

District Improvement Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	12/15/2009
District Plan Submitted	12/16/2008
District Plan Resubmitted	06/01/2009
ISBE District Improvement Plan Monitoring Completed	

Additional Compliance Submissions by District	
Rtl Compliance Submission	
Special Education Compliance Submission	
Title III Compliance Submission	

District Information

RCDT Number:	090270050260000		
District Name:	GIBSON CITY-MELVIN-SIBLEY CUSD 5	Superintendent:	CHARLES AUBRY
District Address:	217 E 17TH ST	Telephone:	2177848296
City/State/Zip:	GIBSON CITY,IL 60936	Extn:	1003
Email:	caubry@gcms.k12.il.us		
Is this for a Title I district ?		<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No
Is this for a Title III district that did not meet AMAO?		<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 1 - 2008 AYP Report

Is this District making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	Yes	Has this District been identified for District Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this District making AYP in Reading?	Yes	2008-09 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this District making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2008-09 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		62.5			62.5			90.0		75.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	85.8		Yes	91.7		Yes	95.5	Yes	90.2	Yes
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	85.9		Yes	91.5		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial/Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	45.7	49.4	Yes	65.7		Yes	94.3		100.0	
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	76.9		Yes	87.8		Yes				

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 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

This district is not accountable for AMAO data for 2008

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

District Information								
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Attendance Rate (%)	94.9	95.6	95.5	95.6	95.8	95.2	95.4	95.5
Truancy Rate (%)	0.2	0.6	0.4	0.3	1.5	1.0	0.2	0.4
Mobility Rate (%)	13.6	10.3	13.4	11.6	8.1	11.7	9.4	11.1
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	89.6	86.1	94.0	78.8	91.7	82.3	91.5	90.2
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	4.9	2.6	1.9	1.9	0.9	3.0	1.5	1.9
District Population (#)	1,035	1,007	1,007	1,016	1,104	1,123	1,092	1,104
Low Income (%)	16.0	18.2	19.8	19.4	25.8	27.6	27.2	19.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.6	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.0
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White, non-Hispanic (%)	97.7	98.1	96.9	96.7	97.1	97.0	97.0	96.8
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	1.1	0.6	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7
Hispanic (%)	1.1	1.2	1.5	1.3	0.7	1.2	1.2	1.2
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.2	0.1	0.6	1.0	1.0	0.6	0.2	0.3
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.0
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	0.2	0.2	0.5	1.0

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 (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	97.8	1.0	1.1	0.2	0	-
	2001	97.7	1.1	1.1	0.2	0	-
	2002	98.1	0.6	1.2	0.1	0	-
	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	0	1.0
	2009	95.2	0.9	2.6	0.4	0.2	0.8
	2010	96.5	0.9	1.5	0.3	0.1	0.8
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

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	0.1	18.1	100.0	95.4	10.3	13	1.3	2.6	89.4
	2001	0.1	16.0	99.8	94.9	13.6	2	0.2	4.9	89.6
	2002	0.5	18.2	99.6	95.6	10.3	6	0.6	2.6	86.1
	2003	0.1	19.8	99.8	95.5	13.4	4	0.4	1.9	94.0
	2004	0.6	19.4	99.8	95.6	11.6	3	0.3	1.9	78.8
	2005	0.1	25.8	100.0	95.8	8.1	16	1.5	0.9	91.7
	2006	0.3	27.6	100.0	95.2	11.7	11	1.0	3.0	82.3
	2007	0	27.2	99.9	95.4	9.4	2	0.2	1.5	91.5
	2008	0	19.4	99.9	95.5	11.1	4	0.4	1.9	90.2
	2009	0.4	29.0	100.0	95.5	13.1	6	0.6	1.2	93.8
	2010	0	30.8	100.0	95.6	8.7	-	0	0.7	98.8
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

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)
D I S T R I C T	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
	2009	1,115	80	106	74	79	90	89
	2010	1,029	89	80	94	76	72	63
S T A T E	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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

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

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	67	16	39,545	69	31	17	13	0	0
	2001	67	17	42,479	71	29	17	13	0	0
	2002	69	16	43,327	67	33	16	12	0	0
	2003	80	16	43,683	68	32	15	13	1	0
	2004	80	16	44,622	68	32	15	13	0	0
	2005	78	14	44,246	68	32	16	15	0	0
	2006	81	15	45,889	70	30	16	14	0	0
	2007	82	14	47,208	68	32	15	14	1	0
	2008	83	14	48,508	68	32	16	14	1	0
	2009	85	13	49,784	73	27	16	14	1	0
S T A T E	2010	85	14	51,997	65	35	15	13	0	0
	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	0	0
	2001	125,735	14	47,929	54	46	19	18	0	0
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	2	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	12	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1
	2010	132,502	13	63,296	42	57	18	18	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 8a - Assessment Data (Reading)

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
Groups	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	40.0	40.0	47.5	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
Low Income	68.2	59.1	52.6	52.2	76.2	75.0	-	-	-	31.3	69.6	76.0	56.5	68.4	78.6	62.0	38.9	73.1

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
Groups	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	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	82.4	81.1	89.8	-	-	-	74.6	88.2	83.6	67.8	83.2	91.3	86.5	82.7	91.9
White	-	-	-	82.1	80.9	89.3	-	-	-	74.0	88.2	82.9	67.4	85.9	91.0	88.1	82.2	92.8
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	27.3	53.8	-	-	-	33.3	-	27.3	-	38.5	-	35.7	53.4	-
Low Income	-	-	-	76.9	72.0	70.6	-	-	-	60.8	79.2	77.8	46.2	57.9	90.9	81.0	81.3	91.3

[Note: for High Schools, High School Districts, or Unit Districts Only]						
PSAE - % Meets & Exceeds Reading grade 11						
Groups	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	65.1	66.6	68.3	72.4	66.3	70.7
White	68.3	66.2	70.9	72.0	67.9	70.7
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	36.4	-
Low Income	-	-	53.3	66.7	53.3	-

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, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
Groups	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	40.0	40.0	47.5	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
Low Income	77.3	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					
Groups	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	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	98.8	90.6	92.4	-	-	-	84.0	98.8	90.6	65.5	81.9	72.4	85.4	85.4	96.5
White	-	-	-	98.8	90.5	92.0	-	-	-	83.5	98.8	90.3	65.1	84.6	73.1	84.9	84.9	97.5
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	54.5	61.5	-	-	-	33.3	-	27.3	-	46.2	-	28.6	33.4	-
Low Income	-	-	-	96.1	92.0	76.5	-	-	-	82.6	100.0	81.5	38.5	52.6	59.1	66.6	81.3	91.3

[Note: for High Schools, High School Districts, or Unit Districts Only]						
PSAE - % Meets & Exceeds Mathematics grade 11						
Groups	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	55.6	69.3	59.7	73.7	63.8	67.2
White	58.3	68.9	62.0	73.4	65.4	67.2
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	27.3	-
Low Income	-	-	40.0	41.7	53.3	-

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 your District Report Card data tell you about student performance in your district? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are indicated?

*The district attendance rate has remained constant for the past eight years at approximately 95%.

*The GCMS truancy rate is at .4%, up .2% from the 2007 statistics. The state average is 2.5%.

*The mobility rate is at 11.1%, up 1.7% from the previous year. The state average for mobility is 14.9%.

*The high school graduation rate is at 90.2%. This is a decrease of 1.3%, but is also 3.7% above the state average of 86.5%.

*The GCMS dropout rate is 1.9%, with the state average at 4.1%.

*The school enrollment has increased by 12 students to 1104.

*The "Economically Disadvantaged" group decreased to 19.4%, which is down 7.8% from the 2007 statistics.

*GCMS parent involvement is at 99.9%.

*Pupil/Teacher ratios at the elementary school is 16/1, with a ratio of 14/1 at the high school.

2008 Assessment Results

*Reading scores improved at grades 4,5,6,and 8. Grade 4 improved 6.8% to 87.6%, grade 5 improved 8.7% to 88.9%, grade 6 increased 8.7% to , and grade 8 increased by 9.2% to a total of 91.9%.

*Reading scores decreased for grade 3 by 7.6%, and in grade 7 by 4.6% to 83.6%.

*Only grades 3,5,6,and 7 had a "Students with Disabilities" subgroup. Grade 5 increased their percentage by 24.1% to 45.5%. Grade 6 increased the percentage by 26.5% to 53.8%. Only grades 5 and 6 had subgroup data from both 2007 and 2008 so that a comparison could be made.

*The "Economically Disadvantaged" subgroup for Reading at grade 3 decreased by 1.2% to 75%. Grades 6 and 7 decreased by 1.4% to 70.6%, and 1.4% to 77.8% respectively.

*The "Economically Disadvantaged" subgroup for Reading at grades 4 and 5 both increased, 6.4% to 76% at the fourth grade level, and 24.1% to 45.5% at the fifth grade level. In the middle school, the grade 8 subgroup increased by 10% to 91.3%.

*PSAE scores for Reading increased by 4.4% to 70.7%. There were no "Economically Disadvantaged" or "Students with Disabilities" subgroups at this level.

*Math scores at the sixth and eighth grade levels improved from the 2007 scores, to 92.4% and 96.5%, respectively.

However, scores declined in grades 3,4,5,and 7. Grade 3 decreased 3% to 94.1%, grade 4 decreased 1.4% to 94.5, grade 5 declined .3%, and grade 7 declined 8.2% to 90.6.

*The Math "Economically Disadvantaged" subgroup decreased its scores in grades 3,4,6,and 7, but increased in grades 5 and 8.

*The Math "Students with Disabilities" subgroups were only reported for Grades 3,5,6, and 7. Only Grades 5 and 6 had subgroup data from both 2007 and 2008. The fifth grade scores decreased by 5.9% to 72.7%, and the sixth grade increased by 7% to 61.5%.

*Math PSAE scores increased 3.4% to 67.2%. There were no "Economically Disadvantaged" or "Students with Disabilities" subgroups at this level.

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

*High priority is placed on student attendance and graduation rates at GCMS. Support comes from faculty, staff, administration, and community volunteers through mentoring programs.

*High parental involvement could likely play a part in the low truancy rate as well as the high attendance and graduation rates.

*The GCMS Board of Education is committed to smaller class sizes. This priority is reflected in student achievement.

*Additional team teachers, Reading Specialists, and focus placed on reading has helped to improve scores.

*Additional focus in the areas of both Math and Reading are in place to assist students who could benefit from

differentiation.

- *Writing continues to be a focus across the curriculum at all grade levels.
- *High school at-risk teams at each grade level have helped target students in need.
- *After school homework programs at each building help to improve skills and responsibility.
- *Inclusion and additional team teaching at each building have both been beneficial to the students.
- *Intervention teams are in place in each building. 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 instructions have been an asset.

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

- *Implementation of differentiation through RtI would benefit students of all abilities.
- *Increased focus in Reading has reaped benefits in learning and achievement. Placing additional focus in Math will assist many students.
- *Team teaching will continue to be a vital resource for all students.
- *High school implementation of AutoSkills will assist students needing additional Math and Reading support.
- *Additional time spent analyzing assessment results will benefit both the students and the teachers. Focusing on both the group and individual scores will meet various needs. By using the tiered concept, continue 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.
- *Additional Math resource time would be a benefit to the students.
- *Creating and communicating an articulation plan for Mastering Math Facts for grades 1-5 would be valuable.
- *Freshmen Transition Program will be in place for the 2009-2010 school year.

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data

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.
- *EPAS testing is used in grade nine through eleven. Testing in grades eight, nine and ten aids in preparation for the PSAT taken in the junior year. The group and individual test results help to analyze group and individual needs in each subject area.
- *The WIN program is used for WorkKeys practice at grades nine, ten and eleven in order to reinforce those skills and assist teachers with progress monitoring.
- *AutoSkills are now used in high school, and will expand to the middle school in the 2009-2010 school year.
- *Curriculum-based assessments are utilized in grades K-12 to determine mastery, and also to locate 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 as probes through out the year. The high school will use STAR tests next year, as well.
- *Study Island is currently used at grades 3-5 as a probe.
- *The middle school will use ThinkLink both as a screener and as a probe.

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

- *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 programs at all three buildings have 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.
- *While our "Economically Disadvantaged" group size has not increased, student achievement in this subgroup is a **factor that contributed to our lower results in some areas.**
- *The reading specialists in each building have been able to implement programs to help those with reading needs.

- *Intervention teams are in place in each building, 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.
- *Focus on teaching reading in all content areas has improved student practice, which has resulted in increased student scores.
- *The usage of curriculum-based assessment and technologically generated instruction has been an asset.
- *The district continues to implement team teaching which benefits students of all abilities.

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

- *RtI plans and additional targeting of students in need could help all areas of student achievement; especially the subgroups.
- *Additional differentiation such as technology will be implemented. Varied teaching styles, such as using AutoSkills could be a benefit to the students.
- *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, teacher, co-teachers, or teams will determine the students' needs, and adjust teaching in order to address those needs.
- *Course offerings and content will be revised according to need, derived by data.
- *Place continued emphasis on the scope and sequence of the Reading and Math curriculum, and emphasize the need to incorporate these subjects across other curricular areas.
- *Students need to place additional importance on homework completion.
- *A high school freshman transition program will be in place for the 2009-2010 school year, including mentors for all freshmen.

Section I-C. Data & Analysis - Other Data
Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

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

- *Parent participation is a strength at the GCMS schools, district-wide, and will be utilized in the RtI planning process.
- *Parents will be introduced to the RtI plan procedure at each building. They will also receive communications and updates through out the year, concerning both the plan, as well as how their specific student is involved within the plan.
- *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.
- *Strong graduation and attendance rates have been a positive influence on achievement, though there still is a small

area of concern.

*Low income subgroups need to be an area of focus.

*District-wide curriculum committees exist to review each academic discipline. This would be a good avenue to discuss RtI needs and assessment results.

*Paraprofessionals work to supplement learning in needed areas.

*95.5% attendance rates has had a strong influence on student achievement.

*Truancy increased by .2% to .4%.

*There was an increase in mobility of 1.7% to 11.1%.

*The graduation rate for 2008 was at 90.2%. This is a decrease of 1.3% from the previous year's data.

*The "Economically Disadvantaged" subgroup population dropped 7.8% to 19.4%.

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

*Occasionally, lack of parental support and input creates difficulties for at risk students.

*Students have benefited from the homework and tutoring programs.

*Increasing team teaching at all building levels 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 all levels has also aided the students.

*An increased number of students with ESL parents has made communication difficult in some cases.

*According to parent representatives, parents know that input is always welcome in our schools.

*Parent involvement helps to encourage high attendance rates and low truancy.

*The mentoring and tutoring programs, as well as the after school homework programs have assisted individual students in areas of need.

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

The implementation of RtI at the elementary school has helped all students, which shows the importance of developing plans for the middle school and the high school. Students at all grade levels and abilities would benefit from differentiation. While subgroup scores are not in the at-risk area, focusing on the subgroups "Economically Disadvantaged," and "Students with Disabilities" will benefit those students, as well as improve the achievement scores as a whole. While attendance, graduation rates, and truancy are not serious concerns at GCMS, focusing on these areas could also improve student achievement.

* 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.

*The GCMS website will include links that will have RtI information to assist parents.

*Parents will be informed about the RtI plan and progress through many venues, district-wide.

Section I-C. Data & Analysis - Other Data
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?

*Professional Development opportunities were offered during the 2008-2009 school year, based on results of data analysis.

August 18, 2008: Teacher preparations

August 19, 2008- afternoon: Teacher meetings to review student accommodations and modifications

October 10, 2008: Joint GCMS /PBL Workshop- "Technology, Education, and Beyond"

December 5, 2008: Reading Components (elementary and high school), RtI Plan Development and Implementation
(Middle School)

January 15, 2009: Reading and Interactive Board Sessions (elementary), Implementing RtI (middle school), HOIC
Institute (high school)

Aug. 2008-May 2009: GCMS University and new teacher mentoring program

Aug. 2008- May 2009: Various workshops attended by faculty members. Institute information is that disseminated to

other faculty members.

*RtI Workshops: attended by various faculty members

*New Teacher Mentoring Program: GCMS University commences during the summer, and continues through the next two years. During the first year, each new teacher meets with the director of student services every nine weeks to review curriculum, and discuss any areas of concern.

*Various workshops attended by various faculty members.

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 achievement.

*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 benefits, and the students are gaining a tremendous amount from their efforts.

*Low pupil/teacher ratios at most grade levels and in most classes makes student contact and teacher availability easier.

*Professional Development at GCMS is focused on areas of the curriculum that need to be addressed, based on the evaluation during the SIP process. All students and teachers benefit from the additional intervention.

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

*Professional Development opportunities are developed for the 2009-2010 school year, based on results of data analysis:

August 17, 2009: Teacher preparations: review student accommodations and modifications (elementary school)
 Teacher preparations and SIP review (middle school)
 RtI Review (high school)

August 18, 2009: Teacher meetings to review student accommodations and modifications (all buildings)

October 5, 2009: GCMS/PBL Institute: RtI, Assessment, and Teacher Best Practices

December 4, 2009: Reading and Math Interventions Strategies Across Ability Levels (elementary)
 Differentiated Instruction (middle School)
 Intervention Strategies (high school)

January 15, 2010: Technological Interventions (elementary school- morning)
 RtI Program Evaluation and Data Analysis (middle school- morning)
 Differentiation: Program Evaluation (high school- morning)
 HOIC Speaker at ISU: Ray McNulty- "Leadership of the 21st Century" (all buildings- afternoon)

*GCMS University and New Teacher Mentoring Program: beginning in August, and continuing through out the year

*Various workshops to be attended by faculty members

Section I-C. Data & Analysis - Other Data
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. Parent support certainly helps with student achievement.

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

*Parent advisory committees at the building level provide input directly to the principals, and will be a great asset for feedback as our RtI plans get underway. At the high school level, student advisories will also meet to discuss RtI.

*Open House nights, concerts, plays, sporting events, academic and fine arts events have consistently been well-attended by parents.

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 all three buildings.

*Having parents who are willing to support new programs and ideas have 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? Responses will be carried forward to Part D (Key Factors).

Parental involvement equates to student success. We are very fortunate to have the level of parent and volunteer involvement district-wide. This plays a large part in our schools' success. Knowing this, our plan is to incorporate ideas and suggestions from parents during the planning portion of the RtI program. Then once RtI is put into place, each building will work, not only to inform parents about the process, but also to give parents the opportunity through several different venues to give their input and suggestions. These ideas will be seriously evaluated, as the RtI plans will be constantly reassessed in order to better serve our students.

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors**Section I-D - Key Factors - From the preceding screens (I-A, I-B, I-C), identify key factors that are within the district'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?**

*Curriculum reviews occur on a rotational basis every seven years. At that time, the objectives are aligned to state standards, and a district wide scope and sequence is created in that subject area. In between those curriculum reviews, annual meetings are held in order to locate any areas of weakness that may cause changes in the curriculum objectives. Those issues are addressed and edited at that time.

*By evaluating test results, grade levels and subject areas are able to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.

*Increased research and education in the area of RtI will help student achievement.

*Finding additional methods to reach and teach the students (differentiated instruction) will serve the students well.

*Additional research as to the best use of the Reading Specialist's time at the middle and high school levels would be beneficial.

*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.

*Increase faculty and staff knowledge of the five components of reading, and how those components can be integrated into the daily work in the classroom.

***Continued training in the areas of RtI and assessment is necessary to continue**

*At the high school and middle school levels, the scheduling will be evaluated in order to determine if scheduling changes would best suit student learning.

Section II-Action Plan

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective	Title	Deficiencies Addressed	
Number		AYP	AMAO
1	The district will research and implement a district-wide RtI plan that contains universal screening, curriculum-based measurements for progress monitoring, and appropriate tier-level activities to increase the overall AYP.		
2	The GCMS School District will continue to develop the RtI program in each building, using research-based materials and assessment data evaluation.		

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

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

This district is not accountable for AMAO for this year

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1 Title :

The district will research and implement a district-wide RtI plan that contains universal screening, curriculum-based measurements for progress monitoring, and appropriate tier-level activities to increase the overall AYP.

Objective 1 Description :

Elementary School: The elementary school will research and work to implement the best universal and individual screeners, monitors, and probes for RtI..

Middle School: The middle school will choose a universal screener with progress monitoring by the fall of 2009.

*The Middle school will develop a schedule that allows for Tier time, in order for students to meet with interventionists, as well as having teams meet with the interventionists.

*The middle school will develop a way to track progress and interventions used across grade levels for all students.

High School: The high school will research and develop a plan to implement RtI in the areas of Reading and Math.

No Deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AYP report.

No Deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO report.

This district is not accountable for AMAO this year

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

Objective 1 Title :

The district will research and implement a district-wide RtI plan that contains universal screening, curriculum-based measurements for progress monitoring, and appropriate tier-level activities to increase the overall AYP.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. Middle School: A. We will research assessments and interventions.	06/01/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	2. Middle School B. Develop a schedule that allows for Tier time and interventions.	06/01/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	3. Middle School: Increase technology to enhance student learning in reading.	08/17/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	4. High School: Work to develop intervention skills such as Autoskills, individual instruction, study hall instruction, and peer tutoring.	01/05/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	5. High School: Continue to research universal screeners, probes, and necessary assessments.	01/05/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
6	6. Elementary School: Continue implementation of RtI at grades K-5.	08/18/2008	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	

7	7. Elementary School: Assess student using DIBELS and MAP, also researching additional probes.	08/18/2008	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
8	8. Elementary School: K-5 Tier 2 interventions will be 30 minutes a day of additional instruction.	08/18/2008	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
9	9. Elementary School: Tier 3 interventions will be 45-60 minutes a day additional reading instruction, with grades 4 and 5 receiving 30 minutes.	08/18/2008	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
10	10. Elementary School: Continue to expand non-fiction texts available, including AR.	01/05/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
11	11. Elementary School: Explore additional upper grade incentives.	01/05/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
12	12. Elementary School: Continue to research options for mutual plan times at all grade levels.	01/05/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
13	13. Elementary School: Use technology to focus on Reading, and also incorporate it into Tiers 1, 2, and 3.	01/05/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

The district will research and implement a district-wide RtI plan that contains universal screening, curriculum-based measurements for progress monitoring, and appropriate tier-level activities to increase the overall AYP.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. District in-services will be provided in order to increase knowledge on action plan goals.	01/05/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	2. Teachers will be encouraged to attend district-funded workshops, which will enhance their knowledge in the action plan goal areas. Also, more training on intervention strategies will be beneficial. This knowledge will be disseminated to other staff members through faculty and team meetings. Then, teachers will need to work to implement new RtI techniques in their own classrooms.	01/05/2010	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	

3	3. Focus will be placed on differentiated instruction through out the district.	01/05/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	4. Faculty will frequently evaluate student assessment results in order to determine student need.	01/05/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

The district will research and implement a district-wide RtI plan that contains universal screening, curriculum-based measurements for progress monitoring, and appropriate tier-level activities to increase the overall AYP.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. Middle School: A. Information regarding RtI will be presented at Parent Night.	08/17/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	2. Middle School: B. There will be a differentiated instruction brochure prepared to be used for registration, parent/teacher conferences, Parent Night, and Family Night.	01/05/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	3. Middle School: C. Parent Advisory will be informed about RtI and help to come up with handbook information.	01/05/2009	06/04/2010	During School	Local Funds	
4	4. High School: Parents will be involved in a reivew of interventions during advisory.	08/17/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	5. Elementary School: The elementary school will educate the parents on a blog on the newly created RtI website, where parents can send in their RtI questions to specific teachers.	08/17/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

The district will research and implement a district-wide RtI plan that contains universal screening, curriculum-based measurements for progress monitoring, and appropriate tier-level activities to increase the overall AYP.

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

After the district RtI plan is developed, each building will research a plan that will best fit the students' learning styles and needs. There is an excellent opportunity to reassess each class and subject area, and to identify the strengths and weaknesses as the team evaluates their current programs. Using that information, the RtI plan will be developed. The RtI format and schedule will have to reflect not only the students' group and individual needs, but also be workable in 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. Professional development will be instrumental in moving this plan to an actuality in each building. The more organized and clear the plan is, and the more informed the teachers are as to the processes and procedures involved, the greater the impact on the students.

The grade level or subject area RtI teams will meet at least weekly, in order to monitor both the group and individual student needs. Activities will be chosen that will best target the strategies that need to be covered. Building principals will be made aware of the weekly summaries from each area. Once a month, the administrators will meet to discuss current needs and changes in their buildings' RtI plan.

At the end of the year, the school RtI teams will meet to evaluate the success of the intervention program, and set goals to accomplish for the coming year. Then the district team will meet. The purpose will be to both disseminate the individual building reports, and then evaluate the plan's success, district-wide. Goals for the next year will be set, also. This information will then be communicated to the faculty, students, and parents. The final report will also be presented to the GCMS Curriculum Coordinating Committee, and then to the GCMS Board of Education.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	Name	Title
1	Shelley Overman	GCMS Elementary School Principal
2	Mike Bleich	GCMS Middle School Principal
3	Michael Lindy	GCMS High School Principal
4	Charles Aubry	GCMS Superintendent

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2 Title :

The GCMS School District will continue to develop the RtI program in each building, using research-based materials and assessment data evaluation.

Objective 2 Description :

Each building will continue to focus on RtI and student achievement. Teaching strategies will be researched, teachers will receive additional knowledge and training, and various methods will be implemented to allow for differentiation. Assessment data will be evaluated frequently to see how the students can be best served, according to their individual needs.

No Deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AYP report.

No Deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO report.

This district is not accountable for AMAO this year

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

Objective 2 Title :

The GCMS School District will continue to develop the RtI program in each building, using research-based materials and assessment data evaluation.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	See strategies named in Objective 1.	08/17/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title :

The GCMS School District will continue to develop the RtI program in each building, using research-based materials and assessment data evaluation.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	See strategies named in Objective 1.	08/17/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title :

The GCMS School District will continue to develop the RtI program in each building, using research-based materials and assessment data evaluation.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	See strategies listed in Objective 1.	08/17/2009	06/03/2011	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

The GCMS School District will continue to develop the RtI program in each building, using research-based materials and assessment data evaluation.

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 for this objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

The principals will meet regularly via faculty meetings, grade level/team planning meetings, RtI team meetings, IEP meetings, and other small group meetings in order to ensure that implementation is successful. The building administrators will receive input from their faculty as to the success of the scheduling of the RtI program. Much time has been devoted to identifying the best researched based interventions, screeners and probes. But while the materials may be of the highest quality, the scheduling must be effective in order for the program to thrive.

Classroom observation will also be a vital part in determining success. Team teaching is an important part of the program, in order to promote differentiation for the students. Principals can observe the success by doing multiple five minute observations in order to determine the RtI success at each level.

Consistent review of assessment data will be a necessity for each teacher in order for the program to remain fluid. This includes evaluation of state assessments, as well as

screeners, probes, daily class work, and tests.

Frequent RtI and assessment updates will be brought to the curriculum coordinating committee in order to keep all district faculty and staff abreast of the current information.

While there is much teamwork necessary in order to implement the plan, the superintendent takes responsibility for overseeing the overall progress of the plan.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	Name	Title
1	Shelley Overman	GCMS Elementary School Principal
2	Jeremy Darnell	GCMS Middle School Principal
3	Mike Lindy	GCMS High School Principal
4	Charles Aubry	GCMS Superintendent

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

A. 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 district improvement team or plan developers are identified here.

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, met to create the district plan. Members of this team are 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 served 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 buildings 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 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 will assist our district to have a comprehensive view of what our plan will look like, both at the distrct 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.

Also, each building has a SIP team to assist in evaluation and planning. These teams also assist in spearheading new projects and events that tie into the school improvement plans.

*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 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

*Midterm grades, quarterly progress reports

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

B. 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 responsibilities include providing technical assistance to the schools including data analysis, identification of the district'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 district's budget to ensure that funds provided under Title I and Title III supplement, not supplant, non federal funds, and that services provided with these funds are comparable with the services in schools that are not receiving funds under Title I (NCLB, Section 1116 and 1120A).

Upon completion of the school improvement plans created by each building's school improvement team, the Gibson City-Melvin sibley CUSD #5 School Improvement Team meets to review and discuss a district plan. Members of the team are as follows: Charles Aubry (GCMS Superintendent), Shelley Overman (GCMS Elementary School Principal), Mike Bleich (GCMS Middle School Principal), Jeremy Darnell (GCMS Middle School Principal, beginning July 2009), Michael Lindy (GCMS High School Principal), and Sharon Pool (GCMS Director of Student Services). After developing the district plan, the district improvement team will meet through out the year to review and check implementation of both the district and the building plans.

Additional communication and feedback will be recieved through parent, principal, and high school student advisory meetings. Faculty meetings will also be used to share information about student learning and achievement.

The GCMS Curriculum Coordinating Committee will meet five times a year. Teacher representatives from grades kindergarten through twelve, along with administrators, two student and two parent representatives, and a board memeber will meet through out the year to discuss both curriculum and assessment information. The committee will serve in

an advisory capacity to the superintendent and the board of education. Frequent updates on the building and district school improvement plans will be reviewed.

Each curricular area is on a seven-year rotation cycle for review. Each seven years, the faculty of that department revises the curriculum, and textbooks are selected. During the other five years, annual review meetings take place. This is a time when revisions, additions, and curriculum evaluations occur. Also during the year, teachers may submit course changes for approval, all which must be matched to the Illinois State Learning Goals and Standards.

The GCMS School District provides budgets for staff developments, both at the district and building levels. 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 goals for the coming year

- *Substitute teachers to allow district staff to attend professional development

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

C. State Responsibilities

State Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that ISBE, RESPROS/ISCs, and other service providers have provided the district 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 district, if requested, to develop and implement the district plan and work with schools needing improvement. Such technical assistance shall be supported by effective methods and instructional strategies based on scientifically based research. The technical assistance shall address problems, if any, implementing the parental involvement activities described in NCLB, Section 1118, and the professional development activities described in NCLB, Section 1119. [NCLB, Section 1116(c)(9)(B)].

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 a 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.

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 12/15/2009

A.Assurances

1. 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).
2. Technical assistance provided by the district serving its school is founded on scientifically based research (NCLB, Section 1116(b)(4)(C)) as defined in NCLB, Section 9101(37).
3. The plan includes strategies and activities that support the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards and ensures alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with the Illinois Learning Standards.
4. The district will spend at least 10 percent of the funds made available under Title I, Part A, subpart 2 of NCLB, for the purpose of providing high-quality professional development. (Title I districts only.)

B.Superintendent's Certification

By submitting the plan on behalf of the district, 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 plan completion from the **Submit Your Plan** page the plan shall be deemed to be executed by the superintendent on behalf of the district.

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?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Does the DIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness?

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

OTHER DATA

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

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?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control?

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES☐ Yes ☐ No

Has the DIP team stated measurable objectives that promote continuous and substantial progress to ensure that students in each subgroup meet the State's target (e.g., in delivering tiered services or differentiated instruction)?

☐ Yes ☐ NoHas the DIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan?☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Do the objectives address all areas of AYP and AMAO deficiency?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Do the objectives address the areas of special education compliance?

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?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Are the strategies and activities measurable?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students?

☐ 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 special education non-compliance?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Do the parent involvement strategies and activities clearly align with the strategies and activities for students?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?

<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Will the collection of strategies and activities along with the monitoring process provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?
MONITORING	
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	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

METHODS OF PLAN DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, AND IMPLEMENTATION

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

☐ Yes ☐ No

Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Does the DIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that best effect necessary changes?

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

If applicable, is it clear what corrective action the district is taking with this school?

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?

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD☒ Yes ☐ No

The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.

PART II - COMMENTS