

Local Board Approved	11/16/2011
Initial Submission	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	



Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 1 - 2011 AYP Report

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this School been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2011-12 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2011-12 State Improvement Status	

	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
Student Groups	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		85.0			85.0			91.0		82.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	68.9		No	86.5		Yes	98.1	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	73.3	84.3	No	85.0		Yes	98.5			
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian														

American Indian														
Two or More Races														
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities														
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	62.0	72.6	No	82.0		Yes	97.9			

**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 85% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 85% 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 85% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 91% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 82% graduation rate for high schools.

\* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2010.

\*\* Safe Harbor Targets of 85% 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.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 2 - 2011 AMAO Report

Schools are not accountable for AMAO. This is a district level requirement only.

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

School Information	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Attendance Rate (%)	96.0	95.5	94.9	94.9	95.1	93.7	98.1	98.1
Truancy Rate (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	2.4	3.6
Mobility Rate (%)	26.7	40.9	23.3	39.7	10.6	14.0	14.7	41.5
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	249	249	258	255	278	330	331	328
Low Income (%)	41.8	44.2	50.0	49.4	57.9	65.8	73.1	69.2
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.0
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.4	22.0
White, non-Hispanic (%)	94.0	90.8	89.5	89.0	87.1	82.4	85.2	84.1
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	4.0	1.2	3.1	2.0	1.4	7.0	5.1	6.4
Hispanic (%)	1.6	2.4	2.3	2.0	1.8	0.6	1.2	0.9
Asian (%)	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.9	0.3	0.9
American Indian(%)	0.0	0.4	0.4	1.2	0.4	0.6	0.0	0.0
Two or More Races (%)	-	4.8	4.3	5.5	8.6	8.5	8.2	7.6
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0

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

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	American Indian (%)	Two Or More Races (%)	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander (%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	2000	93.8	4.3	0.5	1.4	-	-	-
	2001	92.3	4.9	0.6	2.2	-	-	-
	2002	91.5	5.8	1.4	1.4	-	-	-
	2003	91.0	6.2	2.1	0.7	-	-	-
	2004	94.0	4.0	1.6	0.4	-	-	-
	2005	90.8	1.2	2.4	0.4	0.4	4.8	-
	2006	89.5	3.1	2.3	0.4	0.4	4.3	-
	2007	89.0	2.0	2.0	0.4	1.2	5.5	-
	2008	87.1	1.4	1.8	0.7	0.4	8.6	-
	2009	82.4	7.0	0.6	0.9	0.6	8.5	-
	2010	85.2	5.1	1.2	0.3	-	8.2	-
2011	84.1	6.4	0.9	0.9	-	7.6	-	
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	2000	89.5	8.8	0.8	0.8	0.1	-	-
	2001	89.0	9.2	1.0	0.7	0.1	-	-
	2002	89.1	9.2	1.0	0.6	-	-	-
	2003	88.5	9.7	1.0	0.6	-	-	-
	2004	88.0	10.0	1.1	0.8	0.1	-	-
	2005	87.9	9.1	1.3	0.8	0.1	0.7	-
	2006	87.2	9.7	1.1	0.8	0.2	1.1	-
	2007	87.5	8.8	1.2	0.8	0.2	1.5	-
	2008	87.3	8.4	1.2	0.8	0.1	2.2	-
	2009	86.7	8.0	1.2	0.9	0.1	3.2	-
	2010	85.5	8.4	1.3	0.9	0.1	3.9	-

	2011	84.5	8.5	1.4	1.0	0.1	4.5	-
S T A T E	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7	-
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8	-
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2	-
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7	-
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5	-
	2010	52.8	18.8	21.1	4.2	0.2	2.9	-
	2011	51.4	18.3	23.0	4.1	0.3	2.8	0.1

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 5 - Educational Environment

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truancy (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	-	35.2	100.0	96.0	12.4	-	-	-	-
	2001	-	36.3	100.0	94.9	37.4	-	-	-	-
	2002	-	35.5	100.0	95.8	29.5	-	-	-	-
	2003	-	39.4	100.0	95.4	34.4	-	-	-	-
	2004	0.4	41.8	100.0	96.0	26.7	-	-	-	-
	2005	0.4	44.2	100.0	95.5	40.9	-	-	-	-
	2006	-	50.0	100.0	94.9	23.3	-	-	-	-
	2007	-	49.4	100.0	94.9	39.7	-	-	-	-
	2008	0.4	57.9	100.0	95.1	10.6	-	-	-	-
	2009	0.3	65.8	100.0	93.7	14.0	9	2.4	-	-
	2010	-	73.1	100.0	98.1	14.7	8	2.4	-	-
2011	-	69.2	100.0	98.1	41.5	12	3.6	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	0.2	38.9	91.5	94.2	24.7	116	1.8	4.7	75.3
	2001	0.2	38.5	84.8	93.5	28.9	121	1.9	4.2	74.4
	2002	0.1	41.1	86.0	94.1	34.3	169	2.6	3.6	76.6
	2003	0.2	39.0	91.5	94.3	30.5	158	2.5	2.7	78.5
	2004	0.3	42.5	92.3	93.9	33.1	155	2.5	2.5	82.7
	2005	0.1	44.5	97.8	94.4	26.6	145	2.3	2.7	84.5
	2006	0.1	44.1	97.6	94.0	24.4	155	2.5	1.9	87.6
	2007	0.2	43.8	98.1	94.1	24.7	118	1.9	2.6	88.1
	2008	0.2	48.1	98.1	93.4	15.0	210	3.2	1.9	88.9
	2009	0.1	47.4	98.7	93.8	13.7	306	4.6	2.5	91.0
	2010	0.1	52.7	98.8	94.7	14.9	174	2.6	1.4	90.1
2011	0.3	50.6	98.3	93.8	14.4	177	2.8	1.9	87.9	

S T A T E	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
	2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1
	2010	7.6	45.4	96.2	93.9	13.0	72,383	3.6	3.8	87.8
	2011	8.8	48.1	96.0	94.0	12.8	63,067	3.2	2.7	83.8

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

Section I A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 6 - Enrollment Trends

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	368	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	325	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	293	85	1	-	-	-	-
	2003	289	91	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	249	73	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	249	58	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	258	64	-	-	-	-	-
	2007	255	44	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	278	82	-	-	-	-	-
	2009	330	74	-	-	-	-	-
	2010	331	80	1	-	-	-	-
	2011	328	83	-	-	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	6,604	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	6,659	484	516	519	536	544	463
	2002	6,551	467	485	510	542	566	547
	2003	6,573	484	467	477	549	574	542
	2004	6,518	440	479	472	558	555	574
	2005	6,513	422	448	487	512	580	554
	2006	6,484	422	430	460	513	513	556
	2007	6,431	472	426	432	514	505	540
	2008	6,470	515	472	429	479	521	553
	2009	6,060	466	492	456	449	460	449
	2010	6,389	491	483	511	447	463	497
	2011	6,238	508	483	477	463	451	507
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-

S T A T E	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2,044,539	164,413	157,570	159,499	160,924	156,451	138,559
	2004	2,060,048	161,329	160,246	158,367	162,933	160,271	139,504
	2005	2,062,912	156,370	158,622	160,365	162,047	162,192	142,828
	2006	2,075,277	155,155	154,372	158,822	160,362	160,911	147,500
	2007	2,077,856	155,356	153,480	154,719	162,594	159,038	150,475
	2008	2,074,167	155,578	152,895	153,347	160,039	161,310	149,710
	2009	2,070,125	156,512	152,736	152,820	155,433	158,700	144,822
	2010	2,064,312	155,468	154,389	152,681	154,465	154,982	146,919
	2011	2,074,806	153,516	153,301	154,241	153,981	153,986	151,059

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 7 - Educator Data

\*\*Educator Data is available only for district level\*\*

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials (%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	414	16	39,188	46	54	18	32	-	-
	2001	415	15	40,601	50	50	18	36	-	-
	2002	428	15	41,661	53	47	17	36	-	1
	2003	417	16	41,478	49	51	17	40	1	-
	2004	375	17	44,287	45	55	19	37	-	-
	2005	418	15	43,727	50	51	17	31	1	-
	2006	432	13	41,789	54	46	18	25	2	-
	2007	438	13	42,012	50	50	18	20	2	1
	2008	460	13	43,594	48	52	18	20	2	-
	2009	449	14	45,409	45	55	15	19	1	-
	2010	436	14	47,161	46	54	19	21	1	-
2011	407	15	46,810	46	54	19	23	-	-	
	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2

S T A T E	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1
	2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1
	2010	132,502	13	63,296	42	57	18	18	1	1
	2011	128,262	13	64,978	40	60	19	19	1	1

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 8a - Assessment Data (Reading)

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2006-2011																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	82.5	92.5	88.6	67.1	74.6	66.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	83.3	92.3	90.0	69.6	79.1	70.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	70.0	-	91.6	33.3	53.3	57.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	81.5	88.2	85.7	63.1	65.9	59.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 8b - Assessment Data (Mathematics)

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2006-2011																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	90.5	100.0	93.7	79.8	85.9	88.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	90.7	100.0	92.9	81.1	90.4	86.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	90.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	70.0	-	91.7	66.7	73.3	85.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	88.9	100.0	92.9	75.5	81.9	85.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

## Section I-A Data &amp; Analysis - Report Card Data

**Data** - What do the School Report Card data tell you about student performance in your school? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are indicated?

ISAT DATA:

The School Report Card data reflect a decrease in student achievement from 2010 to 2011 for students assessed on the ISAT in Reading and an increase in achievement in **Mathematics**.

Adams School did not make AYP in the area of Reading- 66.7% of the students fell in the meets and exceeds category. This is compared to 72.5% at the district level and 74.7% at the state level. **The number of male students who were meeting or exceeding was 8.6% lower than female students. The subgroup of Low Income students meeting or exceeding was 59.3% and Non- Low-Income 83.3%, a difference of 24%. The difference in IEP students and non-IEP students was 11.7%. The subgroup of multiracial students (two or more races) meeting or exceeding was 60% and the white subgroup was 70.5%.**

Adams School did make AYP in the area of Mathematics-The mathematical assessment data shows that student achievement went from 82.6% of the student body met or exceeded on the 2010 ISAT to **88.5% meeting or exceeding in 2011. 94.3% of females were meeting or exceeding standards and 83.7% of males were meeting or exceeding. The sub groups comparing Low Income students and non-Low income students showed a difference of 10.6%. The difference in IEP students and non-IEP students was 3.4%. The subgroup of multiracial students (two or more races) meeting or exceeding was 90% and the white subgroup was 86.9%.**

Reading Areas of weakness according to ISAT results:

## Standard 1A - Vocabulary Development

1.3.01 Determine the meaning of an unknown word using knowledge of common prefixes, suffixes, and word roots (see Roots and Affixes List) (e.g., use knowledge of the prefix dis- to determine the meaning of disrespect).

1.3.06 Determine the meaning of unknown compound words by applying knowledge of individual known words (e.g., baseball).

**1.3.07 Determine the meaning of unknown words using within-sentence clues.**

**Standard 1B, 1C - Reading Strategies**

1.3.12 Activate prior knowledge to establish purpose for reading a given passage.

**1.3.13 Identify probable outcomes or actions.**

**Standard 1C - Reading Comprehension: Literal or Simple Inferences**

1.3.20 Determine the answer to a literal or simple inference question regarding the meaning of a passage.

**Drawing Conclusions Based on Evidence**

1.3.25 Differentiate between fact and opinion.

**Author's Purpose and Design**

**1.3.28 Identify the author's purpose for writing a fiction or nonfiction text, (e.g., to entertain or to inform).**

**Standard 2A - Literary Elements and Techniques:**

**Story and Literary Structure**

2.3.04 Identify setting (i.e., place and time period).

**2.3.05 Identify author's message.**

**Characterization**

2.3.07 Determine what characters are like by what they say or do by how the author or illustrator portrays them.

Reading Areas of Strength according to ISAT results:

Standard 1A - Vocabulary Development

1.3.09 Use synonyms to define words.

Standard 1B, 1C - Reading Strategies

1.3.14 Use information in illustrations to help understand a reading passage.

Standard 1C - Reading Comprehension: Summarizing and Main Idea

1.3.21 Distinguish the main ideas and supporting details in any text.

Interpreting Instructions

1.3.27 Determine whether a set of simple instructions or procedures is complete and, therefore, clear (e.g., if incomplete, identify what is missing).

Standard 2A - Literary Elements and Techniques:

Story and Literary Structure

2.3.02 Identify main and supporting characters.

2.3.03 Identify events important to the development of the plot.

Mathematics Areas of weakness according to ISAT results:

## Standard 6A - Representations and Ordering

6.3.03 Recognize a fraction represented with a pictorial model.

6.3.04 Represent multiplication as repeated addition.

## Standards 6B, 6C - Computation, Operations, Estimation, and Properties

6.3.11 Model and apply basic multiplication facts (up to  $10 \times 10$ ), and apply them to related multiples of 10 (e.g.,  $3 \times 4 = 12$ ,  $30 \times 4 = 120$ ).

6.3.14 Make estimates appropriate to a given situation with whole numbers.

## Standards 7A, 7B, 7C - Units, Tools, Estimation, and Applications

7.3.04 Solve problems involving the area of a figure when whole and half square units are shown within the figure.

7.3.06 Determine the volume of a solid figure that shows cubic units.

## Standard 8A - Representations, Patterns, and Expressions

8.3.05 Solve word problems involving unknown quantities

## Standard 9A - Properties of Single Figures and Coordinate Geometry

9.3.05 Identify images resulting from flips (reflections), slides (translations), or turns (rotations).

## Standards 10A, 10B - Data Analysis and Statistics

10.3.02 Complete missing parts of a pictograph, bar graph, tally chart, or table for a given set of data.

10.3.05 Describe the chances associated with a context presented visually, including using the response format “3 out of 4.”

-

Mathematics Areas of Strength according to ISAT results:

Standard 6A - Representations and Ordering

6.3.08 Solve problems involving descriptions of numbers, including characteristics and relationships (e.g., odd/even, factors/multiples, greater than, less than).

Standards 6B, 6C - Computation, Operations, Estimation, and Properties

6.3.10 Solve problems involving the value of a collection of bills and coins whose total value is \$10.00 or less, and make change.

Standards 7A, 7B, 7C - Units, Tools, Estimation, and Applications

7.3.02 Select and use appropriate standard units and tools to measure length (to the nearest inch or cm), time (to the nearest minute), and temperature (to the nearest degree).

Standard 9A - Properties of Single Figures and Coordinate Geometry

9.3.11 Determine the distance between two points on the number line in whole numbers.

Standards 10A, 10B - Data Analysis and Statistics

10.3.03 Determine the mode, given a set of data or a graph.

10.3.04 Classify events using words such as certain, most likely, equally likely, least likely, possible, and impossible.

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

- Some culminating factors contributing to the successes of our school include
  - a comparable student demographics and characteristics (diverse race/ethnicity) to that of the districts population. We believe this enables our students to enjoy having learning partners and friendships of diverse backgrounds.
  - Implementation of the Comprehensive Literacy Model with all grades helps to maintain strong core classroom. This allows for differentiated instruction to meet individual student needs and continued progress monitoring showing strengths and next steps for teaching. Through the use of PLCs educators can continue to grow in their understanding of student literacy behaviors.
  - The implementation of Tier I interventions by classroom teachers and Tier II and Tier III interventions by trained interventionists.
  - 60% of all Kindergarten teachers had Reading Recovery training; 80% of all Kindergarten teachers had CIM (Comprehensive Intervention Model) training
  - In first grade, 12/60 (20%) of students meeting or exceeding proficiency received intervention in reading.
  - District professional development opportunities.
  - 53% of teachers took part in coaching cycles with a trained District Coach. Many of these teachers were involved in more than one coaching cycle in Core Classroom instruction.
  - Teachers were given an uninterrupted time for their literacy block
  - Monthly PLC (Professional Learning Communities) at each grade level
- Some culminating factors contributing to the challenges of our school include:

- The Poverty Index Level of the school is 73.1 based on the 2010 Illinois School Report Card. This is compared to 52.7 at the district level and 45.4 at the state level. The Poverty Index Level for the 2010-2011 school year is an all time high for Adams Elementary School, with an increase of 7.3% from the previous year. The data from the School Performance Profile (3<sup>rd</sup> grade ISAT) shows the biggest discrepancies between students who are meeting or exceeding standards and those who are not is in the subgroup of Low Income (59.3%) and Non- Low-Income (83.3%), a difference of 24%. This information aligns closely with the Adams School end of the year data from the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment.

- Increasing mobility of students. Our mobility rate is 14.7 and our attendance rate is 98.1.

- **Continual district budget cuts. 2010 budget cuts resulted in losing 3.5 intervention teachers.** In addition, reduction in the number of children who attended early childhood created less prior knowledge for children entering Kindergarten. Some students not meeting proficiency were unable to be served in intervention (approaching students in writing) due to decreased in intervention teachers.

Adams Elementary School serves as home to two cross-categorical special education rooms, as well as, students with IEPs being served by a resource teacher and speech and language pathologist. The percentage of students with IEPs at Adams Elementary is 15.4 compared to 14.4 at the district level and 13.1 at the state level.

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

1. Focus on ways to better help low SES population and supporting parents with limited resources.
  - Relationship building is the key.
  - Communication with families through notes, phone calls and personal contacts.
  - Involve parents - Join PTA, curriculum Night, Open House, Parent/Child activity, Family Read Night
  - Obtain more community support.
2. Supporting students with Social/Emotional issues to allow them better access to the learning environment.

3. Additional personnel are necessary to support students in need of intervention during the school day.
4. Find ways to build background knowledge for students that did not attend Early Childhood (experiences).
5. Use ongoing assessments to guide and inform our instruction.
6. **Professional development through PLC meetings, SIP days and coaching cycles focusing on Core Classroom** delivered with fidelity, literacy and students from low SES backgrounds in order to accelerate their learning,
7. Continued collaboration with Intervention Team
8. High Expectations for all students.

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

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

1. Both Second and Third Grade students were assessed using the SAT 10 (Stanford Achievement Test) in the fall of 2009. Scores are reported using NCEs (National Curve Equivalents)
2. All students were given a locally selected universal assessment -Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessment with its accompanying comprehension measure. For the First Quarter in Kindergarten- the proficiency levels were measured using the TROLL- Teacher Rating of Oral Language and Literacy. Students were placed on the assessment wall to show below, approaching, meeting and exceeding in proficiency.

	NCE 40 and Below	NCE 41-60	NCE 61-99
--	------------------	-----------	-----------

3. Writing Proficiency levels were created using state and national primary standards. The children were assessed on their understanding of the writing

		Average	Exceeding
2 <sup>nd</sup>	53%	25%	15%
3 <sup>rd</sup>	44%	46%	10%
Entire School	48%	36%	13%

process using an unassisted writing prompt, as well as a writing portfolio kept throughout the year. Samples were scored using a grade-specific benchmark writing rubric that measured proficiency.

1. Stanford Achievement Test

According to the Stanford 10 achievement test, which was given in the fall of 2010-2011 school year, 49% of Adams School students taking the test scored at or average or above on Total Reading. This beginning of the year assessment (Fall) is lower than the end of the year benchmark assessment, with 73.5% of the students meeting or exceeding - indicating growth as a whole for our school.

As a result of the heavy emphasis on early intervention, coaching cycles and overall professional learning, our students have grown in both reading and writing. The data shows that Adams School had an increase in students meeting and exceeding in district benchmarks in all four grade levels (comparisons between first quarter proficiencies and fourth quarter proficiencies).

All School Proficiencies Fall-Spring

Level of Proficiency	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
	Below	Below	Approaching	Approaching	Meets	Meets	Exceeds	Exceeds

As a result of the heavy emphasis on early intervention, coaching

	(1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter)		(1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter)		(1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter)		(1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter)	
K	14%	9%	26%	6%	32%	54%	28%	31%
1	18%	17%	10%	7%	28%	21%	44%	55%
2	33%	21%	13%	11%	15%	35%	39%	33%
3	30%	23%	11%	14%	31%	23%	28%	40%
Whole School	24%	16.9%	15%	9.5%	27%	33.8%	34%	39.7%

cycles and overall professional learning, our students have grown in both reading and writing - as evidenced by the attached data and charts. The data shows that Adams School had an increase in students meeting and exceeding in district benchmarks in all four grade levels. This data reflects the proficiencies of all students at Adams School.

These results show that students in intervention made larger gains than students who did not receive interventions.

	2010-2011 Adams Student Average Growth	Typical Growth (Meeting-Meeting)	Intervention Growth
1st Grade	4.65	5	5.14
2nd Grade	3.04	3	3.58
3rd Grade	3.4	3	4

Kindergarten has been omitted due to the TROLL being used as the first quarter assessment and the Fountas and Pinnell during the other three quarters. The level of growth is skewed for Kindergarten due to all kindergarteners (no matter their TROLL level) given a “0” as a starting point for text level growth. Some students who received intervention may have been markedly below others in the meeting range on the TROLL. This data would not properly be reflected in average growth.

The following table presents data that was disaggregated to examine proficiency levels of sub-groups according to the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment.

Sub-group category	Exceeding	Meeting	Proficient and Above	Approaching	Below	Below proficiency

Transfer students (last nine weeks)- 4	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Racial/Ethnic Minority						
Asian (3 student)	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>66.6%</b>
African-American (22 students)	<b>23%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>41%</b>
Hispanic/Latino (3 students)	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
White(278 students)	<b>39%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>25%</b>
Multi-Ethnic	<b>38%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>43%</b>

(26 students)						
Low SES (free/reduced lunch)						
Kindergarten ( 59 students)	25%	54%	79%	10%	11%	21%
First ( 63 students)	37%	14%	51%	10%	39%	49%
Second ( 52 students)	27%	29%	56%	8%	36%	44%
Third (55 students)	22%	27%	49%	15%	36%	51%
(229 students) Total	28%	31%	59%	11%	30%	41%
Gender						

Female Achievement ( students)	41%	48%	89%	2%	9%	11%
Male Achievement ( students)	21%	59%	80%	10%	10%	20%

During the 2010-2011 school year, Adams Elementary fully implemented the Writing Proficiency Document created by our District Literacy Team. Using this information, we added writing to our wall and we used this information to plan instruction and interventions, as well as, to provide feedback only to the District Team, in order to help with creating a final document for Quincy Public Schools. Using the writing proficiencies helped us to begin to align our writing instruction to state, national, and district standards. This enabled us to hold ourselves and our students to higher expectations. The result was a curriculum aligned closely between grade levels and deeper conversations in PLCs (Professional learning Communities) about grade level expectations.

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

The factors that are likely to have contributed to these results are the same as in Section 1-A;

Low income rate increase (limited parental resources), mobility rate and district budget cuts.

Other factors contributing to success include the diversity of student backgrounds, implementation of the Comprehensive Literacy Model throughout the school, continued professional development in the Comprehensive

Intervention Model for classroom teachers and interventionists, District professional development opportunities, coaching cycles, and monthly PLC meetings.

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

Teachers will be provided two days district school improvement days and a variety of in-service days throughout the school year to learn a multitude of methods on how to support all of their students holistically. Using the work of Dr. Ruby Payne, Peter Johnston and Dr. Murphy the staff will be given the opportunity to explore, as a team, ways to reach students coming from different backgrounds, such as low SES. Professional development opportunities need to be planned to educate staff on how to meet the needs of students of poverty, who are often challenged academically and/or social/emotionally, while considering the diverse cultural backgrounds of each. Through the continued implementation of PBIS and the Covey Seven Habits the staff will work with students and parents to create a learning environment.

All teachers will participate in a books study: Nurturing Independent Learners: Helping Students Take Charge of Their Learning by Meichenbaum and Biemiller.

Coaching cycles/Adams Elementary 2011-2012 school-year. Ongoing PD through Peer Observations and colleague videos facilitated by District coaches/Adams Elementary/NLU (2011-2012). Teachers are given the opportunity to visit their peers within their serving school and/or around the district in effort to collaborate with one another. Videotaping and colleague visits (Adams Elementary School), then viewed and discussed in PLCs.

Continue to support CIM training for all who work in an intervention capacity- facilitate meetings between special education and literacy professionals (2011-2012).

---

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

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

Attributes

- PLC meetings
- Administrative support
- Teachers' desire to learn more to better serve our student population /Staff dedication
- Extended day during the third and fourth quarter of the school year
- Common Assessments in place throughout the school and district
- Community building activities - Covey/PBIS
- Title I funding and staffing
- Literacy coach
- Star guide
- Parent involvement activities
- Active PTA

- Student potential
- Attendance rate is 98.1.

#### Challenges

- Large serving district
- Large IEP population (15.4)
- Class size with wide ranges of ability
- District budget reductions resulting in loss of staff and moving teachers to positions that may need additional support
- Loss of intervention support
- Diverse socio-economic needs
- Large population of students from low SES homes
- High social-emotional needs of students and families

Our mobility rate is 14.7

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

Dedicated staff with a focus on student achievement and well-being.

Professional development leads to increased teacher effectiveness.

Decrease in trained interventionists leads to less student access to Tier II and Tier III support.

High student mobility creates difficulties when students move in and out of district and building to building. Relationship building issues and gaps in learning issues arise.

Low income students with few life experiences necessary for learning. Parents have fewer resources- limited access to educational resources.

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

Increase response in social and emotional issues that arise- PBIS

Clearer understanding of ways to reach students with greater needs: low SES, reading and writing difficulties, mobility issues- Covey, Johnston, Payne studies. Higher implementation of the Covey Seven Habits. A more thorough implementation of the school's PBIS plan.

High collaboration with other schools across the district aligning instruction and intervention (both in curriculum and social/emotional needs).

Support for families with fewer resources in the home with ways to support their children in both academics and behavioral issues. - Parent Involvement.

Continual improvement in core classroom instruction with documentation of student performance and using this information to provide differentiated instruction and individualized interventions.

**Interventions that are closely aligned with classroom instruction and tailored to the needs of individual students.** Interventions will need to look closely and frequently at the effectiveness of the intervention and change as needed.

### Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)

#### Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

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

All certified and classified staff are highly qualified. A majority of the staff are tenured teachers with a variety of strengths in teaching. Continued literacy training with our literacy coach has allowed our staff to stay current in best teaching practices. Staff have been trained in 7 Habits of Highly Effective people, Positive Behavior and Intervention Supports, and Professional Learning Communities. All staff needs continued training in differentiated instruction to meet the academic and social emotional needs of all students.

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

Lack of funds and personnel are obstacles to our professional development and direct services to students. We continue to be inventive in planning PLC meetings to make sure our instruction is seamless school wide. Specific agendas for staff meetings, professional development and PLC meetings focus on the greatest needs and SIP goals of our building and district.

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

The next step is to be fiscally responsible when using funds to support professional development and purchasing resources and supplies. All meetings will focus on student progress and intervention. Additional training in Rtl in literacy, math, and social emotional standards will need to occur.

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

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

Parent contact has been ongoing at Adams School. Our active PTA continues to help facilitate learning opportunities through literature, cultural arts, and family activities. On Read Nights, Math Nights, grade level programs, Open House, Parent Teacher Conferences and Curriculum Nights we have between 25% to 100% parent/guardian participation. Parent surveys indicate that 98% of our families/guardians are pleased with the services at Adams School.

Adult Mentors provided through the District's Child Mentor Program continue to support our school. The number of mentors (10) is the norm for our school. However, we will work on increasing mentor support for next year.

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

Research shows that parent involvement can have a positive impact on student performance. The number of parents who attend special events, volunteer in the classrooms, meet students for lunch, volunteer for PTA activities, and give us feedback show their support for our school and education. We continue to assist parents in their learning of current best teaching practices by inviting them to educational fun nights and adult/child activities during the school day. Without our parent involvement and volunteers our curriculum

would not be as rich and we would not be able to meet as many needs of students.

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

The next steps are to provide additional parent education in PBIS, and current academic best practices so they can see the process, understand it and support it.

Increased monitoring of attendance and utilizing our star guide to support parents in this area.

Increased use of support teams in the school to closely monitor student progress and programs.

We will continue to encourage parent/guardians involvement through a variety of methods at our school. We plan to add parent nights in the spring to increase family awareness and support the 7 Covey habits for Parents.

#### Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

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

- Dedicated staff with a focus on student achievement and well-being - continue to support staff with the tools they need to better serve their students.
- Professional development leads to increased teacher effectiveness - provide professional development for all staff in understanding the needs of a diverse student population, increased fidelity in core classroom and using assessment to drive instruction.
- Decrease in trained interventionist's leads to less student access to Tier II and Tier III support - provide the needed support for students who are not meeting proficiency.

- High student mobility creates difficulties when students move in and out of district and building to building. Relationship building issues and gaps in learning issues arise - collaborate closely with other K-3 buildings to continue intervention and provide seamless core classroom instruction. Quickly provide social/emotional support for students new to our building.

Low income students with few life experiences necessary for learning. Parents have fewer resources- **limited access to educational resources.**

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	<a href="#">Increase literacy achievement for all students.</a>	1,2,3,

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

- Ⓟ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓟ 2. White students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓟ 3. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Increase literacy achievement for all students.

Objective 1 Description

Our goal is to increase student achievement in literacy (reading and writing), shown on our local assessment wall and ISAT data to meeting state standards/proficiencies.

Accelerate the learning of students who come from low income families by strengthening our knowledge on how to reach all learners: through book study as a staff and targeted professional development in this area. Adams School Staff will discuss the use of language and how it affects student learning. The staff will work to, "...build emotionally and

relationally healthy learning communities.” (Johnston, 2004) In addition, we will discuss how poverty can impact student learning, work habits and decision making - (Payne, 1996) using the work of Peter Johnston, Dr. Murphy and Ruby Payne. Our goal is to call attention to the relationships between Literacy, the Covey Habits and PBIS.

Increase fidelity and implementation of core classroom instruction through the use of coaching cycles, grade level team goals, peer observations and the use of tools (research articles, text, list serves, and professional organizations) to build a more thorough knowledge of best practices and research based instruction.

**This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:**

- ⓑ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 2. White students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 3. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Increase literacy achievement for all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Student will participate in Reading Workshop (Guided Reading-differentiated instruction, reading conferences to focus on individual goals during independent reading, focused minilessons on reading strategies and behaviors, author-genre- language studies)	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Title I	
2	Students will participate in Writing Workshop closely aligned with the Common Core standards with focused instruction in personal narratives, poetry, writing about reading, and non-fiction writing (essays and informational texts)	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Title I	
3	K, 1, and Special Education Students will participate in : phonemic awareness activities using a resource from Michael Haggerty	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Title I	

4	Students not meeting or exceeding will receive a Tier I intervention from their Classroom teacher.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Title I	
5	Students not meeting or exceeding will receive a Tier II or Tier III intervention from a highly trained interventionist.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Title I	
6	Reading Recovery will be used as an intervention for at least 20 of the lowest achieving first grade students.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Title I	
7	Students will increase their ability to write about reading.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Title I	
8	Students will participate in running records, benchmark assessments, rubrics and writing proficiencies.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Title I	

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Increase literacy achievement for all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Building Literacy coach will provide professional development opportunities based on group needs (grade level goals). K- Work towards achieving 100% of the classrooms implementing the first four criterions in the ESAIL document with fidelity: Literate environment, organizes the classroom, data to inform instruction and differentiation. 1- Reading Workshop Phase II 2- Writing About Reading/Response Journals 3- Writing About Reading/Yearly Scope and Sequence The ESAIL (Environmental Scale for Assessing Implementation Levels of the PCL model) will be used to target specific areas. The ESAIL will be used two times (Fall and Spring) to document growth. This will take place during monthly PLC meetings.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Title I	
2	Building Literacy coach will provide professional development opportunities based on individual needs. This will be achieved through coaching cycles and individual collaboration times.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Title I	

3	Building Administrator will meet with the literacy coach once per week to discuss student and staff needs and growth in literacy development.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Title I	
4	Literacy intervention team will meet every other week to align interventions with classroom instruction and use data to problem-solve around students' individual learning needs, then use the information to adjust instruction, as needed. The team will use the resources: Interventions That Work (Dorn) and Writing to Read. To enhance their understanding and effectiveness with struggling learners.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Title I	
5	The literacy coach will continue professional development through continuing contact trainings at NLU for District Coaches. In addition, the coach will meet with district coaches one time per month in order to align instruction across the district.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Title I	
6	The literacy coach will participate in Literacy Lessons facilitated during Reading Recovery training sessions.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Title I	
7	Teachers will participate in SIP days provided by the school district.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Title I	
8	Teachers will observe colleagues and discuss instructional moves at their grade level.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Title I	

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Increase literacy achievement for all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Adams School will host an Open House prior to the first day of school to inform parents and students of their classroom and school expectations. We plan for increased participation from 85% to 90%	08/16/2011	08/16/2011	Before School	Other	
2	Adams School will host a Curriculum Night to clearly outline the year's curriculum and classroom routines and expectations. We plan to increase attendance from 42% to 60%	09/13/2011	09/13/2011	After School	Other	

3	Monthly Adult/Child Activities planned for educating families around Covey Leadership in our school.	10/03/2011	04/23/2012	During School	Title I	
4	100% of the Adams staff will meet with families for P/T Conferences to obtain information regarding their child's progress in school.	10/17/2011	11/02/2011	After School	Other	
5	Adams classroom teachers will distribute weekly newsletters to families regarding current events, areas of study, special upcoming events, special projects, and student accomplishments.	08/22/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Other	
6	Adams principal will distribute a monthly newsletter regarding current events, special upcoming events, special projects, and building accomplishments.	07/18/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Other	
7	Adams teachers will send home information regarding the Book It Program, Pizza Hut Reading Program, and Six Flags Reading Program along with independent reading books to encourage parents to read a variety of text at home with their children.	12/01/2011	05/21/2012	During School	Other	
8	Adams leadership will facilitate Parent Nights to teach the 7 Covey Habits for Families	01/17/2011	04/23/2012	After School	Title I	

## Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 1 Title :**

Increase literacy achievement for all students.

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

- Classroom teachers will monitor their student progress through the use of Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessment, informal assessment using student reading logs, response journals, teacher anecdotal notes from student conferences, guided reading planning notes, running records, comprehension checks, writing proficiencies, and any their pertinent literacy assessments.
- Our goal will also be accomplished through the continued implementation of the Comprehensive Literacy Model. Our focus will be on strengthening our core classroom instruction for students with fidelity and integrity. The ESAIL (Environmental Scale for Assessing Implementation Levels) will be used in the fall of 2011 to review goals and progress and in May 2012 to measure improvements in the school's implementation of the Comprehensive Literacy Model.
- Teachers will respond to their reading in their personal reflection logs.

All professional development will align with strengthening classroom instruction, a more in-depth use of assessment to inform instruction and better preparing staff to meet the needs of students from low-SES backgrounds.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	Name	Title
1	Marcey Wells	Principal
2	Heather Friday	Literacy Coach

---

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

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

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

All parents are provided written notice by receiving a copy of our school report card each year and by public reports during PTA meetings, Board of Education Meetings, Parents Right to Know letter from Mr. Lonnie Lemon (superintendent), school handbook and presentations during Parent Involvement Days.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation  
Part B. Stakeholder Involvement

**Stakeholder Involvement** - Describe specifically how stakeholders (including parents, school staff, and outside experts) have been consulted in the development of the plan. The names and titles of the school improvement team or plan developers must be identified here.

Development of our school improvement plan begins before the students begin the academic school year. As the year begins and progresses for the first two months, staff and parents are involved in a series of meetings, collaborative conversations, data analysis sessions and sub group reports. As a result if these trainings and meetings a draft plan is developed. This plan is reviewed by all stakeholders before being submitted I the state format.

	Name	Title
1	Marcey Wells	Principal
2	Vicki Ridder	Secretary
3	Chris Endebrock	Kindergarten Teacher
4	Meaghan Goehl	Kindergarten Teacher
5	Amy Mock	Kindergarten Teacher
6	Laura Snelling	Kindergarten Teacher
7	Lori Will	Kindergarten Teacher
8	Nicole Browning	First Grade Teacher
9	Sandy Cann	First Grade Teacher
10	Stacey Reichert	First Grade Teacher
11	Amber Speckhart	First Grade Teacher
12	Shelly Eager	Second Grade Teacher
13	Kathleen Miklius	Second Grade Teacher
14	Chris Spohr	Second Grade Teacher
15	Julie Tuley	Second Grade Teacher
16	Rebecca Gosnell	Third Grade Teacher
17	Tonya Rodemich	Third Grade Teacher
18	Polly Sprick	Third Grade Teacher
19	Jodi Whitfield	Third Grade Teacher
20	Lisa Cowman	Reading Interventionist
21	Ann Downey	Reading Interventionist
22	Heather Friday	Literacy Coach
23	Cindy Zimmerman	Reading Interventionist
24	Robin Cain	Special Education Resource
25	Kristin Hillebrenner	Special Education Self-Contained
26	Jordan Stegeman	Special Education Self-Contained
27	Sarah Guilford	General Music Teacher
28	Gloria Kirby	Physical Education Teacher

29	Denise Hruska	Paraeducator
30	Gayla Roberts	Paraeducator
31	Carla Shank	Paraeducator
32	Stacy Valentine	Paraeducator
33	Kima Walton	Paraeducator
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation  
Part C. Peer Review Process

**Peer Review** - Describe the district's peer review and approval process. Peer review teams should include teachers and administrators from schools and districts similar to the one in improvement, but significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students. As appropriate, peer reviewers may be teachers from other schools, personnel from other districts, Regional Office of Education staff, Intermediate Service Center staff, RESPRO staff, university faculty, consultants, et al., or combinations thereof. RESPRO staff serving on a School Support Team should not serve on a peer review team in the same district. The peer review should precede the local board approval and must be completed within 45 days of receiving the school improvement plan. For further description of the peer review process see LEA and School Improvement: Non-Regulatory Guidance, July 21, 2006, at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

Description of peer review process including participants and date(s) of peer review.

Trish Viniard, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum & Instruction

---

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation  
Part D. Teacher Mentoring Process

**Teacher Mentoring Process** - Describe the teacher mentoring program. Mentoring programs pair novice teachers with more experienced professionals who serve as role models and provide practical support and encouragement. Schools have complete discretion in deciding what else the teacher mentoring program should provide.

Quincy Public Schools has an induction and mentoring program for new teachers and teachers new to the district. One of the original ten pilot sites selected for the ISBE-funded *Beginning Teacher Induction Pilot Projects* grants in 2006, the program has grown and is now a state approved program. The project goals include: developing new teachers' understanding and implementation of the Professional Teaching Standards and relevant Content Area Standards; developing in new teachers a repertoire of effective, research-based instructional practices; developing trusting supportive and professional relationships and networks; developing reflective, analytical and self-assessment skills in new teachers; creating an effective, smooth transition from being a student to being a teaching professional; and to improve and maximize student learning and achievement. The project includes many components including formal mentor training, formal induction training for new teachers, monthly protégé and mentor trainings, dialogue journals, formative observations, an individual induction plan, and weekly contacts between mentors and protégés. Mentors are matched with new teachers in their first year of teaching with a ratio that is 3 to 1 or less. In most cases mentors and protégés work in the same building. Exceptions may include support staff where the number of support staff in a particular area may be small (e.g. physical education, music, psychologist, speech therapist). New teacher trainings are held once a month for the new teacher's first two years. Year one trainings include topics such as classroom management; parent involvement and communication; differentiating instruction; lesson planning tied to state standards; and, authentic assessment. Year two trainings address topics such as motivating and engaging instructional practices and assessment for learning. Ongoing mentor training occurs monthly.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation  
Part E. District Responsibilities

**District Responsibilities** - Specify the services and resources that the district has provided to revise the plan and other services that the district will provide toward implementation of strategies and activities. District technical assistance should include data analysis, identification of the school's challenges in implementing professional development requirements, the resulting need-related technical assistance and professional development to effect changes in instruction, and analysis and revision of the school's budget (NCLB, Section 1116). If applicable, identify corrective actions or restructuring options taken by the district.

The district provides key professional development funding and activities, especially in the areas addressed in each site's School Improvement Plan. Key activities for the 2011 - 2012 year include:

1. Building Literacy Coach and District Literacy Coach training

2. Special Education Strategic Processing Coach training;
3. **Partnerships in Comprehensive Literacy training for all new K - 6 teachers, and other teachers as appropriate.**
4. Literacy intervention training to meet Response to Intervention;
5. Training for all K - 6 teachers regarding core classroom curriculum and differentiation in math;
6. Math intervention training for targeted staff, with a focus on Tiers 1 and 2;
7. Math alignment (addressing curricular and instructional areas, including transition to new Common Core standards), K - 12.
8. Ongoing PBIS implementation training and other Social/Emotional-related training for targeted personnel.
9. Utilization of key grants (21<sup>st</sup> CCLC, Kern Foundation, Pre-AP, TAOEP, Mental Health, etc.) to provide targeted professional development within key initiative areas—including AVID and Project Lead the Way.
10. Consultation and assistance from Dr. Joseph Murphy (achievement gap and learning-centered leadership), Dr. Barbara Schubert (literacy and brain research), and Dr. Robyn Jackson (**engagement and rigor at the secondary level**) to improve and strengthen instructional programs.

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

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

- Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school.

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

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

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

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

	Name	Title
1		

## Section IV-A Local Board Action

**DATE APPROVED** by Local Board: 11/16/2011

**A. ASSURANCES**

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

**B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION**

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes  No

Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified? [C]

Yes  No

Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness? [C]

Yes  No

Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students? [C]

Yes  No

Does the analysis, along with other optional data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities? [C]

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes  No  N/A

If included, is there evidence that the SIP team analyzed optional data to clarify the areas of weakness?

Yes  No  N/A

Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?

Yes  No  N/A

Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes  No  N/A

If included, has the SIP team analyzed other available data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities?

Yes  No  N/A

Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?

Yes  No  N/A

Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

**IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS**

Yes  No Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance? [C]

Yes  No Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control? [C]

**CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES**

Yes  No Has the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan? [C]

Yes  No  N/A Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency? [C]

**ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES**

Yes  No Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?

Yes  No Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement? [C]

Yes  No Are the strategies and activities measurable? [C]

Yes  No Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified? [C]

Yes  No Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear? [C]

Yes  No  N/A Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students? [C]

Yes  No  N/A Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status or in special education non-compliance?

Yes  No  N/A Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities for students? [C]

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

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only) [C]
---	---

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the SIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes? [C]

PEER REVIEW

Yes  No

Is the peer review process described and is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have “the greatest likelihood” of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP? [C]

**TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS** Yes  No

Is it clear how the school is ensuring that teachers are receiving the support needed for their professional growth and to retain them in the profession? [C]

**DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES** Yes  No

Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]

 Yes  No  N/A

If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]

**STATE RESPONSIBILITIES** Yes  No

Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation? [C]

**SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM** Yes  No  N/A

Have the names and titles of School Support Team members been listed in the plan? Does the team appear to have the expertise to support this school in regards to the school improvement plan? [C]

**APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD** Yes  No

The plan indicates the approval date of this plan. [C]

**PART II - COMMENTS**