

Local Board Approved	11/22/2010
Submitted	12/02/2010
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	86.7		Yes	90.6		Yes	95.4	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	88.0		Yes	90.4		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 (%)	96.0	95.9	96.4	95.6	95.9	96.0	96.2	95.4
Truancy Rate (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mobility Rate (%)	8.4	9.8	12.2	6.5	5.4	4.3	2.3	5.4
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	631	777	679	753	616	623	648	657
Low Income (%)	1.9	2.6	3.7	2.3	2.6	1.6	3.7	6.7
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.0	3.7	3.5	1.3	1.8	3.2	4.6	2.9
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.0
White, non-Hispanic (%)	89.7	87.3	82.9	90.4	89.4	88.0	86.6	86.1
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	1.3	1.7	2.5	1.1	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.2
Hispanic (%)	6.7	9.3	11.0	7.4	6.5	7.2	6.5	6.1
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	2.4	1.7	2.9	0.3	1.3	1.8	2.2	2.7
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	0.4	0.1	1.0	1.3	3.2	3.7

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	93.0	0.6	4.8	1.4	0.2	-
	2001	92.3	1.7	5.7	0.4	-	-
	2002	90.6	1.6	5.3	2.5	-	-
	2003	89.7	1.3	6.7	2.4	-	-
	2004	87.3	1.7	9.3	1.7	0.1	-
	2005	82.9	2.5	11.0	2.9	0.1	0.4
	2006	90.4	1.1	7.4	0.3	0.7	0.1
	2007	89.4	1.6	6.5	1.3	0.2	1.0
	2008	88.0	1.6	7.2	1.8	0.2	1.3
	2009	86.6	1.4	6.5	2.2	0.2	3.2
	2010	86.1	1.2	6.1	2.7	0.2	3.7
D I S T R I C T	2000	96.1	0.6	2.4	0.8	0.2	-
	2001	96.1	0.7	2.5	0.5	0.1	-
	2002	95.0	0.9	3.0	0.9	0.1	-
	2003	94.4	0.9	3.3	1.2	0.1	-
	2004	92.8	1.1	5.0	1.1	0.1	-
	2005	90.4	1.1	6.2	1.7	0.1	0.4
	2006	88.7	1.3	7.4	1.9	0.2	0.5
	2007	86.5	1.4	8.9	2.1	0.1	1.1
	2008	84.1	1.6	10.0	2.4	0.2	1.8
	2009	84.1	1.2	9.9	2.5	0.2	2.1
	2010	83.4	1.7	9.6	2.7	0.2	2.4
	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	1.6	0.8	100.0	96.1	9.7	-	-	-	-
	2001	2.5	1.5	100.0	95.8	9.3	-	-	-	-
	2002	2.1	2.8	100.0	96.2	11.5	-	-	-	-
	2003	-	1.9	100.0	96.0	8.4	-	-	-	-
	2004	3.7	2.6	100.0	95.9	9.8	-	-	-	-
	2005	3.5	3.7	100.0	96.4	12.2	-	-	-	-
	2006	1.3	2.3	100.0	95.6	6.5	1	0.1	-	-
	2007	1.8	2.6	100.0	95.9	5.4	-	-	-	-
	2008	3.2	1.6	100.0	96.0	4.3	-	-	-	-
	2009	4.6	3.7	100.0	96.2	2.3	-	-	-	-
2010	2.9	6.7	90.0	95.4	5.4	-	-	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	0.7	2.0	93.6	95.6	8.3	5	0.2	0.8	95.7
	2001	1.3	2.3	98.0	95.5	10.2	5	0.2	1.0	99.4
	2002	1.4	2.5	94.6	95.2	8.1	8	0.3	2.0	96.5
	2003	0.6	2.7	96.0	95.7	7.0	7	0.2	1.3	100.0
	2004	1.4	3.2	98.2	95.6	8.6	11	0.3	0.6	97.7
	2005	1.6	4.8	99.4	95.2	11.9	26	0.7	0.9	100.0
	2006	1.4	6.4	99.5	95.1	7.3	22	0.6	0.8	97.0
	2007	1.4	5.6	99.5	95.6	7.5	28	0.7	0.5	96.0
	2008	2.6	5.9	99.4	95.5	6.1	4	0.1	0.4	99.6
	2009	3.0	7.3	99.6	94.6	4.8	3	0.1	1.2	96.4
2010	2.4	9.1	98.4	95.1	4.8	-	-	0.5	100.0	
	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	494	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	530	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	564	99	116	-	-	-	-
	2003	631	120	111	-	-	-	-
	2004	777	146	142	-	-	-	-
	2005	679	109	108	104	-	-	-
	2006	753	117	123	101	-	-	-
	2007	616	109	93	102	-	-	-
	2008	623	119	106	99	-	-	-
	2009	648	98	117	109	-	-	-
	2010	657	96	92	119	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	2,647	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,747	224	219	213	229	228	202
	2002	2,862	218	225	221	220	231	186
	2003	3,049	236	238	236	228	245	218
	2004	3,325	280	262	255	266	237	235
	2005	3,616	302	299	286	275	277	240
	2006	3,994	328	355	327	276	289	264
	2007	4,146	352	335	352	326	292	245
	2008	4,409	399	367	360	355	336	283
	2009	4,581	358	395	379	362	353	290
	2010	4,757	364	358	393	358	367	294
	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	161	14	43,713	46	54	19	18	-	-
	2001	175	14	44,072	44	56	18	18	-	-
	2002	193	13	45,355	46	54	17	17	1	-
	2003	195	13	48,386	39	61	18	17	1	-
	2004	202	12	52,447	39	61	19	19	1	-
	2005	219	11	52,107	42	58	18	19	-	-
	2006	240	11	52,226	48	52	18	18	-	-
	2007	276	10	52,884	48	52	16	17	1	-
	2008	285	10	54,648	46	54	17	17	-	-
	2009	300	10	56,525	39	61	16	17	-	-
2010	275	10	58,870	32	68	19	19	-	-	
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	80.4	81.7	79.6	78.6	88.1	82.1	-	85.9	88.6	87.9	88.5	95.6	72.6	85.2	84.6	85.5	87.0	83.6
White	86.8	81.1	80.0	82.3	88.8	85.2	-	86.9	87.5	89.4	91.0	96.3	77.1	83.4	84.9	85.8	88.4	84.3
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	50.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	-	-	81.8	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	20.0	33.3	40.0	63.7	-	-	-	-	46.6	54.5	-	-	-	41.7	-	46.6	36.4
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	54.6

	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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, 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	86.9	94.0	92.6	87.2	96.7	86.3	-	95.9	97.8	96.2	90.3	96.7	87.2	92.0	95.2	93.7	90.8	88.0
White	91.3	94.3	92.6	90.2	96.3	86.4	-	97.2	97.6	95.7	89.9	96.3	91.6	92.3	95.7	92.8	91.5	88.2
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	70.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	60.0	58.3	60.0	81.9	-	-	-	-	86.6	54.6	-	-	-	66.7	-	66.7	54.5
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	70.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	72.7

	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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?

Kaneland John Shields has achieved AYP in all areas at all grade levels.

In the area of reading we have seen a slight decrease in the number of students that meet and exceed but remain above the state average. At the fourth grade level our reading scores increased to 96% meeting and exceeding, and fifth grade students performed at the 84% meeting and exceeding level.

In the area of writing our third grade dropped from 65% meeting exceeding to 56% this past year. The fifth grade students showed improvement in writing by raising the meets and exceed level to 57% when compared to 51% the previous year.

In math our scores indicate that at the third grade level we meet and exceed at 86%, fourth grade saw an increase from 90 to 97% in the meets and exceeds level and in fifth grade the students performed at 88% meeting and exceeding. Kaneland John Shields continues to exceed the state average in math year to year.

In the area of science the fourth grade students showed improvement by raising the level from 89 to 92% in meeting and exceeding levels.

The data shows that each grade level exhibits a variety of performance levels across the curriculum. While all 3rd -5th grade students are performing at high levels the fourth grade students show marked gain in reading, math and science. This cohort of students has consistently performed well in all local and state assessments across the board. Likewise our third grade cohort showed a slight decrease in all areas and is consistent with local assessments as well. Our fifth grade group is solid in all areas and showed good growth in the area of writing.

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

The alignment of the curriculum with Illinois State Standards, the continued focus on curriculum maps, and the identification and focus on red core objectives in all areas of the curriculum and across grade levels are possible factors to the continued success in Kaneland schools. The slow down in growth has led to consistency for students and staff and a slight decrease in class size at some levels.

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

The data indicates that a continued focus on writing is appropriate and useful. While math scores are solid at all grade levels we will continue to work on math fact fluency and automaticity. We will continue to focus on professional development and increased implementation of flexible grouping at all grade levels, as well as, the continued facilitation of RTI in areas of reading and behavior.

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?

Student's reading ability is assessed in the fall and spring of each school year using the Rigby Benchmark Assessment and ISEL. Additionally, AimsWeb fluency probes are administered school-wide three times per year. The data from these assessments reveal that students demonstrate growth in reading throughout the school year at all grade levels. The data was used to identify students in need of reading intervention. Progress monitoring data of these interventions revealed that of the 90 students receiving interventions, 40% were being serviced for a gap in phonic development.

Math pre and post assessment are administered in the fall and spring of each school year and math CBM assessments are administered three times per year. Data from these assessments reveal that continual supplementation of basic math facts is necessary. It further confirms the understanding of the spiraling math curriculum and the sequence of skill introduction and mastery. Student scores increase in years where concepts are mastered and decrease in years where concepts are introduced.

Data was collected on student mastery of writing objectives during the 2009-2010 school year through the use of grade level rubrics and CBM assessments. This data revealed that students excel in the areas of conventions and ideas, but struggle with organization and sentence fluency. Additionally, information gained through staff feedback opportunities revealed inconsistent implementation and understanding of the writer's workshop across grade levels.

Informal feedback from staff identified a lack of consistent building-wide behavioral expectations, as well as a lack of specific, targeted instruction in behavioral expectations.

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

Given that the 2010-2011 school year is the second year of full implementation of RtI for reading, data is beginning to accumulate. There is now enough information to identify intervention trends and to identify continued student needs.

Through the work of the 2009-2010 SIP team, grade level teams demonstrated an increased focus on data analysis and reflection. Collaboration between teachers shifted to a data driven, student learning focused approach.

The Kaneland district continues to monitor the implementation of Professional Learning Communities. While much work has been accomplished toward this goal, next steps identified include the development and use of common formative assessments.

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

Strengths in writing performance have been noted, however additional attention should be given to professional development in writing to increase consistency and continuity of writing instruction. A continued focus on the Writer's Workshop format at all grade levels is necessary.

RtI data reveals a need for increased phonics instruction and strategies for improved comprehension be incorporated within the core curriculum.

The lack of intentional and focused instruction, practice, and assessment of student behaviors, as well as, staff follow-through with behavior referrals and positive rewards implies building-wide behavioral expectations needs to be addressed.

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?

We enjoy a very involved parent and community presence at Kaneland John Shields Elementary. We have seen a decrease in enrollment over the past year and, as with most schools in Kane County, we see families coming and going as a result of continued difficult economic times. We have experienced a slight increase in the number of homeless, and free and reduced families in our school. As parents and teachers ourselves we understand how family dynamics can effect student learning and try to support the student in all ways while they are in our school. We are cognizant of the need for positive behavioral reinforcement and consistent academic and behavioral expectations for our students.

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

Children cannot perform optimally when they are experiencing stress and anxiousness from situations at home. We try to provide a safe and comfortable environment for them to enjoy while they are at school and strive to be consistent with expectations and routines to allow them an increase in control over their surroundings and academic lives.

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

Being aware of the strengths, perceived weaknesses, and potential struggles our students encounter during their school day we are seeking to provide a more structured, supportive, and enriched school day. Our SIP includes continued focus on the writing process to reinforce work accomplished in previous years and reinforcing common language and expectations across classes and grade levels. Additionally, the math goals address any weakness in math fact fluency to support the Everyday Math curriculum thus allowing for greater success in the classroom. Lastly, as we transition into a full implementation of RTI-Behavior the groundwork is being laid to support all students behaviorally, as well as, academically throughout their school day and year.

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?

All teachers and paraprofessionals at Kaneland John Shields are highly qualified professionals. We strongly value professional development and offer seminars and conferences for all faculty and staff. We encourage all staff to avail themselves of tuition waivers from Northern Illinois University, as we enjoy a partnership with the university. At KSS we enjoy an extensive profession library and have access to abundant educational resources and tools. Additionally, we strongly encourage teachers to collaborate within their grade level teams, across vertical teams in the building and horizontally across the district. Teacher Institute Days and School Improvement Days are structured to allow for collaboration and sharing among all Kaneland #302 faculty and staff.

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

As the district further develops and explores all tenets of professional learning communities the students benefit from a more focused and cohesive teaching staff. As we further our work in RTI we have created an atmosphere of collaboration, problem solving, and team work. Everyone is aware and actively participates in "every student is every educator's responsibility". We no longer describe a child as "her student" or "his responsibility" -all children at KSS are "our students and our responsibility". We work together to achieve and we celebrate our successes together.

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

As we move forward we will continue to focus on professional learning communities and the next steps in expanding response to intervention implementation. As we formulate and create our school improvement plans we always take into account the strength of our plan and the resources to support it-both materials and staff. With the decrease in education funding and subsequent decrease in budgets we have had to learn to do more with less. Professional learning communities and RTI facilitate our mission very well as we continue to focus on improved student learning through improved instruction and teamwork.

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?

We have seen a decline in the number of parents attending Curriculum Night and Parent-Teacher conferences this past year and continue to look for ways to encourage parent and community participation in school. Many parents do participate on a weekly or monthly basis by volunteering in the library resource center, their child(ren)'s classrooms, attending field trips, or serving as a Junior Achievement instructor. The PTO has offered continued financial and volunteer support for all facets of student learning throughout the school year.

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

Parent volunteers are indescribably beneficial to the classroom teacher allowing for more time to be focused on teaching and less on preparing to teach. Research shows that reading with their children and supporting the efforts of the teacher and school all raise student achievement in all areas. We appreciate the partnership between school and home and strive to continue and improve effective communication throughout the school year.

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

Creating and providing an increase in opportunities to become involved in school functions and activities is always a goal we strive to accomplish. Through the work with PTO and communitiy groups we enjoy increased access to the school and activities at and for the school. We are offering a Writer's Night to encourage parent involvement and student enthusiasm for writing as a component of our writing goal this year.

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?

We ahve found that our past focus on reading improvement has shown success and we now need to look at other areas of the curriculum for improvement. Writing, math fact fluency and consistent behavioral expectations have been identified as areas for improvement this year. Through the utilization and practice of collaboration, team work, and focused intervention we can do more with less to increase student academic and behavioral success. We are learning to live by and practice "working smarter, not harder" by sharing successes and struggles with each other and mentoring each other as we all move forward in our quest for excellence. The tools for continued student progress and success are available and accessible, our SIP goals challenge us to make use of what we have to improve student learning.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Math Fact Fluency	
2	Behavior	
3	Student Writing	

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Math Fact Fluency

Objective 1 Description

At the end of the 2011-2012 school year, 85% of 1st through 5th grade students will achieve 75% or more identified grade level math fact assessments.

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

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

Objective 1 Title :

Math Fact Fluency

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will practice math facts according to testing (+,-,x,/) on a regular basis	09/20/2010	05/13/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	Students will take timed assessments five times throughout the year.	09/10/2010	05/19/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	Students will actively participate in weekly activities to promote math fact recall	09/10/2010	05/20/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

Math Fact Fluency

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will be trained in math fact fluency and how to integrate into their classrooms effectively	08/23/2010	09/30/2010	Before School	Local Funds	
2	Teachers will use the SIP Team spreadsheet to record scores after each assessment	09/06/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	Teachers will administer math fact assessments during the following weeks: 9/07/10-9/10/10, 10/18/10-10/22/10, 1/10/11-1/14/11, 3/14/11-3/18/11 and 5/9/11-5/13/11	09/07/2010	05/13/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	Teachers will assess students using identified grade level assessments taken from Rocket Math.	09/07/2010	05/13/2011	During School	Local Funds	650

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

Objective 1 Title :

Math Fact Fluency

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will participate by helping students learn their math facts.	09/07/2010	05/13/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	Parents and community will be kept informed as to the growth rate or lack of growth through progress reports and report cards.	10/15/2010	05/13/2011	After School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Math Fact Fluency

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?)

Monitoring is built into the math fact fluency program in that students are able to solve a targeted number of problems within one minute. Teachers will report whether the students are making progress on the end of the quarter reports.

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	Shelley Hueber	Principal
2	Kevin Gordon	Assistant Principal
3	Darla Hayman	Special Education teacher
4	Tara Steward	RTI Facilitator
5	Sharon Dillon	Second grade
6	Betsy Burton	Kindergarten
7	Shaun Wenz	First grade
8	Nancy Meisenger	Literacy Specialist
9	Carrie Workman	Third grade

10	Anna Richards	Fourth grade
11	Kristen Schroeder	Fifth grade

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Behavior

Objective 2 Description

By May 2011, 85% of students will exhibit awareness of and compliance with consistent school-wide behavioral expectations to promote a safe and positive learning community according to the behavior matrix.

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

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

Objective 2 Title :

Behavior

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will participate in Expectation Walks to learn the targeted behaviors that are outlined on the Behavior Matrix	09/07/2010	04/15/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Students will participate in a school-wide assembly that addresses the expectations for behavior and outlines 3R tickets and behavior referral	09/22/2010	09/22/2010	During School	Local Funds	0

	forms					
3	Throughout the school year students will receive 3R tickets for exhibiting the expectations listed on the behavior matrix in various locations throughout the building and on school grounds.	09/22/2010	06/03/2011	Before School	Local Funds	50
4	Students will enter 3R tickets earned into a KNIGHTS box per grade level to earn a chance to draw a prize from the prize box. Three students from each grade level have the opportunity to win each week.	09/22/2010	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	50
5	Students will participate in whole-school behavior incentive rewards through-out the school year. Each quarter the whole school will celebrate positive behavior exhibited that quarter, starting with behavior assembly and culminating with school wide field day.	09/22/2010	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	50

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

Objective 2 Title :

Behavior

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Training for staff on behavioral expectations and 3r's tickets.	09/15/2010	11/09/2010	Before School	Local Funds	
2	Training for staff on SWIS referral forms and select staff on entering data.	09/01/2010	09/15/2010	Before School	Local Funds	
3	Monthly behavior meetings for behavior team to interpret data and create follow up and intervention plans.	09/01/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	Behavior team meets every 4-6 weeks for the purpose of problem solving.	09/15/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	Behavior team will monitor quarterly data from report card learner characteristics and begin to develop hypothesis and plan for problem solving.	09/15/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	

6	Monthly updates for all staff at faculty meetings of where our school is in the problem solving process and also to share data.	09/15/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds
---	---	------------	------------	---------------	-------------

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

Objective 2 Title :

Behavior

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will receive a copy of the behavior matrix as a reference at home to encourage positive behaviors in all settings.	09/22/2010	09/22/2010	After School	Local Funds	
2	Parents will sign the R3 ticket that is sent home with individual students.	09/30/2010	09/30/2010	Before School	Local Funds	
3	Parents will receive updates on student progress for R3 tickets.	09/22/2010	05/27/2011	After School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

Behavior

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 behavior goal will be monitored by the number of students who are able to exhibit the expected behaviors as outlined on the behavior matrix. We will tabulate the number of 3R tickets earned throughout each semester and full year.

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	Shelley Hueber	Principal
2	Kevin Gordon	Assistant Principal
3	Darla Hayman	Special Education
4	Tara Steward	RTI facilitator

5	Sharon Dillon	Second grade
6	Betsy Burton	Kindergarten
7	Shaun Wenz	First grade
8	Nancy Meisenger	Literacy Specialist
9	Carrie Workman	Third grade
10	Anna Richards	Fourth grade
11	Kristin Schroeder	Fifth grade

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3

Student Writing

Objective 3 Description

By the end of the 2010-2011 school year, at least 75% of students will achieve 75% or higher, as established on grade level rubrics, on a first draft (expository piece) during a writing block.

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

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

Objective 3 Title :

Student Writing

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will actively participate in Writer's Workshop and whole group writing lessons.	09/07/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	Students in K-2 will use a visual (four shade blue rubric) to discuss writing samples and expectations during writer's workshop.	09/07/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	Students in grades 3-5 will use a variety of rubrics as a guide to completing writing assignments in the classroom.	09/07/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	Students in grades 3-5 will use the rubrics as a self-assessment tool on in-class assignments and during Literacy Special.	09/07/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	Students will reflect upon graded writing assignments in order to continue student growth in writing.	09/07/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	
6	Students will be given the opportunity to participate in a District Writing Night to expose them to professional writers and encourage a focus in writing.	12/06/2010	12/07/2010	After School	Title I	

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

Objective 3 Title :

Student Writing

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Established expository rubrics will be used three times during the school year (first quarter, mid-year, and fourth quarter). Scores will be	09/07/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	

	recorded on grade level spreadsheet.					
2	Teachers of K-2 students will introduce the language of identified rubrics and use the four shades of blue rubric as a guide for instruction.	09/07/2010	11/03/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Teachers of students in 3-5 grades will introduce the writing expectations by using grade level established rubrics.	09/07/2010	11/03/2010	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 3 Title :

Student Writing

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will be made aware of writing expectations during curriculum night and parent-teacher conferences.	09/02/2010	11/04/2010	After School	Local Funds	
2	Parents will review graded student writing assignments and continue to gain knowledge of expectations to provide support at home.	09/02/2010	05/27/2011	After School	Local Funds	
3	Parents can attend District Writing Night to introduce their children to professional writers and reinforce good writing habits.	12/06/2010	12/07/2010	After School	Local Funds	2,000

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 3 Title :

Student Writing

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?)

Teachers will assess an expository piece of writing three times throughout the school year employing the identified writing rubrics to compare growth and to identify areas of weakness that require additional instruction. Teachers will collaborate to identify instructional strategies to aid in moving students toward the targeted writing goal.

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	Shelley Hueber	Principal
2	Kevin Gordon	Assistant Principal
3	Darla Hayman	Special Education
4	Tara Steward	RTI facilitator
5	Sharon Dillon	Second grade
6	Betsy Burton	Kindergarten
7	Shaun Wenz	First grade
8	Nancy Meisenger	Literacy Specialist
9	Carrie Workman	Third grade
10	Anna Richards	Fourth grade
11	Kristin Schroeder	Fifth grade

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.

The building-level school improvement team, consisting of representation from all grade levels, support staff, and administrators, determined present needs within the building and established the objectives of the action plan. District level personnel consulted and assisted in the development of the plan.

	Name	Title
1	Shelley Hueber	Principal
2	Kevin Gordon	Assistant Principal
3	Darla Hayman	Special Education teacher
4	Tara Steward	RTI Facilitator
5	Sharon Dillon	Second grade
6	Betsy Burton	Kindergarten
7	Shaun Wenz	First grade
8	Nancy Meisenger	Literacy Specialist
9	Carrie Workman	Third grade

10	Anna Richards	Fourth grade
11	Kristen Schroeder	Fifth grade

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 district is piloting a vigorous peer review process in order to provide review, progress monitoring, and accountability for goal completion for each school in the district. The peer review process will consist of three meetings per year to focus on building goals, progress-monitoring, and assessing success based on data. The peer review teams will consist of staff members from various levels within the district, and will receive training on the protocols that will be utilized for each of the peer review meetings. This process will ensure that rigorous student achievement outcomes are pursued in a systematic way through our school improvement plan.

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.

Kaneland Community Unit School District #302 provides a FRIENDS mentoring program (Fostering Relationships Involving Educators New to District Schools). FRIENDS is a two year program with several critical components and training opportunities both mentor and mentee. The program includes a multi-day orientation program designed to introduce new teachers to important policies, practices, and expectations set by the Kaneland School District. The primary purpose of the orientation program is to welcome, acclimate, guide

and support new and novice teachers. Mentoring is accomplished through a team approach. As a result of the individual mentoring experience, new teachers build a greater understanding of their job responsibilities and begin to understand the District's cultures, values, beliefs, and traditions. Throughout the year, monthly training sessions are provided for the new and novice teachers. Topics covered in the session include parent communication, building a positive classroom environment, effective planning and preparation, and the professional responsibilities of a teacher. Sessions are held at both the District and individual building level. The final session of the year allows the participants in the program an opportunity to provide feedback to help improve the program for the following year.

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 Kaneland District provides 4 opportunities to review the implementation of the improvement. Peer review teams are in place to support each building in the monitoring of improvement goals. The initial goals are presented to the school board for feedback and ultimately approval. The district remains flexible and open to suggestions for improvement to curriculum maps, as well as the need for additional resources. School Improvement days focus on furthering building and district initiatives, such as the continual monitoring and futhering of the Kaneland Professional Learning Community. Funding is made available to allow staff members to participate in the development, implementation, and monitoring of school improvements goals. Lastly, the district has allotted time for staff to meet horizontally and vertically within individual buildings, as well as, across district.

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 at this time

	Name	Title
1	Shelley Hueber	Principal
2	Kevin Gordon	Assistant Principal
3	Darla Hayman	Special Education teacher
4	Tara Steward	RTI Facilitator
5	Sharon Dillon	Second grade
6	Betsy Burton	Kindergarten
7	Shaun Wenz	First grade
8	Nancy Meisenger	Literacy Specialist
9	Carrie Workman	Third grade
10	Anna Richards	Fourth grade
11	Kristen Schroeder	Fifth grade

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 11/22/2010

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]

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]
MONITORING	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers? [C]

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only) [C]
---	---

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the SIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes? [C]

PEER REVIEW

Yes No

Is the peer review process described and is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have “the greatest likelihood” of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP? [C]

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS
 Yes No

Is it clear how the school is ensuring that teachers are receiving the support needed for their professional growth and to retain them in the profession? [C]

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES
 Yes No

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

 Yes No N/A

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

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES
 Yes No

Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation? [C]

SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM
 Yes No N/A

Have the names and titles of School Support Team members been listed in the plan? Does the team appear to have the expertise to support this school in regards to the school improvement plan? [C]

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD
 Yes No

The plan indicates the approval date of this plan. [C]

PART II - COMMENTS