

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

## PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

|  |   |                    |   |
|--|---|--------------------|---|
| RCDT Number:   | 170640870252013                                 |                    |   |
| District Name:   | Bloomington SD 87                               | School Name:       | Washington Elem School                  |
| Superintendent:  | Dr Robert S Nielsen                             | 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:  | nielsenr@district87.org                         | School Email:      | lockenvitzj@district87.org              |
| Is this plan for a Title I School? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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     | 90.7                                 |                      | Yes     | 96.3        |                      | Yes     | 95.4             | Yes     |                 |         |
| White                    | 100.0                            | Yes     | 100.0       | Yes     | 91.7                                 |                      | Yes     | 96.2        |                      | Yes     |                  |         |                 |         |
| Black                    |                                  |         |             |         |                                      |                      |         |             |                      |         |                  |         |                 |         |
| Hispanic                 |                                  |         |             |         |                                      |                      |         |             |                      |         |                  |         |                 |         |
| Asian/Pacific Islander   |                                  |         |             |         |                                      |                      |         |             |                      |         |                  |         |                 |         |
| Native American          |                                  |         |             |         |                                      |                      |         |             |                      |         |                  |         |                 |         |



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

| School Information                    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|---------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                                       | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| Attendance Rate (%)                   | 96.0 | 95.5 | 96.5 | 95.8 | 96.4 | 95.6 | 95.7 | 95.4 |
| Truancy Rate (%)                      | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Mobility Rate (%)                     | 11.2 | 11.7 | 13.3 | 11.0 | 14.4 | 10.5 | 12.0 | 12.5 |
| HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%) | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| School Population (#)                 | 437  | 439  | 434  | 406  | 386  | 388  | 377  | 397  |
| Low Income (%)                        | 13.0 | 14.6 | 14.5 | 16.5 | 16.3 | 19.3 | 19.4 | 24.4 |
| Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)  | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 0.5  |
| Students with Disabilities (%)        |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| White, non-Hispanic (%)               | 88.8 | 86.6 | 83.6 | 80.8 | 81.1 | 79.6 | 79.3 | 77.6 |
| Black, non-Hispanic (%)               | 5.5  | 6.4  | 7.1  | 11.3 | 9.6  | 10.1 | 7.4  | 7.8  |
| Hispanic (%)                          | 2.1  | 2.7  | 3.5  | 3.0  | 2.8  | 3.1  | 3.7  | 2.8  |
| Asian/Pacific Islander (%)            | 3.4  | 4.1  | 5.8  | 4.9  | 4.9  | 5.9  | 5.6  | 4.8  |
| Native American or Alaskan Native(%)  | 0.2  | 0.2  | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 0.3  |
| Multiracial/Ethnic (%)                | -    | -    | -    | -    | 1.6  | 1.3  | 4.0  | 6.8  |

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<br/>C<br/>H<br/>O<br/>O<br/>L</b>             | 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                      |
| <b>D<br/>I<br/>S<br/>T<br/>R<br/>I<br/>C<br/>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<br>T<br>A<br>T<br>E | 2001 | 60.1 | 20.9 | 15.4 | 3.4 | 0.2 | -   |
|                       | 2002 | 59.3 | 20.8 | 16.2 | 3.5 | 0.2 | -   |
|                       | 2003 | 58.6 | 20.7 | 17.0 | 3.6 | 0.2 | -   |
|                       | 2004 | 57.7 | 20.8 | 17.7 | 3.6 | 0.2 | -   |
|                       | 2005 | 56.7 | 20.3 | 18.3 | 3.7 | 0.2 | 0.7 |
|                       | 2006 | 55.7 | 19.9 | 18.7 | 3.8 | 0.2 | 1.8 |
|                       | 2007 | 54.9 | 19.6 | 19.3 | 3.8 | 0.2 | 2.2 |
|                       | 2008 | 54.0 | 19.2 | 19.9 | 3.9 | 0.2 | 2.7 |
|                       | 2009 | 53.3 | 19.1 | 20.8 | 4.1 | 0.2 | 2.5 |

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

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

|                                      | Year | LEP (%) | Low Income (%) | Parental Involvement (%) | Attendance (%) | Mobility (%) | Chronic Truants (N) | Chronic Truants (%) | HS Dropout Rate (%) | HS Graduation Rate (%) |
|--------------------------------------|------|---------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| S<br>C<br>H<br>O<br>O<br>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         | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                      |
| D<br>I<br>S<br>T<br>R<br>I<br>C<br>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                   |
|                                      | 2000 | 6.1     | 36.7           | 97.2                     | 93.9           | 17.5         | 45,109              | 2.4                 | 5.8                 | 82.6                   |

|                       |      |     |      |      |      |      |        |     |     |      |
|-----------------------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|--------|-----|-----|------|
| S<br>T<br>A<br>T<br>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<br>(N) | Grade 3<br>(N) | Grade 4<br>(N) | Grade 5<br>(N) | Grade 7<br>(N) | Grade 8<br>(N) | Grade 11<br>(N) |
|--------------------------------------|------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| S<br>C<br>H<br>O<br>O<br>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             | -              | -              | -               |
| D<br>I<br>S<br>T<br>R<br>I<br>C<br>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<br>T<br>A<br>T<br>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<br>I<br>S<br>T<br>R<br>I<br>C<br>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<br>T<br>A<br>T<br>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<br/>% 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  | 81.9        | 77.6        | 79.7        | 88.1        | 85.2        | 90.3        | -           | -           | 82.4        | 81.7        | 88.6        | 84.6        | 77.9        | 86.1        | 83.4        | 74.1        | 87.5        | 88.9        |
| White  | 88.5        | 76.8        | 82.5        | 90.9        | 88.1        | 94.2        | -           | -           | 78.6        | 83.9        | 87.9        | 91.7        | 78.7        | 89.6        | 91.7        | 74.1        | 89.3        | 88.1        |
| Black  | -           | 70.0        | -           | -           | -           | 70.0        | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 50.0        | -           | -           |
| Hispanic   | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| Asian/Pacific Islander   | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| Native American  | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| Multiracial/Ethnic   | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| LEP  | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| Students with Disabilities                                     | 50.0        | 41.2        | 40.0        | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 47.1        | 30.8        | 20.0        | 66.7        | 27.3        | 45.5        | 30.0        | 35.3        | 40.0        | 40.0        |
| Low Income   | 41.7        | 20.0        | 58.3        | 73.4        | 72.7        | 73.4        | -           | -           | -           | -           | 80.0        | 68.8        | 72.8        | -           | 66.7        | 30.0        | 58.3        | 86.7        |

|  | Grade 6 |      |      |      |      |      | Grade 7 |      |      |      |      |      | Grade 8 |      |      |      |      |      |
|--|---------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|
|  | 2004    | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2004    | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2004    | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| <b>AYP Benchmark<br/>% 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<br/>% 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  | 93.1        | 90.7        | 97.3        | 92.5        | 94.4        | 97.2        | -           | -           | 87.8        | 93.0        | 92.9        | 93.8        | 97.7        | 95.0        | 90.3        | 90.8        | 93.1        | 93.1        |
| White  | 93.5        | 91.1        | 98.3        | 94.6        | 95.2        | 98.1        | -           | -           | 85.7        | 91.0        | 93.1        | 97.9        | 98.7        | 95.6        | 95.0        | 94.8        | 94.6        | 93.2        |
| Black  | -           | 80.0        | -           | -           | -           | 100.0       | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 60.0        | -           | -           |
| Hispanic   | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| Asian/Pacific Islander   | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| Native American  | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| Multiracial/Ethnic   | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| LEP  | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| Students with Disabilities   | 66.6        | 70.5        | 80.0        | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 64.7        | 69.3        | 50.0        | 75.0        | 81.8        | 72.7        | 40.0        | 76.5        | 60.0        | 60.0        |
| Low Income   | 91.6        | 60.0        | 91.7        | 86.7        | 81.8        | 86.7        | -           | -           | -           | -           | 80.0        | 87.6        | 100.0       | -           | 83.3        | 60.0        | 83.3        | 86.6        |

|  | 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<br/>% 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 &amp; 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 in 4<sup>th</sup> grade, increased in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade and 5<sup>th</sup> grade: (All grades are above the Illinois Benchmark)**

- o 90.3% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade students M+E (+5.1%).
- o 84.6% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (-4.1%).
- o 89% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (+1.5%).

**Math: The percentage of students that M+E increased slightly in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade and remained constant in 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades: (All grades above the Illinois Benchmark)**

- o 97.2% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade students M+E (+2.8%).
- o 93.8% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (+.8%).
- o 93.2% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade students M+E (+.1%).

**By Grade and Race: (\* = low N)**

- o In 3<sup>rd</sup> grade Math, the percentages of students M+E are all above the Illinois Benchmarks.  
White (98.1 %), Black (100%) and \*Hispanic (100%)
- o In 3<sup>rd</sup> grade Reading the percentages are White (94.2%), Black (70%) and \*Hispanic (100%).
- o In 4<sup>th</sup> grade Math the percentages of students M+E are all above the Illinois Benchmarks.  
White (97.9%), Black (77.8%), and \*Hispanic (100%)
- o In 4<sup>th</sup> grade Reading the percentages are White (91.7%), Black (44.4%), and \*Hispanic (100%).
- o In 5<sup>th</sup> grade Math the percentages of students M+E are all above the Illinois Benchmarks.  
White (93.2%), Black (85.7%), and \*Hispanic (100%)
- o In 5<sup>th</sup> grade Reading the percentages are White (88.1%), Black (85.7%), and \*Hispanic (100%).

**By Grade and Income:**

- o In Math, the percentages of students M+E in both the Low Income and Not Low Income in all grades are above the Illinois

Benchmarks. All the percentages of students M+E in Reading Low Income and Not Low Income subgroups of 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade are above the Illinois Benchmarks.

- o 94.7% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 73.3% of the Low Income students. (Gap = 21.4%)  
 In Math, 100% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 86.7% of Low Income students. (Gap = 13.3%)
- o 89.8% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 68.8% of the Low Income students. (Gap = 21%)  
 In Math, 95.9% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 87.5% of Low Income students. (Gap = 8.4%)
- o 89.5% of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Not Low Income students M+E in Reading compared to 87.5% of the Low Income students. (Gap = 2%)  
 In Math, 94.7% of Not Low Income students M+E compared to 87.5% of Low Income students. (Gap = 7.2%)

**By Grade and IEP Status:**

- o In Reading, significant gaps exist in the percentage of students M+E in the Not IEP and IEP subgroups. Significant gaps exist in the percentage of students M+E in Math at 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades. (97% of Not Low Income students M+E) The N of IEP students is 32 (9,12,11)

Reading Gaps- 3<sup>rd</sup> gr = 95.2% v 55.6% (39.6%), 4<sup>th</sup> gr = 88.7% v 66.7% (22%), 5<sup>th</sup> gr = 96.8% v 45.5% (51.3%)

Math Gaps- 3<sup>rd</sup> gr = 98.4% v 88.9% (9.5%), 4<sup>th</sup> gr = 98.1 v 75% (23.1%), 5<sup>th</sup> gr = 98.4% v 63.6% (34.8%)

**Subscores:**

|                   | <i>Reading</i>    |                   |                      |                   | <i>Number</i> |                    |                | <i>Data</i>     |                 |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                   | <i>Vocabulary</i> | <i>Strategies</i> | <i>Comprehension</i> | <i>Literature</i> | <i>Sense</i>  | <i>Measurement</i> | <i>Algebra</i> | <i>Geometry</i> | <i>Analysis</i> |
| <b>Washington</b> | <b>75.1</b>       | <b>78</b>         | <b>72.2</b>          | <b>72.2</b>       | <b>65.1</b>   | <b>67.5</b>        | <b>81.8</b>    | <b>74.6</b>     | <b>75.1</b>     |
| 3rd               | 76.4              | 84.7              | 68.1                 | 79.2              | 72.2          | 84.7               | 88.9           | 81.9            | 90.3            |
| 4th               | 64.6              | 92.3              | 67.7                 | 61.5              | 64.6          | 55.4               | 80             | 67.7            | 73.8            |
| 5th               | 83.3              | 58.3              | 80.6                 | 75                | 58.3          | 61.1               | 76.4           | 73.6            | 61.1            |

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 to increase our success percentages from students with disabilities, from low income households, and our Black student population.

While the overall scores in both reading and math have continued to remain high at high levels, we believe based on our 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. While we target intervention based on a broad collection of individual student data, 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.

For the purpose of professional development and raising test scores, 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 or Number Sense in Math.

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

Over the past several years, Washington School has experienced demographic changes. We have observed an increase in students from low income households and an increase of racial diversity. The percentage of students in economically disadvantaged households has risen from 10.7% in 2000-01 to 19.4% in 2008 to 24.4% in 2009 and will likely be close to 28% in 2010. Mobility has remained relatively stable for the past 10 years and is very close to the State average. On a positive note our ethnic diversity has increased with white students moving from 89.6% in 2000 to 77.6% in 2009. The numbers of students in ethnic subgroups is still low enough that we often do not have at least ten students per grade in a non-white category to track relevant sub group data.

A combination of high quality teaching of the standards, differentiating instruction, and teaching test taking skills all contribute to ongoing achievement. In addition, intense intervention has been put into place at the early grades.

Students with special needs qualify for special education due to deficits in their learning processes. This is indicated by a lack of achievement in one or more subject area. While NCLB requires these students to make identical progress as their peers without disabilities, this is not logical given the identified student problems. However, District 87 special education teachers use multiple measures, individually administered, to document the continued growth of each child with special education eligibility. These measures minimally include DIBELS, K-TEA, and curriculum-based measurement. Scientifically based intervention programs have increased for struggling students in the younger grades during the past three years. Students are identified through a screening assessment and progress is monitored every 2 to 3 weeks to assure the targeted instruction is effective.

A school wide effort to increase student reading has resulted in dramatic changes in student reading habits. Scholastic Reading Inventory is used to acquire lexile scores for students in grades 2nd through 5th. This assessment provides an excellent measure of progress as well as provides students with guidance for appropriate book selection. While student reading increased last year, they are on track to surpass last year's total before the end of January. This is measured using the Reading Counts program by Scholastic. Increased achievement of all students can be attributed to the items listed above as well as the high quality teaching at each grade level. In addition, teachers in the lower, non-tested grades take responsibility for the future performance of students and annually review ISAT data to target instructional improvement strategies. While the teachers in the tested grades typically attend ISAT training sessions, they share this information with the others to be sure there is a clear understanding of expectations and effective strategies. Furthermore, district-wide efforts targeting standards-based instruction and assessment further prepares students for positive performance on the state assessment.

After school tutoring was offered to our students. Students were instructed twice a week for ten sessions. They were ability grouped and provided

intensive instruction in their area(s) of deficits, specifically reading and math.

Washington 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 Washington School has implemented early literacy programs in the primary grades (Heggerty and DIBELS). These programs were designed to target the beginning readers. They are designed to be short fluency measures used to regularly monitor 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.

Reading Intervention (RtI) is another contributing factor to test scores at Washington School. The Reading Intervention program is used to assist students struggling with their early literacy skills. Students are placed in the pull out program using research based assessments, are progress monitored and dismissed when performing at grade level benchmarks.

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: comprehension, literature, fluency, vocabulary, and reading strategies.

Math: measurement, number sense, algebra, geometry, and data analysis.

Writing: Elementary Writing Guidelines were established by our district.

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

|                                  |                  |                                 |                      |        |
|----------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Scholastic Reading Inventory     | Michael Heggerty | Discovery Education             | Discovery Assessment | Lexia  |
| Soliloquy                        | Road to the Code | 6 Minute Solutions              | Reading Counts       | DIBELS |
| Leveled Readers (Guided Reading) | Symphony         | HM Small Group Intervention Kit | Great Leaps          |        |

#### LONG TERM STRATEGIES & INTERVENTIONS THAT HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO SUCCESS

1. Increased Home / School Connections
3. Response to Intervention (RtI)
4. Support from Other Agencies / Community
5. Early Intervention Emphasis
6. Use of SRI and Reading Counts
7. Discovery Assessment
8. Study Island
9. Participation in the Standards Aligned Classroom project
10. After School Opportunities for Intervention
11. PBIS Behavior Program

**SHORT TERM STRATEGIES & INTERVENTIONS THAT HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO SUCCESS**

1. Increased Test & Data Analysis
2. Increased Use of On-line Tools for Students
3. Creative Test Scheduling
4. Student Rewards

**FACTORS THAT HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED AS "ROADBLOCKS"**

INTERNAL-Limited use of research based and scientifically proven assessments and curriculum

Class size has risen in recent years and is comparatively higher than District and State averages in Kindergarten, Grade 1 and Grade 3.

EXTERNAL-Limited exposure to language prior to school experience

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

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

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.

Professional development activities will focus on reading, writing, and math achievement.

**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?*

**STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST**

The SAT 10 provides annual measures of performance in language/reading, math, science, and social studies. 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.

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 2009 SAT 10 data and identified the following:

The SAT 10 Comprehension NCE data shows a grade to grade comparison in students meeting District benchmarks that is relatively stable except for a significant decrease in 5th grade.

The SAT 10 Reading NCE data shows a grade to grade decrease in students meeting District benchmarks in every grade except 2nd.

The SAT 10 Math NCE data shows a grade to grade comparison decrease in students meeting District benchmarks in grades 2-5.

The cohort data from 2008-2009-2010 shows similar trends for decreasing scores in students meeting District benchmarks.

**SAT 10 NCE Math**

|      | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 |
|------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 2008 | 75.8%   | 75.9%   | 61.8%   | 85.7%   | 82.1%   |
| 2009 | 60.9%   | 77.5%   | 81.8%   | 72.9%   | 81.8%   |
| 2010 | 59.9%   | 71.2%   | 72.3%   | 70.7%   | 73.8%   |

**SAT 10 NCE Reading**

|      | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 |
|------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 2008 | 68.2%   | 67.2%   | 58.2%   | 72.9%   | 74.6%   |
| 2009 | 68.8%   | 68.7    | 80.3%   | 71.2%   | 80.3%   |
| 2010 | 62.2%   | 74.0%   | 74.6%   | 68.9%   | 70.5%   |

**SAT 10 NCE Comprehension**

|      | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 |
|------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 2008 |         | 70.7%   | 65.5%   | 78.6%   | 77.6%   |
| 2009 |         | 79.1%   | 77.3%   | 76.3%   | 80.3%   |

|      |       |       |       |       |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 2010 | 78.1% | 73.8% | 76.0% | 68.9% |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|

**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 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 recent mid-year assessment is represented below. These are the general observations of this data:

The percentage of students increasing thier reading level has demonstrated significant improvement. Seventy Five percent of the students have demonstrated a at least a proficient reading level with only 6% of the students designated as below a basic level of proficiency.

September                  December

| Proficiency Summary | #   | %  | #   | %  |
|---------------------|-----|----|-----|----|
| Advanced            | 47  | 17 | 72  | 24 |
| Proficient          | 134 | 49 | 150 | 51 |
| Basic               | 58  | 21 | 56  | 19 |
| Below Basic         | 36  | 13 | 18  | 6  |

**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 books, the points awarded for each book and their performance on a computer generated comprehension quiz for each book read. This program has been 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 45,000,000 words last year and 60,000,000 words this year. They easily surpassed the first goal and half way through the year have already read 55,000,000 words in 4182 books. The students in 4th grade have outpaced other grades and account for 33.6 million words in 1742 books.

**DIBELS**

Over the course of the 2008-2009 school year, the DIBELS benchmarking system was used to measure the impact of Response to Intervention programs across the grade levels. Varying degrees of success using the specified programs was realized. This table shows the beginning benchmark data for oral Reading Fluency and shows marked improvement in the cohort group from 3rd grade in 2008 to 5th garde in 2010 and from 2nd grade in 2009 to 3rd grade in 2010. It also shows inconsistencies from grade 2 in 2008 to grade 4 in 2010.

**DIBELS 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%   |

**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 80-90% accuracy. Teachers access data organized in a variety of formats. Those reports most useful in the instructional planning process include standard's based proficiency with individual student data and item analysis with individual student data. As this is our first semester of use, we are using data but do not have enough confidence in the implementation with integrity of this program to report at this time.

**RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION**

- 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.
- Classroom teachers in grades K, 1, and 3 committed to the implementation of the intervention process.
- 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
- Increased reading leads to increased reading skills. The widespread participation in Reading Counts support this finding.

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

Analysis of student achievement is discussed in detail in Section 1, Part A of this plan.

Three years of DIBELS data was available for analysis. Classroom teachers and Interventionists provided research based instruction with emphasis on student weaknesses in phonemic awareness and fluency.

Progress Monitoring occurred every 2-3 weeks to assure continued progress of each child receiving intervention services. Intervention Teams reviewed data in order to make intervention changes as necessary.

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

DIBELS and intervention services will be continued with integrity.

K, 1, 2 receive additional pull out intervention services for early literacy intervention.

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 for research-based, skill-specific instruction. Increased use of classroom tools will be encouraged including training for any teacher interested in implementing at Tier I.

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.

Professional development activities will focus on reading, writing, and math achievement.

**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?*

Washington Elementary School is one of six elementary schools in District 87. Our 423 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 services students with special education needs, speech and language services, English Language Learner Services, and Academically Talented opportunities. The percentage of economically disadvantaged students continues to rise. In addition, Washington School has a mobility rate of 19.5%. 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, instruction, 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, Math, and Science according to the benchmarks of No Child Left Behind. 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.

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.

Response to Intervention (RtI) services are offered as a language arts resource program for qualified children in all grades. Every Washington student has weekly instruction in music, art, library/technology and physical education by a certified teacher/specialist.

Washington 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. 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. 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, 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 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 affected 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. Tier interventions were implemented school wide due to the analysis of our data. These interventions included both the special and general populations.

There are a number of factors (both long term and short term) that created Washington'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 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. These will be our challenges since low income tend to correlate with lower achievement.

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

Furthermore, the range in developmental readiness and acquisition of skills is quite extensive.

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.

**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.

### 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 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.

**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.

**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 RtI process finding materials that will allow special education and general education teachers to function as interventionists.

### 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 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.

Curricular content and student progress are communicated through Parent Orientations, parent conferences, newsletters, and 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.

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.

### 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?*

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.

An ongoing process of data analysis allows us to identify areas of students need and challenge. These are then used to guide professional development focus areas to improve the instructional practices that lead to increased student achievement.

Continued efforts to meet the needs of students and families are a priority of Washington School.

### Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

| Objective Number | Title<br>(click the link to edit any objective)  | Deficiencies Addressed |
|------------------|--|------------------------|
| 1                | <a href="#">Reading Meets + Exceeds will be over 91% for all grade levels and all sub group populations.</a>                 |                        |
| 2                | <a href="#">Reading Comprehension Meets + Exceeds will be at least 85% for all grades and all sub populations.</a>           |                        |
| 3                | <a href="#">Math-Students in every grade level will meet or exceeds at 80% for both number sense and measurement on ISAT</a> |                        |

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 will be over 91% for all grade levels and all sub group populations.

#### 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, all students will increase their proficiency in Reading achievement to at least 91%.

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 will be over 91% for all grade levels and all sub group populations.

|   |  | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities  | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Targeted intervention using research based materials will be provided by RtI reading teachers.   | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 200,000    |
| 2 | Students will increase reading skills by increasing the amount of independent reading as measured by Reading Counts.   | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 2,000      |
| 3 | Students who are significantly behind will participate in after school reading small groups to develop skills.   | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | After School  | Other       | 5,000      |
| 4 | Students in grades 2-5 will use Scholastic Reading Inventory, SRI, to set goals and measure reading progress. This sill also be used to determine reading levels for appropriate book selection. | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 5,000      |
| 5 | Use Haggerty Phonemic Awareness materials to increase PALS scores and DIBELS Phoneme Segmentation Fluency.   | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0          |
| 6 | 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.                                     | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 6,000      |
| 7 | Use Discovery Assessment to target specific benchmark deficiencies and then remediate these targeted areas.  | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 1,000      |
| 8 | Students will use Road to the Code/Six Minute Solution to increase fluency and comprehension.  | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 1,500      |
| 9 | Students will increase reading skills through implementation of differentiated instruction through guided reading activities and using Leveled Readers.  | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 1,000      |
|   | Students will develop and apply comprehension strategies in various  |            |            |               |             |            |

|    |   |            |            |               |             |       |
|----|---|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|-------|
| 10 | genres by applying the Reading Strategies Guide posters from Houghton Mifflin.  | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 400   |
| 11 | Students will increase reading skills through implementation of leveled, differentiated instruction through flexible grouping and guided reading activities. Progress monitored by DIBELs tests in K-3 and Houghton Mifflin skills tests at all grade levels. | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 2,000 |

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Reading Meets + Exceeds will be over 91% for all grade levels and all sub group populations.

|   |  | 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.            | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0          |
| 2 | Attend area and regional workshops focused on increasing reading achievement.  | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 1,000      |
| 3 | Provide ongoing training opportunities to use instructional technology to further engage students in the learning process. | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 1,000      |
| 4 | Provide ongoing training opportunities to increase use of targeted interventions.  | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 1,000      |

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Reading Meets + Exceeds will be over 91% for all grade levels and all sub group populations.

|   |   | 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.   | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | After School | Local Funds | 0          |
| 2 | Communicate test data with parents including information about the meaning of the various goals.  | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | 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.) | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | After School | Local Funds | 0          |

**Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring**

**Objective 1 Title :**

Reading Meets + Exceeds will be over 91% for all grade levels and all sub group populations.

**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, SRI, Reading Counts, Discovery Assessment, Study Island, Six Minute Solution, Lexia, and Reading Mastery. Interventio 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, and RtI Team meetings.

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 |

**Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives**

**Objective 2**

Reading Comprehension Meets + Exceeds will be at least 85% for all grades and all sub populations.

**Objective 2 Description**

While our current achievement in reading comprehension for the grade 3 is 68.1%, grade 4 is 67.7% and grade 5 is 80.6% meeting/exceeding for ISAT, all students will increase their proficiency in Reading comprehension to at least 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 :**

Reading Comprehension Meets + Exceeds will be at least 85% for all grades and all sub populations.

|   |  | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities  | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | The same strategies and activities for Objective 1 will be used to achieve Objective 2 | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0          |

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

Reading Comprehension Meets + Exceeds will be at least 85% for all grades and all sub populations.

|   |  | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities  | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | The same strategies and activities for Objective 1 will be used to achieve Objective 2 | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0          |

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

Reading Comprehension Meets + Exceeds will be at least 85% for all grades and all sub populations.

|   |  | TimeLine   |            |              | Budget      |            |
|---|--|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities  | Start Date | End Date   |              | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | The same strategies and activities for Objective 1 will be used to achieve Objective 2 | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | After School | Local Funds | 0          |

**Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring**

**Objective 2 Title :**

Reading Comprehension Meets + Exceeds will be at least 85% for all grades and all sub populations.

**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?)

Same as for Objective 1

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

**Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives**

**Objective 3**

Math-Students in every grade level will meet or exceeds at 80% for both number sense and measurement on ISAT

**Objective 3 Description**

While our current achievement in math number sense for the grade 3 is 72.2%, grade 4 is 64.6% and grade 5 is 58.3% meeting/exceeding for ISAT, all students will increase their proficiency to at least 80% and while our current achievement in math measurement for the grade 3 is 84.7%, grade 4 is 55.4% and grade 5 is 61.1% meeting/exceeding for ISAT, all students will increase their proficiency to at least 80%.

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

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

Math-Students in every grade level will meet or exceeds at 80% for both number sense and measurement on ISAT

|                           |   | 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 | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0          |

|   |   |            |            |               |             |       |
|---|---|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|-------|
|   | the district math series.   |            |            |               |             |       |
| 2 | Students will complete Study Island sections designed to practice on areas of benchmark deficiency.                                 | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 2,000 |
| 3 | Students will use computer software programs to practice computation, estimation, graphing, number sense, measurement, and geometry | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 1,000 |
| 4 | Discovery Assessment and Symphony Math will be used to provide math intervention.   | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0     |
| 5 | Students who are significantly behind will participate in after school math small groups to develop skills.                         | 08/31/2009 | 05/31/2011 | After School  | Other       | 5,000 |
| 6 | Students will use M%M books, Daily Math exercises, and M4T to increase vocabulary skills as well as problem solving skills in math. | 08/20/2010 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0     |

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

Math-Students in every grade level will meet or exceeds at 80% for both number sense and measurement on ISAT

|   |   | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|---|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities   | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Discovery Assessment, Study Island and intervention training.                       | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0          |
| 2 | Exploration of other math resources and interventions.                              | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0          |
| 3 | District level technology training for math intervention software programs.         | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | During School | Local Funds | 0          |
| 4 | District level training for improving math instruction with the use of SmartBoards. | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | After School  | Local Funds | 1,000      |

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

Math-Students in every grade level will meet or exceeds at 80% for both number sense and measurement on ISAT

|   |   | TimeLine   |            |              | Budget      |            |
|---|---|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities   | Start Date | End Date   |              | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Math activities are included in teacher newsletters/ teacher websites.  | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | After School | Local Funds | 0          |
| 2 | Parent Teacher orientation will include information about all grade level curriculum standards and expecttions. | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | After School | Local Funds | 0          |
| 3 | Increase parent awareness of grade level expectations by sharing standards and exit skills on-line or on paper. | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | After School | Local Funds | 0          |
| 4 | Communicate test data with parents including information about the meaning of the various goals.                | 08/20/2009 | 05/31/2011 | After School | Local Funds | 0          |

**Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring**

**Objective 3 Title :**

Math-Students in every grade level will meet or exceeds at 80% for both number sense and measurement on 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?)

Student achievement on the objective will be monitored throughout the year as data is reviewed on Discovery Assessment, Study Island, and Soliloquy. Interventin 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, and RtI Team meetings.

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 |

### 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.

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**

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

|    | <b>Name</b>     | <b>Title</b>                        |
|----|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1  | Teresa Shaver   | Teacher, Kindergarten               |
| 2  | Maggie Killian  | Teacher, Kindergarten               |
| 3  | Anne Waldorf    | Teacher, 1st Grade                  |
| 4  | Jane Cheatham   | Teacher, 2nd Grade                  |
| 5  | Marsha DeMay    | Teacher, 2nd Grade                  |
| 6  | Pam Wilson      | Teacher, 2nd Grade                  |
| 7  | Colleen Rowsey  | Teacher, 3rd Grade                  |
| 8  | Jen Grupp       | Teacher, 4th Grade                  |
| 9  | Lisa Molnar     | Teacher, 5th Grade                  |
| 10 | Denise Myatt    | Counselor, Administrative Assistant |
| 11 | Jeff Lockenvitz | Principal                           |

### 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 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.

The district has provided the following:

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, Performance Descriptors, and Assessment Frameworks

Workshop on the changes in the ISAT for administrators and school teams

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.

Not Applicable

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

|    | <b>Name</b>     | <b>Title</b>                        |
|----|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1  | Teresa Shaver   | Teacher, Kindergarten               |
| 2  | Maggie Killian  | Teacher, Kindergarten               |
| 3  | Anne Waldorf    | Teacher, 1st Grade                  |
| 4  | Jane Cheatham   | Teacher, 2nd Grade                  |
| 5  | Marsha DeMay    | Teacher, 2nd Grade                  |
| 6  | Pam Wilson      | Teacehr, 2nd Grade                  |
| 7  | Colleen Rowsey  | Teacher, 3rd Grade                  |
| 8  | Jen Grupp       | Teacher, 4th Grade                  |
| 9  | Lisa Molnar     | Teacher, 5th Grade                  |
| 10 | Denise Myatt    | Counselor, Administrative Assistant |
| 11 | Jeff Lockenvitz | Principal                           |

---

**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**