

Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	10/19/2009
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	200933480262005		
District Name:	Wabash CUSD 348	School Name:	North Intermediate Ctr of Educ
Superintendent:	Tim Buss	Principal:	Mike Hays
District Address:	218 W 13th St	School Address:	1300 N Walnut St
City/State/Zip:	Mount Carmel,IL 62863 1243	City/State/Zip:	Mount Carmel,IL 62863 1257
District Telephone#:	Label 6182624181 Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	6182633876 Extn: 0
District Email:	tbuss@accessus.net	School Email:	mhays@nice.wabash.k12.il.us
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			

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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status Choice SES	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2009-10 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning Year 2

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	74.4		Yes	85.8		Yes	95.7			
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	74.5		Yes	85.5		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	38.2	45.4	No	55.9	No	94.2			
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	61.7	63.4	Yes	76.6	Yes	94.6			

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:	Focused
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in reading?	Yes
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in math?	Yes

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 (%)	94.7	95.1	95.7	95.1	95.4	95.1	95.0	95.7
Truancy Rate (%)	4.0	0.5	-	-	-	-	0.3	0.3
Mobility Rate (%)	11.2	18.8	9.3	9.5	10.6	6.8	9.2	6.4
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	460	469	477	473	464	449	469	442
Low Income (%)	27.8	36.7	39.4	38.7	40.5	45.0	40.7	47.5
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	-	-	0.4	-	-	-	0.2	-
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	97.2	96.4	96.0	94.9	95.3	95.8	95.1	95.0
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	1.5	1.7	1.5	-	-	0.2	0.2	0.2
Hispanic (%)	-	0.4	1.5	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.4	1.1
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	1.3	1.3	1.0	0.8	0.9	0.2	0.2	0.5
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	0.2	-	-	0.2	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	3.6	3.2	3.6	4.1	3.2

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	2002	97.2	1.5	-	1.3	-	-
	2003	96.4	1.7	0.4	1.3	0.2	-
	2004	96.0	1.5	1.5	1.0	-	-
	2005	94.9	-	0.6	0.8	-	3.6
	2006	95.3	-	0.4	0.9	0.2	3.2
	2007	95.8	0.2	0.2	0.2	-	3.6
	2008	95.1	0.2	0.4	0.2	-	4.1
	2009	95.0	0.2	1.1	0.5	-	3.2
D I S T R I C T	1999	98.8	0.5	0.1	0.5	-	-
	2000	99.0	0.5	0.1	0.2	0.1	-
	2001	99.1	0.4	0.1	0.3	-	-
	2002	98.5	0.8	0.2	0.5	0.2	-
	2003	98.2	0.8	0.3	0.6	0.1	-
	2004	97.8	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.2	-
	2005	96.3	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.2	1.9
	2006	95.9	0.2	0.6	0.5	0.2	2.6
	2007	95.9	0.2	0.7	0.4	0.2	2.6
	2008	95.7	0.2	0.9	0.3	0.3	2.6
	2009	95.9	0.2	1.0	0.6	0.2	2.1
	1999	62.0	20.8	13.9	3.2	0.2	-
	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	2002	-	27.8	100.0	94.7	11.2	15	4.0	-	-
	2003	-	36.7	100.0	95.1	18.8	2	0.5	-	-
	2004	0.4	39.4	100.0	95.7	9.3	-	-	-	-
	2005	-	38.7	100.0	95.1	9.5	-	-	-	-
	2006	-	40.5	100.0	95.4	10.6	-	-	-	-
	2007	-	45.0	100.0	95.1	6.8	-	-	-	-
	2008	0.2	40.7	100.0	95.0	9.2	1	0.3	-	-
	2009	-	47.5	100.0	95.7	6.4	1	0.3	-	-
D I S T R I C T	1999	-	32.7	86.3	95.3	9.6	34	1.7	5.0	81.5
	2000	-	29.8	97.1	95.7	12.6	25	1.3	4.2	84.5
	2001	-	33.3	96.5	95.3	13.3	17	0.9	5.2	87.6
	2002	-	33.2	97.5	95.0	7.0	38	2.1	6.5	78.0
	2003	-	34.9	98.4	94.6	14.5	23	1.3	3.7	89.1
	2004	0.1	27.8	98.7	94.6	8.4	97	5.5	5.2	80.7
	2005	0.1	28.9	99.5	94.3	15.9	47	2.7	4.1	86.1
	2006	-	29.7	99.6	94.3	14.6	77	4.4	3.3	88.4
	2007	-	35.2	99.7	93.9	12.2	93	5.4	3.1	97.8
	2008	0.1	33.3	99.5	93.8	13.0	93	5.4	3.9	89.3
	2009	0.1	35.0	96.8	94.1	10.6	87	5.2	5.6	85.3
	1999	6.4	36.1	96.1	93.6	18.1	43,332	2.3	5.9	81.9
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6

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	2002	460	127	114	136	-	-	-
	2003	469	106	140	126	-	-	-
	2004	477	133	113	134	-	-	-
	2005	473	123	136	115	-	-	-
	2006	464	117	117	135	-	-	-
	2007	449	113	117	120	-	-	-
	2008	469	127	119	125	-	-	-
	2009	442	110	121	112	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	1999	2,081	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	2,042	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,008	132	127	145	150	133	176
	2002	1,983	143	128	136	129	155	176
	2003	1,901	106	140	126	155	126	145
	2004	1,884	133	113	134	141	159	156
	2005	1,868	123	136	115	132	139	152
	2006	1,873	117	117	135	150	126	148
	2007	1,837	113	117	120	117	143	163
	2008	1,852	127	119	125	137	116	166
	2009	1,802	110	121	112	129	138	145
	1999	1,962,026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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	1999	129	17	35,971	64	36	18	18	-	-
	2000	132	17	36,800	64	36	17	17	-	-
	2001	131	17	37,419	61	39	17	16	-	-
	2002	132	16	37,370	65	35	17	16	2	1
	2003	130	17	38,603	66	34	17	15	-	-
	2004	119	18	40,158	66	34	19	18	-	2
	2005	117	15	38,548	68	32	18	18	3	1
	2006	112	15	41,033	66	34	19	19	3	-
	2007	113	15	36,987	68	32	18	19	3	1
	2008	111	14	42,855	71	29	18	20	-	1
2009	115	14	43,152	69	31	17	18	-	-	
S T A T E	1999	119,718	15	45,337	53	47	20	18	-	-
	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	14	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	2	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1

	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1
	2009	133,017	12	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	59.5	72.9	69.3	78.1	76.5	74.0	-	-	77.6	58.0	75.0	76.2	71.2	78.9	68.2	70.5	73.3	73.3
White	59.0	72.8	70.0	77.8	76.3	75.8	-	-	78.3	60.8	73.8	76.1	69.9	80.4	67.7	70.2	73.5	72.9
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	44.8	43.3	47.0	48.6	47.1	52.7	-	-	30.0	35.5	21.7	38.4	40.9	33.4	20.9	12.5	46.1	27.2
Low Income	56.6	62.8	53.1	64.7	59.6	68.1	-	-	69.5	43.3	56.3	61.5	60.0	65.2	57.4	62.7	62.0	56.3

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	84.8	83.9	92.1	92.1	90.2	93.5	-	-	88.1	89.9	81.9	85.2	77.6	78.1	80.0	79.8	81.5	77.7
White	84.3	84.3	92.8	91.7	90.7	94.2	-	-	87.6	89.3	82.0	84.6	76.5	79.5	80.0	78.9	80.3	77.6
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	86.2	60.0	91.2	78.4	82.3	73.7	-	-	54.5	80.7	47.8	69.2	52.2	38.9	45.9	18.8	69.2	27.3
Low Income	79.7	76.5	89.7	84.3	86.5	91.5	-	-	77.1	84.9	68.8	75.0	64.9	67.3	77.0	70.6	70.0	60.4

	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

Refer to approved 2-year SIP, Plus:

NOTE - The following is updated information for an already approved 2-Year School Improvement Plan (2008-2009 & 2009-2010) in response to adaptations of needs following review of 2009 School Report Card.

N.I.C.E. 2009 Illinois School Report Card indicates that ALL NICE Students, when calculated as ALL, are performing at or above the Illinois averages for AYP Meets/Exceeds for 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students in Reading and Math.

Overall Performance - All Grades All Students

06-07	NICE	78.1%	State	73.8%
07-08		79.8%		74.8%
08-09		80.2%		75.5%

NOTE - A goal is to always be at or higher than the State average.

<u>All 3rd Grade</u>	Reading	06-07	NICE	78.1%	State	73.0%	
				07-08		76.4%	71.7%
				08-09		74.1%	72.2%
	Math	06-07	NICE	92.1%	State	86.8%	
			07-08		90.2%	85.1%	
			08-09		93.5%	85.2%	

These performance scores for ALL 3rd Grade Students at NICE indicate that overall 3rd Grade is meeting/exceeding at or higher than the State average in Reading and

Math. However, it also indicates in the area of Reading performance is below the AYP Minimum Target of 77.5% needed to make AYP for the 2010 school year. It is also interesting to note that the State average of 72.2% is below the AYP 2010 Minimum Target of 77.5%.

3rd Grade Sub-Groups in Reading and Math

Gender: Male	Reading	06-07	NICE	77.9%	State	68.7%	Math	06-07	NICE	92.6%	State	86.3%	
		07-08				76.3%		07-08			93.3%	84.6%	
		08-09				62.8%		08-09			90.2%	85.0%	
	Female	Reading	06-07	NICE	78.3%	State	77.4%	Math	06-07	NICE	91.3%	State	87.3%
			07-08			76.6%		07-08			87.5%	85.4%	
			08-09			84.2%		08-09			96.4%	85.4%	
Racial/Ethnic:													
White	Reading	06-07	NICE	77.8%	State	82.4%	Math	06-07	NICE	91.7%	State	93.9%	
		07-08				76.3%		07-08			90.7%	93.6%	
		08-09				75.8%		08-09			94.2%	93.3%	
Students with Disabilities:													
With IEP	Reading	06-07	NICE	48.6%	State	42.9%	Math	06-07	NICE	78.4%	State	70.0%	
		07-08				47.1%		07-08			82.3%	67.8%	
		08-09				52.7%		08-09			73.7%	66.2%	
	Non-IEP	Reading	06-07	NICE	92.2%	State	77.9%	Math	06-07	NICE	98.7%	State	89.5%
			07-08			87.7%		07-08			93.2%	87.7%	
			08-09			78.6%		08-09			97.7%	88.0%	
Economically Disadvantaged:													
Free/Reduced	Reading	06-07	NICE	64.7%	State	57.2%	Math	06-07	NICE	84.3%	State	76.2%	
		07-08				59.6%		07-08			84.5%	75.2%	
		08-09				68.1%		08-09			86.5%	76.0%	

Not Eligible	Reading	06-07	NICE	88.9%	State	84.4%	Math	06-07	NICE	98.4%	State	94.4%
		07-08		88.7%		84.9%		07-08		93.0%		94.0%
		08-09		78.7%		85.8%		08-09		95.1%		94.0%

NOTE:

* 3rd Grade has a lot of successes as indicated by their 2009 ISAT performance. The 3rd Grade is at or above the State averages when considering all 3rd Grade students and most Sub-Groups.

* Students with Disabilities did not make AYP 07-08 in Reading (47.1%) and even though they did not make in 08-09 (52.7%) their meets/exceeds increased.

There is a concern that the percentage meets/exceeds made for 08-09 is below the AYP ISAT Minimum Target of 77.5% for 09-10 school year.

When reviewing the Trends information, as reported by Illinois Interactive Report Card (iirc), we see that through the years, 02-09, IEP Reading meets/exceeds rose from 33% to 54% and then leveled off into the mid 40% range. The latest being 52.7%. (02=33%, 03=54%, 04=45, 05=43%, 06=47%, 07=48%, 08=47%, 09=53%)

According to the indicators on the School Report Card the 3rd Grade Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities as well as the non-IEP students also, needs to continue with the Reading programs that began 2nd semester 08-09 school year. Corrective Reading was also implanted 2nd semester 08-09 school year and also during this time Illinois Buckle Down Reading was implemented. A new Reading curriculum utilizing direct instruction began this, 09-10, school year.

All 4th Grade	Reading	06-07	NICE	58.0%	State	73.7%
		07-08		75.0%		73.2%
		08-09		76.2%		73.8%
Math	06-07	NICE	89.9%	State	86.4%	
		07-08		81.9%		84.6%
		08-09		85.2%		85.7%
Science	06-07	NICE	77.3%	State	79.8%	
		07-08		81.9%		76.2%
		08-09		83.6%		76.8%

These performance scores for ALL 4th Grade Students at NICE indicate that overall 4th Grade is meeting/exceeding at or higher than the State average in Reading, Math, and Science. However, it also indicates that in the area of Reading performance (76.2%) is below the AYP Minimum Target of 77.5% needed for 09-10 school year. It is also interesting to note that the State average for meets/exceeds is below the AYP Minimum Target of 77.5% for the 09-10 school year. It needs to be noted that the 06-07 Reading meets/exceeds was 15.7% lower than the State average. This was a puzzle for NICE. There were a lot of absents that year but other grade levels did not drop like this. This same group, as per iirc Trend Report, the following year as 5th Graders, went to 74% in their Reading performance. It needs to be noted that after the 06-07 Reading performance, during the 07-08 school year, Saxon Phonics curriculum was implemented in the special education classes and Title I. 08-09 school year, beginning 2nd semester, began Corrective Reading curriculum and Illinois Buckle Down Reading.

4th Grade Sub-Groups in Reading, Math, and Science

Gender:			<u>Reading NICE</u>	<u>Reading State</u>	<u>Math NICE</u>	<u>Math State</u>	<u>Science NICE</u>	<u>Science State</u>
Male	06-07		49.2%	70.7%	87.7%	85.5%	77.2%	79.5%
	07-08		69.1%	69.6%	80.8%	84.0%	82.3%	76.1%
	08-09		76.6%	70.3%	88.3%	85.0%	86.6%	76.6%
Female	06-07		66.1%	76.9%	74.0%	87.4%	77.4%	80.0%
	07-08		83.3%	77.0%	83.3%	85.3%	81.3%	76.3%
	08-09		76.6%	77.4%	82.3%	86.5%	80.6%	77.1%
Racial/Ethnic:			<u>Reading NICE</u>	<u>Reading State</u>	<u>Math NICE</u>	<u>Math State</u>	<u>Science NICE</u>	<u>Science State</u>
White	06-07		60.8%	82.6%	80.3%	92.7%	78.6%	90.2%
	07-08		73.8%	83.8%	82.0%	92.5%	82.9%	89.3%
	08-09		76.1%	84.4%	84.6%	92.8%	82.9%	89.3%
Students with Disabilities:			<u>Reading NICE</u>	<u>Reading State</u>	<u>Math NICE</u>	<u>Math State</u>	<u>Science NICE</u>	<u>Science State</u>
With IEP	06-07		35.5%	41.1%	80.7%	64.5%	83.8%	61.7%
	07-08		21.7%	41.2%	47.8%	63.8%	60.9%	58.9%
	08-09		38.4%	40.4%	69.2%	64.0%	61.5%	57.5%
Non-IEP	06-07		65.9%	79.3%	93.2%	90.2%	75.0%	82.9%
	07-08		88.2%	78.3%	90.4%	87.9%	87.1%	78.8%
	08-09		86.5%	79.0%	89.5%	89.1%	89.5%	79.8%

Economically Disadvantaged:		Reading NICE	Reading State	Math NICE	Math State	Science NICE	Science State
Free/Reduced	06-07	43.3%	58.0%	84.9%	76.4%	69.9%	64.2%
	07-08	56.3%	58.7%	68.8%	74.6%	68.7%	60.6%
	08-09	61.5%	59.2%	75.0%	76.6%	75.0%	62.0%
Non-Eligible	06-07	69.7%	84.7%	94.0%	93.3%	83.3%	90.6%
	07-08	88.2%	85.2%	91.2%	92.9%	91.1%	89.0%
	08-09	87.1%	86.7%	92.8%	93.8%	90.0%	90.0%

NOTE:

- 4th Grade does show successes as indicated by their 2009 ISAT performance.
- Sub-Groups, except Students With disabilities, have shown improvement meeting/exceeding over 06-07 school year
- An area of concern that stands out for improvement in the Students with Disabilities sub-group in both Reading and Math. In Math this sub-group missed AYP by .8%.
- When reviewing the iirc Trends in this area we see 06=30%, 07=35%, and 08=22%. 09 has not been posted yet but the existing trend clearly indicates that the sub-group, Students with Disabilities, for Reading has shown fluctuation and a downward trend with a possible upward trend for 09 according to the 2009 School Report Card of 38.4%.
- Also, the iirc trend report for this same sub-group, Students with Disabilities, indicates the area of Math 06=55, 07=81, 08=48 needs to be addressed. 09 Math Trend for IEP has not been posted but the information from the school report card shows that Math may produce an upward trend for 09 (69%) which is below the 70% needed.

According to the indicators, performance levels, on the School Report Card the 4th Grade Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, needs to improve in the areas of Reading and Math. Also, ALL 4th Grade Students need to see improvement in area of Reading. Although ALL 4th Grade Students made AYP their meets/exceeds were close to what will be needed for the AYP ISAT Minimum Target of 77.5% for the 2010 school year.

All 5th Grade		Reading	06-07 NICE	70.6%	State	69.7%
			07-08	73.4%	73.5%	
			08-09	73.2%	73.5%	
	Math	06-07 NICE	79.8%	State	82.5%	
			07-08	81.5%	81.4%	
			08-09	77.7%	82.4%	

These scores for All 5th Grade Students at NICE indicates that NICE 5th Grade is in keeping with the State averages and making AYP. A concern is that the 09 meets/exceeds is lower than the AYP ISAT Minimum Target of 77.5% needed for the 2010 school year. Math is just .2% higher than the needed 77.5% but still too close to be comfortable. It is also interesting to note that the State performance level in Reading is lower than the AYP ISAT Minimum Target of 77.5% for the 2010 school year.

5th Grade Sub-Groups in Reading and Math

Gender:		<u>Reading NICE</u>	<u>Reading State</u>	<u>Math NICE</u>	<u>Math State</u>
Male	06-07	70.0%	66.0%	80.0%	81.4%
	07-08	70.7%	70.1%	82.7%	80.3%
	08-09	70.8%	70.2%	77.0%	81.3%
Female	06-07	71.2%	73.6%	79.7%	83.7%
	07-08	75.7%	77.1%	80.3%	82.4%
	08-09	76.6%	77.1%	78.7%	81.3%
Racial/Ethnic:		<u>Reading NICE</u>	<u>Reading State</u>	<u>Math NICE</u>	<u>Math State</u>
White	06-07	70.2%	79.1%	78.9%	90.1%
	07-08	73.5%	85.3%	80.3%	89.8%
	08-09	72.9%	84.2%	77.6%	90.3%
Students with Disabilities:		<u>Reading NICE</u>	<u>Reading State</u>	<u>Math NICE</u>	<u>Math State</u>
With IEP	06-07	12.5%	33.7%	18.8%	55.9%
	07-08	46.1%	38.5%	69.2%	54.5%
	08-09	27.2%	37.6%	27.3%	54.9%
Non-IEP	06-07	79.6%	75.7%	89.3%	86.9%
	07-08	80.6%	79.1%	84.7%	85.6%
	08-09	84.4%	79.2%	90.0%	86.7%
Economically Disadvantaged:		<u>Reading NICE</u>	<u>Reading State</u>	<u>Math NICE</u>	<u>Math State</u>
Free/Reduced	06-07	62.7%	53.1%	70.6%	70.5%
	07-08	62.0%	58.0%	70.0%	70.0%
	08-09	56.3%	58.6%	60.4%	71.9%

Non-Eligible	06-07	76.4%	81.6%	86.8%	91.0%
	07-08	81.1%	85.9%	89.2%	90.5%
	08-09	86.0%	86.2%	90.6%	91.4%

NOTE:

- 5th Grade performance scores indicates that they have been able to make AYP in all areas except the sub-group Students with Disabilities up until this past school year (08-09)
- Students with Disabilities did not may AYP in Reading and Math for 08-09 school year. The iirc trend report for this sub-group in the area of Reading did show their performance on the rise until the 08-09 School Report results (02=29%, 03=27%, 04=41%, 05=34%, 06=21%, 07=12%, 08=46%). 09 trend information has not been posted yet but the School Report Card information indicates the trend figure to be 27%. Also, Math with this sub-group, according to meets/exceed, needs to be addressed. The iirc trend report shows a strong fluctuation in meeting/exceeding (02=29, 03=46, 04=52, 05=39, 06=46, 07=19, 08=69). 09 Math trend has not been calculated but the School Report Card information indicates the trend Figure to be 27%.
- The 08-09 School Report indicators, performance scores, shows that 5th Grade is below the AYP ISAT Minimum Target of 77.5% in Reading and Math for the 2010 school year.
- Indicators on the 2009 School Report Card show that the 5th grade sub-group, as well as all students, need to have more emphasis in the academic areas of Reading and Math.

Conclusion:

- When All Nice Students are calculated together for AYP, NICE performed above State Minimum Target (70%) for the 2009 ISAT's.
- Overall, the Students with Disabilities Sub-Group did not make AYP in Reading and in Math.
- Another concern is our All Student AYP performance in Reading and in Math is either close too or below the AYP ISAT Minimum Target of 77.5% for the 2010 school year.
- Performance in Reading and Math needs to be a PRIORITY for ALL Students, including all Sub-Groups.

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

- Students with Disabilities, especially those whose eligibility in Learning Disability, have more trouble processing, therefore taking more time learning at the State AYP Minimum Targets. This is quite evident through their IEP evaluations and re-evaluations (Psychs., PIAT's, WRAT's, Speech/Language, etc.).
- There are some students with Disabilities who have problems with memory making it very difficult for them to remember (short/long term) what needs to be remembered for academic success needed to perform at the State AYP Minimum Targets.
- The Reading and Math curriculum for Students with Disabilities, as well as All students in need of evaluation/update.
- The attention span for attending to anything specific for an optimum amount of time in order to cover material is at times limited. This is not only true of Students with Disabilities but also for those students without Sp. Ed. eligibility who may be ADD/ADHD.
- Many of our students are involved in after school activities and at times these activities are more important than their homework.
- Many students do not have support at home to be successful in school.
- Some students do not try to do their best when testing.

- Some students do not do well on paper/pencil tests.
- Need staff development appropriate for the need.
- Staff training to meet the needs of the curriculum is important.
- From year to year the academic abilities of students can fluctuate greatly.
- Economic stresses in our area are great.
- Other

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

- Need to implement a time where students may have help and/or can do their homework
- Need to implement additional time when students can have help developing their reading skills
- Need to review and implement additional time when students can have help developing their math skills
- Need to review and implement new/additional reading curriculum for all students
- Need to review and implement new/additional math curriculum for all students
- Need to create a monitoring system during testing to help IEP students to stay on task
- Need a continued reminder to parents/guardians about the importance of reading and math
- Need to increase the monitoring of reading and math skills of all students at NICE
- Need to further increase monitoring reading and math skills of those students who are below AYP levels
- Need to have assessments guide instruction
- Need to have staff participate in appropriate reading and math workshops
- Need to provide training to staff and subs in implementation of reading curriculum
- Need to increase classroom time for reading and math instruction for those students below grade level
- Other

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?

NICE utilizes Think-Link Assessment to help develop action plans for our students' needs in the academic areas of Reading and Math. During 08-09 school year all NICE students will be given Think-Link during the month of November and again during the month of April. NICE also will be assessing all students three (3) times during the 08-09 school year using AIMSweb in the academic areas of Reading for their comprehension and decoding skills. Those students who demonstrate a need for a stronger development of skills will be assessed more frequently, as they receive help with their comprehension and/or decoding skills. Think-Link is not going to be used after 08-09 school year. AIMSweb will be used exclusively, three (3) each year.

Think-Link Results (November 08-09 school year) in the academic area of Reading:

	<u>Vocabulary</u>	<u>Comprehension</u>	<u>Literature</u>	<u>Grammar</u>	<u>Writing/Org.</u>	<u>Information</u>
3 rd Grade (all students)	87.5%	68.9%	87.9%	75.5%	89.8%	80.1%
4 th Grade (all students)	61.2%	80.0%	90.5%	81.8%	88.1%	93.3%
5 th Grade (all students)	66.8%	75.8%	82.1%	84.1%	70.8%	69.1%
All NICE Students Average	(71.8%)	(74.9%)	(86.8%)	(80.5%)	(82.9%)	(80.8%)

Think-Link Results (November 08-09 school year) in the academic area of Math:

	<u>Numbers</u>	<u>Measurement</u>	<u>Algebra</u>	<u>Geometry</u>	<u>D & P</u>
3 rd Grade (all students)	90.6%	91.8%	86.3%	100%	100%
4 th Grade (all students)	92.8%	99.0%	72.2%	99.0%	74.1%
5 th Grade (all Students)	80.2%	73.9%	89.6%	96.9%	78.6%
All NICE Student Average	(87.9%)	(88.2%)	(82.7%)	(98.6%)	(84.2%)

NOTE:

- Any percentage below 70% (State AYP Minimum Target for 08-09) is in need of addressing
- 3rd Grade has solid assessment results in Vocab., Lit., Wrt./Org., and Info.
- 4th Grade has solid assessment results in Comp., Lit., Grammar, Wrt./Org., and Info.
- 5th Grade has solid assessment results in Lit., and Grammar.
- All together, has solid assessment results in Lit., Grammar, Wrt./Org., and Info.

AIMSweb - First round of assessment of all NICE Students indicated a need for help with Reading Decoding and/or Comprehension 08-09 school year:

- 3rd Grade - 33 Students
- 4th Grade - 38 Students
- 5th Grade - 40 Students

NOTE - These numbers include Sp. Ed. Students as well as non Sp. Ed. Stud

3rd Grade AIMSweb Average Scores Reading - Curriculum Based Measurement Benchmark Periods:

<u>Words Read Correct</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Winter</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Growth Rate</u>
Target	08-09	83.0	105.0	120.0	1.0 WRC/week
General Ed.		84.0	103.4	119.9	1.0 WRC/week
Special Ed.		65.6	89.6	95.9	0.8 WRC/week
Target	09-10	83.0	-	-	N/A

General Ed.	92.3	-	-	N/A
Special Ed.	46.3	-	-	N/A

Responses Correct

<u>Comprehension</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Winter</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Growth Rate</u>
Target	08-09	12.0	15.0	16.0	0.1 RC/week
General Ed.		12.9	15.8	17.0	0.1 RC/week
Special Ed.		9.2	12.8	12.3	0.1 RC/week
	09-10	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Winter</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Growth Rate</u>
Target		12.0	-	-	N/A
General Ed.		15.3	-	-	N/A
Special Ed.		8.7	-	-	N/A

- 08-09 3rd Grade General Ed. Words Read Correct increased for each Fall, Winter, and Spring Benchmark Periods from 84.0 to 119.9 with a Growth Rate of 1.0 WRC/week. Fall indicator was 1.0 above the Target. The Winter indicator was 1.6 below the Target. The Spring indicator was .1 below the Target. The Growth Rate Target was reached.

- 09-10 3rd Grade General Ed. Words Read Correct for Fall Benchmark Period is higher than the Fall indicator for 08-09. The 09-10 Fall indicator is 9.3 above the Target.

- 08-09 3rd Grade Special Ed. Words Read Correct increased for each Fall, Winter, and Spring Benchmark Periods from 65.6 to 95.9 (30.3 increase/Target increased 37.0). There was a Growth Rate of 0.8 WRC/week. The Fall indicator was 17.4 below the Target. The Winter indicator was 15.4 below the Target. The Spring indicator was 24.1 below the Target. The Growth Rate was .2 below the Target.

- 09-10 3rd Grade Special Ed. Words Read Correct for Fall Benchmark Period is lower than the indicator for the Fall 08-09. The 09-10 indicator is 35.7 below the Target.

- 08-09 3rd Grade General Ed. Comprehension increased for each Fall, Winter, and Spring Benchmark Periods from 12.9 to 17.0 with a Growth Rate of 0.1 RC/week. Fall indicator was .9 above the Target. The Winter indicator was .8 above the Target. The Spring indicator was 1.0 above the Target. The Growth Rate Target was reached.

- 09-10 3rd Grade General Ed. Comprehension is higher than the Fall Benchmark for 08-09. The 09-10 Fall

indicator is 3.3 above the Target.

- 08-09 3rd Grade Special Ed. Comprehension indicators increased from 9.2 in the Fall to 12.3 in the Spring (3.1 increase/Target increase 4.0). However, from the Winter to the Spring the indicator dropped by .5. The Fall indicator was 2.8 below the Target. The Winter indicator was 2.2 below the Target. The Spring indicator was 3.7 below the Target. The Growth Rate Target was reached.

- 09-10 3rd Grade Special Ed. Comprehension for Fall Benchmark is lower than the indicator for the Fall 08-09. The 09-10 Fall indicator is 3.3 below the Target.

4th Grade AIMSweb Average Scores Reading - Curriculum Based Management Benchmark Periods:

<u>Words Read Correct</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Winter</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Growth Rate</u>
Target	08-09	103.0	119.0	132.0	0.8 WRC/week
General Ed.		111.4	126.9	140.6	0.8 WRC/week
Special Ed.		63.0	78.7	89.2	0.7 WRC/week
Target	09-10	103.0	-	-	N/A
General Ed.		103.6	-	-	N/A
Special Ed.		86.2	-	-	N/A

Responses Correct

<u>Comprehension</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Winter</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Growth Rate</u>
Target	08-09	13.0	19.0	19.0	.02 RC/week
General Ed.		13.5	22.8	22.6	.03 RC/week
Special Ed.		6.3	11.3	12.6	.02 RC/week
Target	09-10	13.0	-	-	N/A
General Ed.		14.7	-	-	N/A
Special Ed.		10.8	-	-	N/A

- 08-09 4th Grade General Ed. Words Read Correct increased for each Fall, Winter, and Spring Benchmark Periods from 111.4 to 140.6 with a Growth Rate of 0.8 WRC/week. The Fall indicator was 8.4 above the Target. The

Winter indicator was 7.9 above the Target. The Spring indicator was 8.6 above the Target. The Growth Rate Target was reached.

- 09-10 4th Grade General Ed. Words Read Correct for Fall Benchmark is below 08-09 Fall Benchmark. The 09-10 Fall indicator is .6 above the Target.
- 08-09 4th Grade Special Ed. Words Read Correct increased for each Fall, Winter, and Spring Benchmark Periods from 63.0 to 89.2 (increase of 26.2/Target increased 29.0). There was a Growth Rate of 0.7. The Fall indicator was 40.0 below the Target. The Winter indicator was 40.3 below the Target. The Spring indicator was 42.8 below the Target. The Growth Rate was .1 below the Target.
- 09-10 4th Grade Special Ed. Words Read Correct for Fall Benchmark is above the 08-09 Fall Benchmark. The 09-10 Fall indicator is 16.8 below the Target.
- 08-09 4th Grade General Ed. Comprehension increase from Fall to Spring 13.5 to 22.6. However, Winter Benchmark decreased by .2 at the Spring Benchmark. The Growth Rate was .03 RC/week. The Fall indicator was .5 above the Target. The Winter indicator was 3.8 above the Target. The Spring indicator was 3.6 above the Target. The Growth Rate was .01 above the Target.
- 09-10 4th Grade General Ed. Comprehension for Fall Benchmark is above the 08-09 Fall Benchmark and 1.7 above the Target
- 08-09 4th Grade Special Ed. Comprehension increased for each Fall, Winter, and Spring Benchmark Periods from 6.3 to 12.6 (an increase of 6.3/Target increased 6.0). Fall indicator was 6.7 below the Target. Winter indicator was 7.7 below the Target. The Spring indicator was 6.4 below the Target. The Growth Rate was met.
- 09-10 4th Grade Special Ed. Comprehension for the Fall Benchmark is above the 08-09 Fall Benchmark and 2.2 below the Target.

5th Grade AIMSweb Average Scores Reading - Curriculum Based Management Benchmark Periods:

<u>Words Read Correct</u>	<u>School Year</u>	<u>Fall</u>	<u>Winter</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Growth Rate</u>
Target	08-09	116.0	133.0	148.0	0.9 WRC/week
General Ed.		121.6	136.2	154.0	0.9 WRC/week
Special Ed.		65.5	73.1	87.9	0.6 WRC/week

Target	09-10	116.0	-	-	N/A
General Ed.		124.1	-	-	N/A
Title		74.0	-	-	N/A
Special Ed.		83.0	-	-	N/A

Responses Correct

Comprehension	School Year	Fall	Winter	Spring	Growth Rate
Target	08-09	16.0	21.0	25.0	0.3 RC/week
General Ed.		18.8	22.8	28.2	0.3 RC/week
Special Ed.		8.4	9.7	17.1	0.2 RC/week

Target	09-10	16.0	-	-	N/A
General Ed.		20.1	-	-	N/A
Title I		18.0	-	-	N/A
Special Ed.		12.2	-	-	N/A

- 08-09 5th Grade General Ed. Words Read Correct increased for each Fall, Winter, and Spring Benchmark Periods from 121.6 to 154.0. The Fall indicator was 5.6 above the Target. The Winter indicator was 3.2 above the Target. The Spring indicator was 6.0 above the Target. The Growth Rate was met.
- 09-10 5th Grade General Ed. Words Read Correct for Fall Benchmark is above the 08-09 Fall Benchmark and 8.1 above the Target.
- 08-09 5th Grade Special Ed Words Read Correct increased for each Fall, Winter, and Spring Benchmark Periods from 65.5 to 87.9 (an increase of 22.4/Target increased 32.0). The Fall indicator was 50.5 below the Target. The Winter indicator was 59.8 below the Target. The Spring indicator was 60.1 below the Target. The Growth Rate was .1 below the Target.
- 09-10 5th Grade Special Ed. Words Read Correct for Fall Benchmark is above the 08-09 Fall Benchmark and 33.0 below the Target.
- 08-09 5th Grade General Ed. Comprehension increased for each Fall, Winter, and Spring Benchmark Periods from 18.8 to 28.2. The Fall indicator was 2.8 above the Target. The Winter indicator was 1.8 above the Target. The Spring indicator was 3.2 above the Target. The Growth Rate was met.

11/19/2009 11:35:19 AM

- 09-10 5th Grade General Ed. Comprehension for Fall Benchmark was above the 08-09 Fall Benchmark and 4.1 above the Target.
- 08-09 5th Grade Special Ed. Comprehension increased for all Fall, Winter, and Spring Benchmark Periods from 8.4 to 17.1 (increase of 8.7/Target increased 9.0). The Fall indicator was 7.6 below the Target. The Winter indicator was 11.3 below the Target. The Spring indicator was 7.9 below the Target. The Growth Rate was .1 below the Target
- 09-10 5th Grade Special Ed. Comprehension for Fall Benchmark is above the 08-09 Fall Benchmark and 3.8 below the Target.

Conclusion:

- Special Ed. Reading (Word Reading/Comprehension) at all grade levels made increases in the Benchmark periods.
- Special Ed. Reading (Word Reading/Comprehension) Fall Benchmark indicator increased for the 09-10 Fall Benchmark over the Fall Benchmark.
- Need to continue RtI (Corrective Reading) and Reading Mastery fully at 3rd Grade with full implementation at 4th and 5th grade levels 10-11school year.

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

- Possible poor reading curriculum
- Beginning school year and have not reviewed and/or covered needed information
- Students not taking assessments seriously
- Students involved in outside school activities
- Some students do not perform well on paper/pencil/computer/timed testing
- Some students do not have parental support at home for school
- Not understanding the subject matter
- Special Ed. may not be able to learn at the pace required
- RtI (Corrective Reading) has helped maintain growth
- Other

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

- Review and continue to use curriculum that will help below grade level students in Reading and Math
- Communicate to staff the importance to use students assessment to help guide instruction
- Make sure that all below grade level readers receive appropriate reading skills help through RtI
- Be sure staff attend appropriate Reading and Math workshops
- Have staff receive training of any new curriculum

- Review and recommend regular Reading curriculum for all grade levels
- Continue implementation of Reading Mastery (Direct Instruction) curriculum for 4th and 5th grades beginning 2010-2011 school year
- Participant in Direct Instruction Research Project at 4th and 5th grade levels during the 09-10 school year
- Have all Sp. Ed. students participate in regular education Math and Reading and then help in Sp. Ed. setting
- Implement appropriate after school programs that work for student improvement in Reading and Math
- Other

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?

N.I.C.E. attributes that affect student performance:

- * in our 9th year as an intermediate school (grades 3, 4, 5, and we have Pre-K on site)
- * friendly staff (ALL!)
- * staff who work together for all NICE students

Some programs that NICE incorporates during the school year that affects our students are:

- . Teaming
- . Character Education
- . Breakfast Program
- . Title I
- . After School Programs
- . Monthly Newsletter
- . Performing Arts Series
- . Meet & Greet
- . Good News Notes
- . Book Fairs
- . Box Tops Collection
- . Field Trips
- . Wednesday's Child Dental Program
- . Social Worker (full time)
- . Fitness Trail
- . Vertical Articulation
- . Literacy Fair
- . Coats for Kids
- . Fundraiser
- . RtI
- . Computer Use Instruction
- . Truancy Program
- . Service Learning Helpers
- . Student Mentoring Program
- . PTO
- . Birthday Recognition
- . Saxon Math
- . Book It Program
- . Emergency Drills
- . Life Safety Projects
- . STAR Testing
- . Highly Qualified Teachers

11/19/2009 11:35:19 AM

- Special Assemblies
- Web Site
- Arts and Cultural Projects
- Fitness Related Activities
- Technology
- Drug Awareness Programs
- Accelerated Reading Program
- Key Boarding Skills Instruction
- Parent Contacts
- Band/Sports
- Parent/Teacher Conference Days
- Building Leadership Council
- Student/Community Recognition
- Professional Development Teams
- External Review Survey Parents/Guardians
- Internal Review Survey Staff and Students
- Full Time Nurse
- New Teacher Mentoring
- Crisis Management Plan
- SIP Team
- AIMSweb
- Direct Instruction Reading/Math
- Community Support
- Other

N.I.C.E. Challenges that may affect student performance:

- Old facility
- Space
- Time (seems not enough in order to do what needs to be done without cutting into other academic areas)
- Appropriate professional development with minimal cost and distance to travel

- Location (Southeastern Illinois)
- Not enough funding
- Subs - not enough and not trained to do Direct Instruction Reading
- Direct Instruction Reading Research Project at 4th and 5th grade levels
- Other

Positive Community Attributes:

- Caring People
- Business support
- Church support
- Rural Community
- Wabash Valley Junior College
- * **Local Fire Department**
- All District Schools Working Together
- Service Organizations
- Hospital
- Local Media Support
- YMCA
- Project Success
- * **RIDES**
- * **Health Depaertment**
- Local Youth Programs
- Supportive Law Enforcement
- * **Ambulance Service**
- Juvenile Support Programs
- Local Community Library
- Other

Community Challenges:

- Economics
- High Unemployment
- Location
- High impact industry has moved
- Taxes too high
- No new business interest seen
- Limited activities for both youth and adults
- High cost of living
- Nothing here for our students to return too
- Other

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

Contribution of Challenges:

- Transportation issues
- Environmental issues
- Per capita high drug and alcohol use
- Low student self esteem
- Family survival
- Emotional stress for both adults and children
- Higher delinquency rates
- Children taking on more parental responsibilities
- More extended families raising other than their children
- Attendance is affected
- High rate single parent families
- Other

Attribute Contributions:

- Children supported by community
- A sharing community
- Caring schools
- Able to provide some school activities
- Students have available good health care
- other

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

- provide Social Work/Counseling
- provide family service support
- continue to provide positive programs for students and families
- provide school staff with appropriate training in areas of providing support
- Other

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?

- (See Preliminary Information pertaining to Staff) pg. 14
- All NICE Staff and Paraprofessionals are Highly Qualified as per State Standards
- Certified Staff has an average of 14 years experience.
- Other

- All Certified Staff Paraprofessionals are part of Professional Teams
- In-service Training Days are provided within the District Calendar for all staff

11/19/2009 11:35:19 AM

- Workshops are encouraged and provided for the appropriate staff to attend (08-09 school year in the area of Reading and 09-10 school year in areas of Reading and Math)
- Other

Our District is willing to help staff provide updated information/training for the educational needs of our students in the educational, physical, social, emotional, and healthy well-being areas. Also, it indicates that NICE staff is willing to do what they need to do for improvement of both self and student.

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

- * Educational Qualifications (Highly Qualified) have helped increase the knowledge and skills. It is also good that it has kept us in compliance with State mandates.
- * Staff capacity had been one (1) teacher short of having six (6) sections for each grade level. We were able to employ an additional teacher. We now have six (6) sections per grade level. This helped reduce class size making it better teaching/learning in the classroom.
- * Staff, with their Professional Teams, have established goals and projects that will help in educating their students.
- * Also, attending appropriate Reading and Math Workshops helps increase the ability to address the needs of our students with new and updated information and ideas.
- * Future professional development is scheduled for in area of training in our RtI curriculum (Corrective Reading) in the areas of Reading Decoding and Reading Comprehension.
- * District' substitutes ability to teach Direct Instruction is also going to be addressed so they can be ready to go into

the classrooms without students missing quality instruction.

- * RESPRO Workshops have helped provide quality information at a good price.
- * As other Professional Development opportunities come up and are appropriate NICE will participate.

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

- As a school we are willing to participate in Professional Development when it becomes available and it is appropriate for our needs. RESPRO, IPA, our District and our District Curriculum Coordinator keeps us posted on trainings and workshops.

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

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

- PTO
- Parent University
- 100% Parent/Guardian contacts
- Parent Classroom helpers
- American Education Week (parents/guardians visit school - classrooms - and have lunch)
- Parent Coordinated Book Fair
- Scheduled Parent/Teacher Conference Days
- Attend Extra-Curricular Events
- Parent/Guardian Survey
- Agenda Communication
- Parents helping their child succeed in school
- Other

Parental contacts provided to help the parent be involved. This indicates that NICE encourages parent involvement. Also, NICE does have parents who are heavily involved. We feel our parents support NICE and respect what we are doing.

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

- Parents respond to the information provided through the Agenda and website to encourage students to do what they need to do.
- Parent involvement with our School Social Worker has helped provide needed resources.
- Parent involvement has helped provide needed materials/equipment in the classrooms.
- Parents' response to their child's academic and behavioral reports help lead the child to do his/her best.
- Other

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

- Continue to involve parents in the educational process of their child.
- Need to involve the parents in stressing the importance of Reading and Math, especially at home.
- Continue to stress importance of parents reading the Agenda.
- Continue to encourage parents to communicate with their child.
- Continue to encourage parents to communicate with school personnel.
- Review the State Parent Involvement Analysis Tool for possible direction.

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?

- Need to implement a time where students may have help and/or do their homework
- Need to implement additional time when students can have help developing Reading skills
- Need to implement additional time where students can have help developing Math skills.
- Need to review and implement curriculum for those students who are below grade level in Reading
- Need to review and implement curriculum for those students who are below grade level in Math
- Need to create a monitoring system during testing to help IEP students stay on task
- Need a continued reminder to parents/guardians about the importance of reading
- Need to increase monitoring reading skills of all students
- Need to increase monitoring math skills of all students
- Need to further increase monitoring reading skill of those students who read below grade level
- Need to further increase monitoring math skills of those students who are below grade level in math
- Need to have assessments guide instruction
- Need to have staff participate in appropriate reading workshops
- Need to have staff participate in appropriate math workshops
- Need to provide training for staff in implementation of selected reading curriculum
- Need to increase classroom time for reading instruction for those students below grade level
- **Make sure that all below grade level readers receive appropriate reading skills help through RtI**
- Have staff receive training in presentation of any new curriculum
- Provide Social/Counseling
- Provide family services support
- Continue to involve parents in the educational process of their child
- Provide appropriate training for District Substitutes in area of Direct Instruction
- Other

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Reading Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the State minimum target.	1,
2	Math Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the minimum State target.	2,
3	Math Sub-Group, Studetns with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the minimum State target.	2,
4	Math Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the State minimum target.	2,

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

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Reading Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the State minimum target.

Objective 1 Description

While our current achievement in reading for the Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, is 45.8%

meeting/exceeding for ISAT, this subgroup will make AYP at least 70% in 2009 or Safe Harbor and 77.5% in 2010 or Safe Harbor. (NOTE - Did not make 70% for 08-09. Objective still effective for 09-10.)

- Students reading instruction will increase to 140 minutes per day
- RtI Corrective Reading will be continues at all grade levels.
- 3rd Grade will implement Direct Instruction Reading Mastery Curriculum
- 4th and 5th grades will participate in a Direct Instruction Research Project assuring that students in the direct instruction portion of the project receive Direct Instruction Reading Mastery. The plan is to implement Direct Instruction Reading Mastery fully in the 4th and 5th grades next school year thus having Reading Mastery school wide.
- Parents will continue to be encouraged to encourage their child to read, read, read.
- Parents, through PTO, will be involved in Book Fairs and Reading Literacy Fair.
- Students with disabilities will be included in regular reading classes and then given support during their time in Sp. Ed. Classes.
- Parents will participate in teacher contacts and scheduled Parent/Teacher Conference Days.
- AIMSweb will be used to determine RtI participation in the fall, winter, and spring.
- Staff will use assessment to guide instruction.
- Other

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- b 1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- e 2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Reading Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the State minimum target.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	On-going assessments for all students using AIMSweb to determine intervention needs	09/01/2008	05/28/2010	During School	Other	
2	Students receiving intervention will be monitored more frequently	01/07/2008	05/28/2010	During School	Other	
3	Using Corrective Reading placement assessment, place Reading at-risk students in their appropriate area of need	10/20/2008	05/28/2010	During School	State Funds	
4	Provide an after school program (120 minutes per week) to help increase reading skills	11/03/2008	05/20/2009	After School	Title I	
5	Establish RtI, using Corrective Reading, giving an additional 350 minutes per week for students at-risk in Reading	01/07/2008	05/28/2010	During School	Title I	
6	Illinois Buckle Down Reading will be utilized to prepare all students for ISAT	01/05/2009	02/27/2009	During School	State Funds	
7	Implement 2 reading periods per day for all students, increasing reading instruction to a minimum of 140 minutes per day	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	Before School	Local Funds	
8	Continue to provide after school program to help increase Reading skills	01/04/2010	05/28/2010	After School	Title I	

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

Reading Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the State minimum target.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Review/Select appropriate Reading intervention curriculum	10/17/2008	10/17/2008	During School	State Funds	

2	Staff will receive training on use of Corrective Reading(Decoding and Comprehension	12/15/2008	12/17/2008	During School	Title I	
3	Staff will receive training on use of Corrective Reading(Decoding and Comprehension	10/22/2008	05/28/2010	After School	State Funds	
4	Stress the importance of Reading to the parents	08/18/2008	05/28/2010	Before School	Local Funds	
5	SIP Team realizes that a School Improvement Plan is not set in stone and is ever changing, so we will adjust to what needs to be done.	08/18/2008	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
6	Staff will receive taining on Reading Direct Instruction.	08/12/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Title I	
7	District Substitutes will receive Direct Instruction training.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	

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

Reading Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the State minimum target.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Stress the importance of Reading to the parents through the use of newsletter, parent/teacher conferences, agenda, etc.	08/18/2008	05/28/2010	After School	Local Funds	
2	Parent PTO involvement through school projects, Book Fairs, Literac6y Fair, etc.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Parents will have oppportunity to participate through an external survey that has a Reading component to it.	09/30/2009	10/08/2009	After School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Reading Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the State minimum target.

School personnel will monitor progress with the following:

- * All students will be progressed monitored three (3) times per school year using AIMSweb.
- * At-risk students will have increased monitoring throughout the school year using AIMSweb.
- * At-risk students will be monitored every 10 leassons through the RtI Corrective Reading Curriculum.
- * All students will be monitored through Think-Link 2-3 times per year. NOTE - DISCONTINUED AFTER 08-09 SCHOOL YEAR
- * All students will be monitored through their daily work and participation.
- * All Students with Disabilities will be also monitored through their IEP.
- * All students will be monitored through ISAT.
- * Other

	Name	Title
1	Michael Hays	Principal
2	Chris Taylor	School Social Worker

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Math Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the minimum State target.

Objective 2 Description

- * Achievement, 2009 Report Card, in math for the Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, was 55.9% for meeting/exceeding for ISAT. This sub-group will make AYP at least 77.5% or Dafe Harbor in 2010 school year.
- * Students with Disabilities math instruction will increase with up to 160 additional minutes per week.

- * Students with Disabilities will receive math instruction in a regular education classroom.
- * Students with Disabilities will receive math support within the Sp. Ed. classroom.
- * Students, parents, and staff will utilize the Agenda for communicating math concerns and successes.
- * All grade levels will use Saxon Math curriculum.
- * Staff will re-teach math concepts as needed.
- * Staff will use AIMSweb for math assessment beginning 2010-2011 school year.
- * Staff will utilize assessment to guide instruction.
- * Parents will participate in teacher contacts and scheduled Parent/Teacher Conference Days.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- Ⓔ 1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓕ 2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Math Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the minimum State target.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	On-going assessments (every 5th lesson) for all students using Saxon Math to guide instruction	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
2	Adjust schedule to allow Students with Disabilities to participate in regular Ed. math instruction	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Re-teach math concepts that students do not understand	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
4	Provide after school programs for at least 120 minutes per week that will help develop math skills	01/04/2010	05/28/2010	After School	Title I	

5	Utilize Illinois Buckle Down Math or Illinois Math Coach to help prepare students for ISAT	01/04/2010	02/26/2010	During School	State Funds	
---	--	------------	------------	---------------	-------------	--

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

Math Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the minimum State target.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Staff will attend appropriate math workshops pertaining to developing students' math skills	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	State Funds	
2	Staff will utilize math assessment to guide instruction	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Staff will collaborate working with Students with Disabilities while the students are receiving math instruction in the regular classroom.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	Before School	Local Funds	
4	Staff will collaborate during team meeting about math issues dealing with math activities, strategies, etc. to address the needs of the students success in math	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	Before School	Title I	

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

Math Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the minimum State target.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Stress the importance of math to parents/guardians through use of newsletter, parent/teacher conferences, agenda, etc.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	After School	Local Funds	
2	Parents/guardians will become familiar with the process of Saxon Math through conferences, Agenda, and teacher directed information.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Parents/guardians will be encouraged to ask questions, help their students with math homework, and share concerns	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Math Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the minimum State target.

Chris * Staff will progress monitor all students through the Saxon Math curriculum.

* Staff will progress monitor all students through their daily work and participation.

* State will progress monitor all students through ISAT.

* Students with Disabilities are also progress monitored through their IEP

	Name	Title
1	Michael Hays	Principal
2	Chris Taylor	School Social Worker

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3

Math Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the minimum State target.

Objective 3 Description

- * Achievement, 2009 Report Card, for the Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, Math was 55.9% for meet/exceed. This sub-group will make AYP at least 77.5% or Safe Harbor in 2010 school year.
- * Students with Disabilities math instruction will increase with up to 160 additional minutes per week.
- * Students with Disabilities will receive math instruction in a regular education classroom.
- * Students, parents, and staff will utilize the Agenda for communicating math concerns and successes.
- * All grade levels will use Saxon Math Curriculum.
- * Staff will re-teach math concept/skills as needed.
- * Staff will utilize AIMSweb for math assessment beginning 2010-2011 school year.
- * Staff will use assessment to guide instruction.

* Parents will participate in teacher contacts and scheduled Parent/Teacher Conference Days.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- Ⓔ 1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓕ 2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Math Sub-Group, Studetns with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the minimum State target.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	On-going assessments (every 5th lesson) for all students using Saxon Math to guide instruction	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
2	Adjust schedule to allow Students with Disabilities to participate in Regular Ed. math instruction.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Re-teach math concept/skills to those students who do not undwestand	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
4	Provide after school programs for at least 120 minutes per week that will help develop math skills	01/04/2010	05/28/2010	After School	Title I	
5	Utilize Illinois Buckle Down Math ot Illinois Math Coach to help prepare students for ISAT	01/04/2010	02/26/2010	During School	State Funds	

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

Math Sub-Group, Studetns with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the minimum State target.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Staff will attend appropriate workshops/training pertaining to developing studetns' math skills	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	State Funds	
2	Staff will utilize math assessment to guide instruction	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Staff will collaborate working with Students with Disabilities while the students are receiving instruction in the regular classroom.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
4	Staff will collaborate during Team Meetings addressing math issues dealing with math activities, stratgies, etc. to address the needs of students success in math	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	

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

Math Sub-Group, Studetns with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the minimum State target.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents/guardians will know the inportance of math through the newsletter, parent/teacher conferences, agenda, etc.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	After School	Local Funds	
2	Parents/guardians will become familiar with the process of Saxon Math through conferences, agenda, and teacher directed information	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Parents/guardians will participate in math by asking questions, helping with homework, and sharing concerns.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Math Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the minimum State target.

Math Sub-Groups, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on minimum State target.

- * Staff will progress monitor all students through the Saxon Math Curriculum.
- * Staff will progress monitor all students through their daily work and participation.
- * Staff/State will progress monitor all students through ISAT.
- * Students with Disabilities also will be progressed monitored through their IEP.

	Name	Title
1	Michael Hays	Principal
2	Chris Taylor	School Social Worker

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 4

Math Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the State minimum target.

Objective 4 Description

- * Achievement, 2009 Report Card, for sub-group Students with Disabilities in Math was 55.9% for meeting/exceeding. This sub-group will make AYP at least 77.5% or Safe Harbor in 2010 school year.
- * Students with Disabilities math instruction will increase up to 160 additional minutes per week.
- * Students with Disabilities will receive math instruction in a regular classroom.
- * Students with Disabilities will receive math support within the Special Ed. classroom.
- * Students, parents, and staff will utilize the Agenda for communicating math concerns and successes.
- * All grade levels will use Saxon Math curriculum.
- * Staff will re-teach math concept/skills as needed.
- * Staff will use AIMSweb for math assessment beginning 2010-2011 school year.

- * Staff will utilize assessment to guide instruction.
- * Parents will participate in teacher contacts and scheduled Parent/Teacher Conference Days.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- e 1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- b 2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Math Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the State minimum target.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	On-going math assessment (every 5th lesson) for all students using Saxon Math to guide instruction	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
2	Adjust schedule to allow Students with Disabilities to participate in regular Ed. math instruction.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Re-teach math concepts/skills that students do not understand.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
4	Provide after school programs for at least 120 minutes per week that will help develop math skills.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	After School	Title I	
5	Utilize Illinois Buckle Down Math or Illinois Math Coach to help prepare all students for ISAT.	01/04/2010	02/26/2010	During School	State Funds	

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

Math Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the State minimum target.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Staff will attend appropriate math workshops/training pertaining to developing students' math skills.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	State Funds	
2	Staff will collaborate working with Students with Disabilities while the students ar receiving math instruction in the regular classrooms	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Staff will collaborate during team meetings addressing math issues dealing with math activities, strategies, etc. to increase math success for all students.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
4	Information will be presented to staff so they can and will utilize math assessments to guide instruction.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	

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

Math Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the State minimum target.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents/guardians will develope an awareness to the importance of math through newsletters, parent/teacher conferences, agenda, etc.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	After School	Local Funds	
2	Parents/guardians will become familiar with the process of Saxon Math through conferences, ageda, and teacher directed information	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
3	Parents/guardians will be involved with math by asking questions, helping with homework, and sharing ideas/concerns.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Math Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, will improve to meet AYP as based on the State minimum target.

Progress monitor math by will be done by:

- * Staff will progress monito all students through the Saxon Math Curriculum.
- * Staff will progress monitor all students through their daily work and participation,
- * Students with Disabilities will also be progressed monitored through their IEP.
- * Staff and State will progress monitor all students through the ISAT.

	Name	Title
1	Michael Hays	Principal
2	Chris Taylor	School Social Worker

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.*)

- Parents were notified through newsletter.
- Parents were notified by State approved letter.
- Parents were notified by the State Report Card
- Parents were notified through the Parent/Student Handbook.

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.

Parents through parent survey.
Students through student survey.
Staff through staff survey.
Staff through Building Leadership Committee
RESPRO Consultation

	Name	Title
1	Michael Hays	Principal
2	Chris Taylor	School Social Worker
3	Suzette Saxe	Special Education Teacher
4	Jennifer Huff	3rd Grade Teacher
5	LouAnna Racster	4th Grade Teacher
6	Peggy Ernest	5th Grade Teacher
7	Amanda Boze (replaces Mrs. Saltsgaver)	Title I Intervention
8	Julie Merritt	N.I.C.E. Parent

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.

Peer Review persons will review NICE 2 Year School Improvement Plan to help determine if the Plan will be of help in improving Reading skills of our Sub-Group, Students with Disabilities, as well as also helping our general student population.

Peer Review is to be composed of:

- Kerry Maxum (on-going) RESPRO
- Amy Dixon (December 16, 2008) Principal/Director of Instruction
Jefferson Attendance Center
Carmi, Illinois
- Sarah Emery (December 16, 2008) Superintendent/Principal
Allendale C.C.D. #17
Allendale, Illinois

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.

District #348 has a New Teacher Mentoring Program for 3 years that assigns the new teacher to a seasoned teacher for help and guidance.

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.

District will demonstrate support by supplying the means for workshop participation and training that will be needed to help increase teaching skills.

District will also adopt and provide for needed curriculum.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- RESPRO has provided appropriate curriculum.
- RESPRO has provided appropriate professional development.
- RESPRO has provided consultation.
- RESPRO has provided SIP review.
- ISBE approved parent letter.

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: **10/19/2009**

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

OTHER DATA

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

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

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

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

PEER REVIEW

Yes No

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

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS

Yes No

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

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No

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

Yes No N/A

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

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

Yes No

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

SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM

Yes No N/A

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

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD

Yes No

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

PART II - COMMENTS