

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	12/18/2008
Submitted	12/24/2008
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	



Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 1 - 2008 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	2007-08 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2007-08 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		62.5			62.5			90.0		75.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	77.5		Yes	83.8		Yes	94.2	Yes		
White														
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	71.1		Yes	73.3		Yes				
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities													
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	80.0	Yes	85.7	Yes					

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

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. \*\*\*
3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 75% graduation rate for high schools.

\* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2007.

\*\* Safe Harbor Targets of 62.5% or above are not printed.

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

**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 - 2008 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								
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Attendance Rate (%)		94.6	94.3	95.6	94.8	94.7	94.1	94.2
Truancy Rate (%)		-	0.4	0.4	-	0.8	1.5	1.4
Mobility Rate (%)		12.6	33.6	22.3	23.0	42.8	22.8	30.6
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)		272	269	249	252	259	202	215
Low Income (%)		92.6	93.7	84.3	85.3	87.6	89.1	87.9
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)		3.3	4.8	5.2	10.7	8.5	8.9	8.4
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)		30.1	24.9	26.9	26.2	17.8	17.8	14.0
Black, non-Hispanic (%)		59.9	63.6	59.0	58.7	64.5	58.9	58.1
Hispanic (%)		9.9	11.5	13.3	13.9	16.2	21.3	25.1
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)		-	-	0.8	0.8	1.5	2.0	1.4
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)		-	-	-	0.4	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)		-	-	-	-	-	-	1.4

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

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	2002	30.1	59.9	9.9	-	-	-
	2003	24.9	63.6	11.5	-	-	-
	2004	26.9	59.0	13.3	0.8	-	-
	2005	26.2	58.7	13.9	0.8	0.4	-
	2006	17.8	64.5	16.2	1.5	-	-
	2007	17.8	58.9	21.3	2.0	-	-
	2008	14.0	58.1	25.1	1.4	-	1.4
	2009	13.6	61.2	20.8	1.2	-	3.2
D I S T R I C T	2000	36.0	26.1	37.6	0.2	0.1	-
	2001	33.0	25.7	40.7	0.5	-	-
	2002	29.8	26.7	43.3	0.3	-	-
	2003	28.3	25.6	45.7	0.4	-	-
	2004	25.8	25.0	48.7	0.4	-	-
	2005	24.5	24.4	50.1	0.4	0.1	0.5
	2006	22.4	25.3	50.8	0.5	-	1.1
	2007	20.0	25.0	53.3	0.5	0.1	1.2
	2008	17.3	25.9	53.7	0.5	0.1	2.5
	2009	15.5	27.4	53.4	0.5	0.1	3.0
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-

GEORGE WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY SCH  
School Improvement Plan 2008

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

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2002	3.3	92.6	100.0	94.6	12.6	-	-	-	-
	2003	4.8	93.7	100.0	94.3	33.6	1	0.4	-	-
	2004	5.2	84.3	100.0	95.6	22.3	1	0.4	-	-
	2005	10.7	85.3	100.0	94.8	23.0	-	-	-	-
	2006	8.5	87.6	100.0	94.7	42.8	2	0.8	-	-
	2007	8.9	89.1	100.0	94.1	22.8	3	1.5	-	-
	2008	8.4	87.9	100.0	94.2	30.6	3	1.4	-	-
	2009	10.4	87.6	100.0	94.0	33.1	-	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	15.5	59.2	92.7	95.0	20.2	28	0.8	-	-
	2001	14.4	62.9	97.5	94.6	17.5	72	2.1	-	-
	2002	16.9	70.6	98.0	95.4	17.8	114	3.4	-	-
	2003	15.9	64.9	99.7	95.3	19.0	66	2.0	-	-
	2004	19.7	74.2	99.7	95.6	16.4	29	0.8	-	-
	2005	18.7	73.0	99.9	95.3	18.6	54	1.5	-	-
	2006	22.0	76.2	99.9	95.2	21.9	56	1.6	-	-
	2007	21.7	77.6	99.8	94.7	18.9	29	0.8	-	-
	2008	22.1	76.5	97.5	95.2	15.2	47	1.3	-	-
2009	24.3	82.5	98.2	94.9	16.5	26	0.7	-	-	
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2

**GEORGE WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY SCH**  
**School Improvement Plan 2008**

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

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2002	272	51	47	31	-	-	-
	2003	269	52	40	46	-	-	-
	2004	249	41	45	44	-	-	-
	2005	252	57	39	39	-	-	-
	2006	259	58	50	31	-	-	-
	2007	202	33	36	26	-	-	-
	2008	215	32	31	37	-	-	-
	2009	250	46	34	34	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	3,509	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	3,507	399	389	412	381	380	-
	2002	3,613	429	397	387	398	369	-
	2003	3,544	382	416	393	403	385	-
	2004	3,569	425	389	396	375	409	-
	2005	3,645	420	409	386	380	381	-
	2006	3,707	397	396	430	427	401	-
	2007	3,649	372	383	385	408	403	-
	2008	3,649	400	374	369	438	426	-
	2009	3,743	410	404	386	377	446	-
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816

**GEORGE WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY SCH**  
**School Improvement Plan 2008**

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

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

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

\*\*Educator Data is available only for district level\*\*

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	228	14	40,155	60	40	19	-	-	-
	2001	242	13	40,513	63	38	19	-	-	-
	2002	250	13	40,793	65	35	20	-	1	-
	2003	260	14	41,987	65	35	18	-	1	-
	2004	253	15	46,844	58	42	18	-	2	-
	2005	245	13	44,363	56	44	18	-	3	-
	2006	240	13	45,928	57	43	19	-	3	-
	2007	249	13	43,169	54	46	18	-	1	1
	2008	258	13	49,538	52	48	18	-	1	2
2009	280	13	51,655	48	52	16	-	1	2	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1	

---

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

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>
All	32.7	27.5	35.2	71.1	59.4	63.6	-	-	-	45.5	68.6	63.6	42.2	41.9	48.8	53.2	60.0	75.7
White	44.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	57.2	50.0	-	-	-
Black	21.9	25.0	25.0	64.2	55.0	63.7	-	-	-	39.4	56.5	63.2	34.4	26.9	33.4	43.4	45.9	61.9
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	8.3	-	9.1	-	33.3	-	-	-	-	13.3	-	20.0	-	-	8.3	-	25.0	-
Low Income	29.6	24.3	31.3	71.1	60.7	60.7	-	-	-	42.5	67.8	63.0	37.8	33.4	44.8	48.1	60.0	77.2

**GEORGE WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY SCH**  
**School Improvement Plan 2008**

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
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, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>
All	36.3	36.5	46.3	88.9	81.3	78.8	-	-	-	61.3	88.6	69.7	37.7	41.9	70.7	65.7	62.9	86.2
White	44.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	57.1	85.7	-	-	-
Black	21.9	30.3	37.5	85.8	80.0	68.2	-	-	-	57.5	86.9	63.2	31.0	26.9	52.4	56.5	50.0	80.0
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	8.3	-	36.4	-	75.0	-	-	-	-	33.3	-	40.0	8.3	-	16.7	-	41.7	-
Low Income	29.5	31.5	43.8	89.5	85.8	82.1	-	-	-	62.5	87.1	70.4	35.1	33.3	68.9	63.0	63.3	85.3

**GEORGE WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY SCH**  
**School Improvement Plan 2008**

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data**

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

In 2008, 100% of all students were tested. Washington School has two subgroups (Black & Economically Disadvantaged). 77.5% of all students met or exceeded the standard in Reading. 71% of black students met or exceeded the standard in Reading and 80 % of Economically Disadvantaged met or exceeded in Reading.

83.8% of all students met or exceeded in Math and 73.3% of Black students met or exceeded in Math and 85.7% of Economically Disadvantaged students met or exceeded in Math.

Areas of Weakness are defined as 60% of students tested met or exceeded on the following areas:

Areas of Weakness for Reading:

Vocabulary-3rd Grade

Reading Extended Response -3rd, 4th, & 5th Grade

Reading Strategies 3rd,4th, & 5th Grade

Literature-3rd Grade

Ares of Weakness for Math:

Extended Response 3rd & 4th Grade

Explanantion portion of student response-3rd, 4th, & 5th Grade

Measurement 3rd, 4th & 5th Grade

Number Sense-4th Grade

Geometry-4th Grade

2/7/2010 2:32:39 PM

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

The support of the school district in the area of Professional Development and other activities most likely contributes to the continuous improvement of scores. Title I services, Progress Monitoring across all grades allows us to identify students in need of additional services.

Monthly Literacy Meetings

Grade Level meetings

Intervention/Reading Wall

Learning Disabilities Resource teacher in the classroom

Monthly Running Records

Reading Recovery/Primary Literacy

Reading Coach & Reading Coach Assistant

Family Information (TPI Parent Meeting/Title I Parent Meeting)

Family Reading Night

Family Math Night

Over 60% of the students scored a (4) in the area of Mathematical Knowledge and Strategic Knowledge in 5th grade

Math Scope and Sequence

50% of the teachers in grades 3-5th were beginning teachers

**5th Grade teachers are experienced teachers**

**Student mobility** -30% compared to 15% in the District and 14% in the State

Poverty Rate-87% compared to 41% in the state

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

For Improvement planning purposes it is crucial that teachers develop instruction and strategies for presenting Extended Response Questions

5th Grade teachers have developed plans and instruction for strengthening students in the area of Mathematical Knowledge and Strategies

The Professional Development in Reading along with the daily support of resource teachers has assisted student in growth

More Professional Development is needed in the area of Math

In 2007-2008-TCAT, Primary Literacy, Reading Recovery, Reading Coach, have had a positive impact on student academic progress

Mobility Rate implies inconsistent education and a lack of continuity of instruction

Poverty Rate implies a lack of print in the home and minimal access to technology

### Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data

**Data** - Briefly describe the relevant local assessment data used in this plan. What do these data tell you? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are apparent?

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

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

### Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

**Data** - Briefly describe attributes and challenges of the school and community that have affected student performance. What do these data and/or information tell you?

Attributes

Parent Conferences

In-house Professional Development

Outside Professional Dvelopment

Scope and Sequence for:

Math

2/7/2010 2:32:39 PM

---

Science  
Social Studies  
Title I Funding supports  
Reeding Recovery/Primary literacy  
reading Coach  
After Schoolprogram  
Reading Coach Aide  
RTI Process  
Computer Programs-Accelerated Reader, Academy of Reading, Study Island, A+, Read naturally, Earobics  
Ful Time ESL teacher  
Full Day kindergarten  
Reduced Class Size Grant  
Uninterrupted language Arts Block  
Educational Field Trips  
Partnership with Community (Fire dept. & Police Dept.)  
Partnership with Local universities (Trinity, St. Xavier, Governors State)  
Decrease in the number of Special Education studnets  
District Volunteer Program  
Full Time Social Worker

Challenges

**Students enrolled from other schools within the district**

Inexperienced staff

Mobility Rate

Poverty Rate

Lack of Formal Parent Organization

Demographic Shift-IncreasingESL population

The attributes and challeges defined above tell us that the services we provide to students are a great assett to the school and district. It also tells us that the partnership we have formed with police & fire; allows us to give students new experiences, they might not have (safety trailer, Officer Friendly, Poster contests, Fireman visits, etc).

The number of inexperinced staff does impact our school & students , but we have enough resource staff that push into classrooms and collaborates with new staff to assit them with daily professional growth.

Partnership with St. Xavier & Trinity is also a resource we will continue to take adavantage of to support our students and staff.

2/7/2010 2:32:39 PM

Mobility, Poverty Rate, lack of Parent organization continues to have an impact on school programs and student learning. We must continue to look for ways/solutions to combat this problem.

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

Over the last 4 years the students at George Washington school have made tremendous growth. At the beginning of the NCLB mandate approximately 30% of the students at George Washington School were meeting the standard. Over the last several years we continue to grow even as our staff and student population changes. The social challenges that come with mobility, poverty and lack of parental involvement has probably had an impact on student learning, time on task and therefore impacts scores in a negative way. The mobility of students also causes students to be delayed academically, which has created classrooms with a wide range of levels (students are sometimes 1-2 years below level). This wide range of ability can become challenging for teachers to plan and deliver instruction.

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

We must look for ways/solutions to assist students new to district and/or school in meeting the state standards

We must define strategies that assist teachers in designing programs for various abilities

We must design programs that meet the needs of English Language Learners (WIDA)

We must continue to use our support resources whenever possible to support students and teachers

We must use Reading Teachers, Learning Disabilities teacher, Speech and Reading aide, ESL teacher; wherever possible to assist new students in becoming proficient learners .

## 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?*

2007-2008 2008-2009

100% of the staff at George Washington Elementary are highly qualified based on the criteria from the Illinois State Board of Education. All non-tenured staff participate in the

mandatory mentoring program for two years. This program ensures that teacher will move from an initial to standard certificate. All tenured teachers must have a formal professional growth plan that is reviewed twice a year. Data and artifacts are collected and reviewed by the building administrator. The focus of all professional growth plans is to improve teacher effectiveness and improve student achievement.

Four classroom teachers have advanced degrees in Reading and/or Curriculum and Instruction.

We believe in hiring only staff that have completed recognized teaching programs and are highly qualified. We encourage all teachers to continue in their professional growth by pursuing additional training in areas that will provide them with advance knowledge and strategies to deliver quality instruction to students.

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

Teachers with advanced degrees in the area of Reading and Curriculum and Instruction have become a resource and informal mentor to new staff.

Both 4th grade teachers were new to the profession in 2007-2008 and this may have contributed to the sub-par results in the area of Math and Reading. It is our belief that these teachers will continue to grow professionally, their planning and instruction delivery will impact student learning.

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

Continue to provide professional development for new staff

Allow collaboration time with new staff

Many teachers in our school hold advanced degrees. These professionals act as in-house resources to staff, students, parents, and administrators. The continuing education of our staff demonstrates to our school community our commitment to impact the learning of all students.

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

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

2007-2008 and 2008-2009

Open House was held withing the first week of school to report to parents the statrus of George Washington School  
ESL workshop-October  
Family ReadingNight-Fall(60 families)  
Title I workshop -Spring parets of studnets at risk are invited to a parent workshop

Family Fitness Night-Winter 70 attended 2007-2008

Parent conferences-60% attended in 2007

**Teacher Child Assitance team (now know as RTI)**

Teaches keep parent contact logs monthly avaiable in the office

All parents are contaced during the first month of school by:

\*phone

\*letter

\*conference

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

It is our belief that parents have become more knowledgeable of the promotion criteria, Illinois Learning Standards, Reading, Math, Science and Social Studies curriculum. Books are displayed during Open House and parent Conference informing parents of books their child should be able to read for their level. We believe that the parent education we provide has had a positive impact on student performance.

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

We must continue to strategize ways to get more parents involved

We must develop ways to get the parents involved with students in most need (academically and socially)

The school community must review the work that has been done and make changes where needed, based on changes in student performance, curriculum, AYP expectations, or the needs of the school staff. It is also important that we continue parent education and we must explore ways to get the parents currently involved to assist us in bringing more parents into our school.

### 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?*

In 2008 100% of all students were tested. Washington School has two subgroups (Black & Economically Disadvantaged). 77.5% of all students met or exceeded the standard in Reading. 71% of black students met or exceeded the standard in Reading and 80 % of Economically Disadvantaged met or exceeded in Reading.

83.8% of all students met or exceeded in Math and 73.3% of Black students met or exceeded in Math and 85.7% of Economically Disadvantaged students met or exceeded in Math.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	<a href="#">To improve Reading Comprehension and Fluency for all students.</a>	
2	<a href="#">To improve Math understanding and achievement</a>	
3	<a href="#">To improve English Proficiency of English Language Learners</a>	

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

To improve Reading Comprehension and Fluency for all students.

Objective 1 Description

In 2008, 77.5%% of all students met the standards in Reading. 71% of all Black students are meeting in Reading and 80% of all Economically Disadvantaged are meeting in Reading.

While our current achievement in reading for our school continues to grow only 69% of our 4th graders met in reading. In 2009 the bar is raised to 70% in order to make AYP and 77.5% in 2010. We also have a growing ELL population and we must specifically teach to the WIDA standards and include this as we develop strategies.

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

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

To improve Reading Comprehension and Fluency for all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Summarization-Teachers will model re-telling using narratives and non-narrative text	08/25/2008	06/02/2010	During School	Local Funds	
2	Reading strategies-Teachers will instruct students in prior knowledge, establish and adjust purpose and features in informational text, and minor and significant detail.	08/25/2008	05/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Grade Level meetings w/reading Coach to address selection of appropriate materials for teaching reading and writing strategies	08/25/2008	06/02/2010	During School	Local Funds	
4	Monthly Highlight of Book mentor text	08/25/2008	06/02/2010	During School	Local Funds	
5	Using the Illinois Learner Outcomes; students will understand content knowledge and skills in all academic areas and have opportunities to engage in the full curriculum provided by the school.	08/25/2008	06/30/2010	During School	Title I	

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

To improve Reading Comprehension and Fluency for all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Professional development during the school day to support teachers efforts in response to reading and writing	09/01/2008	05/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	
2	Monthly RTI meetings-to identify students at-risk and develop, monitor Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 strategies	10/01/2008	04/30/2009	During School	Local Funds	
3	Monthly Grade level Meetings teachers individual needs regarding reading strategies	09/01/2009	05/30/2009	During School	Title I	
4	All teachers will receive information regarding the WIDA standards and will include these standards in their planning; assisting ELL learners in becoming English proficient.	09/01/2009	05/30/2010	After School	Title III	

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

To improve Reading Comprehension and Fluency for all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Family Reading Night-Focus on Non-fiction strategies and activities	10/22/2008	10/22/2008	After School	Other	
2	Parent Conferences-Review learner outcomes and support parent assistance	11/05/2008	02/28/2010	After School	Local Funds	
3	Title I Parent Night-provide parent support for parents of students; identified "At Risk"	03/30/2009	03/30/2009	After School	Title I	
4	Open House-Fall Revtiew AYP status-Give out Promotion criteria and math scope and sequence	09/04/2008	09/04/2008	After School	Other	
	All families will complete the Home language survey to assure that all					

5	new students lacking English proficiency will receive TBE or TBE services in need of services. The W-APT and IPT will be administered by a trained professional.	08/05/2008	05/30/2009	Before School	Local Funds	
---	--	------------	------------	---------------	-------------	--

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

To improve Reading Comprehension and Fluency for all students.

Personnel will monitor effectiveness of strategies and activities through monthly grade level meetings. Teachers will share data from running records and results from strategies implemented in the classroom. In grade level meetings teachers will update the Intervention Wall based on teacher assessment. Dibels is given 3 times a year in grades K-2 and results will be shared during grade level meeting and a plan will be developed to address individual needs (RTI). ISEL is given in the primary grades in the fall and spring; with subtests given in kindergarten as needed. Results from the ISEL are shared in grade level meetings and a plan will be developed to assist those students in need. Information at grade level meetings, will be used to support students being monitored for RTI purposes. RTI binders were distributed to all teachers working with students. A Progress monitoring tool will be purchased during the 2008-2009 school year for the purpose of tracking students and helping them to approach grade level status.

	Name	Title
1	Phyllis Graham	Principal
2	Mary Moley	Reading Coach
3	Rachel Skupein	RTI Leader

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

**Objective 2**

To improve Math understanding and achievement

**Objective 2 Description**

In 2008, 81% of all students met AYP in math. 73% of our Black students met and 82.9% of our Economically Disadvantaged met in math. We are expecting to continue to make growth in the area of math, knowing that in 2010 the meets expectation is 77.5 and in 2011 the expectation is 85%. After reviewing our data our students continue to struggle with extended response specifically in the area of explanation. We are also in need of helping our students better understand the concept of measurement.

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

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

To improve Math understanding and achievement

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Fifth Grade teacher (Mrs. Beebe) will model extended response during the first semester	09/01/2008	02/02/2009	After School	Local Funds	
2	Teachers will deliver Tier II and TIER III interventions for students identified as below level	09/01/2008	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	Quarterly Review of Scope and Sequence with new textbook	10/22/2008	05/30/2009	After School	Local Funds	
4	Third Grade teachers will share information regarding new materials received from Reduced class size Grant-and share with staff (Overhead materials, fractions manipulatives, etc.)	10/29/2009	05/30/2009	After School	Other	
5	Math after school program to support students identified under RTI	10/30/2009	05/30/2009	After School	Title I	

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

To improve Math understanding and achievement

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Two or more staff members will attend Math workshops and share strategies and ideas with staff	09/01/2008	05/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	
2	Teachers will have the opportunity to observe lessons from other colleagues during the school day	10/30/2008	05/30/2009	During School	Local Funds	

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

To improve Math understanding and achievement

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Family Math Night-parents will participate in a math support night during the second semester	11/01/2009	03/01/2009	After School	Local Funds	
2	Parents will receive the math scope and sequence during the first semester	11/04/2008	11/30/2010	After School	Local Funds	
3	Parents will receive information regarding Study Island usage at home for Math	11/04/2008	05/30/2009	After School	Local Funds	

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

To improve Math understanding and achievement

Faculty will give feedback during staff meetings on the variety of professional development, observations, and any difficulties or holes they see in the new sereis. A running list of needs for math development as well as materials will be considered for purchase.

Students receiving RTI support in the area of math will be monitored monthly through RTI meetings.

Parents will complete a survey for Math Night

	Name	Title
1	Phyllis Graham	Principal
2	Rachel Skupien	RTI Coach
3	Jennifer Beebe	Classroom Teacher

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3

To improve English Proficiency of English Language Learners

Objective 3 Description

During the 2008=2009 school year George Washington School has identified over 25 students as ELL learners. Over 20 students have the same first language (Spanish). Based on this data all staff are obligated to be educated in "Best Practices" for ELL learners. We are obligated to use the WIDA standards in our lessons, make translations in writing notes to parents and assess students in their first language where appropriate.

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

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

To improve English Proficiency of English Language Learners

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	ELL students and ISAT-The TPI and classroom teacher will support these learners by introducing grade level text and reading strategies to prepare them for the ISAT test.	09/01/2008	06/01/2009	During School	Title III	
2	Using the WIDA standards along with Illinois Learner Outcomes; students will understand content knowledge and skills in all academic areas and have opportunities to engage in the full curriculum provided by the school.	09/01/2008	05/29/2009	Before School	Title III	

3	ELL/ESL-Acquire basic and academic English language skills to become proficient learners. (Reading, Speaking, Listening, and Writing	08/25/2008	06/01/2009	During School	Title III	
4	The ESL/TPI teacher will participate in RTI meetings where appropriate to assist with the development of appropriate techniques and strategies for those students	10/01/2009	04/30/2009	During School	Local Funds	

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

To improve English Proficiency of English Language Learners

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	New teachers will participate in district meetings regarding ESL/TPI	09/01/2008	05/30/2009	After School	Title III	
2	Teachers will collaborate with the ESL teachers as needed	09/01/2008	05/30/2009	During School	Local Funds	
3	Building principal will collaborate with ESL Teacher and Title III Director in order to support teachers	09/01/2008	05/23/2009	During School	Title III	

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

To improve English Proficiency of English Language Learners

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	ESL/Title I Night Family Reading Night-parent support	10/08/2008	10/08/2008	After School	Other	
2	Parent Conferences-Review WIDA standards learner outcomes and offer parent assistance as needed	11/05/2008	02/28/2009	After School	Local Funds	
3	All families will complete the Home language survey to assure that all new students lacking English proficiency will receive TBE or TBE services in need of services. The W-APT and IPT will be administered by a trained professional.	08/05/2008	05/30/2009	Before School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

To improve English Proficiency of English Language Learners

The effectiveness of this process will be measured formally by ACCESS test scores which are given annually. We will also measure student growth based on Monthly running records, RTI meetings, parent conferences (report cards) and principal meetings with the ESL/TPI teacher.

	Name	Title
1	Phyllis	Graham
2	Marge Crivellone	Title III Director
3	Cera Chavez	ESL/TPI teacher

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

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

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

Parents receive information about our academic status in a formal parent meeting in September. They continue to receive updates regarding our school focus, instruction, activities in our monthly newsletter the Washington Word.

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

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

The school improvement team has been in place for six years. Classroom teachers along with our Reading Coach make up this team. This team meets regularly to update the plan and include all new data. Activities/Strategies are included in this plan and are implemented by the school staff. The school staff is given an opportunity to review the plan and offer input. Activities are based on Best practices as well as documented activities that building staff have shown will work.

Stakeholders include:

Dr. Korsak-Superintendent

Dr. Woodrow-Curriculum and Instruction

Marge Crivellone-Funded Programs

Local School Board

ISC-4

In 2005-2006 & 2006-2007-the RESPRO team assisted us in the development our plan. We believe their support kept us focused and assisted us in making AYP. We continue to receive assistance from them as needed.

	Name	Title
1	Phyllis Graham	Principal
2	Mary Moley	Reading Coach
3	Cera Chavez	ESL Teacher
4	Kimberly Behland	Classroom teacher
5	Jeanne Brislen	Reading Recovery teacher

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

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

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

The Asst. superintendent collects our plans in the fall. These plans are also submitted to the local school board as well as the Title I director. There is no formal Peer Review taking place at this time

### 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.

First & Second year teachers are participating in the district sanctioned mentoring program. All first and second year teachers are assigned a mentor and are responsible for attending meetings throughout the year.

The mentor program is set in place to:

\* improve teacher performance

\*increase teachers retention through the non-tenure years

\*Promote personal and professional well-being of beginning teachers

\*Transmit a culture to beginning teachers that we know they need support

Teachers that are new to the district but not new to teaching are assigned a buddy. The purpose of the buddy is to address the concerns of procedure, curriculum that may differ from the previous district. These teachers are not assigned to the Governors State Program.

### 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 continues to provide a variety of resources to support our school mission. As a Title I school funds are used to support teacher in-service, after school programs, in-school programs (Reading Recovery) our Reading Coach and assistant, etc. All students benefit from these services in some form. Our Title I funds support after school meetings

in Literacy assisting teachers in implementing best practices in the classroom. Substitute teachers have been offered and used to assist staff in attending professional development and also in developing the necessary programs for students during the school day. The District has provided us with technology (purchasing of licenses for a variety of software) as well as hardware (laptops, SMARTBOARD, etc.) Our assistant superintendent has been key in writing a grant allowing us to reduce class size over the last three years. This grant has allowed the purchase of materials across the content areas that students would otherwise not have access to, today.

The superintendent supports the use of our everyday substitute teacher for RTI when he/she is not assigned to a class.

**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).

- Ⓔ 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.

- Ⓔ 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.

ISC-4 has provided support to our school and district over the years. Through the ISC-4 we have collaborated with our RESPRO team, the director and other faculty from our region. We no longer meet the criteria for formal assistance, but the ISC-4 continues to make themselves available to us in the area of professional development and consultation.

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

---

	Name	Title
1	Dr. Susan Woodrow	Asst. Superintendent-Curriculum & Instruction
2	Margarite Crivellone	Title I Director

## Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 12/18/2008

### 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?

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

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

**IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS**

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

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

**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?

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

**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?

Yes  No Are the strategies and activities measurable?

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

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

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

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?

<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?
<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?
<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?

**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? <span style="color: red;">(Title I Schools Only)</span>
---	--

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?
<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?

**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?

**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?

**DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES**

Yes  No

Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?

Yes  No  N/A

If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school?

**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?

**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?

**APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD**

Yes  No

The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.

**PART II - COMMENTS**