

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	550980060262003		
District Name:	Morrison CUSD 6	School Name:	Southside School
Superintendent:	Dr Suellen Girard	Principal:	Joe Robbins
District Address:	643 Genesee Ave	School Address:	100 Academic Dr
City/State/Zip:	Morrison, IL 61270 2907	City/State/Zip:	Morrison, IL 61270 2954
District Telephone#:	Label 8157722064 Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	8157722183 Extn: 0
District Email:	suellen.girard@morrisonsschools.org	School Email:	
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2009 AYP Report

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	Yes	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	Yes	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2009-10 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		70.0			70.0			90.0		78.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	84.0		Yes	94.1		Yes	96.4			
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	84.8		Yes	95.1		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities													
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	83.6	Yes	89.0	Yes					

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 70% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 70% 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% 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 5/01/2008.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 70% 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.

DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION

The Differentiated Accountability classification for the school is:	-
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in reading?	-
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in math?	-

In 2008, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) was one of 6 states to be chosen by the US Department of Education to participate on the Differentiated Accountability Pilot Program. The Differentiated Accountability classification applies only to schools in federal improvement status.

The classification is a descriptor (i.e., focused or comprehensive) that is added to a school's improvement status. Current Title I requirements do not change.

The classification will assist in distinguishing between schools that need focused supports versus more comprehensive interventions.

Focused-School does not make AYP overall, but does make AYP in the "ALL" students subgroup in both reading and math.

Comprehensive-School does not make AYP overall and does not make AYP in the "ALL" students subgroup in either reading or math.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2009 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								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	96.8	96.8	96.9	96.4	96.7	96.7	96.3	96.4
Truancy Rate (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mobility Rate (%)	12.8	6.2	6.9	4.8	7.3	12.1	9.6	7.6
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	278	275	260	247	245	244	254	246
Low Income (%)	28.8	28.0	28.1	21.5	24.5	29.9	25.6	32.9
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	98.2	98.5	95.8	91.1	90.6	90.6	92.9	93.9
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.4	-	0.4	0.8	0.8	-	-	1.2
Hispanic (%)	0.4	1.1	3.5	3.2	6.5	3.7	2.8	0.8
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	1.1	0.4	0.4	-	1.2	0.4	0.4	-
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	4.9	0.8	5.3	3.9	4.1

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	1999	97.0	0.3	1.5	1.2	-	-
	2000	97.7	0.7	0.7	1.0	-	-
	2001	97.6	0.3	0.7	1.4	-	-
	2002	98.2	0.4	0.4	1.1	-	-
	2003	98.5	-	1.1	0.4	-	-
	2004	95.8	0.4	3.5	0.4	-	-
	2005	91.1	0.8	3.2	-	-	4.9
	2006	90.6	0.8	6.5	1.2	-	0.8
	2007	90.6	-	3.7	0.4	-	5.3
	2008	92.9	-	2.8	0.4	-	3.9
2009	93.9	1.2	0.8	-	-	4.1	
D I S T R I C T	1999	98.6	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.2	-
	2000	98.8	0.2	0.6	0.4	-	-
	2001	98.8	0.2	0.6	0.5	-	-
	2002	98.6	0.2	0.8	0.4	-	-
	2003	98.0	0.1	1.2	0.8	-	-
	2004	95.7	0.5	3.1	0.7	-	-
	2005	93.6	0.6	2.5	0.9	-	2.4
	2006	94.0	0.6	3.8	1.2	-	0.3
	2007	94.3	0.7	2.0	0.7	-	2.4
	2008	94.1	0.7	2.2	0.6	0.1	2.2

	2009	94.6	0.6	1.6	0.4	0.2	2.6
S T A T E	1999	62.0	20.8	13.9	3.2	0.2	-
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	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

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	1999	0.3	16.4	100.0	97.7	11.7	-	-	-	-
	2000	-	24.4	100.0	97.4	6.1	-	-	-	-
	2001	-	16.3	100.0	97.0	7.5	-	-	-	-
	2002	-	28.8	100.0	96.8	12.8	-	-	-	-
	2003	-	28.0	100.0	96.8	6.2	-	-	-	-
	2004	-	28.1	100.0	96.9	6.9	-	-	-	-
	2005	-	21.5	100.0	96.4	4.8	-	-	-	-
	2006	-	24.5	100.0	96.7	7.3	-	-	-	-
	2007	-	29.9	100.0	96.7	12.1	-	-	-	-
	2008	-	25.6	100.0	96.3	9.6	-	-	-	-
2009	-	32.9	100.0	96.4	7.6	-	-	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	1999	0.1	13.0	98.3	95.6	10.5	22	1.7	3.7	86.4
	2000	-	16.0	100.0	96.1	7.7	4	0.3	1.3	96.3
	2001	-	13.9	99.1	95.9	6.1	8	0.6	2.0	95.1
	2002	-	20.2	95.8	95.8	7.7	7	0.6	2.2	98.9
	2003	0.1	20.0	94.7	95.8	5.7	6	0.5	1.1	87.4
	2004	0.1	20.1	97.1	96.0	6.5	1	0.1	2.4	92.1
	2005	-	17.5	92.3	95.5	5.8	6	0.5	0.5	91.4
	2006	-	20.6	98.9	95.4	8.2	7	0.6	1.2	95.4
	2007	-	25.0	99.0	95.2	9.7	2	0.2	1.5	100.0
	2008	-	24.9	98.9	94.7	10.2	17	1.5	3.1	85.7

	2009	-	25.6	99.4	94.9	9.0	7	0.7	0.3	89.0
S T A T E	1999	6.4	36.1	96.1	93.6	18.1	43,332	2.3	5.9	81.9
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	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	

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	1999	329	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	299	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	295	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	278	90	105	83	-	-	-
	2003	275	81	96	98	-	-	-
	2004	260	81	82	97	-	-	-
	2005	247	81	83	83	-	-	-
	2006	245	79	83	83	-	-	-
	2007	244	75	82	87	-	-	-
	2008	254	81	84	89	-	-	-
	2009	246	85	80	81	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	1999	1,296	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1,265	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,260	106	87	106	117	81	90
	2002	1,214	90	105	83	106	114	101
	2003	1,194	81	96	98	108	103	84
	2004	1,169	81	82	97	92	105	70
	2005	1,170	81	83	83	105	89	110
	2006	1,206	79	83	83	93	104	110
	2007	1,187	75	82	87	79	94	105
	2008	1,161	81	84	89	81	82	91
	2009	1,130	85	80	81	96	80	89

S T A T E	1999	1,962,026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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

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	1999	83	16	43,073	58	42	17	16	-	-
	2000	87	16	44,949	57	43	18	13	-	-
	2001	88	16	46,781	57	43	17	14	-	-
	2002	88	16	50,355	51	49	17	13	-	-
	2003	78	16	52,622	40	60	18	16	-	-
	2004	66	18	57,283	25	75	20	20	-	-
	2005	66	18	48,962	22	78	21	20	-	-
	2006	66	17	54,478	27	73	21	21	2	-
	2007	69	17	55,470	26	74	19	19	1	-
	2008	70	16	55,798	29	71	18	18	-	-
2009	75	17	57,249	29	71	17	16	-	-	
S T A T E	1999	119,718	15	45,337	53	47	20	18	-	-
	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	14	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	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

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					
	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	82.8	82.7	87.6	83.4	80.8	82.7	-	-	87.8	85.8	84.2	84.4	68.7	87.0	78.0	86.5	93.0	85.0
White	85.2	83.5	86.1	84.7	81.1	82.7	-	-	90.5	84.0	84.7	85.2	69.4	86.1	78.7	86.7	92.3	86.4
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	69.2	-	-	-	-	50.0	40.0	-	8.3	69.2	-	-	-	-
Low Income	84.6	78.2	81.3	77.2	68.5	85.8	-	-	75.0	76.1	71.4	82.6	41.7	71.4	81.8	75.0	81.3	81.8

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	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	92.6	97.5	98.8	94.8	93.2	95.0	-	-	97.6	92.9	90.7	94.8	85.5	91.8	95.1	94.3	95.4	92.5
White	94.6	98.6	98.6	95.9	94.2	94.7	-	-	97.3	93.3	91.7	95.9	86.3	92.4	94.6	94.0	94.9	94.6
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	76.9	-	-	-	-	60.0	60.0	-	16.7	53.8	-	-	-	-
Low Income	92.3	100.0	93.8	90.9	79.0	92.9	-	-	95.8	76.2	76.1	91.3	70.9	71.4	95.5	89.3	87.6	81.8

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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?

2008-2009 ISAT data indicates the following:

In the content area of Reading:

- 82% of students tested in the third grade met or exceeded standards in the area of Reading; while 18% fell at the below standards or warning level.
- 82% of students tested in the fourth grade met or exceeded standards in the area of Reading; while 18% fell at the below standards or warning level.
- 84% of students tested in the fifth grade met or exceeded standards in the area of Reading; while 16% fell at the below standards or warning level.

In the content area of Math:

- 94% of students tested in the third grade met or exceeded standards in the area of Math; while 6% fell at the below standards or warning level.
- 92% of students tested in the fourth grade met or exceeded standards in the area of Math; while 8% fell at the below standards or warning level.
- 91% of students tested in the fifth grade met or exceeded standards in the area of Math; while 9% fell at the below standards or warning level.

In the content area of Writing:

- 84% of students students in the third grade met or exceeded standards in the area of Writing; while 14% fell at the below standards or warning level.
- 60% of students tested in the fifth grade met or exceeded standards in the area of Writing; while 40% fell at the below standards or warning level.

In the content area of Science:

86% of students tested in the fourth grade met or exceeded standards in the area of Writing; while 14% fell at the below standards or warning level.

Based on the data, it is clear that Southside Elementary School demonstrates a marked strength in the area of Mathematics. This may be attributed to the outstanding Saxon Math program that each teacher in first through fifth grade utilizes to teach and reinforce Math concepts.

Conversely, in the area of Reading, it is apparent that further interventions, strategies, or interventions are necessary - especially in grades three and four, where 18, 18 and 16 percent of the population (respectively) did not meet the expected state standards.

It is also noted that additional interventions, support, or strategies are needed to support the writing instruction throughout the third, fourth, and fifth grades to improve student writing endeavors.

State Report Card data also indicates that 32.9% of the student population at Southside Elementary School qualified for free or reduced lunch during the March 2009 testing window. Therefore, Southside School now has a subgroup of students labeled as Economically Disadvantaged. This subgroup is expected to increase at Northside and Southside

School in the coming years. Southside School was able to meet the AYP target of 70% of this subgroup meeting or exceeding state standards in 2008-09. In 2009, the state AYP target will increase to 77.5% of all students and subgroups meeting or exceeding state standards. The Economically Disadvantaged subgroup is a population that will need to be addressed with increased training, understanding, programs, and teaching strategies at Northside and Southside Schools to increase student progress and achievement.

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

POSITIVE

The Saxon Math Program provides clear, concise, standardized, and repetitive Math curriculum

Parent and stakeholder support

Community volunteers

Standards-based, articulated curriculum

75% of teachers hold Masters degrees or higher

Attendance rate

Reading specialists during the 2008-09 school year

First grade Reading Recovery Program

Community, peer, and after school tutoring programs

Collaborative/Team planning time

Technology to support student learning

Support for continuing education for professional staff

NEGATIVE

Increasing poverty rate

Lack of parent availability to children

Parent surveys indicate lack of parenting skills

Increase in teen pregnancy rate

Increase in high school drop-out rate

Lack of diagnostic assessments

Lack of counselor

Lack of alternative programming for at-risk students

Increase in student mental health issues and hospitalizations

Administrative support is thin

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

Based on data and factors presented in the 2008-09 school report card, it may be concluded that:

- Further interventions, strategies, curriculum, support, or interventions are necessary to increase Reading scores of students in grades 3-5.
- Additional interventions, strategies, curriculum, support, or interventions are necessary in grades three through five to ultimately impact writing scores of students in the fifth grade.

The Economically Disadvantaged subgroup is a population that will need to be addressed with increased training, understanding, interventions, programs, and teaching strategies at Northside and Southside Schools to increase student progress and achievement.

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?

Local assessments in the area of Reading include the DIBELS literacy assessment, STAR testing, Local Quarterly Assessments, as well as Skills/Unit assessments.

DIBELS assessment data indicates the following regarding reading fluency of third through fifth grade students at Southside School:

3rd Grade		1 st assessment	2 nd assessment	3 rd assessment
Reading Fluency	At risk	0-52	0-66	0-79
	Some risk	53-76	67-91	80-109
	Low risk	77+	92+	110+
4th Grade		1 st assessment	2 nd assessment	3 rd assessment
Reading Fluency	At risk	0-70	0-82	0-95
	Some risk	71-92	83-104	96-117
	Low risk	93+	105+	118+
5th Grade		1 st assessment	2 nd assessment	3 rd assessment
Reading Fluency	At risk	0-80	0-93	0-102
	Some risk	81-103	94-114	103-123
	Low risk	104+	115+	124+

Overall, reading assessment data indicates strength in literal comprehension and oral reading fluency. Reading assessment data indicates a weakness in comprehension, including higher level thinking skills and meanings of affixes. Students also demonstrate a weakness in the area of written extended responses to reading prompts. Based on local assessment data, 21% of the Southside student population qualifies for Tier 2 Reading interventions, while 10% of students qualify for Tier 3 Reading interventions.

Local assessments in the area of Mathematics include local quarterly assessments, weekly tests and student grades. Math assessment data indicates strength in the areas of computation and problem solving. Data indicates a weakness in number sense and written responses for math problems.

Local assessments in the area of behavior include student disciplinary notices, attendance, teacher observation, parent input. This data indicates a strength in teacher classroom control. There is also a high percentage of parent participation at Southside School. Data indicates that there is a weakness in the area of parent involvement. There is also a lack of services for students who are hospitalized for mental health issues. These students return to school with little to no transition or support services.

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

POSITIVE

- Parent and stakeholder support
- Community volunteers
- Standards-based, articulated curriculum
- 75% of teachers hold Masters degrees or higher
- Attendance rate
- Two Reading specialists to provide intervention services
- Community, peer, and after school tutoring programs
- Collaborative/Team planning time
- Technology to support student learning
- Computer lab
- Support for continuing education for professional staff

NEGATIVE

- Increasing poverty rate
- Increased student mobility
- Lack of parent availability to children
- Parent surveys indicate lack of parenting skills
- Increase in high school drop-out rate
- Lack of diagnostic assessments
- Lack of counselor
- Lack of alternative programming for at-risk students
- Increase in student mental health issues and hospitalizations

Administrative support is thin

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

Based on this information, one may draw the following conclusions:

- There is a need for additional programs, materials, and technology to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in Reading, Math, and behavior in grades 3-5.
- There is a need for additional diagnostic testing and intervention materials for grades 3-5 Math and behavior.
- There is a need for additional progress monitoring in grades 3-5 in the areas of Reading, Math, and behavior.
- There is a need for further parent education to support student learning endeavors.
- There is a need for continued staff education and development.
- There is a need to review schedules and staffing assignments to support Tier 2 & Tier 3 interventions.

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

The Morrison School District and Southside Elementary School has identified and analyzed the following data in an effort to create an accurate data picture of the community of Morrison:

- Parent need and satisfaction surveys
- Parent feedback following conferences
- Student exit surveys
- Parent contracts - Pre-K and Title I

- Data collection on parent participation

Teacher and support staff survey forms

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

Morrison Community Unit District #6 is a small, rural district in Whiteside County in northwestern Illinois. The city of Morrison consists of 4,447 residents and is located approximately 45 miles northeast of the Quad Cities metropolitan area. The area surrounding Morrison is agricultural and residential in nature.

Due to the closure and downsizing of a number of businesses, there are minimal employment opportunities in the area. Many parents are have to commute to larger areas to find sustainable income, allowing less time to build and foster family and community relationships. 25.3% of our population earns less than \$25,000 per household. In October of 2009, Morrison's unemployment rate was 9.8%.

Other challenges facing the Morrison community and its children include:

- rural setting
- remote area
- unemployment
- single parent homes
- crime
- low income families
- increase in teen pregnancies

Southside School, a third through fifth grade elementary building in Morrison, Illinois supported a student population of 246 students during the 2008-09 school year. Of the 246 students, 93.9% of the student population is identified as White, non-Hispanic; 0.8% of the student population is classified as Hispanic; 1.2 % of the population was identified as Black, Non-Hispanic and 4.1% is reported as Multi-racial or Multi-ethnic.

At the time of testing in 2008-09, there was a 7.6% mobility rate, and 32.9% of the student population was classified as low income.

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

Based on the afore mentioned data, Southside School must address the following issue related to community challenges and education:

- Southside School must address its ever-expanding low income population. Therefore, teachers and staff must continue to research and establish various curriculum, methods, and teaching strategies to continue to reach and educate our diverse population.

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 and information tell you?*

Southside School employs 15.5 certified classroom teachers; 7 certified paraprofessionals; 1 certified Elementary Programs and Services Coordinator; and 1 certified principal.

All but one of the Morrison CUSD #6 staff members is highly qualified.

Southside School staff members serve on building committees in an effort to improve school climate, programs, and instruction.

Southside School staff members participate annually on the School Improvement Committee. They work together to conduct an internal review of school climate, curriculum, programs, and instruction, as well as to formulate an accurate data picture of student and building level performance.

Teachers at Southside School participate in all district inservices.

Early release time provides teachers with quality time to work on the revision of grade level power standards, quarterly objectives, and local common assessment. At this time,

teachers also engage in data analysis of student performance on quarterly assessments, as well as reflections on teaching practices and curriculum.

Strengths:

All but one teachers are highly qualified.

There is a high percentage of teachers who hold masters degrees.

Highly qualified instructors are available at Southside School to provide Tier 2 & Tier 3 Reading interventions.

Teachers view Morrison Community District #6 as a desirable district in which to teach, therefore there is a very low turnover rate.

The Southside staff has received extensive training in curriculum alignment with State and District standards and objectives.

The Southside staff has received training on Response to Intervention

The Southside staff is knowledgeable and trained in the area of differentiated instruction.

Weaknesses:

There is a limited staff capacity in the area of Math at Southside, therefore it is difficult to provide strategic interventions at the Tier 2 & Tier 3 levels in the Response to Intervention model.

There is a need for more training and support in Response to Intervention - especially in the areas of Tier 2 & Tier 3 interventions.

There is a need for further identification and selection of programming, as well as further staff development in the areas of Tier 2 & 3 behavior support and interventions.

There is a need for training on technology interventions at the Tier 2 & Tier 3 levels in the Response to Intervention model.

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

Based on data regarding educator qualifications, staff capacity, and professional development opportunities, Southside School has identified the following staff strengths and areas of improvement:

Strengths

All but one teachers are highly qualified.

There is a high percentage of teachers who hold masters degrees.

Highly qualified instructors are available at Southside School to provide Tier 2 & Tier 3 Reading interventions.

Teachers view Morrison Community District #6 as a desirable district in which to teach, therefore there is a very low turnover rate.

The Southside staff has received extensive training in curriculum alignment with State and District standards and objectives.

The Southside staff has received training on Response to Intervention

The Southside staff is knowledgeable and trained in the area of differentiated instruction.

Weaknesses

There is a limited staff capacity in the area of Math at Southside, therefore it is difficult to provide strategic interventions at the Tier 2 & Tier 3 levels in the Response to Intervention model.

There is a need for more training and support in Response to Intervention - especially in the areas of Tier 2 & Tier 3 interventions.

There is a need for further identification and selection of programming, as well as further staff development in the areas of Tier 2 & 3 behavior support and interventions.

There is a need for training on technology interventions at the Tier 2 & Tier 3 levels in the Response to Intervention model.

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

In contemplating future professional development and staffing needs at Southside Elementary School, it may be concluded that:

Southside School needs to continue to investigate alternative staffing or scheduling in an effort to provide strategic interventions in the area of Math at the Tier 2 & Tier 3 levels in the Response to Intervention model.

Southside School needs to pursue additional training and support in Response to Intervention - especially in the areas of Tier 2 & Tier 3 interventions.

Southside School needs to investigate further identification and selection of programming, as well as further staff development in the areas of Tier 2 & 3 behavior support and interventions.

Southside School needs to incorporate additional training on technology interventions at the Tier 2 & Tier 3 levels in the Response to Intervention model.

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

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

Data in the realm of parental involvement includes

Teacher - reported data regarding the percentage of parent contact

Parent volunteer hours

Title 1 Parent compacts

Attendance sign-in sheets and school sponsored events or seminars

ParentTeacher conference attendance

Teacher contact logs

Parent contact via school disciplinary referral notices

Attendance and truancy data. Data demonstrates that Southside School in Morrison is at the forefront of parental involvement and communication.

Southside School publishes a monthly school newsletter, which is distributed to parents and stakeholders. An electronic version of this newsletter is also available on the district's web page. Press releases for community events are regularly sent to and published in area newspapers. These informational releases are also available for parent and community access on the home page of the district web site.

Southside School holds an annual open house.

The school also sponsors a book fair in the spring of each year. Many parents and other extended family members attend this event to purchase books for children, as well as for the school.

Southside School offers two opportunities for parent teacher conferences in the fall of each year. Each teacher has 100% contact with the parents of each child in their classroom. Student watch list and retention conferences are also held regularly throughout the third and fourth quarters.

School disciplinary notices are sent home on a daily basis, with a copy of the school's disciplinary philosophy.

Parents are encouraged and reminded of the opportunity to eat school lunch with their child. On an average week, there are approximately two to four parents that partake in the school lunch program with their children.

Volunteers have worked at Southside School for numerous years. During the 2008-09 school year, volunteers logged thousands of hours in the Morrison School District. At Southside School volunteers are utilized on a daily basis in classrooms to listen to students read, to tutor students who may be struggling, to perform clerical work, to attend fieldtrips, and to assist students with computer technology.

Parents and other community members act as group facilitators, chaperones, and guest speakers during monthly student character education workshops and community service endeavors.

Southside School also works in conjunction with Big Brothers & Big Sisters of the Mississippi Valley to provide mentoring opportunities children in third through fifth grade via parent and community involvement, including the:

School Based “Lunch Buddy” Program: a one-to-one program that matches a “little” with a “big” in the community during lunch for approximately 30-45 minutes per week; and cooperatively together as a team and build positive relationships with their peers. and the Community Based Big Brother/Sister Program: a one-to-one mentoring program that matches a “little” with a “big” in the community. This is a oneyear commitment to spend ten hours per month with a child (outside of the school day) doing activities of interest.

Many parents are active and involved in the Northside/Southside School Parent Teacher Organization. These parents hold monthly meetings which focus on fundraising for student incentives, providing financial support for classroom supplies, and planning special events. Special events have included a welcome back cookout, a family fall fest, and other family-oriented activities.

At the District level, parents and other stakeholders participate in the strategic planning phase of the District “Plan On A Page,” as well as on the Citizen’s Advisory Committee.

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

Parental involvement has contributed to the academic success of third through fifth grade students, as well as the overall well-being of the school building. Specifically:

Online grade access has improved communication between parents and teachers.

Teacher websites, emails, and other forms of electronic communication have improved communication between parents and teachers.

Parent newsletters (available in print and online formats) have informed stakeholders of school events and educational information in an effort to increase parental participation.

Monthly, positive school-parent contact fosters a better relationship between parents and school professionals.

Informational releases to local newspapers and radio stations increase parent and community awareness, communication, and participation.

New school discipline plan creates awareness of and may curtail disciplinary problems.

Parents receive school handbooks that discuss provisions with the Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, as well as other important information on school policy and procedures.

The involvement of parents as volunteer members of the school improvement team, promote parent and stakeholder input and overall buy-in.

The Teacher Support Teams/Teacher Assistance Teams (that meet when a student begins to struggle) include the parents of said child as part of the team and solution process.

Challenges that Southside School may face in the near future with regards to parental participation may include:

Due to parents work schedules and places of employment, it is difficult for them to play an active role in their children's education.

Teachers and staff report increased difficulties in contacting parents in order to share student success and challenges.

There is a continual increase poverty rates within the school and district, which impacts student and parent involvement and achievement.

The lack of community/parent buy-in.

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

Based on this data and contributing factors, the following conclusions may be reached:

Southside School may need to investigate outside resources to provide parent support group and educational classes, as well as links to critical resources in the community

Southside School may need to investigate the feasibility of providing additional parent access to and education on computer resources and student grades.

Southside school needs to find alternative ways to promote opportunities for non-traditional families.

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?

Key factors that are within the district's capacity to change or control include:

Further interventions, strategies, curriculum, support, or interventions are necessary to increase Reading scores of students in grades third through fifth grade.

Additional interventions, strategies, curriculum, support, or interventions are necessary in fifth grade to ultimately impact writing scores.

There is a need for additional programs, materials, and technology to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in Reading, Math, and Behavior in grades 3-5.

There is a need for additional diagnostic testing and intervention materials for grades 3-5 Math.

There is a need for additional progress monitoring in grades 3-5 in the areas of Reading, Math, and behavior.

There is a need for further parent education to support student learning endeavors.

There is a need for continued staff education and development.

Southside School needs to pursue additional training and support in Response to Intervention - especially in the areas of Tier 2 & Tier 3 interventions.

Southside School may need to investigate additional training on technology interventions at the Tier 2 & Tier 3 levels in the Response to Intervention model.

Southside School may need to investigate outside resources to provide parent support group and educational classes, as well as links to critical resources in the community

These factors may be categorized into one specific area of improvement:

Continued research into Response to Intervention Materials in the Areas of Reading, Math and Behavior.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	School will increase number of students that meet or exceed ISAT standards to 94% in reading.	
2	School will increase ISAT Math scores to 100% meets and exceeds.	
3	School will increase the number of students that meet and exceed on the ISAT to 100% in Math.	
4	School will increase the number of students that meet and exceed on the ISAT to 100% in Math.	
5	School will increase the number of students that meet or exceeds in math to 100%.	

No deficiencies have been identified in the most recent AYP Report for your school

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

School will increase number of students that meet or exceed ISAT standards to 94% in reading.

Objective 1 Description

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

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

School will increase number of students that meet or exceed ISAT standards to 94% in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Continue to investigate materials for 3-5 Reading interventions at the Tier 2 and Tier 3 levels.	08/24/2009	05/31/2010	After School	Title I	
2	Monitor students abilities and local assessment scores and provide additional support for Tier 2 and 3 Students	08/19/2009	05/31/2010	During School	Title I	

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

School will increase number of students that meet or exceed ISAT standards to 94% in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Faculty and staff will attend workshops and conferences targeted at improving reading.	10/01/2009	05/31/2010	During School	Title I	
2	Staff will visit other classrooms to observe instructional reading strategies.	08/19/2009	05/31/2010	During School	Title I	

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

School will increase number of students that meet or exceed ISAT standards to 94% in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will sign Title 1 Compacts for at risk students and will be informed of family reading nights throughout the school year.	09/02/2009	05/31/2010	After School	Title I	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

School will increase number of students that meet or exceed ISAT standards to 94% in reading.

	Name	Title
1	Joe Robbins	Principal

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

School will increase ISAT Math scores to 100% meets and exceeds.

Objective 2 Description

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

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

School will increase ISAT Math scores to 100% meets and exceeds.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	students will continue to use the Saxon Math program.	08/19/2009	05/31/2010	During School	Title I	
2	Administration will utilize all staff members to provide additional support for all Tier 2 and 3 students.	09/01/2009	12/01/2009	After School	Title I	

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

School will increase ISAT Math scores to 100% meets and exceeds.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Staff will continue to use the Saxon Math program looking for new versions to fill in learning gaps.	08/19/2009	05/31/2010	During School	Title I	
2	Administration will utilize all staff members to provide additional support for all Tier 2 and 3 students.	09/01/2009	12/01/2009	After School	Title I	

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

School will increase ISAT Math scores to 100% meets and exceeds.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1				Before School	Title I	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

School will increase ISAT Math scores to 100% meets and exceeds.

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3

School will increase the number of students that mee and exceed on the ISAT to 100% in Math.

Objective 3 Description

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

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

School will increase the number of students that mee and exceed on the ISAT to 100% in Math.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will continue to use the successful Saxon Math series in grades K-5.	08/24/2009	05/31/2010	During School	Title I	
2	Students will be assessed in quartely assessments that are linked to Illinois State Standards.	10/19/2009	05/31/2010	During School	Title I	

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

School will increase the number of students that mee and exceed on the ISAT to 100% in Math.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Staff will attend workshops designed to help struggling students in math based on the RtI model	09/01/2009	02/01/2010	During School	Title I	

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

School will increase the number of students that mee and exceed on the ISAT to 100% in Math.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will continue to sign and return Saxon Math assignments to be graded by teacher that they were present during working time.	09/01/2009	05/28/2010	After School	Title I	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

School will increase the number of students that mee and exceed on the ISAT to 100% in Math.

	Name	Title
1	Joe Robbins	Principal

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 4

School will increase the number of students that mee and exceed on the ISAT to 100% in Math.

Objective 4 Description

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

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

School will increase the number of students that mee and exceed on the ISAT to 100% in Math.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1						

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

School will increase the number of students that mee and exceed on the ISAT to 100% in Math.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1						

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

School will increase the number of students that mee and exceed on the ISAT to 100% in Math.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1						

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

School will increase the number of students that mee and exceed on the ISAT to 100% in Math.

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 5

School will increase the number of students that meet or ecceeds in math to 100%.

Objective 5 Description

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

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

School will increase the number of students that meet or exceeds in math to 100%.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will continue to utilize the Saxon Math Program which has to date shown to be a very effective math curriculum.	08/24/2009	05/31/2010	During School	Title I	

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

School will increase the number of students that meet or exceeds in math to 100%.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Staff will attend workshops focusing on the RtI model in regards to math curriculum and increasing ISAT scores.	10/01/2009	02/12/2010	During School	Title I	
2	School will select a math screener for students in grades k-5 to determine where students are academically in math.	10/01/2009	05/31/2010	After School	Title I	

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

School will increase the number of students that meet or exceeds in math to 100%.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will continue to administer and sign necessary Saxon Math work each night as assigned by teacher	08/24/2009	05/31/2010	After School	Title I	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

School will increase the number of students that meet or exceeds in math to 100%.

	Name	Title
1	Joe Robbins	Principal

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.*)

Southside School offers the following resources for written and verbal communication and education regarding the school's academic status:

- Southside School publishes a monthly school newsletter, which is distributed to parents and stakeholders. An electronic version of this newsletter is also available on the district's web page.
- Southside School Press has generated news releases for informational purposes that are regularly sent to and published in area newspapers. These informational releases are also available for parent and community access on the home page of the district web site.
- Southside School holds an annual open house. Both print and verbal communications regarding the schools' academic status are available during this time.
- Southside School offers two opportunities for parent-teacher conferences in the fall of each year. Each teacher has 100% contact with the parents of each child in their classroom. Both print and verbal communications regarding the schools' academic status are available during this time.

All communication is presented in an easily accessible and understandable format that parents can read and understand.

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.

	Name	Title
1		

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.

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.

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 has provided stipends for staff members who complete work on this plan outside of school hours.

The District Plan is based on the School Improvement Plans.

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).

- ⓔ 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.

- ⓔ 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.

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

	Name	Title
1		

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

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

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

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

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

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

PEER REVIEW

Yes No

Is the peer review process described and is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have “the greatest likelihood” of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP? [C]

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS

Yes No

Is it clear how the school is ensuring that teachers are receiving the support needed for their professional growth and to retain them in the profession? [C]

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No

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

Yes No N/A

If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No

Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation? [C]

SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM

Yes No N/A

Have the names and titles of School Support Team members been listed in the plan? Does the team appear to have the expertise to support this school in regards to the school improvement plan? [C]

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD

Yes No

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

PART II - COMMENTS