

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number	480723260262004		
District Name	PRINCEVILLE CUSD 326	School Name	PRINCEVILLE ELEM SCHOOL
Superintendent	JAMES A. COLYOTT	Principal	BECKY MICHEL
District Address	302 CORDIS AVE	School Address	602 N TOWN AVE
City/State/Zip	PRINCEVILLE,IL,61559	City/State/Zip	PRINCEVILLE,IL,61559
District Telephone#	3093852213 Extn:1949	School Telephone#	3093854994 Extn:0
District Email	jcolyott@princeville326.org	School Email	bmichel@princeville326.org

Is this plan for a Title I School?

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2008 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	Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes
2007-08 Federal Improvement Status		2007-08 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		62.5			62.5			90.0		75.0	
All	99.7	Yes	99.7	Yes	88.5		Yes	94.4		Yes	95.2	Yes		
White	99.7	Yes	99.7	Yes	88.0		Yes	95.1		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	66.7		Yes							
Economically Disadvantaged	98.4	Yes	98.4	Yes	82.0		Yes	88.2		Yes				

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress	
<p>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.</p> <p>2. At least 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. ***</p> <p>3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.</p> <p>4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 75% graduation rate for high schools.</p>	<p>*** Safe Harbor Subgroups with fewer than 45 students are not reported. Safe harbor only applies to subgroups 45 or more. Another way to make AYP is through the 'safe harbor' calculation, which applies to student subgroups only. A school has made 'safe harbor' if for any subgroup it can reduce the performance gap (the difference between the percentage meets & exceeds from the prior year and 100%) by 10%. For example, what does a school achieving 20% meets & exceeds for a subgroup last year need to achieve this year in order to make safe harbor? Step ONE: $(100 - 20) = 80\%$ (performance gap) Step TWO: $(10\% * 80) = 8\%$ Step THREE: $20\% + 8\% = 28\%$ Safe Harbor Target = 28% In this case, a school that makes at least 28% meets & exceeds is making AYP under 'safe harbor' even if it did not achieve the mandated 47.5%. 'Safe harbor', in other words, gives credit for improvement.</p>
<p>* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2007.</p> <p>** Safe Harbor Targets of 62.5% or above are not printed.</p> <p>*** 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.</p>	

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2008 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								
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Attendance Rate (%)	96.5	96.5	95.6	95.9	95.5	96.1	96.0	95.2
Truancy Rate (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.3
Mobility Rate (%)	20.2	18.2	16.4	16.1	15.9	13.6	15.7	10.9
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
School Population (#)	432	386	413	412	404	394	412	414
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	20.4	19.9	28.6	26.2	24.8	24.6	23.3	20.5
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	8.1	5.2	3.1	6.3	4.0	1.3	1.7	2.4
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	86.6	89.4	87.4	86.7	88.9	89.1	88.6	90.6
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.7	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.2
Hispanic (%)	11.8	10.6	11.9	12.1	7.4	7.1	9.0	7.0
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.9	0.0	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	3.5	3.3	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/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
S C H O O L	1999	92.4	0.3	7.1	0.3	0.0	-
	2000	90.7	0.8	8.6	0.0	0.0	-
	2001	86.6	0.7	11.8	0.9	0.0	-
	2002	89.4	0.0	10.6	0.0	0.0	-
	2003	87.4	0.0	11.9	0.7	0.0	-
	2004	86.7	1.0	12.1	0.2	0.0	-
	2005	88.9	0.0	7.4	0.2	0.0	3.5
	2006	89.1	0.3	7.1	0.0	0.3	3.3
	2007	88.6	0.2	9.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
	2008	90.6	0.2	7.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
D I S T R I C T	1999	91.3	0.3	8.2	0.3	0.0	-
	2000	89.5	0.4	9.9	0.3	0.0	-
	2001	87.2	0.6	11.4	0.7	0.0	-
	2002	90.5	0.3	9.1	0.1	0.0	-
	2003	88.4	0.6	10.1	0.6	0.1	-
	2004	87.8	1.1	10.8	0.3	0.0	-
	2005	90.7	0.3	6.6	0.5	0.0	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

	Year	White(%)	Black(%)	Hispanic(%)	Asian/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
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	

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 Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
S C H O O L	1999	6.6	15.9	100.0	96.5	18.7	2	0.5	-	-
	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	0.0	0.0	-	-
	2002	5.2	19.9	100.0	96.5	18.2	0.0	0.0	-	-
	2003	3.1	28.6	100.0	95.6	16.4	0.0	0.0	-	-
	2004	6.3	26.2	100.0	95.9	16.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2005	4.0	24.8	100.0	95.5	15.9	1	0.3	0.0	0.0
	2006	1.3	24.6	100.0	96.1	13.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2007	1.7	23.3	100.0	96.0	15.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2008	2.4	20.5	100.0	95.2	10.9	1	0.3	0.0	0.0
D I S T R I C T	1999	5.8	13.9	100.0	95.9	18.6	2	0.3	1.2	86.2
	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	0.0	0.0	2.6	91.5
	2002	5.1	17.6	100.0	95.9	15.9	0.0	0.0	1.2	89.4
	2003	3.6	24.3	100.0	94.9	13.6	0.0	0.0	1.3	84.6
	2004	5.7	19.9	100.0	95.1	12.9	0.0	0.0	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	0.0	0.0	0.5	93.9
	2007	1.5	23.5	100.0	95.2	14.3	0.0	0.0	2.4	100.0
	2008	2.1	20.9	100.0	95.1	11.4	1	0.1	1.5	100.0
S	1999	6.4	36.1	96.1	93.6	18.1	43332	2.3	5.9	81.9
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39225	2.0	5.1	85.2

Princeville Elem School

School Improvement Plan 2008

	Year	LEP(%)	Low Income(%)	Parental Involvement(%)	Attendance(%)	Mobility(%)	Chronic Truants(N)	Chronic Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
T A T E	2003	6.3	37.9	95.9	94.0	16.4	37525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40764	2.1	4.6	86.5
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49858	2.5	4.1	86.5

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	396	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	1999	760	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
S T	1999	1962026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1983991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2007170	164791	161546	162001	151270	148194	123816
	2002	2029821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2044539	-	-	-	-	-	-

Princeville Elem School

School Improvement Plan 2008

	Year	School(N)	Grade 3(N)	Grade 4(N)	Grade 5(N)	Grade 7(N)	Grade 8(N)	Grade 11(N)
A T E	2004	2060048	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	2062912	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	2075277	136123	139619	146935	153566	154856	-
	2007	2077856	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	2074167	-	-	-	-	-	-

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, Staff Capacity and Professional Development**

	Year	Total Teacher FTE(N)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary(\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree(%)	Teachers with Master's Degree(%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials(%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers(%)
D I S T R I C T	1999	45	16	38732	70	30	20	13	-	-
	2000	47	16	38163	72	28	19	13	-	-
	2001	49	15	38964	74	26	19	13	-	-
	2002	49	15	41030	76	24	17	13	0.0	4
	2003	51	14	41227	77	23	17	12	0.0	0.0
	2004	51	14	43697	71	29	17	11	0.0	0.0
	2005	49	15	46467	72	28	18	11	0.0	0.0
	2006	47	15	48567	68	32	18	11	0.0	0.0
	2007	47	15	51776	52	48	18	11	0.0	0.0
	2008	48	14	53475	44	56	17	11	0.0	0.0
S T A T E	1999	119718	15	45337	53	47	20	18	-	-
	2000	122671	15	45766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125735	15	47929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126544	14	49702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129068	14	51672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125702	14	54446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128079	14	55558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127010	13	56685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127010	13	58275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131488	12	60871	47	53	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, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	79.6	61.9	82.0	75.0	79.0	84.0	-	-	-	80.7	85.7	86.6	74.5	58.2	71.7	66.6	77.4	78.8
White	78.7	62.5	82.6	80.4	79.3	82.7	-	-	-	83.4	86.9	88.0	74.4	59.2	70.9	65.2	76.0	77.6
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	50.0	-	-	-	-	60.0	-	-	-	-	30.0	10.0	54.6	-
Economically Disadvantaged	45.5	38.5	63.6	50.0	83.4	-	-	-	-	50.0	85.7	-	-	-	46.2	45.5	58.3	71.4
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	85.2	88.6	96.1	-	-	-	73.5	84.0	88.1	64.0	84.5	85.4	90.0	82.1	89.4
White	-	-	-	83.0	88.1	95.9	-	-	-	74.5	81.6	87.5	63.3	84.1	84.6	91.1	83.3	88.3
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Princeville Elem School

School Improvement Plan 2008

11/25/2008 2:59:45 PM

Page 14 of 35

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	70.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	66.6	90.0	90.0	-	-	-	60.0	58.3	-	54.5	-	73.3	69.2	-	63.6

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	93.9	83.3	88.0	98.1	93.0	98.0	-	-	-	88.5	96.0	92.6	80.9	72.7	79.6	84.4	88.7	94.1
White	93.6	82.5	89.1	100.0	92.4	97.8	-	-	-	87.6	95.8	94.1	79.1	74.1	81.6	83.8	90.0	93.7
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	75.1	-	-	-	-	60.0	-	-	-	-	40.0	30.0	63.6	-
Economically Disadvantaged	81.8	61.6	63.7	91.7	91.6	-	-	-	-	83.3	92.9	-	-	-	38.5	54.6	83.3	92.8
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	88.9	93.2	96.1	-	-	-	88.7	92.9	95.2	52.0	63.0	81.8	94.0	91.1	93.0
White	-	-	-	89.3	95.2	97.9	-	-	-	88.2	91.9	95.0	51.0	61.3	82.7	95.5	92.6	94.2
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Princeville Elem School

School Improvement Plan 2008

11/25/2008 2:59:45 PM

Page 16 of 35

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	80.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	66.6	80.0	90.0	-	-	-	80.0	75.0	-	18.2	40.0	60.0	84.6	-	72.7

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?*

ISAT Reading

Strengths

1. Vocabulary Development 5-8
2. Comprehension 5-8

Weakness

1. Literary Elements
2. Extended Response
3. Reading Strategies

ISAT Math

Strengths

1. Algebra 4-6
2. Short Response 4-6
3. Extended Response 4-6
4. Algebra 7-8
5. Geometry 7-8
6. Number Sense
7. Above State Level

Weakness

1. Measurement
2. Number Sense
3. Probability
4. Math Explanations
5. Short extend response
6. Geometry 3rd
7. Algebra 3rd

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

1. Can do better b/c dictated responses for extended responses
2. Number of questions under reading strategies only 4

3. Insufficient training for teachers on extended response
4. More exposure to literary elements
5. Background knowledge
6. Explicit comprehension instruction
7. Literacy Coach
8. Extra curricular activities and tutoring hinder attendance to meetings
9. Training and Awareness about comprehension Tools
10. Don't know most important pieces (mile wide inch deep)

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

1. There is a need for Professional Development in all weakness areas.
2. The areas where we have had Professional Development have been our strength areas.
3. Literacy coach has been a strength, because of the individual training given to each teacher.
4. The way that the tests were graded. We had to regrade?
5. Need more feedback on the the test scoring of there responses. It would be helpful to compare the test, go over answers and data, and use as a learning experience.
6. More support from Regional Area, actually coming to PGS. Currently we have to go to them. Then they restrict to only 3 teachers at a time.

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

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

1. AimsWeb
2. DIBELS

Local Data Reading
Stengths

1. Phonics Awareness
2. Word Usage

Local Data Math

Test is given to early to tell.

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

1. Can do better b/c dictated response for extended responses
2. Number of questions under reading strategies only 4
3. Insufficient training for teacher on extended response
4. More exposure to literary elements
5. Background knowledge
6. Explicit comprehension instruction
7. Literacy Coach
8. Extra curricular activities and tutoring hinder attendance to meetings
9. Training and Awareness about comprehension Tools
10. Don't know most important pieces (mile wide inch deep)

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

1. Need phonological screener to pin point the exact place of a student on the continuum
2. There is a need for a screening for phonics to know the exact skill in the phonic continuum

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

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

Princeville Grade School serves a population which has a low mobility rate which provides teachers with knowledge of the students and families over time. Small class sizes and the use of instructional assistants provides for individualized multi-leveled instruction. Princeville Grade School has a stable teaching population, however many teachers are in the early years of their career due to recent retirements of core staff.

Special Education and low-income sub-groups perform below the regular education population in all areas. The major weaknesses in performance of these sub-groups 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.

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 development.

Due to space limitations the Kindergarten and 1st grade students are housed in a building 2 blocks away which limits collaborative efforts between teachers.

The majority of our special education students are also low income students. This means that the same students effect the subgroup scores of both populations.

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

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

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)
Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

Section I-D - Key Factors – From the preceding screens (I-A, I-B, I-C-1, 2, 3) 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?

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Expanding reading instruction in order to improve performance in all students K-8.	
2	Improving math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations.	
3	Improving math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations.	

The following deficiencies [not objectives] have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for your school.

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective: 1

Expanding reading instruction in order to improve performance in all students K-8.

Objective 1 Description:

Utilize data to provide small group and individual instruction utilizing all available personell to support reading blocks. Using web based technology programs appropriate for individual students will provide extended learning opportunities. Parents will receive instruction on how to support their readers.

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

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 1 Title : Expanding reading instruction in order to improve performance in all students K-8.						
	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
1	Provide all readers with extensive instruction using comprehension strategies: Retelling Metacognition Connections Questioning Visualizing Determining Importance Inferences Summarizing Synthesizing Sequencing Think alouds	8/1/2007	5/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	
2	Provide reading intervention through targeted tutoring.	9/1/2007	5/1/2009	After School	Local Funds	
3	Immerse students in one comprehension strategy a month, developing appropriate activities across grade level and curricular areas.	9/1/2007	5/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	
4	Use of graphic organizers to assist learning when reading a variety of fiction and non-fiction texts.	9/1/2007	5/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	
5	Purchase phonological and phonics screens.	11/1/2008		During School	Local Funds	6
6	Assess Implimentation of the tech standards.	1/1/2009		During School	Local Funds	
7	Students read daily at their indepentdent level and follow up with comprehension activities such as: Accelerated Reader; Response Journals; Retelling; Conferenceing with teacher; Graphic Organizers	9/1/2007	5/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	
8	Articulate specific learning targets for reading instruction at each grade level.	9/1/2007	5/1/2009	Before School	Title V	
9	Utilize LIPS, Wilson, Heggerty Phonemic Awareness, and S.P.I.R.E for intervention with severely at risk students. ONGOING			During School	Local Funds	
10	Utilize technology across curriculum to support reading skills and comprehension of fiction and non-fiction.	1/1/2008	5/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	
11	Increasing the early use of appropriate software related to reading instruction. ONGOING			During School	Other	
12	Purchase a web based data collection service with links to reading intervention strategies.	9/1/2007		During School	Local Funds	
13	Develop and use rubrics and checklists to provide clear expectations to students across curricular areas.	1/1/2008	5/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	
14	Set clear learning targets in reading based on state standards that are shared on a daily basis with students.	5/1/2008		During School	Local Funds	
15	Investigate and implement oral reading benchmark instruments across K-8.	5/1/2008	11/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	
16	Computer based Intervention Plan 4-8.			During School	Local Funds	
17	Focus on at least one comprehension strategy a month and require professional development on reading instruction around monthly strategies.	9/1/2007	5/1/2009	Before School	Local Funds	1000
18	Bi-monthly grade level meetings to increase effective reading methods.	9/1/2007	5/1/2009	During School	Title I	3000
19	Implement professional development in using technology effectively in Early Learning Classrooms.	1/1/2008	5/1/2009	Before School	Local Funds	1000
20	Utilize the addition of books on tape for students with specific needs.	1/1/2008	5/1/2009	During School	Other	
21	Utilize DIBELS to identify students weaknesses in early reading skills.	9/1/2007	5/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title : Expanding reading instruction in order to improve performance in all students K-8.						
	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
1	Focus on at least one comprehension strategy a month and require professional development on reading instruction around monthly strategies.	9/1/2007	5/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	1000
2	Bi-monthly grade level meetings to increase effective reading methods.	9/1/2007	5/1/2009	During School	Title I	3000
3	Implement professional development in using technology effectively in Early Learning Classrooms.	1/1/2008	5/1/2009	Before School	Local Funds	1000
4	Professional development focus on phonics and phonemic awareness.	11/1/2008	5/1/2009	Before School	Title I	3000

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

Objective 1 Title : Expanding reading instruction in order to improve performance in all students K-8.						
	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
1	Create parent learning tools (instructional videos, handouts, website lists, ect.) to provide parent and community with needs and expectations of students.	1/1/2009	5/1/2009	After School	Local Funds	200
2	Hold parent nights to share ISAT materials and expectations.	1/1/2009		After School	Local Funds	0
3	Develop parent lending library, utilizing pre-k materials and purchasing additional K-8 materials.	5/1/2008	11/1/2009	After School	Local Funds	500

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title : Expanding reading instruction in order to improve performance in all students K-8.
Monitoring - Describe the process and measures of success for the identified objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

Progress will be monitored during faculty meetings in January, and May. Adjustments in action plan will be made in September, using new ISAT data to assist staff in decisions regarding instruction.

Monitoring Persons - List the individuals and designate the role of each person(e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

Name	Title
Becky Michel	Principal
Tracy Strebel	Literacy Coach

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective: 2

Improving math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations.

Objective 2 Description:

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

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 2 Title : Improving math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations.

	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
1	Evaluate and adopt a research based math text book grades K-8.	12/1/2007	9/1/2008	During School	Other	
2	Vary instructions to meet the diverse intelligence and learning styles of students.	9/1/2007	5/1/2009	Before School	Local Funds	
3	Create opportunities for teachers to share math instructional materials across grade levels.	1/1/2008	5/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	
4	Create a math committee to evaluate math instruction across grade levels.	12/1/2008	5/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	
5	Link current math instruction to Illinois State Standards.	9/1/2008	12/1/2008	During School	Other	
6	Use technology software to enhance math skills.	1/1/2008	5/1/2009	During School	Other	
7	Utilize computer lab to facilitate math practice by scheduling classroom computer time.	9/1/2007	5/1/2009	During School	Other	
8	Develop short cycle assessments quarterly.	1/1/2008	5/1/2009	During School	Other	

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

Objective 2 Title : Improving math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations.						
	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
1	Distribute the framework for assessment at the beginning of each school year.	9/1/2008		During School	Local Funds	50
2	Create a checklist of expectations for grade level meetings.	1/1/2008		Summer School	Local Funds	0
3	At monthly grade level meetings review low scoring objectives in math.	8/1/2008	5/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	0
4	Develop math book discussion group.	9/1/2008	5/1/2009	After School	Local Funds	500
5	Provide mini workshops on math websites usable for student practice.	9/1/2008		After School	Local Funds	0
6	Provide opportunities to increase teacher knowledge of differentiated instruction appropriate for students with multiple learning styles.	9/1/2007	5/1/2009	Before School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title : Improving math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations.						
	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
1	Develop math night to create family excitement centered around math.	3/1/2008		Before School	Local Funds	200
2	Create parent learning tools (instructional videos, handouts, ect.) to provide parents with tools to assist parents in helping students.	9/1/2008	5/1/2009	After School	Local Funds	200
3	Include a family math activity in a newsletter to increase math interest.	9/1/2008	5/1/2009	Before School	Other	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title : Improving math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations.
Monitoring - Describe the process and measures of success for the identified objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

Progress will be monitored during faculty meetings in January, and May. Adjustments in action plan will be made in September, using new ISAT data to assist staff in decisions regarding instruction.

Monitoring Persons - List the individuals and designate the role of each person(e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

Name	Title
Becky Michel	Principal
Jodee Bauman	Teacher
Kim Friedman	Teacher

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective: 3

Improving math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations.

Objective 3 Description:

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

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 3 Title : Improving math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations.

	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
1	Evaluate and adopt a research based math text book grades K-8.	12/1/2007	9/1/2008	During School	Other	
2	Vary instructions to meet the diverse intelligence and learning styles of students.	9/1/2007	5/1/2009	Before School	Local Funds	
3	Create opportunities for teachers to share math instructional materials across grade levels.	1/1/2008	5/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	
4	Create a math committee to evaluate math instruction across grade levels.	12/1/2008	5/1/2009	During School	Other	
5	Link current math instruction to Illinois State Standards.	9/1/2008	12/1/2008	During School	Other	
6	Use technology software to enhance math skills.	1/1/2008	5/1/2009	During School	Other	
7	Utilize computer lab to facilitate math practice by scheduling classroom computer time.	9/1/2007	5/1/2009	During School	Other	
8	Develop short cycle assessments quarterly.	1/1/2008	5/1/2009	During School	Other	

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

Objective 3 Title : Improving math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations.

	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
--	---------------------------	-----------	---------	----------	-------------	--------

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

Objective 3 Title : Improving math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations.

	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
--	---------------------------	-----------	---------	----------	-------------	--------

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 3 Title : Improving math instruction by targeting specific math objectives across all populations.

Monitoring - Describe the process and measures of success for the identified objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

Monitoring Persons - List the individuals and designate the role of each person(e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

Name	Title
------	-------

**Section III - Plan 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.)

The school notifies parents of the status of the school at the State of the Schools Meeting in September. Parents are notified of the AYP status of the school at

parent teacher conferences where parents are given their students ISAT results. This material is presented by teachers when necessary and questions are answered during this process.

The School Report Card is posted online for parents to review. A process of email notification is being developed at the school and district level.

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

Stakeholder Involvement - Describe specifically how stakeholders (including parents, school staff, and outside exerts) 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.

Names and titles of school improvement team or plan developers:

	Name	Title
1	Charlene Wagner	Parent/Teacher
2	Tracy Strebel	Literacy Coach
3	Cheryl Harmison	Special Education Teacher
4	Kristen Duckworth	Teacher
5	Hilary Melick	Kindergarten
6	Melanie Cox-Lagerstrom	Special Services Coordinator
7	Eric Givens	Parent/Teacher
8	Molly Cox	Teacher
9	Scott Endress	Migrant Coordinator/Teacher
10	Jeannie Jones	Counselor
11	Becky Michel	PGS Princeipal
12		

Section III - Plan 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. Peer review and subsequent local board approval 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>.

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

The school improvement plan is reviewed by all staff upon its completion. The school board reviews, following staff approval accepting it at the time of review

Section III - Plan 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 provides grade level support to new teachers. Periodic meetings with the principal also occur.

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

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

The district provides support financially to the school in order to assist the school in meeting the goals.

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).

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.

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

State Responsibilities – List the names and identify the roles (e.g., distinguished educator, district curriculum coordinator, university partner, or RESPRO consultant) of the School Support Team. If applicable, School Support Teams are assigned to schools in corrective action to provide sustained and intensive support for those schools to make adequate yearly progress. Note: School Support Teams are not the same as school improvement teams or the school planning team. Schools I academic watch, restructuring, or restructuring implementation status should have School Support Teams. Some schools in Choice, SES, or academic early warning status also have School Support Teams.

	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

- Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified?
- Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness?
- Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students?
- Does the analysis, along with other optional data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

- If included, is there evidence that the SIP team analyzed optional data to clarify the areas of weakness?
- Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?
- Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

- If included, has the SIP team analyzed other available data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities?
- Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?
- Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

- Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance?
- Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control?

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

- Has the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan?
- Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency?

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

- Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?
- Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement?
- Are the strategies and activities measurable?
- Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified?
- Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear?

	Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students?
	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?
	Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities? for students?
	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?
MONITORING	
	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?
	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION	
	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)
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT	
	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?
	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?
PEER REVIEW	
	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?
TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS	
	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?
DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES	
	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?
	If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school?
STATE RESPONSIBILITIES	

	Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation?
SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM	
	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?
APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD	
	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.

PART II - COMMENTS