunteers have contributed to the enhancement of student performance. Volunteers provide individual and small group tutoring. The PTO supported the purchase of several SmartBoards and professional teacher training that resulted in increased student engagement.

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

Effort to involve families in the school through a combination of social and educational events will be continued. Surveys will be conducted to review families' perceptions of Washington School with the purpose to enhance school climate and to involve parents in meaningful ways. Seeking information from less involved parents will potentially increase the involvement of these parents as we target and respond to their needs.

Continued effort to communicate with families regarding the curriculum and grade level expectations is a priority. Building relationships with families enhances support for student success. Parents and staff working together and communicating regularly have a significant impact on student achievement and success. Efforts to involve parents in the school through a combination of social and educational events should be continued. Continued efforts to communicate with parents regarding the curriculum and grade level outcomes is a high priority. This understanding of the rigorous expectations at each grade level may further enhance parent support of student learning.

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?

For the next few years Washington staff will be comprised of several non-tenured faculty. Staff development must be tiered and overlapping to include veteran teachers as well as new teachers.

Teachers routinely review data and improve their own instructional practices through the ongoing professional development activities that are identified by this data analysis. This commitment to excellence and continuous professional development is based on best practices and research proven programs. We focus on teaching academic areas measured through NCLB and strive to improve the school climate which we know has a significant impact on student learning.

As we change to include Common Core Standards, an ongoing process of data analysis allows us to identify areas of student needs and challenges. This data will be used to guide professional development focus areas to improve the instructional practices that lead to increased student achievement. Professional development will focus on Differentiated Instruction, understanding and using researched based materials for Tiers I, II and III of RtI, implementing the District writing curriculum including 6+1 Traits, Pattern Sentences and

consistent vocabulary and editing tools are top priorities.
Continued efforts to meet the needs of students and families are a priority of Washington School.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Reading Meets + Exceeds on ISAT will increase from 86.7% to 92.5% of all students.	
2	Math Meets + Exceeds on ISAT will increase from 93.1% to at 95% of all students.	

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Reading Meets + Exceeds on ISAT will increase from 86.7% to 92.5% of all students.

Objective 1 Description

While our current achievement in reading for the grade 3 is 90.3%, grade 4 is 84.6% and grade 5 is 89% meeting/exceeding for ISAT, the percentage of all students meeting and exceeding on ISAT will increase in Reading achievement to at least 92.5%.

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

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

Objective 1 Title :

Reading Meets + Exceeds on ISAT will increase from 86.7% to 92.5% of all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Targeted intervention using research based materials will be provided through RtI reading teachers.	08/18/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Students will increase reading skills by increasing the amount of independent reading as measured by Reading Counts.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Students who are significantly behind will participate in after school reading small groups to develop skills.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	8,000
4	Students in grades 2-5 will use Scholastic Reading Inventory, SRI, to set goals and measure reading progress. This will also be used to match reading levels for appropriate book selection.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
5	Students in K-2 will receive daily instruction from Michael Haggerty Phonemic Awareness materials to increase PALS scores and DIBELS Next Phoneme Segmentation Fluency.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
6	Teachers will utilize other research based curriculum at Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III levels to provide remediation and support for students who have not met benchmarks.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
7	Teachers will use Discovery Assessment to target specific benchmark deficiencies and then remediate these targeted areas.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
8	Students will use Road to the Code/Six Minute Solution to increase fluency and comprehension.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
9	Students will increase reading skills through implementation of differentiated instruction through guided reading activities and using Leveled Readers.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
	Students will develop and apply comprehension strategies in various					

10	genres by applying the Reading Strategies Guide posters from Houghton Mifflin.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
11	Students will increase reading skills through implementation of leveled, differentiated instruction through flexible grouping and guided reading activities.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	
12	Students will be progress monitored by DIBELs Next tests in K-5 and Houghton Mifflin skills tests at all grade levels.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	
13	Special education students will be progress monitored and Tier 3 supplemental materials will be implemented based on each student's needs.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	Before School	Other	

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

Objective 1 Title :

Reading Meets + Exceeds on ISAT will increase from 86.7% to 92.5% of all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide multiple training opportunities through year to access, interpret, and plan using various data sources.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Attend area and regional workshops focused on increasing reading achievement.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Provide ongoing training opportunities to use instructional technology to further engage students in the learning process.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
4	Provide ongoing training opportunities to increase understanding and use of targeted interventions.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
5	Provide ongoing training opportunities to increase use of differentiated instruction.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 1 Title :

Reading Meets + Exceeds on ISAT will increase from 86.7% to 92.5% of all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Increase parent awareness of grade level expectations by sharing standards and exit skills on-line or on paper.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	0
2	Communicate test data with parents including information about the meaning of the various goals.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	0
3	Increase parent familiarity and us of Scholastic Reading Counts site to support appropriate book selection and increased reading.(orientation, website connections, orientation, etc.)	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Reading Meets + Exceeds on ISAT will increase from 86.7% to 92.5% of all students.

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?)

Student achievement on the objective will be monitored throughout the year as data is reviewed on DIBELS Next, SRI, Soliloquy, Reading Counts, Discovery Assessment, Study Island, Six Minute Solution, Lexia, and Reading Mastery. Intervention will be provided to students who are not meeting these goals. Students who are not making adequate progress will receive more intensive interventions until their progress improves to meet the objective. Student progress will be monitored and discussed at faculty meetings, building grade level meetings, RtI Team meetings, and Data Days which are held five times per year. Each student receiving intervention will have an Instructional Planning Form completed which lists the interventions, dates started, date completed, the interventionist and notes on achievement.

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	Jeff Lockenvitz	Principal

2	Denise Myatt	Counselor
3	Debby Hamm	Psychologist
4	Susan Anderson	Spec. Ed/Interventionist & RtI Coach
5	Susie Casey	Spec. Ed/Interventionist
6	Sharon Warren	Spec. Ed/Interventionist & RtI Coach
7	Teresa Shaver	Kindergarten
8	Maggie Killian	Kindergarten
9	Anne Waldorf	1st Grade
10	Jen Grupp	4th Grade
11	Lisa Molnar	5th Grade

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Math Meets + Exceeds on ISAT will increase from 93.1% to at 95% of all students.

Objective 2 Description

While over 93% of our students met or exceeded in ISAT math, our current achievement in math number sense for the grade 3 is 81.8%, grade 4 is 66.2% and grade 5 is 52.4% meeting/exceeding district benchmarks on ISAT. Our goal is to increase this to 85%. Our current achievement in math measurement for the grade 3 is 76%, grade 4 is 70% and grade 5 is 60% meeting/exceeding district benchmarks on ISAT. Our goal is to also increase this to 85%.

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

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

Objective 2 Title :

Math Meets + Exceeds on ISAT will increase from 93.1% to at 95% of all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will complete daily math computation and estimation activities to develop/enhance computative procedures, solve real life computation problems and apply a variety of estimation strategies using the district math series.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Students will complete Study Island and Education City sections designed to practice on areas of benchmark deficiency.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Students will use computer software programs to practice computation, estimation, graphing, number sense, measurement, and geometry	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
4	Discovery Assessment, Fast Math and Symphony Math will be used to provide math intervention.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
5	Students who are significantly behind will participate in after school math small groups to develop skills.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	8,000
6	Students will use M&M books, Daily Math exercises, Rocket math and M4T to increase vocabulary skills as well as problem solving skills in math.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
7	Special education students will use supplemental materials including Focus Math in addition to the enVision math materials, based on individual student needs.	08/19/2011	05/31/2011	Before School	Other	

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

Objective 2 Title :

Math Meets + Exceeds on ISAT will increase from 93.1% to at 95% of all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Discovery Assessment, Study Island, Education City, Fast Math and intervention training.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
2	District level technology training for math intervention software programs.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
3	District level technology training for math intervention software programs.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
4	Differentiation of Instruction	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
5	Use item analysis data from ISAT and Discovery Assessment to further differentiate instruction.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 2 Title :

Math Meets + Exceeds on ISAT will increase from 93.1% to at 95% of all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parent Teacher orientation will include information about all grade level curriculum standards and expectations.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	0
2	Increase parent awareness of grade level expectations by sharing standards and exit skills on-line or on paper.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	0
3	Communicate test data with parents including information about the meaning of the various goals.	08/19/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

Math Meets + Exceeds on ISAT will increase from 93.1% to at 95% of all students.

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?)

Student achievement on the objective will be monitored throughout the year as data is reviewed on Discovery Assessment, Study Island, Fast Math and Soliloquy. Intervention will be provided to students who are not meeting these goals. Students who are not making adequate progress will receive more intensive interventions until their progress improves to meet the objective. Student progress will be monitored and discussed at faculty meetings, building grade level meetings, Data Days and Rtl Team meetings. Staff will formally prepare and review the School Improvement Plan (SIP) two times a year during the designated approved days on the District wide calendar. Designated time during each teacher institute/workshop is scheduled for the study of the SIP.

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	Jeff Lockenvitz	Principal
2	Denise Myatt	Counselor
3	Debby Hamm	Psychologist
4	Susan Anderson	Spec. Ed/Interventionist & Rtl Coach
5	Susie Casey	Spec. Ed/Interventionist
6	Sharon Warren	Spec. Ed/Interventionist & Rtl Coach
7	Teresa Shaver	Kindergarten
8	Maggie Killian	Kindergarten
9	Anne Waldorf	1st Grade
10	Jen Grupp	4th Grade
11	Lisa Molnar	5th Grade

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.*)

Washington School provides the families access to the School Report Card information through the district website, the school newsletter, teacher classroom newsletters, and copies are available upon request. Parents are given individual student results at conferences.

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.

We follow the District guidelines for RtI and use the District approved interventions which have been certified as researched based. The District Plans have involved administrators from across the District, classroom teachers, special education teachers, school counselors, social workers and school psychologists.

Developing the School Improvement Plan is an essential goal for the entire Washington community. It is an ongoing process which includes the following to enhance development:

Parent Surveys

Administrative meetings

Teacher School Improvement Days (two per year)

PTO Meetings with ongoing presentations, input and updates

Parent/Teacher Orientation

Administrative meetings

Elementary principal meetings

IIRC staff training

School Improvement (SIP)/Staff Development Team

PBIS and RtI Committees

Each of these groups and activities contribute to the goals of the Washington School Improvement Plan.

	Name	Title
1	Jeff Lockenvitz	Principal
2	Denise Myatt	Counselor
3	Debby Hamm	Psychologist
4	Susan Anderson	Spec. Ed/Interventionist & RtI Coach
5	Susie Casey	Spec. Ed/Interventionist
6	Sharon Warren	Spec. Ed/Interventionist & RtI Coach
7	Teresa Shaver	Kindergarten
8	Maggie Killian	Kindergarten
9	Anne Waldorf	1st Grade
10	Jen Grupp	4th Grade
11	Lisa Molnar	5th Grade

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.

This SIP was reviewed prior to submitting (November 9th) to the District 87 School Board by a peer review committee consisting of Cindy Helmers, Becky Francois, Suzy Dees, Barry Reilly, David Wood, and Hershel Hannah.

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.

Teachers who are new to the district and the school participate in the New Teacher Professional Development Series. This program brings new teachers from all elementary schools together for half day training and mentoring sessions with administrators and/or outstanding veteran teachers. The new teachers participate in workshops, hands-on training and discussion on district curriculum, the Illinois Learning Standards, teaching reading, communicating with parents and other topics. They take time to reflect on their experiences and formulate personal and professional goals. The teachers also receive print and other resources to support their continued growth. A "helping" teacher is assigned to each new teacher to provide a basic orientation to the school.

With the exception of newly hired teachers, all district teachers have participated in long-term professional development addressing assessment practices in the Standards Aligned Classrooms project (SAC). During the current school year, four grade level meetings focused on grading as well as data analysis and use of a new educational information tool.

Teachers had further opportunity to participate in advanced activities through district sponsored classes, professional workshops and conferences, and college courses for which tuition waivers were provided.

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.

Because some of the other elementary schools in the District have not made AYP for two years and Washington School has been identified as making AYP, Washington School has been designated a school students/parents could choose to attend. In August 2011, 68 elementary students were given their first or second choice to attend Washington School as a result. The District administration assisted with plans, policies, communication and logistics to allow this program to be administered without incident.

Technical assistance including the analysis of local standardized achievement test scores, state test scores, and subgroup performance

Data management including the preparation of requested reports on individual students and groups of students

Opportunities for collaboration among elementary school principals to improve the School Improvement Planning process

Professional development on the use of iirc for administrators and school teams

Professional development for teachers on the Illinois Learning Standards, Common Core, Performance Descriptors, and Assessment Frameworks

Professional Development for all teachers in using IlliniData for access to local standardized achievement test scores, state test scores and subgroup performance by individual, class, and grade.

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.

NA

	Name	Title
1	Jeff Lockenvitz	Principal
2	Denise Myatt	Counselor
3	Debby Hamm	Psychologist
4	Susan Anderson	Spec. Ed/Interventionist & RtI Coach
5	Susie Casey	Spec. Ed/Interventionist
6	Sharon Warren	Spec. Ed/Interventionist & RtI Coach
7	Teresa Shaver	Kindergarten
8	Maggie Killian	Kindergarten
9	Anne Waldorf	1st Grade
10	Jen Grupp	4th Grade
11	Lisa Molnar	5th Grade

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

Yes 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