

MARENGO UNION ELEMENTARY CSD # 165

**Locust Elementary
Title I Schoolwide Plan
2012-13**

The purpose of a Title I schoolwide program is to improve academic achievement throughout a school so that all students, particularly the lowest-achieving students, demonstrate proficient related to the state of Illinois academic standards. The improved achievement is to result from improving the entire educational program of the school. This initial plan will be reviews and updated annually by all stakeholders and monitored by Board of Education.

District Information

School District Name: Marengo Union Elementary CSD # 165
School District Address: 816 East Grant Highway
Marengo, IL 60152

District Superintendent: Mrs. Lea Damisch
Phone: 815-568-8323
Fax: 815-568-8367
Email Address: ldamisch@marengo165.org

Title I Coordinator: Mrs. Lea Damisch
Phone: 815-568-8323
Fax: 815-568-8367
Email Address: ldamisch@marengo165.org

School Name: Locust Elementary School
School Address: 739 East Locust Street
Marengo, IL 60152

Principal: Mrs. Suellen Lopez
Phone: 815-568-7632
Fax: 815-568-1830
Email Address: slopez@marengo165.org

AGREEMENT

The school has completed the schoolwide planning process and has met the requirements of the Title I legislation related to schoolwide planning and criteria as outlined in section 1114 of the NCLB Act. The district has worked in consultation with the school as the school developed the schoolwide plan and will continue to assist the school in implementing, revising, and evaluating the plan annually.

Signature of the Superintendent

Date

Board of Education Approval

Date

Initial Year

Annual Review

Table of Contents

District Information	Page 2
Table of Contents	Page 3
District 165's Vision Statement	Page 4
District 165's Mission Statement	Page 4
Participants	Page 5
Meeting Dates	Page 6
Student Demographic Data	Page 7
Student Achievement	Pages 8-24
Student Achievement-Data Analysis	Page 25
Curriculum and Instruction	Page 26
Highly Qualified Staff	Page 27
Family and Community Involvement	Pages 28-31
Professional Development	Page 32
School Context and Organization	Page 33
Priority Needs	Page 34
School Wide Strategies	Pages 35-36
Annual Evaluation	Page 37

District 165's Vision Statement

Educating Today for Tomorrow's World

As we visualize what kind of school we will be in the future, Locust Elementary School staff embraces the District's Vision Statement of *Educating Today for Tomorrow's World*. The activities we choose for students should be learning focused and designed to ensure that students meet the Common Core Standards. In order to bear meet the needs of our student population, the Locust learning community operates a "what's best for our kids" mindset. Thus means that all Locust staff accepts and is personally responsible for the successes of all of the students. We know we will only meet our students' needs by working collaboratively and focusing on our learning community. As we move forward, Locust staff and parents realize the importance of broadening our work to solicit the support of the larger Marengo-Union community. With this focus, we believe that Locust Elementary School will be able to achieve together.

District 165's Mission Statement

District #165's mission is to form a community partnership dedicated to providing a solid educational foundation that enables students to become confident, self-sufficient and productive citizens. Students shall have the academic and technological opportunities to achieve their full potential in a nurturing environment.

Participants

Representative Group	Individual Names	Specific
Parents	Amy Cederland	
Teachers	Laura Joy Borhart Keri Nolen Susan Diedrick Tonya Metras Shari Bruening	Kindergarten 1 st Grade 2 nd Grade 3 rd Grade 4 th Grade
Other Staff	Melanie Kill Karen Weeks	Title I Reading Title I Math
School Administrators	Suellen Lopez Lea Damisch	Principal Superintendent
Additional Members	Karen Boxleitner	Board of Education

Meeting Dates

Meeting Dates	Agenda Items	Attendees	Task
June 8, 2012	Review current Title I Plan	Kill, Weeks, Lopez Damisch	A review of our current program.
August 10, 2012	Survey Results	Lopez, Damisch, Diedrick, Kill, Weeks	Review needs survey from parents
September 24, 2012	Schoolwide Discussion	Entire Team	Beginning the discussion of making Locust School Schoolwide
October 29, 2012	DIP/Schoolwide	DIP Committee	Schoolwide implementation as it relates to the DIP. Look at PD Survey
December 12, 2012	SW v TA	Entire Team	Detailed discussion of how Schoolwide would look in building. Reading Committee in attendance as well
December 18, 2012	Discussion at BOE	Damisch, Lopez	Presentation to the BOE as to transition process
January 14, 2013	First Reading	Entire Team	Begin Reading of Draft Plan
February 4, 2013	Co-Meeting with DIP	Entire Team DIP Team	Look at SW Plan and coordinate with DIP
March 18, 2013	Second Reading	Entire Team	Ensure that we have captured and reported data accurately
April 23, 2013	Final Presentation	Entire Team	Board Approval

Components of a Schoolwide Plan

Section 1 Comprehensive Needs Assessment

As the first step in developing a Title I Schoolwide Plan for Locust Elementary, a team was organized to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment. In completing the needs assessment, the team examined the following key areas: student demographics, student achievement, curriculum and instruction, community and parent involvement, high quality professional staff, and school context and organization. The results of this review along with the identification of strengths and needs for each area is included in the following paragraphs.

Student Demographic Data

Locust Elementary School serves the communities of Marengo and Union in McHenry County, Illinois. Locust Elementary serves approximately 560 students in grades K-4. Locust School is one of two schools in the Marengo Union Elementary CSD # 165. The other school serves students in grades 5-8 and also houses the Pre-School At Risk Program and Early Childhood (Special Education). Beginning in August of 2013, a new intermediate school will be established housing grades 4 and 5. The name of this new school is the Ulysses S. Grant Middle School. The Marengo Union Elementary CSD # 165 has a school population of 1150 students and a community population of 7,654 88.7 % white, 2 % mixed, and 15% Hispanic. The median household income is \$53,392.00. Demographically the cities of Marengo and Union are challenged economically with many families below the poverty index.

Racial/Ethnic Background and other information	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Total Enrollment	618	552	528	536
White	73%	43%	72%	70.5%
Black	0.3%	0.7%	0.8%	1%
Hispanic	20%	20%	25%	26%
Low Income Rate	35%	43%	46%	54%
Mobility Rate	20%	26%	25%	24%
Limited English Proficient	14%	12%	14%	12%
IEP	14%	11%	14%	16%
Attendance Rate	97%	94%	95%	96%
Parent Contact	100%	100%	100%	100%

As illustrated above, over half of our families are receiving assistance for lunch, but more important to note is the acceleration of families in need. Additionally the District also has a very high mobility rate of 24%. In essence this means that 1 out of every four students move in or move out of our District.

Student Achievement

Students at Locust Elementary School are assessed throughout the year using a wide variety of teacher developed/curriculum based assessments. In addition to curriculum based assessments, students are benchmarked three times a year using AIMSWEB in the areas of reading, math, and writing. Students in grades 3 and 4 are also assessed on the annual ISAT. Additionally students are measured on a Fountas and Pinnell scale.

Those responsible for testing include: Title I teacher, ELL teachers, classroom teachers, Title I Paraprofessionals and special education teachers. As part of the Rtl program, struggling students are progressed monitored bi-weekly. Individual and small group needs are determined by data review teams that meet every week to evaluate student data. This team recommends targeted interventions which are provided 30-40 minutes daily in addition to the core curriculum. All reading and math intervention used at Elementary School are researched based.

KINDERGARTEN-AIMSWEB

2010-11

Reading

Percentile	LSF			PSF			NWF			LNF		
	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	-	10% (11)	7% (8)	-	13% (14)	8% (9)	-	-	9% (10)	7% (7)	10% (11)	9% (10)
Below Average	-	12% (13)	16% (17)	-	9% (10)	15% (16)	-	-	13% (14)	15% (14)	14% (15)	14% (15)
Average	-	52% (53)	49% (51)	-	51% (52)	52% (54)	-	-	50% (52)	52% (49)	47% (48)	48% (50)
Above Average	-	12% (13)	16% (17)	-	14% (15)	11% (12)	-	-	14% (15)	15% (14)	16% (17)	16% (17)
Well Above Average	-	10% (11)	9% (10)	-	9% (10)	11% (12)	-	-	11% (12)	9% (9)	9% (10)	10% (11)

Legend

Percent of Students (Number of Students)

KINDERGARTEN-AIMSWEB

2010-11

Math

Percentile	OCM			NIM			QDM			MNM		
	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	9% (10)	9% (10)	9% (10)	11% (11)	7% (8)	8% (9)	-	9% (10)	9% (10)	-	9% (10)	8% (9)
Below Average	12% (13)	14% (15)	10% (11)	13% (13)	16% (17)	15% (16)	23% (23)	13% (14)	14% (15)	25% (24)	12% (13)	14% (15)
Average	51% (52)	50% (51)	53% (55)	51% (49)	48% (49)	29% (30)	51% (49)	50% (52)	25% (26)	50% (48)	50% (51)	48% (49)
Above Average	14% (15)	13% (14)	14% (15)	15% (15)	23% (24)	46% (48)	14% (14)	5% (6)	50% (51)	13% (13)	15% (16)	9% (10)
Well Above Average	10% (11)	11% (12)	11% (12)	8% (8)	3% (4)	-	10% (10)	19% (20)	-	11% (11)	10% (11)	18% (19)

Legend

Percent of Students (Number of Students)

KINDERGARTEN-Fountas & Pinell

2010-11

Not Applicable

KINDERGARTEN-AIMSWEB

2011-12

Reading

Percentile	LSF			PSF			NWF			LNF		
	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	-	11% (12)	8% (9)	-	9% (10)	9% (10)	-	-	8% (9)	12% (13)	9% (10)	8% (9)
Below Average	46% (47)	13% (14)	17% (18)	-	15% (16)	14% (15)	-	-	15% (16)	10% (11)	13% (14)	15% (16)
Average	28% (29)	50% (53)	47% (48)	-	50% (52)	50% (52)	-	-	49% (50)	50% (52)	51% (54)	50% (51)
Above Average	14% (15)	14% (15)	16% (17)	-	14% (15)	13% (14)	-	-	14% (15)	15% (16)	13% (14)	14% (15)
Well Above Average	10% (11)	9% (10)	9% (10)	-	10% (11)	10% (11)	-	-	10% (11)	9% (10)	11% (12)	10% (11)

Legend

Percent of Students (Number of Students)

KINDERGARTEN-AIMSWEB

2011-12

Math

Percentile	OCM			NIM			QDM			MNM		
	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	9% (10)	9% (10)	9% (10)	9% (10)	9% (10)	8% (9)	-	9% (10)	8% (9)	18% (19)	7% (8)	9% (10)
Below Average	15% (16)	13% (14)	13% (14)	13% (14)	15% (16)	16% (17)	25% (26)	15% (16)	14% (15)	5% (6)	18% (19)	14% (15)
Average	48% (49)	50% (52)	51% (53)	50% (51)	40% (42)	64% (66)	48% (49)	49% (51)	41% (42)	49% (50)	46% (48)	48% (50)
Above Average	15% (16)	16% (17)	14% (15)	14% (15)	30% (32)	-	14% (15)	25% (26)	25% (26)	15% (16)	17% (18)	17% (18)
Well Above Average	10% (11)	10% (11)	10% (11)	10% (11)	3% (4)	10% (11)	11% (12)	-	8% (9)	10% (11)	10% (11)	9% (10)

Legend

Percent of Students (Number of Students)

KINDERGARTEN-Fountas & Pinell

2011-12

Not Applicable

KINDERGARTEN-AIMSWEB

2012-13

Reading

Percentile	LSF			PSF			LNF		
	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	-	8% (11)	8% (10)	-	9% (12)	9% (12)	8% (11)	9% (12)	9% (11)
Below Average	-	14% (18)	13% (17)	-	14% (18)	15% (19)	14% (18)	13% (17)	13% (16)
Average	-	51% (64)	53% (65)	-	50% (62)	47% (58)	50% (64)	50% (62)	53% (65)
Above Average	-	13% (17)	13% (17)	-	15% (19)	14% (17)	15% (19)	15% (19)	13% (17)
Well Above Average	-	11% (14)	10% (13)	-	10% (13)	12% (15)	11% (14)	11% (14)	10% (13)

Legend

Percent of Students (Number of Students)

2012-13

Math

Percentile	OCM			NIM			QDM			MNM		
	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	9% (12)	9% (12)	9% (12)	9% (12)	8% (11)	10% (13)	15% (19)	10% (13)	9% (11)	17% (22)	10% (13)	9% (11)
Below Average	16% (21)	14% (18)	14% (18)	14% (18)	14% (18)	13% (17)	9% (12)	13% (17)	17% (21)	4% (6)	13% (17)	14% (18)
Average	50% (64)	50% (63)	50% (61)	50% (64)	29% (37)	75% (92)	50% (63)	41% (52)	73% (90)	50% (62)	50% (62)	49% (60)
Above Average	14% (18)	14% (18)	6% (8)	13% (17)	46% (58)	-	13% (17)	33% (42)	-	17% (22)	15% (19)	9% (12)
Well Above Average	10% (13)	10% (13)	18% (23)	11% (15)	-	-	10% (13)	-	-	9% (12)	10% (13)	17% (21)

Legend

Percent of Students (Number of Students)

KINDERGARTEN-Fountas & Pinell

2012-13

Not Applicable

1st Grade-AIMSWEB

2010-11

Reading

Percentile	R-CBM			LSF			PSF			NWF			LNF		
	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	-	-	9% (9)	9% (10)	-	-	8% (9)	9% (9)	-	9% (10)	8% (8)	10% (10)	9% (10)	-	-
Below Average	-	-	16% (16)	17% (18)	-	-	16% (17)	13% (13)	-	14% (15)	17% (17)	15% (15)	14% (15)	-	-
Average	-	-	48% (48)	47% (49)	-	-	50% (52)	55% (55)	-	49% (51)	50% (49)	48% (48)	49% (51)	-	-
Above Average	-	-	15% (15)	14% (15)	-	-	12% (13)	12% (12)	-	15% (16)	14% (14)	14% (14)	15% (16)	-	-
Well Above Average	-	-	10% (10)	10% (11)	-	-	11% (12)	10% (10)	-	10% (11)	10% (10)	11% (11)	10% (11)	-	-

Legend

Percent of Students (Number of Students)

**1st Grade-AIMSWEB
2010-11
Math**

Percentile	NIM			QDM			MNM		
	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	-	9% (9)	-	-	10% (10)	-	-	9% (9)	-
Below Average	-	15% (15)	-	-	16% (16)	-	-	16% (16)	-
Average	-	49% (49)	-	-	47% (47)	-	-	51% (51)	-
Above Average	-	16% (16)	-	-	10% (10)	-	-	14% (14)	-
Well Above Average	-	10% (10)	-	-	16% (16)	-	-	9% (9)	-

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

**1st Grade-Fountas & Pinnell
2010-11**

Month	Target	% on Target
Sept	A	49%
Oct	B	54%
Nov	C	54%
Dec	D	49%
Jan	E	55%
Feb	F	61%
Mar	G	59%
Apr	H	59%
May	I	63%

**1st Grade-AIMSWEB
2011-12
Reading**

Percentile	R-CBM			LSF			PSF			NWF			LNF		
	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	-	-	9% (10)	8% (9)	-	-	9% (10)	9% (10)	-	-	9% (10)	9% (10)	10% (11)	-	-
Below Average	-	-	15% (16)	14% (16)	-	-	14% (16)	14% (15)	-	-	14% (15)	14% (16)	13% (15)	-	-
Average	-	-	49% (52)	49% (53)	50% (1)	-	48% (52)	50% (54)	50% (1)	-	51% (55)	50% (54)	49% (53)	50% (1)	-
Above Average	-	-	15% (16)	16% (18)	50% (1)	-	17% (19)	14% (16)	50% (1)	-	14% (16)	14% (16)	16% (18)	50% (1)	-
Well Above Average	-	-	10% (11)	11% (12)	-	-	10% (11)	11% (12)	-	-	10% (11)	10% (11)	10% (11)	-	-

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

**1st Grade-AIMSWEB
2011-12
Math**

Percentile	OCM			NIM			QDM			MNM		
	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	9% (10)	-	-	9% (10)	9% (10)	-	8% (9)	9% (10)	-	9% (10)	9% (10)	-
Below Average	14% (16)	-	-	15% (17)	15% (16)	-	16% (18)	15% (16)	-	12% (13)	13% (14)	-
Average	50% (55)	-	-	49% (53)	48% (51)	-	49% (53)	50% (54)	-	52% (57)	49% (52)	-
Above Average	15% (17)	-	-	15% (17)	16% (17)	-	15% (17)	11% (12)	-	15% (17)	17% (19)	-
Well Above Average	9% (10)	-	-	10% (11)	11% (12)	-	10% (11)	13% (14)	-	10% (11)	10% (11)	-

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

**1st Grade-Fountas & Pinnell
2011-12**

Month	Target	% on Target
Sept	A	51%
Oct	B	53%
Nov	C	58%
Dec	D	59%
Jan	E	65%
Feb	F	61%
Mar	G	69%
Apr	H	69%
May	I	73%

**1st Grade-AIMSWEB
2012-13
Reading**

Percentile	R-CBM			LSF			PSF			NWF			LNF		
	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	-	-	8% (10)	8% (10)	-	-	9% (11)	11% (13)	-	-	10% (12)	9% (11)	9% (11)	-	-
Below Average	-	-	16% (19)	16% (20)	-	-	15% (19)	14% (17)	-	-	15% (18)	14% (17)	15% (18)	-	-
Average	-	-	49% (57)	49% (59)	-	-	49% (59)	49% (57)	-	-	48% (56)	50% (59)	50% (61)	-	-
Above Average	-	-	14% (17)	15% (18)	-	-	15% (19)	13% (15)	-	-	14% (17)	14% (17)	14% (17)	-	-
Well Above Average	-	-	10% (12)	10% (13)	-	-	10% (12)	11% (13)	-	-	10% (12)	10% (12)	10% (13)	-	-

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

1st Grade-AIMSWEB
2012-13
Math

Percentile	OCM			NIM			QDM			MNM		
	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	9% (11)	-	-	10% (13)	9% (11)	-	10% (12)	9% (11)	9% (10)	12% (15)	7% (8)	7% (9)
Below Average	15% (19)	-	-	12% (15)	14% (16)	-	15% (18)	14% (16)	17% (18)	14% (17)	16% (18)	15% (18)
Average	49% (59)	-	-	51% (62)	50% (56)	-	47% (57)	49% (55)	49% (52)	47% (57)	50% (56)	52% (59)
Above Average	14% (17)	-	-	15% (19)	14% (16)	-	18% (22)	12% (14)	5% (6)	15% (18)	15% (17)	14% (16)
Well Above Average	10% (13)	-	-	9% (11)	11% (13)	-	9% (11)	13% (15)	18% (19)	10% (13)	10% (12)	9% (11)

Legend
 Percent of Students (Number of Students)

1st Grade-Fountas & Pinnell
2012-13

Month	Target	% on Target
Sept	A	61%
Oct	B	63%
Nov	C	68%
Dec	D	69%
Jan	E	65%
Feb	F	71%
Mar	G	79%
Apr	H	69%
May	I	73%

AIMSWEB-2nd Grade
2010-11
Reading

Percentile	R-CBM			MAZE		
	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	9% (9)	9% (10)	9% (10)	-	-	9% (10)
Below Average	15% (15)	15% (16)	16% (17)	-	-	16% (18)
Average	50% (49)	50% (53)	50% (53)	-	-	44% (47)
Above Average	15% (15)	15% (16)	13% (14)	-	-	18% (20)
Well Above Average	10% (10)	10% (11)	11% (12)	-	-	10% (11)

Legend
 Percent of Students (Number of Students)

AIMSWEB-2nd Grade
2010-11
Math

Percentile	M-CAP			M-COMP		
	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	-	-	-	-	9% (10)	9% (10)
Below Average	-	-	-	-	15% (16)	14% (15)
Average	-	-	100% (1)	-	50% (54)	50% (52)
Above Average	-	-	-	-	14% (15)	6% (7)
Well Above Average	-	-	-	-	10% (11)	19% (20)

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

2nd-Fountas & Pinnell
2010-11

Month	Target	% on Target
Oct	B	53%
Jan	E	58%
Mar	G	62%
May	I	68%

AIMSWEB-2nd Grade
2010-11
Reading

Percentile	R-CBM			MAZE		
	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	10% (10)	9% (10)	9% (10)	-	7% (8)	11% (12)
Below Average	15% (15)	15% (16)	14% (15)	28% (29)	17% (18)	10% (11)
Average	50% (50)	49% (52)	50% (54)	50% (52)	45% (48)	51% (55)
Above Average	15% (15)	14% (15)	15% (16)	9% (10)	18% (19)	14% (15)
Well Above Average	10% (10)	11% (12)	10% (11)	11% (12)	11% (12)	12% (13)

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

AIMSWEB-2nd Grade
2010-11
Math

Percentile	M-COMP		
	F	W	S
Well Below Average	8% (9)	9% (10)	9% (10)
Below Average	14% (15)	14% (15)	15% (16)
Average	50% (52)	48% (51)	50% (53)
Above Average	16% (17)	17% (18)	8% (9)
Well Above Average	9% (10)	10% (11)	16% (18)

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

2nd-Fountas & Pinnell
2010-11

Month	Target	% on Target
Oct	B	53%
Jan	E	58%
Mar	G	62%
May	I	68%

AIMSWEB-2nd Grade
2012-13
Reading

Percentile	R-CBM			MAZE		
	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	9% (11)	9% (11)	9% (10)	-	7% (9)	9% (10)
Below Average	14% (17)	14% (16)	15% (17)	20% (23)	18% (21)	18% (20)
Average	50% (58)	49% (55)	50% (55)	55% (63)	46% (53)	50% (56)
Above Average	14% (17)	16% (18)	14% (16)	14% (17)	16% (19)	13% (15)
Well Above Average	11% (13)	10% (12)	10% (12)	9% (11)	9% (11)	9% (10)

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

AIMSWEB-2nd Grade
2012-13
Math

Percentile	M-COMP		
	F	W	S
Well Below Average	7% (9)	8% (10)	10% (12)
Below Average	14% (17)	15% (18)	11% (13)
Average	52% (60)	50% (57)	49% (55)
Above Average	14% (16)	15% (17)	27% (30)
Well Above Average	10% (12)	9% (11)	-

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

2nd-Fountas & Pinnell
2012-13

Month	Target	% on Target
Oct	B	63%
Jan	E	65%
Mar	G	79%
May	I	73%

AIMSWEB-3rd Grade
2010-11
Reading

Percentile	R-CBM			MAZE		
	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	9% (9)	9% (10)	9% (10)	-	-	9% (10)
Below Average	15% (15)	15% (16)	16% (17)	-	-	16% (18)
Average	50% (49)	50% (53)	50% (53)	-	-	44% (47)
Above Average	15% (15)	15% (16)	13% (14)	-	-	18% (20)
Well Above Average	10% (10)	10% (11)	11% (12)	-	-	10% (11)

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

**AIMSWEB-3rd Grade
2010-11
Math**

Percentile	M-CAP			M-COMP		
	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	-	-	-	-	9% (10)	9% (10)
Below Average	-	-	-	-	15% (16)	14% (15)
Average	-	-	100% (1)	-	50% (54)	50% (52)
Above Average	-	-	-	-	14% (15)	6% (7)
Well Above Average	-	-	-	-	10% (11)	19% (20)

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

**3rd-Fountas & Pinnell
2010-11**

Month	Target	% on Target
Oct	M	63%
Dec	N	61%
Jan	N	65%
Mar	O	66%
May	P	69%

**AIMSWEB-3rd Grade
2011-12
Reading**

Percentile	R-CBM			MAZE		
	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	10% (10)	9% (10)	9% (10)	-	7% (8)	11% (12)
Below Average	15% (15)	15% (16)	14% (15)	28% (29)	17% (18)	10% (11)
Average	50% (50)	49% (52)	50% (54)	50% (52)	45% (48)	51% (55)
Above Average	15% (15)	14% (15)	15% (16)	9% (10)	18% (19)	14% (15)
Well Above Average	10% (10)	11% (12)	10% (11)	11% (12)	11% (12)	12% (13)

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

AIMSWEB-3rd Grade
2011-12
Reading

Percentile	M-COMP		
	F	W	S
Well Below Average	8% (9)	9% (10)	9% (10)
Below Average	14% (15)	14% (15)	15% (16)
Average	50% (52)	48% (51)	50% (53)
Above Average	16% (17)	17% (18)	8% (9)
Well Above Average	9% (10)	10% (11)	16% (18)

Legend

Percent of Students (Number of Students)

3rd-Fountas & Pinnell
2011-12

Month	Target	% on Target
Oct	M	58%
Dec	N	61%
Jan	N	63%
Mar	O	64%
May	P	67%

**AIMSWEB-3rd Grade
2012-13
Reading**

Percentile	R-CBM			MAZE		
	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	9% (11)	9% (11)	9% (10)	-	7% (9)	9% (10)
Below Average	14% (17)	14% (16)	15% (17)	20% (23)	18% (21)	18% (20)
Average	50% (58)	49% (55)	50% (55)	55% (63)	46% (53)	50% (56)
Above Average	14% (17)	16% (18)	14% (16)	14% (17)	16% (19)	13% (15)
Well Above Average	11% (13)	10% (12)	10% (12)	9% (11)	9% (11)	9% (10)

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

**AIMSWEB-3rd Grade
2012-13
Math**

Percentile	M-COMP		
	F	W	S
Well Below Average	7% (9)	8% (10)	10% (12)
Below Average	14% (17)	15% (18)	11% (13)
Average	52% (60)	50% (57)	49% (55)
Above Average	14% (16)	15% (17)	27% (30)
Well Above Average	10% (12)	9% (11)	-

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

**3rd-Fountas & Pinnell
2011-12**

Month	Target	% on Target
Oct	M	57%
Dec	N	55%
Jan	N	63%
Mar	O	61%
May	P	65%

Reading**ISAT-% Meets and Exceeds for 2010-12****Grade 3**

	2011	2012	2013
AYP Benchmark % M+E	85%	85%	92.5%
All	73%	87%	82%
White	82%	92%	87%
Hispanic	46%	67%	64%
IEP	31%	58%	50%
LEP	10%	18%	—
Low Income	53%	79%	75%

Math**ISAT-% Meets and Exceeds for 2010-12****Grade 3**

	2011	2012	2013
AYP Benchmark % M+E	85%	85%	92.5%
All	91%	96%	93%
White	98%	99%	95%
Hispanic	69%	88%	84%
IEP	77%	92%	81%
LEP	60%	73%	—
Low Income	85%	91%	89%

AIMSWEB-4th Grade
2010-11
Reading

Percentile	R-CBM			MAZE		
	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	9% (11)	8% (10)	9% (11)	9% (10)	9% (11)	7% (9)
Below Average	14% (16)	14% (17)	14% (17)	14% (16)	14% (17)	15% (18)
Average	50% (56)	51% (59)	49% (57)	50% (56)	53% (62)	53% (61)
Above Average	16% (18)	14% (17)	15% (18)	17% (19)	12% (14)	12% (14)
Well Above Average	9% (11)	10% (12)	10% (12)	9% (10)	10% (12)	11% (13)

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

AIMSWEB-4th Grade
2010-11
Math

Percentile	M-COMP		
	F	W	S
Well Below Average	8% (10)	10% (12)	8% (10)
Below Average	15% (18)	13% (16)	15% (18)
Average	50% (58)	50% (59)	49% (57)
Above Average	13% (16)	15% (18)	14% (17)
Well Above Average	11% (13)	9% (11)	11% (13)

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

4th-Fountas & Pinnell
2010-11

Month	Target	% on Target
Oct	P	57%
Jan	Q	63%
Mar	R	61%
May	S	65%

AIMSWEB-4th Grade
2011-12
Reading

Percentile	R-CBM			MAZE		
	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	9% (10)	9% (10)	9% (10)	10% (11)	9% (10)	11% (12)
Below Average	14% (15)	14% (15)	14% (15)	15% (16)	16% (17)	14% (15)
Average	49% (51)	49% (50)	49% (50)	48% (49)	46% (47)	48% (49)
Above Average	15% (16)	14% (15)	15% (16)	15% (16)	13% (14)	14% (15)
Well Above Average	10% (11)	10% (11)	10% (11)	9% (10)	12% (13)	10% (11)

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

AIMSWEB-4th Grade
2011-12
Math

Percentile	M-COMP		
	F	W	S
Well Below Average	7% (8)	11% (11)	9% (9)
Below Average	17% (18)	13% (13)	16% (16)
Average	48% (49)	50% (49)	49% (49)
Above Average	15% (16)	14% (14)	16% (16)
Well Above Average	10% (11)	10% (10)	10% (10)

Legend
Percent of Students (Number of Students)

4th-Fountas & Pinnell
2011-12

Month	Target	% on Target
Oct	P	67%
Jan	Q	73%
Mar	R	71%
May	S	75%

AIMSWEB-4th Grade
2012-13
Reading

Percentile	R-CBM			MAZE		
	F	W	S	F	W	S
Well Below Average	8% (9)	9% (10)	9% (10)	8% (9)	10% (11)	11% (12)
Below Average	16% (17)	14% (16)	15% (17)	16% (17)	15% (17)	10% (11)
Average	49% (51)	50% (54)	50% (54)	52% (55)	47% (51)	54% (58)
Above Average	15% (16)	15% (17)	14% (16)	9% (10)	14% (16)	14% (16)
Well Above Average	10% (11)	10% (11)	10% (11)	12% (13)	12% (13)	9% (10)

Legend
 Percent of Students (Number of Students)

AIMSWEB-4th Grade
2012-13
Math

Percentile	M-COMP		
	F	W	S
Well Below Average	9% (10)	9% (10)	8% (9)
Below Average	15% (16)	15% (17)	16% (18)
Average	49% (51)	51% (56)	49% (54)
Above Average	16% (17)	12% (14)	14% (16)
Well Above Average	9% (10)	10% (11)	11% (12)

Legend
 Percent of Students (Number of Students)

4th-Fountas & Pinnell
2012-13

Month	Target	% on Target
Oct	P	65%
Jan	Q	71%
Mar	R	70%
May	S	74%

Reading**ISAT-% Meets and Exceeds for 2011-13**

Grade 4

	2011	2012	2013
AYP Benchmark % M+E	85%	85%	92.5%
All	73%	84%	83%
White	82%	93%	88%
Hispanic	52%	38%	66%
IEP	41%	40%	33%
LEP	18%	18%	—
Low Income	64%	73%	75%

ISAT-% Meets and Exceeds for Math 2010-12

Grade 4

	2011	2012	2013
AYP Benchmark % M+E	85%	85%	92.5%
All	91%	97%	93%
White	93%	88%	96%
Hispanic	80%	90%	100%
IEP	71%	86%	72%
LEP	73%	73%	—
Low Income	88%	94%	98%

Student Achievement-Data Analysis

What is readily apparent when looking through the data at Locust Elementary is the number of students in each of the quintiles in grades K-4 remains almost consistent with approximately 25% of all students scoring in below average or well below average. Whereas there is some movement between the lower two quintiles, the overall number remains consistent. This would indicate that the academic gap intervention is simply maintaining students and not allowing them to regress further. It is important to note that AIMSWEB is simply a screening instrument and is not necessary aligned to any standards. What it does is indicate where intervention is needed. It also allows for progress monitoring of students in an intervention/assistance program to be tested at a lower level.

The Fountas and Pinnell data is somewhat contradictory to what is represented by the AIMSWEB with a majority of our students reaching the targeted goal as recommended. This is not to say that there is no room for improvement with our reading scores, but it is representative of the number of students who need an intervention to close the achievement gap.

The ISAT data for 3rd and 4th grade represents that as a District our students are performing very well and continue to improve. An obvious concern will be the decline in these scores when the new cut score is implemented and then when the ISAT begin to include Common Core questions and formats.

In looking at the data, what needs to be addressed is that the District does not have an assessment that mirrors the new Common Core Standards by which we could measure growth or student achievement. Additionally, when the new exam is launched, our students will have had very little exposure to this type of assessment. Moreover, our students are not familiar with taking assessments on a computer platform. This may also lead to additional anxiety when the new state assessments are launched.

Although the District does provide small group instruction to close the academic gap and the number of students that receive these supports does diminish as the children matriculate, some students seem to never improve enough to not need the remedial services.

Curriculum and Instruction

Locust Elementary School's curriculum needs to be updated and aligned to the Common Core. Teachers are responsible for teaching ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies and Art. Music and Physical Education are taught by highly qualified teachers. Teachers have made "crosswalks" with their current textbooks and curriculum maps to the new standards. They have identified strengths and weaknesses. The District has been hesitant to adopt a new curriculum because textbook manufacturers have not yet truly changed the format.

The reading basal textbook is old and as a result, teachers have been working on the curriculum to better align with the new standards. Academic Intervention services are offered each day for a minimum of 30 minutes for struggling students. The needs assessment identified the need for more reading materials. The current textbook is over 10 years old and not aligned to the new standards. Teachers indicated a need for books with increased rigor of reading material for their classrooms. Teacher indicated that they are interested in providing students with online reading tools that provide complex text to allow students to grow as readers. Also, teachers noted that they are lacking a uniform writing program that spans all grade levels. Additionally, teachers felt they needed more hands on math materials to effectively use guided math instructional strategies and meet the needs of all learners. A time table has been established for adoption of a new ELA and Math Series:

ELA—Grades K-5

Review of Materials	Fall and Winter 2013
Recommendation of Materials	Spring 2013
Training	Summer 2013
Implementation	Fall 2013
Additional Training	School Year 2013-14

Mathematics—Grades 3-4

Review of Materials	Fall and Winter 2014
Recommendation of Materials	Spring 2015
Training	Summer 2015
Implementation	Fall 2015
Additional Training	School Year 2015-16

All classrooms are equipped with SMARTBOARDS and have access to a bank (3) of computers. Teachers have indicated that there is a need for additional computers in every classroom to accommodate any of the new ELA curriculums. It has been recommended at there be a minimum to 8 mobile devices (ipads, surfaces, tablets, or small laptops) in every classroom so as to maximize instructional time with the new reading series. Additionally, increased bandwidth was noted as crucial because of all the new reading series have a "anchor" reading instruction that needs to be done on the SMARTBOARDS. If too many teachers are streaming "live" then proper instruction and introduction cannot occur, thus minimizing the effectiveness of the reading series.

Teachers also noted the need for increased collaboration both horizontally and vertically. There is a wide spread concern that with the implementation of the Common Core, discussions need to happen simultaneously with assignment of how to address the gaps.

Highly Qualified Staff

Locust Elementary School has 5 sections of kindergarten, 4 sections of 1st grade, 4 sections of 2nd grade, 4 sections of 3rd grade and 4 sections of 4th grade. In addition, there are 2 PE teachers, 1 music teacher, 1 reading specialist (Title I Teacher), .5 math specialist (Title I Teacher), 3 Bilingual/ESL teachers, 1.5 Intervention and Support Teachers, 3.5 special education teachers. Additional support personnel include 1.5 Speech and Language, 0.5 OT, 0.25 PT, 0.5 school psychologist, 0.8 social worker, and 1.0 guidance counselor. All staff is NCLB qualified.

Staff at the Marengo Union Elementary District is as follows

School Year	# of Teachers	# of Admin	Male	Female	Masters	Bachelors	Student /Teacher	Ave Teacher
2010	60	5	12.3%	87.7%	55.7%	41.7%	21.8	13.7 yrs
2011	60	5	12%	88%	58.8%	39.5%	21.7	13.6 yrs
2012	61	5	13.3%	86.7%	52.1%	47.9%	21.1	12.8 yrs

The average amount of teachers at the District has remained static over the past three years. However, over the next three years there will be a six teachers retiring. A challenge for the District will be to recruit good teachers with the current teaching pay matrix.

Family and Community Involvement

As part of the comprehensive needs assessment the Locust Elementary School parents completed a parent survey about the Elementary School's academic program. Surveys were completed by parents during registration and academic nights. The survey were completed on-line using Survey Monkey.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
▼ The school staff treats students with respect.	3.91% 7	0.56% 1	44.69% 80	48.04% 86	2.79% 5
▼ The school celebrates the success of all students.	2.81% 5	1.69% 3	43.82% 78	47.75% 85	3.93% 7
▼ My student feels that his or her feelings matter to teachers.	2.81% 5	4.49% 8	47.75% 85	40.45% 72	4.49% 8
▼ My student is able to get extra help when he or she needs it.	2.82% 5	2.26% 4	44.07% 78	44.63% 79	6.21% 11
▼ The school encourages me to set high expectations for my child's overall achievement.	2.81% 5	4.49% 8	48.31% 86	41.01% 73	3.37% 6
▼ My child's teachers expect and promote academic excellence.	2.81% 5	1.69% 3	50.56% 90	41.57% 74	3.37% 6

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
Teachers and principals care about helping me understand what my child is learning.	2.81% 5	0.56% 1	60.11% 107	33.71% 60	2.81% 5
The school provides me with helpful ideas on how to support my student's learning at home.	2.26% 4	4.52% 8	54.24% 96	35.59% 63	3.39% 6
It is easy for me to contact my child's teacher.	2.27% 4	2.27% 4	52.27% 92	38.07% 67	5.11% 9
The school considers communication with me to be an essential part of my child's education.	2.26% 4	5.08% 9	53.11% 94	36.16% 64	3.39% 6
Teachers (s) reach out to notify me of my student's progress/problems.	2.84% 5	10.23% 18	48.30% 85	35.23% 62	3.41% 6

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
Compared to other schools I know about, my school is excellent.	6.29% 11	15.43% 27	56.57% 99	16.57% 29	5.14% 9
All school staff is knowledgeable and professional.	0.57% 1	5.14% 9	64.00% 112	25.71% 45	4.57% 8
The school always does what is best for my student.	2.27% 4	8.52% 15	64.20% 113	21.02% 37	3.98% 7

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
▼ I believe that the principal is the instructional leader in my child's school.	2.27% 4	4.55% 8	54.55% 96	35.23% 62	3.41% 6
▼ The principal clearly communicates the school's goal and priorities to me.	2.82% 5	5.65% 10	54.24% 96	34.46% 61	2.82% 5
▼ I feel welcomed by the school principal or assistant principal.	2.27% 4	2.27% 4	49.43% 87	43.18% 76	2.84% 5
▼ I believe the school's administration is visible in the classroom.	1.71% 3	4.57% 8	50.29% 88	36.57% 64	6.86% 12
▼ The principal is actively involved in planning and reviewing school programs.	2.27% 4	1.14% 2	50.57% 89	39.77% 70	6.25% 11
▼ The special education director clearly communicates my student's needs during IEP meetings or staffings.	2.86% 5	1.14% 2	35.43% 62	25.14% 44	35.43% 62
▼ The superintendent is responsive to inquiries about school programs.	1.71% 3	2.29% 4	47.43% 83	29.14% 51	19.43% 34
▼ The superintendent provides meaningful information via school newsletters and webpage.	1.71% 3	1.14% 2	54.86% 96	34.29% 60	8.00% 14

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
My child feels safe at school.	2.84% 5	1.14% 2	49.43% 87	43.18% 76	3.41% 6
The school addresses teasing and bullying.	3.43% 6	9.71% 17	50.86% 89	28.57% 50	7.43% 13
The school communicates its rules for student behavior (PBIS).	2.87% 5	1.72% 3	45.98% 80	45.40% 79	4.02% 7
Teachers and principals create a safe learning environment.	2.87% 5	1.15% 2	48.28% 84	43.68% 76	4.02% 7

Of the people responding to the survey (32%), it appears as if most parents are satisfied with Locust Elementary School. However, in soliciting feedback from staff, they identified the following concerns raised by parents either through email or at parent teacher conferences:

- There is no consistent homework policy
- Parent's struggle to help students with homework
- Parents and students want more communication about safety procedures
- Connecting the families to the curriculum

The team identified some strength:

- Family events each quarter
- Consistent communication between teacher and parents
- Friendly atmosphere
- Spanish translations on website, flyers, report cards
- Community outreach and support personnel fluent in Spanish

A goal of the school was to have better family and community involvement with the assistance of a Parent Advisory Committee. A struggle for the District has been how to engage more families in their child (ren)'s education. As our poverty demographics increase, the need for a better mode of communication becomes more apparent and a need for follow through is also becoming more relevant. Parents will either make appointments and then not show or do not respond to requests to meet.

Professional Development

The School Wide Committee would like to receive feedback from staff on what types of professional development activities should be offered over the next couple of years. Please rank the following

Answer Options	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Response Count
Common Core-ELA	5	6	6	1	1	3	3	2	0	2	1	0	30
Common Core-Math	1	9	4	1	4	3	1	1	4	0	3	0	31
Using Common Core in the content area	10	1	8	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	29
New Teacher Evaluation Plan	6	3	1	6	5	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	30
Implementing and documenting Tier I in the general	0	3	2	6	3	7	0	1	4	1	2	1	30
Behavior Interventions in the Classroom	1	1	4	2	5	5	1	5	2	1	3	1	31
Understanding the mobile and impoverished	2	0	0	1	0	0	5	5	4	6	5	3	31
Motivating the Unmotivated Student	1	2	1	6	2	2	2	4	5	4	1	1	31
Differentiating instruction in the classroom	1	3	2	2	4	2	4	4	2	4	0	1	29
Smartboard Training	2	0	1	0	2	2	6	3	3	3	8	2	32
Understanding student data and using it to make	1	3	1	1	3	4	4	5	2	4	3	1	32
<i>answered question</i>												32	
<i>skipped question</i>												1	

This survey has a strong correlation with staff clearly indicating that they need PD on the new Common Core and how to use it in the classroom. Staff also has a need to understanding how the new teacher evaluation tool is going to impact their teaching and their overall performance in the District. Many of these items are covered in the School Wide Strategies section of this plan.

School Context and Organization

The team spent time in discussion about the school's Vision and Mission statements to ascertain if they were still relevant. In addition class size and the school handbook were reviewed.

The average class size at Locust Elementary is 25 students per class. There is one reading aide per grade level who is under the direction of the Title I Teacher. Many discussions have been had with the BOE regarding the large class sizes, but the BOE has committed to a "black" budget on a yearly basis. This has not allowed for additional staff to be hired.

Parents have indicated that Locust Elementary School is warm and inviting. There is a high level of trust between the teachers and parents. There is also a very high level of approval for the building principal. This data indicates that Locust School is able to tackle change in a positive manner.

It was also discussed that the District does not have any "Belief" statements. This will be a goal for the superintendent to work through with the BOE.

The District adopted PBIS in the early 2000's. This has been a very robust program with the District seeing very positive results. Every month there is a targeted behavior with an incentive. The amount of students participating in the incentive continues to increase on a yearly basis.

The committee discussed in detail how the poverty demographics and different family values are affecting the school climate. Our staff needs to understand how to deal with this changing dynamic in order to provide the best educational opportunity to students. Additionally, this will be the last year that Locust Elementary is K-4. Beginning in the next school year it will be a Pre K- 3rd Grade Building. Good discussions have been had as to how to build the relationships with the younger parents through outreach and community support.

Priority Needs

As a result to the comprehensive needs assessment, the team identified the following priority needs:

- New ELA Series
- New Math Series
- Additional professional development in the area of math
- Increased reading resources to allow for more differentiation
- Increased technology in the classrooms to support reading resource
- School wide writing curriculum
- Increased math manipulatives to allow for better differentiation
- Collaboration time to align curriculum to better meet the needs of diverse learners
- Programs for parents to help students with homework/reading at home
- Professional development on the effects of poverty on education
- Review homework policy among all grades and communicate with parents

School Wide Strategies

To meet the needs of all learners, the Alden-Hebron Elementary School SIP team recommends the following changes:

Need: Adopt a new reading ELA Series with differentiated materials for grades K-5

- Increased access to differentiated materials for guided reading
- Classroom kits of leveled readers that correspond with the new reading series
- Read Naturally Intervention online edition
- More books for classroom libraries

Need: Adopt a new reading Math Series with differentiated materials for grades 3-8

- Begin discussion with math curriculum team for analog v digital platform
- Increased differentiated materials
- More manipulatives for classroom instruction
- Math Centers

Need: Increased technology in the classrooms to support reading and math resources

- Revisit the number of computers in classrooms
- Develop a way to allow more students to access the computer lab
- Digital editions of ELA and Math
- Investigate “hotspots” for home use

Need: School wide writing program

- In conjunction with new ELA series...
- Consistent across all grade levels
- Non-negotiable standards and expectations

Need: Collaboration time to align curriculum to better meet the needs of diverse learners

- Schedule ½ day PD for teams to work collaboratively with new curriculums
- Schedule some of the SIP days to be set aside for vertical articulation

Need: Professional development in the area of math and ELA for new curriculum adoptions

Need: Professional development in the area of poverty and the effects on education

Need: New assessment platform that aligns to the Common Core

- Schedule a time to investigate MAP

Need: Programs for parents to help students with homework/reading at home

- Quarterly Programs
- Links to new curriculum

Annual Evaluation

As part of the school improvement process, at least once each year, the building principal, with assistance from the Title I coordinator and the School Improvement Team will conduct an evaluation of the program and will assess the effectiveness of the program and what additional needs have emerged. The school through its Yellow and Red team will continue to monitor the data for improvement.

Parents will be notified on an annual basis of the change in delivery plan. At every fall and spring conference, a workshop will be offered for parents to attend.