

Local Board Approved	
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	280060990042002		
District Name:	Spring Valley CCSD 99	School Name:	John F Kennedy Elem School
Superintendent:	James M Hermes	Principal:	Gina Herrmann
District Address:	800 N Richards St	School Address:	800 N Richards St
City/State/Zip:	Spring Valley, IL 61362 1238	City/State/Zip:	Spring Valley, IL 61362 1238
District Telephone#:	Label 8156644242 Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	8156644601 Extn: 0
District Email:		School Email:	
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No			

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2010 AYP Report

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this School been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2010-11 Federal Improvement Status	Choice
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2010-11 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning Year 1

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	76.6		Yes	86.1		Yes	95.8	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	80.3		Yes	89.5		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	73.6		Yes	84.5		Yes				
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American														
Multiracial/Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	49.4	58.8	No	63.4	73.7	No	95.3			
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	70.4	74.4	No	79.4		Yes	95.0			

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.

2010 DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION

The Differentiated Accountability classification for the School is:	Focused
Is this School making AYP in the "ALL" subgroup in reading?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in the "ALL" subgroup in math?	Yes

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 - 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 (%)	95.4	96.1	96.0	96.0	96.1	94.0	95.7	95.8
Truancy Rate (%)	0.2	-	-	6.6	-	1.2	-	0.2
Mobility Rate (%)	12.1	20.1	14.9	14.0	14.0	11.9	13.6	10.9
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	496	469	460	429	461	493	501	527
Low Income (%)	26.8	37.3	34.8	28.2	40.3	47.1	47.3	45.2
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	4.8	10.0	2.4	2.3	2.8	3.0	3.0	4.7
Students with Disabilities (%)								18
White, non-Hispanic (%)	84.7	84.2	80.4	78.3	73.3	70.6	69.7	67.2
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	1.8	2.3	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.8	1.6	2.5
Hispanic (%)	12.5	11.9	15.7	17.7	20.6	22.5	19.8	19.0
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.8	1.5	0.7	0.9	1.1	0.2	0.0	0.0
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.3	3.5	4.9	9.0	11.4

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	2000	92.3	0.8	6.3	0.2	0.4	-
	2001	89.4	1.0	9.4	0.2	-	-
	2002	88.0	1.1	9.2	1.3	0.4	-
	2003	84.7	1.8	12.5	0.8	0.2	-
	2004	84.2	2.3	11.9	1.5	-	-
	2005	80.4	1.3	15.7	0.7	-	2.0
	2006	78.3	0.5	17.7	0.9	0.2	2.3
	2007	73.3	1.5	20.6	1.1	-	3.5
	2008	70.6	1.8	22.5	0.2	-	4.9
	2009	69.7	1.6	19.8	-	-	9.0
	2010	67.2	2.5	19.0	-	-	11.4
D I S T R I C T	2000	90.7	1.5	7.0	0.4	0.3	-
	2001	86.3	2.3	10.7	0.6	0.1	-
	2002	85.9	1.5	10.5	1.5	0.6	-
	2003	83.4	1.3	13.6	1.3	0.4	-
	2004	81.6	2.5	14.2	1.6	-	-
	2005	77.0	1.5	16.8	0.6	-	4.1
	2006	74.4	1.1	17.8	0.8	0.2	5.8
	2007	72.8	1.3	19.0	0.9	-	6.0
	2008	69.8	1.6	20.2	0.1	-	8.2
	2009	67.6	1.5	19.3	-	-	11.6
	2010	67.5	2.2	16.9	-	-	13.4
	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	-	25.7	100.0	96.6	15.3	6	1.1	-	-
	2001	2.2	25.5	100.0	96.7	14.9	-	-	-	-
	2002	-	25.4	100.0	96.3	16.6	7	1.5	-	-
	2003	4.8	26.8	100.0	95.4	12.1	1	0.2	-	-
	2004	10.0	37.3	100.0	96.1	20.1	-	-	-	-
	2005	2.4	34.8	100.0	96.0	14.9	-	-	-	-
	2006	2.3	28.2	100.0	96.0	14.0	27	6.6	-	-
	2007	2.8	40.3	100.0	96.1	14.0	-	-	-	-
	2008	3.0	47.1	100.0	94.0	11.9	6	1.2	-	-
	2009	3.0	47.3	100.0	95.7	13.6	-	-	-	-
2010	4.7	45.2	97.0	95.8	10.9	1	0.2	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	-	26.2	99.1	96.3	15.7	19	2.6	-	-
	2001	5.8	27.1	100.0	96.4	19.3	1	0.1	-	-
	2002	2.8	26.8	100.0	95.9	16.5	7	1.0	-	-
	2003	6.2	26.6	100.0	95.3	16.6	1	0.1	-	-
	2004	10.5	37.8	100.0	95.7	19.8	-	-	-	-
	2005	3.3	38.0	100.0	95.6	17.3	9	1.4	-	-
	2006	3.7	36.0	100.0	95.5	17.2	34	5.4	-	-
	2007	2.3	43.7	100.0	95.8	16.0	5	0.8	-	-
	2008	3.4	51.0	100.0	94.1	22.4	11	1.7	-	-
	2009	5.6	50.1	100.0	95.6	16.3	5	0.7	-	-
2010	4.7	47.8	97.8	95.6	11.6	4	0.6	-	-	
	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	501	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	499	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	476	65	61	94	96	65	-
	2003	496	75	74	66	74	90	-
	2004	469	60	71	74	98	71	-
	2005	460	72	63	65	74	89	-
	2006	429	65	69	60	69	78	-
	2007	461	76	62	66	65	71	-
	2008	493	69	83	64	60	74	-
	2009	501	70	72	83	71	59	-
	2010	527	84	67	71	71	68	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	711	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	701	67	112	79	72	65	-
	2002	683	65	61	94	96	65	-
	2003	692	75	74	66	74	90	-
	2004	675	60	71	74	98	71	-
	2005	666	72	63	65	74	89	-
	2006	653	65	69	60	69	78	-
	2007	684	76	62	66	65	71	-
	2008	728	69	83	64	60	74	-
	2009	750	70	72	83	71	59	-
	2010	779	85	67	71	71	68	-
	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	45	15	32,336	76	24	19	-	-	-
	2001	44	15	33,400	81	19	19	-	-	-
	2002	44	17	35,965	82	18	19	-	-	-
	2003	45	17	36,976	82	18	18	-	-	-
	2004	46	18	40,334	80	20	17	-	2	-
	2005	43	19	44,162	61	40	17	-	5	-
	2006	43	16	43,598	58	42	17	-	2	-
	2007	45	15	44,380	60	40	17	-	6	-
	2008	47	13	43,552	62	38	18	-	-	-
	2009	47	12	44,744	70	30	19	-	-	-
2010	45	13	46,704	64	33	20	-	-	-	
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	132,544	13	63,283	42	57	18	18	-	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	85.7	73.0	65.4	66.1	60.8	73.0	-	85.0	80.0	63.9	76.8	65.6	66.1	76.8	77.1	65.1	72.4	75.0
White	84.9	75.5	69.8	74.4	72.3	80.0	-	83.0	78.7	63.8	81.8	72.5	68.8	78.0	78.4	63.1	70.6	82.6
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	61.6	47.1	23.1	60.0	-	92.9	-	64.3	68.4	50.0	-	-	77.8	71.4	100.0	58.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	53.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	54.6	-	33.3	30.8	-	54.5	83.3	50.0	-	30.8	-	-	53.4	41.7	63.6	-
Low Income	75.0	77.3	56.6	63.7	48.7	64.1	-	80.7	80.0	76.3	70.9	64.5	52.7	70.8	81.5	68.0	75.0	58.6

	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	-	65.2	84.3	81.8	77.9	74.6	-	75.4	78.1	89.5	83.6	71.9	72.7	81.1	85.1	85.7	92.4	95.6
White	-	70.0	88.8	80.8	75.0	80.0	-	72.3	77.6	86.9	81.7	72.4	73.7	82.5	83.4	87.0	94.7	95.8
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	41.7	69.2	82.4	81.8	80.0	-	-	76.9	100.0	86.7	80.0	-	-	-	80.0	90.9	94.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	36.4	50.0	57.1	-	-	-	-	50.0	37.6	10.0	25.0	-	-	-	80.0
Low Income	-	60.7	72.7	78.5	76.9	70.6	-	71.4	69.2	84.0	81.5	81.0	61.9	71.4	76.5	70.0	90.9	89.7

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	90.6	90.5	80.0	95.4	86.9	85.8	-	92.4	95.0	75.9	95.6	83.3	82.2	80.4	97.1	85.7	84.0	93.0
White	90.8	89.8	81.2	97.7	87.3	90.0	-	95.7	95.7	79.3	97.7	90.0	81.3	82.9	96.1	84.7	90.2	100.0
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	92.3	94.1	76.9	90.0	-	85.7	-	71.4	100.0	63.6	-	-	100.0	85.7	72.7	82.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	69.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	90.9	-	83.3	38.5	-	63.6	100.0	91.7	-	76.9	-	-	93.4	91.6	100.0	-
Low Income	80.0	86.4	83.4	94.0	79.5	76.9	-	88.5	95.0	76.3	93.3	74.2	68.4	66.7	92.6	84.0	80.0	86.2

	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	-	65.1	80.8	86.6	75.8	76.0	-	77.1	81.3	78.9	86.6	87.5	52.3	84.2	83.6	85.5	84.9	89.9
White	-	68.0	86.5	87.5	72.6	80.0	-	78.2	81.6	86.9	87.8	87.2	57.9	84.4	83.3	88.6	92.1	89.8
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	50.0	61.5	82.4	81.8	90.0	-	-	76.9	62.6	86.7	90.0	-	-	-	73.3	72.7	88.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	54.5	41.6	42.9	-	-	-	-	50.0	75.1	-	30.8	-	-	-	54.5
Low Income	-	50.0	65.2	75.8	76.0	73.5	-	71.4	73.1	64.0	77.8	90.5	42.9	68.2	70.5	75.8	77.2	83.4

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?*

Special Education students did not make AYP. However, Spring Valley special education students score higher than the co-op as well as higher than the state average.

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

Special education students are instructed at their ability levels which does not coincide with current grade levels. ISAT tests assess at grade levels not at academic levels of students.

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

Rigorous and early interventions need to be in place for special education students.

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?*

AIMS web benchmarks and data 3x per year.

ISAT test scores

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

Low income students do not have access to necessary resources that provide prerequisite skills for school.

Special education students take assessments that are not at their level.

When given local assessments at their level their academic growth is apparent.

Accommodations are made for special education students; however, grade level assessment is not appropriate for them.

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

Continue providing additional interventions and supports with follow-up on progress monitoring.

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?*

High mobility rate

High SES

High ELL

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

Students do not come to school with experiences allowing them to perform at their grade level.

Students do not have resources necessary to bring proper experiences to school.

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

Interventions are necessary to provide students with prerequisite skills required for their education.

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?*

Staff is all highly qualified.

Professional development occurs on-site and through conferences, workshops, and grad level work.

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

Our students perform higher than the state levels; therefore, our professional development and staff are providing for the needs of the students.

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

Continue staff development which focuses on rigorous interventions.

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?*

Parents in our district provide support and attend school functions. However, many are unable to assist their children at home with academics.

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

Parents are unable to assist their children at home.

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

Staff members need to be on task throughout the day and provide the interventions and assistance students are lacking at home.

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?

More rigorous interventions are needed.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Special Education and low income subgroup ISAT scores will increase in order to meet AYP.	1,3,2,

The following deficiencies have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for your school.

- 1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 3. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Special Education and low income subgroup ISAT scores will increase in order to meet AYP.

Objective 1 Description

While our current subgroup of special education and low income are currently not making AYP in math and reading, this subgroup will make of 85% in 2011 and 92.5% in 2012 or Safe Harbor.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- 1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

- 2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 3. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 1 Title :

Special Education and low income subgroup ISAT scores will increase in order to meet AYP.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Curriculum will continue to be aligned with current state standards.	08/23/2010	06/04/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Students will practice ISAT format assessments throughout the year.	08/23/2010	06/04/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 1 Title :

Special Education and low income subgroup ISAT scores will increase in order to meet AYP.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide professional development in areas of reading and math for low SES and special education students.	08/23/2010	06/04/2012	After School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 1 Title :

Special Education and low income subgroup ISAT scores will increase in order to meet AYP.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide education resources which can be used at home with parents and students.	08/23/2010	06/04/2012	After School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Special Education and low income subgroup ISAT scores will increase in order to meet AYP.

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?)

SIP and DIP teams meet regularly to discuss data, interventions and areas of continued need.

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	Kim Lisanby-Barber	Curriculum Director/Special Ed Director
2	Gina Herrmann	Building Principal
3	Sally Jacobson	SIP team member
4	Scott Sebastian	SIP team member
5	Mike Wallace	SIP team member

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.*)

Superintendent sent a letter to all parents/guardians.

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.

Data was analyzed; parents were updated at parent orientation sessions; meetings were held; school newsletter updates on monthly basis.

	Name	Title
1	Kim Lisanby-Barber	Curriculum Director/Special Ed Director
2	Gina Herrmann	Principal
3	Mike Wallace	SIP team member
4	Sally Jacobson	SIP team member
5	Scott Sebastian	SIP team member
6	Marty Herrmann	Parent
7	Charlotte Herrmann	Parent
8	Wendy Woulfe	Parent/PBIS team member

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 following people are on our peer review committee:

SIP and DIP members

Sara McDondald, Principal, Northview School, LaSalle County

Building principals, JFK and Lincoln

Superintendent, SVES #99

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.

District participates in the ROE mentoring 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.

District provides financial support and professional development opportunities to support the SIP.

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.

RESPRO funds for professional development through the ROE.

ISBE provides ISAT data.

IIRC site and data.

	Name	Title
1	Kim Lisanby-Barber	Curriculum Director/Special Ed Director
2	Gina Herrmann	Building Principal
3	Mike Wallace	SIP team member
4	Sally Jacobson	SIP team member
5	Scott Sebastian	SIP team member
6	Marty Herrmann	Parent
7	Charlotte Herrmann	Parent
8	Wendy Woulfe	Parent/PBIS team member
9	Jim Hermes	Superintendent
10	Roz Battersby	RESPRO/Consultant

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

- Yes No Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified? [C]
- Yes No Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness? [C]
- Yes No Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students? [C]
- Yes No Does the analysis, along with other optional data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities? [C]

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

- Yes No N/A If included, is there evidence that the SIP team analyzed optional data to clarify the areas of weakness?
- Yes No N/A Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?
- Yes No N/A Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

- Yes No N/A If included, has the SIP team analyzed other available data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities?
- Yes No N/A Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?
- Yes No N/A Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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