

**School Improvement Plan
for**

Rockton Grade School
1050 East Union Street
Rockton, IL 61072

2010-2012

Table of Contents

Introduction and Planning Process	3
RGS Mission Statement	3
DEMOGRAPHICS:	
School Information	4
Educational Environment	5
Enrollment Trends	6
DATA COLLECTION AND INFORMATION:	
Local Assessment Data	7 - 10
Factors and Conclusions	11
ACTION PLAN:	
Data and Gap Analysis	12 - 13
Objectives, Activities & Strategies	14 - 17

Introduction and Planning Process

The purpose of this school improvement plan is to identify areas for improvement in student achievement, school climate, and staff development. The goals in the plan have come from feedback received from teachers, staff members and parents in surveys conducted in the spring and fall of 2010, as well as a study of student performance on local assessments over the last two years. All Rockton Grade School teachers will be involved in evaluating our progress toward the identified goals during team and faculty meetings throughout the 2010-11 and the 2011-2012 school years.

With the implementation of the Response to Intervention (RtI) model during the 2008-09 school year, we are using the Primary Measure of Academic Progress (PMAP) and the Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment in reading and math from the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) as our universal screener (see p. 7 of plan). These assessments will be given to students three times each school year – once in the fall, again near the semester break, and then in the spring. Teachers will use the data we receive from NWEA to determine the appropriate skills and strategies to focus on in their instruction. We will also use this data to evaluate the progress of students who have been behind academically and need to make more than “typical growth” to catch up to their grade level peers. The results of these assessments will be entered into this plan as they are received and reviewed.

RGS Mission Statement

Rockton Grade School provides a caring, nurturing, and safe environment. We are a learning community working together with parents to serve the social, emotional, and educational needs of all our children.

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 3 – School Information**

Basic Information	2002 -03	2003 -04	2004 -05	2005 -06	2006 -07	2007 -08	2008 -09	2009 -10	2010 -11	2011 -12
Attendance rate (%)	96.1	96.4	95.9	95.3	95.9	96	96.1	95.7	96	
Truancy rate (%)	0	0	0	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	
Mobility rate (%)	11	6.2	9.5	11	10.5	12.5	7.1	10.6	10.7	
School Population (#)	424	417	444	459	505	523	498	485	478	
Economically disadvantaged (%)	5.7	6.2	7.9	13.1	14.3	12.2	15.3	20.6	23.8	
Limited English proficient (LEP) (%)	0	0	0	0.4	0.4	0.8	1.8	2.5	2.9	
Students with disabilities (%)								9.1	13.0	
White, non-Hispanic (%)	93.4	93.3	93.2	90.8	88.7	88.9	88	86.6	88.1	
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	3.5	2.6	2.3	2.6	1.6	2.7	2.4	3.5	2.9	
Hispanic (%)	1.4	2.2	2.3	2.6	4.4	3.4	4.4	5.2	5.0	
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	1.4	1.7	2	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	1.9	
Native American or Alaskan Native (%)	0.2	0.2	0	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)			0.2	1.1	3	2.7	3	2.7	2.1	

Data Source: www.iirc.niu.edu

Item 3 - School Information

Educational Environment

Year	LEP (%)	IEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)
1999		0	-	4.6	100	95.5	-	-
2000		0.3	-	3.9	100	95.8	-	-
2001		0	-	2.9	99	96.2	-	-
2002		0	-	4	100	95.8	-	-
2003		0	-	5.7	99.7	96.1	-	-
2004		0	-	6.2	99	96.4	-	-
2005		0	-	7.9	100	95.9	-	-
2006		0.4	-	13.1	100	95.3	-	-
2007		0.4	-	14.3	100	95.9	-	-
2008		0.8	-	12.2	100	96	-	-
2009		1.8	-	15.3	100	96.1	-	-
2010		2.5	9.1	20.6	99.4	95.7	-	-
2011		2.9	13.0	23.8	100	96.0	-	-
2012								

Data Source: www.iirc.niu.edu

Enrollment Trends

	Year	
R O C K T O N G R A D E S C H O O L	2003	424
	2004	417
	2005	444
	2006	459
	2007	505
	2008	523
	2009	498
	2010	485
	2011	478
	2012	

D I S T R I C T	2003	1,321
	2004	1,356
	2005	1,400
	2006	1,442
	2007	1,524
	2008	1,556
	2009	1,592
	2010	1,566
	2011	1,544
	2012	

Data Source: www.iirc.niu.edu

Section 1-B Data & Analysis – Local Assessment Data

Assessment Data:

Because no state assessment is given in grades K-2 and the data we get from the third grade ISAT results arrive more than a year after those students leave our school, we must focus on our local assessments in our school improvement planning process.

At the local level, we use several assessments to inform our decisions about instruction. Students in kindergarten through second grades take the NWEA Primary MAP assessment. This is an interactive, online assessment, which gives us data comparing our students' performance to national norms. Beginning in January 2011, second grade students will be taking the NWEA MAP assessment. This assessment is different in that none of the test items are read to the students, in contrast to the Primary MAP, in which all test items are read aloud for the students. We are making this change because we feel that it will give us a better picture of students' actual abilities in reading. All students in grades 3 through 8 take the NWEA MAP, and it is our hope that making the transition during the second grade year will provide us with more accurate information about each student's actual growth in skills between second and third grade.

Running records are given to measure guided reading levels beginning second semester of the kindergarten year, and continuing throughout first and second grades. In addition to these assessments, all Kindergarten through 2nd grade students take the "End of Level" tests that are provided with our Harcourt Trophies reading series. In kindergarten, teachers administer one to one assessments to monitor students' understanding of letters and sounds.

Assessment Data

Student Performance on Kindergarten Checklist

School Year	Number Tested	Number Scoring 100% on Letter & Sound Recognition	Percent Scoring 100%
2009-10	155	152	98%
2010-2011	132	130	98.5%
2011-2012			

Kindergarten Guided Reading Levels

School Year	Number Tested	Number Reading at Level C or Higher	Percent at Level C or Higher
2009-10	155	138	89%
2010-2011	132	124	94%
2011-2012			

Rockton Grade School, School Improvement Plan 2010-2012

First Grade Guided Reading Levels

School Year	Number Tested	Number Reading at Level G-I or Higher	Percent at Level G-I or Higher
2009-10	141	130	92.2%
2010-11	157	150	95.5%
2011-12			

Second Grade Guided Reading Levels

School Year	Number Tested	Number Reading at Level L-M or Higher	Percent at Level L-M or Higher
2009-10	151	130	86%
2010-11	157	142	90.4%
2011-12			

MAP Spring Achievement – Reading, Kindergarten		
Year	Number Tested	Percentage of students at or above 50th percentile
2009	152	78.3%
2010	144	86.0%
2011	130	84%
2012		

MAP Spring Achievement and Growth Data – Reading, First Grade				
Year	Number Tested	Percentage of students at or above 50th percentile	Number of students meeting their district individual growth target*	Percentage of students meeting their fall to spring district growth target
2009	152	78.3%	105	69.1%
2010	144	86.0%	107	74.3%
2011	152	88.5%	127	83.6%
2012				

* These growth targets include *adjusted, more rigorous* targets for those students performing below the 50th percentile in the fall.

MAP Spring Achievement and Growth Data – Reading, Second Grade				
Year	Number Tested	Percentage of students at or above 50th percentile	Number of students meeting their individual growth target*	Percentage of students meeting their fall to spring growth target
2009	167	85.5%	103	61.7%
2010	150	81.0%	90	60.0%
2011	149	77.5%	98	65.7%
2012				

* These growth targets include *adjusted, more rigorous* targets for those students performing below the 50th percentile in the fall.

Growth Targets

In addition to looking at the overall performance of each grade level, the MAP assessment also allows us to compare actual student growth from fall to spring each year with "typical growth." Because our overall goal is to get children reading at grade level, those children who are behind will need to exceed "typical" growth in order to catch up. Therefore, when looking at MAP reading assessment scores in the fall of 2010, teachers applied a multiplier to the "typical growth" of those students who were below the 50th percentile in their achievement. These students will be given extra instruction at their level, and if they are able to meet this adjusted growth target, they will be on their way to closing the gap between their performance and that of their grade level peers. The "district individual growth targets" referred to in Objectives 1.5 and 1.7 (and recorded in the charts that follow) reflect the higher growth targets that were set for our lower achieving students.

Cohort Data from NWEA MAP Reading Assessment								
Grade	2009		2010			2011		
	Number Tested	Percentage of students at or above 50th percentile	Number Tested	Percentage of students at or above 50th percentile	Percentage of students meeting their fall to spring growth target *	Number Tested	Percentage of students at or above 50th percentile	Percentage of students meeting their fall to spring growth target
K	143	83.2%						
1			150	86.0%	74.0%			
2						149	77.5%	65.7%

* These growth targets include *adjusted, more rigorous* targets for those students performing below the 50th percentile in the fall.

Cohort Data from NWEA MAP Reading Assessment

Grade	2010		2011			2012		
	Number Tested	Percentage of students at or above 50th percentile	Number Tested	Percentage of students at or above 50th percentile	Percentage of students meeting their fall to spring growth target*	Number Tested	Percentage of students at or above 50th percentile	Percentage of students meeting their fall to spring growth target
K	154	82.0%						
1			152	88.5%	83.6%			
2								

* These growth targets include *adjusted, more rigorous* targets for those students performing below the 50th percentile in the fall.

MAP Spring Achievement – Math, Kindergarten

Year	Number Tested	Percentage of students at or above 50th percentile
2009	152	69%
2010	155	78%
2011	129	77.5%
2012		

MAP Spring Achievement – Math, First Grade

Year	Number Tested	Percentage of students at or above 50th percentile
2009	152	73.6%
2010	150	86.0%
2011	155	84.5%
2012		

MAP Spring Achievement – Math, Second Grade

Year	Number Tested	Percentage of students at or above 50th percentile
2009	167	84%
2010	161	80%
2011	150	82%
2012		

Rockton Grade School, School Improvement Plan 2010-2012

Factors:

In the 2008-09 school year, Rockton Grade School began implementing Response to Intervention (RtI) in reading. Over the past two years, we have been focusing on professional development in using assessment data to identify students' strengths and weaknesses, and differentiating instruction to target weak skill areas. During the 2010-2011 school year, we will be reviewing and purchasing intervention materials that can be used to make the small group instruction more effective. Our school improvement plan includes overall achievement goals and individual growth goals in reading so that we can assess the effectiveness of our classroom and intervention instruction.

During the 2009-10 school year, Rockton Grade School began the RtI process for math as well as reading. We will continue to concentrate on how to best deliver intervention instruction in math throughout the implementation of this school improvement plan. We are including math goals in our plan so that we can determine the effectiveness of our math instruction, both at the whole class and intervention levels.

Conclusions:

Based on our assessment and enrollment data, the focus of our school improvement plan will be on improving reading and math achievement, with the overall goal of having 80% - 85% of our second graders performing at grade level by the end of second grade.

Rockton Grade School, School Improvement Plan 2010-2012

Section II - Action Plan

Data and Gap Analysis:

<p>Data Collected and Source of Data <i>What data do we have, and where did we find the data?</i></p>	<p>Findings/Gap Analysis <i>What are these data telling us about areas we need to target for improvement?</i></p>
<p>According to teacher-administered kindergarten checklists, 98% of kindergartners scored 100% on the kindergarten checklist regarding letter and sound recognition in May 2010.</p>	<p>Continue our focus on phonics and phonemic awareness, using materials provided by Harcourt and the Michael Heggerty Phonemic Awareness program as part of our core instruction in kindergarten.</p>
<p>89% of kindergartners were reading at a Guided Reading level of C or higher in May 2010, according to teacher administered Running Records.</p>	<p>Continue Guided Reading instruction and continue to improve our use of literacy centers as part of our core instruction in kindergarten.</p>
<p>According to Running Record Assessments administered in the spring of 2010, 89% of kindergarten students were reading at a level of C or higher.</p>	<p>Continue to look carefully at the programs we offer all readers, evaluate their effectiveness, identify areas for improvement, and implement improvement strategies. Closely monitor progress of those students receiving extra, targeted instruction to help close the gap in their reading achievement.</p> <p>Continue to implement Guided Reading, giving each child opportunities to read at his/her instructional level every day. Closely monitor progress of students receiving instructional interventions for reading.</p> <p>Set student and classroom growth targets for the MAP reading assessment, and measure progress toward those targets in January of each year.</p>
<p>According to the NWEA Primary MAP assessments given in the spring of 2010, 83% of kindergarten students were at the 50th percentile or higher in overall reading achievement.</p>	
<p>According to Running Record Assessments administered in the spring of 2010, 92% of first graders were reading at a level of G-I or higher.</p>	
<p>According to the NWEA Primary MAP assessments given in the spring of 2010, 85% of first graders were at the 50th percentile or higher in overall reading achievement.</p>	
<p>According to the NWEA Primary MAP reading assessments given in the spring of 2010, 74% of first graders met the school's individual growth target from fall to spring.</p>	
<p>According to Running Record Assessments administered in the spring of 2010, 86% of second graders were reading at a level of L-M or higher.</p>	
<p>According to the NWEA Primary MAP assessments given in the spring of 2010, 81% of second graders were at the 50th percentile or higher in overall reading achievement.</p>	

Rockton Grade School, School Improvement Plan 2010-2012

<p>According to the NWEA Primary MAP reading assessments given in the spring of 2010, 60% of second graders met the school's individual growth target from fall to spring.</p>	
<p>According to the NWEA Primary MAP assessments given in the spring of 2010, 69% of kindergarten students were at the 50th percentile or higher in overall math achievement.</p>	<p>Closely monitor students on math tier plans and make changes to their instructional program as needed to help them be successful.</p> <p>Explore math intervention materials to be used in delivering individual and small group instruction.</p>
<p>According to the NWEA Primary MAP assessments given in the spring of 2010, 74% of first grade students were at the 50th percentile or higher in overall math achievement.</p>	
<p>According to the NWEA Primary MAP assessments given in the spring of 2010, 84% of second grade students were at the 50th percentile or higher in overall math achievement.</p>	
<p>In our school mission statement, we state, "We are a learning community working together with parents to serve the social, emotional, and educational needs of all our children."</p>	<p>Continue to implement a building-wide character program, focusing on a specific character trait each month.</p> <p>Incorporate second-step lessons in small group settings with students identified by teachers as needing support. Use this program in classrooms with challenging behavior needs.</p> <p>Fully implement Response to Intervention in math and reading to meet the needs of all learners.</p>

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GOALS

1. Improve academic achievement.

OBJECTIVE 1.1: In the spring of 2011 and 2012, 80% of kindergarten students will score 100% on the kindergarten checklist regarding letter and sound recognition. – **Actual result: 98.5%**

OBJECTIVE 1.2: In the spring of 2011 and 2012, 80% of kindergarten students will be reading at a Guided Reading level of C or higher, measured with teacher-administered Running Records. – **Actual result: 94%**

OBJECTIVE 1.3: In the spring of 2011 and 2012, 80% of kindergarten students will perform at or above the 50th percentile on the NWEA Primary Measure of Academic Progress (PMAP) reading assessment. **Actual result: Spring 2011 – 84%**

OBJECTIVE 1.4: In the spring of 2011 and 2012, 85% of first grade students will be reading at a Guided Reading instructional level of H-I. **Actual result: Spring 2011 – 95.5%**

OBJECTIVE 1.5: In the spring of 2011 and 2012, 75% of first graders will make the *district* individual target growth goals on the PMAP reading assessment. **Actual result: Spring 2011 – 83.6%**

OBJECTIVE 1.6: In the spring of 2011 and 2012, 80% of first graders will score at or above the 50th percentile on the NWEA PMAP Reading assessment. **Actual result: Spring 2011 – 88.5%**

OBJECTIVE 1.7: In the spring of 2011 and 2012, 85% of second grade students will be reading at a Guided Reading instructional level of L-M. **Actual result: Spring 2011 – 90.4%**

OBJECTIVE 1.8: In the spring of 2011 and 2012, 70% of second graders will make the *district* individual target growth goals on the spring MAP reading assessment. **Actual result: Spring 2011 – 65.7%**

OBJECTIVE 1.9: In the spring of 2011 and 2012, 80% of second graders will score at or above the 50th percentile on the NWEA MAP Reading assessment. **Actual result: Spring 2011 - 77.5%**

OBJECTIVE 1.10: In the spring of 2011 and 2012, 80% of students at each grade level, K-2 will perform at or above the 50th percentile on the NWEA PMAP (Grades K and 1) or MAP (Grade 2) math assessment. **Actual result: Spring 2011 – K – 77.5%; 1st – 84.5%; 2nd – 82%**

Rockton Grade School, School Improvement Plan 2010-2012

<p>ACTIVITIES & STRATEGIES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analyze NWEA MAP data to identify individual and whole group strengths and weaknesses; plan instruction based on this analysis. 2. Administer Running Records and oral reading fluency assessments on at least a quarterly basis with all first and second graders. Administer Running Records to kindergartners, beginning in January of each year. 3. Classroom teachers provide extra reading and math interventions within the classroom, and supplement those interventions through reading specialist, interventionist, and special education teachers for students who are not meeting grade level performance expectations in reading and math. 4. Implement new writing program so that there is consistency and alignment, K-2. 5. Begin to incorporate the Common Core State Standards into instruction and assessment. 	<p>STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide teachers with time to analyze data and plan instruction. 2. Review Running Record Assessment packages to develop a consistent and aligned assessment process, K-2. 3. Guided Reading and Literacy Center training as needed, opportunities for peer observations. Opportunities for teachers to coordinate intervention instruction and share reading and math instruction strategies they have found to be successful for students they share. 4. Training in new program selected by the piloting committee. 5. Training for teachers about the Common Core Standards. Provide time for teachers to align with current instruction and develop new lessons and/or assessments if needed.
--	--

<p>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Classroom teachers, principal 2. Title I teacher, principal, classroom teachers 3. All RGS staff 4. Pilot Teachers, principal 	<p>TIMELINE/TARGET DATE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ongoing 2. Running Records and fluency checks administered throughout 2010-11 and 2011-2012 school year. 3. Ongoing 4. Throughout the school year
--	---

EXPECTED RESULTS/SUCCESS INDICATORS: (How will we know we have succeeded?)
 The results of the assessments identified in the goals, given in the spring of 2011 and 2012 will indicate whether or not we have achieved our goals.

2. Meet the social, emotional, and educational needs of all our students.

OBJECTIVE 2.1: Successfully implement Response to Intervention in math and reading to meet the needs of all learners.

<p>ACTIVITIES & STRATEGIES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase intervention resources for teachers to use with struggling readers, provide support when needed. 2. Monitor progress with reading fluency and comprehension for students on tier plans on at least a monthly basis using Running Records. Adjust interventions based on student progress. 3. Administer AIMS web assessments on a weekly or bi-weekly basis to students on tier plans in reading and math, and adjust interventions based on student progress. 4. Evaluate math intervention programs, purchase programs teachers identify as useful and aligned with our needs. 	<p>STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide time for teachers to evaluate reading intervention programs. Purchase programs and materials in spring 2011. 2. None at this time 3. Train teachers in consistent administration of AIMSweb probes as needed. 4. Provide time for teachers to evaluate math intervention programs. Purchase programs and materials during the 2011-2012 school year.
<p>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Classroom teachers, interventionists, administrators. 2. Classroom teachers, interventionists, school psychologist, administrators. 3. Classroom teachers, interventionists, school psychologist. 4. Classroom teachers, interventionists, administrators. 	<p>TIMELINE/TARGET DATE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2010-2011 school year 2. Ongoing 3. Ongoing 4. 2011-2012 school year

EXPECTED RESULTS/SUCCESS INDICATORS: (How will we know we have succeeded?)
 The results of the NWEA, AIMSweb, and running record assessments, given in the spring of 2011 and 2012, as well as the number of students transitioning out of tier plans will indicate whether or not we have achieved our goals.

Rockton Grade School, School Improvement Plan 2010-2012

OBJECTIVE 2.2: Students will demonstrate characteristics of good character within their classrooms and throughout the day.

ACTIVITIES & STRATEGIES: 1. Continue RGS Character Program, with a building-wide focus on a specific character trait each month. 2. Provide extra support in a small group setting for students who need more assistance in dealing with their social and emotional behaviors.	STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS: None.
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE: Social Worker and principal.	TIMELINE/TARGET DATE: Ongoing.

EXPECTED RESULTS/SUCCESS INDICATORS: (How will we know we have succeeded?)
Discipline referrals and teacher survey responses at the end of the year will indicate our progress toward this objective.