

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

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

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

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	82.9		Yes	92.9		Yes	95.8	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	85.2		Yes	95.1		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian														

American Indian													
Two or More Races													
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities													
Economically Disadvantaged													

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

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 85% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 85% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. ***
3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 85% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 91% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 82% graduation rate for high schools.

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

** Safe Harbor Targets of 85% or above are not printed.

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

applied. Safe Harbor allows schools an alternate method to meet subgroup minimum targets on achievement.

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

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

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

School Information	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Attendance Rate (%)	95.8	96.1	96.0	96.1	95.8	95.9	95.9	95.8
Truancy Rate (%)	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.6
Mobility Rate (%)	21.2	12.4	14.5	9.8	13.4	8.9	19.3	9.4
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	270	281	281	317	289	300	315	313
Low Income (%)	34.1	39.9	39.9	35.0	40.1	37.3	43.2	41.2
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.3
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.5	13.1
White, non-Hispanic (%)	93.7	89.7	90.0	91.5	89.6	88.0	87.9	86.6
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	3.7	4.6	4.3	2.5	2.1	2.7	3.8	5.4
Hispanic (%)	1.9	2.5	1.4	0.9	1.4	1.0	1.6	2.6
Asian (%)	0.7	0.7	1.1	1.3	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
American Indian(%)	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
Two or More Races (%)	-	2.5	2.8	3.8	5.9	7.3	5.7	4.2
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	88.9	5.2	3.3	2.3	0.3	-	-
	2001	89.9	4.2	3.3	2.6	-	-	-
	2002	89.5	4.5	3.5	2.5	-	-	-
	2003	90.8	4.9	3.2	1.1	-	-	-
	2004	93.7	3.7	1.9	0.7	-	-	-
	2005	89.7	4.6	2.5	0.7	-	2.5	-
	2006	90.0	4.3	1.4	1.1	0.4	2.8	-
	2007	91.5	2.5	0.9	1.3	-	3.8	-
	2008	89.6	2.1	1.4	1.0	-	5.9	-
	2009	88.0	2.7	1.0	1.0	-	7.3	-
	2010	87.9	3.8	1.6	1.0	-	5.7	-
2011	86.6	5.4	2.6	1.0	0.3	4.2	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	89.5	8.8	0.8	0.8	0.1	-	-
	2001	89.0	9.2	1.0	0.7	0.1	-	-
	2002	89.1	9.2	1.0	0.6	-	-	-
	2003	88.5	9.7	1.0	0.6	-	-	-
	2004	88.0	10.0	1.1	0.8	0.1	-	-
	2005	87.9	9.1	1.3	0.8	0.1	0.7	-
	2006	87.2	9.7	1.1	0.8	0.2	1.1	-
	2007	87.5	8.8	1.2	0.8	0.2	1.5	-
	2008	87.3	8.4	1.2	0.8	0.1	2.2	-
	2009	86.7	8.0	1.2	0.9	0.1	3.2	-
	2010	85.5	8.4	1.3	0.9	0.1	3.9	-

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

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truancy (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	2.3	29.7	100.0	96.0	10.9	2	0.7	-	-
	2001	-	32.7	99.0	95.1	13.0	3	1.1	-	-
	2002	1.6	33.1	99.0	95.9	10.1	1	0.4	-	-
	2003	0.4	31.0	100.0	95.9	12.9	1	0.4	-	-
	2004	-	34.1	100.0	95.8	21.2	1	0.4	-	-
	2005	0.4	39.9	100.0	96.1	12.4	-	-	-	-
	2006	-	39.9	100.0	96.0	14.5	-	-	-	-
	2007	-	35.0	100.0	96.1	9.8	-	-	-	-
	2008	-	40.1	100.0	95.8	13.4	-	-	-	-
	2009	0.3	37.3	100.0	95.9	8.9	-	-	-	-
	2010	0.3	43.2	100.0	95.9	19.3	1	0.3	-	-
2011	0.3	41.2	100.0	95.8	9.4	2	0.6	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	0.2	38.9	91.5	94.2	24.7	116	1.8	4.7	75.3
	2001	0.2	38.5	84.8	93.5	28.9	121	1.9	4.2	74.4
	2002	0.1	41.1	86.0	94.1	34.3	169	2.6	3.6	76.6
	2003	0.2	39.0	91.5	94.3	30.5	158	2.5	2.7	78.5
	2004	0.3	42.5	92.3	93.9	33.1	155	2.5	2.5	82.7
	2005	0.1	44.5	97.8	94.4	26.6	145	2.3	2.7	84.5
	2006	0.1	44.1	97.6	94.0	24.4	155	2.5	1.9	87.6
	2007	0.2	43.8	98.1	94.1	24.7	118	1.9	2.6	88.1
	2008	0.2	48.1	98.1	93.4	15.0	210	3.2	1.9	88.9
	2009	0.1	47.4	98.7	93.8	13.7	306	4.6	2.5	91.0
	2010	0.1	52.7	98.8	94.7	14.9	174	2.6	1.4	90.1
2011	0.3	50.6	98.3	93.8	14.4	177	2.8	1.9	87.9	

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

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	306	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	306	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	314	70	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	284	91	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	270	62	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	281	68	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	281	56	-	-	-	-	-
	2007	317	97	-	-	-	-	-
	2008	289	67	-	-	-	-	-
	2009	300	69	-	-	-	-	-
	2010	315	73	-	-	-	-	-
	2011	313	72	-	-	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	6,604	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	6,659	484	516	519	536	544	463
	2002	6,551	467	485	510	542	566	547
	2003	6,573	484	467	477	549	574	542
	2004	6,518	440	479	472	558	555	574
	2005	6,513	422	448	487	512	580	554
	2006	6,484	422	430	460	513	513	556
	2007	6,431	472	426	432	514	505	540
	2008	6,470	515	472	429	479	521	553
	2009	6,060	466	492	456	449	460	449
	2010	6,389	491	483	511	447	463	497
	2011	6,238	508	483	477	463	451	507
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

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

Educator Data is available only for district level

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

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

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2006-2011																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	85.2	78.4	80.0	90.1	83.6	82.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	88.0	78.9	81.7	90.0	83.3	84.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	73.3	76.5	-	-	77.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	86.9	75.0	69.3	73.6	66.7	69.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
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	90.8	92.8	86.1	94.4	86.3	91.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	92.0	93.3	88.3	95.0	86.4	93.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	86.7	76.5	-	-	77.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	91.3	88.9	73.1	79.0	74.0	87.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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?

The percentage of Ellington 3rd grade students Meeting and Exceeding in reading remained consistent with 82.8% in 2010 and 82.9% in 2011. Math scores rose slightly from 87.5% in 2010 to 92.9% in 2011.

We continue to be concerned about the discrepancy between our overall student performance and that of our lower socio economic subgroup. An achievement gap of 12.4% (69.7% vs. 82.1%) exists in reading between low income students and the performance of the total 3rd grade group. This gap has decreased the last two years from 22.5% in 2009 to 16.9% in 2010 to 12.4% in 2011 indicating growth in this area.

A smaller gap between our overall student performance and that of our lower socio economic subgroup exists in math. Progress has been made in reducing the achievement gap in the area of math over the last three years from 33.1% in 2009 to 12.3% in 2010 to 3.9% in 2011. This data signifies great progress in closing the achievement gap in math.

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

Our percentage of students coming from low income homes has risen above the 40th percentile and remained there in 2011 at 41.2%. Research shows that many students in this category come to school with fewer life experiences than their peers. These experiences enrich background knowledge and build language skills necessary for learning.

The loss of reading intervention personnel due to local budget cuts and financial cuts at the state and federal levels has continued to result in fewer students getting the additional reading intervention they need to maintain academic growth at the same rate as their grade level peers.

Implementation of the Comprehensive Literacy Model throughout the school continues to offer differentiated instruction to students in the areas of reading and writing resulting in over 82% of our students Meeting and Exceeding on ISAT reading.

Core instruction in reading and math remains strong. Classroom teachers are focused on implementing Tier I interventions in the classroom for those students who are not meeting expectations in literacy and/or math with the core instruction alone.

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

Additional personnel are necessary to support our students who need intervention. The continuation of Reading Recovery is imperative.

Without this personnel we must continue to focus on maximizing the staff we have and ensure that each classroom teacher is implementing Core Classroom instruction with fidelity. We must also ensure that each classroom teacher is knowledgeable in administering and analyzing assessments in order to select and implement appropriate Tier I interventions. The literacy coach will continue to provide coaching cycles in K-3 classrooms to support teachers with implementation of the Comprehensive Literacy Model and the Comprehensive Intervention Model. Weekly Team meetings utilized for grade level staff collaboration and HELP/Intervention Team meetings will continue. These meetings will focus on core classroom instruction and Tier I interventions.

We must improve our documentation of student performance during intervention in order to determine its effectiveness and the student's progress, as well as inform the next steps for student learning. A monitoring system for intervention plans must be established and implemented to assure accountability for all staff responsible for student achievement.

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?

At Ellington, the second and third grade students were assessed using the SAT 10 (Stanford Achievement Test) in the fall of 2010. Historical (NCE) data for grade 2 (Note: an NCE of 50 is average.): Reading comprehension NCE scores were 55.8, 49.0, 52.1, and 49.7. Math NCE scores were 62.2, 51.7, 56.7 and 56.0. Spelling NCE scores were 51.5, 47.8, 50.6 and 47.9.

Historical (NCE) data for grade 3: Reading comprehension scores 50.2, 54.6, 50.3 and 52.1. Math scores 45.4, 49.7, 44.0 and 46.7. Spelling scores 44.0, 52.3, 45.4 and 48.8.

Local Assessment Wall Data for 2010.

Kindergarten Proficient	78%
1st Grade Proficient	57%
2nd Grade Proficient	67%
3rd Grade Proficient	67%

Local Assessment Wall Data for 2011.

Kindergarten Proficient	75%
1st Grade Proficient	70%
2nd Grade Proficient	74%
3rd Grade Proficient	67%

TOTAL

67%

TOTAL

72%

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

The percentage of students coming from low income homes has remained above 40%. Research shows that many students in this category come to school with fewer life experiences than their peers. These experiences enrich background knowledge and build language skills necessary for learning.

The loss of reading intervention personnel over time due to budget cuts and financial cuts at the state and federal levels has resulted in fewer students getting the additional reading intervention they need to maintain academic growth at the same rate as their grade level peers.

Implementation of the Comprehensive Literacy Model throughout the school continues to offer differentiated instruction to students in the areas of reading and writing resulting in 72% of the students Meeting and Exceeding in reading on the assessment wall up from 67% the previous year.

Core instruction in both reading and math remains strong. Classroom teachers are focused on implementing Tier I interventions in the classroom for those students who are not meeting expectations in literacy and/or math with core instruction alone.

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

Additional personnel are necessary to support our students who need intervention. Maintaining Reading Recovery is critical to our students' success.

Without additional personnel we must focus on maximizing the staff we have and ensure that each classroom teacher is implementing Core Classroom with fidelity. We must also ensure that each classroom teacher is knowledgeable in administering and analyzing assessments in order to select and implement appropriate Tier I interventions. The literacy coach will continue to provide coaching cycles in K-3 classrooms to support teachers with implementation of the Comprehensive Literacy Model and the Comprehensive Intervention Model. Team meetings utilized for grade level staff collaboration and HELP/Intervention meetings will continue. These meetings will focus on core classroom instruction and Tier I intervention.

We must improve our documentation of student performance during intervention in order to determine the effectiveness of the intervention and inform the next steps for student learning. A monitoring system for intervention plans must be established and implemented to assure accountability for all staff responsible for student achievement.

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

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

Attributes of the school: Ellington has a high level of parent/guardian involvement. Parents/guardians support student attendance and Ellington's attendance rate remained above 95% in 2011. Parents/guardians attend family events within and outside the school day. They volunteer in the classrooms assisting teachers and students. In addition to parent/guardian support Ellington utilizes the skills of approximately thirty mentors to assist students with academics and social skills.

The Ellington staff has continued to focus our professional development on literacy as the district has implemented the Comprehensive Literacy Model. Weekly collaboration opportunities for staff will be maintained to problem-solve around students and discuss curriculum issues. Common assessments are now in place for quarterly benchmarking in reading and writing and an assessment wall is in place to monitor individual student progress. Math assessments are being determined through grade level teams in order to include this data on the wall.

Challenges of the School: Wide ranges of ability exist within a single classroom, which creates a need for additional support for struggling learners. Staff has requested additional training in implementing Tier I interventions. Due to a lack of literacy support personnel, fewer students identified as "Below Level" on the assessment wall will get Tier II or Tier III intervention this year. For example: One literacy coach is supporting our entire school which includes 14 classroom teachers and 334 students. Class size averages between 24-26 students. Ellington's low income population has remained high at 41.2%.

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

The high level of parent/guardian involvement and mentoring at Ellington supports student growth. Attendance remains high as education is a priority for most families at Ellington.

Ellington's focused professional development in implementing the Comprehensive Literacy Model has resulted in greater curriculum alignment and a stronger foundation for all readers. More than 72% of our students are successful with core literacy instruction alone. Teachers continue to seek professional development in implementing Tier I interventions in order to meet the needs of those students who require additional support in reading and in math.

With the reduction in literacy support personnel student access to Tier II and Tier III interventions is extremely limited. Many students who need this support will not receive it this year.

Research shows that many low income students come to school with fewer life experiences than their peers. These experiences enrich background knowledge and build language skills necessary for learning.

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

Ellington School will continue to work to support parent/guardian involvement. Regular Parent Chats are scheduled to give parents opportunities to share compliments, criticisms and help us offer students the best learning experience we can. We plan to continue offering The 7 Habits of Successful Families at least once per year for interested families.

The focus of professional development this year will continue with Tier I interventions to meet the needs of classroom teachers. The literacy coach will continue to provide coaching cycles in K-3 classrooms to support teachers with implementation of the Comprehensive Literacy Model and the Comprehensive Intervention Model. Weekly Team meetings utilized for grade level staff collaboration and HELP/Intervention Team meetings will continue. These meetings will focus on core classroom instruction and Tier I intervention.

We must improve our documentation of student performance during intervention in order to determine the effectiveness of the intervention and inform the next steps for student learning. A monitoring system for intervention plans must be established and implemented to assure accountability for all staff responsible for student achievement.

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?

During the 2010-2011 school year Tier II reading support was provided by the literacy coach with Tier III reading support provided by the special education teacher. Math support was provided by existing staff with Number Worlds training in grades 1 and 3 only.

We continue to monitor our implementation of the Comprehensive Literacy Model and determine school and grade level professional goals through use of the Environmental Scale for Assessing Implementation Levels (ESAIL).

All but one of Ellington's classroom teachers was tenured. All of our teachers are working toward full implementation of the Comprehensive Literacy Model and the Comprehensive

Intervention Model with ongoing professional development and classroom support from our literacy coach.

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

Reduced staffing levels in literacy intervention did not allow all students "Below" and "Approaching" on the assessment wall to receive the Tier II and Tier III interventions needed to maintain student growth in literacy at the rate of their peers.

The 2010-2011 Ellington literacy support staff worked collaboratively with classroom teachers each quarter to support struggling readers with focused intervention aligned with classroom instruction for as many students not meeting expectations as possible.

Grade 1 and grade 3 implemented Tier II math intervention. Grade 1 followed the DuFour model while grade 3 used the intervention teacher's planning time to meet with students.

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

We will continue to provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate and receive professional development aligned with the Comprehensive Literacy Model and the Comprehensive Intervention Model. In order to address our challenges, classroom teachers along with the intervention team will collaborate extensively on universal classroom instruction and Tier I intervention strategies. In addition, we will continue problem-solving around individual students through the HELP/Intervention Team. Tier II and Tier III intervention will be provided by the literacy coach, special education teacher and Reading Recovery teacher.

Staff will continue professional development in the area of guided math/math workshop and Tier I and Tier II intervention in order to provide all students with the necessary support to be successful in math. Tier II intervention will be provided second quarter by a math intervention teacher. Additional Tier II math intervention may be provided by existing staff by utilizing the DuFour model.

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?

Ellington School has an active and supportive PTA that organizes a number of family events throughout the year including: curriculum night, two book fairs, family read night, science night, CATCH (Coordinated Approach to Children's Health) event, and spring open house. PTA also schedules and pays for student assemblies supporting character education and the cultural arts. Parent volunteers work in the classroom and support both teachers and students. PTA pays for some art supplies used in our partnership with the Quincy Art Center. Finally, PTA established and continues to grow a Circle of Investment through Quincy Public Schools Foundation that will support Ellington School for years to come by returning dividends from the fund back to the school.

Adult mentors provided through the district's Child Mentor Program continue to support our school. The number of mentors (30) remains stable. In addition to supporting individual students as the program was originally intended, mentors provide art instruction to all Ellington students throughout the school year and support small groups of students with the development of social skills.

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

Clearly, without the support of our volunteers the curriculum would not be as rich and we would not be able to meet the needs of our students as completely as we can with their support. Parents/guardians and mentors touch the lives of every student at Ellington in some manner. It truly does take "a village" to accomplish our academic and social goals for our students.

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

At Ellington School we will continue to encourage parent/guardian involvement through PTA and outside the organization. Regular Parent Chats are scheduled to give parents opportunities to share compliments, constructive criticisms and help us offer students the best learning experience we can. We will continue to offer The 7 Habits of Highly Successful Families this school year. Finally, we will utilize the district website to share the school calendar of events and to share information about our school.

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?

In light of budget reductions and limited literacy support personnel, Ellington School continues to seek professional development to support classroom teachers. We will focus our collaboration and professional development on implementing universal core curriculum with fidelity to reach all students. Additional professional development will focus on analyzing assessment data to select and implement appropriate Tier I interventions for those students Below and Approaching on the assessment wall. Documentation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention results will be a priority for us as we determine the effectiveness of each intervention and formulate plans for individual students.

Regular Parent Chats will be offered to give parents opportunities to learn more about the school and curriculum in addition to having a voice in shaping our school.

We will continue to offer The 7 Habits of Highly Successful Families.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	To increase reading achievement for all students.	
2	To increase appropriate student behavior at Ellington School.	

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

To increase reading achievement for all students.

Objective 1 Description

At the end of the 2009-2010 school year 67% of the students Met or Exceeded in reading on our local assessment wall. At the end of the 2010-2011 school year 72% Met or Exceeded. Our goal is to continue to increase this percentage to 75% or greater by the end of this school year as measured by the end of the year Fountas and Pinnell benchmark assessment. In parallel testing, 82.9% of Ellington third grade students Met or Exceeded on the 2011 ISAT test. Our goal will be to increase the percentage of students Meeting or Exceeding on ISAT in 2012 by 5%.

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

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

Objective 1 Title :

To increase reading achievement for all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1.0 Students will actively participate in Readers' Workshop and guided reading instruction that is differentiated to accommodate students at their reading level.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	1.1 Students will participate in individual reading conferences with the teacher in order to discuss and assess their learning and set individual performance goals.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	1.2 Students in kindergarten and first grade will participate in phonemic awareness activities utilizing a Haggerty resource.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	1.3 Students who test Below or Approaching on quarterly benchmark assessments will participate in Tier I classroom interventions.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	1.4 Students will participate in shared reading and assisted writing as their core instruction or Tier I intervention as appropriate.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	1.5 Students will increase their independent reading time throughout the school year and use reading response logs to ask questions, demonstrate their reading comprehension, and make personal connections to the reading through written responses.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
7	1.6 Students qualifying for Tier II and Tier III intervention will participate in small group or one-on-one intervention as available to them.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
8	1.7 Students will participate in Writers' Workshop in order increase their writing skill which will enhance their growth in reading.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

To increase reading achievement for all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1.0 The Literacy Coach will work with teachers on implementing core classroom instruction with fidelity through coaching cycles.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Other	
2	1.1 All classroom teachers will meet weekly in grade level Team Meetings for the purpose of discussing students' literacy progress and sharing instructional strategies and expertise in meeting the instructional needs of all students.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	1.2 The Literacy Coach will assist teachers in becoming proficient in utilizing the Fountas & Pinnell benchmark assessment to assess student reading performance on quarterly benchmarks.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Other	
4	1.3 Teachers will administer montly, or more frequent, running records to determine student competenciew and inform their instruction.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	1.4 The Literacy Coach will offer professional development on scoring and analyzing assessments to increase teachers' expertise in selecting and implementing appropriate Tier I interventions.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Other	
6	1.5 Teachers will use an assessment wall to monitor student progress and identify trends in students' performance in order to guide their core instruction and Tier I intervention.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
7	1.6 Teachers will utilize student assessment portfolios to organize documentation about student performance, facilitate communication with intervention teachers and assist in creating a profile of individual students.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
8	1.7 The Literacy Coach will offer professional development on selecting and implementing Tier I interventions in the classroom for students who are Below or Approaching on the assessment wall.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Other	

9	1.8 The Literacy Coach will monitor and serve as support for teachers in completing intervention plans for students receiving this additional instruction in literacy.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Other	
10	1.9 Teachers will utilize a reading portfolio approach including a variety of measures in order to determine student placement on the assessment wall.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

To increase reading achievement for all students.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1.0 Ellington School will host Back to School Night to inform parents about the curriculum and engage their support in their childrens' education. We plan to increase participation from 63.6% to 67%.	08/19/2011	09/05/2011	After School	Other	
2	1.1 Regular Parent Chats will be held to offer parents a forum to meet with the principal and discuss topics of their choice or those presented by the principal to improve the Ellington School experience.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Local Funds	
3	1.2 100% of the Ellington School parents will meet with teachers during Parent Teacher Conferences to obtain information about their student's performance and how to assist their child(ren) with learning.	10/19/2011	10/28/2011	After School	Local Funds	
4	1.3 Parents will have the opportunity to attend an ISAT Parent Night to receive information about how to prepare their students to do their best on the ISAT test.	02/01/2012	02/29/2012	After School	Local Funds	
5	1.4 Parents will receive a classroom newsletter to inform them about current areas of study, special projects/events in the classroom and school-wide, and student accomplishments.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Local Funds	
6	1.5 Parents will support students with independent reading as homework in addition to participating in the Book It program.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

To increase reading achievement for all students.

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

To increase reading achievement for all students.

At Ellington School the classroom teachers will closely monitor their students' reading progress through the administration of monthly (at a minimum) running records and quarterly benchmark assessments. Teachers will analyze these assessments to inform their instruction and monitor student trends on the assessment wall.

We will document our level of success in a Building Report which includes data from the assessment wall and ISAT assessment data. This report will be published at the end of the 2011-2012 school year.

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	Anne B. Cashman	Principal
2	Kim Mast	Literacy Coach

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

To increase appropriate student behavior at Ellington School.

Objective 2 Description

Ellington School will continue to implement PBIS in conjunction with the 7 Habits and The Leader in Me philosophy of the Covey organization. Through this meshing we plan to increase student leadership opportunities at Ellington so that all students will have a minimum of four leadership opportunities during the 2011-2012 school year.

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

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

Objective 2 Title :

To increase appropriate student behavior at Ellington School.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1.0 All students will participate in the PBIS Kickoff where building procedures for locations and activities are explicitly taught to students.	08/19/2011	08/26/2011	During School	Local Funds	
2	1.1 All students will participate in the development of a classroom matrix documenting what it looks like to SOAR at Ellington.	08/19/2011	08/31/2011	During School	Local Funds	
3	1.2 All students will earn SOAR tickets for following procedures and be able to use them at the SOAR store or donate them to the classroom community jar.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	1.3 All students will have the opportunity to be greeters in the morning and to post the colors during Morning Meeting.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	Before School	Local Funds	
5	1.4 All students will participate in explicit instruction on the 7 Habits in classrooms and at Morning Meeting.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	1.5 Students will have the opportunity to give a testimony on how they have successfully used the Habits during Morning Meeting.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
7	1.6 All students will participate in a January Refresher course re-teaching building procedures for areas of concern in order to improve student behavior in these areas.	01/02/2012	01/31/2012	During School	Local Funds	
8	1.7 Students will participate in PBIS Tier II interventions CICO, SAIG groups, FBP, etc. as necessary.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
9	1.8 Select students will participate in a Leadership Council.	11/01/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title :

To increase appropriate student behavior at Ellington School.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1.0 Staff members will re-teach procedures for students with major and minor referrals rather than just issuing consequences.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	1.1 Staff members will teach lessons related to the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People and use the 7 Habits language throughout the school year.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	1.2 Staff members will recognize positive student behavior with Golden Awards given weekly to the deserving classrooms.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	Before School	Local Funds	
4	1.3 Staff will reshape the format of Morning Meeting to include more student participation, greater variety in music and more meaningful dialogue.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	Before School	Local Funds	
5	1.4 The PBIS team will implement Tier II interventions for students who qualify or are recommended for this level of intervention.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	1.5 Staff will participate in The Leader in Me training as we work toward becoming a Lighthouse School.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Local Funds	
7	1.6 The PBIS Universal team and remaining staff will continue data analysis and training in order to improve behavior at Ellington School.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	Before School	Local Funds	
8	1.7 Establish a Lighthouse Team to guide the staff in moving forward toward Lighthouse status.	08/19/2011	09/30/2011	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title :

To increase appropriate student behavior at Ellington School.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1.0 100% of the parents will receive information about the 7 Habits during parent teacher conferences in order to educate and encourage the use of the 7 Habits beyond the school.	10/19/2011	10/28/2011	After School	Local Funds	
2	1.1 Parents will have the opportunity to participate in the 7 Habits of Highly Successful Families.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Other	
3	1.2 Parents will be informed of major behavior infractions 90% of the time and asked to follow up at home with a discussion about appropriate behavior.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	1.3 Parents will support the PBIS initiative and 7 Habits by volunteering with the SOAR store, assisting with Sharpen the Saw activities or donating to support these events.	08/19/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	1.4 Parents will complete two climate surveys during parent teacher conferences to give input on what is working well at Ellington and what can be improved.	10/19/2011	10/28/2011	After School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

To increase appropriate student behavior at Ellington School.

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?)

To increase appropriate student behavior at Ellington School.

Ellington School will continue to implement PBIS in conjunction with the 7 Habits and The Leader in Me philosophy of the Covey organization. Through this meshing we plan to increase student leadership opportunities at Ellington so that all students will have a minimum of four leadership opportunities during the 2011-2012 school year.

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	Anne B. Cashman	Principal
2	Jen Drew	PBIS Universal Coach/Lighthouse Team Member
3	Andrea Eckhardt	Lighthouse Team Member
4	Rachel Huston	Lighthouse Team Member
5	Leslie Vigor	Lighthouse Team Member

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.*)

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 Literacy Coach, principal, all Ellington teachers and a small group of parents develop and monitor the school improvement plan after reflecting on student data and our Ellington Building Report. We closely examine where we are and determine where we want to be followed by the activities necessary to move in that direction. Review of the plan is ongoing for staff through Team meetings. The Literacy Coach, PBIS Universal Coach, Lighthouse Team and building principal are responsible for monitoring progress throughout the school year. The plan is shared with outside stakeholders during a PTA meeting and with the school board through the Curriculum Committee.

	Name	Title
1	Anne B. Cashman	Principal
2	Kim Mast	Literacy Coach/parent
3	Theresa Miller	Speech
4	Peggy Steinkamp	Special Education
5	Jen Drew	PBIS Universal Coach/1st grade teacher/parent
6	Amy Kuhl	Kindergarten teacher
7	Becky Lunt	Kindergarten teacher

8	Megan Schweitzer	Kindergarten teacher
9	Leslie Vigor	Kindergarten teacher/parent
10	Kim Johannes	1st grade teacher
11	Judy Warren	1st grade teacher
12	Rhonda Brinkman	2nd grade teacher
13	Andrea Eckhardt	2nd grade teacher/parent
14	Sarah Miller	2nd grade teacher
15	Meghan Goetz	3rd grade teacher
16	Rachel Huston	3rd grade teacher
17	Jill Niederhauser	3rd grade teacher
18	Jan Zeidler	3rd grade teacher
19	Jen Bell	Parent
20	Pattie Paxton	PTA president/parent
21	Stephanie Erwin	PTA treasurer/parent/school board member
22	Rexanne Greuter	PTA vice president/parent
23	Stephanie Barbagiovanni	PTA vice president/parent
24	Shannon Nicholas	PTA secretaryparent

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Require implementation of a new research-based curriculum of instructional program;
- Extension of the school year or school day;
- Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance;

- Significant decrease in management authority at the school level;
- Replacement of the principal;
- Restructuring the internal organization of the school;
- Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school.

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

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

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

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

	Name	Title
1		

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 11/16/2011

A. ASSURANCES

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

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

Yes No N/A

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

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

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

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

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

PEER REVIEW

<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Is the peer review process described <u>and</u> 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]</p>
<p>TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>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]</p>
<p>DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITES</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	<p>If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSIBILITES</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>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]</p>
<p>SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	<p>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]</p>
<p>APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The plan indicates the approval date of this plan. [C]</p>

PART II - COMMENTS