

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

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	87.8		Yes	95.1		Yes	95.8	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	88.0		Yes	95.8		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	60.9	Yes	78.3	Yes					
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	82.8	Yes	93.1	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 (%)	96.5	95.6	95.9	95.5	96.1	96.0	95.2	95.8
Truancy Rate (%)	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	0.3	0.3
Mobility Rate (%)	18.2	16.4	16.1	15.9	13.6	15.7	10.9	12.5
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	386	413	412	404	394	412	414	538
Low Income (%)	19.9	28.6	26.2	24.8	24.6	23.3	20.5	20.8
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	5.2	3.1	6.3	4.0	1.3	1.7	2.4	2.6
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	89.4	87.4	86.7	88.9	89.1	88.6	90.6	92.2
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	-	-	1.0	-	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2
Hispanic (%)	10.6	11.9	12.1	7.4	7.1	9.0	7.0	5.2
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	0.7	0.2	0.2	-	-	-	0.2
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	3.5	3.3	2.2	2.2	2.2

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	90.7	0.8	8.6	-	-	-
	2001	86.6	0.7	11.8	0.9	-	-
	2002	89.4	-	10.6	-	-	-
	2003	87.4	-	11.9	0.7	-	-
	2004	86.7	1.0	12.1	0.2	-	-
	2005	88.9	-	7.4	0.2	-	3.5
	2006	89.1	0.3	7.1	-	0.3	3.3
	2007	88.6	0.2	9.0	-	-	2.2
	2008	90.6	0.2	7.0	-	-	2.2
	2009	92.2	0.2	5.2	0.2	-	2.2
D I S T R I C T	2000	89.5	0.4	9.9	0.3	-	-
	2001	87.2	0.6	11.4	0.7	-	-
	2002	90.5	0.3	9.1	0.1	-	-
	2003	88.4	0.6	10.1	0.6	0.1	-
	2004	87.8	1.1	10.8	0.3	-	-
	2005	90.7	0.3	6.6	0.5	-	1.9
	2006	90.4	0.4	6.8	0.3	0.1	2.0
	2007	90.6	0.1	7.5	0.3	0.1	1.4
	2008	91.4	0.1	6.2	0.1	0.1	1.9
	2009	92.0	0.1	5.5	0.3	0.1	2.0
	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

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	4.5	19.2	100.0	96.3	21.4	1	0.3	-	-
	2001	8.1	20.4	100.0	96.5	20.2	-	-	-	-
	2002	5.2	19.9	100.0	96.5	18.2	-	-	-	-
	2003	3.1	28.6	100.0	95.6	16.4	-	-	-	-
	2004	6.3	26.2	100.0	95.9	16.1	-	-	-	-
	2005	4.0	24.8	100.0	95.5	15.9	1	0.3	-	-
	2006	1.3	24.6	100.0	96.1	13.6	-	-	-	-
	2007	1.7	23.3	100.0	96.0	15.7	-	-	-	-
	2008	2.4	20.5	100.0	95.2	10.9	1	0.3	-	-
	2009	2.6	20.8	100.0	95.8	12.5	1	0.3	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	4.7	16.5	100.0	95.9	21.0	1	0.1	1.9	93.2
	2001	6.3	18.0	95.2	96.1	19.5	-	-	2.6	91.5
	2002	5.1	17.6	100.0	95.9	15.9	-	-	1.2	89.4
	2003	3.6	24.3	100.0	94.9	13.6	-	-	1.3	84.6
	2004	5.7	19.9	100.0	95.1	12.9	-	-	1.3	94.9
	2005	3.0	22.8	100.0	94.8	13.4	1	0.1	0.9	91.4
	2006	2.3	22.8	100.0	95.2	12.9	-	-	0.5	93.9
	2007	1.5	23.5	100.0	95.2	14.3	-	-	2.4	100.0
	2008	2.1	20.9	100.0	95.1	11.4	1	0.1	1.5	100.0
	2009	2.5	20.5	100.0	95.3	11.1	1	0.1	1.0	93.8
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6

S T A T E	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	2000	396	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	432	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	386	67	51	47	53	57	-
	2003	413	57	67	51	53	54	-
	2004	412	46	56	60	54	47	-
	2005	404	50	41	57	50	55	-
	2006	394	52	52	43	56	48	-
	2007	412	60	49	54	60	56	-
	2008	414	54	59	49	45	59	-
	2009	538	57	57	56	54	46	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	781	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	807	44	47	55	59	53	62
	2002	739	67	51	47	53	57	60
	2003	770	57	67	51	53	54	61
	2004	757	46	56	60	54	47	59
	2005	732	50	41	57	50	55	47
	2006	706	52	52	43	56	48	49
	2007	724	60	49	54	60	56	51
	2008	721	54	59	49	45	59	54
	2009	747	57	57	56	54	46	47
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816

S T A T E	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	2000	47	16	38,163	72	28	19	13	-	-
	2001	49	15	38,964	74	26	19	13	-	-
	2002	49	15	41,030	76	24	17	13	-	4
	2003	51	14	41,227	77	23	17	12	-	-
	2004	51	14	43,697	71	29	17	11	-	-
	2005	49	15	46,467	72	28	18	11	-	-
	2006	47	15	48,567	68	32	18	11	-	-
	2007	47	15	51,776	52	48	18	11	-	-
	2008	48	14	53,475	44	56	17	11	-	-
2009	48	13	55,410	42	58	18	12	-	-	
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
--	------	---------	----	--------	----	----	----	----	---	---

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	61.9	82.0	75.0	79.0	84.0	87.3	-	-	80.7	85.7	86.6	90.7	58.2	71.7	66.6	77.4	78.8	84.4
White	62.5	82.6	80.4	79.3	82.7	86.3	-	-	83.4	86.9	88.0	90.0	59.2	70.9	65.2	76.0	77.6	85.4
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	50.0	-	-	-	-	60.0	-	-	60.0	-	30.0	10.0	54.6	-	-
Low Income	38.5	63.6	50.0	83.4	-	80.0	-	-	50.0	85.7	-	-	-	46.2	45.5	58.3	71.4	-

	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	-	-	85.2	88.6	96.1	91.5	-	-	73.5	84.0	88.1	92.7	84.5	85.4	90.0	82.1	89.4	85.1
White	-	-	83.0	88.1	95.9	92.8	-	-	74.5	81.6	87.5	92.1	84.1	84.6	91.1	83.3	88.3	84.1
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	70.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	66.6	90.0	90.0	71.4	-	-	60.0	58.3	-	-	-	73.3	69.2	-	63.6	92.3

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 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	83.3	88.0	98.1	93.0	98.0	100.0	-	-	88.5	96.0	92.6	96.3	72.7	79.6	84.4	88.7	94.1	96.6
White	82.5	89.1	100.0	92.4	97.8	100.0	-	-	87.6	95.8	94.1	96.0	74.1	81.6	83.8	90.0	93.7	98.1
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	75.1	-	-	-	-	60.0	-	-	80.0	-	40.0	30.0	63.6	-	-
Low Income	61.6	63.7	91.7	91.6	-	100.0	-	-	83.3	92.9	-	-	-	38.5	54.6	83.3	92.8	-

	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	-	-	88.9	93.2	96.1	96.6	-	-	88.7	92.9	95.2	94.5	63.0	81.8	94.0	91.1	93.0	91.4
White	-	-	89.3	95.2	97.9	96.4	-	-	88.2	91.9	95.0	94.1	61.3	82.7	95.5	92.6	94.2	93.2
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	80.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	66.6	80.0	90.0	92.9	-	-	80.0	75.0	-	-	40.0	60.0	84.6	-	72.7	84.7

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?*

Assessment data indicates that Princeville Grade School students are doing very well in their performance. Students are well above the average in mathematics, however, we do need to continue to evaluate our practices in how we are instructing children to solve short answer and extended response questions, particularly focusing on the explanation portion of the extended response answers. Focus will also be given in making sure students have a clear understanding of algebraic expressions and measurement appropriate for grade level.

In reading data analysis indicates that comprehension and vocabulary are areas of weakness for our students. Professional development addressing these components of reading has provided us with some growth in these areas. Utilizing research based systematic and sequential materials has also increased our performance level over time in these areas. Areas of strength include phonics and fluency and answering explicit questions when given multiple choices. Again, Princeville Grade School is performing well above the state average in general in reading.

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

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

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 data collected through benchmark assessment processes shows that at least 80% of the students are meeting national set standards. Another 15% are testing showing they are at some risk of developing reading difficulties. 5% of the Princeville Grade School students continue to be at risk and require intensive intervention and serves through the RtI process.

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

Contributing factors include a high percentage of teachers who are within the first five years of their teaching career. Providing professional development for these teachers is critically important to assure that they have the highest level of skills to meet the needs of students. Also contributing to the lower performance is 20% of our population come from homes that are economically disadvantaged. A higher percentage of our students fall in the some and at risk groups when they are in kindergarten or first grade so the instruction they are receiving in the early grades is closing the gap between our economic levels.

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

Next steps indicate professional development for a relatively young staff in the areas that our students show lower performance will have the largest impact in improving our performance.

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 population of Princeville Grade School has a low mobility rate that provides teachers and staff with the knowledge of the students and family over time. Small class sizes and use of instructional assistants provide for individualized multi-leveled instruction and intervention which enhances learning.

Many teachers are in the early stages of their careers (14 staff members having less than 5 years experience in the district, 11 with 5-10 years, 10 with 10-20 years, and 5 having more than 20 years). In addition, roughly 60% of certified staff holds a Master's Degree.

Special education and low income sub-groups perform below the regular education population in all areas. The major weaknesses in performance of these subgroups appear to be in the areas of reading. With a rise in the low-income percentage in the district, this significantly affects the general performance of the school. The majority of our special education students are also low income students. This means that the same students affect the subgroup scores of both populations.

Due to our lower percentage of low income students, Princeville Grade School is not eligible for many state and federal grant programs that would assist the school in strategically employing experts and coaches in critical academic areas. The small size of our school district limits the funding for targeted professional developmental and intervention programs.

Due to the space limitations, the Kindergarten and first grade students are housed in a building two blocks away which limits collaborative efforts between teachers. There is also no available space in the grades 2-8 building. We are at full capacity with no space for other small group work.

Factors:

The presence of a counselor and RtI specialist/Literacy coach contributed to the rise in ISAT scores and local data. A decrease in space provides no locations to isolate instruction. Because K-1 are housed at the high school, articulation of curriculum is lost between PreK and Kindergarten and 1st and 2nd grade staff.

Conclusions:

- Sharing resources cannot be done efficiently thereby increasing the number of programs needing purchased. We must investigate solutions for space issues and consider re-hiring a counselor and RtI specialist. Exploration of alternative funding options for materials and staff development is needed. Sharing resources cannot be done efficiently thereby increasing the number of programs needing purchased.

-

-
-
-
-
-

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

No adverse effects have been noted. Support staff has provided necessary leadership to train newer staff in research-based effective strategies.

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

Princeville school district must determine a way to continue to provide professional development and teacher mentoring for less experienced staff.

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?*

35% of the certified staff at Princeville has taught for less than 5 years while 13% have more than 20 years in the district. Professional development needs to be provided for the newer staff and needs to be focused on research based instruction strategies. Grade level partnerships must be created to allow continuity of instruction.

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

It has been necessary to provide in-house professional development for the teaching staff due to their limited experience. This extensive professional development has been provided through the employment of a literacy coach.

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

Princeville school district must determine a way to continue to provide professional development and teacher mentoring for less experienced staff.

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

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

Parent involvement is very strong in the Princeville Community. Our low-income parents, however participate less in their childrens' educational experience and in supporting learning at home. This impacts the performance of these students.

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

Most students have parents who express their values to their students, providing a home that is rich in experiences and carries high expectations of school performance. Most of the students in Princeville perform well on assessments. Those students who struggle tend to fit into one of the two subgroups present in the population, low-income and those students receiving services for special education needs.

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

We must continue to develop strategies to work with our low-income and special education students in order to increase their academic performance.

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?

Our students are doing very well in their performance on all standardized assessments. Princeville Grade School needs to continue to focus on explicit instruction of key learning concepts and provide professional development to support this type of teaching and learning.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Improve math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations but specifically economically disadvantaged and special education.	
2	Goal 2: Improve reading instruction by targeting specific reading objectives across all populations but specifically low income and special education.	

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Improve math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations but specifically economically disadvantaged and special education.

Objective 1 Description

Strategies and best practices will be utilized to provide explicit instruction in the area of math. Tier 1 math instruction will be evaluated 3 times a year, based on benchmark and ISAT assessment information.

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

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

Improve math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations but specifically economically disadvantaged and special education.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. Utilize AIMSWEB math applications and concepts for benchmark math assessment three times per year (September; January; May)	09/04/2009	05/27/2011	During School	Local Funds	3,000
2	2. Create opportunities for teachers to share math instructional materials across grade level	01/04/2010	01/04/2010	After School	Local Funds	0
3	3. Spiral math curriculum to assure students revisit key concepts frequently	09/01/2009	05/21/2010	During School	Local Funds	200
4	4. Practice math response problems weekly focusing on explanation using an answer T-chart including procedure, explanation, and answer, gradually releasing	09/07/2009	05/14/2010	During School	Local Funds	400
5	5. Use hands-on equations to assist in algebraic thinking and equation problem solving.	12/04/2009	05/07/2010	During School	Local Funds	400
6	6. Utilize skip counting practice to improve knowledge of addition/subtraction/multiplication/division	09/01/2009	05/20/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
7	7. Give timed fact tests daily appropriate to grade level to improve math fact recall.	09/08/2009	05/15/2009	During School	Local Funds	200

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

Improve math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations but specifically economically disadvantaged and special education.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. Seek professional development opportunities that provide information on instructional strategies for struggling students	08/27/2009	05/20/2010	During School	Local Funds	2,000
2	2. Explore hands-on materials and professional development for all grade levels	09/11/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	1,000
3	3. Utilize professional development opportunities for math concepts to be explored.	10/30/2009	05/04/2009	During School	Local Funds	1,000

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

Improve math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations but specifically economically disadvantaged and special education.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. Develop math night to create family excitement and opportunities to share teaching strategies with parents.	03/17/2010	03/17/2010	Before School	Local Funds	100
2	2. Include a family math activity in a newsletter to increase math interest.	01/29/2010	05/06/2011	Before School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Improve math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations but specifically economically disadvantaged and special education.

Measurement of growth will be shown in benchmark math assessments and ISAT. Lesson plans will reflect instructional strategies taught and fact tests are being given.

	Name	Title
1	Becky Michel	Principal
2	Sue Williams	Assistant Principal
3	Hilary Melick	K teacher
4	Catherine Carruthers	3rd grade teacher
5	Molly Cox	4th grade teacher
6	Scott Endress	migrant/spanish teacher
7	Patty Hawkins	special education teacher
8	Kim Friedman	6th grade teacher
9	Michael Davidson	technology teacher
10	Eric Givens	Science teacher

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Goal 2: Improve reading instruction by targeting specific reading objectives across all populations but specifically low income and special education.

Objective 2 Description

Strategies and best practices will be utilized to provide explicit instruction in the area of language arts and reading. Tier 1 language arts and reading instruction will be evaluated 3 times a year, based on benchmark and ISAT assessment information.

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

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

Goal 2: Improve reading instruction by targeting specific reading objectives across all populations but specifically low income and special education.

Strategies and Activities		TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. Benchmark Assessments utilizing DIBELS and AIMSWEB will be given to all students three times a year.	09/01/2009	05/20/2011	During School	Local Funds	3,000
2	2. Progress monitoring of all students not meeting benchmark will be done at least every two weeks.	09/01/2009	05/13/2011	During School	Local Funds	3,000
3	3. Low performing students will be assigned Tier 2 interventions at grade level meetings.	10/01/2009	05/13/2011	During School	Local Funds	2,000
4	4. Provide all readers with extensive instruction in comprehension strategies, using comprehensive tool kit, picture books and other appropriate texts to support learning.	09/01/2009	05/13/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
5	5. Use of graphic organizers to provide support in vocabulary instruction	09/01/2011	05/14/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
6	6. Provide reading intervention through targeted instruction using the Rtl process.	10/01/2009	05/20/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
7	7. Provide opportunities for independent reading for all students followed by comprehension and vocabulary activities appropriate to grade level. (concept maps; response journals; retelling graphic organizers; literature circles; teacher conferences)	09/01/2009	05/08/2009	During School	Local Funds	0
8	8. Utilize IL standards and frameworks to target specific reading expectations at appropriate grade level	09/01/2009	05/14/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
9	9. Utilize research based interventions (LIPS; Wilson; Heggarty Phonemic Awareness; SPIRE; routine cards (95% group); Benchmark	09/01/2009	05/20/2010	During School	Local Funds	1,000

	Phonics Bags; six minute solution)					
10	10. Utilize web based data management system to assist in data analysis.	09/04/2009	05/21/2010	During School	Local Funds	3,000
11	11. Implement explicit vocabulary instruction using graphic organizers and Bridges to Vocabulary.	09/01/2009	05/13/2011	During School	Local Funds	1,000
12	12. Continue grade level meetings to support collaboration in meeting curricular standards.	09/01/2009	05/21/2010	During School	Local Funds	10,000
13	13. Utilize books on tape to support student reading when appropriate.	09/01/2009	05/13/2011	During School	Local Funds	300

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

Goal 2: Improve reading instruction by targeting specific reading objectives across all populations but specifically low income and special education.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. Implement professional development in using technology effectively in all classrooms to support reading instruction.	03/05/2010	05/07/2010	During School	Local Funds	500
2	2. Explore professional development offerings that support reading instruction, with a focus on vocabulary	01/08/2010	05/07/2010	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Goal 2: Improve reading instruction by targeting specific reading objectives across all populations but specifically low income and special education.

		TimeLine			Budget	
Strategies and Activities		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. Create parent learning tools (handouts, website lists, etc.) to provide parent and community with needs and expectations of students.	03/12/2010		During School	Local Funds	300
2	2. Provide reading materials for students to read/work on at home.	01/08/2010	09/01/2010	After School	Local Funds	500

3	3. Utilize parent lending library, utilizing pre-k materials and purchasing additional K-8 materials.	01/08/2010	05/14/2010	During School	Local Funds	500
---	---	------------	------------	---------------	-------------	-----

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Goal 2: Improve reading instruction by targeting specific reading objectives across all populations but specifically low income and special education.

Measurement of growth will be shown in benchmark reading assessments and ISAT. Lesson plans will reflect instructional strategies are being utilized in the classroom.

	Name	Title
1	Becky Michel	Principal
2	Sue Williams	Assistant Principal
3	Hilary Melick	K teacher
4	Catherine Carruthers	3rd grade teacher
5	Molly Cox	4th grade teacher
6	Kim Friedman	6th grade teacher
7	Scott Endress	Migrant teacher
8	Patty Hawkins	special education teacher
9	Michael Davidson	technology teacher
10	Eric Givens	Science 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.*)

Published on website and in local newspapers as well as through state of the school meeting held in September annually.

**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.

Gayle Brackett, Mike Davidson, Eric Givens and Deb Givens are parents in the district who consult independently on the plan. ELPAC, which is a parent consulting group also meets annually to review the school improvement plan.

	Name	Title
1	Eric Givens	parent/teacher
2	Sue Williams	ELPAC/teacher/parent
3	Kelly Justkiv	parent/EPAC
4	Julie Day	Parent/ELPAC
5	Nate Rice	ELPAC/parent
6	Summer Rice/parent	ELPAC/ parent

7	
8	
9	

**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.

Currently not mandated.

**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.

Princeville Grade School pairs veteran teachers with new teachers and provides on-going professional development for teachers.

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.

Data analysis is done by faculty and staff members with the assistance of the district administrative team.

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).

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

Not applicable.

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]

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No

Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]

MONITORING

Yes No

Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]

Yes 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

Yes No 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

Yes No

Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]

Yes 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