

District Improvement Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	01/18/2012
District Plan Submitted	
District Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE District Improvement Plan Monitoring Completed	

Additional Compliance Submissions by District	
RtI Compliance Submission	
Special Education Compliance Submission	
Title III Compliance Submission	

District Information

RCDT Number:	010011720220000		
District Name:	Quincy SD 172	Superintendent:	Lonny B Lemon
District Address:	1416 Maine St	Telephone:	2172238700
City/State/Zip:	Quincy, IL 62301 4261	Extn:	0
Email:	lemonlo@qps.org		
<b>Is this for a Title I district ?</b>		<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No
<b>Is this for a Title III district that did not meet AMAO?</b>		<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No

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

Is this District making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this District been identified for District Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this District making AYP in Reading?	No	2011-12 Federal Improvement Status	District Improvement Year 2
Is this District making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2011-12 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning Year 2

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		85.0			85.0			91.0		82.0	
All	99.9	Yes	99.9	Yes	74.1		No	76.4		No	93.8	Yes	87.9	Yes
White	99.8	Yes	99.8	Yes	76.3	78.9	No	78.4	81.9	No	94.7		89.8	
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	53.6	58.8	No	58.0	62.8	No	93.4		71.7	
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes										
Asian														
American Indian														

Two or More Races	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	66.7	72.6	No	68.8	74.4	No	93.5		62.5	
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities	99.7	Yes	99.7	Yes	43.1	51.8	No	51.6	58.3	No	93.6		67.0	
Economically Disadvantaged	99.9	Yes	99.9	Yes	65.5	67.6	No	68.7	73.1	No	93.6		76.6	

**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.

**2011 DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION**

The Differentiated Accountability classification for the District is:	Comprehensive
---	---------------

---

Is this District making AYP in the "ALL" subgroup in reading?	No
Is this District making AYP in the "ALL" subgroup in math?	No

In 2008, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) was one of 6 states to be chosen by the US Department of Education to participate in the Differentiated Accountability Pilot Program. The Differentiated Accountability classification **applies only to districts in federal improvement status that do not make AYP.**







The classification is a descriptor (i.e., focused or comprehensive) that is added to a district's improvement status. Current Title I requirements do not change. The classification assists in distinguishing between districts that need focused support versus more comprehensive interventions.

If a district does make AYP in ALL-student group in both reading and math, this district will be classified as a focused district; otherwise, the district will be identified as a comprehensive district.

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

2011 AMAO Report will be available soon.

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

District Information								
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Attendance Rate (%)	93.9	94.4	94.0	94.1	93.4	93.8	94.7	93.8
Truancy Rate (%)	2.5	2.3	2.5	1.9	3.2	4.6	2.6	2.8
Mobility Rate (%)	33.1	26.6	24.4	24.7	15.0	13.7	14.9	14.4
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	82.7	84.5	87.6	88.1	88.9	91.0	90.1	87.9
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	2.5	2.7	1.9	2.6	1.9	2.5	1.4	1.9
District Population (#)	6,518	6,513	6,484	6,431	6,470	6,060	6,389	6,238
Low Income (%)	42.5	44.5	44.1	43.8	48.1	47.4	52.7	50.6
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.3
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.4	16.6
White, non-Hispanic (%) 	88.0	87.9	87.2	87.5	87.3	86.7	85.5	84.5
Black, non-Hispanic (%) 	10.0	9.1	9.7	8.8	8.4	8.0	8.4	8.5
Hispanic (%) 	1.1	1.3	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.4
Asian (%) 	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	1.0
American Indian (%) 	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Two or More Races (%)	-	0.7	1.1	1.5	2.2	3.2	3.9	4.5
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 (%)
DISTRICT	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	0	-	-
	2003	88.5	9.7	1.0	0.6	0	-	-
	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	0	
STATE	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 (%)
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)
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	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	
<b>S T A T E</b>	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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

	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	0	0
	2001	415	15	40,601	50	50	18	36	0	0
	2002	428	15	41,661	53	47	17	36	0	1
	2003	417	16	41,478	49	51	17	40	1	0
	2004	375	17	44,287	45	55	19	37	0	0
	2005	418	15	43,727	50	50	17	31	1	0
	2006	432	13	41,789	54	46	18	25	2	0
	2007	438	13	42,012	50	50	18	20	2	1
	2008	460	13	43,594	48	52	18	20	2	0
	2009	449	14	45,409	45	55	15	19	1	0
	2010	436	14	47,161	46	54	19	21	1	0
2011	407	15	46,810	46	54	19	23	0	0	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	0	0
	2001	125,735	14	47,929	54	46	19	18	0	0
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	2	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	12	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1
	2010	132,502	13	63,296	42	57	18	18	0	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					
Groups	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	75.9	78.7	80.8	73.0	76.9	72.5	76.1	75.4	78.7	76.9	71.5	75.8	76.5	72.7	73.3	76.7	76.0	74.4
White	79.0	80.7	82.3	74.8	78.3	74.7	78.6	79.3	79.7	78.4	73.2	77.1	79.9	75.5	75.9	78.7	77.8	76.6
Black	60.5	61.7	67.5	56.5	61.5	55.8	60.5	50.0	70.0	67.6	50.0	57.1	51.0	56.1	54.3	60.9	64.1	51.2
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	43.8	84.6	84.0	66.6	72.0	62.5	-	56.3	76.5	73.1	76.5	73.1	-	-	57.9	66.6	80.0	73.4
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	46.0	52.0	70.9	39.8	45.7	44.0	44.8	41.6	51.3	46.4	29.1	33.3	45.7	44.8	30.6	48.5	51.8	41.8
Low Income	69.5	70.2	74.3	61.5	66.9	61.8	66.2	64.9	70.3	68.6	60.2	69.0	67.9	58.2	63.6	66.3	68.0	61.7
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Groups	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	76.0	81.2	80.8	83.2	82.2	83.8	73.2	78.2	82.2	75.7	74.1	75.7	77.9	83.8	79.9	82.3	77.3	78.7
White	79.2	83.8	83.3	85.4	83.7	86.4	76.4	80.7	85.0	76.5	77.4	77.5	80.1	86.3	81.6	84.1	80.2	82.9
Black	47.1	57.4	67.6	65.7	66.6	67.6	48.1	56.0	58.2	75.0	48.5	62.0	56.4	60.4	65.9	66.6	52.6	42.4
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	54.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	73.7	83.3	74.2	-	-	-	-	50.1	71.5	-	-	-	-	-	58.8
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	39.5	36.0	51.3	47.0	49.2	52.7	32.9	33.8	42.6	44.5	40.0	27.9	37.1	43.3	39.5	43.5	40.6	38.6
Low Income	64.2	67.7	68.6	77.9	72.2	76.7	59.2	67.6	73.6	62.4	62.3	60.9	64.2	71.0	68.4	71.8	62.7	70.1
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[Note: for High Schools, High School Districts, or Unit Districts Only]

PSAE - % Meets & Exceeds Reading grade 11

Groups	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	50.3	52.5	57.8	56.4	59.0	54.0
White	52.1	55.6	59.6	59.3	62.4	56.6
Black	28.6	3.1	34.4	22.2	24.4	22.2
Hispanic	-	-	-	54.6	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	10.8	22.7	25.7	14.8	11.3	13.2
Low Income	31.6	36.7	40.2	39.4	43.5	43.3
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																		
Groups	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	88.1	92.2	88.6	86.9	86.5	87.6	87.7	88.0	87.9	85.0	84.0	82.8	81.8	83.5	81.4	81.4	77.1	78.2
White	90.6	93.9	90.4	89.2	87.9	88.8	89.4	90.4	90.2	87.0	85.8	83.8	84.9	84.9	84.5	82.3	79.1	80.5
Black	69.0	78.7	70.0	67.4	71.1	79.1	74.4	71.4	72.5	65.8	66.7	77.2	54.9	75.6	54.3	78.0	61.5	55.9
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	81.3	92.3	92.0	77.8	80.0	82.9	-	81.3	70.6	80.8	82.3	65.4	-	-	73.7	66.7	76.7	73.3
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	68.4	79.3	82.7	70.6	68.3	70.7	77.6	76.6	71.7	65.7	58.2	52.4	63.7	64.5	63.9	58.8	53.0	55.9
Low Income	83.1	86.4	81.7	77.6	80.9	81.9	80.7	84.3	80.1	76.7	75.5	76.2	72.3	74.4	76.0	72.6	70.4	68.8
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Groups	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	85.5	84.1	85.5	82.8	85.2	80.3	81.8	83.6	81.7	78.4	75.6	74.6	76.5	83.9	76.8	74.8	76.9	77.1
White	87.3	85.9	86.6	86.3	87.1	82.6	84.4	86.4	85.5	80.4	79.2	78.0	79.9	86.7	79.1	78.0	79.7	81.1
Black	66.7	68.1	71.0	54.3	69.2	61.1	63.5	60.0	46.5	75.0	42.4	48.3	46.2	61.2	56.1	46.7	55.3	42.4
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	54.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	73.7	78.9	71.0	-	-	-	-	56.3	60.7	-	-	-	-	-	58.8
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	62.8	67.2	66.7	55.9	59.7	51.1	45.9	45.1	41.0	45.2	36.9	33.3	38.0	39.4	31.3	22.2	39.0	31.6
Low Income	77.1	75.1	75.5	75.0	76.3	70.7	72.8	71.8	70.0	66.3	63.2	60.7	63.4	72.6	61.4	59.1	66.1	67.6
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[Note: for High Schools, High School Districts, or Unit Districts Only]

PSAE - % Meets & Exceeds Mathematics grade 11

Groups	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	52.7	54.7	55.0	51.9	54.8	47.5
White	55.2	56.6	56.6	55.2	57.7	50.9
Black	10.7	15.6	31.2	18.5	29.3	11.1
Hispanic	-	-	-	18.2	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	9.2	16.7	10.0	12.7	3.8	5.3
Low Income	31.0	34.3	37.5	35.3	39.4	30.9
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 your District Report Card data tell you about student performance in your district? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are indicated?

## READING

**District-Wide Summary** : With ALL 2011 state assessment Reading data synthesized (ISAT, PSAE and IAA) for ALL students tested at grades 3 - 8 and 11, **74.1%** of QPS students "met" or "exceeded" Reading state standards in 2011, down slightly from 74.5% in 2010. The District composite has been in the 74 - 76% range for 6 consecutive years, an increase from the percentages of 64 - 68% in previous years.

The State average in 2011 for Reading was 75%. For the state of Illinois, of the 10 student subgroups (i.e., White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, Am Indian, Two or More Races, Native Hawaii/Pacific Islander, Limited English Proficient, Students with Disabilities, and Econ Disadvantaged), only one subgroup, Asian, "Met" standards in Reading.

**District-Wide (All QPS Students Combined), No Subgroup Met the AYP Minimum Target of 85% in Reading; specifically:**

- 76.3% of White students "met" or "exceeded" reading state standards (State Ave: 83.4%)
- 66.7% of Two or More Races students "met" or "exceeded" reading state standards (State Ave: 79.1%)
- 65.5% of Economically Disadvantaged students "met" or "exceeded" reading state standards (State Ave: 63.8%)
- 53.6% of Black students "met" or "exceeded" reading state standards (State Ave: 59.4%)
- 43.1% of Students with Disabilities "met" or "exceeded" reading state standards (State Ave: 40.7%)

**Percentage Meeting + Exceeding By Grade Level, Compared to State of Illinois**

The percentage of students who "Met" + "Exceeded" for QPS and the State includes: (QPS percentage is listed first; State average is in parentheses)

Grade 3: **72.5%** (75%)    Grade 4: **75.8%** (75%)    Grade 5: **74.4%** (76%)    Grade 6: **83.8%** (84%)

Grade 7: **75.7%** (79%)    Grade 8: **78.7%** (85%)    Grade 11: **54%** (51%).

**Percentage of Students "Exceeding" on State Reading Assessment, Compared to State of Illinois**

The percentage of students who "Exceeded" for QPS and the State includes: (QPS percentage is listed first; State average is in parentheses)

Grade 3: **22%** (27%)    Grade 4: **29%** (30%)    Grade 5: **27%** (27%)    Grade 6: **26%** (27%)

Grade 7: **20%** (21%)    Grade 8: **12%** (10%)    Grade 11: **9%** (10%).

**ISAT (Grades 3 - 8) Reading Results By Standards**

(a) **Vocabulary Development:** It is a strength at grades 3, 4, and 6; it is an area for improvement at grades 5, 7 and 8.

(b) **Reading Strategies:** It is a strength at grades 4 and 5; it is an area for improvement at grades 3, 6, 7, 8

(c) **Reading Comprehension:** It is a strength at grades 4, 5, 6 and 7; it is an area for improvement at grades 3, 8

(d) **Literature:** Overall, this is a strength area.

- Responding to reading through writing is an area of needed improvement.

### PSAE Reading at Grade 11

(a) The average PSAE reading score of QPS students was 155 ("Meets" score is 155 and "Exceeds" score is 178; State average was 156).

(b) On the ACT Reading portion, the QPS average was 19.4, and the State average was 19.8. The College Readiness Benchmark score is 21. Of QPS juniors, 38% met the benchmark of 21 (down from 2010, but up from 33% four years ago); statewide, 42% of students met the College Readiness Benchmark, the lowest percentage in five years. By subgroup, 41% of white students, 10% of black students, 12% of special education students and 22% of Economically Disadvantaged students met the College Readiness benchmark.

(c) Average ACT reading score of QPS students from 2007 - 2011:

2007: 19.7      2008: 19.8      2009: 19.8      2010: 20.4      2011: 19.4

From 2007 to 2010, the State average score increased only slightly from 19.7 to 19.9.

(d) On *WorkKeys Reading for Information*, QPS students earned an average score of 4.9, and the average score statewide was also 5. (There are five levels of difficulty. Level 3 is the least complex, and Level 7 is the most complex. The levels build on each other, each incorporating the skills assessed at the preceding levels. For example, at Level 5, individuals need the skills from Levels 3, 4, and 5. The reading materials at Level 3 are short and direct. The material becomes longer, denser, and more difficult to use as readers move toward Level 7. The tasks also become more complex as readers move from Level 3 to Level 7. At Level 3, readers begin by finding very obvious details and following short instructions. At the more complex levels, tasks can also involve more application and interpretation.)

### Performance by Gender, Grades 3 - 11

**Gender:** QPS girls' performance in reading is higher than the boys' performance.

### 2011 Specific Achievement Gap Data

#### **Special Education/Non-Special Education:**

- ISAT: The average achievement gap in reading, district-wide grades 3 - 8, was 43% (a slight increase from the 3 previous years, but a decrease from 1995 - 2003). The 2011 achievement gap by grade: Gr. 3: 35%      Gr. 4: 52% (2010, Grade 3: 38%)      Gr. 5: 38% (2010, Grade 4: 48%)

Gr. 6: 38% (2010, Grade 5: 29%)      Gr. 7: 55% (2010, Grade 6: 38%)      Gr. 8: 46% (2010, Grade 7: 40%)

- PSAE: The average achievement gap in Reading at grade 11 was 49% (increase of 5% from 2010).

**Black/White:**

- ISAT: The average achievement gap between Black and White students (grades 3 - 8) was 23%, which represents no change from 2010.

The achievement gap by each grade level: Gr. 3: 19% Gr. 4: 20% (2010, Grade 3: 16%) Gr. 5: 26% (2010, Grade 4: 23%)  
Gr. 6: 18% (2010, Grade 5: 14%) Gr. 7: 16% (2010, Grade 6: 17%) Gr. 8: 41% (2010, Grade 7: 28%)

- PSAE: The average achievement gap in Reading at Grade 11 was 35% (decrease of 3% from 2010).

**Low Income/Non-Low Income:**

- ISAT: The average achievement between Low Income and Non-Low Income Students (grades 3 - 8) was 21%, a 2% decrease from 2010.

The achievement gap by each grade level: Gr. 3: 26% Gr. 4: 16% (2010, Gr. 3: 23%) Gr. 5: 26% (2010, Grade 4: 25%)  
Gr. 6: 14% (2010, Gr. 5: 17%) Gr. 7: 28% (2010, Gr. 6: 20%) Gr. 8: 17% (2010, Gr. 7: 24%)

- PSAE: The average achievement gap in reading at Grade 11 was 18% (a decrease of 6% from 2010).

**MATH**

**District-Wide and State Summary:** With ALL state assessment Math data synthesized (ISAT, PSAE and IAA) for ALL students tested at grades tested 3 - 8 and 11, 76.4% of QPS students "met" or "exceeded" state standards in 2011, down from 78% in 2010.

The State average in 2011 for Math was 80.8% (virtually no change from 2010). For the state of Illinois, of the 10 student subgroups (i.e., White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, Am Indian, Two or More Races, Native Hawaiiin/Pacific Islander, Limited English Proficient, Students with Disabilites, and Econ Disadvantaged), three subgroups met in Math: Asian, Native Hawaiiin/Pacific Islander, and White.

**District-wide Subgroup Results for Math**

- 78.4% of White students "met" or "exceeded" math state standards (State Ave: 87.6%)
- 68.8% of Two or More Races students "met" or "exceeded" math state standards (State Ave: 83.4%)
- 68.7% of Economically Disadvantaged students "met" or "exceeded" math state standards (State Ave: 72.3%)
- 58% of Black students "met" or "exceeded" math state standards (State Ave: 65%)
- 51.6% of Students with Disabilities "met" or "exceeded" math state standards (52.7%)

**Percentage Meeting + Exceeding By Grade Level, Compared to State of Illinois**

The percentage of students who "Met" + "Exceeded" Math standards for QPS and the State includes: (**QPS** percentage is listed first; **State** average is in parentheses)

Grade 3: **87.6%** (87%) Grade 4: **82.8** (88%) Grade 5: **78.2%** (84%) Grade 6: **80.3%** (84%)

Grade 7: **74.6%** (84%) Grade 8: **77.1%** (86%) Grade 11: 47.5% (51%).

#### Percentage of Students Exceeding on State Math Assessments, Compared to State of Illinois

The percentage of students who "Exceeded" in Math for QPS and the State includes: (**QPS** percentage is listed first; **State** average is in parentheses)

Grade 3: **38%** (44%) Grade 4: **20%** (28%) Grade 5: **14%** (19%) Grade 6: **21%** (26%)

Grade 7: **22%** (30%) Grade 8: **24%** (32%) Grade 11: 5% (8%).

#### ISAT (Grades 3 - 8) Math Results by Standards

- (a) **Number Sense:** Area of strength at grade 3. Area for improvement at other grades, especially at grades 7 and 8.
- (b) **Measurement:** Area for improvement at all grades, especially at grades 5 - 8.
- (c) **Algebra:** It is a relative strength at grade 3; it is an area for improvement at other grades, especially grades 4 and 5.
- (d) **Geometry:** Area for improvement at all grades.
- (e) **Data Analysis, Statistics, Probability:** It is a relative strength area at grades 3 and 7; need for improvement at grades 4, 5, and 8.

Responding to math through writing (both short response and extended-response) is an area for needed improvement.

#### PSAE Math at Grade 11

- (a) The average PSAE math score of QPS students was 155 ("Meets" score is 156 and "Exceeds" score is 179; State average was 157).
- (b) On the ACT Math portion, the QPS average was 19.6, and the State average was 20.4. The College Readiness Benchmark score is 22. Of QPS juniors, 34% met the benchmark of

22; statewide, 38% of students met the College Readiness Benchmark. By subgroup, 39% of white students, 6% of black students, 4% of special education students and 17% of Economically Disadvantaged students met the College Readiness benchmark.

(c) Over the past four years, the average ACT math score of QPS students has increased from 19.4 to 20.1, while the State average score has increased from 19.8 to 20.3.

(d) On WorkKeys *Applied Math*, QPS students earned an average score of 5, and the average score statewide was also 5. (There are five levels of difficulty. Level 3 is the least complex, and Level 7 is the most complex. The levels build on each other, each incorporating the skills assessed at the preceding levels. For example, at Level 5, individuals need the skills from Levels 3, 4, and 5.)

### **2010 Specific Achievement Gap Data**

#### **Special Education/Non-Special Education:**

-ISAT: The average achievement gap in math, district-wide in grades 3 - 8, was 35% (2% increase from previous 2 years, but less than average of 43.2% between 1999 - 2003). The

achievement gap by grade: Gr. 3: 20% Gr. 4: 37% (2010, Gr. 3: 22%) Gr. 5: 26% (2010, Gr. 4: 29%)

Gr. 6: 36% (2010, Gr. 5: 29%)

Gr. 7: 48% (2010, Gr. 6: 29%)

Gr. 8: 52% (2010, Gr. 7: 45%)

-PSAE: The average achievement gap in Math at grade 11 was 50%, a decrease of 8%.

#### **Black/White:**

- ISAT: The average achievement gap between Black and White students in grades 3 - 8 was 21%, no change from 2010. The achievement gap by grade:

Gr. 3: 10% Gr. 4: 7% (2010, Gr. 3: 17%) Gr. 5: 25% (2010, Gr. 4: 19%)

Gr. 6: 22% (2010, Gr. 5: 17%) Gr. 7: 30% (2010, Gr. 6: 18%) Gr. 8: 39% (2010, Gr. 7: 37%)

- PSAE: The average achievement gap in Math at grade 11 was 40%, the largest gap since 2006/2007.

#### **Low Income/Non-Low Income:**

-ISAT: The average achievement gap between low income and non-low income students in grades 3 - 8 was 17%. The recent 5-year average is 17.2%, while the average for 2001 - 2005 was 22%. The achievement gap by grade:

Gr. 3: 14% Gr. 4: 15% (2010, Gr. 3: 12%) Gr. 5: 19% (2010, Gr. 4: 18%)

Gr. 6: 19% (2010, Gr. 5: 14%) Gr. 7: 26% (2010, Gr. 6: 18%) Gr. 8: 18% (2010, Gr. 7: 25%)

- PSAE: The achievement gap in Math at grade 11 was 27%.

---

# SCIENCE

In Illinois, students are tested in science at grades 4, 7 and 11.

- ISAT: 80% of QPS students in grades 4 and 7 "met" or "exceeded" state standards on the ISAT Science assessment, a 5% increase from 2010. The state average in 2011 was 81%.

-PSAE: 43% of students in grade 11 "met" or "exceeded" state standards on the PSAE Science assessment, down from 51% in 2010. The state average in 2011 was 49%

**The percentage of students who "Met" + "Exceeded" for QPS and the State includes:** (QPS percentage is listed first; State average is in parentheses)

**Grade 4: 80%**, represents a 3-year high score (79%)      **Grade 7: 80%**, represents a 3-year high score (82%)      **Grade 11: 43%** (49%).

**The percentage of students who "Exceeded" for QPS and the State includes:** (QPS percentage is listed first; State average is in parentheses)

Grade 4: **16%** (21%) Grade 7: **19%** (24%) Grade 11: **5%** (10%)

## **PSAE Science at grade 11:**

(a) The average PSAE science score of QPS students was 155 ("Meets" score is 158 and "Exceeds" score is 178; Statewide average score was 158).

(b) On the ACT Science portion, the QPS average was 19, and the State average was 20. The College Readiness Benchmark score is 24. Of QPS juniors, 21% met the benchmark of 24; statewide, 23% of students met the College Readiness Benchmark. Over the past four years, the average ACT science score of QPS students has increased from 18.7 to 19.7, while the State average score has increased from 19.7 to 20.1.

(c) On the ISBE-Developed Science Areas, with a score range of 40 - 100, the scores of QPS students (with statewide scores in parentheses) includes (Note, these are scores, not percentages): **Life Sciences, 70 (70); Physical Sciences, 67 (70); Earth and Space Sciences, 68 (70); and Science, Technology and Society, 72 (70).**

---

**Factors - What factors are likely to have contributed to these results? Consider both external and internal factors to the district.****Internal and External Factors Relative to Successes:** Quincy Public Schools has...

- ... intelligent, capable students.
- ... highly skilled and highly dedicated educators and support staff.
- ... supportive and largely engaged parents/guardians.
- ... a commitment to *effective* professional development (i.e., ongoing, job-embedded, research-based).
- ... a state-approved, comprehensive, 2-year professional development training/mentoring for new teachers through the QPS Teacher Mentor Program.
- ... effective, research-based curriculum in core content areas (e.g., Comprehensive Literacy Model, USCSP "Everyday Math," Inquiry-Based Science Curriculum).
- ... secured several competitive grants in recent years to support professional development, acquisition of materials and/or programming in a number of areas (e.g., after-school program at QHS and QJHS, Advanced Placement, Reading Interventions, teacher mentoring, truancy, technology and others).
- ... a commitment to being a PLC (Professional Learning Communities) district.

**Internal and External Factors Relative to Challenges or Lack of Progress:** Quincy Public Schools has...

- ... made significant staffing reductions over the past three years. These reductions have had a significantly negative impact on instruction and achievement. As of 2010, the reductions resulted in the loss of the following: 3.0 FTE's at Early Childhood level; 28.51 FTE's at the K - 6 level (including 20.17 Literacy Teachers, 5.17 Classroom Teachers, and 2 Special Education Teachers); 13.16 FTE's at Junior High level (including 4.16 Special Ed, 2.5 English/Literacy, 2.0 Science, 1.0 Math, and 1.0 Social Studies, etc.) and 11.0 FTE's at Senior High level (including .5 English, .5 Math, .5 Science, .5 Special Ed., 1.0 Focused Study Hall, 1.0 Counselor, etc.).
- ... limited literacy intervention time/personnel in some buildings and virtually none in other buildings.
- ... very limited math intervention personnel across the district
- ... a significantly increased population of students/families who are economically disadvantaged (39% six years ago to 56% today), resulting in increasing numbers of students entering school developmentally delayed, lacking foundational language and concepts about print, and/or needing social/emotional/behavioral intervention and support.
- ... NOTE: The district food service director recently reported that 66% of the 3954 QPS students who are eligible for Free meals are in one of the "food insecure" populations (i.e., Food Stamps, Homeless, Head Start, or Foster Child).
- ... experienced significant reductions or complete elimination of several key grants including. For example, **SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS** have occurred in the Early Childhood Block Grant, and Truants Alternative Grant. The following critical grants have been completely **ELIMINATED**: Educational Improvement Block Grant, Title V Innovative Education Grant, Reading Improvement Block Grant, Reading Recovery Grant, and Title IV Safe and Drug Free Schools Grant. The result has been a devastating loss of personnel, programs and professional development. Just one example: In 2006 - 2007, Reading Recovery (the highest-rated early intervention for literacy) was fully implemented with 22 teachers. The number was reduced to 20 teachers in 2008 - 2009, 14 in 2009 - 2010, and during the 2010 - 2011 school year there were 5 Reading Recovery teachers (utilizing short-term ARRA Stimulus funding in four Title I buildings).

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

The factors above indicate the following:

- \* Literacy achievement must be accelerated for *all* student groups at *all* grade levels, and the specific areas of underachievement identified must be addressed.
- \* Math achievement must be accelerated for *all* student groups at *all* grade levels, and the specific areas of underachievement identified must be addressed.
- \* The personnel instructing, providing intervention, and supporting children must receive effective, targeted and ongoing professional development.
- \* The instructional minutes in the school day must be maximized to provide (a) the core curriculum *and* differentiated classroom-level instruction, including Tier 1 intervention, for every student and (b) *timely* Tier 1 and 2 interventions in at least the areas of literacy, math and social/emotional/behavioral for identified students.

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data

**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?**

-QPS has been administering the SAT 10 (Stanford Achievement Test) in the fall of the year to students in grades 2 - 11 since 2007. Historical data appear below in the tables.

NOTES: (1) The number provided is an NCE (Normal Curve Equivalent). (2) An NCE of 50 is the national average.

READING

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Gr. 2	52.2	47.1	46.9	47.8	46.6
Gr. 3	51.2	46.2	47.0	45.3	46.5
Gr. 4	56.6	55.2	54.3	55.1	53.1
Gr. 5	52.5	53.8	52.5	53.2	53.4
Gr. 6	50.6	51.4	54.2	50.3	50.4
Gr. 7	55.7	54.5	54.7	56.8	54.1
Gr. 8	53.7	54.3	54.5	53	54.8
Gr. 9	58.5	55.8	56.0	55.2	54.6
Gr. 10	56.1	58.6	55.9	55	54.2
Gr. 11	62.4	60	59.5	58.2	55.4

## MATH

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Gr. 2	55.3	<b>48.4</b>	48.4	49.4	50.4
Gr. 3	49.5	43.5	43.6	42.5	44.2
Gr. 4	51.9	49.9	47.8	48.4	47.1
Gr. 5	55.7	53.5	52.5	52.2	51.7
Gr. 6	53.5	53.2	54.5	50.3	51.6
Gr. 7	56.1	53.6	53	55.5	50.3
Gr. 8	55.4	54.4	53.6	51.7	51.4
Gr. 9	64.6	61.7	61.7	59.2	59.6
Gr. 10	58.5	59.9	58.5	58.3	57.3
Gr. 11	59.8	60.1	57.5	56.3	58.2

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

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).**

The factors above indicate the following:

- \* Literacy achievement must be accelerated for **all** student groups at **all** grade levels, and the specific areas of underachievement identified must be addressed.
- \* Math achievement must be accelerated for **all** student groups at **all** grade levels, and the specific areas of underachievement identified must be addressed.
- \* The personnel instructing, providing intervention, and supporting children must receive **effective, targeted and ongoing professional development**.
- \* The instructional minutes in the school day must be maximized to provide (a) the core curriculum **and** differentiated classroom-level instruction, including Tier 1 intervention, for every student and (b) **timely** Tier 1 and 2 interventions in at least the areas of literacy, math and social/emotional/behavioral for identified students.

---

Section I-C. Data & Analysis - Other Data  
Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

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

**Enrollment:** The district's enrollment was 6060 in 2009, 6389 in 2010, 6238 in 2011. Current enrollment is 6679.

**Attendance:**

The 2010 overall district attendance rate was 94.7%, which is the highest rate since this data have been reported on the IIRC (beginning 2006). The 2010 state attendance rate was 93.9%.

The 2011 district attendance rate was 93.8%; the state rate was 94%.

**Truancy:**

The 2010 district truancy rate was 2.6%, the lowest rate since 2007. The 2010 state truancy rate was 3.6%.

The 2011 district truancy rate was 2.8%, and the state rate was 3.2%.

**Mobility:**

Many students move into and out of Quincy Public Schools within the course of a year, which provides significant educational challenges and implications. The 2010 district mobility rate was 15%, while the overall state mobility rate was 13%. In 2011, the district mobility rate was 14.4%, and the state rate was 12.8%.

**Low Income:** As noted in an earlier section, the district's Low Socio-Economic rate has increased from 39% to 56% in the matter of a few years. The State's Low Income rate was 45.4% in 2010 and 48% in 2011.

**Students with Disabilities:** In 2010, the percentage of students with disabilities was 14.4%.

**Revenue:** Revenue remains an issue for the district. The district's Education Fund tax rate is \$1.84, which is far below the \$2.55 average for comparable downstate districts. State funding is lagging more than six months behind for all Categoricals. General State Aid is being funded at only about 95% of the district allotment.

**Budget Reductions:** In spite of reductions over the past 3 - 4 years, the district's expenditures have exceeded revenues to the point that the fund balances have been depleted and the district is forced to borrow money annually to meet its financial needs. Each cycle of cuts results in the reduction of staff and the loss of services to children. The district then must decide how to commit its dwindling resources (e.g., class size, support/intervention, programs).

**Pupil-Staff Ratios and Salary Info:**

\* The Pupil-Teacher ratio at the elementary level has increased and QPS' ratio is above the state average.

\* The Pupil-Teacher ratio at the high school level has increased and QPS' ratio is above the state average.

\* The Pupil-Administrator ratio for QPS increased from 220.6 students per administrator in 2000; 229 students per administrator in 2009; 275 students per administrator in 2010; and 285.5 students per administrator in 2011. This is significantly above the state average, which was 202 students per administrator in 2009; 204 students per administrator in 2010; and 211 in 2011.

\* The average teacher salary for QPS is well below the state average.

\* The average administrator salary for QPS is well below the state average.

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

The increased needs of students (e.g., a mobile population, significantly increased numbers of Economically Disadvantaged students and families, significantly increased educational and/or social-emotional-behavioral student needs) coupled with the loss of approximately 75 FTE's have had an extremely detrimental impact on the programs, services and achievement across the district.

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

\* Ways to maximize instructional minutes and existing personnel must be determined and adhered to.

\* Ways to generate additional funding--local, grants and other--must be actively pursued.

\* A commitment to effective professional development must continue to maximize the impact, expertise and capacity of each educator.

### Section I-C. Data & Analysis - Other Data

#### 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 tell you?**

State, Federal and competitive grants (NOTE: several of these grants have been eliminated and several of the competitive grants have expired) have been utilized in recent years to build educator expertise and leadership capacity in several key areas (including but not limited to):

\* Two Instructional Coaches (one at Junior High and one at Senior High) received coach training to utilize in coaching teachers across their respective buildings to increase achievement.

\* Four District Literacy Coaches have been trained through UALR or NLU and continue to receive ongoing professional development through NLU's Illinois Partnerships in Comprehensive Literacy.

- 
- \* One Strategic Processing Coach has been trained through NLU to train, coach and support special education teachers in the areas of literacy instruction and intervention, and she is receiving ongoing professional development through NLU's Illinois Partnerships in Comprehensive Literacy.
  - \* The district has one Reading Recovery Teacher Leader who is also a CIM (Comprehensive Intervention Model) Specialist.
  - \* The district has five Reading Recovery teachers providing intervention to struggling first grade students.  
**2011 Update: An "ADM Cares" grant and local funding has resulted in an increase in Reading Recovery teachers. Title I schools have 2 RR teachers and non-Title teachers have one. There is a training class of # RR teachers this year.**
  - \* All K - 6 buildings have a Literacy Coach who has been, or will be, formally trained.
  - \* All K - 6 teachers have received foundational training in the Comprehensive Literacy Model, and targeted teachers have received training on CIM (Comprehensive Intervention Model) interventions for struggling students.
  - \* Grade 6 - 12 Math teachers have received ongoing training from consultants Sue and Randy Pippens in instruction and assessment.
  - \* Grade 6 - 12 English Language Arts teachers have received literacy strategies' training.
  - \* Newly-hired QPS educators who teacher literacy, math, science and other areas receive core curriculum training.
  - \* Three QPS educators have become Ruby Payne "A Framework for Understanding Poverty" certified trainers and they are providing training across the district.
  - \* New QPS teachers participate in a monthly, two-year Teacher Mentor Program; training topics include differentiation, lesson planning, engaging instruction, teaching/supporting students with socio-economic and other factors.

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

- \* QPS has dedicated teachers who are highly committed to ongoing professional development to meet the changing needs of students.
- \* The district has leveraged grant funding to build educator expertise and leadership capacity.

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

- \* A continued priority and focus on staff professional development must remain strong, and funding must be secured to ensure that effective professional development continues. Studies confirm that educator training that involves limited interactions will not positively impact student achievement. Educator training that is 30 - 100 hours in duration has been correlated with positive student-achievement gains.

---

Section I-C. Data & Analysis - Other Data  
Item 3 - Parent Involvement

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

Each year, at least one personal interaction is held with 100% of QPS students' parents/guardians. For most students, the number of personal interactions is estimated to be 3 - 10 during the course of a school year.

At least once per year, typically during November parent-teacher conferences, a parent/guardian survey is administered at each school, and the results are considered and incorporated into that school's parent involvement/engagement plan.

The survey results indicate that the majority of parents/guardians are satisfied with all or most aspects of Quincy Public Schools. Over the past several years, the percentage of QPS students who qualify for Free/Reduced Lunch status has increased from 39% to 54%. This information confirms what educators are reporting: increased numbers of students and families are experiencing significant financial struggles, and these struggles impact many aspects of a child's life at home and at school.

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

Parent/guardian involvement and engagement in a child's educational life has more impact than anyone else in that student's life. The impact and influence of a parent/guardian on a child's academic achievement cannot be overstated. When a child enters schools lacking one or more of the following **essential foundational components**, he/she begins school **behind**--and without effective and sustained school supports and intervention personnel, it is doubtful whether the child can ever catch up and stay on course. The essential foundational elements every young child **critically needs in order to start school ready to learn and excel** include: (a) Drug- and alcohol-free pre-natal development; (b) Appropriate nutrition; (c) Frequent and responsive opportunities to be talked with, sung to/with, and read to/with; (d) Healthy, predictable daily routines (e.g., physical activity, naps, meals, bath and bedtime routines); and, (e) **Healthy social-emotional interactions** (e.g., healthy self-concept development, appropriate discipline, respectful and predictable interactions). Once a child enters school, the parent/guardian foundational elements expand to include every student receiving: (a) support to ensure excellent daily attendance at school; (b) supportive assistance to be successful at school (e.g., talking about and checking school work, discussing the important of an education); and, (c) an open and collaborative home-school connection and communication.

Across the district, increased numbers of students are not receiving these key foundational support elements. All parents/guardians are providing the best support they can at the time. Many, however, are struggling with obstacles, including financial instability (which leads to heightened stress and inconsistent housing, transportation and routines); generational poverty and lack of education/options; drug and/or alcohol dependency; mental health issues; and/or parenting support needs.

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

Healthy, empowered and informed parents = healthier, happier families and **increased student achievement**. Therefore, the district/community must identify the barriers that are keeping some parents/guardians from being as healthy, empowered and informed as they could be, and then it must take steps to eliminate or minimize the barriers.

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

**Section I-D - Key Factors - From the preceding screens (I-A, I-B, I-C), identify key factors that are within the district'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?**

Within the district's capacity to control or change are the following:

- \* Continue to invest in professional development to train existing personnel to provide core curriculum with fidelity and integrity and, where available, train math and literacy intervention teachers to provide effective, research-based interventions to identified students.
- \* Examine the current daily and yearly schedule to **maximize existing instructional minutes** and, where possible, increase instructional time.
- \* Enlist literacy and math leaders to identify and lead the implementation of specific strategies/approaches to address areas of weakness.
- \* Utilize the information and problem-solving within the "Closing the Achievement Gap" session with Dr. Joseph Murphy to identify goals and priorities to address the achievement gap in the current dire financial state.

Section II-Action Plan

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective	Title	Deficiencies Addressed	
		AYP	AMAO
1	Increase Reading Achievement	1,3,5,7,9,11,	
2	Increase Math Achievement	2,4,6,8,10,12,	

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

- 1 District is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 2 District is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 3 White students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 4 White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 5 Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 6 Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 7 Multi-Racial students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 8 Multi-Racial students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 9 Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 10 Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 11 Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 12 Low Income students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

**No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO Report.  
This district is not accountable for AMAO for this year**

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

**Objective 1 Title :**

Increase Reading Achievement

**Objective 1 Description :**

For each QPS subgroup, at least 85% of students will "Meet" or "Exceed" on the state reading assessment, or will meet the "Safe Harbor" target, by 2013.

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

- 1 District is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 3 White students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

5 Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

7 Multi-Racial students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

9 Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

11 Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

**No Deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO report.**

**This district is not accountable for AMAO this year**

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Increase Reading Achievement

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	NEW: Extended-day intervention (literacy and/or math) will be provided to targeted students in Title I K - 6 schools.	11/01/2011	05/11/2012	During School	Title I	
2	NEW: Reading Recovery literacy intervention will be provided to identified first grade students in all 7 primary schools.	08/22/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Other	
3	NEW: Identified QJHS students will participate in extended day--and summer school--literacy, math and other intervention/instruction through the 21st CCLC grant.	11/07/2011	06/29/2012	During School	State Funds	
4	NEW: Summer School's literacy intervention, provided to targeted students, will be presented as mandatory instead of optional.	06/01/2012	06/29/2012	Summer School	Title I	
5	Continuing: - Students will participate in core literacy curriculum, provided with fidelity and integrity. - Students will receive an individualized Tier 1 - 4 intervention, as determined by Intervention Team. - At secondary level, students will receive additional instruction targeting "reading in the content area." - Every K - 6 student will be	08/15/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Other	

represented on a literacy assessment wall, with individual planning and monitoring occurring on an ongoing basis.					
---	--	--	--	--	--

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Increase Reading Achievement

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	NEW: Dr. Joseph Murphy will provide in-district training to educators on world-class educational programming and learning-centered leadership	10/10/2011	10/11/2011	During School	Title I	
2	NEW: Dr. Robyn Jackson will provide in-district training and coaching to secondary teachers in areas of rigor and engagement	06/08/2011	10/11/2011	During School	State Funds	
3	NEW: Grechen Courtney & Associates' consultant will provide reading instruction and strategies training to secondary teachers	04/01/2011	04/30/2012	During School	Other	
4	NEW: K - 3 teachers will participate in Comprehensive Literacy Assessment planning and training.	06/15/2011	06/30/2012	After School	Other	
5	NEW: A team will participate in ISBE-provided Common Core Standards for English/Language Arts transition and implementation.	01/16/2012	05/31/2012	During School	State Funds	
6	NEW: Training class of new Reading Recovey-trained teachers	08/10/2011	05/31/2012	After School	Other	
7	Ongoing: - Building-level professional book studies - Teacher support/training from Literacy Coaches and administrators; District Coaches' support/training through NLU - Instructional Walk Through-- data analysis and feedback - State-approved New Teacher mentoring and induction program	08/15/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Other	

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Increase Reading Achievement

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	NEW: Parents will receive Common Core Standards' information	03/01/2012	05/31/2012	After School	Local Funds	
2	NEW: The parents/guardians of students eligible for summer school intervention will be asked to consider it "mandatory" not "optional," with a communication/appeals process through Central Office	03/12/2012	06/29/2012	Summer School	Title I	
3	NEW: The parents/guardians of K-6 students identified as "Below" on literacy assessment will after first semester will receive a personal communication from Central Office with information re: attendance, intervention progress, possible required summer school participation, and an invitation for further communication and collaborative problem solving	01/16/2012	01/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	Continuing: - Parent involvement/engagement plan developed and implemented for each school - Programming and involvement for parents/guardians of 21st CCLC students in grades 7 - 12. - Monthly Central Office administrator meeting with PTA members	08/31/2011	05/31/2012	After School	State Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 1 Title :**

Increase Reading Achievement

**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 for this objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

Measure	Person(s) Responsible	When
ISAT/PSAE Reading	Teachers and Administration	Spring, 2012

Literacy Benchmark Assessments	All, K - 6	Quarterly
Stanford Achievement Assessment	Teachers and Administration	Fall, 2013
Pre-/Post-Data for students in intervention	Teachers and Administration	Ongoing, reported in Curriculum Initiatives' Update

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	Principals and Assistant Principals	District-Wide
2	Viniard, Lemon, Beswick, Dickens, Cooper	Central Office Administrators
3	Certified Staff	District-Wide

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

**Objective 2 Title :**

Increase Math Achievement

**Objective 2 Description :**

For each QPS subgroup, at least 85% of students will "Meet" or "Exceed" on the state math assessment, or will meet the "Safe Harbor" target, by 2013.

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

2 District is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
4 White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
6 Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
8 Multi-Racial students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
10 Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
12 Low Income students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

**No Deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO report.  
This district is not accountable for AMAO this year**

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

Increase Math Achievement

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	NEW: Identified K - 3 students will receive a Tier 2 and/or 3 math intervention provided by math interventionist	08/15/2011	05/31/2012		Title I	
2	NEW: Identified QJHS students will receive math instruction and intervention, in extended day setting and summer school, through newly-awarded 21st CCLC grant	11/14/2011	06/30/2012		Title I	
3	Continuing: - Common core provided to students with integrity and fidelity, including individual, differentiated instruction - Tier 2-3 to identified students at Baldwin provided by interventionist - Tier 2 - 3 provided to identified students at secondary level through Math Intensive, Focused Study Hall and/or Extended Day 21st CCLC program - Summer School math instruction, intervention and/or credit recovery	08/15/2011	06/29/2012		Title I	

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

Increase Math Achievement

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	NEW: District K - 6 Common Core Math team will analyze Common Core standards and prepare transition document for QPS teachers	09/12/2011	05/31/2012	After School	Local Funds	
2	NEW: Consultants Sue and Randy Pippens will continue secondary math planning and instructional consultation	09/26/2011	05/15/2012	During School	State Funds	
3	NEW: Math workshop author Laney Sammons will provide training to all K-6 teachers, and more extensive training to representative K - 6 teachers from every school	01/03/2012	06/15/2012	During School	Other	
4	NEW: UCSMP trainers will train K - 2 teachers in new edition of "Everyday Math" series aligned to Common Core standards	01/03/2012	01/03/2012	During School	Other	
5	NEW: Representative math teachers will participate in Common Core training provided by ISBE/ROE, sharing information/training with other district stakeholders (teachers, administrators)	11/01/2012	05/31/2012	During School	State Funds	
6	NEW: Dr. Robyn Jackson will provide training and coaching in areas of rigor and engagement for secondary teachers	06/06/2011	10/15/2012	During School	State Funds	
7	Ongoing: - Teachers new to QPS will receive training in math curriculum, with ongoing support from trained Mentor - Instructional Walk Through data and discussion at secondary level	08/13/2012	05/31/2012	During School	Other	

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

Increase Math Achievement

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	NEW: Parents will receive Common Core Standards' information	01/31/2012	05/31/2012	After School	Local Funds	
2	NEW: The parents/guardians of students eligible for summer school intervention will be asked to consider it "mandatory" not "optional," with a communication/appeals process through Central Office	03/12/2012	06/11/2012	After School	Other	
3	Continuing: - Parent involvement/engagement plan developed and implemented for each school - Programming and involvement for parents/guardians of 21st CCLC students in grades 7 - 12. - Monthly Central Office administrator meeting with PTA members	08/15/2011	05/31/2012	During School	Other	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 2 Title :**

Increase Math Achievement

**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 for this objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

Measure	Person(s) Responsible	When
Stanford Achievement Test	Teachers and Administrators	Fall, Annually
State ISAT/PSAE/IAA	Teachers and Administrators	Spring, Annually
Progress Monitoring Assessment for students in intervention	Math instructor/ interventionist and Administrators	Ongoing, reported in Initiatives Update

---

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	Principals	All Buildings
2	Central Office	Administration
3	Math Interventionists	District

---

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

#### A. 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 district improvement team or plan developers are identified here.**

Stakeholders (teachers, parents, consultants) were involved in the development of each building's School Improvement Plan. The District Improvement Plan is a synthesis of those 11 plans. In addition, stakeholders from the community (e.g., Curriculum Committee members, ROE, PTA officers, consultants) and district reviewed the plan and made contributions.

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

#### B. 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 responsibilities include providing technical assistance to the schools including data analysis, identification of the district'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 district's budget to ensure that funds provided under Title I and Title III supplement, not supplant, non federal funds, and that services provided with these funds are comparable with the services in schools that are not receiving funds under Title I ( NCLB, Section 1116 and 1120A).**

District responsibilities include:

- \* Providing technical assistance to the schools including data analysis;
- \* Identification of the district's challenges in implementing professional development requirements, the resulting need-related technical assistance and professional development to effect changes in instruction;
- \* Analysis and revision of the district's budget to ensure that funds provided under Title I and Title III supplement, not supplant, non federal funds, and that services provided with these funds are comparable with the services in schools that are not receiving funds under Title I ( NCLB, Section 1116 and 1120A).

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation  
C. State Responsibilities

**State Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that ISBE, RESPROS/ISCs, and other service providers have provided the district 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 district, if requested, to develop and implement the district plan and work with schools needing improvement. Such technical assistance shall be supported by effective methods and instructional strategies based on scientifically based research. The technical assistance shall address problems, if any, implementing the parental involvement activities described in NCLB, Section 1118, and the professional development activities described in NCLB, Section 1119. [NCLB, Section 1116(c)(9)(B)].**

## Section IV-A Local Board Action

**DATE APPROVED** by Local Board: 1/18/2012

**A.Assurances**

1. 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).
2. Technical assistance provided by the district serving its school is founded on scientifically based research (NCLB, Section 1116(b)(4)(C)) as defined in NCLB, Section 9101(37).
3. The plan includes strategies and activities that support the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards and ensures alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with the Illinois Learning Standards.
4. The district will spend at least 10 percent of the funds made available under Title I, Part A, subpart 2 of NCLB, for the purpose of providing high-quality professional development. (Title I districts only.)

**B.Superintendent's Certification**

By submitting the plan on behalf of the district, 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 plan completion from the **Submit Your Plan** page the plan shall be deemed to be executed by the superintendent on behalf of the district.

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 DIP 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 data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?[C]

**LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA**

Yes  No Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?

Yes  No Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

**OTHER DATA**

Yes  No Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?

Yes  No 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**

<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Has the DIP team stated measurable objectives that promote continuous and substantial progress to ensure that students in each subgroup meet the State's target (e.g., in delivering tiered services or differentiated instruction)?
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Has the DIP team stated <u>measurable objectives</u> that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan?[C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> N/A	Do the objectives address all areas of AYP and AMAO deficiency?[C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> N/A	Do the objectives address the areas of special education compliance?

**ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES**

<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement?[C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Are the strategies and activities measurable?[C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified?
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear?[C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> N/A	Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students?[C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> N/A	Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status or special education non-compliance?
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> N/A	Do the parent involvement strategies and activities clearly align with the strategies and activities for students?[C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> 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="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?[C]
<b>MONITORING</b>	
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?[C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?[C]
<b>PART I - COMMENTS</b>	

<b>PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN</b>	
<b>METHODS OF PLAN DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, AND IMPLEMENTATION</b>	
<b>STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT</b>	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?[C]
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Does the DIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that best effect necessary changes?[C]
<b>DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES</b>	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?[C]
<b>STATE RESPONSIBILITIES</b>	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> 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]
<b>APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD</b>	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.[C]

PART II - COMMENTS