Local Board Approved	
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	070161670022003		
District Name:	Brookwood SD 167	School Name:	Longwood Elem School
Superintendent:	Dr. Pamela K Hollich	Principal:	Mr. Reginald Patterson
District Address:	201 Glenwood-Dyer Rd	School Address:	441 N Longwood Dr
City/State/Zip:	Glenwood, IL 60425 1845	City/State/Zip:	Glenwood, IL 60425 1211
District Telephone#:	Label 7087585190 Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	7087572100 Extn:
District Email:	phollich@brookwood167.org	School Email:	
Is this plan for a Title I School?	Yes No		

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2010 AYP Report

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this School been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2010-11 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2010-11 State Improvement Status	

	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
Student Groups	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		77.5			77.5			91		80	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	66.0		No	82.1		Yes	94.5	Yes		
White														
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	65.9	69.0	Yes	85.4		Yes	94.8			
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

Native American														
Multiracial/Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities														
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	65.3	68.1	Yes	80.6		Yes	94.1			

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.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

School Information								
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Attendance Rate (%)	95.0	95.3	94.6	94.9	95.7	94.9	94.9	94.5
Truancy Rate (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.4
Mobility Rate (%)	12.5	19.1	19.0	25.7	24.5	40.4	22.1	20.9
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	377	377	370	384	378	395	371	336
Low Income (%)	57.6	58.6	59.5	58.3	55.8	55.7	68.5	73.2
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	1.6	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.1	20.2
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.2
White, non-Hispanic (%)	14.3	12.7	11.9	9.9	8.2	6.6	4.3	4.2
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	69.2	71.9	73.2	72.9	72.2	72.9	73.6	70.2
Hispanic (%)	15.6	14.9	14.6	16.4	18.3	17.5	18.3	20.5
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	0.0	0.3	1.1	3.0	3.8	5.1

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

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
SCHOOL	2000	33.7	54.6	9.8	1.9	-	-
	2001	24.1	55.9	11.3	8.4	0.3	-
	2002	18.2	67.2	12.5	1.7	0.3	-
	2003	14.3	69.2	15.6	0.8	-	-
	2004	12.7	71.9	14.9	0.5	-	-
	2005	11.9	73.2	14.6	0.3	-	-
	2006	9.9	72.9	16.4	0.5	-	0.3
	2007	8.2	72.2	18.3	0.3	-	1.1
	2008	6.6	72.9	17.5	-	-	3.0
	2009	4.3	73.6	18.3	-	-	3.8
	2010	4.2	70.2	20.5	-	-	5.1
DISTRICT	2000	34.2	56.2	8.0	1.7	-	-
	2001	28.7	59.6	8.9	2.8	0.1	-
	2002	24.7	63.5	10.3	1.4	0.2	-
	2003	19.4	67.5	12.0	1.2	-	-
	2004	15.9	71.2	12.0	0.9	-	-
	2005	12.6	75.6	11.2	0.7	-	-
	2006	10.2	76.4	12.4	0.8	0.1	0.2
	2007	8.3	78.0	12.4	0.5	0.1	0.8
	2008	6.5	77.3	14.2	0.3	0.1	1.6
	2009	5.5	77.7	14.1	0.2	0.1	2.4
	2010	5.1	76.6	14.2	0.2	-	3.9
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

STATE	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.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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 (%)
SCHOOL	2000	-	44.8	100.0	94.5	7.3	-	-	-	-
	2001	-	48.9	100.0	94.3	16.6	-	-	-	-
	2002	-	54.4	100.0	94.1	12.6	2	0.6	-	-
	2003	1.6	57.6	100.0	95.0	12.5	-	-	-	-
	2004	0.8	58.6	100.0	95.3	19.1	-	-	-	-
	2005	-	59.5	100.0	94.6	19.0	-	-	-	-
	2006	-	58.3	100.0	94.9	25.7	-	-	-	-
	2007	-	55.8	87.0	95.7	24.5	-	-	-	-
	2008	-	55.7	100.0	94.9	40.4	-	-	-	-
	2009	12.1	68.5	100.0	94.9	22.1	-	-	-	-
	2010	20.2	73.2	100.0	94.5	20.9	39	13.4	-	-
DISTRICT	2000	-	37.0	100.0	95.1	9.2	1	0.1	-	-
	2001	0.6	37.5	100.0	95.0	12.2	-	-	-	-
	2002	0.1	43.3	100.0	94.8	13.6	2	0.2	-	-
	2003	0.7	53.6	100.0	95.3	11.5	-	-	-	-
	2004	0.5	54.1	100.0	95.1	14.7	1	0.1	-	-
	2005	0.1	60.4	100.0	94.8	15.3	2	0.2	-	-
	2006	0.1	61.4	100.0	95.2	16.3	3	0.2	-	-
	2007	-	61.6	96.9	95.0	15.7	9	0.7	-	-
	2008	3.3	67.0	100.0	94.9	19.3	5	0.4	-	-
	2009	10.1	69.9	100.0	95.1	27.2	3	0.3	-	-
	2010	13.1	73.3	100.0	95.0	22.5	47	4.2	-	-
	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

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

STATE	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.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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)
SCHOOL	2000	368	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	311	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	351	66	93	-	-	-	-
	2003	377	74	70	-	-	-	-
	2004	377	70	68	-	-	-	-
	2005	370	67	71	-	-	-	-
	2006	384	57	72	-	-	-	-
	2007	378	57	54	-	-	-	-
	2008	395	72	63	-	-	-	-
	2009	371	57	70	-	-	-	-
	2010	336	61	59	-	-	-	-
DISTRICT	2000	1,291	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,239	148	130	128	141	148	-
	2002	1,247	130	149	140	135	140	-
	2003	1,294	144	136	144	159	143	-
	2004	1,321	142	134	143	155	164	-
	2005	1,360	125	146	132	185	171	-
	2006	1,324	119	141	139	157	171	-
	2007	1,332	150	117	137	138	180	-
	2008	1,305	133	157	118	153	151	-
	2009	1,237	126	133	138	155	152	-
	2010	1,166	129	120	125	119	146	-
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

STATE	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.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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 (%)
DISTRICT	2000	85	14	38,406	74	27	17	-	-	-
	2001	84	14	39,549	74	26	17	-	-	-
	2002	85	15	41,767	73	27	17	-	-	-
	2003	87	13	40,601	74	26	17	-	1	-
	2004	85	11	42,555	76	24	17	-	1	2
	2005	86	12	45,610	66	34	18	-	-	-
	2006	90	12	44,683	61	39	17	-	-	-
	2007	84	11	45,372	57	44	17	-	1	-
	2008	86	11	46,867	56	44	17	-	2	-
	2009	85	11	48,457	59	41	16	-	-	-
	2010	85	9	45,822	58	42	15	-	-	-
STATE	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 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

	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.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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	55.0	57.4	69.8	63.4	68.4	74.6	-	58.5	56.5	64.9	64.7	60.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	53.9	50.0	71.1	63.8	68.2	71.7	-	60.8	50.0	65.3	64.3	58.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	41.6	75.0	-	50.0	-	80.0	-	35.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18.2	-	-	-	20.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	43.5	53.6	61.7	58.5	70.6	68.9	-	50.0	50.0	64.9	60.8	65.8	-	-	-	-	-	-

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

	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.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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	86.9	90.7	88.7	80.0	82.5	84.7	-	72.8	65.9	82.2	76.5	81.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	84.6	91.6	88.9	80.7	84.1	87.0	-	72.5	59.5	80.4	75.0	81.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	91.7	83.3	-	80.0	-	70.0	-	64.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36.4	-	-	-	60.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	84.8	87.8	88.2	76.9	88.2	80.0	-	68.8	59.5	83.4	76.4	81.6	-	-	-	-	-	-

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

	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.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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?

Over the past three years, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding in third grade reading has risen by at least 5% each year. The percentage is meeting adequate yearly progress for the single grade. However, the fourth grade percentage of students meeting or exceeding in fourth grade has flat lined and dropped over the past three years. If adequate yearly progress was measured by an individual grade, fourth grade would not have met over the past two years. In 2010, the percentage of students meeting in fourth grade reading was 15% below the target which kept the building from meeting AYP.

Overall, third grade is continuously making progress in reading while fourth grade is on a downtrend.

In the area of mathematics both third and fourth grade have had a high percentage of students meeting or exceeding which has resulted in meeting AYP in mathematics for several years.

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

Longwood Elementary has seen a transition in the socio- economic status of our population over the last seven years. Our low-income population represents 69.9% of the student population an increase in the 61.4% level in 2006. Differences in socioeconomic status create diverse family patterns of living and structures. There is a high percentage of unemployment among these families, a lack of transportation, and access to technology. The mobility rate in 2010 was 20.9 and had been increasing fairly consistently at the rate of approximately 1% per year.

The demographics of the district have changed over the past three years. The percent of economically disadvantaged students rose from 55.7% in 2007-2008 to 73.2% in 2009-2010. In 2006-2007, 8.2% of the population was White, non-Hispanic and 72.2% was Black, non-Hispanic, and 18.3% Hispanic. In 2009-2010, 4.2% of the student population was White, non-Hispanic; 70.2% was Black, non-Hispanic; and 20.5% Hispanic. From 2000 to 2008, our school has seen an increase in our black and Hispanic student population although the teaching staff is still primarily Caucasian and female. As a result, staffing trends have focused on developing/maintaining diversity among the teaching staff. Staff development is needed to address the poverty, diversity, and instructional delivery systems that are responsive to the needs of our students.

Aligning the curriculum to the state standards and benchmarks and providing all students with an opportunity to learn higher level content is a factor in our achievement scores. The reading curriculum has seen many hours of professional development for teachers in grades K-3 through the Reading First grant from 2006-2007 to 2008-2009. Fourth grade

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

teachers did not receive the same professional development due to the parameters of the grant. More professional development that is common to the practices of the primary grades is needed for all fourth grade teachers and teachers who have started since 2009-2010.

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

Longwood should build upon the existing knowledge base of its teachers who have had many hours of reading professional development through Reading First by scaffolding better communication among staff. Collaborative planning horizontally and vertically can be used to train those staff who have a mastery in certain instructional strategies to pass along to others.

There is a need for common language to be used in all grade levels in reading instruction in order to enable students to develop a consistent and true understanding of reading strategies in phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Best practices and instructional strategies shall be universally sued across all grade levels.

The building should use the elements of a professional learning community by constantly answering the following four essential questions:

1. What do we want students to know? The school district is actively creating curriculum maps, which are standards, based in all subject areas. Our building collaboration teams look at data to determine which standards are either strong or deficient in our core curriculum.

2. How will we know if they have learned? Teachers meet regularly to find specific evidence to bring all students to proficiency. This is done through analyzing student products, including daily tasks, common assessments and other formative and summative measures.

3. What do we do when they have not learned? Appropriate interventions are planned and implemented based on the needs of the students. Support for students who are struggling is collegial.

4. How will we respond when they already know it? Data proving that a student is beyond expectations in a particular area will also receive intervention. This may include presenting a more challenging level of instruction that is determined by assessment analysis.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data (Optional)

Data - Briefly describe the relevant local assessment data used in this plan. What do these data tell you? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are apparent?

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

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

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)
Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

Data - Briefly describe attributes and challenges of the school and community that have affected student performance. What do these data and/or information tell you?

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

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)
Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

Data - Briefly describe data on educator qualifications and data and/or information about staff capacity and professional development opportunities related to areas of weakness and strength. What do these data and information tell you?

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

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

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

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

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

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

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

From the factor pages (I-A, I-B, and I-C), identify key factors that are within the school's capacity to change or control and which have contributed to low achievement. What conclusions about next steps have you reached from reviewing available data and information and about all the factors affecting student achievement?

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Improve Student Performance in Reading for Grade 3 and Grade 4	1,

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

- 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Improve Student Performance in Reading for Grade 3 and Grade 4

Objective 1 Description

In the 2009-2010 school year, 74.6% of Grade 3 met or exceeded in ISAT Reading and 60% of Grade 4 met or exceeded in ISAT Reading. In the 2010-2011 school year, we want 85% of Grade 3 and 4 to meet or exceed in Reading.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improve Student Performance in Reading for Grade 3 and Grade 4

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	**Start Date**	**End Date**		**Fund Source**	**Amount($)**
1	Provide an uniterrupted 90 minute instruction block every day for every grade level	09/06/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Other	
2	Provide a needs based 30 minute reading intervention block every day for every grade level	09/06/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Other	
3	Provide a balanced reading instruction program which includes word study, shared reading, guided reading, independent reading, and read aloud	09/06/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Other	
4	Implement word study, phonemic awareness and phonics, with the components of the 95 Percent Group plan	09/06/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	3,000
5	Implement the strategies for comprehension instruction with the components of the Gretchen Courtney plan	09/06/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	3,000
6	Provide more scheduled and unscheduled opportunities for students to check out books from the school library for independent reading	09/06/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Other	
7	Benchmark and monitor progress in reading with AIMSWeb	09/06/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	3,000
8	Provide comprehension reading instruction with supplemental materials such as Reading A-Z	09/06/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	1,000
9	Provide test preparation skills with the use of Study Island	10/04/2010	02/25/2011	During School	Title I	1,200
10	Provide after school tutoring for struggling readers	11/29/2010	05/06/2011	After School	Title I	32,000

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improve Student Performance in Reading for Grade 3 and Grade 4

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	**Start Date**	**End Date**		**Fund Source**	**Amount($)**
1	Establish a system of peer observation for teachers to share instructional strategies with one another	09/06/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Other	
2	Continue grade level meetings where teachers demonstrate and share knowledge learned in professional development with colleagues	09/06/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Other	
3	Provide opportunities for teachers to attend professional development workshops	09/06/2010	05/27/2011	During School	Title I	3,000

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improve Student Performance in Reading for Grade 3 and Grade 4

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	**Start Date**	**End Date**		**Fund Source**	**Amount($)**
1	Host a series of information nights provided by Pearson's Parent Engagement Workshops	01/03/2011	05/27/2011	After School	Title I	2,500
2	Develop effective communication systems with parents and take responsibility for maintaining these systems	09/06/2010	05/27/2011	After School	Other	

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Improve Student Performance in Reading for Grade 3 and Grade 4

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

Progress will be measured from the data collected through the components of our Assessment Timeline.

Assessment	Strategy	Start Date	Frequency
95% Group PASI	Phonemic Awareness	September 2010	Every 3 Weeks (Grades K-1)
95% Group PSI	Phonics	September 2010	Every 3 Weeks (Grades 1-4)
Fountas and Pinnell Benchmarks	Fluency; Comprehension	September 2010	2 times a year for Kindergarten; 3 times a year for Grades 1-4
AIMSWeb Benchmarks	Fluency: Accuracy	September 2010	3 times a year for Grades K-4
AIMSWeb Progress Monitoring	Fluency; Accuracy	September 2010	Every 3 weeks for students who did not meet the benchmark target
District Writing Assessments	Expository; Persuasive; Narrative	September 2010	Once a year for Kindergarten; Two times a year for Grade 1; Three times a year for Grades 2-4
ISAT Reading	Comprehension; Vocabulary	March 2011	Once a year for Grades 3-4

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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	Reginald Patterson	Principal
2	Chris Burns	Teacher
3	Erin DeBruin	Title I Teacher
4	Christa Angell	Teacher
5	Shannon Mangan	Teacher
6	Margaret Tessling	Teacher
7	Carolyn Nyhan	Teacher
8	Dominique Morgan	Teacher
9	Xochitl Munoz	ELL Teacher

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

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

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

Parents have been informed about the school's academic status in several ways. A formal letter was sent home with a report of the school report card. This was also provided to the parents during our open house. The Board of Education also received a report and scheduled presentation about the school's status.

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.

Stakeholders have been consulted through the following approaches:

- Paper Parent Survey
- Parent Interviews
- Teacher Survey
- Interviews with Community Members
- Student Interviews and Survey
- School Report Card
- School Improvement Team Meetings

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

	Name	Title
1	Reginald Patterson	Principal
2	Chris Burns	Teacher
3	Erin DeBruin	Title I Teacher
4	Christa Angell	Teacher
5	Shannon Mangan	Teacher
6	Margaret Tessling	Teacher
7	Carolyn Nyhan	Teacher
8	Dominique Morgan	Teacher
9	Xochitl Munoz	ELL Teacher

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.

Longwood Elementary will have its plan reviewed by a neighboring school:
Beacon Hill Elementary, Park Forest School District 163

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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.

Longwood has a mentoring program in place that is provided by the Brookwood School District 167 and Governor State University.

The purpose include:

- Increase in teacher effectiveness
- Retaining high quality teachers
- Building collegial and positive relationships among staff members

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.

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

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

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

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

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

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

	Name	Title
1		

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:

A. ASSURANCES

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

B.SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN	
ANALYSIS OF DATA	
Yes No	Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified? [C]
Yes No	Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness? [C]
Yes No	Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students? [C]
Yes No	Does the analysis, along with other optional data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities? [C]
LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)	
Yes No N/A	If included, is there evidence that the SIP team analyzed optional data to clarify the areas of weakness?
Yes No N/A	Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?
Yes No N/A	Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?
OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)	
Yes No N/A	If included, has the SIP team analyzed other available data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities?
Yes No N/A	Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?
Yes No N/A	Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS	
Yes No	Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance? [C]
Yes No	Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control? [C]
CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES	
Yes No	Has the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan? [C]
Yes No N/A	Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency? [C]
ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES	
Yes No	Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?
Yes No	Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement? [C]
Yes No	Are the strategies and activities measurable? [C]
Yes No	Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified? [C]
Yes No	Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear? [C]
Yes No N/A	Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students? [C]
Yes No N/A	Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status or in special education non-compliance?
Yes No N/A	Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities for students? [C]

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

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

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN	
PARENT NOTIFICATION	
Yes No N/A	Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only) [C]
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT	
Yes No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]
Yes No	Does the SIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes? [C]
PEER REVIEW	

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University

Yes No	Is the peer review process described and is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have "the greatest likelihood" of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP? [C]
TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS	
Yes No	Is it clear how the school is ensuring that teachers are receiving the support needed for their professional growth and to retain them in the profession? [C]
DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITES	
Yes No	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]
Yes No N/A	If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]
STATE RESPONSIBILITES	
Yes No	Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation? [C]
SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM	
Yes No N/A	Have the names and titles of School Support Team members been listed in the plan? Does the team appear to have the expertise to support this school in regards to the school improvement plan? [C]
APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD	
Yes No	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan. [C]

PART II - COMMENTS

©2010 Interactive Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University