An Integrated School Improvement Plan for

West Central Elementary School District #235

July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021

Last Edit on May 27, 2020 Board Approved (May 27, 2020)

West Central Elementary



"Providing Opportunities, Expecting Excellence"

Table of Contents

L1 School Community L2 School Improvement Team Table 1: School Improvement Team II. Data Collection, Organization & Trends Table 2: Data Collection Methods II. 2 School Based Assessment Table 32: Data Collection Methods II. 2 School Based Assessment Table 38: MAP Assessment Scores Table 38: MAP Assessment-Simple Growth Table 30: STAR Reading Assessment Grade Placement II. Table 39: STAR Reading Assessment Grade Placement Table 39: STAR Reading Assessment Grade Placement Table 36: STAR Math Assessment Grade Placement Table 36: PARCC/IAR State Assessment Table 38: Hilnois Science Assessment Table 38: Billinois Science Assessment Table 38: Billinois Science Assessment Table 39: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 40: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 40: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 50: Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) Table 5: Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment Demographic Comparisons and Trends 11.4 Program Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Table 10: Parent Survey 3. Table 11: Staff Survey 3. Table 11: Staff Survey 3. Table 11: Staff Survey 3. HIL Problem Statements and Hypotheses	
Table 1: School Improvement Team Table 1: School Improvement Team II. Data Collection, Organization & Trends Table 2: Data Collection Methods II. 2 School Based Assessment Table 3A: MAP Assessment Scores Table 3B: MAP Assessment Scores Table 3B: MAP Assessment Simple Growth Table 3C: STAR Reading Assessment Table 3D: STAR Reading Assessment Table 3D: STAR Reading Assessment Table 3B: STAR Math Assessment Grade Placement Table 3B: STAR Math Assessment Grade Placement Table 3B: Hillinois Science Assessment Table 3B: AIMSweb Fluency Assessment Table 3B: Hillinois Science Assessment Table 3B: Hillinois Science Assessment Table 3B: Billinois Science Assessment Table 4B: Billinois Science Assessment Table 4B: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 4B: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 4B: General School Data (School Report Card) Chronic Absenteeism by Demographics Table 5: Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment Demographic Comparisons and Trends II.4 Program Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends II.5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey 3. III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	3
Table 1: School Improvement Team II. Data Collection, Organization & Trends II. Data Collection Methods II. 2 School Based Assessment Table 32: Data Collection Methods II. 2 School Based Assessment Table 33: MAP Assessment Scores Table 38: MAP Assessment Simple Growth Table 36: STAR Reading Assessment Table 30: STAR Reading Assessment Table 30: STAR Reading Assessment Table 31: STAR Math Assessment Grade Placement Table 35: STAR Math Assessment Grade Placement Table 36: STAR Math Assessment Grade Placement Table 36: PARCC/IAR State Assessment Table 37: AIMSweb Fluency Assessment Table 38: Mallsweb Fluency Assessment Table 38: Parcollar State Assessment Table 38: Billinois Science Assessment Table 39: Parcollar State Assessment Table 39: Parcollar School Data (School Report Card) Table 49: General School Data (Fall Housing Report) Table 49: Seneral Education Student Subgroup Enrollment Demographic Comparisons and Trends II.4 Program Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends II.5 Perception Data Table 11: Staff Survey Table 11: Staff Survey Table 11: Staff Survey Table 11: Problem Statements and Hypotheses	4
II. Data Collection, Organization & Trends Table 2: Data Collection Methods II. 2 School Based Assessment Table 3A: MAP Assessment Scores Table 3B: MAP Assessment Scores Table 3B: MAP Assessment Simple Growth 19 Table 3C: STAR Reading Assessment Table 3C: STAR Reading Assessment Table 3C: STAR Reading Assessment Table 3C: STAR Math Assessment Grade Placement Table 3C: STAR Math Assessment Grade Placement Table 3B: AIMSweb Fluency Assessments Table 3B: AIMSweb Fluency Assessments Table 3B: AIMSweb Fluency Assessment Table 3B: AIMSweb Fluency Assessment Table 3B: Billinois Science Assessment Overal Assessment Observations II. 3 Demographic Data Table 4B: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 4B: General School Data (School Report Card) Chronic Absenteeism by Demographics Table 5: Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) 2 Demographic Comparisons and Trends II. 4Program Data Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment Demographic Comparisons and Trends 2 Demographic Comparisons and Trends 2 Demographic Porgram Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data 2 Demographic Omparison and Trends 3 Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends II. 5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey 3 Table 11: Staff Survey III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	5
Table 2: Data Collection Methods II. 2 School Based Assessment Table 3A: MAP Assessment Scores 77 Table 3B: MAP Assessment-Simple Growth Table 3C: STAR Reading Assessment Table 3C: STAR Reading Assessment 11 Table 3D: STAR Reading Assessment 12 Table 3C: STAR Math Assessment Grade Placement Table 3C: STAR Math Assessment Grade Placement Table 3C: STAR Math Assessment Grade Placement Table 3C: PARCC/JAR State Assessment Overall Assessment Observations II. 3 Demographic Data Table 4B: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 5: Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) 2 Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment Demographic Comparisons and Trends 11.4 Program Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends 13. Serveption Data Table 1B: Parent Survey 3. Table 1B: Staff Survey 13. Table 1B: Staff Survey 14. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	4
II. 2 School Based Assessment Table 3A: MAP Assessment Scores 7 Table 3A: MAP Assessment Scores 7 Table 3B: MAP Assessment Simple Growth 9 Table 3C: STAR Reading Assessment Grade Placement 11 Table 3D: STAR Reading Assessment 11 Table 3E: STAR Math Assessment 12 Table 3E: STAR Math Assessment 13 Table 3F: AlMSweb Fluency Assessments 15 Table 3G: PARCC/IAR State Assessment 16 Table 3H: Illinois Science Assessment 17 Table 3H: Illinois Science Assessment 18 Table 3H: Blinois Science Assessment 19 Table 4A: General School Data (School Report Card) 10 Table 4b: General School Data (School Report Card) (Irlinois Absenteeism by Demographic) 11 Table 4b: General School Data (School Report Card) (Irlinois Absenteeism by Demographic) 12 Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment 19 Demographic Comparisons and Trends 11 Table 7: Educator Data 12 Table 7: Educator Data 12 Table 8: Student Discipline Data 12 Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs 11 Table 10: Parent Survey 13 Table 11: Staff Survey 14 Table 11: Staff Survey 15 Table 11: Staff Survey 16 Table 11: Staff Survey 17 Table 11: Staff Survey 18 Table 11: Problem Statements and Hypotheses	6
Table 3B; MAP Assessment Sores Table 3B; MAP Assessment Simple Growth Table 3C; STAR Reading Assessment Grade Placement Table 3D; STAR Reading Assessment Table 3D; STAR Reading Assessment Table 3E; STAR Math Assessment Table 3F; AIMSweb Fluency Assessments Table 3G; PARCC/IAR State Assessment Table 3H; Illinois Science Assessment Table 3H; Illinois Science Assessment Overall Assessment Observations II.3 Demographic Data Table 4a; General School Data (School Report Card) Table 4b; General School Data (School Report Card) Chronic Absentecism by Demographics Table 5; Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) Table 6; Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment Demographic Comparisons and Trends II.4 Program Data Table 7; Educator Data Table 9; Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends II.5 Perception Data Table 10; Parent Survey 3. III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	6
Table 3B: MAP Assessment-Simple Growth Table 3C: STAR Reading Assessment Grade Placement Table 3D: STAR Reading Assessment Table 3D: STAR Reading Assessment Table 3E: STAR Math Assessment Grade Placement Table 3F: AIMSweb Fluency Assessments Table 3G: PARCC/IAR State Assessment Table 3G: PARCC/IAR State Assessment II. 3Demographic Science Assessment Overall Assessment Observations II. 3 Demographic Data Table 4a: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 4b: General School Data (School Report Card) Chronic Absenteeism by Demographics Table 5: Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment Demographic Comparisons and Trends II. 4 Program Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends II. 5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey Table 11: Staff Survey III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	7
Table 3C: STAR Reading Assessment Table 3D: STAR Reading Assessment 1 Table 3D: STAR Reading Assessment Table 3F: AIMSweb Fluency Assessments Table 3F: AIMSweb Fluency Assessments Table 3H: Illinois Science Assessment Illinois Science Assessment Overall Assessment Observations II.3 Demographic Data Table 4B: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 4B: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 4B: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 5: Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment Demographic Comparisons and Trends II.4 Program Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends II.5 Perception Data Table 1D: Parent Survey Table 11: Staff Survey III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	7
Table 3D: STAR Reading Assessment Table 3E: STAR Math Assessment Grade Placement 1. Table 3F: AIMSweb Fluency Assessments Table 3G: PARCC/IAR State Assessment Table 3H: Illinois Science Assessment Overall Assessment Observations II.3 Demographic Data Table 4a: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 4b: General School Data (School Report Card) Chronic Absenteeism by Demographics Table 5: Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment Demographic Comparisons and Trends II.4 Program Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends Table 10: Parent Survey Table 11: Staff Survey Table 11: Staff Survey III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	9
Table 3E: STAR Math Assessment Grade Placement Table 3F: AIMSweb Fluency Assessments Table 3G: PARCC/IAR State Assessment Table 3H: Illinois Science Assessment Overall Assessment Observations II.3 Demographic Data Table 4a: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 4b: General School Data (School Report Card) Chronic Absenteeism by Demographics Table 5: Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment Demographic Comparisons and Trends II.4 Program Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends II.5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey Table 11: Staff Survey III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	10
Table 3F: AIMSweb Fluency Assessments Table 3G: PARCC/IAR State Assessment In Table 3H: Illinois Science Assessment Overall Assessment Observations II.3 Demographic Data Table 4a: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 4b: General School Data (School Report Card) Chronic Absenteeism by Demographics Table 5: Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment Demographic Comparisons and Trends II.4 Program Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends II.5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey Table 11: Staff Survey 3: III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	11
Table 3G: PARCC/IAR State Assessment Table 3H: Illinois Science Assessment Overall Assessment Observations II.3 Demographic Data Table 4a: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 4b: General School Data (School Report Card) Chronic Absenteeism by Demographics Table 5: Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment Demographic Comparisons and Trends II.4 Program Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends II.5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey Table 11: Staff Survey III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	12
Table 3H: Illinois Science Assessment Overall Assessment Observations II.3 Demographic Data II.3 Demographic Data Table 4a: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 4b: General School Data (School Report Card) Chronic Absenteeism by Demographics Table 5: Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment Demographic Comparisons and Trends II.4 Program Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends II.5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey Table 11: Staff Survey III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	12
Overall Assessment Observations II.3 Demographic Data Table 4a: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 4b: General School Data (School Report Card) Chronic Absenteeism by Demographics Table 5: Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment Demographic Comparisons and Trends II.4 Program Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends II.5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey Table 11: Staff Survey III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	16
II.3 Demographic Data Table 4a: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 4b: General School Data (School Report Card) Chronic Absenteeism by Demographics Table 5: Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment Demographic Comparisons and Trends II.4 Program Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends II.5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey Table 11: Staff Survey JII. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	18
Table 4a: General School Data (School Report Card) Table 4b: General School Data (School Report Card) Chronic Absenteeism by Demographics Table 5: Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment Demographic Comparisons and Trends 11.4 Program Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends 3. II.5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey 3. Table 11: Staff Survey 3. III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	18
Table 4b: General School Data (School Report Card) Chronic Absenteeism by Demographics 2d Table 5: Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) 2d Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment 2d Demographic Comparisons and Trends 2d II.4 Program Data 2d Table 7: Educator Data 2d Table 8: Student Discipline Data 2d Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs 2d Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends 3d II.5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey 3d Table 11: Staff Survey 3d III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	19
Demographics 2d Table 5: Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report) 2 Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment 2 Demographic Comparisons and Trends 2. II.4 Program Data 2. Table 7: Educator Data 2. Table 8: Student Discipline Data 2. Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs 2. Curriculum Implementation Data 2. Program Comparison and Trends 3. II.5 Perception Data 3. Table 10: Parent Survey 3. III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses 4.	19
Table 6: Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment Demographic Comparisons and Trends II.4 Program Data 2. Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends II.5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey Table 11: Staff Survey III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	20
Demographic Comparisons and Trends II.4 Program Data 2. Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends II.5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey 3. Table 11: Staff Survey III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	21
II.4 Program Data Table 7: Educator Data Table 8: Student Discipline Data Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends II.5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey Table 11: Staff Survey III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	21
Table 7: Educator Data 2. Table 8: Student Discipline Data 2. Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs 2. Curriculum Implementation Data 2. Program Comparison and Trends 3. II.5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey 3. Table 11: Staff Survey 3. III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	22
Table 8: Student Discipline Data 2. Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs 2. Curriculum Implementation Data 2. Program Comparison and Trends 3. II.5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey 3. Table 11: Staff Survey 3. III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	23
Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends II.5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey Table 11: Staff Survey 3: III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	23
Curriculum Implementation Data Program Comparison and Trends II.5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey Table 11: Staff Survey III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses	24
Program Comparison and Trends II.5 Perception Data Table 10: Parent Survey Table 11: Staff Survey 3: III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses 4	26
II.5 Perception Data 3. Table 10: Parent Survey 3. Table 11: Staff Survey 3. III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses 4.	26
Table 10: Parent Survey 3: Table 11: Staff Survey 3: III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses 4:	31
Table 11: Staff Survey 3: III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses 4	33
III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses 4	33
	35
Table 12: Pattern Strengths and Problems 4	4 1
	4 1
IV. Goals, Strategies, Integrated Action Plan	14
Table 13: Improvement Goals 4-	14

V. Reflection, Evaluation, Refinement	51
V1. School Improvement Team Meeting Schedule	51
V2. Monitoring	51
V3. Communication Plan	51

I. Introduction and Background

I.1 School Community

Boundaries

The West Central School District consists of 298.7 square miles. The most distal points from north to south would be approximately 26 miles and from east to west about 18 miles. The western border of the school district is the Mississippi River. Townships (located in Henderson County) served by the West Central School District are Bald Bluff, Biggsville, Carman, Gladstone, Lomax, Media, Oquawka, Raritan, Rozetta, Stronghurst, and Terre Haute. Townships (located in Warren County) served by the West Central School District include Ellison, Point Pleasant and Tomkins. Blandinsville Township (located in McDonough County) is also served by the West Central School District.

School History

West Central School District is a consolidated district approved by a large majority of voters in the November general elections of 2004. The district was formed by the consolidation of the former Southern School District #120 and the former Union School District #115 and became officially known as the West Central School District #235 on July 1, 2005. Pupil attendance centers were decided by the West Central School Board to be:

PreK - 5 Biggsville

6-8 Stronghurst 9-12 Biggsville

School Transportation

All of the elementary students are transported by district school buses. Some of the students spend just over an hour each way to school. Four shuttle buses are utilized to transport students from campus to campus before and after school. Seatbelts and safety harnesses are utilized as needed.

Facilities

West Central Elementary School was opened in the fall of 1991. It currently serves the students in grades Pre-K-5. West Central Elementary students share a common music room and library with the high school. New lighting and a new parking lot were installed during the summer of 2006. Improvements in the ventilation system were made in the fall of 2006. A new phone system with phones in each classroom was installed in the fall of 2006 and again in the fall of 2018. The former science lab was divided into two classrooms during the summer of 2007. Wireless capability for technological equipment was added during the summer of 2010. During the 2014-2015 school year, a fiber optic line was installed which significantly increased our overall bandwidth and provided many additional options for wireless devices. Repairs were made to the roof of the gymnasium. The district has hooked up to a main water line project to improve the overall outlook for the facility and to improve the district's ability to control a fire if one should ever occur on campus due to the recent addition of a fire hydrant nearby. During the 2015-2016 school year, there were new boilers installed in the elementary. Playground updates were also made, supported with funds from the PTC. During the 2016-2017 school year, a buzzer system was installed at the main entrance and all doors are locked throughout the school day. Some improvements have been made to C-wing. The bathrooms have new flooring and updated equipment was installed within this area. The water fountains in C-wing were replaced as well. Wall fans were replaced in classrooms and added to the cafeteria. During the summer of 2017, security cameras were installed in the hallways and the outside perimeter of the building to access videos of each parking lot and each exit area. During the summer of 2018, new phones were installed along with new infrastructure wiring for internet service was replaced. The district replaced the copy machines, which eliminates the need for printers throughout the building. New water fountains were installed in A-wing and B-wing in the elementary. During the summer of 2019, the elementary school received a new roof and improvements were made in the office/lounge area with new carpet and a fresh coat of paint. The intercom system was repaired to enable the office to clearly communicate information within the building.

School Community

Based on the 2019 Sixth Day Enrollment report, West Central Elementary School serves a total of 376 students. There are 207 male students and 169 female students. Pre-Kindergarten consists of 60 students, 57 Kindergarten students, 51 first graders, 46 second graders, 58 third graders, 48 fourth graders, and 56 fifth graders. The average classroom has 18 students. 40 students have an individual education plan. The individual education plan includes direct instruction, speech, hearing, occupational therapy, and tutorial services. 28 of the 40 students receive speech services. 23 students receive instruction from special education classroom teachers or have modified instructional plans. According to the September report for the elementary (not including PK), 58% of our students qualify for free or reduced lunch. Students are served by 21 classroom teachers, two full-time special education teachers, and three title I teachers. Fine arts instruction includes one art teacher (shared with high school), two music instructors (shared with the middle school and the high school), and three physical education instructors (one of these is shared with the high school). One librarian is shared between the elementary and the high school. One speech instructor serves district wide. One school psychologist and a full-time school nurse serve the needs of the district. One parttime social worker and physical/occupational therapists serve the needs of the district. There are fourteen full-time paraprofessionals and six part-time Title I paraprofessionals. Full-time paraprofessionals serve as one-on-one aides, computer lab aide, special education classroom aides, pre-kindergarten aides, or library aides. There are three fulltime custodians at the elementary. One maintenance position is shared with the high school. The district's technology needs are managed by two full time and one part time employee. Administrative services are provided by two full-time administrators and two secretaries. Food services are provided by nine full-time cooks and one part-time cook, which serve the needs of the entire district.

I.2 School Improvement Team

School Improvement Team members are volunteers but a stipend is offered. Each member will serve a minimum of three years. Following the initial term, members may be replaced on a rotation schedule if others are willing to serve. New members will also be volunteers. All certified staff are encouraged to serve on either the SIP team or a sub-committee.

Table 1:

School Improvement Team

Team Member	Position	Role	Length of service	# of years on team
Mrs. Kathy Lafary	Administrator	Team Member	Constant	8
Mrs. Andrea Frieden	Administrator	Team Member	Constant	2

Mrs. Emily Klossing	2nd grade	Team Member	2009-2019	11
Mrs. Jessica Winters	5th grade	Team Member	2009-2019	11
Mrs. Charlotte Ackermann	Kindergarten	Team Member	2010-2019	10
Mrs. Julie Ricketts	Title I	Team Member	2010-2019	10
Ms. Laura Lewis	Title I	Team Member	2008-2011 2012-2019	11
Mrs. Cathie Smith	5th grade	Team Member	2008-2011 2012-2019	11
Ms. Chris Ervin	2nd grade	Team Member	2015-2019	5

Sub-committees organized to support the School Improvement Leadership Team during the 2020-2021 school year:

- Staff survey Ms. Lewis, Mrs. Neira
- Parent survey Ms. Lewis, Mrs. Neira, Mrs. Anderson
- Pre-K Family Nights-Mrs. Burrell, Mrs. Leng, Mrs. Gullberg
- K-1 parent program Mrs. Ricketts, Mrs. Thompson, Mrs. Ackermann, Mrs. Keating, Mrs. Kelly
- 2-3 parent program Mrs. Ricketts, Ms. Lewis, Mrs. Keating, Mrs. Kelly
- 4-5 parent program Mrs. Ricketts, Ms. Lewis, Mrs. Kelly, Mrs. Lumbeck, Mrs. Ravenscraft, Mrs. Winters
- School Kick-off/Open House Mrs. Mills, Mrs. Ackermann, Mrs. Todd, Mrs. Gullberg, Mrs. Keating
- Homework Assistance/Tutoring Mrs. Anderson, Mrs. Johnston, Mrs. Keating, Mrs. Boyd, Mrs. Gullberg,
 Ms. Lewis, Mrs. Ricketts, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Winters, Miss Griffin, Ms. Fischer
- Technology- Mrs. Anderson, Mrs. Steck, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Johnston, Miss Griffin
- Response to Intervention Team- Mrs. Lafary, Ms. Ervin, Ms. Lewis, Mrs. Kelly
- Teacher Assistant Team- Mrs. Lumbeck (team leader), Mrs. Ravenscraft, Mrs. Wolf, Mrs. Frieden
- PBIS Team- Mrs. Todd, Mrs. Anderson, Mrs. Ford, Mrs. Hinshaw (parent), Mrs. Ricketts, Mrs. Thompson, Mrs. Frieden, Mrs. Wolf
- PBIS Tier II- Mrs. Carnes, Mrs. Mills, Mrs. Lumbeck, Mrs. Anderson
- Bullying Committee- Mrs. Ackermann, Mrs. Anderson
- District Evaluation Planning Committee- *Mrs. Ackermann, Mrs. Burrell, Mrs. Ricketts, Mrs. Smith, *Ms. Ervin (*denotes Joint Committee members)
- Comprehensive ELA Curriculum investigation- Mrs. Winters, Mrs. Ricketts, Mrs. Johnston, Mrs. Klossing, Mrs. Ford, Mrs. Kelly, Ms. Lewis
- Comprehensive Math program investigation- Mrs. Winters, Mrs. Thompson, Mrs. Ackermann, Mrs. Klossing

II. Data Collection, Organization and Trends

II.1 Data Collection Methods

The school improvement team members surveyed parents and staff in order to assess their attitudes on a number of school issues. Staff was surveyed at their leisure and parents were surveyed during their school visit for fall parent/teacher conferences. Illinois At-A-Glance report card and the fall housing report were used to obtain data that had been reported to the state. STAR reading is used to assess instructional reading level in some grade levels.

Exit outcomes for each grade level are used to guide instruction. AIMSweb is an assessment program based on direct and continuous student assessments in fluency. It is based on scientific reading research and sound classroom practice and is administered to students individually. IAR, the state assessment, is given in grades three, four, and five for math and ELA. Students in grade five also take the Illinois Science Assessment (ISA). Beginning with the 2018-2019 school year, all students at the elementary (K-5) participate in MAP testing for both reading and math. MAP is administered in the fall, winter and spring.

Table 2:

Data Collection Methods

ТҮРЕ	TITLE	TIME FRAME	TOTAL RESPONSE RATE	PURPOSE
Parent Survey	Parent	October 24 October 25	185	To survey parent attitudes
Staff Survey	Staff	November 4-12	66	To survey staff attitudes
Staff Observations	Observations based on tables	Feb. 24 & March 2		To interpret data
Documents	School Report Cards Fall Housing Report IIRC website	Fall		To compare school data
Formal Assessments	MAP STAR reading AIMSweb IAR ISA Star Math	Fall/Winter/Spring Fall/Winter/Spring Fall/Winter/Spring Spring 2020 Spring 2020 Fall/Winter/Spring	100%	To assess academic progress

II.2 School Based Assessment Data

Table 3A: MAP Assessment

MAP Reading

MAP Reading (WC/Norm Fall Mean RIT)	Fall 2018 (8 weeks of instruction)	Winter 2018 (20 weeks of instruction)	Spring 2019 (32 weeks of instruction)
Kindergarten (146.8/143.8)	(32/52) 62%	(20/52) 39%	(14/53) 26%
1st grade (165.7/163.7)	(23/42) 55%	(18/43) 42%	(24/43) 56%
2nd grade (180.7/177.4)	(33/59) 56%	(29/59) 49%	(22/59) 37%
3rd grade (183.2/190.5)	(19/49) 39%	(15/48) 31%	(17/46) 37%

4th grade (198.7/199.8)	(33/60) 55%	(26/59) 44%	(24/59) 41%
5th grade (202.4/206.9)	(26/60) 43%	(22/61) 36%	(21/61) 34%

Total Number and Percent of Students At or Above Norm Grade Level Mean RIT

MAP Reading

MAP Reading (WC/Norm Fall Mean RIT)	Fall 2019 (2 weeks of instruction)	Winter 2019 (16 weeks of instruction)	Spring 2020 (weeks of instruction)
Kindergarten (141.6/139.6)	(33/57) 58%	(33/57) 58%	Not available
1st grade (157.1/159.1)	(18/51) 35%	(20/51) 39%	Not available
2nd grade (175.2/173.3)	(27/44) 61%	(29/45) 64%	Not available
3rd grade (179.7/187.1)	(20/57) 35%	(22/58) 40%	Not available
4th grade (186.8/197.3)	(16/48) 33%	(20/49) 41%	Not available
5th grade (199.7/205)	(22/56) 39%	(30/55) 55%	Not available

Total Number and Percent of Students At or Above Norm Grade Level Mean RIT

Observations for 2019-2020

- With four weeks less instruction, from winter 2018 to winter 2019, there was a higher percentage of students who scored at or above grade level for grades K, 2, 3, and 5.
- From fall 2018 to spring 2019, the number of first grade students who scored at or above grade level increased.
- In 2018, all grade levels decreased from Fall to Winter in reading. In 2019, all grade levels except one increased from Fall to Winter in reading. Kindergarten stayed the same.

MAP Math

MAP Math (WC/Norm Fall Mean RIT)	Fall 2018 (8 weeks of instruction)	Winter 2018 (20 weeks of instruction)	Spring 2019 (32 weeks of instruction)
Kindergarten (144.5/143.1)	(27/52) 52%	(20/53) 38%	(21/53) 40%
1st grade (163.7/165.5)	(19/42) 45%	(18/43) 42%	(22/43) 51%
2nd grade (181.4/179.5)	(29/59) 49%	(30/59) 51%	(37/59) 63%
3rd grade (182.8/192.4)	(13/49) 27%	(9/48) 19%	(12/47) 26%

4th grade (196.7/203.7)	(20/60) 33%	(17/59) 29%	(13/59) 22%
5th grade (202/212.9)	(11/60) 18%	(7/61) 12%	(7/61) 12%

Total Number and Percent of Students At or Above Norm Grade Level Mean RIT

MAP Math

MAP Math (WC/Norm Fall Mean RIT)	Fall 2019 (2 weeks of instruction)	Winter 2019 (16 weeks of instruction)	Spring 2020 (weeks of instruction)
Kindergarten (140.5/138.5)	(36/57) 63%	(24/57) 42%	Not available
1st grade (154.9/160.8)	(20/51) 39%	(20/51) 39%	Not available
2nd grade (177.4/175.6)	(25/44) 57%	(31/45) 69%	Not available
3rd grade (179.6/189.4)	(14/57) 25%	(21/58) 36%	Not available
4th grade (188.6/201.1)	(10/48) 21%	(8/49) 16%	Not available
5th grade (202.5/210.7)	(15/56) 27%	(14/55) 25%	Not available

Total Number and Percent of Students At or Above Norm Grade Level Mean RIT

Observations for 2019-2020

- Even with six weeks less instruction, there was a higher percentage of students who scored at or above grade level for grades K, 2, and 5. (from Fall 2018 to Fall 2019)
- From Winter 2018 to Winter 2019, there were four less weeks of instruction and students in grades K, 2, 3, and 5 had more students at or above grade level.
- The percentage of students in grades K, 3, 4, and 5 who were at or above grade level decreased from Fall 2018 to Spring 2019.
- The percentage of students in first and second grade who met or exceeded grade level expectations increased from Fall 2018 to Spring 2019.
- In the fall of 2018, students had eight weeks of instruction before taking the assessment; whereas in the fall of 2019, the assessment was given after only two weeks of instruction.
- In Winter 2018, students had twenty weeks of instruction before taking the assessment; whereas in Winter 2019, the assessment was given after only sixteen weeks of instruction.
- In 2018, only one grade level increased from Fall to Winter in math. In 2019, two grade levels increased and one grade level stayed the same from Fall to Winter in math.
- We implemented EngageNY Math in 2016-2017. The percentage of students at or above the omr grade level mean is greater in grades one and two than grades 3, 4, and 5.

Table 3B: MAP Assessment

Simple Growth (at least one point growth) from Fall 2019 to Winter 2019 (Current Grade Placement 19-20)

READING			
Grade Level	Males	Females	Total
K	29/35 (83%)	18/21 (86%)	47/56 (84%)
1	21/25 (84%)	24/25 (96%)	45/50 (90%)
2	16/17 (94%)	24/25 (96%)	40/42 (95%)
3	25/27 (93%)	22/25 (88%)	47/52 (90%)
4	29/32 (91%)	12/16 (75%)	41/48 (85%)
5	25/27 (93%)	21/27 (77%)	46/54 (85%)

Simple Growth (at least one point growth) from Fall 2019 to Winter 2019 (Current Grade Placement 19-20)

MATH	(Current Grade		
IVIATTI			
Grade Level	Males	Females	Total
K	24/35 (67%)	18/21 (86%)	42/56 (75%)
1	24/25 (96%)	25/25 (100%)	49/50 (98%)
2	16/17 (94%)	24/25 (96%)	40/42 (95%)
3	25/27 (93%)	19/25 (76%)	44/52 (85%)
4	26/32 (81%)	12/16 (75%)	38/48 (79%)
5	26/27 (96%)	24/27 (89%)	50/54 (93%)

Observations for 2019-2020

- In reading, all grade levels, with the exception of 5th grade, had 84% or more students make simple growth.
- In math, grades 1, 2, 4, and 5 had 85% of students make simple growth.
- In math and reading, a greater percentage of males than females made simple growth in grades 3, 4, and 5.

Table 3C:

STAR Reading Assessment Average Grade Equivalent (Current Grade Placement 19-20) 2019 - 2020

All students tested. Chart rows read from 1st to 5th Grade.

	1 st	2 nd	2 nd	3 rd	3 rd	4 th	4th	5 th	5 th
	Grade	Grade	Grade	Grade	Grade	Grade	GradeS	Grade	Grade
	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	pring	Fall	Spring
Second Grade	1.9	1.8							

Third Grade	1.9	2.0	3.0	2.7					
Fourth Grade	1.8	1.8	2.5	2.5	3.4	3.7			
Fifth Grade	2.0	2.2	3.1	2.9	3.8	3.7	4.8	4.5	
Sixth Grade	2.0	2.0	2.7	2.9	3.8	3.8	4.4	4.5	5.0

^{*}Renaissance Learning updated their format 2017/2018.

Observations of 2016-2017

- Between spring and fall, student scores decreased four times, increased seven times, and stayed the same three times.
- Each class showed growth from spring to fall of the 15/16 school year.
- Second, third, and fourth grade all showed growth each time they took the STAR test.

Observations for 2017-2018

- Between spring and fall, student scores decreased five times, increased five times, and stayed the same four times.
- Each class showed growth from fall to spring of the 16/17 school year.

Observations for 2018-2019

- Between spring of 18 and fall of 18, all 4 grade levels either stayed the same or changed by a tenth of a grade equivalency level
- Each class showed a minimum growth of a .6 grade equivalency from fall to spring of the 17/18 school year.

Observations for 2019-2020

- From Spring 2019 to Fall 2019, the 2019-2020 second grade students dropped by a tenth of a grade level equivalency.
- From Spring 2019 to Fall 2019, this year's third grade students dropped by three-tenths of a grade level equivalency.
- From Spring 2019 to Fall 2019, this year's fourth grade students rose by three-tenths of a grade level equivalency.
- From Spring 2019 to Fall 2019, this year's fifth grade students fell by three-tenths of a grade level equivalency.
- Each grade level showed growth from Fall to Spring during the 2018-2019 school year.
- During the fall testing, the average grade equivalent is below grade level for all groups of students.

Table 3D:

STAR Reading Assessment End of Year Percentage of students that met grade level STAR expectations

	Target Score	2016 Spring % that	2017 Spring % that	2018 Spring % that	2019 Spring % that
		met/exceed	met/exceed	met/exceed	met/exceed
First Grade	1.8	71%	38%	50%	53%
Second Grade	2.8	49%	61%	40%	60%
Third Grade	3.8	47%	56%	48%	40%
Fourth Grade	4.8	46%	42%	43%	51%
Fifth Grade	5.8	36%	36%	27%	33%

^{*}Renaissance Learning updated their testing format in 2017/2018.

Observations of 2016-2017

- Four out of five tested grade levels decreased the percentage of meets and exceeds from 2015 to 2016.
- Every class showed a decrease from spring of 2015 to 2016 when looked at diagonally.
- First grade scores from previous year increased 19 percentage points.
- The number of students meeting and exceeding on the STAR test in second, fourth, and fifth grade has decreased each of the past two years.

Observations of 2017-2018

- Two out of five tested grade levels decreased the percentage of meets and exceeds from 2016 to 2017.
- Three of four classes showed a decrease from spring of 2016 to 2017 when looked at diagonally.

- First grade scores in Spring of 2017 show that only 38% met/exceeded expectations, which is the lowest percentage in five years.
- Fifth grade scores in Spring 2017 show that only 36% met/exceeded expectations, which is the lowest percentage in five years.
- Fourth grade scores in Spring of 2017 show that only 42% met/exceeded expectations which is the lowest percentage in five years.

Observations of 2018-2019

- Fifth grade scores have decreased every year except one from 2014 to 2018. There is a steady score of 36% from the 2016/2017 school year.
- From Spring 2017 to Spring 2018 3 out of 4 grade levels decreased in the number of students who met or exceeded grade level star expectations. This is the year Renaissance Learning updated their test.
- From Spring of 2017 (1st) to Spring of 2018 (2nd), the percent of students that met grade level star expectations increased by 2 percentage points.

Observations of 2019-2020

- From Spring 2018 to Spring 2019, three out of the five grade levels increased in the number of students who met or exceeded grade level STAR expectations.
- The percent of 5th grade students who have met or exceeded grade level STAR expectations has remained 36% or less each year from 2016 to 2019.
- For 2019, three out of five grade levels had 50% or more students that met or exceeded grade level STAR expectations.

Table 3E:

STAR Math Assessment Average Grade Equivalent (Current Grade Placement 19-20) 2019 - 2020

STAR Math is no longer required at all grade levels. NA indicates that it was not administered in that year. Chart rows read from 1^{st} to 5^{th} Grade.

	1 st	2 nd	2 nd	3 rd	3 rd	4 th	4 th	5 th	5 th
	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Second Grade	NA	NA							
Third Grade	2.0	NA	NA	3.7					
Fourth Grade	1.7	1.4	2.7	2.6	3.3	NA			
Fifth Grade	2.2	2.4	3.0	2.6	3.7	3.7	4.5	4.6	
Sixth Grade	1.9	1.7	2.9	3.1	3.6	3.4	4.1	4.1	5.3

Observations of 2016-2017:

- Between spring and fall, student scores decreased ten times, increased two times, and stayed the same two times.
- Each class showed growth from spring to fall of the 16/17 school year.
- In the past three years, students have shown a year of growth or more from Fall to Spring in all grade levels.
- Three out of five grade levels met their target average grade equivalency during Spring 2016.

Observations of 2017-2018

- Between spring and fall, student scores decreased ten times, increased two times, and stayed the same two times.
- Two out of five grade levels met their target average growth equivalency during spring 2017.
- In the 2016 -2017 school year, second and fifth grade students showed expected growth of 0.8 grade equivalency.

Observations of 2018-2019

- There is a higher growth in STAR Math than STAR Reading from the fall to spring.
- Last year's fifth grade scores improved from 4.2 to 5.6, which is more than a year's growth.
- Last year's second grade improved from 1.4 to 2.7, which is more than a year's growth.
- Last year's third grade improved from 2.6 to 3.7, which is more than a year's growth.

Observations of 2019-2020 (2nd and 4th grade did not take this assessment)

- From Spring 2019 to Fall 2019, 5th grade average scores went up from 4.5 to 4.6.
- 5th grade scores went from 4.1 to 5.3 in 2018-2019, which is more than one year's growth.
- 3rd grade students took the test after those students took a year off as second graders.

Table 3F:

AIMSweb

AIMSweb is an assessment program based on direct and continuous student assessments in fluency and comprehension. It is based on scientific Reading research and sound classroom practice and is administered to students individually by the Title I teachers in grades one, two, four and five. Whereas, the classroom teachers administer this test in grade three. All students in second-fifth grade are tested three times a year. First grade students are tested twice a year.

AIMSweb Fluency Assessment 2016-2017

	AIMSweb Fluency Assessment 2016-2017								
5 th grade	Fall	Winter	Spring						
TARGET	121	139	153						
# tested	39	40	40						
#met	29	31	32						
% met	74%	78%	80%						
4 th grade	Fall	Winter	Spring						
TARGET	107	125	139						
# tested	55	55	54						
# met	29	23	27						
% met	53%	42%	50%						
3 rd grade	Fall	Winter	Spring						
TARGET	87	111	127						
# tested	61	62	62						
# met	31	32	32						
% met	51%	52%	52%						
2 nd grade	Fall	Winter	Spring						
Target	62	88	106						
# tested	56	56	56						
# met	35	38	37						
% met	63%	68%	66%						
1st grade	Fall	Winter	Spring						
Target		36	67						
# tested		52	53						
# met		15	8						
% met		28%	15%						

AIMSweb Fluency Assessment 2017-2018

5 th grade	Fall	Winter	Spring
TARGET	121	139	153
# tested	50	50	50
#met	24	26	26
% met	48%	52%	52%

4 th grade	Fall	Winter	Spring
TARGET	107	125	139
# tested	60	60	59
# met	29	34	35
% met	48%	57%	59%
3 rd grade	Fall	Winter	Spring
TARGET	87	111	127
# tested	60	58	59
# met	26	25	23
% met	43%	43%	39%
2 nd grade	Fall	Winter	Spring
Target	62	88	106
# tested	48	46	46
# met	18	17	19
% met	38%	37%	41%
1st grade	Fall	Winter	Spring
Target		36	67
# tested		58	59
# met		24	25
% met		41%	42%

AIMSweb Fluency Assessment 2018-2019

5 th grade	Fall	Winter	Spring
TARGET	121	139	153
# tested	60	60	56
#met	34	34	36
% met	57%	57%	64%
4 th grade	Fall	Winter	Spring
TARGET	107	125	139
# tested	60	59	60
# met	27	27	31
% met	45%	46%	52%
3 rd grade	Fall	Winter	Spring
TARGET	87	111	127
# tested	50	48	45
# met	17	17	14
% met	34%	35%	31%
2 nd grade	Fall	Winter	Spring
Target	62	88	106
# tested	58	55	56
# met	26	27	32
% met	45%	49%	57%

1st grade	Fall	Winter	Spring
Target		36	67
# tested		42	42
# met		16	17
% met		38%	40%

AIMSweb Fluency Assessment 2019-2020

5 th grade	Fall	Winter	Spring
TARGET	121	139	153
# tested	56	54	
#met	20	27	
% met	36%	50%	
4 th grade	Fall	Winter	Spring
TARGET	107	125	139
# tested	45	46	
# met	13	16	
% met	29%	35%	
3 rd grade	Fall	Winter	Spring
TARGET	87	111	127
# tested	56	56	
# met	19	19	
% met	34%	34%	
2 nd grade	Fall	Winter	Spring
Target	62	88	106
# tested	44	45	
# met	22	22	
% met	50%	49%	
1st grade	Fall	Winter	Spring
Target		36	67
# tested		49	
# met		18	
% met		37%	

^{*} In 2019-2020, West Central Elementary changed from using AIMSweb to AIMSweb Plus. A modification to the assessment procedures changed to include the following: using the mean of two passages rather than the median of three passages as well as using two different passages for each assessment.

Observations of 2016-2017

- 2nd, 3rd, and 5th increased from fall to winter in 2016/17.
- 4th grade decreased from fall to winter by 11 percentage points in 2016/17.
- Two of the four grades increased the percentage that met from spring 2015/16 to fall 2016/17.
- The percentage of 1st graders who met decreased from winter of 2015/16 to winter of 2016/17 by 14 percent.

Observations of 2017-2018

• The percentage of 4th and 5th grade students who met the target increased from fall 2017/2018 (48%) to winter 2017/2018 (52%).

- 15% of first graders met target in spring 2016/2017 whereas 38% met target in the fall of 2017/2018.
- 66% of second graders met target in spring 2016/2017 whereas on 43% of these students in 3rd grade met target in the fall of 2017/2018
- 42% of 4th graders met target in winter 2016/2017 whereas 52% of 5th graders met target in winter 2017/2018.

Observations of 2018-2019

2nd through 5th grade increased or stayed the same from fall 2018 to winters 2018.

Observations of 2019-2020

- 4th and 5th grade increased by 6% and 14% from fall to winter.
- From Spring 2019 to Fall 2020, third grade decreased 23% from their second grade year, fourth decreased 2% from third and fifth decreased 16% but second grade increased from 10% from first grade Spring 2019 to second grade Fall 2019.

Table 3G:

STATE TESTING - PARCC/IAR

PARCC Assessment Scores 2016/2017

Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers

3rd - 5th Grade Scores - WC percentage is given first and state's percentage is listed second per performance distribution

	Did not yet meet	Partially met	Approached	Met	Exceeded
	WC/ State	WC/ State	WC/ State	WC/ State	WC/ State
3 rd Grade ELA	27/21	16/19	31/24	26/33	0/3
3 rd Grade Math	21/14	39/20	24/27	16/31	0/8
4 th Grade ELA	32/14	20/20	26/28	22/31	0/6
4 th Grade Math	39/16	20/25	30/28	11/28	0/3
5 th Grade ELA	14/14	19/21	33/28	33/34	0/3
5 th Grade Math	17/13	29/27	43/31	12/26	0/4

PARCC Assessment Scores 2017/2018

Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers

3rd - 5th Grade Scores - WC percentage is given first and state's percentage is listed second per performance distribution

	Did not yet meet	Partially met	Approached	Met	Exceeded	Average overall score
	WC/ State	WC/ State	WC/ State	WC/ State	WC/ State	WC/State
3 rd Grade ELA	25/21	31/18	29/24	14/34	2/3	720/735
3 rd Grade Math	25/15	31/22	29/26	12/30	3/8	723/738

4th Grade	18/14	23/20	37/27	22/31	0/8	727/739
ELA						
4th Grade	32/16	23/26	40/27	5/28	0/3	716/733
Math						
5 th Grade ELA	22/14	36/22	34/29	8/33	0/3	717/736
5 th Grade Math	29/17	27/25	33/28	10/26	0/5	720/733

IAR Assessment Scores 2018/2019

Illinois Assessment of Readiness

3rd - 5th Grade Scores - WC percentage is given first and state's percentage is listed second per performance distribution

	Did not yet meet	Partially met	Approached	Met	Exceeded	Average overall score
	WC/ State	WC/ State	WC/ State	WC/ State	WC/ State	WC/State
3 rd Grade ELA	41/23	24/19	24/23	11/33	0/4	711/734
3 rd Grade Math	39/15	22/20	26/25	13/33	0/8	712/739
4 th Grade ELA	28/17	25/20	32/26	13/29	2/7	720/736
4 th Grade Math	27/17	25/21	35/29	13/31	0/3	719/734
5 th Grade ELA	21/13	28/21	30/27	21/34	0/4	722/738
5 th Grade Math	20/14	46/30	28/27	7/25	0/5	716/733

Note - State averages obtained on "School Performance Level Summary" report on Pearson Access Next in October 2019.

Observations of 2016-2017:

- The gap between the overall scores between West Central and the state widened in every area except 4th grade ELA.
- Overall scores in every tested area went down except for 4th grade ELA.
- The percentage of students who "did not meet" increased for 2015-2016 in four out of six tested areas.
- The average percentage of students tested in grades three through five combined who met or exceeded state standards in ELA was 20% (3rd 17%, 4th 21%, and 5th 22%)
- The average percentage of students tested in grades three through five combined who met or exceeded state standards in Math was 16% (3rd 21%, 4th 12%, and 5th 14%)

Observations of 2017-2018:

- The percentage of students who "did not meet" increased for 2016-2017 in three out of six tested areas.
- The average percentage of students tested in grades three through five combined who met or exceeded state standards in ELA was 27% (3rd-26%, 4th- 22% and 5th- 33%).
- The average percentage of students tested in grades three through five combined who met or exceeded state standards in math was 13% (3rd 16%, 4th 11%, and 5th 12%.
- 3rd, 4th and 5th grade ELA and Math met/exceeded scores are still below state average.
- The gap between the overall met/exceeded scores between WC and the state narrowed for 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade in ELA as compared to the 2015-2016 year.

Observations of 2018-19:

• West Central overall scores were lower than the state average in all grade levels in the 2015/2016 school year and the 2017/2018 school year. No data is available for 16/17.

- In comparing 17/18 scores with 15/16 scores, 3rd grade average overall score increased. 4th and 5th grades went down in both reading and math.
- 3rd grade had two exceeds in ELA and 3 in Math.

Observations of 2019-20:

- West Central overall average scores were lower than the state average in all grade levels in the 2017-2018, and 2018-2019. No data available for 2016-2017.
- In 2018-2019, 4th grade had two students earn an exceeds in ELA.
- Overall score in 4th grade math and 5th grade ELA increased when comparing 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 scores.
- 4th grade math, 5th grade ELA and 5th grade math has fewer students in the "does not yet meet" category when comparing 2017-2018 to 2018-2019.
- When comparing the scores of the same class from 2017-2018 to their scores in 2018-2019, there was an increase in students who fell into the "does not yet meet" category in both 4th and 5th grade ELA and 4th grade math. No comparison data available for 3rd grade.
- In 2018-2019, the West Central percentage was higher than the state in the "Approached" category for all grade levels.

Table 3H:

Illinois Science Assessment (Data is reported as % proficient)

Year	All	Male/Female	IEP	Free/Reduced	Average Scale Score WC/State
2017	63.4	52.9/70.8			
2018	46	38.5/54.2	27.3	43.8	297/299
2019	49.2	50/48.4	23.1	42.5	N/A

Observations on 2018-2019:

- 63.4% of our 2017 5th graders scored proficient compared to 46% of our 2018 5th graders.
- During both testing years, the percentage of male students who scored at a proficient level was lower than the percentage
 of female students scoring at a proficient level.

Observations on 2019-2020:

- The percentage of students who are proficient went up from 46% (2018) to 49.2% (2019).
- More males were proficient than females.
- The percent of students with IEP's who were proficient in 2018 (27.3%) went down in 2019 (23.1%).
- The percent of proficient students with free/reduced status went down from 43.8% (2018) to 42.5% (2019).
- In 2018, the average scale score of West Central was only two points lower than the average scale score of the state.

Overall Assessment Observations

Observations of 2016-2017

On the PARCC, West Central Elementary scored below state average in both ELA and Math in all tested grade levels. The Illinois Science Assessment (ISA) was administered in 2016 to the fifth grade students. At this time, the results have not been received and the state anticipates that these scores will not be available until the summer of 2017, which will be after the administration of the 2017 science assessment.

Observations of 2017-2018

On the PARCC, West Central Elementary scored below state average in both ELA and Math in all tested grade levels. The Illinois Science Assessment (ISA) was administered in 2016 to the fifth grade students. Preliminary results indicate that 49% of the students achieved a proficient rating on that assessment. At this time, the 2017 ISA results have not been released.

Observations of 2018-2019

On the PARCC, West Central Elementary scored below state average in both ELA and Math in all tested grade levels. The Illinois Science Assessment (ISA) results indicate that 63.4% of our students were proficient on the 2017 test; whereas 46% of our students scored a proficient rating on the 2018 assessment.

Observations of 2019-2020

On the IAR, West Central Elementary scored below state average in both ELA and Math in all tested grade levels based on the average overall score. The Illinois Science Assessment (ISA) results indicate that 63.4% of our students were proficient on the 2017 test; whereas 46% of our students scored a proficient rating on the 2018 assessment and 49.2% of the students were proficient on the 2019 test.

II.3 Demographic Data

Table 4a:

General School Data Provided by School Report Card (Data released on 10/31/2019)

(Data is based on the prior school year/male/female % from sixth day enrollment)

	15-16		16-17		17-18		18-19	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Enrollment/ Attendance	340	94%	341	95%	333	95%	325	95%
*Truancy Rate	27	8%	31	9%	40	12%	20	6%
**Chronic Absenteeism						16%		9%
Students with Disabilities		16%		14%		13%		13%
English Learners		1%		1%		0%		1%
Homeless		0%		3%		0%		2%
Mobility Rate	34	10%	27	8%	23	7%		5%
Low Income Rate		62%		62%		59%		60%
Retention Rate	2	.006%	1	.003%	1	.003%	0	0%
White		93%		91%		92%		91%
Black		0%		0%		0%		0%
Hispanic		4%		4.1%		3%		3%
American Indian		0%		0.3%		0%		0%
Two or More Races		3%		5%		5%		6%
Pacific Islander		0%		0%		0%		0%

^{*}Truancy rate (2017-2018 Report Card) refers to Chronically Truant students, which denotes students who miss 5% or more of the school days per year without a valid excuse.

Observations for 2016-2017:

- The percentage of low income decreased for the first time in four years from 65% to 62%.
- The truancy rate increased from 3.4% (14-15) to 8% (15-16), which is the same as the 13-14 school year.
- A slight increase in the enrollment was noted from 14-15 school year (337 students) to the 15-16 school year (340 students). These enrollment numbers do not include the early childhood students.

Observations for 2017-2018:

- The truancy rate increased from 8% (15-16) to 9% (16-17), which equates an additional 4 students.
- 91% of our students are white, which continues to decrease.
- Our number of Hispanic (4.1%) and multiracial (5%) students has increased.

Observations for 2018-2019:

- The total percentage of students identified with a disability is on a downward trend.
- The total percentage of low income students reported has decreased from 62% in 16/17 to 59% in 17/18.
- The mobility rate has decreased from 8% in 16/17 to 7% in 18/19.
- Our enrollment dropped from 341 students in 2016/2017 to 333 students in 2017/2018.
- The truancy rate continues to increase. It was 3.4% in 2014/2015, 8% in 2015/2016, 9% in 2016/2017 and 12% in

^{**}Chronic Absenteeism (2017-2018 Report Card) refers to the number of students who miss 10% or more of the school days per year with or without a valid excuse.

2017/2018.

Observations for 2019-2020:

- Truancy rate decreased by 6 percentage points from 2017-2018 (12%) to 2018-2019 (6%).
- Chronic absenteeism decreased from 2017-2018 (16%) to 2018-2019 (9%).
- Enrollment declined by 8 students in 2017-2018 and again in 2018-2019.
- Mobility rate continued to go down each year 10% in 20115-2016, 8% in 2016-2017, 7% in 2017-2018, and 5% in 2018-2019.
- Low income increased by 1% from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019.
- Homeless increased 2% from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019.

Table 4b:

General School Data Provided by School Report Card (Data released October 31st of the current year) Chronic Absenteeism by Demographics

*Chronic Absenteeism by Group	17-18	18-19
All	16%	9%
White	16%	9%
Two or More Races	9%	15%
Low Income	23%	15%
Students with Disabilities	NA	17%
Students with IEPs	23%	18%
Male	16%	10%
Female	16%	9%

^{*}Chronic Absenteeism (2017-2018 Report Card) refers to the percentage of students who miss 10% or more of the school days per year with or without a valid excuse.

Observations for 2018-2019:

• In 2017/2018, 16% of our students meet the criteria for chronic absenteeism.

Observations for 2019-2020:

- In 2018-2019, 9% of the students that meet the criteria for chronic absenteeism decreased by 7% from 16% in 2017-2018
- The chronic absenteeism rate for students with IEP's dropped from 23% in 2017-2018 to 18% in 2018-2019.

Table 5:

Enrollment Data Fall Housing Report

	2016-		2017-		2018-		2019-	
	2017		2018		2019		2020	
Grade Levels in School	*Pk-5		*Pk-5		*~Pk-5		*~Pk- 5	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
School	400		397		387		374	

Pop.								
Male	216	54	208	52	210	54	205	55
Female	184	46	189	48	177	46	169	45
PK	60	15.0	61	15.4	58	14.9	59	15.8
Grade K	68	17.0	48	12.1	54	13.9	57	15.2
Grade 1	57	14.3	63	15.9	44	11.4	52	13.9
Grade 2	57	14.3	54	13.6	60	15.5	46	12.3
Grade 3	62	15.5	60	15.1	50	12.9	57	15.2
Grade 4	56	14.0	60	15.1	60	15.5	49	13.1
Grade 5	40	10.0	51	12.8	61	15.7	54	14.4

^{*}In 2015-2016, the enrollment numbers for the early childhood (PK) were added to the chart.

Observations of 2016-2017:

- The enrollment for 16/17 is the same as 15/16: 400 students.
- Kindergarten enrollment increased by twelve students from 15/16.
- While 3rd-5th grade decreased in enrollment by 3, K-2 increased enrollment by 3 from 2015/16 to 2016/17.

Observations of 2017-2018:

- The overall school population decreased by three students from the previous year.
- Our percentage of male students has been above 50% since the 2013 data collection period.

Observations of 2018-2019:

- The overall school population decreased by ten students from the previous year.
- Our percentage of male students has been above 50% since the 2015 data collection period.

Observations of 2019-2020:

- The overall school population decreased again this year by 13 students. This is at least four consecutive years where
 the enrollment has decreased.
- The male population continues to be higher than females.
- From 2018-2019 to 2019-2020, the PK 2nd grade enrollment only decreased by 2 students while grades 3-5 decreased by 11 students.

Table 6:

Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment

*Students with IEPs; Data provided by school psychologist when received by state report in October. Students may receive services in more than one area. This number does not include the students with 504 Plans.

	16-17	17-18	18-19	19-20
	#	#	#	#
Total Special	52	45	40	40
Education*				
Intellectual	3	2	1	3
Disability				
Speech or	38	26	24	28
Language Imp				
Visual Impairment				
Emotional	2	2	3	0
Disability				
Orthopedic				
Other Health	3	4	3	2
Impairment				
Specific Learning	14	17	14	10
Disability				
Autism	2	0	0	1
Development Delay	10	9	14	11
Deaf/Blindness				
504 Plan				3

Observations 2016-2017:

- The total number of Special Education students is at the lowest it's been in the past 5 years at 52 students.
- Speech and language impaired students is at its lowest level in 4 years at 38 students.

[~]Data includes the number of students who were enrolled as of October 1st of that year.

• The number of developmentally delayed students has more than tripled since 2012/13.

Observations 2017-2018:

- The number of students with Autism has decreased from two to zero.
- The total number of students receiving special education services has decreased from 52 to 45.
- The number of speech and language impaired students continues on a downward path as evidenced by a decrease from 38 to 26 students.

Observations 2018-2019:

- From 17/18 to 18/19, the total number of special education students has decreased by five.
- The total number of students identified as developmentally delayed continues to increase From 7 in 14/15 to 14 in 18/19.
- The total number of students identified as speech/language impaired has decreased since the 2015/2016 school year.

Observations 2019-2020:

- The total number of special education students has decreased by 12 over the last 4 years, remaining the same as last year.
- There are no students identified to have an Emotional Disability down from 3 last year.
- Speech and Language students increased by 4 from last year to this year. This is the first time in 4 years that there was
 an increase.
- There is an increase of 2 students identified as having an Intellectual Disability from 2018-2019 to 2019-2020.

Demographic Comparison and Trends

Based on data from Table 5 - Enrollment Data (Fall Housing Report)

The enrollment for 16-17 is 400 students, including Pre-K. When comparing enrollment using previous data collection model, there is an equal number of students in the elementary from the previous year. There are 21 classrooms, including Pre-K and the average class size is 19 students. Kindergarten has four sections. Fifth grade has two sections. Pre-K, first, second, third, and fourth has three sections each.

The enrollment for 17-18 is 397 students, including Pre-K. When comparing enrollment using previous data collection model, there are three less students from the previous year. There are 22 classrooms, including Pre-K and the average class size is 19 students. First grade has four sections whereas, the rest of the grade levels (Pre-K, Kindergarten, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th) have three sections each.

The enrollment for 18-19 is 387 students, including Pre-K. When comparing enrollment using previous data collection model, there are ten less students from the previous year. There are 21 classrooms, including Pre-K and the average class size is 18 students. All grade levels have three sections each.

The enrollment for 19-20 is 376 students, including Pre-K. When comparing enrollment using previous data collection model, there are eleven less students from the previous year. There are 21 classrooms, including Pre-K and the average class size is 18 students. All grade levels have three sections each.

II.4 Program Data

Table 7:

Educator Data

	16-17	17-18	18-19	19-20
Total Full Time Classroom	31	32	32	32
Teachers				
Average Years Teaching	11.4	11.6	12	12.65
# Teachers New to Building	5	3	2	3
# First Year Teachers	3	3	2	2
# with B. A. Degree	31	32	31	32
# with M.A. & Above	12	12	10	11
# with Emergency or	0	0	0	1
Provisional Certificates				
# Teachers Working Out of	0	0	0	0

Field				
% Caucasian Teachers	100%	100%	100%	97%
# Male Teachers	2	2	3	2
# Female Teachers	29	30	29	30
# Full-time	11	10	11	14
Paraprofessionals				
# Part-time	6	6	6	6
Paraprofessionals				
# Total Under-qualified	0	0	0	0
Paraprofessionals				
# Total Counselors	0	0	0	0
# Total Librarians	.5	.5	.5	.5
# Total Social	1	1	1	1
Workers/Psychologist				
# Total Other Staff	5.71	5.71	6	6
# Speech Pathologist	.85	.85	.85	.85
# National Board Certified	4	4	4	4
Teacher				

- Out-of-field means that a teacher is teaching a class for which he/she has no certification in academic major or endorsement with sufficient credit hours in the content area taught.
- ➤ Under-qualified paraprofessional means that the paraprofessional has less than 2 years of training and/or education degree.
- > Social Worker, psychologist, librarian and speech pathologist is shared with the rest of the district.

Observations 2016-2017:

- The number of first year teachers has increased this year from one to three.
- The number of full-time paraprofessionals has increased this year from nine to eleven.
- The number of new teachers to the building went from one to five this year.
- The number of full-time teachers has increased from thirty to thirty-one.

Observations 2017-2018:

- One additional full-time teacher was added to the staff this year.
- The number of teachers new to the building has decreased from five to three.

Observations 2018-2019:

- We have zero counselors at the elementary.
- 2 first year teachers were hired for the 18/19 school year.

Observations 2019-2020:

- Since 2016-2017, our average years of teaching has increased 1.25 years.
- We still have zero counselors at the elementary.
- Two first year teachers were hired for the 2019-2020 school year.
- We have 32 full-time classroom teachers.
- For the first time in four years, we have a teacher with an emergency/provisional license.
- There are 3 more full time paraprofessionals in 2019-2020 than 2018-2019.

Table 8:

Student Discipline Data

Number of Referrals Per Grade Level Who Have Received 1 or More Referrals (Bus and School)

	S1 15-	S2	Year	S1	S2	Year 16-17	S1	S2	YEA R	S1 18-19	S2 18-19	YEA R
	16	15-16	15-16	16-17	16-17	10-17	17-18	17-18	17-18	10-19	10-19	18-19
Kind	1	10	11	3	3	6	4	2	6	1	17	18
1 st grade	10	5	15	37	39	76	4	2	6	1	7	8
2 nd grade	11	31	42	11	3	14	27	31	58	5	17	22
3 rd grade	14	28	42	28	25	53	16	34	50	15	39	54
4 th grade	1	6	7	17	28	45	27	55	82	15	55	70
5 th grade	17	27	44	8	8	16	22	28	50	73	139	212
Total	56	107	163	104	106	210	100	152	252	110	274	384

Referr						
als						

^{*}Some students exhibiting significant behaviors throughout the day are not issued written referrals. A Google form is used to record the behaviors during the school day to enable staff to better track the data. This may cause a discrepancy in the total referal count each year.

Types of Behavior as Reported on All Referrals (Bus and School)

	S1	S2	Year									
	15-16	15-16	15-16	16-17	16-17	16-17	17-18	17-18	17-18	18-19	18-19	18-19
Disruptive	10	15	25	28	16	44	20	11	31	23	29	52
Physical	21	33	54	28	41	69	35	68	103	35	95	130
aggression												
Fighting	0	0	0	1	2	3	11	1	12	4	3	7
Defiance/	21	46	67	29	28	57	14	40	54	32	101	133
Disrespect												
Harassment	0	0	0	7	8	15	5	15	20	6	15	21
Inapp.	3	10	13	5	3	8	8	4	12	6	15	21
Language												
Property	1	0	1	1	3	4	0	1	1	0	0	0
damage												
Other	0	3	3	5	5	10	7	12	19	4	10	14
Total	56	107	163	104	106	210	100	152	252	110	274	384

Suspensions

	S1	S2	Year	S1 16-	S2	Year	S1	S2	Year	S1	S2	YEAR
	15-16	15-16	15-16	17	16-17	16-17	17-18	17-18	17-18	18-19	18-19	18-19
OSS	1 day	10	11	4	21.5	25.5	3.25	12	15.25	0	8.0	8.0
		days	days	days	days	days	days	days	days		days	days
					-	-	-	-	-			_
ISS	3	3	6	2	1.5	3.5 days	3	10.5	13.5	1.5	4	5.5
	days	days	days	days	days		days	days	days	days	days	days
Bus	2	4	6	12	12	24 days				0	3.5	3.5
	days	days	days	days	days					days	days	days

Number of Referrals Based on Top 5 Locations

	S1 15- 16 Total #56	\$2 15-16 Total #107	Year 15- 16Total # 163	S1 16-17 Total #104	S2 16-17 Total #106	Year 16- 17Tota 1#210	S1 17-18 Total #98	S2 17-18 Total #136	Year 17-18 Total #234	S1 18-19 Total #100	S2 18-19 Total #265	Year 18-19 Total #365
Bus	6 (12%)	17 (16 %)	23 (15%)	27 (26%)	12 (11%)	39 (21%)	23 (23%)	14 (10%)	37 (16%)	17 (17%)	29 (11%)	46 (13%)
Classroom	24 (48%)	50 (48 %)	74 (48%)	47 (45%	53 (50%)	100 (53%)	36 (37%)	67 (49%)	103 (44%)	45 (45%)	137 (52%)	182 (50%)
Hallway	7 (14%)	12 (12 %)	19 (12%)	11 (11%)	10 (12%)	22 (12%)	2 (2%)	13 (10%)	15 (6%)	6 (6%)	19 (7%)	25 (7%)
Recess (Playground)	6 (12%)	6 (6%)	12 (8%)	6 (6%)	3 (3%)	9 (5%)	17 (17%)	7 (5%)	24 (10%)	9 (9%)	11 (4%)	20 (5%)
Gymnasium (Recess and P.E.)										18 (18%)	53 (20%)	71 (19%)
Cafeteria										5 (5%)	16 (6%)	21 (6%)
Total Referrals in Top 5	50	104	154	98	90	188	98	136	234	100	265	365

Locations

*Bathroom was added as a top 5 location for the 14-15 school year as it surpassed the playground for number of referrals.

Observations in 2016-2017:

- There are more than 149 fewer total referrals for the 15-16 school year as compared to any of the previous years in the table.
- There were zero referrals for fighting and harassment in the 15-16 school year.
- A total of 48% of the referrals took place in the classroom.
- The fewest number of referrals, 4%, were in the bathroom.

Observations in 2017-2018:

- There was an increase of 47 overall referrals during the 2016/2017 school year compared to 2015/2016.
- A total of 53% of the referrals during 2016/2017 took place in the classroom which is an increase of 5% from 2015/2016.
- The number of OSS days increased from 11 during 2015/2016 to 25.5 during 2016/2017, , which is an increase of 14.5 days.
- The number of bus suspension days increased from 6 in 2015/2016 to 24 in 2016/2017, which is an increase of 18 days.

Observations in 2018-2019:

- Each year, the number of referrals consistently increases from 1st semester to 2nd semester.
- During the 2017/2018 school year, the percentage of referrals for the classroom and hallway were the lowest when comparing to previous years in those locations.
- From 16/17 to 17/18 out of school suspensions decreased from 25.5 days to 15.25 days.
- From 16/17 to 17/18 in-school suspensions have increased from 3.5 days to 13.5 days.

Observations in 2019-2020:

- Each year, the number of referrals increases from 1st semester to second semester.
- There was an increase in referrals each year from 2015-2016 to 2018-2019.
- There were 132 more total referrals from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019.
- In 2018-2019, physical aggression (34%) and disrespect/noncompliance (35%) were the two highest types of behaviors.
- Physical aggression referrals have more than doubled since 2015-2016.
- Both OSS and ISS reduced by half from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019.
- Classroom referrals account for 50% of referrals in the top 5 locations.
- During the 2018-2019 school year, the grade level with the lowest % of referrals was 1st (2%) and the highest was 5th grade (55%).
- Total referrals increased from 210 in 2016-2017 to 384 in 2018-2019, which is an overall increase of 174 referrals.
- The number of bus referrals was 37 in 2017-2018 and there were 46 bus referrals in 2018-2019. However, when comparing the number of bus referrals to the total number of referrals, the percentage in 2017-2018 was 16% whereas they accounted for only 13% in 2018-2019.
- The total number of referrals has increased every year since the 2015-2016 school year.
- Out of school suspensions have decreased each year beginning with the 2016-2017 school year.

Table 9: Students Participating in Support Programs

Number of students participating in support programs divided into male/female groups and total numbers.

	K (M/F)	1 (M/F)	2 (M/F)	3 (M/F)	4 (M/F)	5 (M/F)	Total
CICO Check in-Check out	2/1 (3)	4/3 (7)	2/3 (5)	0/0 (0)	8/0 (8)	4/0 (4)	27 (20/7)
TAT Teacher Assistant Team	0/0 (0)	0/2 (2)	0/0 (0)	0/0 (0)	2/0 (2)	0/0 (0)	4 (2/2)
RtI Response to Intervention	2/3 (5)	5/2 (7)	3/2 (5)	1/0 (1)	2/0 (2)	0/1 (1)	21 (13/8)

^{*}Data collected as of 3/1/2020 for 2019-2020 school year.

Observations in 2019-2020:

- More males than females were referred for support through both CICO and RtI.
- First grade students are receiving the most assistance through these support programs.
- Of these three support services, CICO has the most students participating.

Curriculum Implementation Data

Language Arts and Reading Curriculum: The Four-Block framework was implemented during the 05 - 06 school year. This framework is still used in Kindergarten with Building Blocks, 3rd Grade with Four Blocks, and 4th and 5th Grades with Big Blocks. The Four-Block framework consists of 4 different areas of focus. These include Working with Words, Guided Reading, Writing, and Self-Selected Reading. Each grade level has identified essential skills that correlate with the New Illinois State Standards that are assessed quarterly. Technology based resources, such as Reading A-Z and IXL, are also used to reinforce skills and gather materials for classroom use. Renaissance Learning which encompasses Accelerated Reader, Star Reading and Star Early Literacy is being used in grades K-5. In the 2015-2016 school year, the Jolly Phonics program was purchased and implemented at the kindergarten level. Resources from Teachers Pay Teachers are utilized by the teachers as supplemental resources. In the 18-19 school year, the Fountas and Pinnell Classroom system was purchased for the 1st and 2nd grades. Components purchased include Guided Reading; Phonics, Spelling, and Word Study; Shared Reading; and Interactive Read Alouds. The Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) system was also purchased to be used with Title 1 Reading and in the Special Education classrooms in grades K-5. In 2019-2020, Fountas and Pinnell Shared Reading and Interactive Read-Aloud components were purchased for third grade and kindergarten.

Math Curriculum: All Grades K–5 implemented the EngageNY Math program during the 2016-2017 school year. EngageNY Math integrates the New Illinois/Common Core Standards, rigorous classroom reasoning, extensive problem sets, and high expectations for mastery. Supplemental materials are added as needed for extra practice throughout the grade levels. Grades K-5 use EngageNY Math worksheets and manipulatives. Star Math is used as an assessment tool, along with online math programs for practice such as IXL, Embarc, Zearn, Reflex Math, and Splash Math.

Social Studies Curriculum: The elementary social studies curriculum is aligned to the new Illinois Social Science Standards. Grade levels use a variety of resources including, Time for Kids, Scholastic News, Teachers Pay Teachers, McGraw Hill text, and Junior Achievement. The lower grades is based on thematic units involving people or events in American History. Students also explore family life, job careers, and community roles. Beginning in the 2nd grade, the students begin to explore how units of government work and an introduction into state history. 4th grade focuses on Illinois History. 5th grade studies early American History and economics through the Biz Town curriculum and simulation each fall.

Science Curriculum: The elementary science curriculum in grades K, 1st, 2nd is based around thematic units. Supplemental materials are used for these units, including technology based resources. 3rd, 4th and 5th grades have Scott Foresman textbooks available for use as needed. K - 5th grades also use Scholastic News or Time for Kids as a reference material. All grade levels are aligned to the Next Generation Science Standards and many are utilizing materials from Mystery Science, an online curriculum source.

Writing Curriculum: The purpose of the Writing curriculum is to provide students with the support needed to express themselves clearly and effectively to others. It is our belief that in order to accomplish this, students must be offered the following instructional opportunities: time to write each and every day, knowledge of and practice in the writing process, the teacher's role is as a coach to the writer, and that skills are not taught in isolation but in the context of the written pieces. Samples of K - 12 writing were evaluated during the summer of 2009 and from this process a Writing curriculum for the elementary was established. Each grade has defined the writing expectations and aligned the expectations to the Illinois Learning Standards. Writing workshops presented to the entire elementary staff continue to aid in the advancement of the writing curriculum. Samples were then reviewed again in the Spring of 2010 with a few adjustments made to the curriculum.

Title I Program: The Title I program assists all grades in focusing on exit outcomes performance, basic reading skills and strategies, standardized test preparation, RtI interventions and individualized instruction. It also provides support and resources to strengthen the classroom instruction. Title does screening and diagnostic testing on a regular

basis. The analysis of these tests provides focus for the teacher's instruction. In the morning, Title I paraprofessionals go into kindergarten, first, and second grade classrooms for thirty- forty minutes. They assist in giving intensive small group instruction at the student's ability level focusing on the student's developing reading needs. The afternoon consists of the Title I teachers working with small groups of students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades on individualized instruction in Reading and Math with a focus on literacy skills. During the 2016-17 school year, a school-wide RtI block was initiated. All students K-2 are placed in smaller groups based on abilities, crossing grade level and classrooms. They are provided learning opportunities in ELA and Math for 30 minutes each day. Enrichment opportunities are also included. The intermediate grades 3-4 also have an RtI block of time focusing on ELA, Math, Technology and STEM activities. In 2018-2019, the Fountas and Pinnell classroom component (grades 1 & 2) program was introduced. It is a structured, guided reading program. The LLI (Leveled Literacy Intervention) was also introduced K-5. It places students in cross classroom, cross grade level small groups for intensive word skill and comprehension instruction. In 2019-20, the kindergarten and 3rd grade implemented the Fountas and Pinnell Shared Reading and Interactive Read Aloud components.

Special Education: The Special Education Department meets the needs of students with academic or behavioral disabilities. They receive IEP's (Individual Education Plans) that are designed specifically for their individual needs. Their goals are aligned to the New Illinois State Standards (Common Core) or the Illinois Social/Emotional Learning Standards. Students are usually pulled for assistance in language arts, reading, math, and social skills. They also receive extra support in their general education classes through high school. Accommodations are put in place as needed based on each child's specific areas of concern. Students work in small groups or one-on-one. The special education classrooms each have one or more paraprofessionals that helps work with the students. The RtI process (Response to Intervention) was introduced during the 06-07 school year. This process is to help struggling learners through different research-based interventions that are matched to student needs. This progress is monitored continually. These interventions are to help prevent long-term academic failure. There are 3 Tiers to this process. Tier I is represented with the core instructional program in the general education classroom. Interventions can take place within the classroom in small groups. Tier 2 is designed for students who are not making adequate progress in Tier I. They need a more intensive service and targeted interventions. These interventions are provided by a trained paraprofessional or a certified teacher. Progress is monitored weekly and meetings are held every 4 weeks. Tier III is for students who do not respond to the interventions in Tier II and can become eligible for special education services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Additional testing may be needed to target the deficit skills area. Another team that is in place is the TAT or Teacher's Assistance Team. They work with students who are struggling with behavior or emotional concerns. They work with other teachers as mentors for these students. In 2009 our classrooms were equipped with interactive SMART Boards. We also have updated student computers, individual Chromebooks, and document cameras. Overall, our special education program serves those students with both academic and behavior issues while providing extra support to those identified as at-risk through our Response to Intervention and Teacher Assistance teams.

Physical Education: The West Central Physical Education Program for elementary students is designed to develop the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains of students by providing a developmentally appropriate and sequentially progressive program. The program enables students to acquire the basic foundations of movement skills and strategies needed to participate in a variety of games and sports. Specific aspects of the program will aid in the development of higher fitness levels, thinking and problem solving, time, cooperation (sportsmanship) and decision -making skills. These activities help to prepare them for adult life and the world of work.

Art Education: The West Central Art Program for elementary students works toward meeting several different goals. One is that students should be able to observe, name, and describe the basic components in art. Another is that students should know about basic tools and can shape simple ideas and emotions into visual art. Students should also know about artistic tools and how they are used in artworks. They should be able to purposefully shape (plan and execute) visual artwork to express an idea. Elementary students should also know what artists do, where they work, and where their works are displayed. To help attain these goals, time spent weekly in art class was extended in the 07-08 school year. Instead of meeting for 35 minutes once a week, each class meets for at least 55 minutes once a week.

Band: The goal of 5th grade band at WCES is to lay the foundation for students to participate in band for the rest of their lives. 5th graders start with instrument tryout day. Students are encouraged to select two instruments they would like to try. Ultimately, the participants get to select which instrument they would like to play for the entire year. Class starts in September with small group instruction. As their skill level progresses, students are grouped according to which instrument they play. The 5th grade band performs at two concerts during the school year. The first concert is in November and the second concert is in April. When concert time approaches, the ensemble will rehearse all together. On average, 5th grade band meets three times per week for thirty minutes a class.

Music Education: The main objective of the West Central Music program for elementary students is to create lifelong musicians by providing a developmentally appropriate curriculum from Kindergarten to Fifth grade. Students begin with the exploration of music through movement, vocal production, aural skills and instrumentation and progress to the foundation and construction of music. Basic theory aids the upper elementary grade levels in reading (music) staff notation and implementing said knowledge while playing instruments in the general music classroom and fifth grade band. Specific goals of the program aid in the development of other skills including reading, writing, mathematics, locomotor skills and self-discipline. In addition to music content, the elementary music program produces two concerts per school year. On average, elementary music students attend class for 30 minutes once a week. If music is unable to meet due to scheduling, arrangements are made to compensate for missed class time.

Enrichment Program: The West Central Elementary School will provide an after school enrichment program one day a week for our academically-talented students. The goal of the program is to provide an appropriate program of enrichment focused on the integration of technology in multi-disciplinary units of study, the development of individual student interests, growth in higher-level thinking skills, and the provision of an opportunity for interaction with other talented children in the district. This program began in Fall 06. Approximately 15 students in the Grades 3rd - 5th participate in this program.

After School Tutoring Program: The after school tutoring program was implemented in Fall 2006. This program is free to our elementary students and is funded by the district. Academic assistance is provided in a variety of subject areas. During the 2017-2018 school year, we made some changes. At this time students in grades 3-5 may attend the program if a teacher recommends them for the extra support. It meets twice a week for a one hour session. We currently have up to two supervisors for each session.

Keyboarding/Computer: The lab can be utilized by K-2 grades, to take Star Reading, Star Math, as well as Accelerated Reading Assessments. The lab is also available for classes to use the internet for research and educational games. It houses a SMARTBoard for interactive use and a portable lab. The portable lab contains 20 chromebooks. Each laptop has internet access and can access the network printers. 2nd - 5th grade students can access their own google accounts. This allows them to work on a document at school, anywhere in the building and at home. They can also share the document with their teacher so he or she may make corrections without printing. Second through fifth grade students have Chromebooks (1:1 devices). They are used daily in the classroom for instructional purposes, projects, online supplemental support, and special activities. Kindergarten uses Starfall to do reading and math activities, as well as phonics. IXL and Reflex are being used for math supplementation. The lab serves as a 21st Century Classroom complete with flexible seating, a Green Screen, and collaborative hubs.

Social Emotional Learning (SEL) Structures: West Central Elementary began using the Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports Program in 2011-12. This program teaches all students the expectations in all settings of the school. Students can earn HEAT points for following these expectations. By setting forth clear social and behavioral expectations, we are able to create a positive environment for learning. Tier 1 support is Universal for all students. General interventions for all students include expectations and routines for school behaviors. Tier 2, which was added in 2014-15, includes individualized interventions to help students at risk for social and/or behavioral concerns. Tier 3 is further individualized interventions used to meet social and/or behavioral needs of students with more intense and/or persistent problems. In 2018-2019, District #235 began the process of using

trauma sensitive practices in classrooms. This professional development will continue to be offered in the future. For the 2019-2020 school year, Grade K-5 students are sorted into six groups called "Families." The purpose of the "Family" structure is to provide another avenue for building strong relationships at school, not only adult to student but also, student to student. "Families" also build a culture of community at school and a way for students to serve the school community as leaders and mentors. Students will remain in this family for their entire career at WCE. Also beginning in 2019-2020, the Second Step curriculum was implemented in grades K-5. Second Step is a program rooted in social-emotional learning that has a holistic approach intended to create a more empathetic society by providing education professionals, families, and the larger community with tools to enable them to take an active role in the social-emotional growth and safety of today's children.

Response to Intervention: Response to Intervention (RtI) is an academic intervention program. It provides early interventions to children who are having difficulties learning. Students receive intensive research-based interventions in small group settings or one-on-one settings. Through frequent progress monitoring, teachers and parents are able to see the progress the students are making and the specific areas of difficulties that need to be targeted. During meetings, the RtI committee, classroom teacher, Title teacher and parents review the interventions and the progress being made. New goals are set every three to five weeks until a student either progresses out of the RtI program or an individualized education plan is created.

Library Services: The elementary has approximately 26,000 books available to students. Accelerated Reader provides access to over 200,000 quizzes on books. We belong to the RAILS (Reaching Across Illinois Library System) of Burr Ridge, Illinois, that provides our students and staff with access to books found in other libraries through interlibrary loan. We also have access to Axis 360, a digital media platform, providing libraries and their patrons with a state-of-the-art system for circulating digital e-books from the eRead Illinois shared collection for Illinois libraries. Patrons at libraries participating in eRead Illinois can access the cloud-based delivery across a number of devices including iPad, iPhone, Android, Windows, NOOK, Sony Reader and Chromebook devices, and many more. The Henderson County Public Library stops once a week providing additional services to our school as well as Tumblebooks.

2016 - 2017 Parent/School Compact: The parent-school compact was included in the 16-17 student handbook. We have had a 100% parent signage acknowledging receipt of the student handbook.

2017 - 2018 Parent/School Compact: The parent-school compact was included in the 17-18 student handbook. We have had a 100% parent signage acknowledging receipt of the student handbook.

2018 - 2019 Parent/School Compact: The parent-school compact was included in the 18-19 student handbook. We have had a 100% parent signage acknowledging receipt of the student handbook.

2019 - 2020 Parent/School Compact: The parent-school compact was included in the 19-20 student handbook. We have had a 100% parent signage acknowledging receipt of the student handbook.

Program Comparisons and Trends

During the 16-17 school year, all certified and support staff met the definition of highly qualified. The PBIS program is in its sixth year and the staff has altered the HEAT celebrations timeline from monthly to quarterly. Low class size has been maintained with an average class size of 19 students. With support from the school board, we have been able to expand the accessibility of Chromebooks within the younger grades. The kindergarten and first grade classrooms each have five devices and each second grade room has ten devices to be used for instructional and supplemental purposes. Some staff members utilize Google Classroom as an instructional tool. All students in grades 3-5 have Google accounts. The PERA committee has agreed to an evaluation tool that includes student growth. Regarding curriculum, the elementary staff has implemented a new math program called EngageNY and supplemental materials have been purchased to assist with instruction, including an online program called IXL Math. To practice math fluency, we are using an online program called Reflex Math. The elementary teachers are working towards an alignment of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) and many are using the program called Mystery Science as a reference tool. A change to the schedule has taken place that allows the children to

participate in recess prior to eating lunch. A school-wide Response to Intervention (RtI) block of approximately thirty minutes has been added to each grade level. The elementary staff has been offered a chance to participate in two book studies on topics such as Whole Brain Teaching and Standards Based Grading.

During the 17-18 school year, all certified and support staff met the definition of highly qualified. The PBIS program was implemented in 2010 and the staff has decided to host quarterly HEAT celebrations. Low class size has been maintained with an average class size of 19 students. With support from the school board, we have been able to expand the accessibility of Chromebooks within the younger grades. The kindergarten and first grade classrooms each have five devices and each second grade room has fifteen devices to be used for instructional and supplemental purposes. Some staff members utilize Google Classroom as an instructional tool. All students in grades 3-5 have Google accounts. The PERA committee has agreed to an evaluation tool that includes student growth. This plan is reviewed annually. Regarding curriculum, a math program called EngageNY is in its second year of implementation. We are still utilizing the IXL program along with Zearn and Reflex Math for supplemental activities. The elementary teachers are working towards an alignment of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) and many are using the program called Mystery Science as a reference tool. Staff is becoming familiar with new Illinois Social Science standards and focusing on curriculum alignment. A school-wide Response to Intervention (RtI) block of approximately thirty minutes is utilized at each grade level.

During the 18-19 school year, all certified and support staff met the definition of highly qualified. The PBIS program was implemented in 2010 and the staff continues to host quarterly HEAT celebrations. The elementary, along with others from the middle and high school, are participating in a book study to learn about strategies through the Leader in Me to enhance our current behavior program. Low class size has been maintained with an average class size of 18 students. With support from the school board, we have been able to expand the accessibility of Chromebooks within the younger grades. The kindergarten and first grade classrooms have six devices and each second grade room has a classroom set to be used for instructional and supplemental purposes. Some staff members utilize Google Classroom as an instructional tool. All students in grades 3-5 have Google accounts. The PERA committee meets on an annual basis to review the evaluation tool that includes student growth. Regarding curriculum, a math program called EngageNY is in its third year of implementation. We are still utilizing the IXL program, along with Zearn and Reflex Math for supplemental activities. The first and second grade teachers have implemented the Fountas and Pinnell classroom component as their reading curriculum. The title staff is providing interventions from the Leveled Literacy Intervention component of Fountas and Pinnell for grades K-5. The elementary teachers have adjusted their units to meet the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) and many are using a program called Mystery Science as a reference tool. Staff continues to increase their familiarity with the new Illinois Social Science standards and are working to align their curriculum. A school-wide Response to Intervention (RtI) block of approximately thirty minutes is available at each grade level. To increase our ability to organize students into instructional groups based on data, we have purchased MAP Growth Assessment licenses for each child. All students will participate in these growth measurements three times a year, beginning with the fall benchmarking period which ended November 30, 2018.

During the 2019-20 school year, all certified and support staff met the definition of highly qualified. The PBIS program was implemented in 2010. In the fall of 2019, the Family structure was implemented in order to develop stronger relationships within the school. The students participate in monthly Family meetings and quarterly Family celebrations. In order to address the social emotional needs of our students, the Second Step curriculum is taught in our classrooms (Fall 2019). Low class size has been maintained with an average class size of 18 students. With support from the school board, we continue to expand the accessibility of Chromebooks within the younger grades. The kindergarten and first grade classrooms have six devices and each second grade room has a classroom set to be used for instructional and supplemental purposes. Some staff members utilize Google Classroom as an instructional tool. All students in grades 2-5 have Google accounts. The PERA committee meets on an annual basis to review the evaluation tool that includes student growth. Regarding curriculum, a math program called EngageNY is in its fourth year of implementation. We are still utilizing the IXL program, along with Zearn and Reflex Math for supplemental activities. The first and second grade teachers have implemented the Fountas and Pinnell classroom component as their reading curriculum. The title and special education staff are providing services from the Leveled

Literacy Intervention component of Fountas and Pinnell for grades K-5. In addition, the special education staff is using the Edmark Reading program with some of their students. The elementary teachers have adjusted their units to meet the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) and many are using a program called Mystery Science as a reference tool. Staff continue to increase their familiarity with the new Illinois Social Science standards and are working to align their curriculum. A school-wide Response to Intervention (RtI) block of approximately thirty minutes is available at each grade level with a variety of options to meet their needs. To increase our ability to organize students into instructional groups based on data, we utilize MAP Growth Assessment information. All students participate in these growth measurements three times a year, beginning with the 2018 Fall benchmarking period.

II.5 Perception Data

Table 10:

Parent Survey

This survey is only available during the scheduled conference times.

	**2016	**2017	2018	2019
# of surveys completed	207	207	191	185
Total # of families in the	282 (73%)	278 (74%)	270 (71%)	253 (73%)
elementary				
Do you have access to the	83%	92%	87%	95%
internet at home?				
Attended one of the				
following events in the past				
year:				
Open House/School Kick	63%	69%	70%	85%
Off/Locker Night				
Music Concerts	70%	80%	75%	81%
Donuts with Dads	43%	42%	45%	50%
Muffins with Mom	66%	69%	70%	70%
Pastries with Parents	22%	27%	35%	41%
Pre-K Family/Parent Night	39%	44%	42%	43%
Carnival	61%	64%	71%	65%
PTC meeting	14%	23%	31%	25%
Other Special Activity	0%	3%	7%	40%
Confident helping with math	81%	83%	81%	77%
homework?				
Confident helping with	99%	100%	98%	100%
reading homework?				
Do you feel our PBIS	95%	96%	97%	95%
program has been effective?				
Child feel safe on the bus?	91%	82%	81%	82%
		14% n/a	15% n/a	15% n/a
Child feel safe at school?			97%	99%
Communication tools				
Skyward	39%	42%	59%	43%
Connect Ed	90%	99%	97%	96%
Adequate opportunity for	99%	96%	98%	96%
communication?				
Adequate opportunity to			78%	78%
participate in making			12% n/a	16% n/a
decisions?				
Recommend WC to a parent			93%	94%
looking for school?			3% n/a	3% n/a
WC providing adequate			96%	96%

education?		1% n/a	1% n/a

^{**}Pre-K through 5th grade parents were invited to participate in the survey, which was given during conferences that took place one week following the end of the first quarter.

Observations 2016-2017:

- Parents confidence helping with math homework decreased 15%, whereas their confidence in helping with reading homework is 99%.
- Parent participation in special activities (concert, conferences, Donuts, Muffins, Pastries) is higher than in the past three
 vears.
- Parents who reported their use of Connect-Ed increased by 6%.

Observations 2017-2018:

- Only 82% of respondents feel that their child is safe on the bus which is a decrease from 91% the previous year. However, we added the option of N/A this year and 14% of respondents selected this option.
- Respondents who attended a Pre-K Family night increased from 39% (2016-2017) to 44% (2017-2018)
- Parents who attended the Pastries with Parents event has increased each year starting with the 2014 data.
- 80% of the respondents attended a music concert, which is the highest recorded since 2013.
- 96% of the respondents feel that our PBIS program has been effective.

Observations 2018-2019:

- Internet access at home went down from last year by 5% (92% in 2017 to 87% in 2018).
- The number of surveys completed decreased by 16 2018 after holding steady the last two years.
- In 2018 parents are more confident helping with reading homework (98%) than math homework (81%).
- Use of Skyward went up from 42%(2017) to 59%(2018), which is an increase of 17% overall. This is the highest it has ever been.
- The number of parents who said they had attended parent programs such as Donuts with Dads, Muffins with Moms, and Pastries with Parents all increased in 2018.
- The parents' confidence in being able to help their child with math homework has decreased 15% from 2015 to 2018.

Observations 2019-2020:

- The percentage of families who have access to the internet at home increased by 8 percentage points from 2018 to 2019.
- The percentage of parents who felt confident helping their child with math homework decreased by 4 percentage points from 2018 to 2019.
- The percentage of parents who felt confident helping their child with reading homework increased by 2 percentage points from 2018 to 2019.
- Parents who would recommend West Central increased by 1percentage point from 2018 to 2019.
- The total number of families in the elementary has decreased every year since 2016.
- The carnival attendance peaked in 2018 at 71% in attendance.
- Based on those who completed the survey, carnival attendance dropped 6 percentage points from 2018 to 2019.
- Based on those who completed the survey, Skyward usage dropped 16 percentage points from 2018 to 2019.
- 85% of those who completed the survey attended the Open House which increased from 70% in 2018.
- 99% of those who completed the survey feel safe at school.
- There was a 2 percentage point decrease drop for PBIS effectiveness from 2018 (97%) to 2019 (95%).
- The attendance at Pastries with Parents has increased every year from 2016 to 2019.
- Participation in Donuts with Dads, Muffins with Moms, and Pastries with Parents each increased or remained the same from 2018 to 2019.

Table 11:

2019-2020

2019-2	2020				
Staff Su	irvev				
		ıstodians, sec	cretaries, and tea	achers	
Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Does Not Apply
55%	35%	5%			6%
20%	45%	14%	2%	2%	18%
30%	47%	11%	6%		6%
33%	48%	6%	3%	6%	3%
39%	42%	6%	3%	6%	3%
20%	44%	15%	2%		20%
18%	42%	15%			24%
13%	28%	19%	2%		39%
13%	20%	20%	2%	2%	44%
8%	23%	25%	3%		39%
5%	41%	8%	39%	5%	2%
8%	55%	8%	15%	11%	3%
24%	36%	17%			23%
3%	15%	33%	19%	5%	24%
5%	15%	32%	19%	5%	24%
36%	41%	6%			17%
33%	33%	6%	2%		26%
27%	45%	11%	5%		12%
27%	50%	6%	5%	3%	9%
9%	39%	14%	5%		33%
8%	27%	21%	6%		38%
11%	30%	24%			35%
	Staff Suincluding associ Strongly Agree 55% 20% 30% 39% 20% 13% 13% 8% 24% 3% 5% 36% 27% 9% 8%	Strongly Agree Agree 55% 35% 20% 45% 30% 47% 33% 48% 39% 42% 20% 44% 18% 42% 13% 28% 13% 20% 8% 23% 5% 41% 8% 55% 24% 36% 3% 15% 5% 15% 36% 41% 33% 33% 27% 45% 27% 50% 9% 39% 8% 27%	Staff Survey including associates, cooks, custodians, see Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure 55% 35% 5% 20% 45% 14% 30% 47% 11% 33% 48% 6% 39% 42% 6% 20% 44% 15% 18% 42% 15% 13% 28% 19% 13% 20% 20% 8% 23% 25% 5% 41% 8% 24% 36% 17% 3% 15% 33% 5% 15% 32% 36% 41% 6% 33% 33% 6% 27% 45% 11% 27% 50% 6% 9% 39% 14% 8% 27% 21%	Staff Survey including associates, cooks, custodians, secretaries, and tea Strongly Agree Agree Sure Not Sure Disagree 55% 35% 5% 20% 45% 14% 2% 30% 47% 11% 6% 33% 48% 6% 3% 39% 42% 6% 3% 20% 44% 15% 2% 18% 42% 15% 2% 13% 28% 19% 2% 8% 23% 25% 3% 5% 41% 8% 39% 8% 55% 8% 15% 24% 36% 17% 15% 3% 15% 32% 19% 3% 15% 32% 19% 36% 15% 32% 19% 36% 41% 6% 2% 27% 45% 11% 5% 27% 50% 6%	Staff Survey including associates, cooks, custodians, secretaries, and teachers Strongly Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly Disagree 55% 35% 5% 2% 2% 30% 47% 11% 6% 2% 33% 48% 6% 3% 6% 39% 42% 6% 3% 6% 13% 28% 19% 2% 13% 28% 19% 2% 8% 23% 25% 3% 5% 41% 8% 39% 5% 8% 55% 8% 15% 11% 24% 36% 17% 5% 5% 36% 41% 8% 39% 5% 5% 15% 32% 19% 5% 5% 15% 32% 19% 5% 24% 36% 17% 5% 5% 36% 41% 6% 2% 27% 45% 11

Students in grades K-2 have adequate access to appropriate technology.	9%	26%	20%	8%	5%	33%
Students in grades 3-5 have adequate access to appropriate technology.	18%	35%	15%			32%
Staff at the elementary work hard to build trusting relationships with parents.	46%	32%	6%	5%		11%
Staff at the elementary work hard to build trusting relationships with students.	53%	29%	6%	3%		9%
Once we start a new program, we follow up to make improvements.	12%	42%	25%	9%		12%
It is important to collaborate with other teachers to offer suggestions, plan activities, and share strategies to be used within the classroom.	45%	38%	3%			14%
I would recommend the elementary to parents seeking a place for their child.	36%	45%	11%		3%	5%

2018-2019 Staff Survey

Staff Survey
40 out of 76 surveys were returned and completed, including associates, cooks, custodians, secretaries, and teachers

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Does Not Apply
Parents have a variety of opportunities	45%	50%	5%			
to become involved. (i.e. volunteering, parent conferences, PTC, etc)						
The teacher in-service generally provides beneficial information.	25%	53%	8%	5%		10%
Family involvement activities are scheduled to allow working parents to	24%	54%	16%	5%		
participate. The school is safe for students and staff.	34%	54%	3%	10%		
The school has security procedures that are consistently followed (i.e. volunteer sign-in, locked building, name tags, buzzer entry, etc).	48%	48%		5%		
PBIS has been effective in our school.(Tier 1-General Program)	23%	45%	10%	10%		13%
PBIS has been effective in our school. (Tier 2-Check-in, check-out)	20%	45%	8%	8%		18%
PBIS has been effective in our school. (Tier 3-TAT)	18%	42%	16%	5%		18%
RtI Block has been beneficial to our K-2 students.	10%	30%	18%	18%	3%	23%
RtI Block has been beneficial to our 3-5 students.	5%	37%	28%	5%	3%	23%
Facilities are clean.	5%	55%	11%	29%		
The school's furniture and equipment is in good working condition.	3%	76%	3%	16%		3%
Accelerated Reader is a valuable component in the curriculum.	18%	53%	8%	3%		16%
EngageNY is a valuable component in the curriculum.	3%	33%	23%	15%	3%	23%
The school has a consistent writing program in place.		13%	23%	38%	10%	18%
The library offers sufficient reading materials to meet the needs of the students.	33%	49%	5%	3%		10%
My classroom library offers sufficient reading materials to meet the needs of the students.	33%	43%	3%	3%		20%

There is good quality and frequency of communication between the school and parents.	23%	65%	5%	3%		5%
I am aware of the school's discipline policies and procedures.	33%	56%	5%	3%		3%
Our reading instruction is meeting the needs of our K-2 students.	18%	30%	21%	10%		22%
Our reading instruction is meeting the needs of our 3-5 students.	5%	32%	25%	19%		19%
Our science instruction is aligned to NGSS.	13%	33%	13%	8%	5%	21%
Students in grades K-2 have adequate access to appropriate technology.	13%	28%	20%	15%	5%	20%
Students in grades 3-5 have adequate access to appropriate technology.	44%	28%	8%	3%		18%
Staff at the elementary work hard to build trusting relationships with parents.	49%	44%		5%		3%
Once we start a new program, we follow up to make improvements.	49%	44%		5%		3%
It is important to collaborate with other teachers to offer suggestions, plan activities, and share strategies to be used within the classroom.	62%	26%	3%	3%		8%
I would recommend the elementary to parents seeking a place for their child.	50%	31%	10%	8%		3%

2017-2018 Staff Survey

Staff Survey53 out of 88 surveys were returned and completed, including associates, cooks, custodians, secretaries, and teachers

53 out of 88 surveys were returned and completed, i	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Does Not Apply
Parents have a variety of opportunities to	49%	47%	2%			2%
become involved. (i.e. volunteering,						
parent conferences, PTC, etc)						
The teacher in-service generally provides	21%	40%	5%	7%		25%
beneficial information.						
Family involvement activities are	31%	54%	5%	5%		4%
scheduled to allow working parents to						
participate.						
The school is safe for students and staff.	42%	49%	8%	2%		
The school has security procedures that	53%	40%	6%		2%	
are consistently followed (i.e. volunteer						
sign-in, locked building, name tags,						
buzzer entry, etc).						
PBIS has been effective in our	30%	43%	17%			9%
school.(Tier 1-General Program)						
PBIS has been effective in our school.	26%	40%	17%	2%		15%
(Tier 2-Check-in, check-out)						
PBIS has been effective in our school.	27%	31%	27%			15%
(Tier 3-TAT)						
WIN Time/RtI Block has been beneficial	15%	19%	23%	8%		36%
to our K-2 students.						
WIN Time/RtI Block has been beneficial	15%	21%	21%	4%	4%	36%
to our 3-5 students.						
Facilities are clean.	14%	40%	15%	29%	2%	
The school's furniture and equipment is	13%	55%	17%	13%		2%
in good working condition.						
Accelerated Reader is a valuable	32%	38%	13%			17%
component in the curriculum.						
EngageNY is a valuable component in	12%	21%	37%			31%
the curriculum.						

The select has a consistent multipe	2%	15%	30%	32%	4%	17%
The school has a consistent writing	2%	13%	30%	32%	4%	1 / %
program in place.	200/	100/	110/	20/		00/
The library offers sufficient reading	38%	40%	11%	2%		9%
materials to meet the needs of the						
students.	250/	2.50/	00/	40/		200/
My classroom library offers sufficient	25%	36%	8%	4%		28%
reading materials to meet the needs of						
the students.	210/	7.50/	100/			20/
There is good quality and frequency of	31%	56%	12%			2%
communication between the school and						
parents.	10.51					2
I am aware of the school's discipline	40%	51%	6%	2%		2%
policies and procedures.						
Our reading instruction is meeting the	19%	42%	23%	4%		13%
needs of our students.						
Our science instruction is aligned to	13%	30%	25%	2%		30%
NGSS.						
Students in grades K-2 have adequate	9%	34%	21%	13%		23%
access to appropriate technology.						
Students in grades 3-5 have adequate	40%	25%	17%			19%
access to appropriate technology.						
Staff at the elementary work hard to	34%	51%	13%			2%
build trusting relationships with parents.						
Once we start a new program, we follow	25%	40%	19%			6%
up to make improvements.						
It is important to collaborate with other	53%	34%	2%	2%		9%
teachers to offer suggestions, plan						
activities, and share strategies ot be used						
within the classroom.						
I would recommend the elementary to	45%	42%	9%			2%
parents seeking a place for their child.						

2016-2017 Staff Survey

Staff Survey65 out of 81 surveys were returned and completed, including associates, cooks, custodians, secretaries, and teachers

65 out of 81 surveys were returned and completed, ii	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Does Not Apply
Parents have a variety of opportunities to become involved. (i.e. volunteering, parent conferences, PTC, etc)	42%	44%	2%	3%	2%	6%
The teacher in-service generally provides beneficial information.	13%	43%	16%	2%		27%
Family involvement activities are scheduled to allow working parents to participate.	24%	51%	10%	8%	2%	6%
The school is safe for students and staff.	44%	48%	8%			
The school has security procedures that are consistently followed (i.e. volunteer sign-in, locked building, name tags, buzzer entry, etc).	56%	40%	3%	2%		
PBIS has been effective in our school.(Tier 1-General Program)	30%	35%	19%	2%		14%
PBIS has been effective in our school. (Tier 2-Check-in, check-out)	24%	35%	22%			19%
PBIS has been effective in our school. (Tier 3-TAT)	24%	27%	29%			21%
WIN Time/RtI Block has been beneficial to our K-2 students.	19%	27%	24%			29%
WIN Time/RtI Block has been beneficial to our 3-5 students.	13%	29%	24%			32%
Facilities are clean.	19%	45%	13%	18%	5%	1

The school's furniture and equipment is	10%	54%	18%	14%		
in good working condition.						
Accelerated Reader is a valuable	21%	41%	16%			22%
component in the curriculum.						
EngageNY is a valuable component in	10%	19%	34%	5%		33%
the curriculum.						
The school has a consistent writing	8%	17%	33%	19%	2%	21%
program in place.						
The library offers sufficient reading	24%	55%	11%			10%
materials to meet the needs of the						
students.						
My classroom library offers sufficient	15%	36%	13%	2%		34%
reading materials to meet the needs of						
the students.						
There is good quality and frequency of	29%	53%	13%	3%		2%
communication between the school and						
parents.						
I am aware of the school's discipline	34%	56%	3%	5%	2%	
policies and procedures.						
Our reading instruction is meeting the	16%	34%	26%	5%	2%	18%
needs of our students.						
Our science instruction is aligned to	10%	15%	37%	6%	2%	31%
NGSS.						
Students in grades K-2 have adequate	16%	34%	18%	10%		23%
access to appropriate technology.						
Students in grades 3-5 have adequate	34%	30%	14%			23%
access to appropriate technology.						
Having recess before lunch was a positive	8%	14%	28%	22%	14%	14%
change to our schedule.						

Observations from 2016-2017:

- 50% of respondents believe our reading instruction meets the needs of our students.
- 25% of respondents believe our Science curriculum is aligned with NGSS.
- 25% of 2016/17 and 23% of 2015/16 respondents agree that we have a consistent writing program in place.
- There was an increase of 13% of respondents who agree or strongly agree that security measures are consistently followed.
- 2% of all staff disagree that PBIS-Tier 1 is effective. No staff member disagreed with Tier 2 and 3 being effective.
- 62% of staff feel that AR is a valuable component in the curriculum.
- 36% of all staff disagree that having recess before lunch was a positive change to our schedule.

Observations from 2017-2018:

- During the 2017/2018 school year, 31% of respondents either disagree or strongly disagree that our facilities are clean. This is an increase from the previous data that showed 23% of respondents in this category.
- There was an increase of 10% of respondents who strongly agreed that their classroom library offers sufficient reading materials to meet the needs of their students.
- Only 17% of respondents agree/strongly agree that we have a consistent writing program in place which is a decrease from 25% the previous year.
- 91% of respondents agree/ strongly agree they are aware of the school's discipline policies and procedures.
- 43% of respondents agree/strongly agree that our science instruction is aligned to the NGSS, which is an increase of 18% from the previous year.
- Only 43% of respondents agree/strongly agree that K-2 students have adequate access to technology, which is down 7% from the previous year.
- The percentage of respondents who feel PBIS has been effective has increased for all tiers from the previous year.
- Only 61% of respondents agree/strongly agree that our reading instruction is meeting the needs of our students.
- Only 33% of respondents agree/strongly agree that ENY is a valuable component in the curriculum. An additional 37% are unsure at this time. No respondents disagree/strongly disagree.

- Only 85% of respondents agree/strongly agree that the staff work hard to build trusting relationships with parents. Only 87% of respondents agree/strongly agree that they would recommend the elementary to parents seeking a place for their child.
- 93% of respondents agree/strongly agree that school safety procedures are consistently followed.
- Only 46% of respondents agree/strongly agree that the WIN/RtI block has been beneficial for our k-2 students, which compares to 34% during the previous year.
- Only 42% of respondents agree/strongly agree that the WIN/RtI block has been beneficial for our 3-5 students, which compares to 36% during the previous year.

Observations from 2018-2019:

- There was a 7% increase of staff members who strongly agree/agree that grades 3-5 have adequate access to technology from the 2017/2018 school year to the 2018/2019 school year.
- The number of staff members who agree or strongly agree that the RtI block was beneficial increased from last year to this year in K-2 from 34% to 40% and in grades 3-5 increased from 36% to 42%.
- From 2017/2018 to 2018/2019, the percentage of staff members increased from 13% to 20% who disagreed or strongly disagreed that there is adequate technology in grades K-2.
- 48% of staff agreed or strongly agreed that grades k-2 reading curriculum meeting the needs of our students.
- 37% of staff agreed or strongly agreed that grades 3-5 reading curriculum is meeting the needs of our students.
- 71% of the staff agreed or strongly agreed that AR is a valuable component of the reading program.

Observations from 2019-2020:

- In 2019-20, 81% of staff agree or strongly agree that the school is safe for students and staff as compared to 88% in 2018-19.
- In 2019-20, 60% of staff who agree or strongly agree felt PBIS Tier 2 is effective in our school as compared to 65% in 2018-19 who agreed or strongly agreed.
- In 2019-2020, 33% of our staff agree/strongly agree that RtI is beneficial in K-2 whereas in 2018-2019 40% of the staff responded with agree/strongly agree.
- In 2019-2020, 46% of our staff agree/strongly agree that the facilities are clean as compared to 60% in 2018-2019.
- In 2019-2020, 66 out of 77 (86%) surveys were returned as compared to 40 out of 76 (53%) the previous year (2018-2019).
- Only 18% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that ENY is a valuable component of the curriculum as compared to 36% in 2018-2019.
- In 2019, no respondents disagreed that CICO is effective whereas in 2018 8% disagreed.
- Only 20% agree or strongly agree that WC has a consistent writing program in place.
- 60% of the respondents believe that AR is a valuable part of the curriculum.
- In 2019-2020, 54% agree or strongly agree that we follow up to make improvements to new programs whereas 93% either agreed or strongly agreed in 2018-2019. However, 25% were "not sure" and 12% "does not apply" resulting in only 9% reporting "disagree".

2020-2021

III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses

Table 11:

Patterns of Strengths and Problems

Patterns of Strengths	Bullet Data Upon Which Conclusion is Drawn
1. 96% of our parents surveyed feel they have adequate opportunity for communication.	Table 9 - Parent Survey
2. The number of surveys completed in 2016 was 207, which was 73% of our families. The number of surveys completed in 2017 was 207, which is 73% of our families. The number of completed surveys in 2018 was 191, which is 71%. In 2019, the number of surveys completed was 185, which is 73% of our families.	Table 9 - Parent Survey
3. 84% of our students had at least one parent/guardian attend parent/teacher conferences in the Fall of 2019.	Statistics gathered from sign in sheets provided by classroom teachers.
4. The PBIS Program is a positive component to the	Table 9 - Parent Survey

elementary curriculum as 95% of the parents surveyed reported it is effective.	
5. Of the 21 classrooms in the elementary, including the early childhood program, the class average is 18 students per classroom.	Table 5 - Enrollment Data from Fall Housing Report
6. A variety of Fine Arts programs are offered. This includes daily Physical Education, weekly lessons in Art and General Music, and 5th graders are allowed to participate in Band as an elective.	Curriculum Implementation Data SIP Day Discussion
7. 100% of our parents feel confident helping their children with reading homework.	Table 9 - Parent Survey
8. All of our students in grades 2-5 have their own Chromebook computer for school use. Additional equipment has been added in the upper grades.	SIP Day Discussion
9. Additional programs are in place to supplement the individual needs of the students such as RtI, CICO, Title, TAT, Tutoring, and Enrichment.	SIP Day Discussion
10. The use of technology continues with additional online, supplemental programs available for student use.	SIP Day Discussion
11. There is an assistant principal available to deal with the increase in the number of referrals based on the correlational data.	SIP Day Discussion Table 8 - Student Discipline Data
12. There is continued support with outside organizations such as the Henderson County Library (Bookmobile/1000 books before kindergarten/summer reading incentives), Erin's Law presentations, Dental programs (student presentations/Tooth Mobile), Turning Pages Book Club, FOCC, College for Kids, Ag in the Classroom, Farm Bureau, BizTown, Banzai, Meemic, West Central Education Foundation, Donors Choose, and the Regional Office of Education.	SIP Day Discussion
13. Fourteen full-time paraprofessionals and 6 part-time paraprofessionals are needed and utilized throughout the day. When needed, the replacement/addition of support staff occurs in a timely manner.	SIP Day Discussion Table 7 - Educator Data
14. Throughout the 2019-2020 school year, we have had a full time district nurse.	Table 7 - Educator Data
15. The PTC Parent group has been meeting on a regular basis to plan additional activities for our families.	SIP Day Discussion
16. Students participate in transitional activities when moving from Pre-K to Kindergarten, 4th to 5th grade, and 5th to middle school.	SIP Day Discussion
17. MAP assessment is given district wide and data is being reviewed by staff.	SIP Day Discussion Program Comparisons and Trends

18. 99% of our parents surveyed feel that their child is safe at school.	Table 9 - Parent Survey
19. The rates for chronic absenteeism, chronic truancy, and mobility have all decreased.	Table 4a - General School Data
20. Parent participation in Donuts with Dads, Muffins with Moms, and Pastries with Parents has stayed the same or increased over the past three years.	Table 9 - Parent Survey
21. WCE has implemented the Second Step SEL curriculum.	SIP Day Discussion Program Comparisons and Trends
22. Family structures have been introduced at the elementary and community building activities occur monthly.	SIP Day Discussion Program Comparisons and Trends
23. New curriculum (Edmark and LLI) is being utilized with our struggling students.	SIP Day Discussion Program Comparisons and Trends
24. Observations hint at improved scores in math for some grade levels.	Table 3A - MAP Assessment Table 3G - State Testing - PARCC/IAR Table 3E - STAR Math Assessment
Patterns of Problems	Bullet Data Upon Which Conclusion is Drawn
1. In comparison to the state average, the percentage of students who met/exceeded in 3rd grade was 26% below the state average in reading and 28% below the state average in math in 2019.	Table 3G - IAR Assessment Scores
2. In comparison to the state average, the percentage of students who met/exceeded in 4th grade was 21% below the state average in reading and 21% below the state average in math in 2019.	Table 3G - IAR Assessment Scores
3. In comparison to the state average, the percentage of students who met/exceeded in 5th grade was 17% below the state average in reading and 23% below the state average in math in 2019.	Table 3G+ - IAR Assessment Scores
4. There is a need for additional updated technology available in the lower grade classrooms. According to the staff survey, only 35% agree or strongly agree that adequate technology is available in grades k-2.	SIP Day Discussion Table 10 - Staff Survey
5. Only 77% of our parents reported that they feel confident helping their children with math homework, which has decreased the past two years.	Table 9 - Parent Survey
6. Staff is concerned about the ELA curriculum effectiveness and inconsistency between grade levels.	SIP Day Discussion Table 10 - Staff Survey
7. There has been an increase in major discipline referrals since the 2015-2016 school year. During the 2018-2019 school year, there were 384 major referrals.	Table 8- Student Discipline Data
8. Staff recognizes the need for a trained counselor to	SIP Day Discussion
meet the ever growing social emotional needs of our	Staff Survey Comments

student population.	Needs Assessment
9. Staff is concerned about the developmental appropriateness of Engage New York Math. Only 18% of the staff surveyed feel that EngageNY Math is a valuable component in the curriculum.	SIP Day Discussion Table 10 - Staff Survey
10. Our overall enrollment at the elementary continues to decrease based on the following data: 400 students in 2016-2017, 397 students in 2017-2018, 387 students in 2018-2019 and 374 students in 2019-2020.	Table 5 - Enrollment Data from the Fall Housing Report
11. The number of major discipline referrals categorized as physical aggression continues to increase based on the following data: 54 in 2015-2016, 69 in 2016-2017, 103 in 2017-2018, and 130 in 2018-2019.	Table 8 - Student Discipline Data
12. There is a lack of programming available to meet the diverse needs of our students with special needs.	SIP Day Discussion Table 6 - Special Education Student Subgroup Enrollment
13. There has been a decrease of instructional time due to discipline issues.	SIP Day Discussion Staff Survey comments Table 8 - Student Discipline Data Table 9 - Students Participating in Support Programs

IV. GOALS, STRATEGIES, INTEGRATED ACTION PLAN

Table 13:

Improvement Goals

Improvement Goal #1

To increase the availability of supportive services in order to meet the social emotional needs of our students and increase their overall success during the 2020-21 school year.

Current Condition and Data Sources: Discipline Data, Survey Results, SIP Day Discussion Data, and Vision Meeting Information

Specific Action

Continue PBIS, parental involvement programs, and increase student support services.

Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost and Funding Source	Evaluation
Host a school kick- off/curriculum night to distribute educational hints prior to the start of the 2020- 2021 school year. Teachers will have curriculum packets to hand out to the parents.	August 2020	Mrs. Todd, Mrs. Mills, Mrs. Gullberg, Mrs. Ackermann, Mrs. Keating	\$200	Comparison of attendance data. 2016 - 86% (PK-5) 2017- 86% (PK-5) 2018- 85% (PK-5) 2019-84% (PK-5)
Maintain the percentage of	October 2020	Mrs. Ricketts, Ms.	Title 1 Grant	Comparison of number

parents that fill out an elementary parent survey at the fall parent teacher conferences.		Lewis, Mrs. Todd, Miss Young, Mrs. Kelly		of surveys completed. (207-2016) (207 - 2017) (191- 2018) (185-2019)
Host parent programs to discuss and share STEM activities for parents of students in grades K-5 that can be utilized at home during non-school time	October 2020, November 2020, & February 2021	Mrs. Ackermann, Mrs. Kelly, Ms. Lewis, Mrs. Ricketts, Mrs. Thompson, Mrs. Keating, Mrs. Lumbeck, Mrs. Winters, Mrs. Ravenscraft	\$850 Title I Grant	Comparison of attendance data for each program
Review and revise as necessary the PBIS positive behavior expectations and matrix.	August 2020	Mrs. Todd, Mrs. Anderson, Mrs. Ford, Mrs. Hinshaw (parent), Mrs. Wolf, Mrs. Ricketts, Mrs. Thompson, Mrs. Frieden	None	Expectations will be distributed to all staff and reviewed with students in proper setting (first PBIS assembly)
In-service and continuing review for all elementary staff including teachers, paraprofessionals, cooks, and bus drivers on PBIS program.	August 2020	Mrs. Todd, Mrs. Anderson, Mrs. Ford, Mrs. Hinshaw (parent), Mrs. Wolf, Mrs. Ricketts, Mrs. Thompson, Mrs. Frieden	None	Professional development completed
Implement family structures and meetings	Monthly	Staff	\$1500 District Funds	Comparison of data on staff survey will be completed
Continue implementing the character educational component of PBIS.	Monthly - First Wednesday of every month September- May	Classroom teachers	None	Discussion at grade level team meetings.
Continue monthly student recognitions and quarterly HEAT celebrations	Monthly - First Wednesday of every month September- May and quarterly events	Mrs. Todd, Mrs. Anderson, Mrs. Ford, Mrs. Hinshaw (parent), Mrs. Wolf, Mrs. Ricketts, Mrs. Thompson, Mrs. Frieden	\$1500 District Funds	Number of students earning recognition will be charted.
Implement character education program called Second Step	August 2020- May 2021	Classroom teachers	None	Review program components
Monitor student discipline referrals.	Monthly	Mrs. Frieden, Mrs. Lafary, and classroom teachers	None	End of year review of data comparisons.
Continuation of converging PBIS tiered programs.	August 2020- May 2021	Mrs. Frieden, Mrs. Lafary, Mrs. Lumbeck, Mrs. Carnes, Mrs. Mills, Mrs. Anderson	None	Meeting completed
Monitor progress of implementation and evaluate activities through students,	May 2021	Mrs. Frieden & Mrs. Lafary	None	Data analysis of survey results and discipline referrals.

staff, and parent surveys as well as discipline referral data collection source detailing referral numbers and types.				
To offer a tutoring program to students. Program will serve approximately 5-15 students. Focus will be on assisting students in reading, math, social studies and science. Student selection will be based on teacher referral and parent approval	Sept May Tues. & Thurs evenings 3:30-4:30 p.m.	Mrs. Anderson, Mrs. Johnston, Mrs. Keating, Mrs. Boyd, Mrs. Gullberg, Ms. Lewis, Mrs. Ricketts, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Winters, Miss Griffin, Ms. Fischer	\$2360 (\$20/hr x's 2 teachers per evening x's 2 nights per week x's 30 weeks)	Mid-term and quarter grades will be tracked
Host Fine Arts events that showcase musical and artistic abilities of our students.	Sept 2020 to May 2021	Children's Choir, Art classes, Band members, music classes, and Fine Arts class	None	Student participation
Continue to in-service staff on trauma-informed practices	August 2020 to May 2021	Mrs. Frieden, Mrs. Carnes, Mrs. Lumbeck	None	Workshop Evaluation
Hire a full time counselor at the elementary to provide individual and group counseling as well social skills training	Prior to Fall 2020	Mrs. Lafary, Mrs. Frieden	\$35,000	End of year data review
Hire an additional full time teacher to work with our students with special needs	Prior to Fall 2020	Mrs. Lafary, Mrs. Frieden	\$35,000	IEP goal review and conduct a program needs evaluation of special education

Improvement Goal #2

The Goal in 2020-21 is that West Central Elementary will increase the percentage of staff in kindergarten through grade five who agree or strongly agree that our school has a consistent writing program in place.

Current Condition and Data Sources: Staff Survey (According to the staff survey only 20% of staff reported that our school has a consistent writing program in place. Based on the SIP day discussion, staff shared an overwhelming concern for this need.)

Specific Action:

The WCES staff, along with a sub-committee in place, will continue to investigate and identify a consistent ELA curriculum to implement in the elementary.

Responsible Funding Source

The district Title I program ensures teachers and associates are fully supporting the ILS by, among other things, emphasizing staff is being utilized properly during the entire work day and students' needs are being met by programs such as LLI and RtI support.	September 2020 - May 2021	Mrs. Lafary, Mrs. Ricketts, Ms. Lewis, & Mrs. Kelly	None	Updated Title plan and grant
After reviewing data revisit the elementary exit outcomes and revise as necessary to ensure alignment to the ILS.	Monthly grade level meetings 2020-2021	Mrs. Lafary, classroom, Title I & Spec. Ed teachers	None	Quarterly outcomes aligned to the Illinois Learning Standards will be revised or created
Assess students early during the first semester. The assessments include AIMSweb Plus, Spelling Inventories, STAR Reading, Fountas and Pinnell benchmarking, and MAP.	August 2020	Mrs. Ricketts, Ms. Lewis, Mrs. Kelly & Staff	District & Special Education Co-op Approximate cost = \$9000 Aimsweb. MAP= \$3950 - Title Grant	Assessments will be selected and administered in a timely manner.
Mid-point check will be completed based on the appropriate timeline	December 2020 (full year) & October 2020 (1st year)	Mrs. Ricketts, Ms. Lewis, Mrs. Kelly & Staff	None	Assessments will be completed in a timely manner
Analyze student assessment data to identify students that did not meet WCES assessment standards and plan appropriate remediation strategies.	September 2020 and January 2021	Mrs. Ricketts, Ms. Lewis, Mrs. Kelly & Staff	None	Assessment data will be reviewed after each assessment. Changes in instruction will be made as needed
Subscribe to Learning A to Z for online use.	August 2020	Mrs. Lafary	\$550 Title I Grant	Subscription purchased
Purchase BrainPop and STARFALL to enhance reading instruction	August 2020	Mrs. Lafary	\$2550- BrainPop \$270 - STARFALL Title I Grant	Pre and Post Testing
Conduct regular walkthroughs of all elementary classrooms to assess the implementation of a balanced literacy approach.	Beginning August 2020 - May 2021	Mrs. Lafary and Mrs. Frieden	None	Results of the walkthroughs will be shared with staff
Purchase Renaissance Learning	2020-2021	Mrs. Lafary	\$5467 Title I Grant	Subscription purchased
Daily schedule for team collaboration time to ensure 40 minutes per week of collaboration per grade level team. Late start Monday teaming available.	Team meetings will be ongoing 2020-2021	Mrs. Lafary & grade level teams	None	Meetings will be held weekly.
Attend IL Reading Conference	October 2020	3 teachers	\$1999 Title I Grant	Present to staff - workshop completed
Purchase student magazines	August 2020	Mrs. Lafary	\$1606	Purchase subscriptions

such as Scholastic News and Story Works			Title 1 Grant	to be used in the classroom
Form a Comprehensive ELA Curriculum Investigation Committee to review/revise the scope and sequence of our writing and grammar curriculum, and begin researching materials to support identified instruction.	August 2020 - May 2021	Mrs. Lafary, Mrs. Winters, Mrs. Johnston, Mrs. Ricketts, Ms. Lewis, Mrs. Kelly, Mrs. Ford, Mrs. Klossing	None	Gather, analyze, and share various ELA programs and additional materials for reading instruction.

Improvement Goal #3

The goal in 2020-2021 is that West Central Elementary will increase the percentage of students in kindergarten through grade five that obtain a simple growth of at least one point from the fall 2020 MAP Math Assessment to the winter 2020 MAP Math Assessment.

Current Conditions and Data Sources: MAP Math Assessment Scores (The average percentage of students tested in kindergarten through fifth grade combined who obtained at least one point growth on their overall score from fall 2019 to winter 2019 was 87%.)

Specific Action

The West Central Elementary Staff will focus on improving math instruction to meet the demands of the Illinois Learning Standards.

Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost and Funding Source	Evaluation
The district Title I program ensures teachers and associates are fully supporting the ILS by, among other things, emphasizing staff is being utilized properly during the entire work day and students' needs are being met by programs such as RtI support.	September 2020 - May 2021	Mrs. Lafary, Mrs. Ricketts, Ms. Lewis, Mrs. Kelly & Staff	None	Updated Title Plan and Grant
Assess students early during the first semester. The assessments include STAR Math, student growth assessments, and MAP.	August 2020	Classroom teachers	District Approximate cost = \$5467 Renaissance MAP \$3900	Assessments will be selected and administered in a timely manner.
Administer MAP Assessment	August 2020 and December 2020	Teachers & paraprofessionals	District MAP = \$3900	MAP Assessment will be completed in a timely manner
To offer a tutoring program to students. Program will serve approx. 5-15 students. Focus will be on assisting students in reading, math, s.s. and science. Student	Sept - May Tues. & Thurs. evenings 3:30-4:30pm	Mrs. Anderson, Mrs. Johnston, Mrs. Keating, Mrs. Boyd, Mrs. Gullberg, Ms. Lewis, Mrs. Ricketts, Mrs. Smith, Mrs.	\$2400 (\$20/hr x's 2 teachers per evening x's 2 nights per week x's 30 weeks)	Mid-term and quarter grades will be tracked.

selection will be based on teacher referral and parent approval.		Winters, Miss Griffin, Ms. Fischer		
Analyze student assessment data to identify students that did not meet WCES assessment standards and plan appropriate remediation strategies.	September and December 2020	Classroom teachers	None	Assessment data will be reviewed after each assessment. Changes in instruction will be made as needed
Daily schedule for team collaboration time to ensure 40 minutes per week of collaboration per grade level team. Late Start Monday teaming available.	Team meetings will be ongoing 2020-2021	Mrs. Lafary & grade level teams	None	Meetings will be held weekly.
Host parent programs to discuss and share STEM activities for parents of students in grades K-5 that can be utilized at home during non-school time	October 2020, November 2020, & February 2021	Mrs. Ackermann, Mrs. Kelly, Ms. Lewis, Mrs. Ricketts, Mrs. Thompson, Mrs. Keating, Mrs. Lumbeck, Mrs. Winters, Mrs. Ravenscraft	\$850 Title I Grant	Comparison of attendance data for each program
In-service opportunities for implementation of math curriculum/ programs.	Starting June, 2020	Mrs. Lafary and committee	None	Workshop evaluation
Purchase IXL online math program	August 2020	Mrs. Lafary	\$4145	Subscription purchased
Purchase Reflex Math, an online fact fluency program	August 2020	Mrs. Lafary	\$2965	Subscription purchased
Establish a committee to collect information, collaborate and discuss math curriculum/programs	June 2020	Mrs. Winters, Mrs. Thompson, Mrs. Ackermann, Mrs. Klossing	To be determined	Presentation of findings

Improvement Goal #4

The goal in 2020-2021 is that West Central Elementary will increase the use and availability of technology for all grade levels.

Current Condition and Data Sources: SIP Day Discussion Data and Staff Survey (During the SIP Day Discussion, some staff noted their concern regarding the availability of technology at the lower grade levels. According to the staff survey, only 35% agree or strongly agree that K-2 has adequate access to technology, whereas 53% of the staff agree or strongly agree that the students in grades 3-5 have adequate access to technology.

Specific Action

Focus on identifying the most appropriate technology at all grade levels.

, ,				
Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost and Funding Source	Evaluation

Offer professional development opportunities for staff (WC Tech Institute)	November 2020	Mrs. Frakes & committee	None	Workshop evaluation/ Program evaluation
Look at visiting other schools to see what's available	August 2020 - May 2021	Mrs. Frakes & committee	None	Presentation of findings following the visit(s)
Share possible technology ideas with tech team	August 2020- May 2021	Elementary staff and Tech Team	None	List of possible equipment for the elementary classrooms
Encourage staff to attend the summer WIT-CON conference	Summer 2020	Elementary staff & Tech Team	None	Presentation of findings following the conference
Encourage staff to reach out to other colleagues (other districts or online platforms)	August 2020 - May 2021	Elementary staff & Tech Team	None	Presentation of findings
Create a tech plan showing possible options for purchasing tech equipment for grades K-2	August 2020 - May 2021	Elementary staff & Tech Team	None	Presentation of tech plan at the elementary level

V. Reflection, Evaluation, Refinement

V.1 School Improvement Team Meeting Schedule

• Will meet monthly on the second and fourth Wednesday of each month to discuss our progress.

V.2 Monitoring

To monitor the progress on our goals throughout the year, we will utilize a monthly calendar that
has been created for this purpose. It includes a checklist to help us as we progress through the
year.

V.3 Communication Plan

- School Improvement Plan will be available online, plus a flyer stating school's strengths and goals.
- Regular conferences (one fall semester and one spring semester) with students, teachers, and adult family members organized around a review of student work and academic progress
- Monthly newsletters