

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

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	010011720222006		
District Name:	Quincy SD 172	School Name:	Dewey Elementary School
Superintendent:	Lonny B Lemon	Principal:	Mrs. Krista Finklea
District Address:	1416 Maine St	School Address:	2040 Cherry St
City/State/Zip:	Quincy, IL 62301 4261	City/State/Zip:	Quincy, IL 62301 2210
District Telephone#:	Label 2172238700 Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	2172287117 Extn: 0
District Email:	lemonlo@qps.org	School Email:	
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2011 AYP 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	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	85.5		Yes	92.7		Yes	94.2	Yes		
White														
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian														

American Indian													
Two or More Races													
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander													
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 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 (%)	96.2	95.8	95.9	95.3	94.5	94.7	94.4	94.2
Truancy Rate (%)	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.4	0.4
Mobility Rate (%)	13.2	17.1	19.3	12.5	13.2	9.8	15.0	16.7
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	182	191	185	198	221	224	243	238
Low Income (%)	58.8	63.4	56.8	55.6	65.6	65.6	70.0	72.3
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.6	13.4
White, non-Hispanic (%)	85.2	80.6	83.8	85.9	83.3	83.9	81.5	80.3
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	11.0	11.0	5.4	5.1	8.6	8.9	9.1	8.8
Hispanic (%)	2.2	1.6	1.6	2.0	1.4	0.9	1.6	2.1
Asian (%)	1.6	1.6	2.7	2.0	1.4	1.3	1.6	1.3
American Indian(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Two or More Races (%)	-	5.2	6.5	5.1	5.4	4.9	6.2	7.1
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 (%)
S C H O O L	2000	82.9	15.6	0.5	1.0	-	-	-
	2001	85.6	12.8	1.1	0.5	-	-	-
	2002	87.0	11.5	1.0	0.5	-	-	-
	2003	85.9	11.3	1.7	1.1	-	-	-
	2004	85.2	11.0	2.2	1.6	-	-	-
	2005	80.6	11.0	1.6	1.6	-	5.2	-
	2006	83.8	5.4	1.6	2.7	-	6.5	-
	2007	85.9	5.1	2.0	2.0	-	5.1	-
	2008	83.3	8.6	1.4	1.4	-	5.4	-
	2009	83.9	8.9	0.9	1.3	-	4.9	-
	2010	81.5	9.1	1.6	1.6	-	6.2	-
2011	80.3	8.8	2.1	1.3	0.4	7.1	-	
D I S T R I C T	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	0.5	58.5	100.0	96.7	18.0	-	-	-	-
	2001	0.5	61.5	100.0	95.6	19.3	-	-	-	-
	2002	-	62.5	100.0	96.6	18.7	-	-	-	-
	2003	-	59.3	100.0	96.3	15.3	-	-	-	-
	2004	-	58.8	100.0	96.2	13.2	-	-	-	-
	2005	-	63.4	100.0	95.8	17.1	1	0.5	-	-
	2006	-	56.8	100.0	95.9	19.3	-	-	-	-
	2007	-	55.6	100.0	95.3	12.5	-	-	-	-
	2008	-	65.6	100.0	94.5	13.2	3	1.3	-	-
	2009	-	65.6	100.0	94.7	9.8	-	-	-	-
	2010	0.4	70.0	100.0	94.4	15.0	1	0.4	-	-
2011	0.4	72.3	100.0	94.2	16.7	1	0.4	-	-	
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	205	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	187	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	200	54	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	177	39	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	182	50	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	191	55	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	185	39	-	-	-	-	-
	2007	198	44	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	221	47	-	-	-	-	-
	2009	224	58	-	-	-	-	-
	2010	243	57	-	-	-	-	-
2011	238	56	-	-	-	-	-	
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
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	66.7	88.9	89.4	75.4	84.6	85.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	63.9	89.1	86.8	78.9	86.4	85.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	45.5	-	69.2	-	58.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	57.2	88.0	82.7	68.4	78.4	79.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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 & 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	78.5	97.8	91.7	93.5	88.7	89.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	77.7	100.0	89.8	96.2	88.9	92.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	54.6	-	78.6	-	61.5	70.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	78.5	96.0	86.6	89.4	86.5	85.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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 & 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?

READING

Third grade students at Dewey Elementary exceeded the 85% AYP target in Reading. There was a very slight increase in 2011 at 85.5% compared to 85.4% in 2010 in the number of students meeting or exceeding standards.

Subgroup Results for Reading

- White students did meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), with 85.4% of students in this subgroup meeting or exceeding standards.
- Economically Disadvantaged students did not meet AYP, with 79.4% of students in this subgroup meeting or exceeding standards.
- 5 out of 10, or 50%, of Students with Disabilities met or exceeded standards.
- 4 out of 5, or 80%, of Black students met or exceeded standards.
- 5 out of 7, or 77%, of Multi-Racial students met or exceeded standards.

Percent Meeting + Exceeding Compared to State of Illinois

Dewey Elementary Percentage= 85.5%

State of Illinois Average= 74.7%

Percent of Students Exceeding Compared to State of Illinois

Dewey Elementary Percentage= 27.8%

State of Illinois Average= 27.1%

Specific Areas of Strength

- Determine Author's Purpose
- Set Purpose for Reading
- Determine Explicit Sequence of Events

Areas of Growth

- Determine Main Idea
- Select An Appropriate Reading Strategy in a Given Situation
- Applying Ideas from Text to a New Situation

MATH

The third grade students at Dewey Elementary showed an increase in 2011 at 92.7% compared to 89% in 2010 in the number of students meeting or exceeding standards.

Subgroup Results for Math

- White students did meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), with 92.7% of students in this subgroup meeting or exceeding standards.
- Economically Disadvantaged students met AYP, with 85.7% of students in this subgroup meeting or exceeding standards.
- 7 out of 10, or 70%, of Students with Disabilities met or exceeded standards.
- 4 out of 5, or 80%, of Black students met or exceeded standards.
- 5 out of 7, or 77%, of Multi-Racial students met or exceeded standards.

Percent Meeting + Exceeding Compared to State of Illinois

Dewey Elementary Percentage= 92.7%

State of Illinois Average= 87.3%

Percent of Students Exceeding Compared to State of Illinois

Dewey Elementary Percentage= 29.1%

State of Illinois Average= 44.1%

Specific Areas of Strength

- Subtraction of Whole Numbers
- Addition of Whole Numbers

Areas of Growth

- Multiplication Facts

- Compare the Value Sets of Coins

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

Internal and External Factors Relative to Successes

- Effective Core Content Curriculum (e.g., USCSP “Everyday Math”, Comprehensive Literacy Model)
- Weekly Team Meetings (Professional Learning Communities)
- Ongoing Professional Development Opportunities for Staff
- Supportive Parents
- Committed Educators and Staff

Internal and External Factors Relative to Challenges

- Limited Math Intervention Personnel
- Limited Experiences in Language Development Prior to Entering School
- An Increased Population of Students/Families that are Economically Disadvantaged

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

- Dewey must continue to implement Everyday Mathematics with integrity.
- Dewey will implement Problem Solvers in all grade levels.
- Dewey will continue full implementation of the Comprehensive Literacy Model and Comprehensive Intervention Model with integrity. Weekly team meetings, bi-monthly staff meetings, and weekly intervention meetings will assist staff in this implementation.
- Educators will use assessment portfolios to drive instruction at all three tiers.

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?

Students in 2nd and 3rd grade were assessed using the SAT-10 in the fall of 2010.

Dewey Third Grade NCE Averages

RdgCom	Math	Problem Solving	Procedures	Spell
45.6	40.8	39.9	44.1	45.8

District Third Grade NCE Averages

RdgCom	Math	Problem Solving	Procedures	Spell
45.3	42.5	42.2	44.4	43.6

Dewey 2009 SAT-10 NCE Averages (Current third grader's scores as second graders)

RdgCom	Math	Problem Solving	Procedures	Spell
43.5	42.2	37.3	48.9	45.5

Specific Areas of Strength

- Reading Comprehension- Initial Understanding
- Problem Solving- Estimation
- Procedures- Computation with Whole Numbers

Areas of Growth

- Extract Implicit Main Idea
- Fractions
- Read and Interpret Tables and Graphs

Dewey Second Grade NCE Averages

RdgCom	Math	Problem Solving	Procedures	Spell
44.2	45.1	38.8	53.0	44.9

District Second Grade NCE Averages

RdgCom	Math	Problem Solving	Procedures	Spell
47.8	49.4	44.6	54.5	47.1

Specific Areas of Strength

- Understanding Two and Three Sentence Stories
- Identify Explicit Supporting Details
- Addition of Whole Numbers
- Subtraction of Whole Numbers

Areas of Growth

- Complete Cloze Passages
- Make Inferences Based on Text
- Solving Problems Using Place Value Concepts

- Solving Problems Using Appropriate + and - Strategies

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

The same internal and external factors listed in Section A apply.

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

- Effective and on-going professional development opportunities for Basic Facts, Problem Solvers, Numbers World, and Math Workshop are needed.
- Continued professional development opportunities in the Comprehensive Literacy Model and the Comprehensive Intervention Model will be provided for staff.
- Professional development opportunities provided for staff for Tier 1 and Tier 2 interventions.
- Educators will maximize instructional minutes to provide core curriculum and differentiated classroom-level instruction.

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:

- Dewey is staffed with experienced teachers who share a common belief that all children can and will learn to the best of their abilities.
- The attendance rate for 2010 was 94.7%
- Dewey has provided highly effective and comprehensive literacy intervention services for students reading below proficiency.

- Dewey has an active PTA that works to provide additional resources for the school.
- Dewey has developed community partnerships with many community organizations including Quincy University, Knapheide, Faith Presbyterian Church, and The Crossing Church.
- Dewey has developed a comprehensive PBIS plan that incorporates Steven Covey's *7 Habits of highly Effective People*.
- Dewey participates in the QPS Mentor program that links mentors with at-risk kids.

Challenges:

- Dewey has a free/reduced lunch rate in excess of 70%.
- Many students move in and out of Dewey. The 2010 mobility rate was 15%. This provides many educational challenges.
- Literacy intervention support has decreased from four teachers to three teachers due to district budget cuts.
- Dewey has one quarter with one interventionist of math intervention.
- The Emotional Disabilities program is beginning its third year. This program, while a great benefit too many students, provides challenges for our social worker to meet the needs of all students.
- A lack of financial resources has had a negative impact on the availability of technology resources for students and staff.

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

The increased needs of students coupled with budget cuts have had a negative impact on the programs, services, and achievement of Dewey Elementary.

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

- Dewey must search for alternative ways to find additional financial and human resources to increase the level of instructional and behavioral support when possible.
- Maximizing instructional minutes must continue to be a priority for Dewey.
- Professional Development opportunities remain a priority to make the most of the time and resources that are available.

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 staff is highly qualified according to NCLB standards.
- The majority of staff is tenured.
- All staff is trained in core curriculum including Comprehensive Literacy Model, Everyday Mathematics, Sitton Spelling, and Inquiry Based Science.
- Dewey has two teachers who are dedicated to providing Reading Recovery and additional tiers of reading support to students in need.
- Dewey has a social worker on site four days a week to assist student with socio-emotional needs.

- A school psychologist supports Dewey one day a week.
- A literacy coach provides coaching cycles and professional development opportunities for teachers to improve instruction in the classroom. The literacy coach also provides additional tiers of reading support for students.
- Two special education teachers provide expertise and support for students with learning and emotional disabilities.
- Staff has been trained in PBIS and Non-violent Crisis Prevention (CPI).
- New staff participates in a monthly, two-year Teacher Mentor Program.

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

Dewey has dedicated teachers who participate in professional development opportunities in order to meet the challenges of their students. Dewey's staff continues to work as a team, even though resources are limited, to provide the best education possible for kids.

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

- Professional Development training for classroom teachers in Tier 1 and Tier 2 interventions in both math and reading are needed.
- Dewey needs consistent implementation by staff school wide of PBIS expectations.
- Staff needs to focus on maximizing instructional minutes during the school day.

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?

Dewey has an active PTA. Parents regularly attend school wide functions. There are many opportunities throughout the year that parents are invited to Dewey and have the chance to interact with staff.

- PTA Meetings
- Dewey Read Night- Attendance 118 Parents
- Christmas Program
- Field Day
- End of Year Party
- Talent Show
- 3rd Grade Graduation
- Mother's Day Tea
- Writer's Workshop Celebrations
- Back to School Night- Attendance 165 Parents
- Parent/Teacher Conference- 100% Attendance

During Parent/Teacher Conferences, Dewey conducted a survey. This was a good opportunity to ask for parents opinions due to the fact that Dewey had 100% attendance at Parent/Teacher conferences.

The survey asked five questions. The questions were to be answered using a scale of 0 to 10, with 10 being the best. 115 surveys were completed.

Questions	% of 9or 10 rating
How well do you think your child's school does at building self-esteem in students?	85%
How respectfully do you think your child's classmates treat each other?	61.6%
How well do you think your child's school is teaching what students need to know to excel in the 21 st Century?	91.2%
Based on its overall culture, how likely are you to recommend your child's school to other parents?	93.8%
Would you like to make other comments on the school?	

These survey results indicate that parents are satisfied with most aspects of Dewey Elementary. One area of improvement would be how students treat each other. This area is being addressed in Dewey's PBIS plan for the school year.

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

The impact of a parent or guardian on a child's academic success is great. The school relies on parents or guardians to ensure attendance, arrival on time, checking for homework, provide language development opportunities, collaboration on successes and problems, bedtimes, and socio-emotional development to name a few. It is vital to develop an open and collaborative home-school connection that communicates on a regular basis.

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

Staff at Dewey Elementary must provide opportunities for the parents to be partners in their child's education.

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?

- Continue training and implementation in core curriculum which includes ; Comprehension Literacy Model, the Comprehensive Intervention Model, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, Everyday Mathematics, Sitton Spelling, and Inquiry Based Science.
- Provide effective Tier 2 and Tier 3 academic and behavioral interventions.
- Use limited financial and human resources in a manner that will provide the most benefit to all students.
- Increase the level of involvement of parents in their education.
- Look at the daily schedule to find ways to maximize instructional minutes.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	To improve performance of all students in reading.	
2	To improve student performance in Math.	

No deficiencies have been identified in the most recent AYP Report for your school

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

To improve performance of all students in reading.

Objective 1 Description

92.5% of third grade students will meet or exceed standards on the 2012 ISAT reading assessment. All students will show growth through local benchmark assessments and on the Fountas and Pinnell assessment.

No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AYP Report.

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

Objective 1 Title :

To improve performance of all students in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers will continue to implement reader's and writer's workshop, phase one and phase two, of the Comprehensive Literacy Model in all classrooms. Phase one is guided instruction and independent literacy opportunities. Phase two envelopes language studies.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Reading Recovery for 1st grade students identified as needing services.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	Reading Intervention Teachers, Special Education teachers, and Reading Recovery teachers will provide additional tiers of support to students experiencing difficulty and collaborate with teachers weekly.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	In valuing the reciprocity of reading and writing, written response to reading will occur daily beginning in the 2nd quarter in 1st grade and Kindergarten and will occur daily in 2nd & 3rd grades.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	Each day teachers will use student data to inform and provide differentiated instruction with graded degrees of support for all students.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

To improve performance of all students in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Dewey teachers will participate in weekly professional learning communities to discuss student progress, interventions, formative and summative assessments, and professional development opportunities.	09/05/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Professional development for Dewey Literacy Coach will be provided by District Literacy Coaches.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	A Literacy coach will work with all teachers to implement coaching cycles.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

To improve performance of all students in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Inform parents of Partnership in Comprehensive Literacy Model and Comprehensive Intervention Model currently being implemented at Dewey.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Local Funds	
2	100% participation in Parent/Teacher conferences	10/19/2011	10/27/2011	After School	Local Funds	
3	75% participation in Adult/Child activities, Read Night, Curriculum Night, and other school activities.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Title I	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

To improve performance of all students in reading.

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 use student data to monitor daily progress of their students. Reading recovery teachers, intervention teachers, literacy coach, special education teachers, student service personnel, and school administration will use student data to monitor the progress of students receiving literacy interventions. Student progress will be discussed during weekly professional learning communities. Assessment portfolios will be a required component of student assessment.

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	Krista Finklea	Principal
2	Tracee Farmer	Literacy Coach
3	Julie McLaughlin	Literacy Support
4	Allison Gabriel	Literacy Support
5	Barb Runyon	Special Education

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

To improve student performance in Math.

Objective 2 Description

92.5% of third grade students will meet or exceed standards on the 2011 ISAT Math Assessment. All students will show growth on local assessments.

No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AYP Report.

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

Objective 2 Title :

To improve student performance in Math.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All teachers will fully implement Everyday Mathematics - The University of Chicago School Mathematics Project, Basic Facts, and Problem Solver.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Each day teachers will use student data to inform and provide differentiated instruction with graded degrees of support for all students.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	Teachers will increase opportunities to write about math using Problem Solvers, math reflections, and written responses.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	During the third quarter, Dewey will have a district math interventionist work with students not progressing adequately based on student data. Numbers World will be implemented.	01/04/2012	03/16/2012	During School	Title I	

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

Objective 2 Title :

To improve student performance in Math.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
	Teachers will attend a monthly faculty meeting focused on math to					

1	discuss student progress based on student data, possible interventions, and professional development topics.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Local Funds	
2	Dewey teachers will plan instruction based upon Everyday Math and Problem Solvers assessments. Dewey math teacher leaders will be available for input and/or assistance.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title :

To improve student performance in Math.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Dewey's third quarter parent/child activity will be focused om math.	02/24/2012	02/24/2012	During School	Title I	
2	Inform parents of Everyday Mathematics and Problem Solvers curriculum using homelinks.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Local Funds	
3	100% participation in parent/teacher conferences.	10/19/2011	10/27/2011	After School	Local Funds	
4	Present core math curriculum during Curriculum Night and Math Night.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Title I	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

To improve student performance in Math.

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 daily progress of their students using student data. Intervention teacher, extended day teachers, and administrator will monitor the progress of students receiving math interventions. Professional development opportunities will be provided at monthly faculty meetings focused on math. Math teacher leaders will participate in curricular discussions at the district level and report back to Dewey staff.

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	Krista Finklea	Principal
2	Marty Rubottom	Teacher
3	Julie Schulte	Teacher
4	Sharon Phillips	Teacher
5	Tracee Farmer	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 of Dewey School have been notified of our School Improvement plan during Parent Teacher Association meetings. A copy of the School Report card is sent home to each family. Notification of our goals for the year are shared in the PTA newsletter and through local media. The School Improvement is available to view on our district's website.

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.

The principal, with assistance from staff, monitor the school improvement process at Dewey Elementary School. Staff meets weekly to discuss the progress that are students are making our assessment data and wall during Professional Learning Communities. All staff was included in the development of the School Improvement Plan and instructional activities. During Professional Learning Communities and faculty meetings goals and progress are reviewed. A parent representative from the Dewey Elementary Parent Teacher Association will review the School Improvement Plan to provide suggestions and feedback. The Assistant Superintendent and the Quincy School Board will review Dewey Elementary's Plan.

	Name	Title
1	Krista Finklea	Principal
2	Tracee Farmer	Literacy Coach
3	Julie McLaughlin	Literacy Support
4	Allison Gabriel	Literacy Support
5	Barb Runyon	Special Education
6	Renea Henning	Special Education
7	Denise Poland	Social Worker
8	Kelly Waner	School Psychologist
9	Tera Blickhan	Speech and Language
10	Julie Allen	Kindergarten
11	Laura Stutzman	Kindergarten
12	Emily Heemeyer	Kindergarten
13	Connie Haschemeyer	First Grade
14	Julie Schulte	First Grade
15	Vicky Mallory	First Grade
16	Jerri Hall	Second Grade
17	Lori Post	Second Grade
18	Kathy Humphry	Second Grade
19	Marty Rubottom	Third Grade
20	Kim Albert	Third Grade
21	Sharon Phillips	Third Grade
22	Sherry Zaerr	Physical Education
23	Jean Murray	Music
24	Kim Obert	Parent
25	Jamie Foster	Parent

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.

Two Elementary principals in Quincy District 172 reviewed the School Improvement Plan and provided feedback. This was done in October 2011.

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. *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 (21st 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]
MONITORING	
<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