

District Improvement Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	06/14/2010
District Plan Submitted	06/15/2010
District Plan Resubmitted	
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 1072	Extn:	1003
Email:	spool@gcms.k12.il.us		
Is this for a Title I district ?		<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" 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 - 2009 AYP Report

Is this District making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	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?	No	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this District making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2009-10 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		70.0			70.0			90.0		78.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	84.7		Yes	88.4		Yes	95.5		93.8	
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	84.9		Yes	88.9		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial/Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	45.5	51.1	No	58.4	69.1	Yes	95.3		100.0	
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	72.5		Yes	81.0		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 70.0% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 70.0% 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 70.0% 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 78% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2008.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 70.0% 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 - 2009 AMAO Report

This district is not accountable for AMAO data for 2009

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

District Information								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	95.6	95.5	95.6	95.8	95.2	95.4	95.5	95.5
Truancy Rate (%)	0.6	0.4	0.3	1.5	1.0	0.2	0.4	0.6
Mobility Rate (%)	10.3	13.4	11.6	8.1	11.7	9.4	11.1	13.1
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	86.1	94.0	78.8	91.7	82.3	91.5	90.2	93.8
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	2.6	1.9	1.9	0.9	3.0	1.5	1.9	1.2
District Population (#)	1,007	1,007	1,016	1,104	1,123	1,092	1,104	1,115
Low Income (%)	18.2	19.8	19.4	25.8	27.6	27.2	19.4	29.0
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.5	0.1	0.6	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.4
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White, non-Hispanic (%)	98.1	96.9	96.7	97.1	97.0	97.0	96.8	95.2
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.6	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.9
Hispanic (%)	1.2	1.5	1.3	0.7	1.2	1.2	1.2	2.6
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.1	0.6	1.0	1.0	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.4
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.2
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	0.2	0.2	0.5	1.0	0.8

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, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
Groups	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	74.4	73.1	66.2	89.7	82.1	88.6	-	-	77.1	80.8	87.6	77.7	73.4	76.1	69.4	80.2	88.9	86.9
White	75.1	73.1	67.6	90.8	83.5	89.3	-	-	76.7	81.4	87.2	77.9	72.6	77.7	69.0	79.7	89.9	86.3
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	-	40.0	35.7	-	18.2	21.4	45.5	-
Low Income	59.1	52.6	52.2	76.2	75.0	84.0	-	-	31.3	69.6	76.0	62.5	68.4	78.6	62.0	38.9	73.1	75.0

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
Groups	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	82.4	81.1	89.8	88.9	-	-	74.6	88.2	83.6	92.0	83.2	91.3	86.5	82.7	91.9	88.9
White	-	-	82.1	80.9	89.3	89.8	-	-	74.0	88.2	82.9	93.2	85.9	91.0	88.1	82.2	92.8	89.6
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	27.3	53.8	54.5	-	-	33.3	-	27.3	-	38.5	-	35.7	53.4	-	40.0
Low Income	-	-	76.9	72.0	70.6	76.0	-	-	60.8	79.2	77.8	80.0	57.9	90.9	81.0	81.3	91.3	80.7

[Note: for High Schools, High School Districts, or Unit Districts Only]						
PSAE - % Meets & Exceeds Reading grade 11						
Groups	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	66.6	68.3	72.4	66.3	70.7	69.8
White	66.2	70.9	72.0	67.9	70.7	72.2
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	36.4	-	7.1
Low Income	-	53.3	66.7	53.3	-	55.0

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, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
Groups	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	84.1	86.1	90.5	97.1	94.1	93.6	-	-	89.2	95.9	94.5	93.9	86.7	92.1	87.0	94.7	94.4	96.1
White	85.1	86.1	91.5	97.0	94.8	94.7	-	-	89.0	95.7	94.3	93.7	86.3	91.8	86.9	94.6	94.2	97.2
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	-	80.0	57.1	-	54.5	78.6	72.7	-
Low Income	72.7	70.0	82.6	95.4	90.7	88.0	-	-	68.8	95.7	92.0	90.7	89.4	89.2	86.2	83.3	88.4	91.7

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
Groups	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	98.8	90.6	92.4	93.0	-	-	84.0	98.8	90.6	92.0	81.9	72.4	85.4	85.4	96.5	91.3
White	-	-	98.8	90.5	92.0	94.2	-	-	83.5	98.8	90.3	93.1	84.6	73.1	84.9	84.9	97.5	92.2
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	54.5	61.5	63.6	-	-	33.3	-	27.3	-	46.2	-	28.6	33.4	-	50.0
Low Income	-	-	96.1	92.0	76.5	84.0	-	-	82.6	100.0	81.5	73.3	52.6	59.1	66.6	81.3	91.3	84.0

[Note: for High Schools, High School Districts, or Unit Districts Only]						
PSAE - % Meets & Exceeds Mathematics grade 11						
Groups	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	69.3	59.7	73.7	63.8	67.2	60.3
White	68.9	62.0	73.4	65.4	67.2	60.7
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	27.3	-	7.1
Low Income	-	40.0	41.7	53.3	-	45.0

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 .6%, up .2% from the 2008 statistics. The state average is 3.7%.
- The mobility rate is at 13.1%, up 2.0% from the 2008 report. The state average for mobility is 13.5%.
- The high school graduation rate is 93.8%, which is an increase of 1.6%. The GCMS rate is 6.7% above the state average, which is 87.1%.
- The GCMS dropout rate is 1.2%, which is a decrease of .7%. The state average is 3.5%.
- The district enrollment is 1115 students, which is an increase of 11 students from the 2008 report.
- The “Economically Disadvantaged” subgroup increased to 29%, which is a 9.6% increase from 2008.
- GCMS parent involvement ranks at 100% for the 2008-2009 school year.

- Pupil/Teacher ratio at the elementary school is 16/1, with a ratio of 14/1 at the high school level. The state average for both groups is 18/1.

2009 Assessment Results

Reading

- The district “Students with Disabilities” subgroup scored at 51.1% Safe Harbor Target, and therefore; did not meet AYP.
- Reading scores improved at grades 3 and 7. Grade 3 improved 6.5% to a score of 88.6%, and grade 7 improved by 8.4% to 92%.
- Reading scores decreased for grade 4 by 9.9% to 77.7%, and in grade 5 by 2.0% to 86.9%. Grade 6 saw a decrease in scores to 88.9%, which was a reduction from last year’s scores of .9%. Grade 8 went down 3.0% for a total of 88.9%.
- Only grades 4, 6 and 8 had a “Students with Disabilities” group. Grade 6 increased their percentage by .7% to 54.5%. Only grade 6 had a subgroup in the 2008 reports from which a score comparison could be made. Both grades 4 and 8 were at 40%.
- The “Economically Disadvantaged” subgroup for reading at grade 4 decreased by 13.5% to 62.5%. Grade 8 decreased by 10.6% to 80.7%.
- The “Economically Disadvantaged” subgroups for reading at grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 all reported increased scores from the previous year. The third grade increased 9% to 84%, while the fifth grade saw an increase of 1.9% for a total of 75%. The middle school had a 5.4% increase to 76% at grade 6, with a score of 80% at grade 7, which was an increase of 2.2%.
- The PSAE scores for reading decreased by .9% to 69.8%. The “Economically Disadvantaged” subgroup ranked 55.0% with no 2008 subgroup for a comparison. The “Students with Disabilities” subgroup ranked a 7.1%.

Math

- Math scores at grades 5, 6, and 7 all improved from the 2008 scores. Fifth grade was up 1.7% to 96.1%, sixth grade saw a rise of .6% to 93%, and the seventh grade was up 1.4% to 92%.
- However, scores in grades 3, 4, and 8 saw a decline. Grade 3 saw a .5% reduction to 93.6%. Grade 4 lowered its score by .6% to 93.9%, and grade 8 declined by 5.2% to 91.3%.
- The math “Economically Disadvantaged” subgroup decreased its scores in grades 3, 4, 7, and 8. Grade 3 decreased by 2.7% to 88.0%, and grade 4 decreased by 1.3%. At the middle school, grade 7 decreased to 73.3% with a reduction of 8.2%, and grade 8 decreased to 84% with a reduction of 7.3%. Both grades 5 and 6 had an increase. Grade 5 reported a 3.3% increase to 91.7%. Grade 6 increased by 7.5% to 84%.
- The math “Students with Disabilities” subgroups were only large enough to report at grades 4, 6, and 8. Grade 4’s score was 80%, with no 2008 from which to compare. Grade 8 had a score of 50%, also with no 2008 data. Only grade 6 had data from both 2008 and 2009 in order to do a comparison. The subgroup at this level had an increase of 2.1% for a total of 63.6%.
- The math PSAE scores decreased by 6.9% to 60.3%. The “Economically Disadvantaged” subgroup had a score of 45%, with no 2008 to compare to. The “Students with

Disabilities” subgroup had a score of 7.1%, again with no subgroup comparison for 2008.

- The math “Students with Disabilities” subgroups were only large enough to report at grades 4, 6, and 8. Grade 4’s score was 80%, with no 2008 from which to compare. Grade 8 had a score of 50%, also with no 2008 data. Only grade 6 had data from both 2008 and 2009 in order to do a comparison. The subgroup at this level had an increase of 2.1% for a total of 63.6%.
- The math PSAE scores decreased by 6.9% to 60.3%. The “Economically Disadvantaged” subgroup had a score of 45%, with no 2008 to compare to. The “Students with Disabilities” subgroup had a score of 7.1%, again with no subgroup comparison for 2008.

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 parents, faculty, staff, administration, and community volunteers, which occurs during mentoring programs.
- Strong 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.
- Local business closures, as well as the increase of new businesses in the area have contributed to the increase in student mobility.
- Co-teacher, reading specialists, and additional focus on reading has helped to improve some reading scores.
- Additional assistance in both the areas of math and reading through the RtI process has helped differentiate instruction.
- Writing continues to be a focus across the curriculum at all grade levels.
- High school at-risk teams at each grade level have helped to target students in need.
- Before and after school assistance from teachers, along with after school homework programs have been very valuable to the students.
- Teachers at each building utilized data to target students who need interventions. This is a fluid process.
- AutoSkills training at all three buildings in the areas of math and reading has provided a valuable resource for the students.

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

- Continued data analysis in the areas of math and reading could drive the educational process, and determine student need.
- Data driven instruction will be the result of the data analysis, and will provide fluid and changing instruction, which will change with group or individual needs.
- Continued implementation of differentiation would benefit students of all abilities, as the RtI process is refined at each building level.
- Team teaching will continue to be a vital resource for all students. Additional training, resources, and communication will improve co-teaching to an even higher level.
- The reading specialist will continue to assist those students who need additional reading assistance.
- Each building will work to create the most optimum schedule to help students reach their potential.
- Continued implementation of AutoSkills, with a focus on the incentive aspect will be a valuable tool for differentiation.
- In order to best serve new students at the high school level, the Freshman Transition Program will continue for its second year.
- High school at-risk teams will continue to be in place, and will have an important task of targeting and assisting those students in need.
- All grade levels will continue to focus their articulated math curriculum on critical thinking and algebra skills.

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. AutoSkills presents are given to students in grades three through eleven. Both can be utilized as universal screeners.
- Teachers also look at the ISAT assessment data to create “Target Goals” in the areas of math and reading, in order to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses. This assists teachers in focusing more on these areas during the school year.
- Individual test results are analyzed in order to determine the students who will need special assistance. Through the fluid RtI process, this analysis is an ongoing procedure throughout the year.
- DIBELS is given throughout 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 grades eight through eleven. Testing in grades eight, nine, and ten aids in preparation for the PSAT that is taken in the junior year. The group and individual test results help to analyze group and individual needs in each subject area.
- 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 in grades K-5 and Mastering Math Facts (grades 1-5 are utilized as both universal screeners and as probes throughout the year.
- The middle school used ThinkLink as a screener and a probe during the 2009-2010 school year.

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 to improve some scores.
- Tutoring and mentoring programs have helped to assist individuals to improve in specific subject areas.
- Before and after school assistance as well as homework programs has helped students to improve both skills and responsibility.
- Inclusion and additional team teaching at each building has proven to be beneficial to the students.
- Increased writing practice at all grade levels is reflected in the high writing high scores.
- Rtl assessment tools have helped to identify student need.
- The reading specialists have been an asset to the Rtl program.
- Intervention teams are in place at each building to determine student need.
- Continued communication when analyzing data and student need would benefit all students.
- Focusing on the teaching reading across the curriculum has improved student practice, which will in turn, improve student scores.
- The usage of curriculum-based assessment and technologically generated instruction has been an asset.
- Daily or weekly grade level/team/subject meetings have improved communication.

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

- In an effort to analyze consistent testing data, beginning with the 2010-2011 school year all three buildings will utilize MAP testing.
- AutoSkills usage will continue in all three buildings, and will also include the second grade.
- Data analysis will continue to be a strong focus at each building.
- The high school will continue to utilize and refine the grade level at-risk teams.
- Due to the Rtl process and data analysis, grade level and subject area teachers 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 teachers, co-teachers, and teacher teams, as well as specialists, interventionists, and parents.
- Continue the practice of teacher availability to students for assistance outside of the regular school day.
- Continue awareness and training in the areas of data analysis, including achievement gap information.
- Curriculum-based achievement tests and technologically based instruction should continue to be an emphasis in the educational process.
- Continue to strive for grade level/team/subject area meetings to occur frequently throughout the district.

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?

- Web-based communication is on the increase, which allows more information to get to parents and community members in a timely manner.
- Community volunteers have been a welcomed assistance to our schools.
- Homework and tutoring programs have been a benefit to the at-risk students, as well as for students who desire additional assistance.
- Strong graduation and attendance rates have been a positive influence on achievement. But is very important to be vigilant in making sure that students value daily attendance and see the importance of a high school degree.
- Low income and students with disabilities subgroups need to be an area of focus.
- Paraprofessionals work to supplement learning in needed areas.
- The increasing mobility rate needs to be considered.
- Parent participation is a strength at the GCMS schools, as well as district-wide. Their input is always welcome, and is often requested.

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

- While it is a positive effort to increase the amount of web-based communication, there is still that small population of parents and community members who do not have access to the Internet.
- Faculty members make it a point to attend community events as speakers or participants in order to communicate school activities and information.
- Many students have been involved in service activities for the community which is an excellent way to promote a positive view of the school system as a whole.

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

- Faculty and students should continue to interact with the community in order for communication to increase.
- Continue to increase service learning. It will benefit both the community and the students.
- Offering outside of class assistance is a very positive way to assist students.
- It is important to continue to convey the message to students that daily attendance and a high school degree are both vital in student success.
- When involved in data analysis, monitor the achievement gap of subgroups.

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?

Teachers attended various workshops this past year, in order to gain knowledge in various areas, especially dealing with co-teaching, RtI, and differentiation.

Professional Development activities for the 2009-2010 school year were based on the results of data analysis, and teacher education needs. The activities were as follows:

- August 12,13,14, 2009 New Staff Induction Orientation*
- August 17, 2009 Teacher Institute
- August 18, 2009 Half Day Teacher Workshop
- October 5, 2009 GCMS/PBL Teacher Institute
- December 4,, 2009 Half day School Improvement Workshop
- January 15, 2010 Technology Interventions and HOIC Institute

*GCMS University begins two-year new teacher mentoring program.

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

- Professional Development at GCMS District #5 is focused on areas of curriculum and assessment that need to be addressed, based on the evaluation during the SIP process, both at the building and district level. All students and teachers benefit from this process.
- Implementation of Thinklink, AutoSkills has assisted in identification and intervention for students needing additional assistance.
- Co-teaching has proven to be very beneficial in assisting students of all abilities.

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

- With RtI interventions being utilized at all GCMS schools, they are now ready to identify what changes could be made to best assist students at all achievement levels.
 - Determine what class instructor and schedule changes could be made in order to best serve the students.
 - Professional Development activities for the 2010-2011 school year are based on the results of data analysis, and teacher education needs.
-
- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| • August 18, 19, 2010 | New Staff Induction Orientation* |
| • August 20, 2010 | Teacher Institute |
| • August 23, 2010 | Teacher Workshop |
| • August 24, 2010 | Half day Teacher Workshop |
| • October 8, 2010 | Teacher Institute |
| • January 14, 2011 | Half day School Improvement Workshop |
-
- *GCMS University begins two-year new teacher mentoring program.

Section I-C. Data & Analysis - Other Data
Item 3 - Parent Involvement**Data - Briefly describe data on parent involvement. What do these data tell you?**

- The parent advisory committee at all three buildings provides input directly to the principal, and will continue to be a great asset for feedback. This information can be communicated to the superintendent.
- All three buildings strive for 100% parental contact. It is a regular occurrence for parental contact to occur on a frequent basis throughout the district.
- Parents receive progress reports at the midpoint of each nine weeks.
- Senior citizen involvement through breakfasts and other events helps to keep the community informed about the school district.
- The Curriculum Coordinating Committee has parent representatives in order to obtain feedback in many curricular areas.
- Teachers and administrators communicate with parents through phone, mail, e-mail, Edline, Listserve websites, the Global Connect phone system, and school events.

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 to improve achievement.
- Parent volunteers assist both students and teachers.
- Parental access to Edline has opened communication between the parents, and staff, in order to promote academic success
- Each year, parents and community members are asked to take part of the needs assessment survey. The district results are then evaluated.

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

- Changes and improvements that are made to district programs are best accepted and implemented when those changes are communicated to the parents.
- Continue to increase methods of communication with parents. Determine methods that would reach the most parents in the most cost efficient manner. Work to increase web-based information, but at the same time, keeping in mind that not all parents have Internet access.
- The school district benefits when parents are given the opportunity to offer their input on an ongoing basis.

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 to the new core curriculum, as well. A district-wide scope and sequence is also developed. 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. Achievement gaps can be identified and goals can be determined.
- Continue to refine in the RtI process will help student achievement.
- Finding additional methods to reach and teach the students through differentiated instruction will serve the students well.
- Evaluation of the schedule and student need will drive the schedule changes for the 2010-2011 school year.
- Continuing to target academic areas and attendance will improve student achievement.
- Continue to place parent and community involvement as an important priority for student achievement.
- At the middle school and high school levels, the scheduling will be evaluated in order to determine if change would be suit student learning.
- Reading will continue to be a focus throughout the school district, with special concentration on the student subgroups.
- Teachers will receive professional development and collaboration time in achievement gap and data analysis.

Section II-Action Plan

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective	Title	Deficiencies Addressed	
Number		AYP	AMAO
1	The GCMS School District #5 will continue to work to improve achievement at all grade levels by focusing on individual building needs.	1,	

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

1 Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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 GCMS School District #5 will continue to work to improve achievement at all grade levels by focusing on individual building needs.

Objective 1 Description :

Elementary School: The GCMS Elementary School will continue to improve math and reading scores.

1. Continued data analysis, data organization, and teacher collaboration concerning the results.
2. RtI refinement at both ends of the achievement spectrum, which will include additional small group activity.

3. Students in grades K-2 will benefit from a behavior modification program.
4. The AR program will be continued with additional emphasis on student involvement, incentives, and recognition.
5. **Increasing parent involvement and achievement will be an asset to both students and teachers.**
6. **Evaluation of classroom computer needs would assist in ease of student project completion and achievement.**

Middle School: Use RtI to meet individual student needs and challenges.

1. **Provide training for teachers to administer universal screeners to students.**
2. **Identify individual student needs for reading, math, and behavior.**
3. Adapt student and teacher schedules based on need.
4. Provide collaboration time for staff.
5. Communicate RtI process and purpose to parents and students.
6. Communication and continuity with other buildings in the district will be a necessity.
7. Utilize SIP for behavior intervention.
8. Frequent monitoring of individual student interventions will be a priority.
9. Delineate and communicate responsibilities for paraprofessionals and teachers in co-taught classes.

High School: Improvement in attendance, work completion, and graduation rates will help to improve math scores for students for all nationalities.

1. **Work on specific math skills in order to improve student achievement. Targeting the skills will be done through organized data analysis.**
2. Devise a plan to reinforce the importance and value of consistent attendance.
3. Evaluate the goals and philosophy of homework that is assigned, dedicating time to a review of homework completion, and techniques that can be used to improve the amount and quality of work that is turned in.
4. Determine methods to improve graduation rates, which will include methods to educate students on the importance of learning a high school degree.
5. Increase parent involvement at the high school level, through additional communication, parent membership on committees, and the use of parent volunteers.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

1 Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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 GCMS School District #5 will continue to work to improve achievement at all grade levels by focusing on individual building needs.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Elementary: Students will be involved in the AR program that will include peer tutoring, incentives, and additional recognition.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	Elementary: Students will participate in the RtI process, which will involve assessment, assistance, and enrichment.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	Elementary: A behavior modification program will be introduced weekly to students in grades K-2.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	Elementary: Students will have increased opportunities to either be a peer tutor, or to receive the services of a peer tutor.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	Elementary: Student will be able to understand the importance of local and state assessments through information, incentives, and recognition of achievement.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
6	Elementary: The students will get the opportunity to experience additional small groups and other classroom settings in order to improve achievement.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
7	Elementary: Update classroom technology, and increase availability in all classes.	08/01/2010	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	
8	Middle: Students will take universal screeners to determine how they can best be assisted.	09/01/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
9	Middle: Students schedules will be adapted in order to best address needs and abilities.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	

10	Middle: Communicate RtI process to students, including academic and achievement updates.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
11	Middle: Utilize SAP for behavior intervention.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
12	Middle: Students will be informed in the monitoring process, in order to best address academic or behavioral needs.	08/23/2010	06/01/2010	During School	Local Funds	
13	High: Catch-up Cafe- Lunch time tutoring program. Some peers will serve as tutors.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
14	High: Credit Retrieval Program- e20/20 will allow students to earn online credits. This can also occur during school hours.	08/30/2010	08/11/2011	During School	Local Funds	
15	High: Incentive Program- Students will take part in an incentive program in order to show that consistent attendance is a priority.	08/23/2010	06/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	
16	High: Teacher/Student Mentoring- At-risk students will have a mentor to monitor and assist them throughout the school year.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
17	High: Before and after school help- Students will have assistance available before and after school. This service may be required attendance for some students.	08/30/2010	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	
18	High: Tutor- A tutor will be available in the library three days a week to assist any student. Tutoring may be a requirement for certain students who need assistance.	08/30/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
19	High: Reading Intervention Pull-out Program: Students who could benefit from extra reading skills will take part in this pull-out program.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
20	High: Summer Bridge Program-Incoming freshmen students who could benefit from remedial study will be asked to take part in this program.	07/19/2010	07/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	
21	High: Math Problem of the Week- All students will take part in this activity.	08/30/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
22	High: Sports Study Tables- Students involved in a sport who have difficulty with a class will be required to attend study tables twice a week during that particular sports season, until grades are raised.	08/30/2010	06/01/2011	Before School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

The GCMS School District #5 will continue to work to improve achievement at all grade levels by focusing on individual building needs.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All district teachers will analyze data on a regular basis throughout the school year. An organized data system would be a time saver and offer teachers one location for which to gather data.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	All district teachers will attend district professional development days that will target building and district SIP goals.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	All district: Teacher collaboration will be encouraged and supported throughout the school district.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	All district: Emphasis on co-teaching in each building will continue, in order to support RtI and student differentiation.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	Elementary: Teachers will work to increase RtI enrichment opportunities for their students.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
6	Elementary: Additional small group activities will be developed, and classroom teachers will collaborate to divide the students according to need and activity.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
7	Elementary: Opportunities to share ideas and lesson plans through such activities as "in-house open house" will take place.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
8	Elementary: Co-teaching, learning stations, and technology will continue to be areas of focus.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
9	Elementary: Develop a technology needs assessment in order to best identify elementary student and teacher needs.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
10	Middle: Provide training for use of the universal screener.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
11	Middle: Work with grade level teams to determine individual needs for reading, math, and behavior.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	

12	Middle: Provide collaboration time for staff.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
13	Middle: Communicate RtI process to staff, and in turn, prepare to inform parents and students.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
14	Middle: Increase communication and continuity with other building within the district.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
15	Middle: Utilize SAP for behavior interventions.	09/01/2010	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	
16	Middle: Monitor individual student interventions.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
17	Middle: Delineate and communicate responsibilities for paraprofessionals and teachers in co-taught classes.	08/20/2010	06/01/2010	During School	Local Funds	
18	Middle: Adapt teacher schedules based on need, and communicate information concerning changes.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
19	High: Teachers will take part in a Googledocs and E20/20 in-service in order to improve communication and assist students in a new credit retrieval program.	08/20/2010	08/23/2010	During School	Local Funds	
20	High: Reading Strategy of the Month- A new reading strategy will be presented at the monthly faculty meetings, with the goal of implementing the strategy during that month.	08/30/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
21	High: Teacher/student mentoring- Teachers will mentor and connect with one student throughout the school year, in order to develop and maintain a relationship.	08/24/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
22	High: Curriculum Departmental Meetings- Departments will convene in order to assess both students and curricular needs.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	
23	High: Coaches will be in charge of study tables for students needing study assistance during the sport season.	08/30/2010	06/01/2011	Before School	Local Funds	
24	All district: GCMS University- New teachers will take part in this two year program that will include orientation and mentoring.	08/18/2010	06/01/2012	After School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

The GCMS School District #5 will continue to work to improve achievement at all grade levels by focusing on individual building needs.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Elementary: The elementary school will work to increase the number of parent and community volunteers.	08/09/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	Elementary: There will be increased opportunities to sign up for tutoring. Communication will be sent through the GCMS homepage, GCMS Listserv, the Gibson Courier, WGCY, and special sign-up sheets that will be available at registration.	08/09/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	Elementary: Continue to increase membership on the parent advisory committee by inviting additional parents.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
4	Elementary: Continue school events that involve parents and encourages them to be part of the school	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	
5	Middle: Communicate student need to parents concerning Rtl by online information, Edline, parent teacher conferences, and parent nights.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	
6	Middle: Communicate student schedule information, as well as any permanent schedule changes that are made throughout the year.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	
7	Middle: Communicate the Rtl process to the parents.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	
8	Middle: Communicate the SAP process to the parents. Some parents may be requested to be part of the SAP process.	09/01/2010	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	
9	High: The parent advisory committee will be continued for the 2010-2011 school year, but will also be enlarged in order to gain additional parent input and ideas.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	
10	High: In and effort to increase parent communication and awareness of high school programs, parents will be invited to volunteer to assist with school projects.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	

11	High: Teacher websites, podcasts, and vodcasts will continue to be available to parents as another means of communication concerning student achievement and student activities.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	
12	High: Parent-teacher conferences, Falcon Pride Night, and other high school activities will continue to be a priority.	08/30/2010	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	
13	District: A new student data system will be implemented, which will allow for additional parent communication and input.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	Before School	Local Funds	
14	District: All buildings will continue to increase communication to parents and community through online technology, newspapers, radio, and student and parent events through out the year.	08/20/2010	06/01/2011	After School	Local Funds	
15	District: All buildings will invite parents to be a part of the SIP team.	08/23/2010	06/01/2011	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

The GCMS School District #5 will continue to work to improve achievement at all grade levels by focusing on individual building needs.

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?)

Each building principal will take responsibility to assure that each student, professional development, and parent involvement strategy will occur during the school year. The principals will accomplish each strategy with the assistance of school staff members, parents and/or students.

At the end of the 2010-2011 school year, each principal will meet with his or her team for the purpose of evaluating the strategies to determine success, and also whether their building would benefit by having that strategy repeated for the next year.

In the summer and fall of 2011, data analysis of both the ISAT and PSAT scores will occur. This process will help to determine the strategy effectiveness. Assessment results will then be communicated to the public.

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	Michael 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 District #5 voluntarily prepared an SIP plan for the school district, after each building developed their individual plan and goals.

The school SIP members were chosen as representatives and are responsible to bring the ideas from other faculty members, as well as report the final plans back to the faculty. The team also reviews the current RtI plan, with decisions as to how to improve the process. Next, the School Improvement Team will analyze and review data for the purpose of determining what focus the goals should have for the 2010-2011 school year. After the building team develops their plan, a faculty meeting will be conducted so that the plan can be communicated to the entire staff for the purpose of reviewing the plan and its procedures. Upon completion of the plan at the building level, the district data is then analyzed. Input and goals from all three SIP plans are evaluated in order to create the district school improvement plan. It will be submitted to the CUSD #5 Curriculum Coordinating Committee for review. This step assists our district in having a comprehensive view of what the building plans will look like, as well as how it will fit into the plans for the district. The plan will then be taken to the board for approval. Also, additional communication and feedback will be received through parent and principal advisory meetings. All SIP plans will be placed on the GCMS website for all of the community to have access to. Faculty meetings will also serve as a time to update teachers on the RtI and SIP plans and processes. Also, department level meetings occur frequently in order to review student data, curriculum, and other concerns. The grade level student at-risk teams also meet regularly to identify students who may need additional interventions. The Director of Student Services also shares curriculum and assessment information with the administration and staff throughout the year in order to analyze data for areas of strengths and weaknesses.

- The GCMS website will include the school improvement plans.
- The Principals' Advisory Committee, (comprised of teacher representatives) the Parent Advisory (comprised of parent representatives), and the Curriculum Coordinating Committee can offer input, and review plans.
- Other opportunities for parent communication are listed in IIIA.

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).

The GCMS District provides budgets for staff development, both at the district and the building level. Staff is often encouraged to take advantage of staff development opportunities that reflect the year's SIP goals. As our budget becomes tighter, teachers will not be able to attend as many out of district conferences as in the past. Also due to cost, it is more difficult to provide varied conferences topics for each building. We find that we now have to share speakers, both among buildings, as well as with another school district.

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

- Team meetings
- Staff Development
- Out-of-district conferences and workshops (These will be limited for the 2010-2011 school year.)
- School Improvement Teams, which address and plan improvement goals for the coming year
- Substitute teachers, in order to allow classroom teachers to attend the various events

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 plan that will serve as a basis for what our school will accomplish with the SIP and RtI plan. The ROE will offer workshops on creating the plan, and later will offer more workshops on assisting with the RtI component. The Champaign-Ford County Regional Office of Education also provides staff development, curriculum round tables, and administrative workshops in the areas of needed professional development for the staff. Again, due to limited funds, few teachers are allowed to take advantage of these workshops, due to the prohibitive costs.

Each building will identify state resources that best benefit their needs, and will solicit their assistance. The difficulty lies in the fact that while many of our programs are much needed for student achievement, the state government funding for a school of our demographics and needs is very limited.

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 6/14/2010

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

Note: The items marked with a [C] are compliance items the ISBE readers will review for those district improvement plans that are required to be submitted based on the district's academic status as reported in the 2009 Report Card. These district improvement plans are to span a two year period: 2009-2011.

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

☐ Yes ☐ No

Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified?[C]

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

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?[C]

<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control?[C]
CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES	
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> 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?
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Has the DIP team stated <u>measurable objectives</u> that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan?[C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> N/A	Do the objectives address all areas of AYP and AMAO deficiency?[C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> N/A	Do the objectives address the areas of special education compliance?
ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES	
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement?[C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Are the strategies and activities measurable?[C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified?
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear?[C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> N/A	Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students?[C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> 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?
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> N/A	Do the parent involvement strategies and activities clearly align with the strategies and activities for students?[C]

<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> 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?[C]
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?[C]
<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?[C]
PART I - COMMENTS	

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN	
METHODS OF PLAN DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, AND IMPLEMENTATION	
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT	
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?[C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> 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?[C]
DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES	
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?[C]
STATE RESPONSIBILITIES	
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation?[C]

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD☒ Yes ☐ No

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

PART II - COMMENTS