

Local Board Approved	11/16/2011
Initial Submission	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2011 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?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2011-12 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2011-12 State Improvement Status	

	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
Student Groups	%	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		85.0			85.0			91.0		82.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	60.7		No	78.6		Yes	94.0	Yes		
White														
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian														

American Indian														
Two or More Races														
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities														
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	57.7	76.6	No	76.9		Yes	94.0			

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 85% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 85% 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 85% 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 82% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2010.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 85% 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 - 2011 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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Attendance Rate (%)	95.1	95.0	95.1	94.9	94.5	94.1	93.7	94.0
Truancy Rate (%)	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.3	1.8	0.7	2.8
Mobility Rate (%)	59.5	26.3	31.8	45.5	27.1	29.3	30.4	23.3
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	211	223	239	208	208	242	271	274
Low Income (%)	81.5	89.7	89.1	88.0	89.9	92.6	94.8	95.3
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.1	21.5
White, non-Hispanic (%)	58.3	60.5	61.5	61.5	63.9	63.2	58.3	58.4
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	40.3	38.6	36.4	36.5	31.3	27.3	28.0	29.6
Hispanic (%)	0.9	0.4	0.4	1.4	0.0	0.4	0.4	1.1
Asian (%)	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	1.0	1.2	0.4	0.0
American Indian(%)	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.4	0.0
Two or More Races (%)	-	0.0	0.8	0.5	3.4	7.9	12.5	10.9
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0

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 (%)	American Indian (%)	Two Or More Races (%)	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander (%)
S C H O O L	2000	68.9	29.2	1.9	-	-	-	-
	2001	64.4	33.7	2.0	-	-	-	-
	2002	64.2	33.3	1.5	1.0	-	-	-
	2003	65.1	33.9	0.9	-	-	-	-
	2004	58.3	40.3	0.9	-	0.5	-	-
	2005	60.5	38.6	0.4	-	0.4	-	-
	2006	61.5	36.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.8	-
	2007	61.5	36.5	1.4	-	-	0.5	-
	2008	63.9	31.3	-	1.0	0.5	3.4	-
	2009	63.2	27.3	0.4	1.2	-	7.9	-
	2010	58.3	28.0	0.4	0.4	0.4	12.5	-
2011	58.4	29.6	1.1	-	-	10.9	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	89.5	8.8	0.8	0.8	0.1	-	-
	2001	89.0	9.2	1.0	0.7	0.1	-	-
	2002	89.1	9.2	1.0	0.6	-	-	-
	2003	88.5	9.7	1.0	0.6	-	-	-
	2004	88.0	10.0	1.1	0.8	0.1	-	-
	2005	87.9	9.1	1.3	0.8	0.1	0.7	-
	2006	87.2	9.7	1.1	0.8	0.2	1.1	-
	2007	87.5	8.8	1.2	0.8	0.2	1.5	-
	2008	87.3	8.4	1.2	0.8	0.1	2.2	-
	2009	86.7	8.0	1.2	0.9	0.1	3.2	-
	2010	85.5	8.4	1.3	0.9	0.1	3.9	-

	2011	84.5	8.5	1.4	1.0	0.1	4.5	-
S T A T E	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-	-
	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	-
	2011	51.4	18.3	23.0	4.1	0.3	2.8	0.1

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 Truancy (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	-	91.4	100.0	95.1	55.6	-	-	-	-
	2001	-	88.3	100.0	94.5	40.5	-	-	-	-
	2002	-	90.2	100.0	94.5	57.7	-	-	-	-
	2003	0.5	84.9	100.0	94.5	35.7	-	-	-	-
	2004	-	81.5	100.0	95.1	59.5	3	1.4	-	-
	2005	-	89.7	100.0	95.0	26.3	-	-	-	-
	2006	-	89.1	100.0	95.1	31.8	-	-	-	-
	2007	-	88.0	100.0	94.9	45.5	2	0.9	-	-
	2008	-	89.9	100.0	94.5	27.1	3	1.3	-	-
	2009	-	92.6	100.0	94.1	29.3	5	1.8	-	-
	2010	-	94.8	100.0	93.7	30.4	2	0.7	-	-
2011	-	95.3	100.0	94.0	23.3	8	2.8	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	0.2	38.9	91.5	94.2	24.7	116	1.8	4.7	75.3
	2001	0.2	38.5	84.8	93.5	28.9	121	1.9	4.2	74.4
	2002	0.1	41.1	86.0	94.1	34.3	169	2.6	3.6	76.6
	2003	0.2	39.0	91.5	94.3	30.5	158	2.5	2.7	78.5
	2004	0.3	42.5	92.3	93.9	33.1	155	2.5	2.5	82.7
	2005	0.1	44.5	97.8	94.4	26.6	145	2.3	2.7	84.5
	2006	0.1	44.1	97.6	94.0	24.4	155	2.5	1.9	87.6
	2007	0.2	43.8	98.1	94.1	24.7	118	1.9	2.6	88.1
	2008	0.2	48.1	98.1	93.4	15.0	210	3.2	1.9	88.9
	2009	0.1	47.4	98.7	93.8	13.7	306	4.6	2.5	91.0
	2010	0.1	52.7	98.8	94.7	14.9	174	2.6	1.4	90.1
2011	0.3	50.6	98.3	93.8	14.4	177	2.8	1.9	87.9	

S T A T E	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
	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
	2011	8.8	48.1	96.0	94.0	12.8	63,067	3.2	2.7	83.8

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	209	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	205	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	204	58	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	218	49	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	211	49	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	223	39	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	239	69	-	-	-	-	-
	2007	208	53	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	208	56	-	-	-	-	-
	2009	242	58	-	-	-	-	-
	2010	271	62	-	-	-	-	-
2011	274	67	-	-	-	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	6,604	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	6,659	484	516	519	536	544	463
	2002	6,551	467	485	510	542	566	547
	2003	6,573	484	467	477	549	574	542
	2004	6,518	440	479	472	558	555	574
	2005	6,513	422	448	487	512	580	554
	2006	6,484	422	430	460	513	513	556
	2007	6,431	472	426	432	514	505	540
	2008	6,470	515	472	429	479	521	553
	2009	6,060	466	492	456	449	460	449
	2010	6,389	491	483	511	447	463	497
2011	6,238	508	483	477	463	451	507	
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-

S T A T E	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2,044,539	164,413	157,570	159,499	160,924	156,451	138,559
	2004	2,060,048	161,329	160,246	158,367	162,933	160,271	139,504
	2005	2,062,912	156,370	158,622	160,365	162,047	162,192	142,828
	2006	2,075,277	155,155	154,372	158,822	160,362	160,911	147,500
	2007	2,077,856	155,356	153,480	154,719	162,594	159,038	150,475
	2008	2,074,167	155,578	152,895	153,347	160,039	161,310	149,710
	2009	2,070,125	156,512	152,736	152,820	155,433	158,700	144,822
	2010	2,064,312	155,468	154,389	152,681	154,465	154,982	146,919
	2011	2,074,806	153,516	153,301	154,241	153,981	153,986	151,059

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)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials (%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	414	16	39,188	46	54	18	32	-	-
	2001	415	15	40,601	50	50	18	36	-	-
	2002	428	15	41,661	53	47	17	36	-	1
	2003	417	16	41,478	49	51	17	40	1	-
	2004	375	17	44,287	45	55	19	37	-	-
	2005	418	15	43,727	50	51	17	31	1	-
	2006	432	13	41,789	54	46	18	25	2	-
	2007	438	13	42,012	50	50	18	20	2	1
	2008	460	13	43,594	48	52	18	20	2	-
	2009	449	14	45,409	45	55	15	19	1	-
	2010	436	14	47,161	46	54	19	21	1	-
2011	407	15	46,810	46	54	19	23	-	-	
	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

S T A T E	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
	2011	128,262	13	64,978	40	60	19	19	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, 2006-2011																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	66.1	68.8	84.4	60.4	66.1	60.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	73.0	80.7	90.0	60.0	61.3	61.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	59.1	54.5	71.4	60.0	66.6	64.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	44.4	50.0	77.0	-	30.0	40.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	66.1	66.7	83.3	58.2	65.5	57.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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, 2006-2011																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	72.6	81.3	86.7	74.1	77.6	78.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	81.1	92.4	93.3	77.2	80.7	82.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	63.6	68.1	71.4	65.0	70.5	70.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	38.9	80.0	92.3	-	60.0	60.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	71.2	78.6	85.7	72.8	79.6	77.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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?

Demographic Data

Over the past three years Washington's enrollment has increased. Along with an increase in enrollment, the attendance rate increased. Another positive is the mobility rate decreased by 7.1% in a one year period. However, the truancy rate has increased by 2.1% over a one year time frame. Over the past year, the low income status has increased by .5%. Washington School's special education population has increased by 6.4%.

Academic Data

In reviewing Washington Elementary School's longitudinal data for literacy and math over the past three years:

The literacy and math data shows that our committed hard work has kept our students at or above the state average performance given the many challenges we face. While not at the state benchmark, students are making significant growth. Math achievement shows an increase from year to year, allowing us to meet annual yearly progress in mathematics.

Over the past two years the African American population scored higher than the white population in reading. However, the opposite is true for mathematics.

Reading data over the past three years show that there are specific subgroups and state benchmarks that are strengths. One strength is vocabulary development, specifically determining the meaning of unknown words using context clues. determining the meaning of unknown compound words is another strength in vocabulary development. Another strength is literary elements and techniques. Data shows that students are successful in determining the main and supporting characters. Stating the main idea and identifying background knowledge is a strength of reading comprehension.

Reading data has shown there are areas of growth that need to occur to improve student literacy success. Identifying genres, identifying the author's message, identifying the setting and determining the character's motivation are areas of literary elements and techniques that need to show improvement. Reading comprehension needs to improve by educating students in determining the author's purpose for writing the story, differentiating fact/opinion, making inferences, drawing conclusions and summarizing the story in order.

Math data over the past three years show specific weaknesses and strengths. Identification of coins and their value, turn around facts and reading/interpretation data are areas of strength. However, focus needs to occur on two and three dimensional shapes, measurement, number sense and solving story problems to improve math achievement.

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

Internal Factors Contributing to Success

Hardworking and devoted staff with high expectations

Dedicated staff open to new ideas

Weekly Professional Learning Communities

Children who enjoy reading

Covey Leadership Model

Good parent/guardian contact

External Factors Contributing to Success

Good relationship with parents/guardians

Parents/guardians like sending children to Washington School

Parents/guardians trust the staff

Internal Factors Contributing to Challenges

Highest enrollment in years - 11% increase from 2009 to 2011

Lowest number of support staff

Reading Recovery from 3 to 1

External Factors Contributing to Challenges

The poverty rate of 95.3% is due to the economic down turn. Over the past three years the poverty rate has increased by 2.7%.

High mobility rate - 23.3%

Poor attendance - 94% which is a result of inconsistent attendance due to lack of transportation, oversleeping, education not being a main priority in the family life, suspensions due to social/emotional needs not being met appropriately.

High number of tardies - 2.8% chronic truancy

Home environment is due to some basic needs not being met - emotional, physical and social.

Decrease in literacy support staff - 5 FTE have been cut due to budget constraints over a two year period (2009 - 2011).

High number of students with an IEP for speech and academic- 15.1 to 21.5% (This percentage includes students who are not within the school boundaries.)

Lack of parental support - some home environments are unstable or inconsistent. Some children are "floating" to various homes daily.

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

School wide we will continue to support our children in the classroom, provide intervention support and continue to communicate with parents/guardians to maintain student growth and strive for constant improvement with high expectations. As a staff, conscious effort to consistently teach (a seamless approach) our students comprehension strategies, determine literary elements and understand how to read, as well as, understand unknown words while reading.

Parents/guardians, teachers and students will have heightened awareness of the importance of the daily attendance. The counselor and administrator will communicate with parents/guardians through personal contact by phone or home visit, written letters and if needed, referral to the ROE to encourage and promote regular daily attendance. A bar graph will be posted in the main hallway as a visual reminder of daily attendance. As a district we need to look at smaller class sizes in all grades and more support staff in order to improve the quality of education.

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?

Local Assessments used to assess student learning and to plan for future educational opportunities.

TROLL - An assessment used with students who are in the pre-emergent stage of literacy. Student behaviors are observed and cited on a rating scale. Students also identify lower and uppercase letters. Students are given this assessment until they become emergent readers.

Quarterly Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark - A literacy assessment that is given to all students first and fourth quarter. Students who are not "meeting" or "exceeding" on the assessment intervention wall are given the assessment quarterly. This assessment informs teachers of the reading behaviors students use when reading, their level of comprehension and fluency when reading text. This tool also identifies the students instructional level.

Running Records - Reading Assessment over unseen text

Conferring with children during Reader's and Writer's Workshop- Daily informals assessments occur through observation and conversations. These interactions show teachers what reading and writing behaviors the student has under control and determine the next steps to instruction for individual students.

Anecdotal Notes - Teacher observations

Stanford 10 Standardized Assessment - A standardized test given in mid September that is used to compare local and national achievement for second and third grade students. The data is used to identify student strengths in reading, math and spelling.

The above assessments, help place students on the assessment intervention wall. This data informs staff about student achievement throughout the year. This information identifies trends and patterns at Washington School in reading and writing. This data helps determine which students will receive interventions. Our building literacy report data shows our intervention students are showing one to two years growth in a single school year.

2010 - 2011 Fourth Quarter Assessment Intervention Wall Data

Percentage of students meeting or exceeding

Kindergarten - 71%
First Grade - 65%
Second Grade- 75%
Third Grade - 57%

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

Internal Factors Contributing to Success

Hardworking and devoted staff with high expectations
Dedicated staff open to new ideas
Weekly Professional Learning Communities
Professional Development

External Factors Contributing to Success

Good relationship with parents/guardians
Parents/guardians like sending children to Washington School
Parents/guardians trust the staff

Internal Factors Contributing to Challenges

Lack of time to reach every learner every day
High class size to teacher ratio

External Factors Contributing Challenges

The poverty rate of 95.3% is due to the economic down turn. Over the past three years the poverty rate has increased by 2.7%.
High mobility rate - 23.3%

94% attendance rate which is a result of inconsistent attendance due to lack of transportation, oversleeping, education not being a main priority in the family life, suspensions due

to social/emotional needs not being met appropriately.

High number of tardies - 2.8% chronic truancy

Home environment is a challenge due to some basic needs not being meet - emotional, physical and social

Decrease in literacy support staff - 5 FTE have been cut due to budget constraints over a two year period (2009 - 2011).

High number of students with an academic or speech IEP - 15.1% to 21.5% (This percentage includes students who are not within the school boundaries.)

Lack of parental support - **some home environments are unstable or inconsistent**. Some children are "floating" to various homes daily.

Reduction of classroom staff - In 2009 when Irving student were placed at Washington a kindergarten teacher was not added. In 2010, two literacy support teachers changed assignments to classroom teachers due increased enrollment.

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

Staff will continue to participate in district professional development opportunities, as well as reach out to parents/guardians to promote educational growth. Some professional development opportunities may include colleague visits within the school day, weekly literacy collaboration at PLC time, staff meetings will be used to complete book studies on math workshop, professional development will be available so staff members understand how to educate students living in poverty and professional development will be sought out for classroom teachers on IPCL and interventionists on CIM. Ongoing professional development opportunities will help teachers diagnose student needs and increase student achievement.

Local data shows that students receiving interventions grow one to four levels in literacy behaviors. Local data will help interventionist and classroom teachers determine who will receive early interventions in kindergarten and first grade. Third grade students will receive instruction on reading stamina and comprehension strategies.

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?

Attributes

Dedicated and supportive staff
High expectations
High quality of professional development
Weekly Professional Learning Community
Covey Leadership Model
Our students love their school

Challenges

Decrease in number of children allowed to attend Pre School
Data shows students with poor attendance made poor progress
Class sizes have increased while our support has decreased. Extra support is necessary for student growth with our at risk student population.
Literacy support staff decreased by at least 5 since 2009 to 2011
21.5% of our students have an academic or speech IEP
Washington School mainstreams most students with an academic IEP into the regular education class all day
94% attendance rate which is a result of inconsistent attendance due to lack of transportation, oversleeping, education not being a main priority in the family life, suspensions due to social/emotional needs not being met appropriately.
Increased truancy rate
High mobility rate
Building capacity has reached a maximum
Insufficient parenting education- The school counselor and administrator are responsible for educating parents about academics and the basic needs of children on top of other responsibilities. Most parenting events focus on the Covey Habits, which are the guiding principles of life.
Some students regress academically over the summer break if they do not attend summer school. Having mandatory summer school in 2011 has helped summer regressions. Most students sustained their growth or gained two to three reading behavior levels during the month of June and August.
State tests do not show growth of students. We need to look at each individual student and celebrate the growth that is made
Government expectations are not individualized for each school

Poverty rate- 95.3% due to the economic down turn over the past three years.

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

Students feel loved and challenged because of high expectations and continue to make progress, but not at federal level expectation.

As a staff we need to meet our students' basic needs (emotional, social, physical, material) before academic progress can be attained. Relationships must be formed and time must be devoted to meet students' basic needs.

Staff reductions have led to higher class sizes which in turn affects the individualized instruction given to each student.

Our children are being required to meet higher NCLB expectations and standards.

Washington students are being compared to other schools that may or may not have the same challenges as Washington School.

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

Washington staff will make every effort to improve attendance and increase parental involvement. Our school district will make every effort to provide every child who lives in poverty a quality education from three years old through twelfth grade.

In order to improve, we will use PBIS and the Covey Habits to build relationships for students and parents/guardians. The counselor can facilitate parental involvement, in addition to counseling students and leading the PBIS initiative.

Professional Learning Communities will be used to meet student learning needs in small group instruction.

Continue to use Dr. Murphy's research to provide: layered interventions, smaller class sizes, possible redistricting to place at risk students on the hip of non at risk students and a restructuring of the school year.

Find resources to provide oral language information to families who have newborns to three years of age.

Look for ways to provide funding for a full-time parenting position

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?

The majority of staff members employed at Washington Elementary School have 10+ years of educational experience. Most staff members have worked with Washington students and families for more than 10+ years. There is little turn over or mobility of Washington staff members.

A large number of staff members hold a masters degree with additional educational courses. Many staff members seek out opportunities for ongoing professional learning outside of what is offered through the school district. Staff members participate in district in-service days. Teachers participate in weekly team meetings in addition to staff meetings in which collaboration and dialogue occurs around professional text.

All staff members would like intensive on going literacy professional development and math workshop. Interventionists would like to have ongoing Comprehensive Intervention Model professional development to increase their knowledge to best service students and teachers.

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

When professional development opportunities are offered the majority of the staff takes advantage of the offerings. These professional opportunities help every member of the staff have a common understanding of district expectation which lead to student success. Washington school is in the fourth year of IPCL implementation and the third year of CIM implementation. Currently, the staff is making sure that core curriculum is in place for literacy and math.

Budget constraints have resulted in the reduction of interventionists which reduces the number of students receiving a "layer" of additional support needed to increase student performance.

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

The administrator will advocate for ongoing literacy and math professional development, additional interventionists and smaller class sizes to meet the needs of students. Staff will also look for professional development to enhance their knowledge and skill to educate students. Weekly professional learning communities and staff meetings will be used to increase collaboration to enhance student learning.

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 and guardians continue to be active in their child's education when they are available. Parent Teacher conferences are held twice a year. Each year we have 100% participation in fall conferences. Spring conferences are optional unless requested by a parent/guardian or the teacher. Students also participate in conferences to share

their goals, strengths and areas in which they would like to improve. 60% of Washington families completed the Washington School survey at fall conferences. The results showed that all parents/guardians were extremely happy with the education their child was receiving and the interactions with the staff.

Monthly parent child activities are offered with at least 250 to 300 participants at each evening event. Parent child activities held during the school day attract approximately 80 to 100 participants. Parent child activities held during the day, focused on empowering student/child leadership, as well as, the Covey Habits. Activities were student lead and parents enjoyed seeing their children lead events. Evening events focused academics: literacy, math and science.

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

Students who attend parent child activities and other school events with their guardian/parent show increased academic gains or maintain their academic achievement.

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

Washington staff continues to do more with less with the majority of students making substantial growth throughout the year. Our staff will continue to collaborate on a daily and weekly basis in order to learn, grow and shine. Regardless of the federal No Child Left Behind guidelines, we will work hard to increase individual student achievement by:

continuing to make our school a warm, inviting environment for our parents/guardians and students

continuing to encourage good attendance

showcase the caring, dedicated, positive staff who interact with the students daily.

continuing to collaborate within grade level teams to support all children

increasing parent/guardian involvement by asking every parent/guardian to volunteer one hour of their time for each child that attends Washington School.

continuing parent child activities to increase parent involvement

empowering students to set goals for attendance, behavior and academics. Once goals are set, students will track their goals in a data notebook.

continuing the blending of PBIS + Covey Habits = Leadership. Students will attend morning assemblies focusing on using the Habits to meet school wide expectations and foster the love of school/education.

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?

Washington School can effectively use professional learning community time weekly by having focused agendas that focus on student needs. Teachers will collaborate by using professional resources. Staff meetings will be used to grow professionally through book or literature studies.

Professional development opportunities will be available from the administrator and teacher leaders who have expertise in literacy, math and social emotional issues.

Parent child activities will be held monthly to increase parent/guardian knowledge of literacy, math, PBIS and Covey Habits.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	To improve performance of all students in reading.	1,2,
2	To improve performance of all students in mathematics.	

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

- 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 2. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

To improve performance of all students in reading.

Objective 1 Description

The number of students meeting/exceeding will increase on the local assessment intervention wall. For the year, all students will increase their reading behaviors by 2 to 4 levels. This will be measured quarterly by local assessment: Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark assessment, district writing proficiencies, running records, comprehension and fluency checks.

The below skills will be taught to increase reading:

Student knowledge of literary elements and techniques will improve.

Students will better understand the deeper meaning of text.

Students will be able to identify and understand the purpose for a variety of genres in reader's and writer's workshop.

Student comprehension will improve through the use of strategies.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- ⓑ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 2. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 1 Title :

To improve performance of all students in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will actively participate in literacy element discussions after read alouds.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
2	Students will be engaged during reader's workshop by listening and contributing to discussions.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
3	Students will participate in author and genre studies in order to create their own writings.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
4	Students will participate in comprehension focus groups to target specific strategies.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
5	Students will reflect on comprehension strategies in their reading response notebooks.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
	Students "below" on the assessment intervention literacy wall will					

6	recieve a 30 minute intervention daily. Interventions provided will be guided reading plus, oracy, comprehension focus groups or Reading Recovery.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
---	--	------------	------------	---------------	---------	--

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

Objective 1 Title :

To improve performance of all students in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will model the use of literary elements during read alouds and conferences. Teachers will utilize and align story elements resources in planning lessons.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
2	Teachers will provide daily opportunities at Reader's Workshop for children to make deeper connections to text.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
3	Teachers will focus on grade level genre and author studies. Collaboration will occur at morning team meeting times.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	Before School	Title I	
4	Teachers will use Linda Hoyt's Interactive Read Aloud as a resouce to teach focused mini lessons.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
5	Literacy Interventionists will participate in the book study "Interventions that Work".	10/07/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
6	Classroom teachers will participate in coaching cycles with the literacy coach.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
7	The literacy coach and classroom teachers will consult with district literacy leaders/district literacy coaches to improve literacy lessons and student achievement.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	

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

Objective 1 Title :

To improve performance of all students in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will be given a model to follow when discussing literary elements at home.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Title I	
2	Parents will be educated about literacy expectations at conferences and curriculum night.	09/20/2011	10/28/2011	After School	Title I	
3	Parents will participate in Washington School's annual read night.	04/17/2012	04/17/2012	After School	Title I	
4	Parents will partner as a partnership with their child to read a book and create written response together throughout the school year.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Title I	
5	Parents will be provided with conversation prompts to use with their child during home reading and writing.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Title I	
6	Parents will be provided with a parent friendly comprehension guide at conferences as well as book ideas.	10/19/2011	10/28/2011	After School	Title I	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

To improve performance of all students in reading.

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?)

All staff members will be responsible for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities proposed to help students improve literacy skills. Teachers will assess students through local assessments and anecdotal notes. Each student will also have a portfolio which will document his/her progress. The data from assessments will allow staff to monitor student progress on the assessment/intervention wall.

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	Sara Cramer	Principal
2	Linda Douglas	Literacy Coach
3	Linda Steinbach	Literacy Interventionist
4	Julia Brady	Literacy Interventionist
5	Alisa Saunders	Reading Recovery & Literacy Interventionist
6	Michelle Jacobsen	Reading Recovery
7	Mindy Cole	Special Education Teacher - LDR
8	Susan Holzgraefe	Cross Categorical Teacher - Special Ed
9	Amy Buss	Cross Categorical Teacher - Special Ed
10	Jeanne Cramsey	Kindergarten
11	Denise Heberlein	Kindergarten
12	Melissa Fantz	Kindergarten
13	Marylin Gabriel	Kindergarten
14	Patsy Cornwell	First Grade
15	Kathy Womack	First Grade
16	Tara Stutheit	First Grade
17	Brenda Vandament	First Grade
18	Margaret Bauer	Second Grade
19	Kathie Berter	Second Grade
20	Clarissa Bangert	Second Grade
21	Amy Valeu	Second Grade
22	Douglas Willimann	Third Grade
23	Penny Westerman	Third Grade
24	Luan Sandberg	Third Grade

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

To improve performance of all students in mathematics.

Objective 2 Description

The number of students meeting and exceeding on ISAT mathematical short response will increase by 5%. Student growth will be shown in all three areas: mathematical knowledge, strategic knowledge and explanation.

Staff will teach students mathematical strategies that can they can activate when working independently. Parents/guardians will be provided with activities to enhance their mathematical knowledge, so they can help their children be better mathematicians.

Areas of Mathematics that will be focused on:

Students will be exposed to weekly number/story problems and be able to explain their mathematical processing, understanding and knowledge.

Students will gain a better understanding of the value of numbers and make comparisons between them

Students will have a better understanding of number sense

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- ê 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ê 2. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 2 Title :

To improve performance of all students in mathematics.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will use manipulatives to solve story problems. Students will be provided with time to work in whole group, small group and as individuals to solve problems	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
2	Students will engage fully in math workshop by listening and contributing ideas. Some activities include: calendar, number line, number grid and stronger use of manipulatives with higher numerals.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
3	Students will have a better understanding of number sense. Students will use color coded manipulatives to understand place value and expanded notation.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
4	Students will write about the strategies they use to solve word problems.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
5	Students who are below district expectations will be screened by the math interventionist and considered for math support for 30 minutes a day.	11/01/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	

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

Objective 2 Title :

To improve performance of all students in mathematics.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
	Teachers will model the use of manipulatives to solve story problems.					

1	Teachers will provide the opportunity for students to work in a whole group, small group and one on one situations to show their understanding of solving number problems with manipulatives.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
2	The teacher will provide students with concrete representation of numbers on the number grid through the use of manipulatives.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
3	Teachers will collaborate to find additional activities using manipulatives for number sense.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
4	Teachers will model how to solve word problems and model "think alouds". Teachers will also guide student thinking to compose a written explanation.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
5	Teachers and Math Interventionist will collaborate on student progress and check for transfer of skills from small group to the classroom.	11/01/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title I	
6	Teachers will participate, collaborate and reflect with colleagues during a professional book study of "Guided Math".	09/01/2011	01/05/2012	After School	Title I	

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

Objective 2 Title :

To improve performance of all students in mathematics.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will assist students at home in completing "home play" on number story problems.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Title I	
2	Parents will partner with their teacher and child to complete number sense "home play" throughout the school year.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Title I	
3	Students will demonstrate for their parents/guardians the newly learned number sense knowledge with manipulatives.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Title I	
4	Parents will be educated at curriculum night and conferences about the importance of math. Parents will leave with a better understanding of how students need to write about math.	09/20/2011	10/28/2011	After School	Title I	

5	Parent child activitiy will be held at Save - a -Lot to practice math skills in a real life situation.	10/11/2011	10/11/2011	After School	Other
---	--	------------	------------	--------------	-------

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

To improve performance of all students in mathematics.

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?)

Staff members will re evaluate the math goals. Collaboration will occur regarding students who are exceeding, meeting, approaching and below standards. Ongoing classroom and unit assessments will be analyzed, as well as teacher observations during conferencing. Students receiving intervention will be monitored using pre and post tests from Number Worlds.

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	Sara Cramer	Principal
2	Laken Schrecke	Math Interventionist (2nd - 4th Quarter)
3	Carri Bellis	Maht Interventionist (2nd Quarter)
4	Denise Heberlein	Kindergarten
5	Jeanne Cramsey	Kindergarten
6	Marylin Gabriel	Kindergarten
7	Melissa Fantz	Kindergarten
8	Amy Buss	Cross Categorical - Special Education
9	Mindy Cole	Special Education - LDR
10	Susan Holzgraefe	Cross Categorical - Special Education
11	Patsy Cornwell	First Grade
12	Kathy Womack	First Grade
13	Tara Stutheit	First Grade
14	Brenda Vandament	First Grade & District Math Com Rep
15	Margaret Bauer	Second Grade
16	Clarissa Bangert	Second Grade & District Math Com Rep

17	Amy Valeu	Second Grade
18	Kathie Berter	Second Grade
19	Luan Sandberg	Third Grade
20	Douglas Willimann	Third Grade
21	Penny Westerman	Third Grade
22	Shaun Houghton	Parent
23	Abbey Hively	Parent

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.*)

All parents received a parent right to know letter. Parents/guardians also received Washington School's report card. At Wolf Pack Pride Night/Curriculum Night the administrator presented Washington School's academic success and challenges. Parents/guardians are provided with ongoing updates on their child's individual progress.

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.

In August 2011, Washington staff, two parent representative and a few community members reviewed the data available and identified areas of strengths and challenges. From the data stakeholder sat goals for literacy and math to improve student achievement. Ongoing review occurs at professional learning communities and staff meetings to keep all stakeholders focused on school and grade level goals. The SIP is a working document that will be referred to throughout the school year.

	Name	Title
1	Sara Cramer	Principal
2	Linda Douglas	Literacy Coach
3	Linda Steinbach	Literacy Interventionist
4	Julia Brady	Literacy Interventionist
5	Alisa Sanders	Reading Recovery & Literacy Interventionist
6	Michelle Jacobsen	Reading Recovery

7	Marylin Gabriel	Kindergarten
8	Denise Heberlein	Kindergarten
9	Melissa Fantz	Kindergarten
10	Jeanne Cramsey	Kindergarten
11	Patsy Cornwell	First Grade
12	Kathy Womack	First Grade
13	Tara Stutheit	First Grade
14	Brenda Vandament	First Grade
15	Clarissa Bangert	Second Grade
16	Amy Valeu	Second Grade
17	Margaret Bauer	Second Grade
18	Kathie Berter	Second Grade
19	Luan Sandberg	Third Grade
20	Douglas Willimann	Third Grade
21	Penny Westerman	Third Grade
22	Mindy Cole	Special Education - LDR
23	Susan Holzgraefe	Cross Categorical - Special Education
24	Kris Rhea	Speech Language Pathologist
25	Cindy Cramer	Social Worker
26	Andy Douglas	Physical Education Teacher
27	Nikki Finney	Star Guide
28	Candy Scott	Speech Language Pathologist
29	Mary Townley	Paraeducator
30	Anne Meyer	Paraeducator
31	Dotty Oelklaus	Paraeducator
32	Linda Hall	Paraeducator
33	Vickie Mims	Paraeducator
34	Susie Hagerbaumer	Paraeducator
35	Kathy Anastas	Paraeducator
36	Laken Schrecke	Math Interventionist

37	Jeanne Smith	Paraeducator
38	Erin Hogan Law	Community Member
39	Whitney Kroeger	Community Memeber

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.

Trish Sullivan Viniard will review Washington's 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.

Quincy Public Schools has an induction and mentoring program for new teachers and teachers new to the district. One of the original ten pilot sites selected for the ISBE-funded *Beginning Teacher Induction Pilot Projects* grants in 2006, the program has grown and is now a state approved program. The project goals include: developing new teachers' understanding and implementation of the Professional Teaching Standards and relevant Content Area Standards; developing in new teachers a repertoire of effective, research-based instructional practices; developing trusting supportive and professional relationships and networks; developing reflective, analytical and self-assessment skills in new teachers; creating an effective, smooth transition from being a student to being a teaching professional; and to improve and maximize student learning and achievement. The

project includes many components including formal mentor training, formal induction training for new teachers, monthly protégé and mentor trainings, dialogue journals, formative observations, an individual induction plan, and weekly contacts between mentors and protégés. Mentors are matched with new teachers in their first year of teaching with a ratio that is 3 to 1 or less. In most cases mentors and protégés work in the same building. Exceptions may include support staff where the number of support staff in a particular area may be small (e.g. physical education, music, psychologist, speech therapist). New teacher trainings are held once a month for the new teacher's first two years. Year one trainings include topics such as classroom management; parent involvement and communication; differentiating instruction; lesson planning tied to state standards; and, authentic assessment. Year two trainings address topics such as motivating and engaging instructional practices and assessment for learning. Ongoing mentor training occurs monthly.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation
Part E. District Responsibilities

District Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that the district has provided to revise the plan and other services that the district will provide toward implementation of strategies and activities. District technical assistance should include data analysis, identification of the school's challenges in implementing professional development requirements, the resulting need-related technical assistance and professional development to effect changes in instruction, and analysis and revision of the school's budget (NCLB, Section 1116). If applicable, identify corrective actions or restructuring options taken by the district.

The district provides key professional development funding and activities, especially in the areas addressed in each site's School Improvement Plan. Key activities for the 2011 - 2012 year include:

1. Building Literacy Coach and District Literacy Coach training
2. Special Education Strategic Processing Coach training;
3. Partnerships in Comprehensive Literacy training for all new K - 6 teachers, and other teachers as appropriate.
4. Literacy intervention training to meet Response to Intervention;
5. Training for all K - 6 teachers regarding core classroom curriculum and differentiation in math;
6. Math intervention training for targeted staff, with a focus on Tiers 1 and 2;
7. Math alignment (addressing curricular and instructional areas, including transition to new Common Core standards), K - 12.
8. Ongoing PBIS implementation training and other Social/Emotional-related training for targeted personnel.

9. Utilization of key grants (21st CCLC, Kern Foundation, Pre-AP, TAOEP, Mental Health, etc.) to provide targeted professional development within key initiative areas—including AVID and Project Lead the Way.

10. Consultation and assistance from Dr. Joseph Murphy (achievement gap and learning-centered leadership), Dr. Barbara Schubert (literacy and brain research), and Dr. Robyn Jackson (engagement and rigor at the secondary level) to improve and strengthen instructional programs.

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.

	Name	Title
1		

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 11/16/2011

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