

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2011-12

Fisher Grade School

Fisher Grade School
801 S. Fifth Street
Fisher, Illinois 61843

Phone: 217-897-1133

Fax: 217-897-6676

E-Mail: fisher@k12.il.us

Principal: James V. Moxley

FGS Mission Statement:

Fisher Grade School is a place where students are **RESPECTFUL** to one another. Our students will strive to be **RESPONSIBLE** for their own actions and their own learning. By the time our students leave Fisher Grade School, they will show that they are **READY** for higher educational opportunities and civic duty.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA:

Attendance Rate:

Year:	School:	State:
2010-11	95.9%	?

What does this data say?

Fisher Grade School students have an outstanding “Attendance Rate,” coming in at 95.9% for the school year 2010-11. The parents and students of this district obviously value a good education, making school attendance a priority.

Chronic Truancy:

Number of chronic truants:	School:	State:
2010-11	2.6%	

What does this data say?

Last year we included Attendance Incentives for our students at the end of each quarter. We improved our number of chronic truants, moving from 3.4 down to 2.6.

Mobility:

Mobility rate:	School:	State:
2010-11	7.7%	?

What does this data say?

This number is based on the number of times students enroll in or leave a school during the school year. We are well under the State Average, our Mobility Rate improved last year moving from 11.9 down to 7.7.

Class Size:

Ave Class Size	K	Grade 1	Grade 3	Grade 6
District:	23	15.5	22.5	17.5
State:	?	?	?	?

What does this data say?

Our class sizes are very comparable to the state average. We try to keep our class sizes under 25.

Analyze Our I.S.A.T. Scores:

Please understand that this ISAT information can provide insight to our school's academic performance and achievement, which is measured by one test on one particular day. There are many factors that may cause student performance to be superior or less than expected.

Ours schools do take the time to analyze the test information in order to help us better understand our areas of strength and weakness as a school. Whenever we find an area of deficit, we address it through the School Improvement Process.

On the following pages are 12 years of I.S.A.T. scores for each grade level tested. The last row is bolded to highlight last year's performance. This longevity study is used to show the consistency at which our students perform. We have been consistently better than the State Average in every subject.

State Assessment Data- Third Grade

3RD GRADE READING

YEAR	WARNING	BELOW	MEETS	EXCEEDS	MEETS OR EXCEEDS
2000	0	3.3	50	18	68 (6)
2001	0	15	67	19	86 (24)
2002	3	18.2	57.6	21.2	78.8 (16.6)
2003	8.7	23.9	56.5	10.9	67.4 (5.4)
2004	14.3	16.7	38.1	31	69.1 (4.1)
2005	2.6	7.7	69.2	20.5	89.7 (23.1)
2006	2.1	19.1	48.9	29.7	78.6
2007	5.3	23.7	47.4	23.7	71.1 (-1.1)
2008	0	18.1	63.6	18.1	81.7 (12.3)
2009	2.2	19.6	56.5	21.7	78.3 (6.1)
2010	5.8	21.2	55.8	17.3	73.1 (-0.6)
2011	7.3	22	53.7	17.1	70.7 (-4.0)

3RD GRADE MATH

YEAR	WARNING	BELOW	MEETS	EXCEEDS	MEETS OR EXCEEDS
2000	7	21	60	12	72 (3)
2001	0	6	61	33	94 (20)
2002	0	3	54.5	42.4	96.9 (22.7)
2003	2.2	8.7	65.2	23.9	89.1 (13.4)
2004	0	14.3	59.5	26.2	85.7 (6.6)
2005	0	12.8	53.8	33.3	87.1 (7.8)
2006	0	17	48.9	34	82.9
2007	2.6	2.6	55.3	39.5	94.8 (8.1)
2008	0	6	54.5	39.3	93.8 (8.8)
2009	0	8.7	60.9	30.4	91.3 (6.1)
2010	0	9.6	50.0	40.4	90.4 (4.1)
2011	2.4	0	65.9	31.7	97.6 (10.3)

3RD GRADE WRITING

YEAR	WARNING	BELOW	MEETS	EXCEEDS	MEETS OR EXCEEDS
2000	13	49	38	0	38 (-17)
2001	0	15	83	2	85 (27)
2002	0	9.4	90.6	0	90.6 (34)
2003	6.5	43.5	47.8	2.2	50 (-10.1)
2004	7.1	16.7	73.8	2.4	76.2 (12.5)

2005	Did	Not	Test	Writing	In 2005
2006	Did	Not	Test	Writing	In 2006
2007	Did	Not	Test	Writing	In 2007
2008	Will	Begin	Testing	Again	In 2008
2009	2.2	30.4	67.4	0	67.4 (5.4)
2010	13.5	17.3	67.3	1.9	69.2 (4.8)
2011	Did	Not	Test	Writing	In 2011

TRENDS:

Over a 12-year period of time, our 3rd graders have consistently scored better than the STATE AVERAGE. The last column reflects our combined Meets & Exceeds score. It also indicates in parentheses how many percentage points better or worse we were than the STATE AVERAGE.

State Assessment Data- Fourth Grade

4TH GRADE SCIENCE

YEAR	WARNING	BELOW	MEETS	EXCEEDS	MEETS OR EXCEEDS
2000	0	23	55	21	76 (12)
2001	4	19	69	8	77 (12)
2002	0	9.1	78.2	12.7	90.9 (23.8)
2003	0	18.4	63.2	18.4	81.6 (15.1)
2004	1.9	25	67.3	18.4	85.7 (18.7)
2005	0	17.9	61.5	20.5	82 (10.6)
2006	0	5.1	69.2	25.6	94.8
2007	0	4.1	75.5	20.4	95.9 (20.2)
2008	0	13.5	67.5	18.9	86.4 (10.3)
2009	2.7	5.4	81.1	10.8	91.9 (15.1)
2010	0	20.8	68.8	10.4	79.2 (2.5)
2011	0	20.4	64.8	14.8	79.6 (0.2)

4TH GRADE READING

YEAR	WARNING	BELOW	MEETS	EXCEEDS	MEETS OR EXCEEDS
2006	0	15.3	58.8	30.7	84.5
2007	0	32.7	42.9	24.5	67.4
2008	0	18.9	64.8	16.2	81 (7.9)
2009	2.7	16.2	62.2	18.9	81.1 (7.3)
2010	0	31.3	43.8	25.0	68.8 (-4.9)
2011	0	27.8	57.4	14.8	72.2 (-2.5)

4TH GRADE MATH

YEAR	WARNING	BELOW	MEETS	EXCEEDS	MEETS OR EXCEEDS
2006	0	10.2	66.6	23	89.6
2007	0	22.4	59.2	18.4	77.6
2008	0	13.5	67.5	18.9	86.4 (1.9)
2009	2.7	8.1	78.4	10.8	89.2 (3.5)
2010	0	18.8	75.0	6.3	81.3 (-4.7)
2011	0	3.7	83.3	13.0	96.3 (8.6)

TRENDS:

Over a 12-year period of time, our 4TH graders have consistently scored better than the STATE AVERAGE in the area of SCIENCE. The last column reflects our combined Meets & Exceeds score. It also indicates in parentheses, how many percentage points better we were than the STATE AVERAGE. 4th graders are no longer tested in Social Studies, however, in 2006, the state began testing them in the areas of Reading and Math.

State Assessment Data- Fifth Grade

5TH GRADE READING

YEAR	WARNING	BELOW	MEETS	EXCEEDS	MEETS OR EXCEEDS
2000	0	33	36	31	67 (8)
2001	2	21	40	37	77 (18)
2002	2	35.3	35.3	27.5	62.8 (3.7)
2003	0	18.5	57.4	24.1	81.5 (21.1)
2004	7.9	21.1	55.3	15.8	71.1 (10.2)
2005	0	40.7	46.3	13	59.3 (-5)
2006	0	28.2	58.9	12.8	71.7
2007	0	16.3	48.8	34.9	83.7 (14)
2008	0	18.7	50	31.2	81.2 (7.7)
2009	0	19.5	68.3	12.2	80.5 (7)
2010	0	14.3	74.3	11.4	85.7 (11)
2011	2	24.5	53.1	20.4	73.5 (-2.9)

5TH GRADE MATH

YEAR	WARNING	BELOW	MEETS	EXCEEDS	MEETS OR EXCEEDS
2000	0	24	76	0	76 (19)
2001	2	33	63	2	65 (4)
2002	5.9	33.3	54.9	5.9	60.8 (-2)
2003	0	5.6	87	7.4	94.4 (26.1)
2004	0	26.3	60.5	13.2	73.7 (1.9)
2005	0	25.9	70.4	3.7	74.1 (.9)
2006	0	25.6	69.7	5.1	74.3
2007	0	11.6	69.8	18.6	88.4 (5.9)
2008	0	16.6	75	8.3	83.3 (2)
2009	0	14.6	75.6	9.8	85.4 (3)
2010	0	8.6	85.7	5.7	91.4 (8)
2011	0	26.5	65.3	8.2	73.5 (-10.5)

5TH GRADE WRITING

YEAR	WARNING	BELOW	MEETS	EXCEEDS	MEETS OR EXCEEDS
2000	5	26	67	3	70 (-1)
2001	0	18	59	23	82 (12)
2002	5.9	45.1	49	0	49 (-9.8)
2003	0	44.4	53.7	1.9	55.6 (-9.2)

2004	5.3	36.8	57.9	0	57.9 (-12.1)
2005	Did	Not	Test	Writing	In 2005
2006	Did	Not	Test	Writing	In 2006
2007	Writing	Will	Be	Tested	In 2007-08
2009	25	42.5	27.5	5	32.5 (-21.8)
2010	5.7	62.9	31.4	0	31.4 (-23.9)
2011	Did	Not	Test	Writing	In 2011

TRENDS:

Over a 12-year period of time, our 5TH graders have consistently scored better than the STATE AVERAGE in the areas of Reading and Math. The last column reflects our combined Meets & Exceeds score. It also indicates in parentheses, how many percentage points better or worse we were than the STATE AVERAGE.

State Assessment Data- Sixth Grade

SIXTH GRADE READING

YEAR	WARNING	BELOW	MEETS	EXCEEDS	MEETS OR EXCEEDS
2006	0	16.3	69	14.5	83.5 (NA)
2007	0	17.4	71.7	10.9	82.6 (9.2)
2008	0	10.8	45.6	43.4	89 (10)
2009	0	12.8	55.3	31.9	87.2 (7.3)
2010	0	18.2	63.6	18.2	81.8 (0.6)
2011	0	16.7	66.7	16.7	83.3 (-1.2)

SIXTH GRADE MATH

YEAR	WARNING	BELOW	MEETS	EXCEEDS	MEETS OR EXCEEDS
2006	0	9	78.1	12.7	90.8 (NA)
2007	0	19.6	71.7	8.7	80.4 (-1)
2008	0	10.8	60.8	28.2	89 (6.9)
2009	0	12.8	66	21.3	87.2 (4.8)
2010	0	13.6	63.6	22.7	86.4 (1.8)
2011	2.8	8.3	69.4	19.4	88.9 (5.0)

SIXTH GRADE WRITING

YEAR	WARNING	BELOW	MEETS	EXCEEDS	MEETS OR EXCEEDS
2009	0	23.4	72.3	4.3	76.6 (7.9)
2010	9.1	38.6	50.0	2.3	52.3 (-18.2)
2011	Did	Not	Test	Writing	In 2011

TRENDS:

This is the 6th year that Illinois 6th graders were tested in ISAT Reading and Math. As you can see, we scored very well. The last column reflects our combined Meets & Exceeds score. It also indicates in parentheses, how many percentage points better or worse we were than the STATE AVERAGE.

AREAS OF CONCERN:

Prioritize Concerns:

1. **Address Students Below Standards:** Although we had just a couple of students in the “Warning” category, we did have a significant number of students in the “Below Standards” category. We need to identify and assist these students.
2. **RTI Math:** Our school has been making great gains in the implementation of RTI Reading over the past few years. We now need to implement RTI Math.
3. **Technology:** Technology changes daily, and although we do a great deal with technology, we want to stay ahead of the game.
4. **Bullying Behaviors:** Last year we had trouble dealing with students who display bullying behaviors at times.

GOALS FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT:

- Goal #1** We need to identify students who are “at risk” and we want to provide them with extra interventions so that they can improve in the areas of Reading and Math. (Response To Intervention)
- Goal #2** We need to fully implement RTI in the area of Math. Last year we piloted RTI in one grade level, this year we want to go school-wide.
- Goal #3** We need to stay current on new uses of technology in the classroom and strive to maintain home-school communication by use of web-pages, STI Student Management System and through e-mail.
- Goal #4** Last year, we had in-service on the topic of Bullying. This year we need to see Anti-Bullying theories put into practice throughout the building.

DEVELOP PLAN OF ACTION:

Goal #1 Students At-Risk (Response To Intervention)

- Activity 1: We will strive to improve the make-up and involvement of the RTI team. This committee was established to help make decisions about students “at risk” and on what interventions will best meet their needs.
- Activity 2: Last year we implemented an RTI Intervention Block into our schedule. Although it was successful, we want to continue to make that process even better. We will also work on finding time to include RTI Math into our schedule.
- Activity 3: We will track students who are identified “at risk,” to see progress or lack there of. Learning to use the m class DIBBLES assessment tools (Reading) and AIMSweb (Math) will help a great deal in this process.

Goal #2 RTI Math

- Activity 1: We will hire and train an RTI Math interventionist who will be in charge of assessment and intervention programs to use with struggling Math students.
- Activity 2: We will send our Title I Math/RTI person to an RTI conference on how to implement RTI Math into our curriculum. We plan to incorporate RTI Math K-4 this year.

Goal #3 Technology

- Activity 1: Continually update web-pages
- Activity 2: We will strive to purchase enough Star Boards for every classroom teacher.
- Activity 3: We will complete more training on classroom uses for the Star Boards.

Goal 4: Bullying

- Activity 1: We will survey students in our upper grades to determine the extent at which Bullying is present in our school.
- Activity 2: We will begin an Anti-Bully Campaign.
- Activity 3: Bring in a guest speaker to present on the topic of Bullying.

Activity 4: We can provide a workshop for parents on the topic of Bullying.

TIMELINE:

Goal 1: Students At-Risk (Response to Intervention)

All activities 1-3 to be in place by October

Goal 2: RTI Math

All activities 1-2 to be completed by Semester

Goal 3: Technology

All activities 1-3 to be completed by March

Goal 4: Bullying

All activities 1-4 to be completed by March

PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE:

All goals one through four, pertain to classroom and special education teachers alike, therefore, everyone will be expected to make every effort to collaborate and plan appropriately.

The building Principal, with the aid of the School Improvement Committee, will organize and carry out the in-service portions of the plan.

ESITMATED EXPENSES:

The expenses for the staff members who will attend workshops/conferences on RTI will be covered within the Superintendent's Budget. Likewise, any expenses required by any guest speakers will need to be approved by and paid for within the Superintendent's Budget.

Our goal to put a Star Board in every classroom teacher's room by the end of the year will require funding through our Technology Budget and through the kind support of our Parent-Teacher Organization (P.I.E.).

DEVELOPERS OF THE PLAN:

The building Principal, James V. Moxley, developed this plan. The plan was presented and approved by the School Improvement Committee.

Members Include:

Trina Burk
Kelly Harvey
Kim Morstatter
Amber Sievers (Chairman)
Donna Smith
Emily Saathoff