

**REVISED 03/02/06**

***2005-2006 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program***

*U.S. Department of Education*

**Cover Sheet** Type of School: (Check all that apply)  Elementary  Middle  High  K-12  Charter

Name of Principal Ms. Nancy Munoz  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name York Center Elementary School  
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 18 W 701 - 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Lombard IL 60148-4708  
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

County DuPage State School Code Number\* 022-0450-2015

Telephone (630)932-6540 Fax (630)932-6543

Website/URL www.d45.dupage.k12.il.us E-mail nmunoz@d45.dupage.k12.il.us

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Principal's Signature) Date 02/08/06

Name of Superintendent\* Dr. William C. Schewe  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name School District 45, DuPage County Tel. (630)530-6205

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Superintendent's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name of School Board  
President/Chairperson Mrs. Linda S. Nystrom  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this package, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

*\*Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

## **PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION**

**[Include this page in the school's application as page 2.]**

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2005-2006 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2000 and has not received the 2003, 2004, or 2005 *No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools Award*.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

## PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

---

All data are the most recent year available.

**DISTRICT** (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district:       6   Elementary schools  
   2   Middle schools  
   \_\_\_\_\_ Junior high schools  
   \_\_\_\_\_ High schools  
   \_\_\_\_\_ Other  
   8   TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure:      \$8788   
     Average State Per Pupil Expenditure:      \$8786

**SCHOOL** (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
- Urban or large central city  
 Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area  
 Suburban  
 Small city or town in a rural area  
 Rural
4.   5   Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.  
     \_\_\_\_\_ If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?
5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

| Grade  | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total | Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|--|------------|--------------|-------------|-------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK   |            |              |             | 7     |            |              |             |
| K  |            |              |             | 8     |            |              |             |
| 1  |            |              |             | 9     |            |              |             |
| 2  |            |              |             | 10    |            |              |             |
| 3  | 23         | 34           | 57          | 11    |            |              |             |
| 4  | 39         | 29           | 68          | 12    |            |              |             |
| 5  | 35         | 32           | 67          | Other |            |              |             |
| 6  |            |              |             |       |            |              |             |
| <b>TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →</b> |            |              |             |       |            |              | <b>192</b>  |

*[Throughout the document, round numbers to avoid decimals.]*

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- |   |
|---|
| <u>20</u> % White                         |
| <u>18</u> % Black or African American     |
| <u>43</u> % Hispanic or Latino            |
| <u>17</u> % Asian/Pacific Islander        |
| <u>2</u> % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| <b>100% Total</b>                         |

Use only the five standard categories in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of the school.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 25%

[This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.]

|            |  |     |
|------------|--|-----|
| <b>(1)</b> | Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.   | 24  |
| <b>(2)</b> | Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year. | 24  |
| <b>(3)</b> | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]  | 48  |
| <b>(4)</b> | Total number of students in the school as of October 1   | 192 |
| <b>(5)</b> | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)                           | .25 |
| <b>(6)</b> | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100  | 25  |

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 44%  
85 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 11

Specify languages: Albanian (Tosk), Bosnian, Farsi (Persian), German, Gujarati, Korean, Malayalam, Panjabi, Polish, Spanish and Urdu

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 66%

Total number students who qualify: 126

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families or the school does not participate in the federally-supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 16%  
30 Total Number of Students Served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

|                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <u>    </u> Autism                | <u>    </u> Orthopedic Impairment                 |
| <u>    </u> Deafness              | <u>  3  </u> Other Health Impaired                |
| <u>    </u> Deaf-Blindness        | <u>  16  </u> Specific Learning Disability        |
| <u>    </u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>  12  </u> Speech or Language Impairment       |
| <u>    </u> Hearing Impairment    | <u>    </u> Traumatic Brain Injury                |
| <u>    </u> Mental Retardation    | <u>    </u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>    </u> Multiple Disabilities |   |

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

**Number of Staff**

|                                       | <u>Full-time</u> | <u>Part-Time</u> |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Administrator(s)                      | <u>  1  </u>     | <u>  1  </u>     |
| Classroom teachers                    | <u> 10  </u>     | <u>  0  </u>     |
| Special resource teachers/specialists | <u>  2  </u>     | <u>  7  </u>     |
| Paraprofessionals                     | <u>  4  </u>     | <u>  0  </u>     |
| Support staff                         | <u>  0  </u>     | <u>  2  </u>     |
| Total number                          | <u> 17  </u>     | <u> 10  </u>     |

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers: 18:1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.

| *Estimated                          | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance            | 97%       | 97%       | 97%       | 97%       | 97%       |
| *Daily teacher attendance           | 97%       | 97%       | 96%       | 99%       | 98%       |
| Teacher turnover rate               | 0%        | .07%      | .15%      | 0%        | 0%        |
| Student dropout rate (middle/high)  | %         | %         | %         | %         | %         |
| Student drop-off rate (high school) | %         | %         | %         | %         | %         |

### **PART III - SUMMARY**

The York Center Elementary School staff greets the 192 students as they approach the building each school day. After entering, many receive a much-needed breakfast. While the parents are generally supportive and caring, many have been at work hours before their children start the school day or they are already home asleep after working the night shift. Both scenarios put students on their own to prepare for the school day. An understanding, well-trained staff helps students unpack both their backpacks and the baggage brought from home. "From the moment they step off the bus, they know it's a caring environment," said Principal Nancy Munoz. "They won't be judged. The purpose is to empower."

Situated off a main thoroughfare in unincorporated Lombard, Illinois, York Center School is one of eight in the family of Villa Park/Lombard School District 45. The PreK-2 building (Stevenson School) and the 3-5 building (York Center School) are sister schools sharing an assistant principal, social worker and psychologist. The principals agree that even though, "we are two sites, we are one building." Just blocks from each other, the buildings are surrounded by a diverse neighborhood with York Center's main population drawn from a grouping of town homes that lends to a mobility rate of 25%. Due to the mobility of families or pressing needs at home that keeps students bound there, the staff finds it imperative to maximize every moment of instruction. They work with the PTA and the surrounding community to provide services for students and their families beyond the educational setting. It is a resourceful staff that has brought over 20 outside organizations to the school. Operation Bell provides winter coats; the Fire Department provides 911 training; and Elmhurst College brings students onto the college campus for hands-on science instruction. A staff member found a resource that provided for a student's broken arm to be cast. "The staff doesn't dismiss anything. If there is any indication something is needed, they don't hold back," said Munoz. The staff lives by her motto, "What's best for the kids."

The foundation with the families is laid at Stevenson with First Step and then all-day kindergarten for those at-risk. Transitioning students from one building to the other is accomplished with shared staff members and then the daily efforts of the York Center School core staff ensures the success of a student population that is 20% white, 18% black, 43% Hispanic, 17% Asian/Pacific Islander and 2% multi-racial/ethnic. In addition to Spanish support through teaching, office and specialty staff, a need was met by providing a part time Urdu speaking staff member. The mission statement for York Center, which is shared by Stevenson, reads: "York Center and Stevenson Schools celebrate their cultural diversity by honoring the many traditions of their students and promote academic growth through independent inquiry and collaborative cooperation. These practices prepare students to become knowledgeable, contributing members of their community who understand and value each other."

York Center is a Title I school with a low-income level of 66%. The building has 10 classroom teachers, two half time Title I reading teachers and two special education teachers along with full-time teachers in art, music and physical education working in a model that also has them teaching reading. Careful scheduling and a sensitive staff facilitate this model. They believe every moment is a teaching moment. For example, a classroom teacher and a physical education teacher have paired to create a daily Lunch/Recess program to structure the unstructured time. The students are taught "large group behavior" and given enjoyable activities to participate in during recess. According to Principal Munoz, the afternoons are no longer spent on "problem-solving" lunch/recess mishaps. Instead, students are ready for an afternoon of learning. Also, several enrichment opportunities are provided. Among the offerings are Art Club, Orchestra and Band, Games Galore, Video Kids, tutoring, Student Council, and Computer Stars. Through grant monies, York Center students and their families have also had access to a school library on Saturdays and in the summer as well as a day camp offering structured group physical activity.

York Center School staff works daily to make a culturally diverse school, a culturally rich atmosphere. At the same time students with loving, but busy parents are taught academic and life skills that will put them in step with the surrounding community. It is after all as Principal Nancy Munoz states, "What's best for the kids."

## **PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS**

**1. Assessment Results:** All York Center School students participate in one of the state assessments. The Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) is the assessment that is administered to the majority of students in the state, while the Illinois Measure of Achievement and Growth in English (IMAGE) is an assessment tool for second language learners or limited English proficient students. Both assessments are written in English. (No students were enrolled in the alternate assessment for severely disabled students in any year.)

Before the longitudinal state assessment data in reading for students in grades 3 and 5 is explained, it is important to understand the term proficiency. Illinois reports assessment in four categories. Both *Academic Warning* and *Below* categories indicate the percentage of students not meeting the state standards in a subject area or not being proficient. The other two categories, *Meets the Standards* and *Exceeds the Standards*, report percentages of students the state defines as being proficient. In other words proficiency percentages on any given test can be calculated by adding the percent of students who meet the standards and the percent of students who exceed the standards. Additional information of the Illinois state assessment system can be located on the website for the Illinois State Board of Education at [www.isbe.net](http://www.isbe.net). By clicking on the student assessment link listed on the left of the screen, additional information can be collected on our state assessment system.

When the York Center data for reading is analyzed, ISAT reading at grade 3 indicates a steady decline over the last three years from 76% of the students achieving proficiency in 2003 to 69% achieving proficiency in 2005. Yet at grade 5, the ISAT data in reading indicates that in that same three year period, students increased in reading proficiency from 61% in 2003 to 72% in 2005. IMAGE data in reading indicates that over the last three years students in grade 3 increased in proficiency from 40% in 2003 to 86% in 2005. The grade 5 reading IMAGE data indicated a similar increase with 27% of the students attaining proficiency in 2003 to 96% of the students in 2005. Back in 2001 the Stevenson/York Center staff adopted a new integrated reading and language arts program that provided instructional materials in English and Spanish. The staff believes these materials along with the use of consistent instruction across all grades and a strong professional development plan for staff is beginning to have a positive impact on student achievement. Data indicates that while low income enrollment percentages are fairly constant at about 65%, the limited English proficient subgroup are increasing in enrollment (38% in 2003 to 44% in 2005) as well as our Black subgroup (39% in 2002 to 43% in 2005). The staff recognizes that the LEP student achievement in reading is on the rise, while the Black subgroup remains a challenge with a drop in proficiency from 66% in 2003 to 60% in 2005. To address this issue during the 2005-06 school year, the staff is monitoring the progress of their Black subgroup more closely and students who are not progressing are being supplemented with additional tutoring and extended instruction in reading during school and after school.

The most remarkable improvement in student achievement for all York Center students is documented in the ISAT and IMAGE math data. Grade 3 students went from 87% in 2003 to 96% proficiency in 2005 on ISAT and from 27% in 2003 to 45% proficiency in 2005 on IMAGE. Grade 5 students improved from 70% in 2003 to 88% proficiency in 2005 on ISAT and from 18% in 2003 to 50% proficiency in 2005 on IMAGE. The data indicates gains for every reported subgroup. After analyzing the data the staff attributes the gains to several initiatives. A new math program was adopted in 2002 and included two years of extensive professional development in the teaching of math using strategies from the book Five Easy Steps to a Balanced Math Program. As a result of the training, the staff engaged in the examination of student work in a collaborative setting to discuss student progress and to identify instructional strategies that they use consistently in every classroom. They required students to be accountable for the memorization of their math facts, and they taught students strategies for thinking and writing about the solutions to written story problems. York Center student achievement in math is skyrocketing because of a combination of all of these initiatives.

**2. Using Assessment Results:** The spring state assessments provide the staff with trend data that measures the culmination of learning for the current school year. The staff begins the analysis process for the next school year with this data as the starting point. While state assessment data is important, the York Center staff recognizes the value of the local assessments to drive the day to day teaching and learning process. It is really the quarterly local assessments (October, January, March, and May) that are the foundation for measuring growth in learning. The results give the staff useful information on how well each student is meeting the state standards in math and reading in order to make decisions about instruction and additional support services for students. These results are also used by the school leadership team, grade level teams, individual classroom teachers, and students to measure progress toward building, grade, classroom, and student goals. Data analysis is an embedded practice with staff and students. Any visitor can walk into a classroom after a local assessment and observe students graphing their progress on math chapter tests; math facts timed tests, and/or the local reading tests. The visitor can also observe the York Center staff examining the data on individual students to decide if any student's curricular program needs adjusting. For example, a fourth grade student who is doing above grade level work in math may be moved to an accelerated math class that is providing instruction in grade five math concepts. A student struggling in expository reading may need additional instruction through the services of a reading specialist, reading tutor, or after school reading. A student in a sheltered English class may show enough growth to be successful in a regular science or reading class. A classroom teacher discovers that her classroom data indicates students will require additional instruction in measurement before tackling the grade level strand on this subject. Another teacher adjusts her guided reading groups after learning that particular students have made gains in reading comprehension and can now move up to more challenging material. The principal plans for additional professional development in vocabulary strategies because the trend data indicates the problem needs addressing through staff training. These are all examples of how the York Center staff use data to drive the instructional process.

**3. Communicating Assessment Results:** The York Center staff believes that parent communication and involvement in their child's learning is the key to improving student achievement. To foster this process, the school makes a concerted effort to always provide communication in English and Spanish. The classroom staff sends home semi-weekly newsletters that address classroom curriculum, assessment information, and tips for parents on how to support their child in school. The teacher may include questions for dinner table conversation regarding a story, novel, or a social studies or science unit of study. Mid quarter progress reports and quarterly report cards keep parents informed. Report cards include grades and test data from the local district assessments. The information gives them a picture of their child's progress and compares it to the grade level standards and benchmarks by indicating whether they exceed expectations, meet expectations, or need improvement. Parent conferences are held after the first quarter to give parents a clear picture of where their child's strengths and weaknesses lie in each of the curricular areas so that the parent/teacher team can set a plan for improvement. The principal's role in communicating assessment is to train the staff in analyzing assessment data, providing them with the time to study data and plan for instructional changes, and communicate to parents and the larger community through PTA meetings, district PTA council, the news media, and the school website. The school report card is sent home to parents, the data from the report card is posted on the district website, and comparison data is published on the local community newspapers. A quarterly district newsletter provides another avenue to reach the entire community. In addition the principal is responsible for one presentation each year to the Board of Education highlight school improvement activities, assessment trends, and school goals.



**4: How York Center Shares Their Success: With Stevenson:** As described in our building summary, the York Center staff must work with their PreK – 2 sister school which is located one mile away. Both principals bring their school leadership teams together to provide a quarterly forum for collaboration and articulation, data analysis, and sharing of ideas. **At York Center School:** Within the school setting, the principal and school improvement team share successes and learn from their mistakes. Faculty meetings provide the forum for teachers to discuss and share strategies that have proven to be effective in the classroom. Teachers meet by grade level to share what is working in their classroom and to look at data to support what they are saying. The principal contacts the public relations coordinator to make sure the good news gets out to the parents and the community either through the local papers or the district quarterly newsletter. **Across the District:** The York Center staff and administration demonstrate leadership across the district by sharing proven strategies with their grade level/administrative colleagues. Each year the district schedules five district grade level meetings for the purpose of articulation and problem solving. For example, when analyzing the state math assessments for 2005, the York Center staff discovered that their building wide implementation of a math T-Chart had a positive impact on student achievement across the grades. During a district grade level meeting early in the fall the staff shared this strategy with others. As a result, four other buildings have chosen to implement the strategy and are reporting improvements in student understanding of the problem solving process. At Administrative Council the principal also shares assessment data by subgroups with other principal colleagues and discusses the reasons for improvements so other buildings may duplicate what they have learned and identified as working with their students.

## **PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION**

**1. Curriculum:** The York Center curriculum is standards - based and identifies what students are expected to know and be able to do by grade and curricular area. *Technology* is used as a tool for learning as students create power point presentations, track math grades in excel, or use websites for research and the *Library/Media Center* is the “hub” for extended learning or connecting students with a good book!

The *Mathematics Curriculum* includes standards-based daily math reviews. These reviews of measurement, geometry, computation, algebraic relationships, fractions, and/or other math concepts and skills serve as a springboard for discussion and a quick assessment of student understanding. A hands-on, interactive approach introduces new concepts. For instance, base ten blocks can be used to teach place value, multiplication or a variety of other computation skills. Journaling and math T-Chart enables the student to demonstrate his/her math knowledge in written form.

In the *Reading Curriculum*, comprehension, understanding, and a love of books are valued. During the ninety minute reading block every staff member and every student are immersed in the reading process. We know that as the students progress through the grades the length of the material, the complexity of the analysis and the degree of reader independence is critical to meeting the state standards. The reading curriculum targets fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, and the development of student owned strategies to ensure students are successful when reading non-fiction text. Student motivation and engagement is considered essential and the staff accomplishes this by having students read books in their area of interest.

The purpose of the *Writing Curriculum* as identified by the state standards is to communicate for a variety of purposes. Throughout the writing process, students learn about *Spelling and Grammar*. They are taught the skills of support and elaboration, whether they are responding to text they have read or in a letter to local businesses asking them to participate as a guest reader or the superintendent asking for better lunches. By the end of fifth grade, student writing samples should illustrate examples of how a student is able to write a well organized document demonstrating an understanding of topic sentences, supporting details, a personal connection to the topic, and a summary and conclusion.

*Science Curriculum* is balanced between life, physical, and earth sciences. Through an activity based approach, the standards for learning are addressed through scientific inquiry by expecting students to conduct experiments, solve problems, and write solutions. *Health Education* is often embedded in the study of science as students learn about healthy bodies and healthy minds by studying body systems, nutrition, safety, diseases, and drug education. Their learning is often showcased in visual projects, skits, or oral and written reports.

*Social Studies* standards expect students to develop an understanding of United States; its government, citizenship, economic systems, geography, social systems, and historical events and trends that have shaped the history of the United States. Given the diversity of York Center, the staff prides itself on celebrating the rich cultural backgrounds of their students as they learn how to bridge their own pasts with the present day culture in the United States.

The *Fine and Practical Arts Curriculum* is also valued for our students. *Art and Music* teach students about sensory elements, organizational principles, and expressive qualities of the arts through creating and performing. *Physical Education* focuses on nutrition and exercise and the importance of a physical life style to maintain good health throughout their lives.

Band and Orchestra, Character Counts!!, Student Council, after school enrichment programs like Science Super Slueths (in partnership with Elmhurst College), Computer Stars, Fitness4Life at Lunch, Games Galore, tutoring instruction, Super Saturdays, Family Literacy, and Family Technology provide the balance to a well rounded education that focuses on life long learning habits to ensure the students become successful, independent learners when they leave York Center School.

**2A. Elementary School Reading Curriculum:** York Center School ensures that reading instruction is a research-based approach by electing to follow the National Reading Panel (2000) recommendations. The curriculum is an integrated approach taught in English and Spanish, but and more importantly, the lessons are taught through explicit, systematic instruction that addresses the key components of essential reading/writing instruction as identified by the National Panel. Systematic phonics instruction that includes writing and spelling is addressed in the primary grades at Stevenson, the pre K – 2 “sister school”. When Stevenson students arrive at York Center, every classroom teacher grades 3 – 5 actively engages them in fluency, vocabulary development, guided oral reading, independent reading, text comprehension strategies and writing across the curriculum to support the importance of literacy skills. Fiction and non-fiction selections from a variety of genres expose students to text that integrates well with what they are learning in science and social studies. Abundant classroom libraries of leveled books give students ready access to materials at their independent reading level. Quarterly reading assessments monitor fluency and comprehension, and written response to text gives the staff information for analyzing each student’s progress in order to develop a flexible grouping delivery model. Every single York Center student can tell you what they do before reading, during reading, and after reading. They can tell you what strategies they are using and why. Recognizing that learning to read may require additional instructional time, York Center involves every staff member in the teaching of reading. Reading specialists provide one on one or small group instruction to students most deficient in reading. They are also responsible for assessing the fluency development of all the students three times a year, serving as a reading coach in classrooms, and developing mini lessons for professional development for all the staff. The art, music, and physical education staff has been trained as reading tutors using a program from the reading series designed to offer additional support for struggling readers. These special area teachers are assigned two small groups of students to provide additional reading instruction four days per week/30 minutes per day. Special Education teachers have specific training in a Reading Recovery model designed to meet the needs of students with reading disabilities. After school tutoring and daytime/evening programs that involve parents as teachers in the reading process are also included. Family reading nights, grandparent’s day, and Super Saturdays where families can come to check out books and games from the library, hear a story, or use the computers enrich the reading program.

**3. Other Curriculum - Mathematics:** The staff believes students must leave York Center School with a “balance” of math skills (knowledge of concepts, skills, and problem solving strategies). They want their students to succeed where it counts most. The students must be able to apply their math skills and reasoning ability to solve real-life problems requiring math solutions. In order to meet this goal, the math curricula is designed to balance the skills related to computation proficiency, the deepening of conceptual understanding, the development of mathematical reasoning and problem solving abilities, and the ability of all students to demonstrate their understanding of mathematical skills and concepts in a variety of assessment formats. Sixty minutes of explicit instruction using a “Five Easy Steps” framework in every single classroom and at every single grade is proving to move student achievement in a positive direction. Daily math boxes provide continuous review of skills already taught, explicit, interactive instruction brings in new concepts and skills. Teachers use lessons that engage students in the discussion of math concepts and encourage them to use multiple ways to problem solve. An observer might see a teacher coaching students to provide both verbal and written explanations to solve a problem involving planning a party for 14 people. Problem solving skills over memorization of procedures and formulas are valued most. Every grade has a big idea: grade 3 multiplication, grade 4 division, and grade 5 fractions. Other strands of mathematics are taught, but the major focus for proficiency is the “big idea” for the grade level. Quarterly computation tests and the three times per year on line math assessment give the teachers useful data by math strands to guide instruction through flexible groupings. Every week students must solve a problem and explain the solution to the problem step by step in writing. Students grade their responses using student friendly rubrics. Daily math journals help students log new math vocabulary and homework is an extension. Students may be asked to find examples of how measurement is used in their home or expected to engage the family in a story problem. Each grade differentiates for the varying abilities of their math students. Bright students who are very proficient are accelerated a year ahead and

students needing extra assistance are tutored by staff during the day and after school. Students monitor their progress by charting or graphing their math facts tests, chapter tests, and weekly student responses.

**4. Instructional Methods:** York Center prides itself on using best practice strategies that have been proven to improve student learning. We use “block scheduling” for reading and math. All third, fourth, and fifth grade students are blocked for reading or math at the same time every day and receive 90 minutes of uninterrupted reading instruction and 60 minutes of uninterrupted math instruction. Frequent assessments, time for staff collaboration, and analysis of reading and math data and the examination of student work allows the staff to place students at their appropriate instructional reading and math levels. We do not want children to be “stuck” a particular grouping that isn’t right for them. For example, second quarter observations and assessments of a bilingual student that has been receiving reading instruction in his/her native language classroom for reading indicate that the student is ready to be placed in a sheltered English classroom for reading. The staff is able to change his reading placement without a disruption to his schedule. Closing the achievement gap is the greatest challenge for our staff. The research indicates students need additional instructional time in areas where they are struggling. Art, music, and physical education teachers tutor small groups in reading and math outside the scheduled blocks, reading specialists work with students with significant reading delays and provide modeling, coaching, and training to classroom staff to build their skills. Of course after school tutoring and summer school using Success for All materials extends the school day and school year. Math instruction includes hands on materials to develop concepts, journal writing to explain student thinking, and students are held accountable for memorizing their basic facts by the end of 5<sup>th</sup> grade at the 90 percentile level. Every moment is a teaching moment. Even lunchtime recess has organized games to develop team building, self esteem, and character building in our students so that when they return to their classrooms after lunch they are ready to learn.

**5. Professional Development:** Professional development is addressed at three levels: district wide, building wide, and individually. Staff development focuses on root causes and long-term solutions to issues within our building. Recently, the York Center staff had a two day training session on understanding poverty and how it impacts parent support and academic achievement. The staff has also received considerable training on assessments and how to interpret data from assessments. The data is utilized to determine if learning is taking place and to drive the instruction in the classrooms. Outside professional development opportunities such as seminars and conferences set the stage for in-house mini-workshops for conference participants to share what they have learned. The Title I Reading Specialists are also a key influential force. In addition to providing direct services to students, the reading specialists model successful reading strategies in the classrooms and plan after school lessons for the staff. As an example, the reading specialists are currently training the ESL staff in the Lindamood-Bell Model for visualizing and verbalizing. Each after school session is followed up with the classroom teachers having an opportunity to observe the reading specialists teach an in class lesson with their students. This series of lessons follows the research on best practice for professional development by spanning two after school sessions and eight in class observations with each teacher. The principal, who also attended the training, will provide additional follow-up through classroom visits and formal observations. In-house training has also been on topics such as Question – Answer Relationships (QAR Method) and strategies to help students with writing extended responses in math and reading. On an individual level, all of the staff members have recently received additional certification by acquiring their ESL endorsements because of the high numbers of second language learners that attend York Center. This has placed all our staff members in the “highly qualified” category as defined by the state of Illinois.

**Grade 3 Reading: ISAT State Assessment  
Testing Month - March**

|  | <b>ISAT</b>    |                |                |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|  | <b>2004-05</b> | <b>2003-04</b> | <b>2002-03</b> |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | 15             | 19             | 18             |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | 69             | 71             | 76             |
| Number of Students Enrolled in ISAT                    | 26             | 21             | 38             |
| Percent of Students Tested in ISAT                     | 100            | 100            | 100            |
| Number of Students Enrolled on Alternative Assessments | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| Percent of Students Tested on Alternative Assessments  | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| <b>SUBGROUP Scores Reported by NCLB</b>                |                |                |                |
| <b>A. Low Income</b>                                   |                |                |                |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | 0              | *              | *              |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | 54             | *              | *              |
| % of Low Income Students Tested                        | 100            |                |                |
| <b>B. Black</b>  |                |                |                |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | 0              | *              | 8              |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | 60             | *              | 66             |
| % of Black Students Tested                             | 100            |                | 100            |
| <b>C. White</b>  |                |                |                |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | *              | *              | 45             |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | *              | *              | 90             |
| % of White Students Tested                             |                |                | 100            |

No other subgroups reported because subgroup size is less than ten (10) students.

\* Indicates fewer than 10 students tested.

**Grade 5 Reading: ISAT State Assessment  
Testing Month - March**

|  | <b>ISAT</b>    |                |                |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|  | <b>2004-05</b> | <b>2003-04</b> | <b>2002-03</b> |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | 26             | 20             | 20             |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | 72             | 70             | 61             |
| Number of Students Enrolled in ISAT                    | 43             | 40             | 49             |
| Percent of Students Tested in ISAT                     | 100            | 100            | 100            |
| Number of Students Enrolled on Alternative Assessments | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| Percent of Students Tested on Alternative Assessments  | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| <b>SUBGROUP Scores Reported by NCLB</b>                |                |                |                |
| <b>A. Low Income</b>                                   |                |                |                |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | 10             | 17             | 8              |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | 68             | 55             | 35             |
| % of Low Income Students Tested                        | 100            | 100            | 100            |
| <b>B. Black</b>  |                |                |                |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | 28             | 23             | 17             |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | 67             | 54             | 34             |
| % of Black Students Tested                             | 100            | 100            | 100            |
| <b>C. Hispanic</b>                                     |                |                |                |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | *              | 0              | 7              |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | *              | 60             | 27             |
| % of Hispanic Students Tested                          |                | 100            | 100            |
| <b>D. White</b>  |                |                |                |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | 36             | *              | 31             |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | 90             | *              | 100            |
| % of White Students Tested                             | 100            |                | 100            |

No other subgroups reported because subgroup size is less than ten (10) students.

\* Indicates fewer than 10 students tested.

**Grade 3 Mathematics: ISAT State Assessment  
Testing Month - March**

|  | <b>ISAT</b>    |                |                |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|  | <b>2004-05</b> | <b>2003-04</b> | <b>2002-03</b> |
| <b>% of Students Exceeding State Standards</b>               | <b>31</b>      | <b>27</b>      | <b>31</b>      |
| <b>% of Students Meeting &amp; Exceeding State Standards</b> | <b>96</b>      | <b>91</b>      | <b>87</b>      |
| <b>Number of Students Enrolled in ISAT</b>                   | <b>26</b>      | <b>22</b>      | <b>39</b>      |
| <b>Percent of Students Tested in ISAT</b>                    | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     |
| <b>Number of Students Tested on Alternative Assessments</b>  | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       |
| <b>Percent of Students Tested on Alternative Assessments</b> | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       |
| <b>SUBGROUP Scores Reported by NCLB</b>                      |                |                |                |
| <b>A. Low Income</b>   |                |                |                |
| <b>% of Students Exceeding State Standards</b>               | <b>0</b>       | <b>*</b>       | <b>27</b>      |
| <b>% of Students Meeting &amp; Exceeding State Standards</b> | <b>92</b>      | <b>*</b>       | <b>63</b>      |
| <b>% of Low Income Students Tested</b>                       | <b>100</b>     |                | <b>100</b>     |
| <b>B. Black</b>  |                |                |                |
| <b>% of Students Exceeding State Standards</b>               | <b>0</b>       | <b>*</b>       | <b>15</b>      |
| <b>% of Students Meeting &amp; Exceeding State Standards</b> | <b>93</b>      | <b>*</b>       | <b>69</b>      |
| <b>% of Black Students Tested</b>                            | <b>100</b>     |                | <b>100</b>     |

**No other subgroups reported because subgroup size is less than ten (10) students.**

**\* Indicates fewer than 10 students tested.**

**Grade 5 Mathematics: ISAT State Assessment  
Testing Month - March**

|  | <b>ISAT</b>    |                |                |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|  | <b>2004-05</b> | <b>2003-04</b> | <b>2002-03</b> |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | 9              | 9              | 8              |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | 88             | 71             | 70             |
| Number of Students Enrolled in ISAT                    | 43             | 45             | 50             |
| Percent of Students Tested in ISAT                     | 100            | 100            | 100            |
| Number of Students Enrolled on Alternative Assessments | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| Percent of Students Tested on Alternative Assessments  | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| <b>SUBGROUP Scores Reported by NCLB</b>                |                |                |                |
| <b>A. Low Income</b>                                   |                |                |                |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | 10             | 7              | 4              |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | 73             | 61             | 50             |
| % of Low Income Students Tested                        | 100            | 100            | 100            |
| <b>B. LEP</b>  |                |                |                |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | *              | *              | 0              |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | *              | *              | 38             |
| % of LEP Students Tested                               |                |                | 100            |
| <b>C. Black</b>  |                |                |                |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | 78             | 53             | 58             |
| % of Black Students Tested                             | 100            | 100            | 100            |
| <b>D. Hispanic</b>                                     |                |                |                |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | *              | 0              | 0              |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | *              | 62             | 47             |
| % of Hispanic Students Tested                          |                | 100            | 100            |
| <b>E. White</b>  |                |                |                |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | 18             | *              | 12             |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | 91             | *              | 94             |
| % of White Students Tested                             | 100            |                | 100            |

No other subgroups reported because subgroup size is less than ten (10) students.

\* Indicates fewer than 10 students tested.



**Grade 3 Reading: IMAGE State Assessment  
Testing Month - March**

|   | <b>IMAGE</b>   |                |                |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|   | <b>2004-05</b> | <b>2003-04</b> | <b>2002-03</b> |
| <b>% of Students Exceeding State Standards</b>                | <b>24</b>      | <b>15</b>      | <b>8</b>       |
| <b>% of Students Meeting &amp; Exceeding State Standards</b>  | <b>86</b>      | <b>37</b>      | <b>40</b>      |
| <b>Number of Students Enrolled in IMAGE</b>                   | <b>30</b>      | <b>43</b>      | <b>25</b>      |
| <b>Percent of Students Tested on IMAGE</b>                    | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     |
| <b>Number of Students Enrolled on Alternative Assessments</b> | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       |
| <b>Percent of Students Tested on Alternative Assessments</b>  | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       |
| <b>SUBGROUP Scores Reported by NCLB</b>                       |                |                |                |
| <b>A. Low Income</b>  |                |                |                |
| <b>% of Students Exceeding State Standards</b>                | <b>14</b>      | <b>15</b>      | <b>10</b>      |
| <b>% of Students Meeting &amp; Exceeding State Standards</b>  | <b>82</b>      | <b>38</b>      | <b>40</b>      |
| <b>% of Low Income Students Tested</b>                        | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     |
| <b>B. LEP</b>   |                |                |                |
| <b>% of Students Exceeding State Standards</b>                | <b>24</b>      | <b>15</b>      | <b>8</b>       |
| <b>% of Students Meeting &amp; Exceeding State Standards</b>  | <b>86</b>      | <b>37</b>      | <b>40</b>      |
| <b>% of LEP Students Tested</b>                               | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     |
| <b>C. Hispanic</b>  |                |                |                |
| <b>% of Students Exceeding State Standards</b>                | <b>18</b>      | <b>11</b>      | <b>9</b>       |
| <b>% of Students Meeting &amp; Exceeding State Standards</b>  | <b>82</b>      | <b>32</b>      | <b>36</b>      |
| <b>% of Hispanic Students Tested</b>                          | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     |

**No other subgroups reported because subgroup size is less than ten (10) students.**

\* Indicates fewer than 10 students tested.

**Grade 5 Reading: IMAGE State Assessment  
Testing Month - March**

|   | <b>IMAGE</b>   |                |                |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|   | <b>2004-05</b> | <b>2003-04</b> | <b>2002-03</b> |
| <b>% of Students Exceeding State Standards</b>                | <b>64</b>      | <b>0</b>       | <b>18</b>      |
| <b>% of Students Meeting &amp; Exceeding State Standards</b>  | <b>96</b>      | <b>33</b>      | <b>27</b>      |
| <b>Number of Students Enrolled in IMAGE</b>                   | <b>25</b>      | <b>21</b>      | <b>11</b>      |
| <b>Percent of Students Tested on IMAGE</b>                    | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     |
| <b>Number of Students Enrolled on Alternative Assessments</b> | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       |
| <b>Percent of Students Tested on Alternative Assessments</b>  | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       |
| <b>SUBGROUP Scores Reported by NCLB</b>                       |                |                |                |
| <b>A. Low Income</b>  |                |                |                |
| <b>% of Students Exceeding State Standards</b>                | <b>55</b>      | <b>0</b>       | <b>*</b>       |
| <b>% of Students Meeting &amp; Exceeding State Standards</b>  | <b>95</b>      | <b>35</b>      | <b>*</b>       |
| <b>% of Low Income Students Tested</b>                        | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     |                |
| <b>B. LEP</b>   |                |                |                |
| <b>% of Students Exceeding State Standards</b>                | <b>64</b>      | <b>0</b>       | <b>18</b>      |
| <b>% of Students Meeting &amp; Exceeding State Standards</b>  | <b>96</b>      | <b>33</b>      | <b>27</b>      |
| <b>% of LEP Students Tested</b>                               | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     |
| <b>C. Hispanic</b>  |                |                |                |
| <b>% of Students Exceeding State Standards</b>                | <b>60</b>      | <b>0</b>       | <b>*</b>       |
| <b>% of Students Meeting &amp; Exceeding State Standards</b>  | <b>95</b>      | <b>33</b>      | <b>*</b>       |
| <b>% of Hispanic Students Tested</b>                          | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     |                |

**No other subgroups reported because subgroup size is less than ten (10) students.**

**\* Indicates fewer than 10 students tested.**

**Grade 3 Mathematics: IMAGE State Assessment  
Testing Month - March**

|  | <b>IMAGE</b>   |                |                |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|  | <b>2004-05</b> | <b>2003-04</b> | <b>2002-03</b> |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | 7              | 7              | 0              |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | 60             | 54             | 48             |
| Number of Students Enrolled in IMAGE                   | 30             | 43             | 25             |
| Percent of Students Tested on IMAGE                    | 100            | 100            | 100            |
| Number of Students Enrolled on Alternative Assessments | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| Percent of Students Tested on Alternative Assessments  | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| <b>SUBGROUP Scores Reported by NCLB</b>                |                |                |                |
| <b>A. Low Income</b>                                   |                |                |                |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | 4              | 0              | 0              |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | 56             | 48             | 48             |
| % of Low Income Students Tested                        | 100            | 100            | 100            |
| <b>B. LEP</b>  |                |                |                |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | 7              | 7              | 0              |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | 60             | 54             | 48             |
| % of LEP Students Tested                               | 100            | 100            | 100            |
| <b>C. Hispanic</b>                                     |                |                |                |
| % of Students Exceeding State Standards                | 4              | 0              | 0              |
| % of Students Meeting & Exceeding State Standards      | 56             | 46             | 46             |
| % of Hispanic Students Tested                          | 100            | 100            | 100            |

No other subgroups reported because subgroup size is less than ten (10) students.

\* Indicates fewer than 10 students tested.

**Grade 5 Mathematics: IMAGE State Assessment  
Testing Month - March**

|   | <b>IMAGE</b>   |                |                |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|   | <b>2004-05</b> | <b>2003-04</b> | <b>2002-03</b> |
| <b>% of Students Exceeding State Standards</b>                | <b>4</b>       | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       |
| <b>% of Students Meeting &amp; Exceeding State Standards</b>  | <b>50</b>      | <b>38</b>      | <b>18</b>      |
| <b>Number of Students Enrolled in IMAGE</b>                   | <b>25</b>      | <b>21</b>      | <b>11</b>      |
| <b>Percent of Students Tested on IMAGE</b>                    | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     |
| <b>Number of Students Enrolled on Alternative Assessments</b> | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       |
| <b>Percent of Students Tested on Alternative Assessments</b>  | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       |
| <b>SUBGROUP Scores Reported by NCLB</b>                       |                |                |                |
| <b>A. Low Income</b>  |                |                |                |
| <b>% of Students Exceeding State Standards</b>                | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       | <b>*</b>       |
| <b>% of Students Meeting &amp; Exceeding State Standards</b>  | <b>37</b>      | <b>35</b>      | <b>*</b>       |
| <b>% of Low Income Students Tested</b>                        | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     |                |
| <b>B. LEP</b>   |                |                |                |
| <b>% of Students Exceeding State Standards</b>                | <b>4</b>       | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       |
| <b>% of Students Meeting &amp; Exceeding State Standards</b>  | <b>50</b>      | <b>38</b>      | <b>18</b>      |
| <b>% of LEP Students Tested</b>                               | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     |
| <b>C. Hispanic</b>  |                |                |                |
| <b>% of Students Exceeding State Standards</b>                | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>       | <b>*</b>       |
| <b>% of Students Meeting &amp; Exceeding State Standards</b>  | <b>42</b>      | <b>33</b>      | <b>*</b>       |
| <b>% of Hispanic Students Tested</b>                          | <b>100</b>     | <b>100</b>     |                |

**No other subgroups reported because subgroup size is less than ten (10) students.**

\* Indicates fewer than 10 students tested.