

L E STARKE ELEM SCHOOL
PEKIN PSD 108
PEKIN, ILLINOIS



ILLINOIS
SCHOOL
REPORT
CARD

GRADES : K 1 2 3

State and federal laws require public school districts to release report cards to the public each year.

STUDENTS

RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUND AND OTHER INFORMATION

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Native American	Multi racial /Ethnic	Low- Income Rate	Limited- English- Proficient Rate	High Sch. Dropout Rate	Chronic Truancy Rate	Mobility Rate	Attendance Rate	Total Enrollment
School	92.7	0.9	1.7	0.9	1.7	2.1	54.7	0.0		0.0	15.6	94.7	234
District	94.7	0.4	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.9	47.9	0.3		0.3	12.4	94.2	3,493
State	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2	40.9	7.2		2.5	15.2	93.7	2,077,856

Low-income students come from families receiving public aid; live in institutions for neglected or delinquent children; are supported in foster homes with public funds; or are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches.

Limited-English-proficient students are those students eligible for transitional bilingual programs.

Mobility rate is based on the number of times students enroll in or leave a school during the school year.

Chronic truants are students who are absent from school without valid cause for 18 or more of the last 180 school days.

INSTRUCTIONAL SETTING

PARENTAL CONTACT*		STUDENT-TO-STAFF RATIOS			
	Percent	Pupil- Teacher Elementary	Pupil- Teacher Secondary	Pupil- Certified Staff	Pupil- Administrator
School	100.0	--	--	--	--
District	100.0	20.4		14.1	188.2
State	96.1	18.8		13.9	230.6

* Parental contact includes parent-teacher conferences, parental visits to school, school visits to home, telephone conversations, and written correspondence.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE (as of the first school day in May)

Grades	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 - 12
School	15.2	13.5	12.3	17.0						
District	18.8	17.2	17.9	21.2						
State	20.9	21.0	21.3	21.8						

TIME DEVOTED TO TEACHING CORE SUBJECTS (Minutes Per Day)

Grades	Mathematics			Science			English/Language Arts			Social Science		
	3	6	8	3	6	8	3	6	8	3	6	8
School	60			30			120			30		
District	60			30			120			30		
State	58			30			145			31		


TEACHER INFORMATION (Full-Time Equivalents)								
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Native American	Male	Female	Total Number
District	99.9	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	88.9	227
State	85.1	8.8	4.6	1.2	0.2	23.0	77.0	127,010

TEACHER INFORMATION (Continued)					
	Average Teaching Experience (Years)	% of Teachers with Bachelor's Degrees	% of Teachers with Master's & Above	% of Teachers with Emergency or Provisional Credentials	% of Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
School	--	--	--	0.0	0.0
District	15.1	48.4	51.6	0.0	0.0
State	12.9	47.6	52.3	1.5	3.2

Some teacher/administrator data are not collected at the school level.


SCHOOL DISTRICT FINANCES

TEACHER/ADMINISTRATOR SALARIES (Full-Time Equivalents)



Salaries and counts of staff are summed across a district based on the percentage of time that each individual is employed as a teacher or an administrator and may or may not reflect the actual paid salaries for the district.

EXPENDITURE BY FUNCTION 2005-06 (Percentages)



REVENUE BY SOURCE 2005-06				EXPENDITURE BY FUND 2005-06			
	District	District %	State %		District	District %	State %
Local Property Taxes	\$14,005,928	44.9	58.8	Education	\$23,353,119	77.5	73.0
Other Local Funding	\$2,610,532	8.4	6.0	Operations & Maintenance	\$2,769,313	9.2	8.6
General State Aid	\$9,183,802	29.5	18.2	Transportation	\$1,566,204	5.2	3.9
Other State Funding	\$2,853,935	9.2	9.3	Bond and Interest	\$300,741	1.0	6.2
Federal Funding	\$2,529,972	8.1	7.7	Rent	\$0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	\$31,184,169			Municipal Retirement/ Social Security	\$465,779	1.5	1.8
				Fire Prevention & Safety	\$1,667,732	5.5	1.1
				Site & Construction/ Capital Improvement	\$0	0.0	5.4
				TOTAL	\$30,122,888		


OTHER FINANCIAL INDICATORS				
	2004 Equalized Assessed Valuation per Pupil	2004 Total School Tax Rate per \$100	2005-06 Instructional Expenditure per Pupil	2005-06 Operating Expenditure per Pupil
District	\$112,391	2.70	\$4,210	\$7,155
State	**	**	\$5,567	\$9,488

** Due to the way Illinois school districts are configured, state averages for equalized assessed valuation per pupil and total school tax rate per \$100 are not provided.
Equalized assessed valuation includes all computed property values upon which a district's local tax rate is calculated.
Total school tax rate is a district's total tax rate as it appears on local property tax bills.
Instructional expenditure per pupil includes the direct costs of teaching pupils or the interaction between teachers and pupils.
Operating expenditure per pupil includes the gross operating cost of a school district excluding summer school, adult education, bond principal retired, and capital expenditures.


ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

OVERALL STUDENT PERFORMANCE

These charts present the overall percentages of state test scores categorized as meeting or exceeding the Illinois Learning Standards for your school, district, and the state. They represent your school's performance in reading, mathematics and science.




OVERALL ILLINOIS STANDARDS ACHIEVEMENT TEST (ISAT) PERFORMANCE



ISAT PERFORMANCE

These charts provide information on attainment of the Illinois Learning Standards. They show the percents of student scores meeting or exceeding Standards for the grades and subjects tested on ISAT.

**PERFORMANCE ON STATE ASSESSMENTS**

Federal law requires that student achievement results for reading, mathematics and science for schools providing Title I services be reported to the general public.

The Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) is administered to students in grades 3 through 8. The Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE) is administered to students in grade 11. The Illinois Measure of Annual Growth in English (IMAGE) is administered to limited-English-proficient students. The Illinois Alternate Assessment (IAA) is administered to students with disabilities whose Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) indicate that participation in the ISAT or PSAE would not be appropriate.

Students with disabilities have an IEP (No Child Left Behind Act). An IEP is a written plan for a child with a disability who is eligible to receive special education services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

In order to protect students' identities, test data for groups of fewer than ten students are not reported.

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS NOT TESTED IN STATE TESTING PROGRAMS														
		Gender			Racial/Ethnic Background						LEP	Migrant	Students with Disabilities	Economically Disadvantaged
		All	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	Native American	Multi racial /Ethnic				
School	*Enrollment	46	32	14	45					1			6	20
	Reading Mathematics	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0									0.0 0.0
District	*Enrollment	2,314	1,188	1,126	2,189	9	32	20	20	44	8		423	1,068
	Reading Mathematics	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0		0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0			0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0
State	*Enrollment	1,084,882	553,532	530,308	595,977	214,100	206,359	41,730	1,757	23,196	84,125	548	158,457	455,494
	Reading Mathematics	0.2 0.2	0.1 0.1	0.1 0.1	0.1 0.1	0.2 0.2	0.1 0.1	0.1 0.1	0.2 0.2	0.0 0.0	0.2 0.2	0.2 0.2	0.5 0.5	0.1 0.1

* Enrollment as reported during the testing windows.

ILLINOIS STANDARDS ACHIEVEMENT TEST (ISAT)

The following tables show the percentages of student scores in each of four performance levels. These levels were established with the help of Illinois educators who teach the grade levels and learning areas tested. Due to rounding, the sum of the percentages in the four performance levels may not always equal 100.

- Level 1 -- Academic Warning - Student work demonstrates limited knowledge and skills in the subject. Because of major gaps in learning, students apply knowledge and skills ineffectively.
- Level 2 -- Below Standards - Student work demonstrates basic knowledge and skills in the subject. However, because of gaps in learning, students apply knowledge and skills in limited ways.
- Level 3 -- Meets Standards - Student work demonstrates proficient knowledge and skills in the subject. Students effectively apply knowledge and skills to solve problems.
- Level 4 -- Exceeds Standards - Student work demonstrates advanced knowledge and skills in the subject. Students creatively apply knowledge and skills to solve problems and evaluate the results.

Grade 3

Grade 3 - All

Levels	Reading				Mathematics			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
School	0.0	10.9	65.2	23.9	0.0	4.3	43.5	52.2
District	3.0	15.0	54.6	27.4	1.2	7.5	44.6	46.6
State	5.3	21.7	48.8	24.1	3.7	9.5	44.7	42.0

Grade 3 - Gender

Levels	Reading				Mathematics				
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Male	School	0.0	9.4	62.5	28.1	0.0	3.1	40.6	56.3
	District	5.3	16.7	54.5	23.4	1.4	6.7	45.0	46.9
	State	7.0	24.3	47.5	21.2	4.3	9.4	43.2	43.1
Female	School	0.0	14.3	71.4	14.3	0.0	7.1	50.0	42.9
	District	0.5	13.0	54.7	31.8	1.0	8.3	44.3	46.4
	State	3.6	19.0	50.2	27.2	3.1	9.7	46.4	40.9

Grade 3 - Racial/Ethnic Background

Levels	Reading				Mathematics				
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
White	School	0.0	11.1	66.7	22.2	0.0	4.4	44.4	51.1
	District	3.2	15.3	54.1	27.4	1.3	7.1	44.9	46.7
	State	2.7	14.9	50.5	31.9	1.2	4.9	41.6	52.3
Black	School								
	District								
	State	12.3	37.2	42.4	8.1	10.8	21.0	49.7	18.4
Hispanic	School								
	District								
	State	6.1	28.2	52.2	13.5	3.5	11.7	53.8	31.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	School								
	District								
	State	1.1	9.2	48.4	41.4	0.5	2.4	27.8	69.2
Native American	School								
	District								
	State	4.7	16.4	56.9	22.0	1.7	7.8	50.2	40.3
Multiracial/Ethnic	School								
	District	0.0	9.1	72.7	18.2	0.0	18.2	54.5	27.3
	State	4.9	22.3	50.0	22.8	2.8	9.9	47.9	39.5

Grade 3 - Economically Disadvantaged

Levels	Reading				Mathematics				
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Free/Reduced Price Lunch	School	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	60.0	30.0
	District	4.5	20.9	53.2	21.4	2.0	11.9	49.8	36.3
	State	9.8	33.1	46.4	10.8	7.2	16.5	51.6	24.6
Not Eligible	School	0.0	0.0	57.7	42.3	0.0	0.0	30.8	69.2
	District	1.5	9.0	56.0	33.5	0.5	3.0	39.5	57.0
	State	2.2	13.5	50.6	33.8	1.1	4.5	39.8	54.6

2007 ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS (AYP) Status Report

Is this school making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	Yes	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this school making AYP in Reading?	Yes	2007-08 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this school making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2007-08 State Improvement Status	

	Percent Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards *						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target **	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target **	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		55.0			55.0			90.0		72.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	92.5		Yes	97.5		Yes	94.7	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes										
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities														
Economically Disadvantaged														

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP):

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 55.0% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 55.0% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. ***
3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 55.0% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 72% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2006.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 55.0% or above are not printed.

*** Subgroups with fewer than 45 students are not reported. Safe Harbor only applies to subgroups of 45 or more. In order for Safe Harbor to apply, a subgroup must decrease by 10% the percentage of scores that did not meet state standards from the previous year plus meet the other indicators (attendance rate for non-high schools and graduation rate for high schools) for the subgroup. For subgroups that do not meet their Safe Harbor Targets, a 75% confidence interval is applied. Safe Harbor allows schools an alternate method to meet subgroup minimum targets on achievement.

PLANNED IMPROVEMENT FOR THE SCHOOL AND DISTRICT

This is the final section of the school report card in which your school and district provide information below on areas of success and areas for planned improvement based on your school's improvement plan.

(For report cards disseminated electronically, this information may be provided in a separate document due to differences in the software used. If you are unable to locate this document, please contact your local school or district office.)

L.E. Starke Primary School participates in an annual school-wide improvement planning process (SWIP). The SWIP process requires the use of data as the basis of discovering targeted goals for improvement. The data sources used to inform L.E. Starke's Improvement Plan include:

- 1) Starke's May, 2008 Grade Level Writing Rubric Scores as compared to October's Baseline Scores;
- 2) Documentation of Principal Visits (minimum of 2) to observe best practices being taught;
- 3) Documentation of Peer Observations (minimum of 1) of best practices being taught and a reflective piece;
- 4) Documentation of Teacher Share-outs of Best Practices during staff meetings (everyone does minimum of 1);
- 5) Planning Summaries from Released Planning Time Meetings and;
- 6) Documentation of each Grade Level Writing Rubric.

The annual SWIP process incorporates processes and tools that involve the entire building in selecting research-based strategies to address improvement goals. The following goal was selected for this school year:

- 1) If all Starke teachers use writing best practices and increase time spent on writing instruction then 90% of our students' writing scores will improve by May 2008, as measured by our spring grade level writing rubric (check list).