

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

## PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	170640870252012		
District Name:	Bloomington SD 87	School Name:	Stevenson Elem School
Superintendent:	Dr Robert S Nielsen	Principal:	Tina Fogal
District Address:	300 E Monroe St	School Address:	2106 Arrowhead Dr
City/State/Zip:	Bloomington,IL 61701 4028	City/State/Zip:	Bloomington,IL 61704 2357
District Telephone#:	Label 3098276031                      Extn: 221	School Telephone#:	3096632351                      Extn: 0
District Email:	nielsenr@district87.org	School Email:	fogalt@district87.org
<b>Is this plan for a Title I School?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			

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	92.9		Yes	97.3		Yes	95.3	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	96.4		Yes	98.2		Yes				
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes										
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities													
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	84.6	Yes	93.6	Yes					

**Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress**

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 70% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 70% 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 70% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 78% graduation rate for high schools.

\* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2008.

\*\* Safe Harbor Targets of 70% 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.

<b>DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION</b>
---

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

In 2008, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) was one of 6 states to be chosen by the US Department of Education to participate on the Differentiated Accountability Pilot Program. The Differentiated Accountability classification applies only to schools in federal improvement status.

The classification is a descriptor (i.e., focused or comprehensive) that is added to a school's improvement status. Current Title I requirements do not change.

The classification will assist in distinguishing between schools that need focused supports versus more comprehensive interventions.

Focused-School does not make AYP overall, but does make AYP in the "ALL" students subgroup in both reading and math.

Comprehensive-School does not make AYP overall and does not make AYP in the "ALL" students subgroup in either reading or math.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 2 - 2009 AMAO Report

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

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

School Information								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	95.5	95.3	96.2	95.3	96.0	95.3	95.6	95.3
Truancy Rate (%)	-	-	0.2	0.8	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.2
Mobility Rate (%)	15.2	45.1	18.6	18.8	20.8	19.7	15.0	11.9
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	516	526	539	528	466	431	462	477
Low Income (%)	36.0	35.4	36.9	44.1	40.1	43.6	47.2	47.0
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	-	18.8	21.9	13.6	11.4	5.6	3.5	7.5
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	56.4	53.8	47.5	47.0	55.4	56.4	54.5	52.4
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	18.6	17.1	19.7	20.5	20.4	20.6	23.6	22.4
Hispanic (%)	18.2	19.2	19.9	19.7	10.9	5.1	4.1	5.0
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	6.8	9.9	13.0	12.9	11.2	11.4	9.1	10.7
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	1.9	6.5	8.7	9.4

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

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	2000	65.3	18.4	12.2	4.1	-	-
	2001	60.9	17.5	15.1	6.1	0.4	-
	2002	56.4	18.6	18.2	6.8	-	-
	2003	53.8	17.1	19.2	9.9	-	-
	2004	47.5	19.7	19.9	13.0	-	-
	2005	47.0	20.5	19.7	12.9	-	-
	2006	55.4	20.4	10.9	11.2	0.2	1.9
	2007	56.4	20.6	5.1	11.4	-	6.5
	2008	54.5	23.6	4.1	9.1	-	8.7
	2009	52.4	22.4	5.0	10.7	-	9.4
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	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
	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 (%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	2000	13.8	26.7	100.0	95.6	15.4	-	-	-	-
	2001	15.7	29.5	100.0	95.3	19.9	-	-	-	-
	2002	-	36.0	100.0	95.5	15.2	-	-	-	-
	2003	18.8	35.4	100.0	95.3	45.1	-	-	-	-
	2004	21.9	36.9	100.0	96.2	18.6	1	0.2	-	-
	2005	13.6	44.1	100.0	95.3	18.8	4	0.8	-	-
	2006	11.4	40.1	100.0	96.0	20.8	1	0.2	-	-
	2007	5.6	43.6	100.0	95.3	19.7	2	0.5	-	-
	2008	3.5	47.2	100.0	95.6	15.0	2	0.4	-	-
	2009	7.5	47.0	100.0	95.3	11.9	1	0.2	-	-
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	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
	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	516	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	509	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	516	93	82	90	-	-	-
	2003	526	88	92	82	-	-	-
	2004	539	85	81	90	-	-	-
	2005	528	89	73	76	-	-	-
	2006	466	71	79	70	-	-	-
	2007	431	68	59	70	-	-	-
	2008	462	76	66	58	-	-	-
	2009	477	87	87	56	-	-	-
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
	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	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	-	-	
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
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>
All	81.2	81.9	84.2	86.2	88.5	91.5	-	-	76.5	86.8	82.8	85.0	73.3	80.7	81.5	75.5	94.3	90.0
White	86.7	89.8	89.7	85.0	88.9	97.7	-	-	87.5	96.9	86.8	90.7	85.3	85.4	85.3	85.7	96.7	94.5
Black	64.7	70.0	66.7	90.0	84.2	80.9	-	-	57.1	-	66.7	71.4	47.4	63.6	-	58.3	92.8	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	70.0	54.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40.0	-	40.0	-	-	-	-
Low Income	84.3	72.0	80.0	73.1	83.8	84.9	-	-	70.3	72.3	70.3	77.3	50.0	70.0	80.0	73.9	87.6	80.0

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>
All	91.3	93.0	96.8	98.3	94.9	96.3	-	-	94.1	96.1	93.2	92.6	95.0	93.0	90.7	93.0	100.0	96.1
White	93.4	94.9	97.5	97.5	97.8	97.6	-	-	95.0	96.9	97.4	95.3	94.1	97.6	91.2	92.9	100.0	94.4
Black	82.4	90.0	93.4	100.0	84.2	95.3	-	-	85.7	-	75.0	85.7	94.8	81.8	-	83.3	100.0	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	90.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	60.0	81.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50.0	-	70.0	-	-	-	-
Low Income	84.2	92.0	96.0	96.0	89.2	94.1	-	-	92.6	94.1	85.7	88.6	83.3	85.0	86.7	87.0	100.0	95.2

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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?*

Stevenson School met AYP in all categories. We recognize a need for continuous improvement of student learning through the examination of test data. The data below will be used to guide the staff at Stevenson School to maximize learning and increase achievement of all students.

Stevenson School's overall reading and math scores have increased over the past several years. Broken down by grade level, comparing 2007/2008 test scores to 2008/2009 test scores, the third grade students' reading scores have increased from 88.8% to 91.5% and the fourth grade reading test scores have increased from 82.8% to 84%. However, the fifth grade reading scores saw a decline 94.3% to 90%. It should be noted the fifth grade reading scores reflect a 16.5% increase over the past three years. Third grade math increased from 95% to 96.4%, fourth grade declined from 93.2% to 91.4% and fifth grade declined from 100% to 96%. Although some math scores declined, these scores are considerably above AYP benchmarks.

As we look at our sub groups, our black students at the third grade level in reading decreased 3.3% from the previous year. In the 2007/2008 school year 84.2 % met or exceeded compared to 80.9% in the 2008/2009 school year. At the fourth grade level 66.7% met or exceeded in 2007/2008 compared to 71.4% in 2008/2009, an increase of 4.7%. In the 2008/2009 school year, Stevenson School did not have a fifth grade black sub group in reading. If we compare black students in 2006/2007 to students in 2007/2008, there was an increase in the percentage of students that met or exceeded by 34.5% (58.3 to 92.8).

In math during the 2008/2009 school year, our third grade black sub group who met or exceeded increased 11.1% from 84.2% to 95.3% from 2007/2008. Fourth grade also demonstrated an increase, with 75 % meeting or exceeding in 2007/2008 and 85.7% in 2008/2009. In the 2008/2009 school year, Stevenson School did not have a fifth grade black sub group in math, but if we compare our black students in 2006/2007 to 2007/2008 in the met or exceeded category, there was a 16.7% increase. Eighty-five percent of our third and fourth grade black sub group met or exceeded in the 2008/2009 school year.

Our low income students at the third grade level in reading increased 1.1% from the previous year. In the 2007/2008 school year, 83.8 % met or exceeded compared to 84.9% in the 2008/2009 school year. At the fourth grade level, 70.3% met or exceeded in 2007/2008 compared to 77.3% in 2008/2009, an increase of 7.0%. At the fifth grade level, there was a 7.6% decrease from 87.6% in 2007/2008 to 80% in 2008/2009.

The third grade low income students' math scores increased 4.9% from the previous year. In the 2007/2008 school year, 89.2 % met or exceeded, compared to

94.1% in the 2008/2009 school year. At the fourth grade level, 85.7% met or exceeded in 2007/2008 compared to 88.6% in 2008/2009, an increase of 2.9%. At the fifth grade level, there was a 4.8% decrease from 100% in 2007/2008 to 95.2% in 2008/2009. Overall, if you look at the last three years of data, our low income sub group has achieved AYP benchmarks with all scores being above 85%.

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

Stevenson School has seen an increase in our low income population over the past three years. Comparing 2005/2006 percentages to the 2008/2009 percentages, the low income population has increased 6.9%. Despite this increase, our scores have remained above AYP benchmarks.

Increased achievement of all students can be attributed to the quality and dedication of our staff. The staff at Stevenson School has taken an active role in the professional development opportunities in our district and community. Stevenson School also offers a variety of programs in our building to enhance and improve student achievement.

After school tutoring was offered to our students. Students were instructed twice a week for eighteen sessions. They were ability grouped and provided intensive instruction in their area(s) of deficits, specifically reading and math.

Stevenson staff is dedicated to differentiating instruction. Each grade level recognizes the individual needs of their students. The Language Arts instruction at a variety of grade levels is grouped by ability. These practices enable teachers to meet the wide range of individual needs at their grade level.

Over the past several years, Stevenson School has piloted early literacy programs in the primary grades (Heggerty and DIBELS). These programs were designed to support beginning readers not meeting district benchmarks by regularly monitoring the development of early literacy and reading skills. These programs have been researched and found to be reliable and valid indicators of early literacy development and a very powerful predictor of later reading achievement.

Title One is another contributing factor to test scores at Stevenson School. Our Title One program is used to assist students struggling with their early literacy skills. Students are placed in the Title One program using research based assessments. The students are progress monitored and dismissed when performing at grade level benchmarks. In 2008, Stevenson Elementary transitioned from a Target Assistant Title One school to a School-Wide Title One school. This change has allowed our Title One staff to expand services to students at all grade levels.

Many teachers at Stevenson have participated, or are currently participating, in the Standards Aligned Classroom (SAC) initiative. SAC offers a rigorously tested, research-based teaching program with proven strategies for aligning classroom instruction and assessment to the Illinois Learning Standards. This program allows students to become more engaged in learning, thereby, improving their performance and building their confidence.

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

Each year the staff at Stevenson Elementary uses local and state test scores to make decisions about student learning. All subject areas and their sub groups are reviewed to determine areas of instructional weakness. Student sub groups are also reviewed to determine if one particular group is not being sufficiently addressed. Differentiation allows us to meet the needs of our diverse population.

Professional development needs will change as our school improvement goals change. Bloomington Public School District 87 is dedicated to provide staff a variety of professional development opportunities in and outside of the district.

Review of these tests scores indicates the need for improvement in a few areas. The staff continues to provide the interventions necessary and attend professional development opportunities to meet those challenges.

### 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?

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.

Our fall 2007 SAT-10 data indicates:

---

**Reading: The percentage of students that M+E increased significantly in 4<sup>th</sup> grade, marginally in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade and decreased in 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> grade:**

- 51.9% of 1<sup>st</sup> Grade students M+E (-4.4%).
- 55% of 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade students M+E (-.4%).
- 72% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade students M+E (+.2%).
- 68.9% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (+12.3%).
- 53.8% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (-7%).

**Math: The percentage of students that M+E increased significantly in 4<sup>th</sup> grade, marginally in 2<sup>nd</sup> grade, and decreased in 1<sup>st</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades:**

- 53.2% of 1<sup>st</sup> Grade students M+E (-5.6%).
- 66.3% of 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade students M+E (+2.8%)
- 61.2% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade students M+E (-7%)
- 76.7% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (+27.3%).
- 55% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (-5.8%).

**By Grade and Race:**

- In 1<sup>st</sup> grade the percentage of students M+E in both Reading and Math are White (71.9%) and Black (18.8%).
- In 2<sup>nd</sup> grade the percentage of students M+E in Reading are White (68.3%), Black (23.8%) and Hispanic (50%). The percentage of students M+E in Math are

White (73.2%), Black (47.6%) and Hispanic (50%).

- In 3<sup>rd</sup> grade the percentage of students M+E in Reading are White (66.7%), Black (85.7%), and Hispanic (83.3%). The percentage of students M+E in Math are White (61.3%), Black (61.5%) and Hispanic (83.3%).
- In 4<sup>th</sup> grade the percentage of students M+E in Reading are White (79.5%), Black (29.4%) and Hispanic (75%). The percentage of students M+E in Math are White (81.6%), Black (20.7%) and Hispanic (100%).
- In 5<sup>th</sup> grade the percentages of students M+E in Reading are White (64.3%), Black (37.5%) and Hispanic (40%). The percentage of students M+E in Math are White (61.9%), Black (50%) and Hispanic (40%).

#### By Grade and Income:

- In Reading 65.9% of 1<sup>st</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E compared to 33.3% of the Low Income students. (Gap = 32.6%). In Math 61.4% of 1<sup>st</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E compared to 42.4% of Low Income students (Gap = 19%)
- In Reading, 65.1% of 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E compared to 43.2% of Low Income students (Gap = 21.9%). 79.1% of 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Math compared to 51.4% of Low Income Students (Gap=27.7%).
- 71% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 73.1% of Low Income students (Gap = +2.7%). In Math, 65.9% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 53.8% of Low Income students (Gap = 12.1%)
- 88.1% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 43.8% of Low Income students (Gap = 44.3%). In Math, 87.8% of Not Low

Income students M+E compared to 62.5% of Low Income students (Gap = 12.1%)

- 71.8% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 36.6% of the Low Income students. (Gap = 35.2%) In Math, 76.9% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 34.1% of Low Income students. (Gap = 42.8%)

#### By Grade and IEP Status:

- In Reading, 56.7% of 1<sup>st</sup> Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 20% IEP students (Gap = 54.7%). In Math, 58.2% of Not IEP students M+E compared to 20% of IEP students (Gap = 38.2%)
- In Reading, 57.5% of 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 28.6% of IEP students (Gap = 28.9%). 69.9% of 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 28.6% of IEP students (Gap = 41.3%).
- 78.3% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Not IEP students M+E in Reading compared to 0% of IEP students (Gap = 78.3%). In Math, 61.9% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 50% of IEP students (Gap = 11.9%).
- In 4<sup>th</sup> Grade, 73.9% of Not IEP students M+E in Reading compared to 0% of IEP Students (Gap 73.9%). In Math 80.9% of Not IEP students M+E compared to 20% of IEP students (60.9%).
- In Reading 62.1% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Not IEP students M+E compared to 14.3% of IEP students (Gap = 47.8%). In Math, 62.1% of Not IEP students M+E compared to 21.4% of IEP students (Gap = 40.7%).

\*In reading, overall an average 60.32% of our first through fifth grade students met or exceeded in the reading category.

\*An area of weakness in reading was sounds, letters and listening at the first grade level. Fifty-three percent of the students indicate the need for intervention or support in sounds and letters.

\*In math, the number of students that met or exceeded in first through fifth grade ranged from 53.22% to 76.7%. The average of students who met or exceeded was 62.5%.

\*An area of weakness in math was procedures in third and fifth grade level, both scoring 46.3%. Students in second through fifth scored above the district expectations in problem solving.

\*Our black population scored lower in reading and math as defined by our district benchmark at all grade levels except for third grade.

\*There continues to be a gap between our low income and non low income students. In reading and in math the non low income students scored higher than low income students in all grades except for third grade reading.

The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) are a set of standardized, individually administered measures of early literacy development. The assessment includes fluency measures used to regularly monitor the development of pre-reading and early reading skills. The DIBELS assessment is administered three times a year to all K-5th graders, data is used to select students for intervention and to measure program effectiveness.

This is the first year our district implemented the DIBELS program school wide. Students in kindergarten and first grade are provided intense instruction in the areas of literacy and reading skills, specifically initial sound fluency, letter naming, phoneme segmentation and nonsense word fluency. Students in second through fifth are provided instruction in oral reading fluency.

The DIBELS instrument is designed in such a way that the expectations increase as the year progresses and at each grade level. The scores in the table below demonstrates the effectiveness of this program.

Grade (2008 - 2009)	Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS)	% Low Risk	% Some Risk	% At Risk
Kindergarten	Phoneme Segmentation Fluency	92	7	1
First	Oral Reading Fluency	81	15	4
Second	Oral Reading Fluency	73	18	9

Third	Oral Reading Fluency	74	18	8
Fourth	Oral Reading Fluency	65	21	14
Fifth	Oral Reading Fluency	NA	NA	NA

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

Several factors impact these excellent 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.

Four years of DIBELS data was available for analysis. We believe the positive trend is related to a variety of factors:

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

\*Interventionists committed to implementing each tool precisely as designed.

\*Classroom teachers in grades K- 2 fully implemented the Heggerty phonemic awareness program with all students.

\*Frequent data collection occurred every 2.5 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.

\*District 87 adopted a new language arts series in 2008.

\*Staff is offered on-going professional development throughout the school year.

\*Title One services are provided to students in the bottom quartile in grades one through five not meeting district or state benchmarks.

**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 black subgroups in both math and reading.

### 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?*

Stevenson School is a NCLB Blue Ribbon School. It is one of six elementary schools in the Bloomington Public School District 87. Our 497 students are served in grades kindergarten through fifth grade and reflect a rich cultural mix. In addition to serving regular education students, our highly qualified staff teaches English Language Learners (ELL), children with special needs and academically talented students. A fulltime social worker/counselor and nurse assist Stevenson students. Response to Intervention (RtI) and Title I services are offered as a language arts resource program for qualified children in all grades. Every Stevenson student has weekly instruction in music, art, library/technology and physical education by a certified teacher/specialist.

Stevenson School continues to achieve the adequate yearly progress status required by the state. In addition, our school ranks at or above both district and state scores in the meets and exceeds categories. Stevenson Elementary is rated in the top ten schools whose demographics are comparative to us. 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 black students. This plan is based upon a variety of test scores and student observations. Title I services, Response to Intervention, After School Reading/Math programs, individual tutoring through Illinois State University and Illinois Wesleyan University, community volunteers and Junior Achievement assist our teachers in achieving these goals for students.

Our outstanding 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. Our Building Leadership Team (BLT) gives guidance to enhance school climate. Many community partners assist Stevenson School including the McDonald's Corporation, Ecology Action Center, Rotary Club, Kiwanis, State Farm, Verizon, 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 Stevenson School can be reviewed through teacher newsletters and websites, PTO meetings, our Tiger Talk Newsletter and the Stevenson 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?*

There are a number of factors (both long term and short term) that created Stevenson's improved student performance. The first and foremost is the highly qualified and dedicated staff. The staff strives to create a culture where students, teachers, parents and community work together to build a community of life long 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, Stevenson School has seen an increase in their low-income population and the mobility rate over the past several years. The low income population and mobility rate will be our challenge since they can be an indicators of lower achievement.

The trend data for Stevenson School indicates a need to continue monitoring our Black sub group.

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

These factors imply a need for Stevenson School to continue addressing the needs of all students. Continued efforts to meet the personal needs of students and families must be vigorous.

### 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?*

All certified staff at Stevenson School were determined to be "highly qualified" by NCLB guidelines. The number of full time educators has increased. There has been an increase in the number of teachers obtaining a masters degree in the field of education. Several staff members have achieved and others are pursuing National Board Certification. There has been an increase in the number of staff serving ELL students and providing Response to Intervention (RtI) services.

School-based professional development focused on meeting the needs of a wide range of learners. Professional development opportunities are also offered through the district, state, regional office of education, local universities and other universities with on line courses. Staff development also occurs in the building in the form of peer mentoring and collaborative efforts. Collectively these professional development opportunities have contributed to the success of our students.

Staff have found that professional development opportunities must be aligned with the needs of our student population. Our staff is dedicated to engaging in on-going staff development opportunities that address both our low-income and mobility challenges.

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

As indicated above all certified staff at Stevenson School are determined to be "highly qualified" by NCLB guidelines. The capacity of highly qualified staff allows us to meet the individual educational needs of all students. The staff at Stevenson School takes pride in engaging in the continuous professional development opportunities offered through the district, state, regional office of education, local universities and other universities with on line courses. Staff development also occurs in the building in the form of peer mentoring and collaborative efforts.

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

These factors imply a need for additional staff development opportunities that address our black sub group, low-income and mobility challenges.

### Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data Item 3 - Parent Involvement

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

The involvement and support of programs by parents at Stevenson School has had a positive impact on student learning. Families are involved in various ways including: PTO membership, Family Reading Nights, Open House, Carnival, Title I meetings, parent conferences, home visits, volunteers, Parent trainings, Multicultural Nights, Orientation, After School Programs, Computer Night, Book Fair, Fall Festival, Math Night, Language Arts Night, Play Day, Musical Programs, Spelling Bee, Invention Convention, Career Day, Rhythms, Butterfly Parade, Field Trips, Specials Needs Community Trainings, Butterfly Garden, Walk for the Cure, Destination Imagination, Student Led Conferences and an Art Club. The staff at Stevenson School are adamant in encouraging parental involvement. Staff email and classroom websites are readily available to all our Stevenson families. Staff send home weekly newsletters and student work folders to encourage parental involvement.

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

Parents and other volunteers are involved daily with children both directly and indirectly. Parent involvement and volunteers allow our staff to devote more time to individual student needs for enrichment and intervention. Not only do they devote their time, but also provide a great deal of financial support for many important projects that are dedicated to student learning. Parent goals are coordinated with the state goals. Families have a great understanding of the standards because of their communication with teachers.

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

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. Seeking information from less involved parents will potentially increase the involvement of these parents as we target and respond to their needs.

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?*

Our teachers continually seek to improve instructional practices. This commitment to excellence and continuous professional development is based on best practices and research-based programs. We focus on the "science" of teaching in the academic areas measured through NCLB, but also examine and improve the school climate which we believe has a significant impact on student engagement and learning. This includes such things as management, appearance, optimism, etc.

As previously described, continued efforts to meet the personal needs of students and families must be vigorous. Additional staff development opportunities should address our black sub group, low-income and mobility challenges.



### Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	<a href="#">Low income students' reading scores at each grade will be raised to at least 85% by the 2010 and 90% in 2011 ISAT.</a>	
2	<a href="#">The average of the black sub group in grades 3 - 5 in reading will be at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.</a>	
3	<a href="#">All students will increase their number sense ability through a variety of instructional strategies.</a>	

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

### Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

#### Objective 1

Low income students' reading scores at each grade will be raised to at least 85% by the 2010 and 90% in 2011 ISAT.

#### Objective 1 Description

Low income students at the third, fourth and fifth grade level scored 84.9%, 77.3% and 80% respectively on the 2009 ISAT reading. Scores at each grade will be raised to at least 85% by the 2010 and 2011 ISAT.

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

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Low income students' reading scores at each grade will be raised to at least 85% by the 2010 and 90% in 2011 ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will develop and apply comprehension strategies in various genres by applying the Reading Strategies Guide Posters from Houghton Mifflin	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Students will improve their reading through implementation of the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) and Reading Counts.	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	18,000
3	Students will expand phonemic awareness and phonics through the practice of skills from Houghton Mifflin Phonics K-5, Heggerty, Title One and DIBELS/RTI (K-5).	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	600
4	Students will enhance their language arts skills by attending and studying in the After School Reading and Math Program.	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	State Funds	6,000
5	Students will use interactive white boards (Smartboard) to maximize student engagement.	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Other	0
6	Students and parents will participate in Family Reading Night	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Title I	500
7	Students and parents will participate in Title One/ELL/ RtI Informational Night	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Title I	500

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Low income students' reading scores at each grade will be raised to at least 85% by the 2010 and 90% in 2011 ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Smartboard Training	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	750
2	Phyllis Hostmeyer Writing	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	5,000
3	DIBELS training	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	500
4	Heggerty Phonemic Awareness training	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	750
5	Standards Aligned Classroom Initiatives	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	2,000
6	Peer Coaching	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
7	Staff Development at building level (Writing, Reading, After School Tutoring, Math & Technology)	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	5,000

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Low income students' reading scores at each grade will be raised to at least 85% by the 2010 and 90% in 2011 ISAT.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parent/Teacher Conferences	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Family Reading Nights	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	500
3	Title One Fall Housing Meeting (ELL and Rtl are also included at this event)	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Title I	500
4	Curriculum Nights	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	0

## Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 1 Title :**

Low income students' reading scores at each grade will be raised to at least 85% by the 2010 and 90% in 2011 ISAT.

**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?)

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. In addition to the School Improvement Day activities, teachers will discuss progress during district and school grade level meetings. Designated time during each teacher institute/workshop is scheduled for the study of the SIP. A new data collection component (Illinidata) is available to all classroom teachers. This tool allows our teachers the ability to review student assessment data at the local and state level. Staff utilizes Discovery Assessment to monitor student progress, guide instruction and develop remediation activities. Routinely staff will use teacher check lists, student conferencing, observations, ongoing formal and informal assessment and student profiles.

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	Tina Fogal	Principal
2	Dr. Joann Walters	Title One Reading Specialist
3	Chris Bohne	Library Media Specialist

## Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

**Objective 2**

The average of the black sub group in grades 3 - 5 in reading will be at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.

**Objective 2 Description**

The scores in reading for the black sub group in 2009 were as follows:

Third 81%

Fourth 68.2%

Fifth 62.5%

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

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

The average of the black sub group in grades 3 - 5 in reading will be at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will develop and apply comprehension strategies in various genres by applying the Reading Strategies Guide Posters from Houghton	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Students will improve their reading through implementation of the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) and Reading Counts	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	16,000
3	Students will expand phonemic awareness and phonics through the practice of skills from Houghton Mifflin Phonics and DIBELS/RTI (K-5)	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	1,000
4	Students will enhance their language arts skills by attending and studying in the After School Reading Program	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	6,000
5	Students will utilize the knowledge they learn from Balanced Literacy for Special Education program	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	0

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

The average of the black sub group in grades 3 - 5 in reading will be at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	DIBELS training	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	500
2	Targeted interventions using Title One	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Title I	100,000
3	Heggerty Phonemic Awareness training	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	500
4	Standards Aligned Classroom Initiatives	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	500
5	Curricular Trainings offered through district and ROE	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	1,000
6	Staff Development at building level (Writing, Reading, After School Tutoring, Math & Technology)	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	5,000

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

The average of the black sub group in grades 3 - 5 in reading will be at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parent/Teacher Conferences	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	0
2	Family Reading Nights	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	500
3	Use local business's reading incentive programs	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	0
4	Curriculum Night	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	0

## Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 2 Title :**

The average of the black sub group in grades 3 - 5 in reading will be at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011.

**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?)

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. In addition to the School Improvement Day activities, teachers will discuss progress during district and school grade level meetings. Designated time during each teacher institute/workshop is scheduled for the study of the SIP. A new data collection component (Illinidata) is available to all classroom teachers. This tool allows our teachers the ability to review student assessment data at the local and state level. Staff utilizes Discovery Assessment to monitor student progress, guide instruction and develop remediation activities. Routinely staff will use teacher check lists, student conferencing, observations, ongoing formal and informal assessment and student profiles.

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	Tina Fogal	Principal
2	Dr. Joann Walters	Title One Reading Specialist
3	Chris Bohne	Library Media Specialist

## Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

**Objective 3**

All students will increase their number sense ability through a variety of instructional strategies.

**Objective 3 Description**

While our current achievement in math in all grade levels and sub groups indicate that 85% or more of our students mets/exceeds categories this goal will allow our school to maintain this current level of progress.

The 2009 ISAT scores indicate that computation, operation, estimation and properties for third, fourth and fifth grades were as follows:

Third 65% met or exceeded  
Fourth 59% met or exceeded  
Fifth 71% met or exceeded

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

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

All students will increase their number sense ability through a variety of instructional strategies.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will complete daily math computation and estimation activities by developing/enhancing computative procedures, solve real life computation problems and apply a variety of estimation strategies using the district math series.	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Students will complete daily math computation and estimation activities by using basic facts strategies to improve computation.	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Spiraling activites such as Drops in a Bucket, Math Minutes, Math 4 Today, Daily Oral Math	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
4	Students will use computer software programs to practice computation, estimation, graphing, number sense, measurement, and geometry	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
5	Students will participate in after school tutoring with the focus of math	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Title I	6,000

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

All students will increase their number sense ability through a variety of instructional strategies.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Standard Aligned Classroom Initiatives	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	1,000
2	Regional Office of Education workshops	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	0
3	Challenger Learning Center Training	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	550
4	Smartboard Level 1 and Level 2	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	0
5	Professional Learning Communities	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	5,000

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

All students will increase their number sense ability through a variety of instructional strategies.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will participate in curriculum nights, spotlight on students, open house, computer night, Title One Fall Housing meeting.	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	0
2	Math activities are included in teacher newsletters/teacher websites.	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	0
3	Title I Coordinator will help develop Family Training Nights.	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Title I	2,000
4	Students and parents will work together on problem solving homework using rubrics and graphic organizers.	08/20/2009	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	0

## Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 3 Title :**

All students will increase their number sense ability through a variety of instructional strategies.

**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?)

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. In addition to the School Improvement Day activities, teachers will discuss progress during district and grade level meetings. Designated time during each teacher institute/workshop is scheduled for the study of the SIP. Staff will also use teacher checklists, student conferencing, observations, ongoing formative and summative assessment and student profiles.

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	Tina Fogal	Principal
2	Melanie Stanley	2nd Grade Teacher
3	LaShanta Williams	4th Grade Teacher

### 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.*)

Stevenson School provides the families access to the School Report Card information through the district website, the school website, the Tiger Talk school newsletter and teacher classroom newsletters.

Hard copies of the State School Report Card are available upon request. Parents are given individual student testing results at conferences.

Title I Parent/Principal/Teacher/Student Compact, Title I Policy, Budget, and Highly Qualified Staff are provided to parents at the Fall Housing Meeting and upon request.

### 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.

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

Parent Surveys

Teacher School Improvement Days (two per year)

PTO Meetings with ongoing presentations, input and updates

Meet the Teacher Open House/Orientation

Administrative meetings

Elementary principal meetings

IIRC staff training

**Title I Fall Housing Meeting**

Building Leadership Team(BLT) composed of staff and parents

Spotlight Night for Families

School Improvement (SIP)/Staff Development Team

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

	Name	Title
1	Tina Fogal	Principal
2	Julie Dawson	Third Grade Teacher
3	Melanie Stanley	Second Grade Teacher
4	Barbi Dennis	First Grade Teacher
5	La'Shanta Williams	Fourth Grade Teacher
6	Katharine Corley	Kindergarten Teacher
7	Dr. JoAnn Walters	Title One Reading Specialist

8	Deedee Mullenix	Fifth Grade Teacher
9	Chris Bohne	Library Media Specialist
10	Vicky Picone	Physical Education Teacher

**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.

Not Applicable

**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 a new teacher professional development training at the beginning of the school year. This on-going program brings new teachers from all elementary schools together for a half-day training 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 other resources to support their continued growth.

### 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 the following:

- \*Access to local standardized achievement test scores, state test scores and subgroup performance through IlliniData
- \*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, Performance Descriptors and Assessment Framework
- \*Workshop on the changes in the ISAT for administrators and school teams
- \*Opportunities for all teachers to participate in the Standards Aligned Classroom project and assessment training
- \*Other assistance at the request of and in collaboration with the building principals

**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;

1/19/2010 1:31:48 PM

- 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.

Not applicable

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

	Name	Title
1	Tina Fogal	Principal
2	Katharine Corley	Kindergarten Teacher
3	JoAnn Walters	Title I Reading Specialist
4	DeeDee Mullenix	5th Grade Teacher
5	Vicky Picone	Physical Education
6	Julie Dawson	3rd Grade Teacher
7	Melanie Stanley	2nd Grade Teacher
8	Barbi Dennis	1st Grade Teacher
9	La'Shanta Williams	4th Grade Teacher
10	Chris Bohne	Library Media Specialist
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		

---

**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

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]
<b>MONITORING</b>	
<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**