

Local Board Approved	11/23/2010
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2010 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	2010-11 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2010-11 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		77.5			77.5			91		80	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	88.9		Yes	94.4		Yes	96.6	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	88.2		Yes	94.1		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American													
Multiracial/Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities													
Economically Disadvantaged													

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

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 77.5% 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 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 91% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 80% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2009.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 77.5% 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.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2010 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	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Attendance Rate (%)	97.4	96.4	97.2	96.5	97.4	96.8	97.4	96.6
Truancy Rate (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0
Mobility Rate (%)	1.0	8.0	14.3	14.7	5.4	5.6	2.3	5.8
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	119	118	111	102	112	105	112	107
Low Income (%)	6.7	8.5	8.1	7.8	10.7	7.6	3.6	8.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.7
White, non-Hispanic (%)	100.0	96.6	97.3	96.1	96.4	96.2	96.4	96.3
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hispanic (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.8	1.9
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.9	1.8	1.9

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

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	2000	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	96.6	0.8	-	2.5	-	-
	2005	97.3	-	-	-	-	2.7
	2006	96.1	-	1.0	-	-	2.9
	2007	96.4	-	0.9	-	-	2.7
	2008	96.2	-	1.0	-	-	2.9
	2009	96.4	-	1.8	-	-	1.8
	2010	96.3	-	1.9	-	-	1.9
D I S T R I C T	2000	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	96.6	0.8	-	2.5	-	-
	2005	97.3	-	-	-	-	2.7
	2006	96.1	-	1.0	-	-	2.9
	2007	96.4	-	0.9	-	-	2.7
	2008	96.2	-	1.0	-	-	2.9
	2009	96.4	-	1.8	-	-	1.8
	2010	96.3	-	1.9	-	-	1.9
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

S T A T E	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5
	2010	52.8	18.8	21.1	4.2	0.2	2.9

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	-	9.2	98.8	97.7	5.1	-	-	-	-
	2001	-	5.6	100.0	97.5	9.8	-	-	-	-
	2002	-	8.3	100.0	97.7	0.9	-	-	-	-
	2003	-	6.7	100.0	97.4	1.0	-	-	-	-
	2004	-	8.5	100.0	96.4	8.0	-	-	-	-
	2005	-	8.1	100.0	97.2	14.3	-	-	-	-
	2006	-	7.8	100.0	96.5	14.7	1	1.1	-	-
	2007	-	10.7	100.0	97.4	5.4	-	-	-	-
	2008	-	7.6	100.0	96.8	5.6	1	1.1	-	-
	2009	-	3.6	100.0	97.4	2.3	-	-	-	-
2010	-	8.4	100.0	96.6	5.8	-	-	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	-	9.2	98.8	97.7	5.1	-	-	-	-
	2001	-	5.6	100.0	97.5	9.8	-	-	-	-
	2002	-	8.3	100.0	97.7	0.9	-	-	-	-
	2003	-	6.7	100.0	97.4	1.0	-	-	-	-
	2004	-	8.5	100.0	96.4	8.0	-	-	-	-
	2005	-	8.1	100.0	97.2	14.3	-	-	-	-
	2006	-	7.8	100.0	96.5	14.7	1	1.1	-	-
	2007	-	10.7	100.0	97.4	5.4	-	-	-	-
	2008	-	7.6	100.0	96.8	5.6	1	1.1	-	-
	2009	-	3.6	100.0	97.4	2.3	-	-	-	-
2010	-	8.4	100.0	96.6	5.8	-	-	-	-	
	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

S T A T E	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
	2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1
	2010	7.6	45.4	96.2	93.9	13.0	72,383	3.6	3.8	87.8

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	131	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	126	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	120	19	6	22	14	9	-
	2003	119	4	19	4	14	13	-
	2004	118	11	6	17	20	14	-
	2005	111	14	11	6	5	19	-
	2006	102	5	15	8	18	5	-
	2007	112	8	5	14	10	16	-
	2008	105	9	8	7	9	8	-
	2009	112	7	9	6	14	11	-
	2010	107	11	6	9	6	14	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	131	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	126	5	22	14	10	12	-
	2002	120	19	6	22	14	9	-
	2003	119	4	19	4	14	13	-
	2004	118	11	6	17	20	14	-
	2005	111	14	11	6	5	19	-
	2006	102	5	15	8	18	5	-
	2007	112	8	5	14	10	16	-
	2008	105	9	8	7	9	8	-
	2009	112	7	9	6	14	11	-
	2010	107	11	6	9	6	14	-
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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	11	8	26,701	83	18	13	-	-	-
	2001	11	8	28,264	83	18	12	-	-	-
	2002	11	9	29,816	83	18	12	-	-	-
	2003	10	8	30,292	81	19	13	-	-	-
	2004	9	9	31,846	79	21	14	-	-	-
	2005	9	8	33,883	79	21	13	-	-	-
	2006	9	9	34,656	79	21	12	-	-	-
	2007	9	7	34,871	89	11	13	-	-	-
	2008	10	8	36,538	90	10	12	-	-	-
	2009	10	9	38,190	80	20	11	-	-	-
2010	10	10	38,489	90	10	11	-	-	-	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1
2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1	

	2010	132,502	13	63,296	42	57	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, 2005-2010																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	75.1	-	-	-	-	90.9	-	80.0	-	-	-	-	-	80.0	73.3	-	-	80.0
White	73.4	-	-	-	-	90.9	-	78.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	73.3	-	-	80.0
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	-	-	-	81.3	-	-	-	94.7	80.0	90.0	73.4	-	80.0	-	88.3	-	90.0	100.0
White	-	-	-	80.0	-	-	-	94.7	80.0	90.0	71.4	-	80.0	-	88.3	-	90.0	100.0
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, 2005-2010																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	93.4	-	-	-	-	-	90.0	80.0	-	-	80.0
White	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	92.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	80.0	-	-	80.0
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	-	-	-	93.8	-	-	-	100.0	90.0	100.0	93.4	-	60.0	-	88.2	-	100.0	100.0
White	-	-	-	93.4	-	-	-	100.0	90.0	100.0	92.8	-	60.0	-	88.2	-	100.0	100.0
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?

Student Achievement Data

Due to its small size, the school/district receives no disaggregated data based on No Child Left Behind categories. The recent Illinois Standards Assessment Tests do seem to indicate the following needs may be addressed;

1. A higher percentage of students (100%) score 'meets' (M) or 'exceeds' (E) in Reading at Grade 8 level than they do (91%) at Grade 3. This trend does not progress smoothly through the grades, as evidenced with 80% in Grade 5.
2. In Mathematics, 80% of the students M or E Standards in Grades 3 and 8.
3. Few students score 'exceeds' in Writing at all grades, while Students in all grades M or E at a higher level than the State.

Scores in most subtests and grades seem to be gradually improving in time; however, the small number of scores makes it difficult to analyze at a statistically significant level.

District Demographics	2007	2010
Enrollment	112	107
Low Income	10.7%	8.4%
Teacher:Student Ratio	13:1	11.4:1
Mobility	5.6%	5.8%
Attendance Rate	97.4%	96.6%

Educator Data

Yrs of Experience	7	9.5
Education BS	89%	90.4%
Avg Salary % State Avg	60%	61%
Number of Teachers	9	10

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

The school demographics actually reflect the highly static community demographics.

The combination of funding levels and small school size does make it difficult to provide 'specialists' for all academic areas. Nearly \$60,000 of Hold Harmless funding will reduce to \$0 within three years, resulting in a nearly 7% reduction of total revenues. While all subjects are taught by Highly Qualified teachers as per No Child Left Behind and fully certified as per Illinois State Board of Education, they are not all taught by what could be considered specialists.

There is considerable question about how ISAT tests are scored in the Writing sections. Students who are typically fluent writers did not necessarily do well, while others who struggle to write several sentences into a paragraph scored M or E.

It should be noted that this small sampling size makes year to year statistical analysis unreliable.

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

The number of students reaching the 'exceeds' criteria in writing is lower than desired. Strengthening this area of the curriculum is needed.

Student Demographics are quite consistent in the past three years and the teaching staff has become extremely stable.

New funding sources need to be explored.

Further teacher inservice related to classroom learning interventions and integrating technology into classroom curriculum is desired for the stable teaching staff.

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data (Optional)

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

Students grades Kindergarten through 8th Grade are assessed with the Stanford 10 Achievement Test in the Fall of each year. Results are generally available the beginning of November. The School Improvement Planning Team maintains a longitudinal record of these scores as the cohorts move from grade to grade to monitor improvement. Data gathered from charting Stanford 10 Achievement Test scores indicate that our grade cohorts make steady progress though the grades. Scores in most subtests and grades seem to be gradually improving in time; however, the small number of scores makes it difficult to analyze at a statistically significant level.

The 8th Grade students participate in the EXPLORE test December of each year. This assessment is administered by Freeburg High School District 70 and the results help

determine class placements for the freshman year. The School Improvement Planning Team maintains a longitudinal record of these scores, and the results reflect consistent overall achievement progress from year to year.

Teachers have begun using AIMSweb assessment 2009-2010 school year. Students in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade will participate in the Fall, Winter, and Spring. Students Kindergarten through 8th Grade will participate in the Fall, Winter, and Spring each year after 2011. Results will be used to drive classroom instruction and individual assistance.

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

Low class sizes and low student to teacher ratio enables more individualized instruction than would otherwise be possible.

Stanford 10 Achievement Test longitudinal results indicate overall gains in the National Percentile Rates the longer students attend school at St. Libory.

Funding levels have been narrowly keeping up with increased operating expenses. This is primarily due to the fact that income is heavily dependent upon the State Average Daily Attendance funding, and student enrollment has started to drop slightly. The community's rural status and gradual graying has resulted in this situation. A review of budgetary figures indicates mixed data. The District had received status of "Financial Recognition" for three straight years, but now is on Financial Warning.

Due to its small size and low income percentage of students, the District receives less than \$3,000 in Federal grants.

While teachers integrate technology into their daily lessons, further development needs to continue for students to evolve into self-directed learners and utilizing computers within curricular activities. Teachers also need further in-service opportunities for differentiated instruction.

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

Technology needs to be more fully utilized to bring more students into the 'exceeds' category on the ISAT.

New funding sources need to be explored.

Teacher in-service related to integrating technology into classroom curriculum and interventions is needed.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)
Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

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

The school has one classroom per grade level. This creates a sense of isolation for teachers. Instructional strategies include scientifically based whole-class instruction, small group instruction, one-on-one instruction, higher order questioning, choices on how student will demonstrate learning, and Accelerated Reader. In-service on new methodology and activities is needed to keep strategies current.

Staffing is at the minimum amount to provide instruction. Staff training and professional development is needed to assist teachers in learning how to better and more consistently develop better student writing across the curriculum and grades. Past efforts have seemed to help, but further work is needed.

Staff training and professional development is needed to assist teachers in providing classroom interventions and differentiated instruction. Examples of instructional approaches to be explored include differentiated instruction in whole classrooms, using higher order questioning, and giving choices to students on how they will demonstrate knowledge.

Software utilization is needed for teachers to utilize further technology in the teaching of reading and mathematics.

Community Demographics

The community has a minimal low-income population. Most come from the St. Clair County Housing Authority housing, approximately 15 units. Population figures are very stable over the past 5 years. Data from the 2000 Census as per the factfinder.census website include;

98.3% white

583 total residents (plus approximately 200 other from the surrounding rural area)

2.74 average household size

3.5% of families below the low-income level

A review of the budgetary figures indicates mixed data. On one hand, last year the District achieved the status of "Financial Recognition" for the fourth straight year. On the other hand, this year's projection is a net 'red' figure of \$50,000 and we are on "Financial Watch". Our revenues are heavily dependent upon ADA, and our enrollment has been stable or slightly declining for the past three years. It is anticipated that the Education Fund will incur a higher amount of expenses than revenue for the next several years. Plus (or minus) Hold Harmless funding will be completely phased out over the next two years. Without an increase in families or community size, the student population will continue at the current level (lowest in 12 years) or fall even further.

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

Based upon the consistent number of students achieving M and E on ISAT assessments, the students continue to make appropriate progress.

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

Further staff development activities are needed for teachers to incorporate classroom interventions and differentiated instruction for students in whole classrooms, using higher order questioning, and giving choices to students on how they will demonstrate knowledge.

Additional SMARTboards, laptops, and teacher in-service training are needed to expand teaching pedagogy.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)

Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

Data - Briefly describe data on educator qualifications and data and/or information about staff capacity and professional development opportunities related to areas of weakness and strength. What do these data and information tell you?

Every class is taught by a teacher who meets NCLB standards for Highly Qualified.

The demographics of the ten full time teaching staff are even more consistent that that of the student population. Three staff changes occurred in the past six years. No retirements are anticipated for many years.

All grades have received individual instruction in mathematics, reading, and language arts; however, they are combined with another grade virtually each period the remainder of the day. This may negatively impact language acquisition in the primary grades, because reading is actually learned in all subject areas at those levels.

1. Staff training / professional development is needed to assist teachers in learning how to better and more consistently develop better student writing across the curriculum and grades.

2. Software utilization and equipment, perhaps in the form of additional SMARTboards and laptops, are needed for the teachers to utilize in the teaching of reading and mathematics.

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

It is believed that the stable and highly qualified staff has a positive effect 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).

Meeting the needs of some of our individual students will require new methods and interventions on the part of the classroom teachers.

Every teacher has a good background in the basics of utilizing technology to enhance classroom instruction, but many feel they need additional hardware and in-service training to take this to the next level. Examples would include designing and assessing lessons, designing learning projects using technology (aligning learning and assessment, creating graphic organizers, and exploring/sharing instructional aides), and multi-media technology.

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

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

According to the most recent School Report Card, 100% of the parents participated in a teacher conference at least once during the past year. There are few opportunities designed to encourage parent participation with instruction during the school day. One way communication is provided via newsletters, websites, student planners, email list, and classroom weekly updates. Parents participate on the Parent Teacher Advisory Committee and other various committees such as Wellness.

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

Keeping informed and updated on student performance assists the teaching/learning process.

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

Efforts are needed to continue parent involvement and support for classroom participation.

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?

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Rtl Reading Program Implementation	
2	Increase percentage of 'meets' and 'exceeds' ISAT scores	

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Rtl Reading Program Implementation

Objective 1 Description

In 2010-2011, an Rtl Program in reading will begin for Grades 4-8 and continue grades K-3. Teachers at grade levels K-8 will receive additional training related to Rtl strategies.

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

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

Objective 1 Title :

RtI Reading Program Implementation

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	K-8 universal screening 3X per year using AIMSweb	09/20/2010	03/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	500
2	Students identified for Tier II will receive 30 minutes of instruction in addition to the general education reading program daily	09/27/2010	05/20/2011	During School	Local Funds	5,000
3	Students identified for Tier III will receive 60 minutes of instruction in addition to the general education reading program daily	11/01/2010	05/20/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

RtI Reading Program Implementation

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Train K-8 teachers in RtI and AIMSweb protocols	09/07/2010	05/20/2011	After School	Local Funds	200

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

Objective 1 Title :

RtI Reading Program Implementation

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Letters, brochures, and surveys related to the RtI process will be developed	09/20/2010	05/20/2011	During School	Local Funds	100

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

RtI Reading Program Implementation

Monitoring - Include the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities for the objective and identify the person(s) responsible for overseeing the work. Describe the process and measures of success of this objective. (How will school personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

The School Improvement Team will review the general results yielded and progress made by Tier II and III students.

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	Carl Buehler	Superintendent
2	Sherrie Bultman	Teacher
3	Michelle Albrecht	Teacher
4	Kathy Robinson	Teacher

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Increase percentage of 'meets' and 'exceeds' ISAT scores

Objective 2 Description

Students will participate in classroom activities which involve application of technology skills, progressing from basic word processing and spreadsheet documents to inquiry based learning, web research, and graphic organizers. Students will be taught how to answer extended response questions. Programs recognizing student achievement and improvement will be continued.

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

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

Objective 2 Title :

Increase percentage of 'meets' and 'exceeds' ISAT scores

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will be instructed in the basics and use of Microsoft Word and spreadsheet documents, use web research and inquiry based learning to increase reading and writing skills. Students will use and learn to develop graphic organizers. Purchase an additional SMARTboard.	09/13/2010	05/20/2011	During School	Local Funds	2,000

2	Students will be taught to answer extended response questions as part of Chapter/Unit assessments.	09/13/2010	05/19/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	Continuation of programs such as BUG, Raging Rivers, BookIT, 100% Club, Six Flags, and Honer Roll.	09/13/2010	05/20/2011	During School	Local Funds	200

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

Objective 2 Title :

Increase percentage of 'meets' and 'exceeds' ISAT scores

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	In-service will be provided for teachers related to SMARTboard utilization and methods of developing inquiry based technology infused lessons.	09/13/2010	05/20/2011	During School	Local Funds	200

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

Objective 2 Title :

Increase percentage of 'meets' and 'exceeds' ISAT scores

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will be provided an opportunity to visit school and see classroom applicatoins of technology.	09/20/2010	05/20/2011	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

Increase percentage of 'meets' and 'exceeds' ISAT scores

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?)

Classroom lessons will be monitored and applications of these concepts noted.

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	Carl Buehler	Superintendent

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.)*

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.

	Name	Title
1		

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.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation
Part D. Teacher Mentoring Process

Teacher Mentoring Process - Describe the teacher mentoring program. Mentoring programs pair novice teachers with more experienced professionals who serve as role models and provide practical support and encouragement. Schools have complete discretion in deciding what else the teacher mentoring program should provide.

New teachers participate in the Teacher Mentoring Program offered through the St. Clair ROE if funding permits.

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.

Being a single school district, the district is solely responsible for technical assistance.

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.

None

	Name	Title
1		

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 11/23/2010

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

Yes No Has the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan? [C]

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

Yes No Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?

Yes No Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement? [C]

Yes No Are the strategies and activities measurable? [C]

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

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

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

Yes No N/A Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status or in special education non-compliance?

Yes No N/A Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities for students? [C]

Yes No 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?

 Yes No

Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]

MONITORING Yes No

Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]

 Yes 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** Yes No 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 Yes No

Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]

 Yes 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