

Local Board Approved	
Initial Submission	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	550980050262007		
District Name:	Sterling CUSD 5	School Name:	Jefferson Elem School
Superintendent:	Mr. Tad Everett	Principal:	Mr. Ron Rick
District Address:	410 E Le Fevre Rd	School Address:	806 E Le Fevre Rd
City/State/Zip:	Sterling, IL 61081 1391	City/State/Zip:	Sterling, IL 61081 1551
District Telephone#:	Label 8156265050 Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	8156256402 Extn: 0
District Email:	teverett@sterlingschools.org	School Email:	rrick@sterlingschools.org
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2010 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	2010-11 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2010-11 State Improvement Status	

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		77.5			77.5			91		80	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	92.7		Yes	98.2		Yes	95.5	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	96.7		Yes	98.3		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American													
Multiracial/Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities													
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	88.7		Yes	96.8		Yes			

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 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 77.5% 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 77.5% 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 80% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2009.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 77.5% 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 - 2010 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	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Attendance Rate (%)	96.1	95.9	95.8	95.4	95.6	95.0	95.4	95.5
Truancy Rate (%)	0.0	0.5	0.9	0.0	0.0	6.3	3.2	6.3
Mobility Rate (%)	9.5	9.0	15.0	16.6	16.8	15.8	12.8	11.7
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	458	475	435	551	427	427	407	419
Low Income (%)	31.2	32.4	35.9	32.7	53.4	49.9	56.8	60.9
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	8.9	11.9	11.5	15.5
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.8
White, non-Hispanic (%)	80.6	71.2	65.7	60.8	56.0	56.2	53.8	51.6
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	4.4	4.6	2.1	2.5	2.3	2.3	3.7	3.8
Hispanic (%)	14.2	23.2	23.4	24.9	26.5	26.0	25.1	26.5
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	7.8	11.4	15.0	15.5	17.4	17.9

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 4 - Student Race/Ethnicity

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	2000	77.5	3.5	18.1	0.6	0.2	-
	2001	79.4	2.4	17.5	0.7	-	-
	2002	79.2	2.9	17.0	0.7	0.2	-
	2003	80.6	4.4	14.2	0.7	0.2	-
	2004	71.2	4.6	23.2	0.6	0.4	-
	2005	65.7	2.1	23.4	0.5	0.5	7.8
	2006	60.8	2.5	24.9	0.2	0.2	11.4
	2007	56.0	2.3	26.5	-	0.2	15.0
	2008	56.2	2.3	26.0	-	-	15.5
	2009	53.8	3.7	25.1	-	-	17.4
	2010	51.6	3.8	26.5	0.2	-	17.9
D I S T R I C T	2000	74.5	3.7	20.4	1.0	0.4	-
	2001	73.9	3.7	21.0	1.0	0.3	-
	2002	73.4	3.9	21.4	0.9	0.4	-
	2003	73.0	4.4	21.5	0.8	0.3	-
	2004	71.2	4.3	23.5	0.8	0.3	-
	2005	67.9	2.7	21.5	0.6	0.3	7.0
	2006	66.3	3.0	21.8	0.6	0.1	8.2
	2007	64.4	3.2	21.7	0.5	0.1	10.1
	2008	63.9	3.4	21.3	0.5	0.2	10.7
	2009	62.3	3.4	21.4	0.6	0.2	12.1
	2010	62.2	3.3	21.4	0.3	0.2	12.5
	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
	2010	52.8	18.8	21.1	4.2	0.2	2.9

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 5 - Educational Environment

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	-	24.4	100.0	95.4	7.9	2	0.4	-	-
	2001	-	28.5	100.0	95.5	10.1	3	0.7	-	-
	2002	-	29.4	100.0	95.7	6.0	2	0.4	-	-
	2003	-	31.2	100.0	96.1	9.5	-	-	-	-
	2004	-	32.4	100.0	95.9	9.0	2	0.5	-	-
	2005	-	35.9	100.0	95.8	15.0	3	0.9	-	-
	2006	3.4	32.7	100.0	95.4	16.6	-	-	-	-
	2007	8.9	53.4	100.0	95.6	16.8	-	-	-	-
	2008	11.9	49.9	100.0	95.0	15.8	27	6.3	-	-
	2009	11.5	56.8	100.0	95.4	12.8	13	3.2	-	-
2010	15.5	60.9	100.0	95.5	11.7	28	6.3	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	2.2	27.2	98.4	93.5	9.9	57	1.6	7.1	78.6
	2001	2.7	30.1	98.2	93.3	14.0	41	1.2	7.9	77.2
	2002	3.4	33.0	98.4	94.1	14.3	46	1.3	4.3	78.5
	2003	2.1	35.1	97.5	94.3	14.9	127	3.5	6.9	75.4
	2004	1.5	36.2	99.2	94.5	16.4	33	1.0	8.0	74.2
	2005	1.7	40.6	99.3	94.6	15.2	53	1.6	4.0	80.8
	2006	1.7	34.1	100.0	94.4	16.5	69	2.1	4.0	82.6
	2007	2.3	37.0	100.0	94.6	14.2	75	2.3	4.8	81.5
	2008	3.5	42.6	100.0	94.6	15.5	84	2.6	4.9	83.1
	2009	3.0	45.4	100.0	94.9	14.5	52	1.6	3.3	82.2
2010	4.0	50.2	100.0	94.9	12.4	60	1.8	4.2	86.6	
	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

S T A T E	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

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	480	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	452	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	453	79	67	76	-	-	-
	2003	458	84	80	64	-	-	-
	2004	475	1	2	-	-	-	-
	2005	435	1	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	551	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2007	427	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	427	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2009	407	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2010	419	-	-	-	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	3,558	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	3,563	266	296	269	268	253	248
	2002	3,529	252	269	290	285	275	270
	2003	3,505	257	250	269	283	293	290
	2004	3,556	249	232	233	294	275	257
	2005	3,457	246	247	231	259	286	265
	2006	3,612	254	250	262	227	248	281
	2007	3,362	269	257	250	222	223	249
	2008	3,269	237	256	260	244	227	246
	2009	3,225	256	244	263	238	248	209
	2010	3,308	272	257	236	255	248	204
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-

S T A T E	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

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 7 - Educator Data

Educator Data is available only for district level

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	222	17	43,592	64	36	18	19	-	-
	2001	231	17	45,075	66	35	17	20	-	-
	2002	233	17	49,593	66	34	17	19	1	-
	2003	225	17	50,031	66	34	18	20	2	-
	2004	202	17	51,768	63	37	19	23	2	-
	2005	189	17	53,133	66	35	20	22	1	-
	2006	199	15	51,314	70	30	19	23	1	-
	2007	215	14	52,031	72	28	17	21	2	-
	2008	206	14	53,405	69	31	19	21	1	-
	2009	215	13	54,954	53	47	19	18	1	-
2010	219	12	54,789	51	49	19	19	1	-	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1
2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1	

	2010	132,502	13	63,296	42	57	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, 2005-2010																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
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, 2005-2010																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
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?

Based on these results, students at Jefferson are doing very well. We meet all criteria for AYP, in fact we actually exceed the expected levels for state guidelines. Math scores are slightly higher than reading scores, but again, both are above current expected levels. No real weaknesses are pointed out, but once again we must maintain vigil on the percentage of low SES students and are high mobility rate.

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

Jefferson has done well, as the data shows. Students and teachers have worked very hard to attain the level of achievement indicated by the collected data. The focus of the District professional development, for the past number of years, has been student achievement. By focussing in the past on state standards, differentiated instruction and Response to Intervention (RtI), and now the Common Core Standards, Sterling Public Schools has constantly strived to be at the forefront of programming to ensure student success and achievement.

External factors causing areas of concern are high percentages of low SES and mobility rates. These are direct results of economic conditions in the community, state, and nation. With economic downturns come unemployment, foreclosures, reductions in workforce, little, if any, economic development, and decreased consumer expenditures. Sterling's industrial base is almost non-existent. Jobs remaining in the area are basically service-oriented and therefore not as high paying as previous jobs. Many have sought jobs in other communities. People are constantly moving back and forth between Sterling and Rock Falls in search of affordable housing. The number of "homeless" is on the rise. Our Hispanic population continues to grow with the influx of persons from other areas of our nation.

In spite of these concerns, Jefferson students continue to be successful as a whole. All sub-groups, those reported and those not reported, due to few number, continue to meet or exceed state standards. Our low SES, Hispanic students, Special education populace, and males/females continue to meet or exceed standards. With the use of RtI, interventions are in place to help students achieve grade-level reading. Bucks for Books and A+ Initiative continue to support student achievement. The adoption of Common Core standards will, hopefully, ensure success at higher grades for our students. As in the past, Jefferson continues to increase parent involvement. Grandparent's Day, Open House, Bilingual Parent Night, Family Reading Nights, and parent conferences have all been held to increase parent involvement in the success of their children.

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

We will continue those practices which have contributed to our success. Through the use of Rtl, universal screening, progress monitoring, problem-solving strategies and interventions, we have been successful in increasing student achievement in the area of literacy. We will extend Rtl into the area of mathematics. We will adopt a universal screener, adopt problem-solving strategies, the Common Core Standards, and interventions in order to increase the skills necessary to be successful in the area of mathematics.

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?

DRA, Dibels, Istation, and Rigby theme tests are used as local reading assessments. Star Math, a common math assessment, and timed addition/subtraction math fact assessments are currently used as local math assessments. These assessments are used as indications of growth. Istation is given monthly and acts as a progress monitor and universal screener. These results are used to drive instruction and help determine which skills need to be addressed. DRA and the addition/subtraction timed math fact assessments are used as assessments for learning. DRA is given three times per year and timed math fact assessment occurs at least four times per year.

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

Our strengths could be contributed to a strong school-wide Title 1 program and strong SPS emphasis on Rtl. With the use of a universal screener and the resultant placing of students in tiers and addressing their individual needs, our programs are not only stronger, but more efficient and beneficial. We are finding at each grade level there are particular skills that need to be addressed. Second grade is addressing reading fluency. First grade is addressing comprehension and vocabulary. Kindergarten is addressing phonemic awareness and phonics.

External factors that affect these results are lack of background knowledge and experiences which prevent students from making connections of text to self that will result in poorer comprehension scores. With our free and reduced rate (lowSES) at 61% and a high mobility rate, our families do not have the resources to provide the background experiences needed to enter school with a rich vocabulary and experiences to draw upon to make connections. Social/emotional issues are increasing and as a result students are not prepared for the rigors of school, today.

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

Our teachers are becoming interventionists. In reading support, we have individuals who specialize in reading support and determining what interventions to use. General education teachers will become interventionists in the area of mathematics. These interventionists and teachers will assist in the identification of at-risk students and in the delivery of instruction at tier two and tier three interventions. In mathematics some may even deliver enrichment activities. With the adoption of the new Common Core Standards and the continued use of universal screeners, we should have a better picture of the individual skills that need improved and of the researched-based delivery that will assist in raising achievement levels.

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?

Jefferson school, as I have said often, is a great place to be. Teachers and administration have high expectations and the students and staff have delivered. At Jefferson, we believe all children can learn. We have tried to create a very safe, caring, and welcoming environment. Time on task is crucial. Jefferson staff believe in bell-to-bell planning, but they also believe in the total development of the child, social/emotional as well as academic. Jefferson, over time, has become more child-centered. Being a K-2 building, we focus on early learning standards, Common Core Standards, and RtI, and its key component, early intervention.

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

Our student performance in reading and math does not reflect the many challenges facing the community at large. Our students' academic success can be attributed to the hard work on the part of parents, teachers, staff, and the students. Jefferson is a close community where each student's success is a concern for all members. Even though parents may not be as available as in the past, due to economic stresses on our community, many attend our events, volunteer in classrooms, and express a desire for their child's educational success. Learning is still strong as evidenced earlier by assessment scores.

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

We need to continue to make Jefferson a warm, caring, safe, and welcoming environment for students and their families. Students must be treated with the respect they deserve, as do the parents and teachers. Social and emotional well-being is necessary for academic success. Our nurse, counselor, support staff, administration, and teachers will continue to treat each child's issues as urgent and of the utmost importance. Our objectives and activities will focus on consistent improvement in the areas of reading and math, not being satisfied with current levels of success. This improvement will be enhanced by the efforts toward improved communication with Lincoln School, our sister school.

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?

Jefferson currently has 31 certified staff members, all of which are "highly qualified". Twenty-three percent of Jefferson teachers are non-tenured. Teachers at Jefferson average 12 years of experience. One teacher, with over 35 years of experience, retired this past year. 62% of Jefferson's teachers hold master's degrees. Four Jefferson teachers are currently national board certified teachers.

Jefferson will have, at least, six sections of every grade level. If numbers hold true to the past three years, class sizes will be in the range of 21-24 across the board. Jefferson will house 1.5 Pre-K classes, if the state grant is approved.

SPS has done a tremendous job of delivering relevant and quality professional development. The past two years the focus was on RtI, especially in the area of Literacy. This upcoming year our focus will continue to be RtI, but more focus will be in the area of mathematics and in delivering strong Tier 1 instruction. A new math series, new math screener, and the adoption of the Common Core Standards will become important areas of focus for professional development.

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

Jefferson is a great place to be, as I have said repeatedly. This is an outstanding staff. Jefferson's staff is very much aware of their student's needs. They are very much aware of their student's environments, outside of school. The Jefferson staff is instrumental in making Jefferson a caring, safe, inviting environment for their students and families. They understand the need for early intervention to ensure future academic success. They understand the demands placed upon them to meet achievement levels and the necessity of an increased understanding of a child's social/emotional well-being as a contributing factor to academic achievement.

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

Jefferson teachers understand and support RtI. They understand the importance of early intervention. They are prepared and have refined their craft to meet the demands of student achievement, which is not easy to do with the constant need to develop new pathways. Jefferson teachers will be prepared to address both the social/emotional side of the pyramid and the academic side. Through the use of the universal screener, progress-monitoring, and the resultant data, teachers will be equipped with a better understanding of a student's needs and learning styles. Teachers will differentiate their instruction to better meet the needs of their students.

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?

Parent involvement begins with parent conferences prior to the start of the school year. These conferences serve as a means for parents, teachers, and students to meet each other before the start of school. Expectations are outlined, students become familiar with the teacher and the classroom, parents meet their child's teacher, and obtain necessary materials prior to school's start. Jefferson students and parents are involved in school life. Various activities have been held. Jefferson/Lincoln PTO sponsors a book fair during our fall open house. The PTO has helped sponsor a Family Reading Night in conjunction with our Title teachers and aides. Storytellers were brought in, community members to read to groups of children. Books were given away for participation, and door prizes were given for attendance. Jefferson held a school-wide "Grandparent's Day". This was very successful with over 300 grandparents in attendance. A second round of parent conferences were held following the end of the first quarter, which was very well attended. This past year, for the second year, a bilingual family night was held with much success. Success due to the content and the attendance from the families.

The number or percentage of parents involved in any given activity was directly affected by the participation of students in the activity. If their child was involved there was a

greater likelihood of the parent showing up and participating. Food does not hurt, either.

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

Any time a parent can be involved with their child, rewards will be reaped. Our scores reflect not only hard work on the students and teacher part, but strong support from parents. We may not get as many parents to take part, or necessarily the parents who need to take part, but those who have taken part have been tremendously supportive and thankful. There are many contributing factors to low numbers in attendance, many parents hold two or more jobs working different shifts, cultural differences, and events that are of little importance, especially those where children are not directly involved.

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

Continued efforts to involve parents are needed, tempered with an awareness of the economic challenges and work schedules facing the families. Varying the times of meetings, as well as written communication to parents, in their native language, on the results of the meetings will be necessary. Avoid becoming judgemental, believing that parents do not care.

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?

We will continue to use those practices that have led to the success we have had in the past. However, with the implementation of RtI and the resultant use of universal screeners, progress monitoring, data collection, data driven decision-making, and tiered interventions, we hope to identify areas of particular skill deficits (fluency, comprehension, phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary), intervene earlier to correct these deficits, and, ultimately, lead to greater success for all students. We, also, will continue our transition to the Common Core Standards which allow us to go deeper in subject content rather than broader and as a result students will be more prepared for the expectations of the future and better compete on a global scale.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	92% of all students will meet or exceed state standards for determining AYP in the area of mathematics.	
2	During the 2011-2012 school year, 92% of all students will meet quarterly benchmarks and meet state standards for AYP in Reading.	
3	Less than 8% of the student population will have two or more office referrals during the 2011-2012 school year	

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

92% of all students will meet or exceed state standards for determining AYP in the area of mathematics.

Objective 1 Description

Students will increase knowledge of math facts, both addition and subtraction, increase problem-solving ability, and meet/exceed state standards.

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

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

Objective 1 Title :

92% of all students will meet or exceed state standards for determining AYP in the area of mathematics.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Use of a new universal screener. Screen all students to identify those at risk for potential difficulties.	01/09/2012	05/21/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Implement 90 minute math block to include 60 minute whole group, guided group independent practice, and 30 minutes of intervention interventions.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Implement new math series, focussed on Common Core Standards, with integrity	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Local Funds	13,000

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

Objective 1 Title :

92% of all students will meet or exceed state standards for determining AYP in the area of mathematics.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide staff development in the use of the new math series.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Provide staff development in the use of the new universal screener.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Provide staff development in the use and development of math interventions	08/18/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 1 Title :

92% of all students will meet or exceed state standards for determining AYP in the area of mathematics.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide parents with information on the new math series and how to access the math book from home through the school website.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Provide parents with information on the new math screener and tips to support their children through the website and monthly newsletter.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

92% of all students will meet or exceed state standards for determining AYP in the area of mathematics.

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?)

Through the use of the universal screener, timed math facts assessments, scores from unit tests, and conferences, both pre and post, using the teacher's evaluation tool, personnel will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities.

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	Ron Rick	Principal
2	Cheryl Robinson	Director of Curriculum and Instruction
3	Sara Dail	Director of Student Services

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

During the 2011-2012 school year, 92% of all students will meet quarterly benchmarks and meet state standards for AYP in Reading.

Objective 2 Description

Monitor student progress toward meeting quarterly benchmarks. Develop and implement strategies to help students achieve those benchmarks

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

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

Objective 2 Title :

During the 2011-2012 school year, 92% of all students will meet quarterly benchmarks and meet state standards for AYP in Reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Implement grade level meetings to analyze grade level data, Tier 1 student progress, and Tier 1 Curriculum	09/12/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Implement the revised rubric for problem-solving based on AIMSweb, DRA2, and Rigby thematic units	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Continued use of the checklist to ensure that core instruction (Rigby) is delivered with integrity and fidelity.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 2 Title :

During the 2011-2012 school year, 92% of all students will meet quarterly benchmarks and meet state standards for AYP in Reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide staff development on guided reading techniques and DRA2	09/21/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Provide staff development on Tier 1 interventions	08/22/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Provide staff development on analyzing data, especially AIMSweb rates of progress	09/21/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
4	Provide AIMSweb staff development	09/21/2011	10/07/2011	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 2 Title :

During the 2011-2012 school year, 92% of all students will meet quarterly benchmarks and meet state standards for AYP in Reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide parents with information about the RtI process, an overview of the RtI framework, and tips to support their children	09/01/2011	05/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Communicate student data with parents on a quarterly basis	10/07/2011	05/18/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

During the 2011-2012 school year, 92% of all students will meet quarterly benchmarks and meet state standards for AYP in Reading.

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?)

Data obtained through the use of AIMSweb, Data collected through progress monitoring, the use of walkthroughs, and the utilization of pre and post conference sections of the current teacher evaluation tool will be used to monitor the progress of objective 2.

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	Ron Rick	Principal
2	Sara Dail	Director of Student Services
3	Cheryl Robinson	Director of Curriculum and Instruction
4	Literacy team	

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3

Less than 8% of the student population will have two or more office referrals during the 2011-2012 school year

Objective 3 Description

Strategies will be put in place and data collected addressing social/emotional issues at school.

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

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

Objective 3 Title :

Less than 8% of the student population will have two or more office referrals during the 2011-2012 school year

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Implement a behavioral referral form for major and minor offenses.	08/17/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Administer the PBIS Benchmarks of Quality.	08/17/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Establish celebration activities and reward system.	08/17/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	1,000
4	Implement AIMSweb social/emotional universal screener	08/17/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Other	0
5	Using SWIS data reporting system identify patterns of student problems and behaviors.	08/17/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	250

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

Objective 3 Title :

Less than 8% of the student population will have two or more office referrals during the 2011-2012 school year

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide professional development for implementing PBIS. Continue implementing Calm Classroom	08/16/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Other	0
2	Provide training on establishing classroom rules, consequences, and classroom climate. Align classroom rules with 3 PBIS school-wide expectations	08/16/2011	08/31/2011	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Provide training for AIMSweb universal screener	08/15/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 3 Title :

Less than 8% of the student population will have two or more office referrals during the 2011-2012 school year

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Through monthly news; letter and counselor website parents will receive information on PBIS	08/16/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 3 Title :

Less than 8% of the student population will have two or more office referrals during the 2011-2012 school year

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?)

Student behavioral referral forms will be entered on SWIS and monitored by personnel. End of the year report should indicate success or need for continued efforts to meet goal. Report should include number and type of offense, location, time, teacher, frequency, and demographics; such as, gender, ethnicity, grade level, etc.

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	Ron Rick	Principal
2	Casey Meltzer	Counselor, Internal Coach
3	Cheryl Robinson	Director of Curriculum and Instruction, External Coach
4	Sara Dail	Director of Student Services, External Coach

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.*)

Our school report card is available to parents. The school report card is available on the District website and is available in a hard copy at the school upon request.. In addition, parents have received notification of the availability of the report card through our monthly newsletter. This report is available in English as well as Spanish. Upon request parents may have a copy of our SIP, in which the school report card may also be found. At our level, K-2, there is no reporting of individual scores.

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.

Our SIP team consisted of certified staff, support personnel, and the administrator. The SIP team reviewed the data and formulated a plan of how to address the needs of students at Jefferson. Parent, Karen Neal from our PTO, was allowed to review the plan and suggest possible inclusions. Ongoing conversations were held with Sara Dail, Director of Student Services, and Cheryl Robinson, Director of Curriculum and Instruction.

	Name	Title
1	Ron Rick	Principal
2	Gonzalo Reyes	Sterling Public Schools Board of Education
3	Casey Meltzer	Counselor
4	Bonnie Dern	First grade Teacher
5	Andrea Brenner	Kindergarten Teacher
6	Lisa Lobdell	First Grade Teacher
7	Chelese Palmer	Second Grade Teacher
8	Jackie Watson	Rtl Interventionist
9	Ann Holthaus	Special Education Teacher
10	Jose Gonzalez	Educational Support Personnel
11	Karen Neal	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.

Each building SIP team, or designated peer review team completes an internal review process using the ISBE scoring rubric. Scoring should be completed independently and then shared with the group. Adjustments to the SIP are made if necessary. This rubric is submitted with the SIP to the District Office in May. During the months of June, July, and August representatives from each school's SIP team meet with the Board of Education's Education Committee. The Education Committee members will provide feedback to each school. The school SIP members will review the feedback and make any necessary changes before the SIPs are submitted to the Board of Education as a whole.

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.

So that Sterling Schools may enhance student learning, as well as provide its teachers with instructional teaching methods, it has contractually created a Teacher Induction and Mentoring Program. The purpose of the Induction program is to provide ongoing support and assistance to all novice teachers, with the outcome being that each staff member moves from an Illinois Initial Teaching Certificate, to an Illinois Standard Teaching Certificate. Within this Induction Program is our two-year Mentoring Program that is required of each beginning and new teacher to the district.

Details of the Program

Every novice and new teacher that comes to the district is provided with a mentor. This mentor is selected by principals, but must meet district criteria, as well as participate in the district's Mentoring Training Program. Then, throughout the school year, the mentor and mentee meet regularly with one another. On a monthly basis, the mentor/mentee team will meet with the building principal to communicate progress and future strategies. Sterling School's uses Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching as a guide and a model for its Mentoring Program. This researched-based framework, which each mentor is trained in, helps to lead discussions between mentors and mentees that focus on student achievement and effective classroom strategies.

Goals of the Program

The program has three major goals. First and foremost, it is to improve the quality of classroom instruction of the participating teacher by ensuring that he/she is provided with researched-based, best-practices for teaching. Secondly, Sterling Schools strives to provide not just academic support, but also personal support to those in its Mentor Program. Lastly, it is our desire to acquaint each mentee with tools and information that will assist them "on the job." These items include, the prevailing culture of our school, the District evaluation procedure, the union contract, and district policies affecting teachers and teaching,

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

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

The District will provide funding and technical assistance such as ; data collection, data analysis, identification of the school's challenges in implementing professional development, and assistance in revising the school's budget. ISBE will provide technical assistance, if necessary. *The Interactive Report Card* was made available through the state and local school district. Our regional office also serves as a source of professional development

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.