

Local Board Approved	11/28/2011
Initial Submission	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this School been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2011-12 Federal Improvement Status	Choice
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2011-12 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning Year 1

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	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	81.3		Yes	91.1		Yes	95.8	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	94.6		Yes	98.0		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	50.9		No	69.8		No				
Asian	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes										

American Indian													
Two or More Races													
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander													
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	54.8	75.7	No	80.8		Yes	94.7		
Students with Disabilities													
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	55.6	66.7	No	76.2		No	94.4		

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 School is:	Focused
Is this School making AYP in the "ALL" subgroup in reading?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in the "ALL" subgroup in math?	Yes

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 schools in federal improvement status that do not make AYP**.

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

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

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	95.2	95.8	95.2	96.0	95.5	95.7	95.8
Truancy Rate (%)	0.2	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.6	0.8	0.9	0.2
Mobility Rate (%)	9.2	32.3	9.2	14.3	3.9	7.4	8.6	16.6
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	584	607	627	624	563	630	693	637
Low Income (%)	7.2	11.4	8.0	9.9	8.9	18.3	18.8	26.8
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	10.1	15.8	20.9	21.2	24.0	25.2	25.8	29.5
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.4	12.9
White, non-Hispanic (%)	61.6	59.0	59.3	58.7	57.4	54.6	50.6	54.0
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	7.9	8.4	7.3	6.4	6.0	4.9	4.8	5.8
Hispanic (%)	15.8	15.0	14.2	15.2	15.8	18.7	22.1	21.0
Asian (%)	14.4	17.1	14.7	14.3	15.1	15.7	16.6	18.2
American Indian(%)	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2
Two or More Races (%)	-	0.0	4.0	5.3	5.5	5.9	5.8	0.8
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	74.5	8.5	9.0	7.6	0.4	-	-
	2001	73.7	6.5	9.3	10.1	0.4	-	-
	2002	70.2	6.3	10.6	12.9	-	-	-
	2003	70.0	6.7	10.6	12.6	-	-	-
	2004	61.6	7.9	15.8	14.4	0.3	-	-
	2005	59.0	8.4	15.0	17.1	0.5	-	-
	2006	59.3	7.3	14.2	14.7	0.5	4.0	-
	2007	58.7	6.4	15.2	14.3	0.2	5.3	-
	2008	57.4	6.0	15.8	15.1	0.2	5.5	-
	2009	54.6	4.9	18.7	15.7	0.2	5.9	-
	2010	50.6	4.8	22.1	16.6	0.1	5.8	-
2011	54.0	5.8	21.0	18.2	0.2	0.8	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	87.7	4.5	3.8	3.9	0.1	-	-
	2001	85.9	4.0	5.1	4.9	0.1	-	-
	2002	85.8	4.0	4.6	5.5	0.1	-	-
	2003	84.0	4.3	5.5	6.1	0.1	-	-
	2004	81.0	4.5	6.9	7.4	0.2	-	-
	2005	79.5	5.6	6.3	8.3	0.3	-	-
	2006	77.8	5.1	7.0	7.8	0.2	2.1	-
	2007	76.3	5.0	7.6	7.4	0.2	3.5	-
	2008	76.1	4.0	8.3	7.8	0.3	3.5	-
	2009	75.2	3.9	8.4	8.4	0.3	3.8	-
	2010	73.5	3.3	10.0	8.7	0.3	4.3	-

	2011	71.3	4.4	11.8	8.9	0.2	3.3	0.1
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	6.6	6.6	100.0	95.8	11.5	-	-	-	-
	2001	11.5	5.3	100.0	95.3	15.0	-	-	-	-
	2002	2.6	3.3	100.0	95.5	14.9	1	0.2	-	-
	2003	8.5	5.9	100.0	95.5	35.2	-	-	-	-
	2004	10.1	7.2	100.0	96.2	9.2	1	0.2	-	-
	2005	15.8	11.4	100.0	95.2	32.3	-	-	-	-
	2006	20.9	8.0	100.0	95.8	9.2	3	0.5	-	-
	2007	21.2	9.9	100.0	95.2	14.3	-	-	-	-
	2008	24.0	8.9	100.0	96.0	3.9	4	0.6	-	-
	2009	25.2	18.3	100.0	95.5	7.4	5	0.8	-	-
	2010	25.8	18.8	100.0	95.7	8.6	5	0.9	-	-
2011	29.5	26.8	100.0	95.8	16.6	1	0.2	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	2.8	3.1	100.0	96.2	11.7	6	0.2	-	-
	2001	4.3	2.2	100.0	95.9	9.8	1	-	-	-
	2002	2.3	1.8	100.0	95.3	10.4	3	0.1	-	-
	2003	3.9	2.9	100.0	95.5	14.1	1	-	-	-
	2004	4.0	4.0	100.0	96.0	10.4	2	0.1	-	-
	2005	3.9	4.8	100.0	95.4	13.7	6	0.2	-	-
	2006	6.5	6.0	100.0	95.5	10.5	7	0.2	-	-
	2007	7.1	6.2	100.0	95.6	10.0	5	0.1	-	-
	2008	7.8	8.2	100.0	96.0	7.3	10	0.3	-	-
	2009	9.7	10.4	100.0	95.9	9.4	22	0.6	-	-
	2010	9.5	11.8	100.0	95.4	13.7	8	0.2	-	-
2011	11.4	15.9	100.0	95.8	8.2	10	0.3	-	-	

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	564	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	567	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	583	74	87	91	-	-	-
	2003	564	100	80	88	-	-	-
	2004	584	98	102	85	-	-	-
	2005	607	101	94	100	-	-	-
	2006	627	101	105	90	-	-	-
	2007	624	106	99	100	-	-	-
	2008	563	104	100	88	-	-	-
	2009	630	102	105	106	-	-	-
	2010	693	69	107	111	-	-	-
2011	637	98	68	114	-	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	3,280	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	3,384	374	381	356	340	358	-
	2002	3,382	364	351	373	376	342	-
	2003	3,434	400	381	354	355	365	-
	2004	3,482	398	405	379	371	352	-
	2005	3,504	404	386	385	379	379	-
	2006	3,549	379	406	374	379	379	-
	2007	3,588	393	384	395	389	377	-
	2008	3,566	405	399	375	383	391	-
	2009	3,551	376	401	399	395	380	-
	2010	3,651	412	392	409	364	384	-
2011	3,640	366	413	390	404	382	-	
	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	175	15	53,264	32	68	21	-	-	-
	2001	180	15	54,232	33	67	22	-	-	-
	2002	211	13	53,556	43	57	18	-	1	-
	2003	214	12	53,350	47	53	18	-	1	-
	2004	226	13	56,224	39	61	18	-	1	-
	2005	235	13	58,739	29	71	17	-	-	-
	2006	242	12	60,936	27	73	17	-	1	-
	2007	241	12	64,215	27	73	17	-	1	-
	2008	239	12	66,189	25	75	17	-	-	-
	2009	235	12	69,384	23	77	17	-	1	-
	2010	243	12	72,495	22	78	16	-	-	-
2011	234	13	75,489	23	77	17	-	-	-	
	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	86.3	92.4	82.4	84.0	76.4	75.5	85.0	87.6	87.0	80.6	88.9	84.5	86.4	91.2	79.3	81.5	88.1	82.9
White	96.0	91.5	94.4	97.1	87.9	95.9	93.4	90.0	91.7	90.7	97.2	93.9	93.4	95.0	94.2	88.6	98.2	94.7
Black	60.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	72.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	60.0	-	46.2	46.2	80.0	-	75.0	66.6	-	75.1	-	-	-	66.7	80.0	23.1
Asian	-	-	80.0	61.6	81.8	75.1	-	-	86.6	65.0	78.5	81.8	-	-	78.5	77.8	75.0	84.2
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	52.1	70.0	68.5	26.1	-	-	76.0	45.8	68.1	61.5	-	-	47.1	69.5	55.0	33.3
Students with Disabilities	70.0	60.0	-	66.6	-	50.0	47.0	-	70.6	-	72.8	-	57.1	-	-	50.1	-	41.7
Low Income	-	-	53.4	62.5	52.6	35.0	-	-	75.1	60.0	66.6	75.0	-	-	-	69.6	61.9	58.0
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	90.6	91.1	96.0	93.4	87.8	88.3	90.7	95.9	95.0	93.6	95.4	94.4	93.8	93.8	88.5	89.0	95.5	90.6
White	95.9	89.8	100.0	98.5	97.0	100.0	96.7	98.0	98.3	100.0	100.0	96.9	98.3	98.4	96.1	93.5	100.0	98.7
Black	72.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	81.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	85.0	-	69.3	65.4	90.0	-	93.8	94.4	-	93.8	-	-	-	83.3	95.3	53.9
Asian	-	-	100.0	92.3	100.0	93.8	-	-	93.3	80.9	100.0	100.0	-	-	100.0	83.3	90.5	94.8
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	91.3	90.0	80.9	60.9	-	-	88.0	80.0	91.3	92.8	-	-	76.5	70.8	86.4	72.2
Students with Disabilities	70.0	66.7	-	83.3	-	75.0	64.7	-	88.2	-	81.8	-	69.3	-	-	75.1	-	50.0
Low Income	-	-	93.3	81.3	75.0	60.0	-	-	81.3	76.2	92.0	95.8	-	-	-	69.6	86.9	71.0
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?

Churchill School is Pre-K-5 elementary school in Glen Ellyn. There have been significant changes in the white, Hispanic, Limited English Proficient, and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. While our attendance rate remained high, we experienced a spike in our mobility rate during the 2010-2011 school year. Our total enrollment for the 2010-2011 school year was 637 students in grades Pre-Kindergarten through 5th grade. This enrollment figure also includes one section of bilingual Spanish at each grade from Pre-Kindergarten through 3rd grade that encompasses students from across District 41.

Given our growing diversity, we have worked hard to improve student achievement for all of our students at Churchill. While our white students are currently meeting standards, our Hispanic, Limited English Proficient, and Economically Disadvantaged students have not made the necessary growth that we would have liked. The activities in this school improvement plan are designed to meet the needs of all of our underachieving subgroups of students.

Demographics:

White, non-Hispanic student population has decreased from 58.7% in 2007 to 54.0% in 2011

Hispanic student population has increased from 15.2% in 2007 to 21.0% in 2011

Asian population has increased from 14.3% in 2007 to 18.2% in 2011 (2011% is higher than state average)

Economically Disadvantaged student population has jumped from 9.9% in 2007 to 26.8% in 2011

Limited English Proficiency student population has increased from 21.2% in 2007 to 29.5% in 2011 (2011% is significantly higher than state average)

Students with disabilities population rose from 8.4% in 2010 to 12.9% in 2011

Student mobility rate jumped from 14.3 % in 2010 to 16.6% in 2011 (2011% is higher than state average)

Student attendance rate has increased from 95.2 % in 2007 to 95.8% in 2011

Strengths:Math

Our school report card data indicates that Churchill students are making progress in the NCLB subject area of math.

As a whole, students making progress have increased from 89.4% in 2007 to 91.1% in 2011. **Our** 2011 percentage is above the state average.

Limited English Proficiency students are making AYP in math.

Economically Disadvantaged students making progress have increased from 74.5% in 2009 to 76.2 % in 2011.

Overall grade level performance in math exceeds the AYP benchmark targets.

Asian and white sub groups are performing above AYP benchmark targets.

Reading

White, non-Hispanic students making progress has increased from 91.8% in 2007 to 94.6% making progress in 2011.

Limited English Proficient students making progress has increased from 40.7% in 2008 to 54.8% in 2011.

Weaknesses:Math

69.8% of Hispanic students are making progress according to the AYP target.

Limited English Proficient students making progress has decreased from 89.0% in 2010 to 80.8% making progress in 2011.

76.2 % of Economically Disadvantaged students are making progress according to the AYP target.

Reading

50.9 % of Hispanic students are making progress according to the AYP target.

55.6 % of Economically Disadvantaged students are making progress according to the AYP target.

54.8 % of Limited English Proficient students are making progress according to the AYP target.

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

External:

Our low-income percentage has increased from 6.6% in 2000 to 26.8 % in 2011.

A low-income population of 26.8% suggests that many students come to school lacking the skills necessary that prepare them to be ready to learn.

Our Limited English Proficient population has increased from 6.6% in 2000 to 29.5 % in 2011.

A Limited English population of 29.5% suggests that vocabulary development and English proficiency is an obstacle to being successful on a test in English like the ISAT.

Our Hispanic population has increased from 9.0% in 2000 to 21.0 % in 2011.

Students who are new to our school often exhibit limited background knowledge and tend to come with a larger achievement gap when compared to students within our district.

Internal:

There have been limited opportunities for ENL teachers to collaborate and plan with grade level colleagues to align instruction to meet student sub group needs.

Parental involvement at parent-teacher conferences has remained high but may not be a true indicator of involvement for supporting the educational development of students outside of school.

Language issues between home and school make communication more difficult.

Grade level teachers may lack the appropriate training and background knowledge necessary to effectively work with the Limited English populations in their classrooms.

ENL students may have been pulled from classroom literacy instruction in order to meet service minutes.

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

Need to increase collaboration opportunities between the ENL/bilingual teachers and grade level teachers within the school day.

Need to increase collaboration opportunities for literacy and math specialists with grade level teams.

Need to increase the amount of consistent literacy instruction for our neediest students at all grade levels.

Need to create protected math and literacy instructional blocks for all students.

Need to increase teacher knowledge on sheltered instruction strategies that can be used to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Team collaboration needs to focus on identifying and aligning common core literacy and math essentials for consistent instruction across the grade level.

Need to bring tighter alignment and additional support to intervention services for struggling literacy students.

Need to increase staff knowledge on engaged instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners.

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 grades 1-5 take the NWEA MAP (Measures of Academic Progress) assessment 3 times (fall, winter, spring) in a school year. MAP test data is used to determine the instructional level of a child in the areas of math and reading and to measure academic growth for a given year. District 41 has looked at our growth data for MAP and found that there is generally a strong correlation between growth on the MAP and performance on the ISAT.

MAP/ISAT

The percentage of 3rd grade students making adequate progress on the ISAT reading was **75.5%** compared to **81.4 %** who scored at or above the NWEA spring median score on the MAP.

The percentage of 4th grade students making adequate progress on the ISAT reading was **84.5%** compared to **81.4 %** who scored at or above the NWEA spring median score on the MAP.

The percentage of 5th grade students making adequate progress on the ISAT reading was **82.9 %** compared to **85.2 %** who scored at or above the NWEA spring median score on the MAP.

The percentage of 3rd grade students making adequate progress on the ISAT math was **88.3 %** compared to **84.5 %** who scored at or above the NWEA spring median score on the MAP.

The percentage of 4th grade students making adequate progress on the ISAT math was **94.4 %** compared to **88.5 %** who scored at or above the NWEA spring median score on the MAP.

The percentage of 5th grade students making adequate progress on the ISAT math was **90.6 %** compared to **91.3 %** who scored at or above the NWEA spring median score on the MAP.

ACCESS for ELL Learners

26.6 % of 3rd grade students who scored at a level 5 or 6

20.0 % of 4th grade students who scored at a level 5 or 6

38.4 % of 5th grade students who scored at a level 5 or 6

Weaknesses:

Based upon the MAP data, more of our 3rd and 5th grade students should have made adequate yearly progress on the ISAT in reading.

A low percentage of our ENL students are scoring well enough on the ACCESS to exit the program.

Strengths:

The percentage of ENL students exiting services increases with the age/educational experience of the students.

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

External:

Changing demographics of our student population results in a broader range of achievement levels and background knowledge.

Increasing percentage of low-income families and families for whom English is not the first language.

Parents do not speak English and may be unable to support student learning at home.

Our mobility rate has increased to 16.6%. Many students who are new to Churchill have attended multiple schools in the past and/or have significant gaps in their learning.

Internal:

Grade level identified essential goals may not align with ISAT expectations.

Expectations for learning and instruction may not be aligned among grade level teams.

Common assessments may not consistently be used for instructional decisions within the grade level teams.

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

Need to increase collaboration opportunities for literacy and math specialists with grade level teams.

Need to increase the amount of consistent literacy instruction for our neediest students at all grade levels.

Need to create protected math and literacy instructional blocks for all students.

Need to increase teacher knowledge on sheltered instruction strategies that can be used to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Team collaboration needs to focus on identifying and aligning common core literacy and math essentials for consistent instruction across the grade level.

Need to bring tighter alignment and additional support to intervention services for struggling literacy students.

Need to increase staff knowledge on engaged instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners.

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?

Low-income student population has jumped from 9.9% in 2007 to 26.8% in 2011.

Limited English Proficiency student population has increased from 21.2% in 2007 to 29.5% in 2011 (2011% is significantly higher than state average).

Student mobility rate jumped from 14.3 % in 2010 to 16.6% in 2011 (2011% is higher than state average).

Hispanic student population has increased from 15.2% in 2007 to 21.0% in 2011.

Asian population has increased from 14.3 in 2007 to 18.2 in 2011 (2011% is higher than state average).

Students with disabilities population rose from 8.4% in 2010 to 12.9% in 2011.

Nine families within the school community are homeless and living in temporary shelters.

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

A low-income population of 26.8% suggests that many students come to school lacking the skills necessary that prepare them to be ready to learn.

A Limited English population of 29.5% suggests that vocabulary development and English proficiency is an obstacle to being successful on a test in English like the ISAT.

Students who are new to our school often exhibit limited background knowledge and tend to come with a larger achievement gap when compared to students within our district.

Mobility rate may hinder parent understanding of the school learning expectations and goals when families move into a community mid-year.

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

- Need to identify staff professional development in supporting, understanding the needs of, and working with at-risk families.
- Increase teacher knowledge to involve students in communicating their learning progress to parents.
- Need to increase teacher knowledge on sheltered instruction strategies that can be used to meet the needs of diverse learners.

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 teachers at Churchill Elementary School are highly qualified for their teaching assignment.
- 77% of the Churchill staff have Master's degrees.
- Eleven staff members speak a language other than English.
- Churchill has one full time Literacy Coach and one half time Math Coach.
- All special education teachers, ENL teachers, and teachers in grades 3-5 will have received training in SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Operation Protocol) by the end of the 2011-2012 school year.
- All Churchill teachers have been implementing a balanced literacy approach since 2009.
- Everyday Math has been implemented in the district since 2009.
- Building Literacy Coach meets with each grade level team on a weekly basis to discuss student progress and provide professional development based on need.
- Building Math Coach meets with each grade level team twice a month to discuss student progress and provide professional development based on need.
- All certified staff members have received professional development in PLC practices from Cindy Harrison (Learning Forward) and Tom Many (Solution Tree).
- Bilingual and ENL staff have received professional development from the Illinois Resource Center (IRC).

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

- Some Churchill teachers have limited experience working with our linguistically and culturally diverse population, and as a result don't know all of the necessary teaching strategies to best meet the needs of this population of students.

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

- Need to increase collaboration opportunities between the ENL/bilingual teachers and grade level teachers within the school day.
- Need to increase teacher knowledge of sheltered instruction strategies that can be used to meet the needs of diverse learners.

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?

Nearly 100% of parents attend a conference at some point during the school year.

About 60% of parents attended this year's grade level curriculum night.

On-line access to student grades has been opened to parents in the last year.

The district has added a Bilingual Spanish parent liaison position that is housed at Churchill Elementary School and assists with the translating and interpreting needs of our Spanish speaking families.

Bilingual families are offered the opportunity to participate in the Navigating the American Educational System (NAES) meetings throughout the school year.

Bilingual parents have the opportunity to serve on the district Bilingual Parent Advisory Committee (BPAC).

72 Churchill families completed the district satisfaction survey in the spring of 2011.

83% of the families completing the survey stated that they felt welcome at the school.

Low-income student population has jumped from 9.9% in 2007 to 26.8% in 2011.

Limited English Proficiency student population has increased from 21.2% in 2007 to 29.5% in 2011 (2011% is significantly higher than state average).

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

- Many low-income and second language families lack the computer skills or internet services necessary to be able to consistently access the on-line grading system for reporting.
 - Parents do not speak English and may be unable to support student learning at home.
 - Parents do not speak English and may be unable to communicate with the school.
- Communicating learning expectations is hindered when parents are not present at the grade level curriculum nights.

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

- Promote and increase opportunities for parents to be involved in the school.
- Increase parental knowledge of the school learning goals through written and oral communication in English, Spanish, Vietnamese, and Urdu.
- Identify families without internet skills and services to provide progress information to parents multiple times throughout the school year.
- Increase parent evening opportunities for families within our struggling subgroups to offer strategies and resources for supporting learning at home.
- Training is needed for our bilingual and ENL families in accessing and interpreting the on-line student report card system.

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?

Need to increase collaboration opportunities between the ENL/bilingual teachers and grade level teachers within the school day.

Need to increase collaboration opportunities for literacy and math specialists with grade level teams.

Need to increase the amount of consistent literacy instruction for our neediest students at all grade levels.

Need to create protected math and literacy instructional blocks for all students.

Need to increase teacher knowledge on sheltered instruction strategies that can be used to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Team collaboration needs to focus on identifying and aligning common core literacy and math essentials for consistent instruction across the grade level.

Need to bring tighter alignment and additional support to intervention services for struggling literacy students.

Need to increase staff knowledge on engaged instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Increase parental knowledge of the school learning goals through written and oral communication in English, Spanish, Vietnamese, and Urdu.

Identify families without internet skills and services to provide progress information to parents multiple times throughout the school year.

Increase parent evening opportunities for families within our struggling subgroups to offer strategies and resources for supporting learning at home.

Training is needed for our bilingual and ENL families in accessing and interpreting the on-line student report card system.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Improve reading performance for Hispanic, LEP, and Economically Disadvantaged students.	1,3,4,
2	Improve math performance for Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged students.	2,5,

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

- Ⓟ 1. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓟ 2. Hispanic students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓟ 3. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓟ 4. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓟ 5. Low Income students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Improve reading performance for Hispanic, LEP, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

Objective 1 Description

While our overall current achievement in reading for Hispanic students is 50.9%, LEP students 54.8%, and Economically Disadvantaged students 66.7 % of all students

meeting/exceeding AYP in Reading for 2011, our objective is for all three subgroups to make AYP of at least 92.5% in 2012 and 2013, or Safe Harbor as measured by the ISAT.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- ⓑ 1. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓔ 2. Hispanic students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 3. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 4. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓔ 5. Low Income students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improve reading performance for Hispanic, LEP, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Insure that all ENL students have the opportunity to participate daily in an uninterrupted reading and writing workshop model.	08/24/2011	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Insure that all students not meeting standards on ISAT receive a targeted daily double dose of reading instruction in a small guided reading group setting.	08/24/2011	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	Insure that students at or near the warning level for ISAT reading are placed in small intervention groups to increase reading strategies and comprehension skills.	08/24/2011	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	Students will be provided with curriculum and instruction aligned to Common Core Literacy Standards.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	During School	Local Funds	

5	Students will set individual goals for MAP reading growth and share those goals with parents at conferences.	10/24/2011	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	Students will be provided daily time to practice reading at their independent level.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	During School	Local Funds	
7	Students will practice reading at home and record their daily reading on a reading log.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	After School	Local Funds	
8	Students will be provided with environmental print in the classroom to support word and vocabulary acquisition for second-language learners.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improve reading performance for Hispanic, LEP, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teacher teams will be given daily collaboration time to monitor the progress towards school goals.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	During School	Local Funds	
2	Grade level teachers will collaborate at least one day a week with the building Literacy Coach for the purpose of planning literacy instruction and discussing student progress.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	During School	Local Funds	
3	ENL and special education teachers will be assigned to one grade level PLC for the purposes of assisting with planning instruction and supporting student progress for that given grade level.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	During School	Local Funds	
4	SIOP training to increase teachers' use of strategies that meet the needs of a linguistically and culturally diverse student population.	08/24/2011	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	Grade level teams will meet on a bi-monthly basis with building principal and Literacy Coach to chart student progress in reading on the school data wall.	11/08/2011	06/03/2013	During School	Local Funds	
6	Grade level teams will study Common Core standards to identify essential skills by trimester and develop a monthly pacing guide for	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	During School	Local Funds	

consistent implementation of instruction.					
---	--	--	--	--	--

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improve reading performance for Hispanic, LEP, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Offer translation services for parents at conferences so that student progress and plans for improvement can be discussed.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	After School	Local Funds	
2	Parent orientation nights within the first month of the school year to inform parents of class goals and expectations.	09/05/2011	09/09/2011	After School	Local Funds	
3	Access district's parent involvement committee for ideas to expand parent outreach efforts.	08/24/2011	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	Provide assistance in English and Spanish at school for parents without home internet access to use the Pinnacle parent viewer.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	After School	Local Funds	
5	Parent involvement presentations 5 times a year for bilingual Spanish families that focus on participating in their child's education and helping their child have success in school.	08/24/2011	06/01/2012	After School	Other	
6	Bilingual Parent Advisory Committee presentations will be held 4 times a year in the school for Spanish, Vietnamese, and Urdu families.	08/24/2011	06/01/2012	After School	Other	
7	Offer parent evening for bilingual Spanish families for the purpose of helping parents understand their child's results on the ISAT and MAP tests.	11/07/2011	01/31/2012	After School	Other	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Improve reading performance for Hispanic, LEP, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

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

- Fountas and Pinnell running records will be taken on all subgroup students in August, January, and May for the purposes of measuring growth.
- Bi-monthly data wall meetings monitoring student growth and progress in the area of reading.
- Mid-year MAP to monitor growth of identified subgroup students.
- The fidelity of implementation of the Common Core standards will be monitored through classroom observations and the collection and analysis of weekly team minutes.
- Use of attendance sheets, feedback forms, and direct feedback from our parents to monitor the effectiveness of parent strategies.

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	Scott Klespitz	Principal
2	Tim Lofgren	Assistant Principal (Half time)
3	Janis Pfister	Literacy Coach
4	Kristine Aldrich	Building Leadership Co-chair

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Improve math performance for Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged students.

Objective 2 Description

While our overall current achievement in math for Hispanic students is 69.8% and 76.2 % for Economically Disadvantaged students of all students meeting/exceeding AYP in Math for 2011, our objective is for both subgroups to make AYP of at least 92.5% in 2012 and 2013, or Safe Harbor as measured by the ISAT.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- e 1. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- b 2. Hispanic students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- e 3. LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- e 4. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- b 5. Low Income students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 2 Title :

Improve math performance for Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Insure that all students have the opportunity to participate daily in an uninterrupted 70 minute instructional math block using the Everyday Math curriculum.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	During School	Local Funds	
2	Students at or near the warning level for ISAT math will increase their fact fluency using Fastt Math 3 to 5 times a week for 15 minutes.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	During School	Local Funds	
3	Students at or near the warning level for ISAT math will receive small group math instruction 3 to 5 times a week during their uninterrupted math block.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	During School	Local Funds	
4	Students at or near the warning level for ISAT math will be provided access to Do the Math, a research based intervention, on a daily basis in addition to their core instruction.	11/14/2011	06/03/2013	During School	Local Funds	

5	Students will set individual goals for MAP math growth and share those goals with parents at conferences.	10/24/2011	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	Students will be provided with curriculum and instruction aligned to Common Core math standards via district wide Great Tasks.	11/07/2011	06/03/2013	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title :

Improve math performance for Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teacher teams will be given daily collaboration time to monitor the progress towards school goals.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	During School	Local Funds	
2	Grade level teachers will collaborate at least twice a month with the building Math Coach for the purpose of planning math instruction and discussing student progress.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	During School	Local Funds	
3	ENL and special education teachers will be assigned to one grade level PLC for the purposes of assisting with planning instruction and supporting student progress for that given grade level.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	During School	Local Funds	
4	Teachers will begin to explore and implement guided math groups during thier daily math block with the assistance of the Math Coach.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title :

Improve math performance for Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Offer translation services for parents at conferences so that student progress and plans for improvement can be discussed.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	After School	Local Funds	
2	Parent orientation nights within the first month of the school year to inform parents of class goals and expectations.	09/05/2011	09/09/2011	After School	Local Funds	
3	Access district's parent involvement committee for ideas to expand parent outreach efforts.	08/24/2011	06/01/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	Provide assistance in English and Spanish at school for parents without home internet access to use the Pinnacle parent viewer.	08/24/2011	06/03/2013	After School	Local Funds	
5	Parent involvement presentations 5 times a year for bilingual Spanish families that focus on participating in their child's education and helping their child have success in school.	08/24/2011	06/01/2012	After School	Local Funds	
6	Bilingual Parent Advisory Committee presentations will be held 4 times a year in the school for Spanish, Vietnamese, and Urdu families.	08/24/2011	06/01/2012	After School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

Improve math performance for Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged students.

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

- Do the Math progress monitoring data will be collected and analyzed on all subgroup students on a monthly basis for the purposes of measuring growth.
- Everyday Math assessments will be analyzed at the end of each unit for the purposes of measuring student growth.

- Mid-year MAP to monitor growth of identified subgroup students.
- The fidelity of implementation of the Common Core standards will be monitored through classroom observations and the collection and analysis of weekly team meetings.
- Use of attendance sheets, feedback forms, and direct feedback from our parents to monitor the effectiveness of parent strategies.

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	Scott Klespitz	Principal
2	Tim Lofgren	Assistant Principal (Half time)
3	Jeanne Chmelik	Math Coach (Half time)
4	Kristine Aldrich	Building Leadership Co-chair

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 Churchill families received written notification in English and Spanish of our "Choice" status in early August 2011. All families were invited to attend a public meeting where the school's academic status was discussed on August 18, 2011. As a result of our status, 18 students and their families elected to take advantage of the Choice option and move to another school in the district.

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 building principal and district superintendent attended a regional workshop of SIP requirements on October 5, 2011. The school improvement writing team reviewed our recent student performance data, past trend data, and school improvement plans, and used this data to develop the current electronic plan. The plan will be shared with our full school staff in late November 2011 and then with parents via our PTA.

	Name	Title
1	Scott Klespitz	Principal
2	Amanda Roudebush	Teacher
3	David King	Teacher
4	Grace Van Maanen	Teacher
5	Michele Couzens	Teacher
6	Lynnea Urbanowicz	Teacher
7	Liz Vogel	Parent/PTA 1st Vice President/BLT Parent Rep

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.

The district has arranged for a peer review to be completed by the DuPage Regional Office of Education in November 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.

District 41 negotiated a formal mentoring program as part of the 2008-12 collective bargaining agreement with the Glen Ellyn Education Association (GEEA). In the spring of 2010 when the final components of the program were completed and approved by both the Board of Education and GEEA membership, it was determined not to implement the program during the 2010-11 school year due to two factors: financial constraints and a school year when very few new staff were hired. Any new to the district staff members at Churchill take part in the district's induction program. In this program, new teachers meet monthly with the Human Resources Director as well as other specialists across the school district to learn about programmatic best practices, resources and support for teachers new to the school district.

New teachers are also supported in the school through our grade level and department PLC teaming structures. Math and literacy coaches meet with teams to provide support for differentiation, data analysis, and to discuss best practices.

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 has trained teachers on the use of the district's data warehouse which gives teachers access to all formal assessment data available for each student. The district has also provided support and training for all staff members in the Professional Learning Community model.

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.

The DuPage Regional Office of Education offered services to support the writing of the SIP. The session for writing the eplan was offered on October 5, 2011.

	Name	Title
1	Ann Riebock	Superintendent
2	Karen Carlson	Assistant Superintendent
3	?	Regional office of education liaison

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 11/28/2011

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