

Local Board Approved	11/16/2011
Initial Submission	12/01/2011
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2011 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	2011-12 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2011-12 State Improvement Status	

	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
Student Groups	%	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		85.0			85.0			91.0		82.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	88.6		Yes	94.3		Yes	95.4	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes										
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian														

American Indian													
Two or More Races													
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities													
Economically Disadvantaged													

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress(AYP)

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 85% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 85% 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 85% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 91% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 82% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2010.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 85% or above are not printed.

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

applied. Safe Harbor allows schools an alternate method to meet subgroup minimum targets on achievement.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2011 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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Attendance Rate (%)	96.4	96.1	95.3	96.2	95.2	95.7	95.0	95.4
Truancy Rate (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.0	0.0	0.0
Mobility Rate (%)	8.3	19.3	12.6	11.8	5.4	19.0	19.6	18.0
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	122	132	164	154	134	124	128	138
Low Income (%)	31.1	34.8	34.1	31.2	33.6	42.7	39.1	38.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	16.4	20.3
White, non-Hispanic (%)	97.5	97.7	93.9	97.4	96.3	97.6	98.4	97.1
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	0.8	0.0	0.6	0.6	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.7
Hispanic (%)	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.7
Asian (%)	0.8	1.5	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
American Indian(%)	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Two or More Races (%)	-	0.8	4.3	1.3	2.2	1.6	1.6	1.4
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0

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 (%)	American Indian (%)	Two Or More Races (%)	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander (%)
S C H O O L	2000	95.9	3.4	-	0.7	-	-	-
	2001	96.6	2.7	-	0.7	-	-	-
	2002	97.5	-	1.3	1.3	-	-	-
	2003	96.9	1.6	0.8	0.8	-	-	-
	2004	97.5	0.8	0.8	0.8	-	-	-
	2005	97.7	-	-	1.5	-	0.8	-
	2006	93.9	0.6	-	0.6	0.6	4.3	-
	2007	97.4	0.6	-	-	0.6	1.3	-
	2008	96.3	1.5	-	-	-	2.2	-
	2009	97.6	-	0.8	-	-	1.6	-
	2010	98.4	-	-	-	-	1.6	-
2011	97.1	0.7	0.7	0.7	-	-	1.4	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	95.4	2.8	0.9	0.8	0.1	-	-
	2001	94.6	3.2	0.8	1.3	0.1	-	-
	2002	95.0	3.0	0.9	1.0	0.1	-	-
	2003	94.8	2.8	1.2	1.1	0.1	-	-
	2004	94.3	3.2	1.2	1.2	0.1	-	-
	2005	93.0	3.3	1.4	1.2	0.1	0.9	-
	2006	93.2	2.9	1.4	1.0	0.1	1.4	-
	2007	91.9	3.0	1.4	1.0	0.2	2.4	-
	2008	91.0	3.6	1.8	1.0	0.3	2.4	-
	2009	91.0	3.1	1.7	1.0	0.2	3.0	-
	2010	90.6	2.8	1.7	1.3	0.2	3.4	-

	2011	90.3	3.2	1.2	1.1	0.5	3.6	-
S T A T E	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7	-
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8	-
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2	-
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7	-
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5	-
	2010	52.8	18.8	21.1	4.2	0.2	2.9	-
	2011	51.4	18.3	23.0	4.1	0.3	2.8	0.1

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	2000	-	18.5	100.0	95.6	8.6	11	9.4	-	-
	2001	-	16.4	100.0	95.9	13.5	-	-	-	-
	2002	-	27.5	100.0	95.8	20.3	-	-	-	-
	2003	-	29.9	100.0	96.0	11.6	-	-	-	-
	2004	-	31.1	100.0	96.4	8.3	-	-	-	-
	2005	-	34.8	100.0	96.1	19.3	-	-	-	-
	2006	-	34.1	100.0	95.3	12.6	-	-	-	-
	2007	-	31.2	100.0	96.2	11.8	-	-	-	-
	2008	-	33.6	100.0	95.2	5.4	1	0.9	-	-
	2009	-	42.7	100.0	95.7	19.0	1	1.0	-	-
	2010	-	39.1	100.0	95.0	19.6	-	-	-	-
2011	-	38.4	100.0	95.4	18.0	-	-	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	-	19.5	89.5	94.2	16.3	36	1.2	3.3	84.2
	2001	-	23.5	99.2	94.4	15.0	33	1.1	3.5	87.5
	2002	0.3	24.7	98.4	94.4	14.1	33	1.1	4.3	85.8
	2003	0.2	25.8	98.3	94.4	12.6	65	2.2	2.6	92.6
	2004	0.3	29.5	97.8	94.9	11.1	22	0.8	4.3	85.3
	2005	0.4	30.2	99.8	94.6	13.8	106	3.7	2.1	87.3
	2006	0.4	27.6	99.8	94.6	12.2	34	1.2	1.8	90.3
	2007	0.4	31.4	99.8	94.5	16.9	34	1.2	2.5	91.6
	2008	0.5	33.9	100.0	94.6	13.1	18	0.7	3.1	88.8
	2009	0.3	35.2	100.0	94.8	9.4	17	0.6	2.7	88.0
	2010	0.5	37.6	100.0	94.3	13.9	20	0.7	2.7	82.4
2011	0.5	36.2	99.6	94.6	10.3	17	0.6	2.7	84.5	

S T A T E	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
	2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1
	2010	7.6	45.4	96.2	93.9	13.0	72,383	3.6	3.8	87.8
	2011	8.8	48.1	96.0	94.0	12.8	63,067	3.2	2.7	83.8

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	146	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	146	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	160	26	28	-	-	-	-
	2003	127	22	23	-	-	-	-
	2004	122	26	18	-	-	-	-
	2005	132	26	23	-	-	-	-
	2006	164	36	29	-	-	-	-
	2007	154	21	36	-	-	-	-
	2008	134	24	23	-	-	-	-
	2009	124	26	27	-	-	-	-
	2010	128	21	27	-	-	-	-
2011	138	19	31	-	-	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	3,166	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	3,017	226	238	223	249	233	238
	2002	3,083	224	218	217	247	250	241
	2003	2,993	227	220	220	225	245	224
	2004	2,952	218	218	223	240	215	208
	2005	2,922	245	216	219	222	230	233
	2006	2,902	213	244	208	217	212	228
	2007	2,859	184	208	237	221	212	217
	2008	2,881	211	192	203	196	215	210
	2009	2,776	212	217	187	227	185	204
	2010	2,853	207	216	227	209	223	202
2011	2,849	213	204	213	181	204	198	
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-

S T A T E	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2,044,539	164,413	157,570	159,499	160,924	156,451	138,559
	2004	2,060,048	161,329	160,246	158,367	162,933	160,271	139,504
	2005	2,062,912	156,370	158,622	160,365	162,047	162,192	142,828
	2006	2,075,277	155,155	154,372	158,822	160,362	160,911	147,500
	2007	2,077,856	155,356	153,480	154,719	162,594	159,038	150,475
	2008	2,074,167	155,578	152,895	153,347	160,039	161,310	149,710
	2009	2,070,125	156,512	152,736	152,820	155,433	158,700	144,822
	2010	2,064,312	155,468	154,389	152,681	154,465	154,982	146,919
	2011	2,074,806	153,516	153,301	154,241	153,981	153,986	151,059

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)	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	2000	194	17	39,593	36	64	19	21	-	-
	2001	196	17	40,782	36	64	18	20	-	-
	2002	192	16	42,395	38	63	19	20	-	-
	2003	191	17	44,700	35	65	19	20	1	-
	2004	185	16	44,576	35	65	20	20	-	3
	2005	181	16	45,498	36	64	19	23	1	-
	2006	179	15	46,068	36	64	20	23	1	-
	2007	187	15	45,983	40	60	18	22	1	1
	2008	184	15	47,897	39	61	19	22	1	-
	2009	189	15	48,475	39	61	18	19	-	1
	2010	180	15	50,336	37	63	20	20	-	-
2011	167	16	51,346	38	62	20	23	-	-	
	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2

S T A T E	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1
	2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1
	2010	132,502	13	63,296	42	57	18	18	1	1
	2011	128,262	13	64,978	40	60	19	19	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, 2006-2011																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	76.5	70.0	81.5	77.8	91.0	83.4	82.7	88.6	77.3	72.0	88.4	96.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	75.8	70.0	81.5	77.8	91.0	83.4	85.2	88.2	77.3	72.0	88.4	96.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	50.0	-	72.7	-	-	-	64.3	70.0	-	61.6	-	92.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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, 2006-2011																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	91.2	95.0	92.6	88.9	90.9	94.5	89.6	94.3	86.4	84.0	96.2	96.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	90.9	95.0	92.6	88.9	90.9	94.5	88.9	94.2	86.4	84.0	96.2	96.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	80.0	-	100.0	-	-	-	78.6	90.0	-	76.9	-	92.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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?

In looking at our most recent state testing information, the following items are of note:

1. Students in Ashmore School did very well this year.
2. There was a definite increase in our percentage meeting or exceeding standards from the previous year.

Reading Grade 3 increase from 77.8 to 91
 Grade 4 increase from 72 to 88.4
Math Grade 3 increase from 88.9 to 90.9
 Grade 4 increase from 84 to 96.2

3. Due to a small enrollment, our scores tend to fluctuate from year to year.
4. Typically our math scores are higher than our reading scores.

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

This past year we made a concerted effort to target students who needed extra help. We were able to provide multiple opportunities for students to receive extra instruction delivered in a small group setting.

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

It would appear that if we are able to provide targeted interventions for specific students in a small group setting that we have a much greater chance for student success as measured by ISAT testing. School improvement planning should focus on identifying those students most in need of interventions and then designing an intervention model that will provide the greatest chance of success.

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?

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

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 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?

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 and information 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

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?

As we look at student performance data, we look at factors that might impact student learning. Factors such as mobility, low-income, and the involvement of parents are all examined. We cannot change what happens outside of the school setting. Our charge is to recognize our students' needs and design an instructional program that will meet those needs. For the most part, we do a good job of this. We have a caring, competent staff that knows our students and strives to be sensitive to outside influences. We felt a great deal of success this past year, and our ISAT scores reflect that, in targeting specific student needs with specific interventions. As budget constraints have restricted our available personnel, and student needs continue to increase, it is our challenge to continue to provide interventions for those struggling learners. We will continue to monitor student performance, identify struggling students, and find ways to utilize available staff to meet their needs. We will also continue to move forward with classroom strategies that maximize learning and provide curricular differentiation strategies that will benefit all students.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Students will improve literacy skills.	

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Students will improve literacy skills.

Objective 1 Description

Student performance on the reading portion of the ISAT will meet AYP requirements (85% meets/exceeds in 2011; 92.5% in 2012) or safe harbor.

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

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students will improve literacy skills.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Intervention groups and strategies for struggling learners at all grade levels will be implemented.	09/01/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	300
2	Teachers will utilize Reader's and Writer's Workshop as part of their instructional practices.	09/01/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	300
3	An assessment wall will be maintained to chart student progress throughout the year.	09/01/2011	05/25/2012	Before School	Title I	100

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students will improve literacy skills.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Monthly early dismissals will provide staff members with information/professional development relative to literacy.	09/01/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Local Funds	100
2	Staff members will be provided with collaboration/inservice time.	09/01/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Title II	500
3	At least one staff member will attend the Reading Recovery Conference in January of each year providing funds are available.	01/03/2011	01/31/2012	During School	Title I	300
4	At least one staff member will attend continuing professional development related to the new literacy model.	09/01/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Other	100

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students will improve literacy skills.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will be informed of classroom instructional practices during an orientation meeting in August of 2011 and 2012.	08/02/2011	08/31/2012	After School	Local Funds	0
2	A "Family Reading Night" will be held in April of 2012.	04/01/2012	04/29/2012	After School	Local Funds	50
3	Information related to literacy development/instructional practices will be shared with parents through the monthly office newsletter.	11/01/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Local Funds	50

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Students will improve literacy skills.

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

Progress toward SIP goals will be reviewed and evaluated in January of 2012. The entire faculty will meet in May of 2012 to review progress and make changes as necessary. Monthly faculty meetings may also be used for SIP work if necessary. The building-level school improvement team will review the plan in February of 2012. ISAT information will be reviewed and evaluated as it is released to the school. Student data from AIMSWeb and MAP testing will also be considered.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	Name	Title
1	E. E. "Bud" McMillan	Principal

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

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

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

Information regarding school goals and progress toward those goals is available on the school report card. This information is posted on our website. We have made paper copies of the report card available to those requesting a paper copy.

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.

A committee of parents and teachers is formed to review what is going on at Ashmore. All staff members are provided the opportunity to be a part of the School Improvement Team. The team looks at academic issues, parent involvement opportunities, and day-to-day operation of our school.

Parents are important participants on our School Improvement Team. The team reviews the school improvement plan and provides feedback and suggestions for any needed changes. A peer review team also reviews the SIP and makes suggestions for needed changes.

	Name	Title
1	E. E. "Bud" McMillan	Principal
2	Pat Beasley	Kindergarten teacher
3	Ann Cougill	First grade teacher
4	Tiffany Oakley	Second grade teacher
5	Tracy Strader	Third grade teacher
6	Connie Walters	Fourth grade teacher
7	Holly Storm	Reading Recovery teacher
8	Jennifer Schuler	LBS1
9		Parent
10		Parent
11		

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.

The District-wide Peer Review Team met on December 9, 2010 to review each building's current school improvement plan by using an ISBE-provided School Improvement Plan (SIP) Monitoring Prompt. An opportunity was provided for each plan reviewer to make suggestions and to discuss the plans of the different schools.

The Peer Review Team met on October 12, 2011 to review each building's new school improvement plan utilizing the same process as was done in 2010. Participants included

building-level administrators and the assistant superintendent.

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.

The mentoring program was established for two purposes: to allow teachers to move their certificate from the status of "Initial" to "Standard" and to ensure that new staff members are cognizant of the expectations of their position. The mentoring program is designed to provide teachers with information about their school and the district. An individually assigned mentor with which teachers can consult throughout the year is provided. Opportunities to observe tenured staff members who want to share their wealth of knowledge and experience are also available.

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.

Our district has a variety of services and resources to assist us with our educational program. We have in-district "experts" who can provide us with requested help. Through a combination of grants as well as district money, we have been able to provide numerous professional development opportunities. Our building also utilizes a Teacher Collaboration Team that provides support and suggestions for individual students.

A semester review of the SIP will be completed using a district monitoring checklist. The checklist includes a summary of the progress of each SIP goal. Criteria that will be addressed by using the checklist include: review SIP action plan to ensure that proposed actions have been carried out; review budgets to ensure appropriate percentage of expenditures; review student achievement data in the SIP; consult the SIP Timeline; review the professional development plan to ensure that planned professional development activities have been carried out; other areas reviewed by the SIP team.

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

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

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

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

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

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

We utilize the Regional Office of Education, Eastern Illinois Area of Special Education, and state and national consultants to assist us in implementing our efforts to improve our school. We secure their assistance through workshops, phone calls, and visits.

	Name	Title
1		

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 11/16/2011

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

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

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

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

PEER REVIEW

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