GCMS Elementary School

School Improvement Plan 2008

Local Board Approved	
Submitted	5/18/2009
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number	090270050262004		
District Name	GIBSON CITY-MELVIN-SIBLEY CUSD 5	School Name	GCMS Elementary School
Superintendent	CHARLES AUBRY	Principal	Shelley Overman
District Address	217 E 17TH ST	School Address	902 N Church St
City/State/Zip	GIBSON CITY,IL 60936	City/State/Zip	Gibson City ,IL, 60936
District Telephone#	2177848296 Extn:1003	School Telephone#	2177844278 Extn:1023
District Email	caubry@gcms.k12.il.us	School Email	soverman@gcms.k12.il.us

Is this plan for a Title I School? True

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2008 AYP Report

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	Yes	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	Yes	2007-08 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2007-08 State Improvement Status	

	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		62.5			62.5			90.0		75.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	86.3		Yes	95.3		Yes	95.9	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	86.7		Yes	95.1		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities														
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	77.6		Yes	93.4		Yes				

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.

2. At least 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. ***

3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.

4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 75% graduation rate for high schools.

---

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

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

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2008 AMAO Report

Schools are not accountable for AMAO. This is a district level requirement only.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 3 - School Information

School Information

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Attendance Rate (%)	95.9	95.9	95.6	96.2	96.0	95.8	95.6	95.9
Truancy Rate (%)	0.5	-	-	-	-	0.6	0.2	-
Mobility Rate (%)	12.3	12.5	12.9	13.6	11.9	13.2	14.0	13.4
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	461	450	468	454	519	530	512	532
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	18.9	18.7	23.5	18.7	28.9	29.8	29.3	12.2
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	-	0.2	-	0.4	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	97.4	98.2	97.0	96.7	97.7	97.0	96.3	95.7
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	1.5	0.4	0.9	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.2	1.1
Hispanic (%)	1.1	1.3	1.7	0.9	0.4	0.8	0.8	0.9
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	-	0.2	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.6
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.2	1.7

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/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
SCHOOL	1999	98.5	0.6	0.8	-	-	-
	2000	97.7	1.3	1.0	-	-	-
	2001	97.4	1.5	1.1	-	-	-
	2002	98.2	0.4	1.3	-	-	-
	2003	97.0	0.9	1.7	0.2	0.2	-
	2004	96.7	1.5	0.9	0.7	0.2	-
	2005	97.7	1.0	0.4	0.8	0.2	-
	2006	97.0	1.5	0.8	0.6	0.2	-
	2007	96.3	1.2	0.8	0.4	0.2	1.2
	2008	95.7	1.1	0.9	0.6	-	1.7
DISTRICT	1999	97.9	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.1	-
	2000	97.8	1.0	1.1	0.2	-	-
	2001	97.7	1.1	1.1	0.2	-	-
	2002	98.1	0.6	1.2	0.1	-	-
	2003	96.9	0.8	1.5	0.6	0.2	-
	2004	96.7	0.9	1.3	1.0	0.2	-
	2005	97.1	0.8	0.7	1.0	0.2	0.2
	2006	97.0	0.8	1.2	0.6	0.2	0.2
	2007	97.0	0.8	1.2	0.2	0.3	0.5
	2008	96.8	0.7	1.2	0.3	-	1.0

GCMS Elementary School

	Year	White(%)	Black(%)	Hispanic(%)	Asian/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
S	1999	62.0	20.8	13.9	3.2	0.2	-
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
T	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
A	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
T	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
E	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

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

GCMS Elementary School

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	1999	-	17.2	97.5	96.0	6.1	2	0.4	-	-
	2000	-	22.4	100.0	96.0	10.0	9	2.1	-	-
C	2001	-	18.9	99.6	95.9	12.3	2	0.5	-	-
H	2002	0.2	18.7	99.0	95.9	12.5		-	-	-
O	2003	-	23.5	99.6	95.6	12.9		-	-	-
O	2004	0.4	18.7	99.6	96.2	13.6		-	-	-
L	2005	-	28.9	100.0	96.0	11.9		-	-	-
	2006	-	29.8	100.0	95.8	13.2	3	0.6	-	-
	2007	-	29.3	99.8	95.6	14.0	1	0.2	-	-
	2008	-	12.2	100.0	95.9	13.4		-	-	-
D	1999	0.2	14.8	99.1	95.5	6.5	3	0.3	4.1	83.8
I	2000	0.1	18.1	100.0	95.4	10.3	13	1.3	2.6	89.4
S	2001	0.1	16.0	99.8	94.9	13.6	2	0.2	4.9	89.6
T	2002	0.5	18.2	99.6	95.6	10.3	6	0.6	2.6	86.1
R	2003	0.1	19.8	99.8	95.5	13.4	4	0.4	1.9	94.0
I	2004	0.6	19.4	99.8	95.6	11.6	3	0.3	1.9	78.8
C	2005	0.1	25.8	100.0	95.8	8.1	16	1.5	0.9	91.7
T	2006	0.3	27.6	100.0	95.2	11.7	11	1.0	3.0	82.3
	2007	-	27.2	99.9	95.4	9.4	2	0.2	1.5	91.5
	2008	-	19.4	99.9	95.5	11.1	4	0.4	1.9	90.2

	Year	LEP(%)	Low Income(%)	Parental Involvement(%)	Attendance(%)	Mobility(%)	Chronic Truants(N)	Chronic Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
S	1999	6.4	36.1	96.1	93.6	18.1	43,332	2.3	5.9	81.9
	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
T	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
A	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
T	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
E	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

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	1999	472	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	466	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	461	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	450	74	88	59	-	-	-
	2003	468	75	71	90	-	-	-
	2004	454	76	78	72	-	-	-
	2005	519	80	92	83	-	-	-
	2006	530	79	78	89	-	-	-
	2007	512	72	76	74	-	-	-
	2008	532	100	73	73	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	1999	1,022	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1,035	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,035	91	60	82	90	85	70
	2002	1,007	74	88	59	84	87	69
	2003	1,007	75	71	90	84	86	63
	2004	1,016	76	78	72	65	86	78
	2005	1,104	80	92	83	98	69	82
	2006	1,123	79	78	89	76	98	83
	2007	1,092	72	76	74	91	75	78
	2008	1,104	100	73	73	88	88	64

	Year	School(N)	Grade 3(N)	Grade 4(N)	Grade 5(N)	Grade 7(N)	Grade 8(N)	Grade 11(N)
S	1999	1,962,026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
S	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-
T	2003	2,044,539	-	-	-	-	-	-
A	2004	2,060,048	-	-	-	-	-	-
T	2005	2,062,912	-	-	-	-	-	-
E	2006	2,075,277	136,123	139,619	146,935	153,566	154,856	-
	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

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

GCMS Elementary School

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

	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	1999	69	15	37,729	74	26	17	13	-	-
I	2000	67	16	39,545	69	31	17	13	-	-
S	2001	67	17	42,479	71	29	17	13	-	-
T	2002	69	16	43,327	67	33	16	12	-	-
R	2003	80	16	43,683	68	32	15	13	1	-
I	2004	80	16	44,622	68	32	15	13	-	-
C	2005	78	14	44,246	68	32	16	15	-	-
T	2006	81	15	45,889	70	30	16	14	-	-
	2007	82	14	47,208	68	32	15	14	1	-
	2008	83	14	48,508	68	32	16	14	1	-
S	1999	119,718	15	45,337	53	47	20	18	-	-
T	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
A	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
T	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
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

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 forReading for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008

	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	74.4	74.4	73.1	66.2	89.7	82.1	-	-	-	77.1	80.8	87.6	71.9	73.4	76.1	69.4	80.2	88.9
White	73.6	75.1	73.1	67.6	90.8	83.5	-	-	-	76.7	81.4	87.2	73.0	72.6	77.7	69.0	79.7	89.9
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	33.3	33.3	14.2	-	50.0	-	-	-	40.0	33.3	-	36.9	35.7	-	18.2	21.4	45.5
Economically Disadvantaged	68.2	59.1	52.6	52.2	76.2	75.0	-	-	-	31.3	69.6	76.0	-	68.4	78.6	62.0	38.9	73.1
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

GCMS Elementary School

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Stu	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Eco	-

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 8b - Assessment Data (Mathematics)

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds forMathematics for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	89.2	84.1	86.1	90.5	97.1	94.1	-	-	-	89.2	95.9	94.5	80.9	86.7	92.1	87.0	94.7	94.4
White	88.9	85.1	86.1	91.5	97.0	94.8	-	-	-	89.0	95.7	94.3	82.4	86.3	91.8	86.9	94.6	94.2
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	53.4	63.2	57.1	-	83.3	-	-	-	73.4	91.7	-	52.7	57.1	-	54.5	78.6	72.7
Economically Disadvantaged	-	72.7	70.0	82.6	95.4	90.7	-	-	-	68.8	95.7	92.0	65.2	89.4	89.2	86.2	83.3	88.4
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

| Students with Disabilities | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Stu | - |
| Economically Disadvantaged | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

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?*

*The elementary school attendance rate remains stable at 95.9%.
*The mobility rate has decreased .6%.
2008 enrollment is grades 3,4,and 5 increased a total of 24 students over the 2007 enrollment. The third grade class size was 100 students, which was the largest class enrollment at the elementary school.
*The pupil/teacher ratio is 16 students to one teacher.
*The low income subgroup has decreased by 17.1% from the 2007 statistics.
*The elementary school's parental involvement is at 100%.
*The third grade Reading score dropped 7.6% This is a class with a large number of Students with Disabilities. Their meets and exceeds subgroup percentage was 50%.
*The third grade Economically Disadvantaged subgroup score decreased by 1.2% from the previous year.
*The fourth and fifth grade Reading scores increased 6.8% and 8.7%, respectively.
*The fourth grade Reading subgroup of Students with Disabilities was too small to report.
*The fourth grade Reading subgroup of Economically Disadvantaged increased by 6.4% to 76.0%.
*The fifth grade Reading subgroup of Students with Disabilities increased its score 24.1% to 45.5%.
*The fifth grade subgroup of Economically Disadvantaged increased its score by 34.2%, with a score of 73.1%.
*The third grade Math scores decreased by 3%, with the subgroup of Economically Disadvantaged decreasing by 4.7% to 90.7%. The Students with Disabilities had a score of 83.3%.
* The fourth grade Math scores dropped by 1.4%. The subgroup of Students with Disabilities was too small to report. The Economically Disadvantaged subgroup's score dropped by 3.7%.
*The fifth grade Math score dropped by only .3%. The Students with Disabilities subgroup dropped to 72.7%, with a drop of 5.9% from the 2007 data. The Economically Disadvantaged subgroup increased by 5.1% to 88.4%.

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

*Additional focus in the areas of both Math and Reading are in place to assist students who could benefit from differentiation.
*Resource teachers in the area of Math and reading have had positive effects on the students.
*High attendance rates, and lowered mobility rates help with student achievement.
*Our positive parental involvement is a great asset to GCMS Elementary School.

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

*Continued concentration on the RtI program will assist the subgroups in improving their scores.
*Reading scores are strong, but continued improvement is a goal.
*Adding a Math component to the RtI program will help to increase our Math scores.
*The problem solving teacher will continue her program. This problem solving period has assisted many students in the extended response and critical thinking areas of Math.

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?

*SAT10 tests are administered in the fall in grades one through eight. ISAT testing occurs in the spring in grades three through eight.   Both tests are used at these grade levels as universal screeners.
*Teachers also look at the assessment data to create "Target Goals" in the areas of Math and Reading, in order to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses.
*Individual test results are analyzed in order to determine the students who will need special assistance.
*DIBELS is given through out the year in grades one and two. The third, fourth, and fifth grades are assessed three times a year, using MAP testing.
*Curriculum-based assessments are utilized in grades K-12 to determine mastery, and also needs that should be addressed. These assessments reveal helpful information both for the group as a whole, as well as for individual students.
*STAR tests (grades K-5) and Mastering Math Facts (grades 1-5) are utilized as both universal assessments and probes through out the year.
*Study Island is currently used at grades 3-5.
*STAR Test- AR (Accelerated Reader-grades K-5 Reading)
2008 Data
*Grade 3,4,5 ISAT Math scores decreased, 3.0%, 1.4%, and .3% respectively.
*The "Economically Disadvantaged" subgroups at grades 3 and 4 show a decrease in Math scores.
*The "Meets and Exceeds" scores for Reading increased in grades 4 and 5.
*ISAT "Meets and Exceeds" Reading scores decreased in grade 3 as well as the "Economically Disadvantaged" subgroups for grades 3 and 4.
*Individual tests- curriculum based assessments (grades 3-5) in Reading and Math

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

*Increased focus in the areas of Reading and Math has helped improve scores.
*Tutoring and mentoring programs have helped assist individuals to improve in specific subject areas.

*After school homework program at the elementary school has helped the students to improve skills and responsibility.
*Inclusion and additional team teaching at each building has been beneficial to the students.
*Increased writing practice at all grade levels reflects the high scores at the various levels.
*The reading specialists has been able to implement programs to help those with reading needs.
*Intervention teams are in place, and they utilize the data to target students who need assistance.
*Continued teacher training and awareness in the areas of assessment and RtI have benefited the students.
*The usage of curriculum based assessment and technologically generated instruction has been an asset.
*Students face new Math challenges with the increased difficulty and rigor of the new Math series.
*Qualified teachers
*Reading and Special Education aides
*Title I/Intervention specialists
*Special Education teachers- Co-teaching
*Volunteers
*Reading specialist
*Computer aide
*Block schedule (Reading)
*Schedule of people and classes
*Weekly team collaboration time

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

*Additional time spent analyzing assessment results will benefit both the students and the teachers.   Focusing on both the group scores and the individual student scores would meet various needs.
*By using the tiered concept, continual assessment review will be necessary.
*Data-driven instruction will be the basis for all classroom learning. This instruction will be fluid, and changing with the group and individual student needs.
*Based on data evaluation, teachers, co-teachers, or teams will determine the students' needs, and adjust teaching in order to address those needs.
*Additional Math resource time would be a benefit to the students.
*Creating and communicating an articulation plan for Mastering Math Facts for grades one through five would be valuable.
*Grades Kindergarten through five will have a block Reading time in their schedule.
*Team teaching will be incorporated into the fifth grade program.

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?

*Parents will be introduced to the RtI plan procedure at each building. An RtI website for the GCMS Elementary School will be linked to the school webpage.
*Community volunteers have been a welcomed assistance to our schools.
*Both homework and tutoring programs have been a benefit to at-risk students, as well as for students who desire additional assistance.
*High attendance rates have been a strong influence on achievement.
*Paraprofessionals work to supplement learning in needed areas.
*Staff has an RtI link available from the GCMS website that gives teachers information on the elementary RtI plan.
*The elementary school has strong support in the areas of parent participation at conferences, volunteerism, and attending school events. But not all students enjoy the parental support at home. This causes some students to lack parental input and backing concerning responsibility for their education. Community volunteers have helped to mentor some of our at-risk students, which has been a great benefit.

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

*Students have benefited from the homework and tutoring programs.
*Increasing team teaching at the elementary school has improved student achievement.
*The utilization of RtI interventionists has made a dramatic difference in student achievement at the elementary level.
*The utilization of Reading specialists at GCMS Elementary has also aided the students.
*The mentoring and tutoring programs, as well as the after school assignment program have assisted individual students in areas of need.

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

*The implementation of RtI at the elementary school has helped all students.
* Increasing paraprofessional involvement could be a benefit to the students at GCMS.
*Parent notification, education, and input concerning RtI could be very advantageous to our district. Appropriate policies and procedures need to be frequently communicated to parents.
*Grade levels and subject areas are able to make good decisions concerning lesson implementation and student assistance. These decisions can be based on data from various assessments, as well as input from team teachers, specialists, and interventionists. Students will benefit from the frequent evaluations.
*Next year, the GCMS website will include a link to the elementary RtI program so that parents can have access. The principal plans to include a section for parents to be able to send their questions concerning RtI.

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 tell you?

*RtI Workshops: attended by various faculty members
*New Teacher Mentoring Program: GCMS University commences during the summer. The mentoring program is a two year process.
*Various workshops attended by faculty members
*Professional development opportunities help our educators to gain knowledge in various areas. The GCMS Elementary Staff took part in the following:
Aug. 17, 2008: Teacher Preparations, review studen accommodations and modifications
Aug. 18, 2008: Teacher meetings to review student accommodations and modifications
Oct. 10, 2008: GCMS & PBL Institute
Dec. 5, 2008: Five Components of Reading: Grade Level Share Day
Jan. 23, 2009: Reading and Interactive Board Sessions

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

*The utilization of RtI interventionists has made a dramatic difference in student acheivement.
*Continued training, sharing of information, and communication of interventions would benefit the teachers.
*Team teaching continues to be a great assistance to the program. Teachers who team teach are seeing the benefits, and the students are gaining a tremenous amount from their efforts.

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

*After experiencing the RtI program and seeing the results, the elementary school is interested in pursuing inclusion of the Math component.
*Continued focus on integrating technology into differentiated learning will benefit all students.
*Based on the data and factors, the following professional development is in place for the 2009-2010 school year:
Aug. 17, 2009: Teacher preparations: review student accommodations and modifications
Aug. 18, 2009: Teacher meetings to review student accommodations and modifications
Oct. 5, 2009: GCMS & PBL Institute
Dec. 4, 2009: Reading and Math Intervention Strategies Across Ability Levels
Jan. 15, 2010: Technological Interventions

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

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

Since 1999, the GCMS school district has taken pride in its parent involvement, which has remained at a steady 99% or above.

*Teachers and administrators communicate with parents through phone, mail, e-mail, Edline, Listserve, websites, the emergency phone system, and face to face.

*Parent advisory committee at the elementary school provides input directly to the principal, and will be a great asset for feedback as our RtI plans get underway.

*The PTA provides informative perspectives and ideas concerning many academic areas.

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

*Parent communication is a strong asset for our school district.

*Parent support has helped improve student achievement.

*Parent volunteers have created a very positive influence at the elementary building.

*McCormick Tutoring has provided one on one assistance for students in need.

*Having parents who are willing to support new programs and ideas has actually helped to get some of these concepts "off the ground," due to their contagious positive attitudes. It reflects onto other parents, and onto the students as well.

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

An RtI website has been created to disseminate information, primarily to parents. A question/answer section allows parents to contact any member of any RtI grade level team with questions. All appropriate questions will be posted with answers coming from any team member.

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

Section I-D - Key Factors – From the preceding screens (I-A, I-B, I-C-1, 2, 3) 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?

*While many students have benefitted from the RtI implementation, increased research and education in this area will continue to help scores to increase. Also, finding additional ways to reach and teach the students (through technology, for example) will serve the students well.
*Continue to target key areas in academic and attendance areas.
*Continue to encourage parent involvement in the area of RtI, in order to ensure parent communication, and student success.
*The utilization of RtI interventionists has made a dramatice difference in student acheivement.
*Continued training, sharing of information, and communication of interventions would benefit the teachers.
*Team teaching continues to be a great assistance to the program. Teachers who team teach are seeing the benefits, and the students are gaining a tremendous amount from their efforts.
*Due to the increased rigor and challenge in the new Math series, students may require additional interventions.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed
1	The elementary school will research and utilize the best universal screener and probes for RtI and streamline the progress monitoring process.	
2	Continue to improve ISAT Math and Reading Scores.	

The following deficiencies [not objectives] have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for your school.

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective: 1

The elementary school will research and utilize the best universal screener and probes for RtI and streamline the progress monitoring process.

Objective 1 Description:

The elementary school will continue with implementation of the RtI process. With the process in place, continued research will occur in order to streamline the monitoring process for each student. Students who do not require additional assistance or practice will also receive differentiated instruction that will include more advanced or challenging activities.

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

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 1 Title : The elementary school will research and utilize the best universal screener and probes for RtI and streamline the progress monitoring process.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount ($)
1	1. Elementary School: A. *Continue implementation of RtI at grades K-5 B. Assess students using DIBELS and MAP, also researching additional probes C.K-5 Tier 2 Interventions will be 30 minutes a day additional instruction D.K-3 Tier 3 interventions will be 45-60 minutes a day additional reading instruction; with Grades 4 and 5 receiving 30 minutes. E. Continue to expand non-fiction texts available, including AR. F. Explore additional upper grade incentives. G. Continue to research options for mutual plan times at all grade levels. H. Use technology to focus on Reading, and also incorporate it into Tiers 1,2,and 3.	8/24/2009	6/3/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title : The elementary school will research and utilize the best universal screener and probes for RtI and streamline the progress monitoring process.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount ($)
1	More training on intervention strategies would be beneficial. this knowledge will be disseminated to other staff members through faculty and team meetings.	1/5/2009	6/3/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	Faculty will frequently evaluate student assessment results in order to determine student need.	1/5/2009	6/3/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title : The elementary school will research and utilize the best universal screener and probes for RtI and streamline the progress monitoring process.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount ($)
1	The parents will be educated on the elementary blog, which is located on the newly created RtI website.	8/17/2009	6/3/2011	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title : The elementary school will research and utilize the best universal screener and probes for RtI and streamline the progress monitoring process.

Monitoring - Describe the process and measures of success for the identified objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

*The RtI format and schedule will have to reflect not only the students' group and individual needs, but also be workable within the constraints of the schedule and the faculty that is available.
*It will be high priority to identify quality and researched based interventions and assessment data.
*The grade level or subject area RtI teams will meet at least weekly, in order to monitor both the group and individual student needs.

Monitoring Persons - List the individuals and designate the role of each person(e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

Name	Title
Shelley Overman	GCMS Elementary Principal
Linda Schmitt	GCMS Social Worker

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective: 2

Continue to improve ISAT Math and Reading Scores.

Objective 2 Description:

Continue to work toward increasing the number of students who meet/exceed state standards in the areas of Math and Reading.

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

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 2 Title : Continue to improve ISAT Math and Reading Scores.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount ($)
1	1. Elementary School: A. *Continue implementation of RtI at grades K-5 B. Assess students using DIBELS and MAP, also researching additional probes C.K-5 Tier 2 Math and Reading Interventions will be 30 minutes a day additional instruction. D.K-3 Tier 3 Reading interventions will be 45-60 minutes a day additional reading instruction; with Grades 4 and 5 receiving 30 minutes.	8/17/2009	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	
2	Continue to expand non-fiction texts available, including AR.	8/17/2009	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Explore additional upper grade incentives.	8/17/2009	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	
4	Use technology to focus on Reading and Math, and also incorporate it into Tiers 1,2,and 3.	8/17/2009	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	
5	Continue daily use of Mastering Math Facts at grades 1-5. Begin the program after the first nine weeks at the kindergarten level.	8/17/2009	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	
6	Continue team teaching, and include the fifth grade classes, as well.	8/17/2009	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title : Continue to improve ISAT Math and Reading Scores.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount ($)
1	Institutes will provide resources to improve teaching in the areas of Math, Reading, and ISAT test preparation.	8/17/2009	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	
2	Teachers will be encouraged to attend district-funded workshops, which will enhance their knoweldge in the Reading/Math area.	8/17/2009	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Co-teaching, learning stations, and technology use will also be areas of focus.	8/17/2009	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title : Continue to improve ISAT Math and Reading Scores.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount ($)
1	*Principal's Advisory *Field trip that includes parent chaperones *Red Ribbon Week Activities *AR Celebrations *PTA Room Parents *Family Reading Nights for third grade *Open House Night *Teacher Orientation Night *Class Connect Activities *Grades 3-5 Lunch Connect *School-wide Story Telling Night *GCMS Webpage *Edline *E-mail List Serve: parent notification of district notices and events. *Quarterly Progress Reports for all students *District Needs Assessment, available online *Parent-Teacher Conferences *Global Connect Automated Telephone System *Out of district resources, available through social worker *Kindergarten "Make It, Take It" night	8/17/2009	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title : Continue to improve ISAT Math and Reading Scores.

Monitoring - Describe the process and measures of success for the identified objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

Mrs. Overman, GCMS Elementary School Principal, meets regulary via faculty meetings, grade level planning meetings, RtI team meetings, and IEP meetings to discuss building needs and goals. Plans for professional development through in-services and workshops are discussed.
While there is much teamwork to ensure the implementation of the plan, ultimately the Superintendent takes responsibility for overseeing the progress of the plan.

Monitoring Persons - List the individuals and designate the role of each person(e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

Name	Title
Shelley Overman	Principal
Charles Aubry	Superintendent

Section III - Plan 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.)*

The GCMS CUSD #5 created a district RtI team. This team, comprised of representatives from each of the three buildings, along with the parent liaison, a parent representative, the curriculum director, and superintendent, will meet to create the district plan. Members of this team were as follows: Staci Lindelof, Jenny Acree, and Dustin White (elementary school), Jenny White and Julie Withrow (middle school), Angie Funk and John Boehner (high school). Cathy Walker Steidinger (GCMS parent liaison) and Cheryl Sommer (parent representative) also serve on the team. Administrative representatives on the team included: Charles Aubry (GCMS Superintendent), Shelley Overman (GCMS Elementary School Principal), Mike Bleich (GCMS MIddle School Principal), Michael Lindy (GCMS HIgh School Principal), and Sharon Pool (GCMS Director of Student Services). After developing the district plan,
the representatives returned to their respective buiidings and met with other team members for the purpose of creating a grade level specific plan that would succeed in their building. After the district and building RtI teams developed their plans, faculty meetings were conducted for the purpose of reviewing the plan and its procedures. Then, upon completion of the RtI plans at the building level, the Gibson City-Melvin Sibley CUSD#5 Curriculum Coordinating Committee had the reports presented to them. This step assisted our district having a comprehensive view of what our plan will look like, both at the district level and the building levels. After approval, each plan will be presented to the GCMS Board of Education.
After board approval, additional communication and feedback will be received through parent, principal, and high school student advisory meetings. Faculty meetings will also serve as a time to update teachers on the RtI plan and process.
*The GCMS Website will include an RtI segment.
* The Principal's Advisory Committee (comprised of teacher representatives), the Parent Advisory Board (comprised of parent representatives), and the Curriculum Coordinating Committee can offer input, and review plans.
*The GCMS Website provides school report card information, as well as the school improvement plans. Both the report card, the RtI plan, and the SIP will be available in the elementary school office.
*Each year at school registration, grade level parent guides are handed out. The books outline all subjects' curriculums matched to the state standards.
*The following provide other opportunities for parent communication:
*E-mail List Serve for notification of district events and notices
*E-mail, phone, and U.S. Mail correspondence
* Class and school newsletters
*Edline: online grading notification system
*District Needs Assessment, available online
*Global Connect Automated Telephone system
*Parent-teacher conferences
*PTA room parents
*Red Ribbon Week activities
*PACT events, dances

*Midterm grades, quarterly progress reports
*Out-of-district resources available through social worker
*WGCY reporting

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

Stakeholder Involvement - *Describe specifically how stakeholders (including parents, school staff, and outside exerts) 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.*

Through out the year, student learning and achievement are both discussed and reviewed by many different people in various settings, in order to gain input. Principal Shelley Overman meets regularly through out the year with parent and principal advisory groups, as well as the PTA. She also meets monthly with the GCMS Elementary School Faculty. Weekly grade level meetings occur in order to review student data, curriculum, and other concerns. The Director of Student Services also shares curriculum and assessment information with the elementary school faculty and staff.

Names and titles of school improvement team or plan developers:

	Name	Title
1	Nicole Kirkpatrick	Kindergarten Teacher
2	Amanda Wetherell	First Grade Teacher
3	Tammy Zehr	Second Grade Teacher
4	Kathy Brown	Third Grade Teacher
5	Cheryl Hasenauer	Fourth Grade Teacher
6	Jenny Allen	Fifth Grade Teacher
7	Cortney Troyer	Math Specialist
8	Sharon Pool	Director of Student Services
9	Shelley Overman	Elementary School Principal
10	Charles Aubry	Superintendent

Section III - Plan 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. Peer review and subsequent local board approval 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.

Describe the peer review process including participants and date(s) of peer review.

Each curriculum area is on a seven-year cycle for review. Every seven years, the faculty of that department meets together for an 18-month study to revise the curriculum, compare it to state standards, and then evaluate and select textbooks. During the other five years, annual review meetings take place. The teachers work together and discuss revisions, additions, and curriculum evaluations. Also during the year, teachers may submit course changes for approval, all which must be matched to the Illinois State Learning Goals and Standards.
Five times a year, the GCMS Curriculum Corrdiniating Committee meets. All curriculum additions, revisions, and concerns are communicated and discussed.

Section III - Plan 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.

GCMS University is a mentoring program for new teachers that was implemented in 2004. Gene Everett, the Induction Coordinator, is an integral part of the successful program. He coordinates the training and in-service events for the new teachers. Gene helps to promote a working relationship between the inductees and the mentors. He also meets and talks with the new teachers several times a month. Gene has helped these new teachers by hosting socials at his house, as well.
Veteran teachers are paired with a new teacher in order to assist, coach, support, and encourage the teachers through out the two-year program. The program begins with a three-day mentoring program before the school year begins. During this time, the new employees are provided with district background information, explanation of district policies, timelines for filling out employment paperwork, curriculum information, and also a tour of the towns in the GCMS district. During the school year, three half-day in-services are also provided. These cover discussions on classsroom management, curriculum, assessment,

building policies, and other areas. It also provides a time for new teachers to share their questions and concerns. The mentee is observed three times during the year by their mentor, and also receives two teacher observations. Then reflective writings are required through out the year, which encourages self-evaluation.

For the new teacher, it is very valuable to have both a mentor and a coordinator to be able to bring questions and concerns to. Also, the GCMS Director of Student Services meets with each new teacher one time a quarter. This gives the new teacher an opportunity to discuss curriculum and assessment questions with her, as well.

GCMS University is recognized by the ISBE as an accredited program that satisfies the criteria for Continued Professional Development Units (CPDUs). This enables the new teachers to move from an initial teaching certificate to a standard certificate after completing four years of teaching.

The GCMS Superintendent and the GCMS Board of Education show great support for the district mentoring program, by funding and implementing it since 2004.

Section III - Plan 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 GCMS School District provides budgets for staff developments, but at the district and the school level. Staff is often encouraged to take advantage of staff development opportunities that reflect the year's SIP goals.

The district continues to provide time and funding for the following:

*Weekly grade level or team meetings
*Staff Development
*Out of district conferences and workshops
*School Improvement Teams, which address and plan improvement issues for the coming year
*Substitute teachers

Corrective Actions taken by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet AdequateYearly 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).

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.

Section III - Plan 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.

The IIRC, along with the ISBE has created a step by step outline for the school to follow, in order to create a specific district and building plans that will serve as an basis for what our schools will accomplish within the RtI plans. The ROE will offer workshops on creating the plan, and later will offer more conferences on implementing the plan at the various grade levels. Each building will identify state resources that best benefit their needs, and will solicit their assistance.
The Champaign-Ford County Regional Office of Education will provide staff development, curriculum roundtables, and administrative workshops.
The state government will provide financial funding. The federal government will provide Title I Reading Improvement monies.

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

State Responsibilities – List the names and identify the roles (e.g., distinguished educator, district curriculum coordinator, university partner, or RESPRO consultant) of the School Support Team. If applicable, School Support Teams are assigned to schools in corrective action to provide sustained and intensive support for those schools to make adequate yearly progress. Note: School Support Teams are not the same as school improvement teams or the school planning team. Schools I academic watch, restructuring, or restructuring implementation status should have School Support Teams. Some schools in Choice, SES, or academic early warning status also have School Support Teams.

	Name	Title
1		

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:

A. ASSURANCES

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

B.SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN	
ANALYSIS OF DATA	
	Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified?
	Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness?
	Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students?
	Does the analysis, along with other optional data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?
LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)	
	If included, is there evidence that the SIP team analyzed optional data to clarify the areas of weakness?
	Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?
	Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?
OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)	
	If included, has the SIP team analyzed other available data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities?
	Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?
	Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?
IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS	
	Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance?
	Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control?
CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES	
	Has the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan?
	Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency?
ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES	
	Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?
	Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement?
	Are the strategies and activities measurable?
	Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified?
	Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear?

	Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students?
	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?
	Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities? for students?
	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?
MONITORING	
	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?
	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN	
PARENT NOTIFICATION	
	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)
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT	
	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?
	Does the SIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes?
PEER REVIEW	
	Is the peer review process described and is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have "the greatest likelihood" of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP?
TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS	
	Is it clear how the school is ensuring that teachers are receiving the support needed for their professional growth and to retain them in the profession?
DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITES	
	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?
	If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school?
STATE RESPONSIBILITES	

	Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation?	
SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM		
	Have the names and titles of School Support Team members been listed in the plan? Does the team appear to have the expertise to support this school in regards to the school improvement plan?	
APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD		
	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.	

PART II - COMMENTS