

Local Board Approved	
Initial Submission	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2010 AYP Report

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this School been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	Yes	2010-11 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2010-11 State Improvement Status	

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		77.5			77.5			91		80	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	81.7		Yes	89.5		Yes	96.1	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	84.1		Yes	88.3		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	73.3		Yes	90.7		Yes				
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American													
Multiracial/Ethnic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	81.8		Yes	89.1		Yes			
LEP													
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	56.9	54.2	Yes	67.2		No	95.2		
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	74.9		Yes	87.4		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 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. ***
3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 91% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 80% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2009.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 77.5% or above are not printed.

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2010 AMAO Report

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

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

School Information	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Attendance Rate (%)	95.8	96.0	96.0	96.4	96.6	95.8	96.5	96.1
Truancy Rate (%)	1.5	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mobility Rate (%)	15.7	14.7	11.6	11.3	11.8	13.1	7.8	6.8
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	387	388	405	419	412	407	425	421
Low Income (%)	69.5	38.7	50.6	39.9	43.2	45.9	48.9	53.7
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	10.3	0.5	2.2	2.4	3.2	4.4	7.3	9.3
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18.3
White, non-Hispanic (%)	48.3	70.4	64.2	61.3	61.9	62.2	56.0	56.1
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	4.9	3.9	2.7	2.9	2.2	2.9	3.1	3.6
Hispanic (%)	46.3	25.5	25.9	27.7	27.7	25.6	26.4	25.2
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.2	0.5	0.9	0.5
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	6.7	7.4	8.0	8.6	13.6	14.5

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 4 - Student Race/Ethnicity

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	2000	44.9	5.3	47.8	0.7	1.2	-
	2001	48.1	3.5	47.7	0.7	-	-
	2002	45.4	2.5	51.4	0.7	-	-
	2003	48.3	4.9	46.3	0.3	0.3	-
	2004	70.4	3.9	25.5	0.3	-	-
	2005	64.2	2.7	25.9	-	0.5	6.7
	2006	61.3	2.9	27.7	0.5	0.2	7.4
	2007	61.9	2.2	27.7	0.2	-	8.0
	2008	62.2	2.9	25.6	0.5	0.2	8.6
	2009	56.0	3.1	26.4	0.9	-	13.6
	2010	56.1	3.6	25.2	0.5	0.2	14.5
D I S T R I C T	2000	74.5	3.7	20.4	1.0	0.4	-
	2001	73.9	3.7	21.0	1.0	0.3	-
	2002	73.4	3.9	21.4	0.9	0.4	-
	2003	73.0	4.4	21.5	0.8	0.3	-
	2004	71.2	4.3	23.5	0.8	0.3	-
	2005	67.9	2.7	21.5	0.6	0.3	7.0
	2006	66.3	3.0	21.8	0.6	0.1	8.2
	2007	64.4	3.2	21.7	0.5	0.1	10.1
	2008	63.9	3.4	21.3	0.5	0.2	10.7
	2009	62.3	3.4	21.4	0.6	0.2	12.1
	2010	62.2	3.3	21.4	0.3	0.2	12.5
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

S T A T E	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5
	2010	52.8	18.8	21.1	4.2	0.2	2.9

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	14.5	56.0	98.8	94.8	17.6	2	0.5	-	-
	2001	14.6	65.0	98.0	94.5	17.1	4	0.9	-	-
	2002	17.5	72.1	97.0	95.0	14.3	4	1.0	-	-
	2003	10.3	69.5	98.0	95.8	15.7	6	1.5	-	-
	2004	0.5	38.7	100.0	96.0	14.7	-	-	-	-
	2005	2.2	50.6	100.0	96.0	11.6	1	0.2	-	-
	2006	2.4	39.9	100.0	96.4	11.3	-	-	-	-
	2007	3.2	43.2	100.0	96.6	11.8	-	-	-	-
	2008	4.4	45.9	100.0	95.8	13.1	-	-	-	-
	2009	7.3	48.9	100.0	96.5	7.8	-	-	-	-
2010	9.3	53.7	100.0	96.1	6.8	-	-	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	2.2	27.2	98.4	93.5	9.9	57	1.6	7.1	78.6
	2001	2.7	30.1	98.2	93.3	14.0	41	1.2	7.9	77.2
	2002	3.4	33.0	98.4	94.1	14.3	46	1.3	4.3	78.5
	2003	2.1	35.1	97.5	94.3	14.9	127	3.5	6.9	75.4
	2004	1.5	36.2	99.2	94.5	16.4	33	1.0	8.0	74.2
	2005	1.7	40.6	99.3	94.6	15.2	53	1.6	4.0	80.8
	2006	1.7	34.1	100.0	94.4	16.5	69	2.1	4.0	82.6
	2007	2.3	37.0	100.0	94.6	14.2	75	2.3	4.8	81.5
	2008	3.5	42.6	100.0	94.6	15.5	84	2.6	4.9	83.1
	2009	3.0	45.4	100.0	94.9	14.5	52	1.6	3.3	82.2
2010	4.0	50.2	100.0	94.9	12.4	60	1.8	4.2	86.6	
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2

S T A T E	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
	2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1
	2010	7.6	45.4	96.2	93.9	13.0	72,383	3.6	3.8	87.8

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

Section I A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 6 - Enrollment Trends

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	414	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	432	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	405	56	62	74	-	-	-
	2003	387	62	52	60	-	-	-
	2004	388	133	131	124	-	-	-
	2005	405	131	137	137	-	-	-
	2006	419	134	138	147	-	-	-
	2007	412	140	135	137	-	-	-
	2008	407	129	140	138	-	-	-
	2009	425	138	138	149	-	-	-
	2010	421	152	137	132	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	3,558	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	3,563	266	296	269	268	253	248
	2002	3,529	252	269	290	285	275	270
	2003	3,505	257	250	269	283	293	290
	2004	3,556	249	232	233	294	275	257
	2005	3,457	246	247	231	259	286	265
	2006	3,612	254	250	262	227	248	281
	2007	3,362	269	257	250	222	223	249
	2008	3,269	237	256	260	244	227	246
	2009	3,225	256	244	263	238	248	209
	2010	3,308	272	257	236	255	248	204
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

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

Educator Data is available only for district level

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	222	17	43,592	64	36	18	19	-	-
	2001	231	17	45,075	66	35	17	20	-	-
	2002	233	17	49,593	66	34	17	19	1	-
	2003	225	17	50,031	66	34	18	20	2	-
	2004	202	17	51,768	63	37	19	23	2	-
	2005	189	17	53,133	66	35	20	22	1	-
	2006	199	15	51,314	70	30	19	23	1	-
	2007	215	14	52,031	72	28	17	21	2	-
	2008	206	14	53,405	69	31	19	21	1	-
	2009	215	13	54,954	53	47	19	18	1	-
2010	219	12	54,789	51	49	19	19	1	-	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1
2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1	

	2010	132,502	13	63,296	42	57	18	18	1	1
--	------	---------	----	--------	----	----	----	----	---	---

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 8a - Assessment Data (Reading)

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2005-2010																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	79.9	73.3	77.7	84.8	75.2	78.6	-	76.2	75.0	75.7	79.4	78.6	73.5	67.2	82.9	79.4	77.6	83.8
White	84.0	72.6	80.8	85.9	82.2	84.8	-	81.5	77.1	76.7	81.0	78.0	78.1	72.3	84.8	81.1	84.2	82.8
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	65.6	80.0	72.1	83.9	55.2	62.9	-	65.7	71.4	71.8	77.7	75.8	65.5	55.3	74.2	75.0	68.1	80.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	100.0	-	92.3	80.0	75.0	78.2	-	72.8	-	86.6	83.3	80.0	-	81.8	91.0	90.9	78.9	88.9
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	44.0	28.5	50.0	66.7	52.9	50.0	-	38.5	32.0	55.2	43.8	47.8	36.3	29.2	54.5	40.0	52.4	45.5
Low Income	75.7	57.1	68.1	73.3	65.1	70.2	-	71.7	60.5	67.9	70.6	70.1	63.6	49.0	86.3	62.5	68.8	77.1

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2005-2010																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	90.3	92.4	93.5	92.4	91.9	91.1	-	93.1	92.4	87.3	90.5	84.1	83.3	83.9	91.1	87.8	88.2	88.8
White	92.0	93.5	94.9	92.3	91.7	92.4	-	92.6	92.8	89.4	89.2	81.9	87.9	86.9	95.0	89.4	92.1	86.8
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	87.6	92.0	93.1	93.5	86.2	88.6	-	94.2	85.7	86.7	92.6	86.2	75.9	76.4	81.3	85.7	80.0	88.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	81.9	-	92.3	93.3	100.0	91.3	-	90.9	-	80.0	94.5	86.6	-	90.9	90.9	90.9	89.5	94.4
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	84.0	78.6	75.0	66.7	76.5	75.0	-	80.7	80.0	67.9	62.5	52.2	50.0	54.2	72.7	63.3	81.0	45.5
Low Income	87.2	87.8	89.9	90.0	87.1	86.9	-	93.3	88.4	81.3	88.2	82.1	70.9	77.3	92.3	76.8	84.6	84.5

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Data - What do the School Report Card data tell you about student performance in your school? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are indicated?

Through we failed to meet AYP in mathematics based on our results with our "students with disabilities" subgroup in 2010, which met or exceeded at a rate of 67.2%, Washington School's achievement in mathematics has been very strong at Washington School for many years. For example, in our "all" category, since 2004 at least 87.0% of our students have "met" or "exceeded" on the ISAT each and every year. More specifically, 87.8% "met" or "exceeded" in 2004 while 91.8% of Washington students "met" or "exceeded" on the ISAT in 2009, of which we are very proud. The achievement of our white and low SES subgroups peaked on the 2009 ISAT at 92.3% and 87.9% meets or exceeds respectively. Impressively, the achievement of our Hispanic and new multi-racial/ethnic subgroups peaked on the 2010 ISAT at 90.7 and 89.1% meets or exceeds respectively. In addition, our "students with disabilities" subgroup raised their performance on the ISAT math from 67.6% in 2008 to 77.4% meets or exceeds in 2009.

From 2003 through 2010, reading in the "all" category, as well as most of our subgroups, have been on an upward trend. For example, our "all" category has risen from 59% in 2003 to 81.7% in 2010. Our white subgroup has risen from 69.5% in 2003 to its highest point in 84.1% in 2010. Our Hispanic subgroup has risen from 52.8% in 2003 to 73.3% in 2010 with a peak (spike) in performance in 2008 at 76.5%. Our students with disabilities subgroup has risen from 32.6% in 2004 to 56.9% in 2010. Our low SES has risen from 52.8% in 2003 to a peak performance of 74.9% in 2010. Our strength has been our consistent upward trend in all subgroups in the area of reading achievement. In 2010, Washington School met AYP in reading across all subgroups; however, as we combed through the data, we recognized some glaring concerns in our reading achievement that drive our School Improvement planning. These concerns include the fact that in 2009 our students with disabilities subgroup failed to meet AYP in reading and we also had two other subgroups, Hispanic as well as low SES subgroups, that barely met AYP in reading in 2009. In addition, we are not satisfied with, and are addressing, our reading achievement in our "all" category as that has been hovering in the high 70s or low 80s for the past four years, especially considering the threshold for Adequate Yearly Progress in reading achievement rises to 92.5% in Spring of 2012.

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

In regard to the very positive and improving achievement results in mathematics and reading as listed above, we believe that they can be attributed to good and effective instructional practices, strong instructional materials and equipment, regular and systematic professional development, strong educational support services including Title I staff, RtI interventionists, guidance counseling services, special education services, and a commitment to extended school day programs. In addition, our RtI Initiative has resulted in universal screeners, progress monitors, and Tier 2/Tier 3 interventions in the area of reading. For 2011-2012, Washington School will be implementing a new math series and phasing in Tier 2/Tier 3 math interventions to meet the needs of our students in math.

In regard to the weaknesses, including our low reading achievement in our students with disabilities, Hispanic, and low SES subgroups, external factors, including a declining economy resulting in an increase in our free and reduced lunch rate and high mobility rate, and students with emotional needs increasing, may have all been factors. Students with disabilities are typically delayed in achievement and deficient with their skills as a consequence of their disability. Students from low SES backgrounds often lack the educational experiences, the background knowledge, vocabulary, and the value of education necessary for academic success. We, at Washington School, also recognize the internal factors that must continue to be addressed. We continually strive to improve our Tier 1, as well as Tier 2/Tier 3, instruction through improved methods, strategies, assessments, and differentiation. We also strive to increase student time engaged in reading activities, as well as reduce the student to staff ratio in order to give students the attention they need. Finally, we continually strive to meet the social/emotional needs of our students through key interventions and programs such as guidance counseling and PBIS.

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

1. Concentrate on the improvement of reading and math achievement.
2. Concentrate on a continuous improvement of instruction through staff development and improved instructional materials and strategies.
3. Concentrate on assessments that are accurate, diagnostic, and able to monitor progress effectively and often.
4. Concentrate on strategic staffing to assist with implementing key strategies and instruction.
5. Create opportunities for school-wide and targeted social/emotional learning and asset building.

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data (Optional)

Data - Briefly describe the relevant local assessment data used in this plan. What do these data tell you? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are apparent?

At Washington School, we administered the iStation Reading as a way of assessing the status and progress of our students in the area of reading. Washington School administered the iStation as a universal screener. In April 2011, 78% of our 3rd grade students were Tier 1, 80% of our 4th grade students were Tier 1, and 78% of our 5th grade students were Tier 1. Although our ISIP growth charts show steady growth from September 2010 through April 2011, the percentage of students identified as Tier 3 is still a concern, as 8% of our 3rd grade were Tier 3 as of April 2011, 9% of our 4th grade students were Tier 3 as of April 2011, and 11% of our 5th grade students were Tier 3 as of April 2011.

At Washington School, we administered the Star Math as a way of assessing the status and progress of our students in the area of math. Washington School administered the pre-assessment of Star Math in December 2010 and our post-assessment was administered in April 2011. Third grade grew from 3.1 to 3.5 grade equivalent while their percentile ranking

remained at 44 in both pre and post. Fourth grade grew from 4.3 to 4.5 grade equivalent while their percentile ranking actually decreased from 54 to 50 during the same time period. Fifth grade grew from 5.0 to 5.5 grade equivalent and their percentile ranking increased from 48 to 52. The goal of our Tier 1 instruction, as well as our Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in the areas of reading and math, are to get to 100% of our students reading and achieving in math at grade level at a Tier 1 level.

In conclusion, Washington School needs to and will continue to strive to increase the percentage of students in Tier 1 and decrease the percentage of students in Tier 3.

These trends have naturally caused our overall percentage meeting on the ISAT to be a concern. Consequently, Washington continues to be concerned with reading and math achievement and continues to strive to improve reading and math achievement overall and in each subgroup.

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

The number of students with Limited English Proficiency enrolled at Washington School has increased dramatically over the past 3 years and it will continue to increase through 2011-2012 according to projections. These past 3 years Washington School's number of self-contained special education students has increased as well. Students with disabilities are often delayed and behind in their achievement as a consequence of their disability. A very high percentage of the LEP and IEP subgroups fall in the below or watch categories which has prevented us from making greater strides toward our goal of 100% achievement on ISAT.

Washington School has come to the conclusion that some students keep growing and improving as readers over the summer months, while others do not and sometimes even regress. Consequently, summer programs have traditionally been offered to Washington School students in order to counter this trend including during the summer of 2009. However, due to budgetary deficits, these programs were not offered during the summer of 2010 nor will they be offered during the summer of 2011.

In our low SES subgroup, external factors including the declining economy, increased free and reduced lunch rates, high mobility rate, and students with emotional needs increasing, may have all been factors. Students from low SES backgrounds often lack the necessary early educational experiences, the background knowledge, vocabulary, and the value of education necessary for academic success.

Tier 2/Tier 3 interventions, as well as after school programs, will be used to provide assistance to students that need extra help meeting the targets in reading and math.

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

After analyzing data, it is clear to Washington School that reading and math need to be the focus of our school improvement planning. Tiered interventions have been and will continue to be implemented in order to increase the number of students in Tier 1. Through improved assessments and an increased number of intervention strategies and tools, Washington School will work toward our goal of 100% of our students meeting on the ISAT tests.

We, at Washington School, also recognize the internal factors that must continue to be addressed. We continually strive to improve our instruction through strategic professional development. We also strive to increase the time engaged in reading activities as well as reduce the student to staff ratio in order to give students the attention they need.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)
Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

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

Washington School's student population, its percentage of students who are economically disadvantaged, and its percentage of students who have limited English proficiency have been on the rise for the past 5-7 years. These 3 factors alone create challenges for Washington School and the wider community of Sterling, which in turn have the potential to affect student performance.

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

As was stated before, external factors, including the declining economy, increase in students with social/emotional needs and an increase in the percentage of our students who are economically disadvantaged may have a negative impact on student performance results.

The challenges we face at Washington School in establishing an environment where students feel safe are being addressed through PBIS. We recognize our need to continue to provide a safe and orderly school environment, one that is conducive to optimal learning, hence our more in depth use of PBIS as we move forward.

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

Washington School will continue to teach Second Step lessons. In addition, Washington School will move to the initial implementation phase of PBIS. A building team and building rules have been established. The PBIS team will meet during the summer to make plans for the 2011-2012 school year.

Washington School will provide after-school programs such as Techgyrls, the YMCA After-School Program, TEAM Tutoring, Student Council and special education resource extended-day tutoring program in order to provide more instruction, positive role models, and alternatives to television and video games. Washington School will continue to utilize Foster Grandparents and the SHS Service Learning students to assist in providing assets for our students.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)

Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

Data - Briefly describe data on educator qualifications and data and/or information about staff capacity and professional development opportunities related to areas of weakness and strength. What do these data and information tell you?

The entire staff of Washington School has achieved Highly Qualified status. Sterling Public Schools teacher institute days, each year, are dedicated to new learning for faculty and staff. Each month Sterling Public Schools schedules early dismissal days to provide staff with professional development opportunities. In addition, Sterling Public Schools continues to offer Summer Learning Opportunities for staff to further professional development to enhance teaching and learning.

A full-time Director of Curriculum and Instruction has been employed by our district to seek out and provide educational opportunities for faculty and staff. Sterling Public Schools offers a series of half-day and full-day workshops spread out throughout the summer. Examples of the workshops being offered for this summer 2011 are "Aimsweb Overview-Including What's NEW", "Creating Genius in the Classroom", "Rtl Our Journey", and "Rethinking Homework." The Whiteside Regional Office of Education sends a monthly newsletter also providing educational opportunities for our staff.

During the 2008-2009 school year, as well as, the 2009-2010 school year, several collaboration days were made available to our teaching staff in order for entire grade levels to learn new information and share teaching strategies with each other. These same opportunities were made available for our specials teachers to write curriculum, our special education teachers, as well as the district's bilingual teachers. During 2010-2011 school year, opportunities for school improvement days, which occurred quarterly, were made available where the SIP teams from each of the four elementary buildings came together for learning opportunities and discussions for future direction.

A faculty book study was offered to Washington School staff this past year. Eight faculty/staff from Washington School participated, read, studied and discussed the book entitled

The Daily 5 by Gail Boushey and Joan Moser. Washington Elementary School does have plans for at least one faculty book study for the 2011-2012 school year related to teaching and learning in order to enhance classroom instruction. Books being considered are *The Daily 5* by Boushey and Moser, *The Cafe Book* by Boushey and Moser, *Strategies that Work*, *Teaching Comprehension to Enhance Understanding* by Harvey and Goudvis, and *Rethinking Homework* by Cathy Vatterott.

Finally, our district's mentor/mentee program provides regular professional development for 2 years to our new faculty members.

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

The qualifications and training of our Washington School staff have played a key role in our upward trends in achievement over the past four to seven years depending on the subgroup.

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

Our school improvement planning for 2011-2012 includes activities for professional development for the Washington School staff in order to meet the demands of our changing community and student demographics with our ultimate goal being continuous improvement in academic achievement.

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

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

Parent-teacher conferences before school - 329 students represented
Parent-teacher conferences - End of first quarter - 329 students represented
Gathering for Grandparents - 471 participants
Morning with Mom - 422 participants
Donuts with Dad - 405 participants
Open House - 624 people attended
Family Fun Night - 275 participants

2 Bilingual parent family nights were hosted. Attendance data is not available at this time.

Family Reading nights were done monthly. 439 books were given away to students who read with an adult family member.

Parents as Education Partners (PEP) - English language learning for Spanish speaking parents held every other week from September 15th through April 20th from 4:00-5:00 p.m.

A Washington School monthly newsletter is sent home with each child. In addition, accompanying the first few months' editions of our Washington School newsletter, was Search Institute's *Ideas for Parents, Easy Ways to Build Assets for Your Child* handout. Assets 1-40 were displayed in order on local television station, Channel 11. Monthly podcasts from the principal were posted on the www.sterlingpublicschools.org website along with our monthly newsletter.

The data indicates that we have been successful in offering many opportunities for parents to become involved in their child's education. Based on participation rates, the data also indicates that most parents take full advantage of the opportunity when it is offered to them.

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

While most parents take an opportunity to become involved in their child's education, which Washington School believes has a positive impact on their child's academic/social-emotional performance, we do have parents that are not able to come to events due to work, family obligations, lack of transportation, etc., which includes parent-teacher conferences. Washington School believes that parents who are not able or willing to get involved in their child's education may have a negative impact on their child's academic/social-emotional performance. The lack of parent involvement may be perceived by their child that school is not important, which in turn may prevent them from reaching their full potential.

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

Washington School will continue to encourage parents to become involved in their child's educational success by holding parent-teacher conferences and additional events in order to maximize parent/family involvement and support.

Washington School will continue to use our newsletter and monthly podcasts to invite participation and/or remind parent/guardians, grandparents, and community members of upcoming events to increase participation.

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

From the factor pages (I-A, I-B, and I-C), identify key factors that are within the school's capacity to change or control and which have contributed to low achievement. What conclusions about next steps have you reached from reviewing available data and information and about all the factors affecting student achievement?

1. **Concentrate on the improvement of reading and math achievement.**
2. Concentrate on a continuous improvement of instruction through staff development and improved instructional materials and strategies.
3. Concentrate on assessments that are accurate, diagnostic, and able to monitor progress effectively and often.
4. Concentrate on strategic staffing to assist with implementing key strategies and instruction.
5. Create opportunities for school-wide and targeted social/emotional learning and asset building.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Improvement of mathematics achievement at Washington Elementary School	1,
2	Improvement of reading achievement at Washington School.	
3	Provide Tier 1 SEL instruction to Washington students.	

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

- 1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Improvement of mathematics achievement at Washington Elementary School

Objective 1 Description

In the area of Mathematics, Washington School will increase the percentage of students who meet or exceed on the 2012 ISAT in all subgroups to 92.5%.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- 1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improvement of mathematics achievement at Washington Elementary School

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Washington Elementary School will provide an extended day program for students with IEPs in order to reinforce, reteach, and support student needs.	10/26/2011	03/01/2012	After School	Local Funds	2,880
2	Washington Elementary School will identify various math interventions that are scientifically research-based.	08/17/2011	02/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Washington Elementary School will implement a new math series in order to strengthen the transition to the Common Core Math Standards and ultimately provide appropriate interventions to all tiers, including enrichment.	08/17/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
4	Washington Elementary School will implement AimsWeb Math Assessment as a universal screener and progress monitor with integrity as monitored by the building principal.	01/09/2012	05/21/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
5	Washington Elementary School will continue to evaluate, revise, and adjust the building-wide schedule in order to successfully provide the necessary tiered interventions and meet the needs of all students.	08/17/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Other	0

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improvement of mathematics achievement at Washington Elementary School

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Washington Elementary School will provide professional development regarding the new math series and implement with integrity.	08/15/2011	04/18/2012	Before School	Local Funds	0
2	Washington Elementary School will continue, along with all other K-5 buildings, to identify gaps in the Illinois Learning Standards and provide professional development to ease the transition to the Common Core Standards.	08/15/2011	05/17/2012	During School	Other	0
3	Washington Elementary School will, using the train the trainer model, offer professional development for Aimsweb Math Assessment throughout the school year as needed.	12/14/2011	04/11/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improvement of mathematics achievement at Washington Elementary School

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Washington Elementary School will continue to communicate with parents regarding their student's progress in math by providing data (Aimsweb) at various opportunities throughout the the school year such as parent-teacher conference and/or report cards.	11/03/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Other	0
2	Washington Elementary School will, using the new math series, utilize parent connection components to increase communication (online	09/15/2011	11/03/2011	After School	Other	0

component).					
-------------	--	--	--	--	--

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Improvement of mathematics achievement at Washington Elementary School

Monitoring - Include the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities for the objective and identify the person(s) responsible for overseeing the work.

Describe the process and measures of success of this objective. (How will school personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

The principal and the Washington School SIP team will meet at least quarterly to monitor the progress and effectiveness of the strategies and activities, and this team, in turn, will maintain close communication with the entire Washington School staff in order to update/inform them and receive feedback from them. In addition, the entire Washington School staff will meet at least once per month as another way of monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities.

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	Patrick Fortney	Principal
2	Jo Anne Adams	Title I Teacher
3	Jen Banks	Interventionist
4	Jeff Brown	5th Grade Teacher
5	Valerie Hill	3rd Grade Teacher
6	Susan Noble	Guidance Counselor

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Improvement of reading achievement at Washington School.

Objective 2 Description

In the area of reading, Washington School will increase the percentage of students who meet or exceed on the 2012 ISAT in all subgroups category to 92.5%.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- 1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 2 Title :

Improvement of reading achievement at Washington School.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Washington Elementary School will provide an extended day program for students with IEPs in order to reinforce, reteach, and support student needs.	10/26/2011	03/01/2012	After School	Local Funds	2,880
2	Washington Elementary School will implement Aimsweb Reading Assessment as a universal screener and progress monitor with integrity as monitored by the building principal.	01/09/2012	05/21/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Washington Elementary School will provide appropriate reading interventions, along with regular progress monitoring, for all of our students, including our students with IEPs and students with Limited English Proficiency.	08/17/2011	05/21/2012	Before School	Local Funds	0
4	Washington Elementary School will review current interventions in order to evaluate effectiveness as well as implement additional interventions to help close the reading achievement gap for all students.	08/17/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Other	0

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

Objective 2 Title :

Improvement of reading achievement at Washington School.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Washington Elementary School will continue to offer a staff book study to related to teaching and learning in order to enhance classroom instruction. Books being considered are The Daily 5 by Boushey & Moser, The Cafe Book by Boushey & Moser, Strategies that Work: Teaching Comprehension to Enhance Understanding by Harvey & Gousvis, and Rethinking Homework by Cathy Vatterott	11/01/2011	02/29/2012	After School	Local Funds	300
2	Washington Elementary School will, using the train the trainer model, offer professional development for Aimsweb Reading Assessment throught the school year as needed.	08/17/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Other	0
3	Washington Elementary School will offer training for any newly adopted reading interventions.	08/15/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Other	0
4	Washington Elementary School will train teachers using the Ipod Touch or iPad technology to enhance reading instruction.	08/15/2011	11/16/2011	During School	Other	0
5	Washington Elementary School grade level teams will utilize common planning time at least once a month in order to evaluate student data and make decisions regarding student progress, tier movement and appropriate interventions.	09/07/2011	05/09/2012	Before School	Other	0

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

Objective 2 Title :

Improvement of reading achievement at Washington School.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Washington Elementary School will continue to communicate with parents regarding their student's reading progress by providing data (DRA and/or Aimsweb, Edline) at various opportunities throughout the school year such as parent-teacher conferences and report cards.	11/03/2011	05/21/2012	After School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

Improvement of reading achievement at Washington School.

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

The principal and the Washington School SIP team will meet at least quarterly to monitor the progress and effectiveness of the strategies and activities, and this team, in turn, will maintain close communications with the entire Washington School staff in order to update/inform them and receive feedback from them. In addition, the entire Washington School staff will meet at least once per month as another way of monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities.

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	Patrick Fortney	Principal
2	Jen Banks	Interventionist
3	Jo Anne Adams	Title I Teacher
4	Susan Noble	Guidance Counselor
5	Jeff Brown	5th Grade Teacher
6	Valerie Hill	3rd Grade Teacher

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3

Provide Tier 1 SEL instruction to Washington students.

Objective 3 Description

Washington School will provide Tier 1 SEL instruction, resulting in 90% of its students with 2 or fewer office referrals, during the 2011-2012 school year.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- é 1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 3 Title :

Provide Tier 1 SEL instruction to Washington students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	As part of the PBIS initial implementation, Washington Elementary School will develop a T-chart in order to explain teacher-managed behaviors versus office-managed behaviors.	08/08/2011	04/18/2012	During School	State Funds	1,440
2	Washington Elementary School will progress through the initial implementation of PBIS Tier 1 by developing acknowledgement programs, developing Cool Tools, and planning and implementing the students kickoff.	08/08/2011	08/17/2011	During School	State Funds	1,440
	Washington Elementary School will use the Aimsweb Behavior Screener					

3	in order to identify social and emotional needs of students in the building.	10/03/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Other	0
4	Washington Elementary School will continue its use of the SWIS data collection system to assist in evaluating and improving our PBIS Program.	08/17/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Other	

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

Objective 3 Title :

Provide Tier 1 SEL instruction to Washington students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Washington Elementary Staff will participate in SAS, a school-wide survey, in order to measure progress toward in PBIS full implementation based on staff perception.	04/02/2012	04/30/2012	During School	Other	
2	Washington Elementary Staff will receive training on the implementation of PBIS Tier 1 including but not limited to the developed acknowledgement programs, Cool Tools, referral system and the student kickoff.	08/15/2011	08/17/2011	Before School	Other	
3	Washington Elementary Staff will receive training on the Aimsweb Behavioral Screener in order to implement with integrity.	08/15/2011	08/17/2011	Before School	Other	

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

Objective 3 Title :

Provide Tier 1 SEL instruction to Washington students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Washington Elementary School will increase communication with parents by creating a PBIS podcast and monthly newsletter updates regarding implementation.	09/01/2011	05/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 3 Title :

Provide Tier 1 SEL instruction to Washington students.

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

Effectiveness of the PBIS Program will be monitored through office referrals recorded in the SWIS data collection system. The principal and PBIS team will meet regularly to analyze the behavior data in order to make necessary adjustments. Data collected will be shared with staff no less than monthly.

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	Patrick Fortney	Principal
2	Susan Noble	Counselor
3	Jeff Brown	Teacher
4	Michelle Musselman	Teacher
5	Jill Hoyle	Teacher
6	Jo Anne Adams	Teacher
7	Denise Harts	Teacher

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation
Part A. Parent Notification*

This section describes how the plan has been developed and reviewed and identifies the support in place to ensure implementation.

Parent Notification - Describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand. (**Requirement for Title I Schools only.*)

Parent Involvement in the School Improvement Team

Quarterly reports of our current SIP. Notice in the monthly newsletter that they are available in the office.

Report SIP update to the Board of Education in a public forum.

Powerpoint presentation reflecting action plans AYP status trend data.

Washington School will communicate PBIS goals through monthly newsletters and a PBIS podcast.

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

Stakeholder Involvement - Describe specifically how stakeholders (including parents, school staff, and outside experts) have been consulted in the development of the plan. The names and titles of the school improvement team or plan developers must be identified here.

Washington School has developed a School Improvement Team, consisting of a a parent of one of our 4th grade students who is also a member of the Sterling Public Schools Board of Education, one 5th grade teacher, one 3rd grade teacher, Washington School's Guidance Counselor, our Title I teacher, our RtI Interventionist, and our principal. They are as follows:

Marc Geil, Board Member and parent

Susan Noble, Guidance Counselor

Jo Anne Adams, Title I teacher

Jen Banks, RtI Interventionist

Jeff Brown, 5th grade teacher

Valerie Hill, 3rd grade teacher

Patrick Fortney, Principal

Vicky Salas, School Secretary and ESP representative

The team meets at least quarterly, and on an as needed basis additionally, to analyze data, develop building schedules, identify target groups and subject areas, brainstorm and research strategies, and make recommendations to the whole staff in regard to the action plan. The SIP is reviewed quarterly and an update is presented to the Board of Education annually.

	Name	Title
1	Marc Geil	Board Member and parent
2	Susan Noble	Guidance Counselor
3	Jo Anne Adams	Title I Teacher
4	Jen Banks	RtI Interventionist
5	Jeff Brown	5th Grade Teacher
6	Valerie Hill	3rd Grade Teacher
7	Patrick Fortney	Principal
8	Vicky Salas	School Secretary and ESP representative

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part C. Peer Review Process

Peer Review - Describe the district's peer review and approval process. Peer review teams should include teachers and administrators from schools and districts similar to the one in improvement, but significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students. As appropriate, peer reviewers may be teachers from other schools, personnel from other districts, Regional Office of Education staff, Intermediate Service Center staff, RESPRO staff, university faculty, consultants, et al., or combinations thereof. RESPRO staff serving on a School Support Team should not serve on a peer review team in the same district. The peer review should precede the local board approval and must be completed within 45 days of receiving the school improvement plan. For further description of the peer review process see LEA and School Improvement: Non-Regulatory Guidance, July 21, 2006, at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

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

Each building SIP team or designated Peer Review team completes an internal review process using the ISBE scoring rubric. Scoring should be completed independently. Adjustments to the SIP are made as necessary. This rubric is submitted with the School Improvement Plan to the district office in June of each fiscal year. During the months of June, July or August, each school's SIP is presented to the Board of Education's Education Committee. The Education Committee members may provide feedback to each school. The school SIP members will review the feedback and make any necessary revisions to the School Improvement Plan.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part D. Teacher Mentoring Process

Teacher Mentoring Process - Describe the teacher mentoring program. Mentoring programs pair novice teachers with more experienced professionals who serve as role models and provide practical support and encouragement. Schools have complete discretion in deciding what else the teacher mentoring program should provide.

Purpose of the Mentoring Program

So that Sterling Public Schools may enhance student learning, as well as provide its teachers with instructional teaching methods, it has contractually created a Teacher Induction and Mentoring Program. The purpose of the Induction Program is to provide ongoing support and assistance to all novice teachers, with the outcome being that each staff member moves from an Illinois Initial Teaching Certificate to an Illinois Standard Teaching Certificate. Within this Induction Program is our two-year Mentoring Program that is required of each beginning and new teacher to the district.

Details of the Program

Every novice and new teacher that comes to the district is provided with a mentor. This mentor is selected by the principals, but they must also meet district criteria, as well as participate in the district's Mentoring Training Program. Then, throughout the school year, the mentor and mentee meet regularly with one another. On an as needed basis, the mentor/mentee will meet with the building principal to communicate progress and future strategies.

Sterling Schools uses Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teachers as a guide and a model for its Mentoring Program. This research-based framework, which each mentor is trained in, helps to lead discussions between mentors and mentees that focus on student achievement and effective classroom strategies.

Goals of the Program

The program has three major goals. First and foremost, it is to improve the quality of classroom instruction of the participating teacher by ensuring that he/she is provided with research-based, best practices for teaching. Secondly, Sterling Public Schools strives to provide not just academic support, but also personal support to those in its Mentor Program. Lastly, it is our desire to acquaint each mentee with tools and information that will assist them "on the job." These terms include the prevailing culture of our school, the District evaluation procedure, the union contract, and district policies affecting teachers and teaching.

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

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

The District provides the following services and resources to support the development and implementation of Washington School's Improvement Plan.

- *Professional Development during institute days and SIP 1/2 days focused on SIP Activities and improved teaching and learning and a Professional Development Coordinator to assist Washington School with this.
- *Financial support for professional development including 2010 Summer Learning Opportunities.
- *Curriculum development opportunities and stipends to improve the curriculum for core teachers.
- *A Director of Student Support Services that provides SIP teams with templates and the format for writing and reviewing the Washington School Improvement Plan.
- *A student data base, data collection and analysis help, and technology support via the district's technology department.
- *Financial support and resources to our extended day program and extended school year to help meet the academic needs of special education students.
- *Through the Title I grant, Washington School was able to bring in a reading specialist these past four years along with three program aides to assist with instruction.
- *Reallocation of funds has provided full-time guidance counselors for each of our elementary buildings.

Corrective Actions taken by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress for a fourth annual calculation (Corrective Action Status) should be aligned with the strategies and activities of this plan. The district must take one or more of the following actions in such a school per NCLB, Section 1116(b)(7)(C)(iv). (Check all that apply.)

- Require implementation of a new research-based curriculum of instructional program;
- Extension of the school year or school day;
- Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance;
- Significant decrease in management authority at the school level;
- Replacement of the principal;

- ☒ Restructuring the internal organization of the school;
- ☒ Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school.

Restructuring Options (allowed in Illinois) selected by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress for a fifth annual calculation (Restructuring Status) should be aligned with the strategies and activities of this plan. The district must take one or more of the following options in such a school. (Please check all that apply.)

- ☒ Reopening the school as a public charter school, consistent with Article 27A of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/Art. 27A.);
- ☒ Replacing all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school's inability to make AYP;
- ☒ Entering into a contract with a private entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the school as a public school;
- ☒ Implementing any other major restructuring of the school's governance that makes fundamental reform in:
 - ☒ governance and management, and/or
 - ☒ financing and material resources, and/or
 - ☒ staffing.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part F. State Responsibilities

State Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that ISBE, RESPROS, and other service providers have provided the school during the development and review of this plan and other services that will be provided during the implementation of the plan. ISBE shall provide technical assistance to the school if district fails to do so.

The Illinois Interactive Report Card provides us with the e-plan outline and trend data necessary for writing this plan. ISBE also provides Washington School with an annual Illinois School Report Card as well as the materials necessary for taking the ISAT as well as their prompt results. ISBE provides us with this ISBE website, which is a wealth of information. In addition, State Superintendent Dr. Christopher Koch provides us with weekly information in order to keep us updated on key happenings, events, and information. Regional Office of Education for Whiteside County assists us with technical services, professional development, and educator certification.

Other governmental and community agencies that provided resources, services, or assistance during the implementation of the plan are as follows:

Sterling Township - Provided financial support, training and assistance for our TEAM tutoring program and our bilingual tutoring program.

Sterling Schools Foundation - Provided financial support and materials through the mini-grants program, the Bucks for Books Program, and through the distribution of dictionaries to all third grade students.

Sterling Police Department - Provided Drug Awareness Resistance Education (DARE) program for Washington 5th grade students and conducted a safety awareness assembly on weapons for students.

YMCA - **Provided after school care within our facilities for students and a grant to provide the opportunity for at-risk students to attend this program.**

YWCA - **Provided sexual harrassment and abuse education for Washington 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students in a school-based program. In addition, they provide and fund an after-school program called Techgyrls, which ran two different sessions (fall and spring) one night per week until 4:30 p.m. for some of our 4th grade girls.**

Sauk Valley Bank - Provided 5th graders with "Teach Children to Save" curriculum.

Sterling High School - Provided students to assist with Family Fun Night and SHS Science Club members demonstrated science experiments to fourth graders. Washington School also benefits from SHS's Service Learning Program.

Tri-County Opportunities Council - Provides Washington School with Foster Grandparents.

	Name	Title
1	Tad Everett	Superintendent
2	Cheryl Robinson	Director of Curriculum and Instruction
3	Sara Dail	Director of Student Services

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

If included, is there evidence that the SIP team analyzed optional data to clarify the areas of weakness?

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

If included, has the SIP team analyzed other available data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities?

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

Yes No Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance? [C]

Yes No Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control? [C]

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

Yes No Has the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan? [C]

Yes No N/A Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency? [C]

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

Yes No Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?

Yes No Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement? [C]

Yes No Are the strategies and activities measurable? [C]

Yes No Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified? [C]

Yes No Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear? [C]

Yes No N/A Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students? [C]

Yes No N/A Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status or in special education non-compliance?

Yes No N/A Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities for students? [C]

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

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

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

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

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

PEER REVIEW

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Is the peer review process described <u>and</u> is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have “the greatest likelihood” of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP? [C]
TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Is it clear how the school is ensuring that teachers are receiving the support needed for their professional growth and to retain them in the profession? [C]
DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITES	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]
STATE RESPONSIBILITES	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation? [C]
SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Have the names and titles of School Support Team members been listed in the plan? Does the team appear to have the expertise to support this school in regards to the school improvement plan? [C]
APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan. [C]

PART II - COMMENTS