

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| Local Board Approved      |  |
| 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)? | <b>No</b>  | Has this School been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act? | <b>No</b>                     |
| Is this School making AYP in Reading?                 | <b>Yes</b> | 2011-12 Federal Improvement Status  |                               |
| Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?             | <b>No</b>  | 2011-12 State Improvement Status  | Academic Early Warning Year 1 |

|                          | Percentage Tested on State Tests |            |             |            | Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards* |                      |             |      |                      |            | Other Indicators |            |                 |         |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|-------------|------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|------|----------------------|------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|---------|
|                          | Reading                          |            | Mathematics |            | Reading                              |                      | Mathematics |      |                      |            | Attendance Rate  |            | Graduation Rate |         |
| Student Groups           | %                                | Met AYP    | %           | Met AYP    | %                                    | Safe** Harbor Target | Met AYP     | %    | Safe** Harbor Target | Met AYP    | %                | Met AYP    | %               | Met AYP |
| State AYP Minimum Target | 95.0                             |            | 95.0        |            | 85.0                                 |                      |             | 85.0 |                      |            | 91.0             |            | 82.0            |         |
| All                      | 100.0                            | <b>Yes</b> | 100.0       | <b>Yes</b> | 84.9                                 |                      | <b>Yes</b>  | 84.6 |                      | <b>Yes</b> | 95.5             | <b>Yes</b> |                 |         |
| White                    | 100.0                            | <b>Yes</b> | 100.0       | <b>Yes</b> | 86.2                                 |                      | <b>Yes</b>  | 84.2 |                      | <b>Yes</b> |                  |            |                 |         |
| Black                    |                                  |            |             |            |                                      |                      |             |      |                      |            |                  |            |                 |         |
| Hispanic                 | 100.0                            | <b>Yes</b> | 100.0       | <b>Yes</b> | 84.4                                 |                      | <b>Yes</b>  | 87.1 |                      | <b>Yes</b> |                  |            |                 |         |
| Asian                    |                                  |            |             |            |                                      |                      |             |      |                      |            |                  |            |                 |         |

|                                  |       |     |       |     |      |      |     |      |      |     |      |  |  |
|----------------------------------|-------|-----|-------|-----|------|------|-----|------|------|-----|------|--|--|
| American Indian                  |       |     |       |     |      |      |     |      |      |     |      |  |  |
| Two or More Races                |       |     |       |     |      |      |     |      |      |     |      |  |  |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander |       |     |       |     |      |      |     |      |      |     |      |  |  |
| LEP                              |       |     |       |     |      |      |     |      |      |     |      |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities       | 100.0 | Yes | 100.0 | Yes | 50.0 | 53.1 | Yes | 50.0 | 61.6 | No  | 94.6 |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged       | 100.0 | Yes | 100.0 | Yes | 78.5 | 78.6 | Yes | 81.2 | 78.3 | Yes | 94.6 |  |  |

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 (%)                   | 95.2 | 95.1 | 95.3 | 94.7 | 95.5 | 95.6 | 95.4 | 95.5 |
| Truancy Rate (%)                      | 2.1  | 0.4  | 0.0  | 1.0  | 0.1  | 0.1  | 0.1  | 0.3  |
| Mobility Rate (%)                     | 21.9 | 18.5 | 10.8 | 11.6 | 11.0 | 9.3  | 8.9  | 8.3  |
| HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%) | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| School Population (#)                 | 821  | 775  | 711  | 698  | 712  | 738  | 794  | 803  |
| Low Income (%)                        | 38.6 | 40.8 | 37.0 | 36.8 | 44.8 | 43.0 | 50.4 | 52.8 |
| Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)  | 0.2  | 0.5  | 0.6  | 1.3  | 1.8  | 1.8  | 2.0  | 3.2  |
| Students with Disabilities (%)        | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 14.5 | 12.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic (%)               | 73.0 | 71.2 | 70.2 | 66.9 | 64.2 | 63.7 | 62.7 | 62.3 |
| Black, non-Hispanic (%)               | 4.5  | 1.9  | 2.3  | 3.3  | 3.2  | 3.4  | 3.1  | 3.5  |
| Hispanic (%)                          | 22.0 | 19.4 | 19.5 | 21.2 | 22.8 | 21.4 | 22.0 | 30.0 |
| Asian (%)                             | 0.5  | 0.5  | 0.7  | 0.9  | 0.6  | 0.7  | 0.3  | 0.4  |
| American Indian(%)                    | 0.0  | 0.0  | 0.0  | 0.0  | 0.3  | 0.1  | 0.4  | 0.4  |
| Two or More Races (%)                 | -    | 7.0  | 7.3  | 7.7  | 9.0  | 10.7 | 11.5 | 3.5  |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%)  | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 0.0  |

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 4 - Student Race/Ethnicity

|                                      | Year | White (%) | Black (%) | Hispanic (%) | Asian (%) | American Indian (%) | Two Or More Races (%) | Native Hawaiian/<br>Pacific Islander (%) |
|--------------------------------------|------|-----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------------------|--|
| S<br>C<br>H<br>O<br>O<br>L           | 2000 | 75.2      | 3.6       | 19.4         | 1.1       | 0.6                 | -                     | -  |
|                                      | 2001 | 72.5      | 4.9       | 20.7         | 1.4       | 0.5                 | -                     | -  |
|                                      | 2002 | 73.7      | 4.2       | 20.4         | 1.2       | 0.5                 | -                     | -  |
|                                      | 2003 | 72.8      | 4.9       | 21.6         | 0.7       | -                   | -                     | -  |
|                                      | 2004 | 73.0      | 4.5       | 22.0         | 0.5       | -                   | -                     | -  |
|                                      | 2005 | 71.2      | 1.9       | 19.4         | 0.5       | -                   | 7.0                   | -  |
|                                      | 2006 | 70.2      | 2.3       | 19.5         | 0.7       | -                   | 7.3                   | -  |
|                                      | 2007 | 66.9      | 3.3       | 21.2         | 0.9       | -                   | 7.7                   | -  |
|                                      | 2008 | 64.2      | 3.2       | 22.8         | 0.6       | 0.3                 | 9.0                   | -  |
|                                      | 2009 | 63.7      | 3.4       | 21.4         | 0.7       | 0.1                 | 10.7                  | -  |
|                                      | 2010 | 62.7      | 3.1       | 22.0         | 0.3       | 0.4                 | 11.5                  | -  |
| 2011                                 | 62.3 | 3.5       | 30.0      | 0.4          | 0.4       | 3.5                 | -                     |  |
| D<br>I<br>S<br>T<br>R<br>I<br>C<br>T | 2000 | 74.5      | 3.7       | 20.4         | 1.0       | 0.4                 | -                     | -  |
|                                      | 2001 | 73.9      | 3.7       | 21.0         | 1.0       | 0.3                 | -                     | -  |
|                                      | 2002 | 73.4      | 3.9       | 21.4         | 0.9       | 0.4                 | -                     | -  |
|                                      | 2003 | 73.0      | 4.4       | 21.5         | 0.8       | 0.3                 | -                     | -  |
|                                      | 2004 | 71.2      | 4.3       | 23.5         | 0.8       | 0.3                 | -                     | -  |
|                                      | 2005 | 67.9      | 2.7       | 21.5         | 0.6       | 0.3                 | 7.0                   | -  |
|                                      | 2006 | 66.3      | 3.0       | 21.8         | 0.6       | 0.1                 | 8.2                   | -  |
|                                      | 2007 | 64.4      | 3.2       | 21.7         | 0.5       | 0.1                 | 10.1                  | -  |
|                                      | 2008 | 63.9      | 3.4       | 21.3         | 0.5       | 0.2                 | 10.7                  | -  |
|                                      | 2009 | 62.3      | 3.4       | 21.4         | 0.6       | 0.2                 | 12.1                  | -  |
|                                      | 2010 | 62.2      | 3.3       | 21.4         | 0.3       | 0.2                 | 12.5                  | -  |



|                       |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |
|-----------------------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
|                       | 2011 | 60.1 | 3.2  | 32.6 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 3.3 | -   |
| S<br>T<br>A<br>T<br>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<br>C<br>H<br>O<br>O<br>L           | 2000 | 1.3     | 28.5           | 85.5                     | 94.3           | 10.4         | 24                  | 3.0                 | -                   | -                      |
|                                      | 2001 | 3.0     | 31.4           | 100.0                    | 93.7           | 23.8         | 14                  | 1.7                 | -                   | -                      |
|                                      | 2002 | 4.2     | 31.6           | 100.0                    | 94.5           | 20.2         | 10                  | 1.2                 | -                   | -                      |
|                                      | 2003 | 2.5     | 35.7           | 96.0                     | 94.6           | 19.8         | 13                  | 1.5                 | -                   | -                      |
|                                      | 2004 | 0.2     | 38.6           | 96.9                     | 95.2           | 21.9         | 17                  | 2.1                 | -                   | -                      |
|                                      | 2005 | 0.5     | 40.8           | 97.0                     | 95.1           | 18.5         | 3                   | 0.4                 | -                   | -                      |
|                                      | 2006 | 0.6     | 37.0           | 100.0                    | 95.3           | 10.8         | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                      |
|                                      | 2007 | 1.3     | 36.8           | 100.0                    | 94.7           | 11.6         | 7                   | 1.0                 | -                   | -                      |
|                                      | 2008 | 1.8     | 44.8           | 100.0                    | 95.5           | 11.0         | 1                   | 0.1                 | -                   | -                      |
|                                      | 2009 | 1.8     | 43.0           | 100.0                    | 95.6           | 9.3          | 1                   | 0.1                 | -                   | -                      |
|                                      | 2010 | 2.0     | 50.4           | 100.0                    | 95.4           | 8.9          | 1                   | 0.1                 | -                   | -                      |
| 2011                                 | 3.2  | 52.8    | 100.0          | 95.5                     | 8.3            | 2            | 0.3                 | -                   | -                   |                        |
| D<br>I<br>S<br>T<br>R<br>I<br>C<br>T | 2000 | 2.2     | 27.2           | 98.4                     | 93.5           | 9.9          | 57                  | 1.6                 | 7.1                 | 78.6                   |
|                                      | 2001 | 2.7     | 30.1           | 98.2                     | 93.3           | 14.0         | 41                  | 1.2                 | 7.9                 | 77.2                   |
|                                      | 2002 | 3.4     | 33.0           | 98.4                     | 94.1           | 14.3         | 46                  | 1.3                 | 4.3                 | 78.5                   |
|                                      | 2003 | 2.1     | 35.1           | 97.5                     | 94.3           | 14.9         | 127                 | 3.5                 | 6.9                 | 75.4                   |
|                                      | 2004 | 1.5     | 36.2           | 99.2                     | 94.5           | 16.4         | 33                  | 1.0                 | 8.0                 | 74.2                   |
|                                      | 2005 | 1.7     | 40.6           | 99.3                     | 94.6           | 15.2         | 53                  | 1.6                 | 4.0                 | 80.8                   |
|                                      | 2006 | 1.7     | 34.1           | 100.0                    | 94.4           | 16.5         | 69                  | 2.1                 | 4.0                 | 82.6                   |
|                                      | 2007 | 2.3     | 37.0           | 100.0                    | 94.6           | 14.2         | 75                  | 2.3                 | 4.8                 | 81.5                   |
|                                      | 2008 | 3.5     | 42.6           | 100.0                    | 94.6           | 15.5         | 84                  | 2.6                 | 4.9                 | 83.1                   |
|                                      | 2009 | 3.0     | 45.4           | 100.0                    | 94.9           | 14.5         | 52                  | 1.6                 | 3.3                 | 82.2                   |
|                                      | 2010 | 4.0     | 50.2           | 100.0                    | 94.9           | 12.4         | 60                  | 1.8                 | 4.2                 | 86.6                   |
| 2011                                 | 5.5  | 53.6    | 100.0          | 94.7                     | 16.0           | 70           | 2.1                 | 2.8                 | 84.3                |                        |

|                                  |      |     |      |      |      |      |        |     |     |      |
|----------------------------------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|--------|-----|-----|------|
| <b>S<br/>T<br/>A<br/>T<br/>E</b> | 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<br>(N) | Grade 3<br>(N) | Grade 4<br>(N) | Grade 5<br>(N) | Grade 7<br>(N) | Grade 8<br>(N) | Grade 11<br>(N) |
|--------------------------------------|------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| S<br>C<br>H<br>O<br>O<br>L           | 2000 | 799           | -              | -              | -              | -              | -              | -               |
|                                      | 2001 | 812           | -              | -              | -              | -              | -              | -               |
|                                      | 2002 | 824           | -              | -              | -              | 281            | 269            | -               |
|                                      | 2003 | 842           | -              | -              | -              | 274            | 286            | -               |
|                                      | 2004 | 821           | -              | -              | -              | 294            | 275            | -               |
|                                      | 2005 | 775           | -              | -              | -              | 259            | 286            | -               |
|                                      | 2006 | 711           | -              | -              | -              | 227            | 248            | -               |
|                                      | 2007 | 698           | -              | -              | -              | 222            | 223            | -               |
|                                      | 2008 | 712           | -              | -              | -              | 244            | 227            | -               |
|                                      | 2009 | 738           | -              | -              | -              | 238            | 248            | -               |
|                                      | 2010 | 794           | -              | -              | -              | 255            | 248            | -               |
|                                      | 2011 | 803           | -              | -              | -              | 292            | 261            | -               |
| D<br>I<br>S<br>T<br>R<br>I<br>C<br>T | 2000 | 3,558         | -              | -              | -              | -              | -              | -               |
|                                      | 2001 | 3,563         | 266            | 296            | 269            | 268            | 253            | 248             |
|                                      | 2002 | 3,529         | 252            | 269            | 290            | 285            | 275            | 270             |
|                                      | 2003 | 3,505         | 257            | 250            | 269            | 283            | 293            | 290             |
|                                      | 2004 | 3,556         | 249            | 232            | 233            | 294            | 275            | 257             |
|                                      | 2005 | 3,457         | 246            | 247            | 231            | 259            | 286            | 265             |
|                                      | 2006 | 3,612         | 254            | 250            | 262            | 227            | 248            | 281             |
|                                      | 2007 | 3,362         | 269            | 257            | 250            | 222            | 223            | 249             |
|                                      | 2008 | 3,269         | 237            | 256            | 260            | 244            | 227            | 246             |
|                                      | 2009 | 3,225         | 256            | 244            | 263            | 238            | 248            | 209             |
|                                      | 2010 | 3,308         | 272            | 257            | 236            | 255            | 248            | 204             |
|                                      | 2011 | 3,551         | 242            | 275            | 258            | 292            | 261            | 252             |
|                                      | 2000 | 1,983,991     | -              | -              | -              | -              | -              | -               |

|                       |      |           |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|-----------------------|------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| S<br>T<br>A<br>T<br>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 (%) |
|--|------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>D<br/>I<br/>S<br/>T<br/>R<br/>I<br/>C<br/>T</b> | 2000 | 222                   | 17                                 | 43,592                      | 64                                  | 36                                | 18                               | 19                               | -  | -   |
|  | 2001 | 231                   | 17                                 | 45,075                      | 66                                  | 35                                | 17                               | 20                               | -  | -   |
|  | 2002 | 233                   | 17                                 | 49,593                      | 66                                  | 34                                | 17                               | 19                               | 1  | -   |
|  | 2003 | 225                   | 17                                 | 50,031                      | 66                                  | 34                                | 18                               | 20                               | 2  | -   |
|  | 2004 | 202                   | 17                                 | 51,768                      | 63                                  | 37                                | 19                               | 23                               | 2  | -   |
|  | 2005 | 189                   | 17                                 | 53,133                      | 66                                  | 35                                | 20                               | 22                               | 1  | -   |
|  | 2006 | 199                   | 15                                 | 51,314                      | 70                                  | 30                                | 19                               | 23                               | 1  | -   |
|  | 2007 | 215                   | 14                                 | 52,031                      | 72                                  | 28                                | 17                               | 21                               | 2  | -   |
|  | 2008 | 206                   | 14                                 | 53,405                      | 69                                  | 31                                | 19                               | 21                               | 1  | -   |
|  | 2009 | 215                   | 13                                 | 54,954                      | 53                                  | 47                                | 19                               | 18                               | 1  | -   |
|  | 2010 | 219                   | 12                                 | 54,789                      | 51                                  | 49                                | 19                               | 19                               | 1  | -   |
| 2011   | 204  | 13                    | 57,894                             | 44                          | 56                                  | 19                                | 22                               | 1                                | -  |   |
|  | 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<br>T<br>A<br>T<br>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 |
| <b>AYP Benchmark<br/>% Meets + Exceeds</b>                     | 47.5    | 55.0 | 62.5 | 70.0 | 77.5 | 85.0 | 47.5    | 55.0 | 62.5 | 70.0 | 77.5 | 85.0 | 47.5    | 55.0 | 62.5 | 70.0 | 77.5 | 85.0 |
| All  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| White  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Black  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Hispanic   | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Asian  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| American Indian  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Two or More Races  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| LEP  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Students with<br>Disabilities                                  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Low Income   | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific<br>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 |
| <b>AYP Benchmark<br/>% Meets + Exceeds</b> | 47.5    | 55.0 | 62.5 | 70.0 | 77.5 | 85.0 | 47.5    | 55.0 | 62.5 | 70.0 | 77.5 | 85.0 | 47.5    | 55.0 | 62.5  | 70.0  | 77.5 | 85.0 |
| All  | 75.1    | 72.4 | 86.7 | 83.0 | 84.3 | 91.8 | 73.8    | 72.0 | 80.8 | 78.8 | 74.7 | 80.3 | 79.1    | 84.5 | 86.6  | 84.0  | 86.8 | 83.1 |
| White                                      | 79.2    | 74.4 | 89.5 | 83.8 | 85.7 | 92.1 | 76.3    | 75.9 | 84.8 | 83.7 | 77.4 | 81.6 | 80.1    | 85.9 | 89.7  | 87.2  | 89.7 | 84.1 |
| Black                                      | -       | 50.0 | -    | -    | 90.0 | -    | -       | -    | 72.7 | -    | -    | 90.9 | -       | -    | 60.0  | 70.0  | -    | -    |
| Hispanic                                   | 68.9    | 64.3 | 77.0 | 82.9 | 77.2 | 93.1 | 61.5    | 61.0 | 68.9 | 66.7 | 72.0 | 76.2 | 78.6    | 75.7 | 77.5  | 71.2  | 76.4 | 86.9 |
| Asian                                      | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -     | -     | -    | -    |
| American Indian                            | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -     | -     | -    | -    |
| Two or More Races                          | 69.2    | 89.5 | 93.1 | 86.9 | 89.2 | 91.7 | 80.0    | 81.3 | 85.7 | 77.4 | 75.0 | 83.3 | 81.0    | 83.4 | 100.1 | 100.0 | 93.1 | -    |
| LEP  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | 63.6 | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | 60.0 | -       | -    | -     | -     | -    | -    |
| Students with Disabilities                 | 28.9    | 34.9 | 63.9 | 47.4 | 41.3 | 62.5 | 20.0    | 28.9 | 53.7 | 48.6 | 25.0 | 36.6 | 35.5    | 31.0 | 61.9  | 57.5  | 61.8 | 50.0 |
| Low Income                                 | 66.6    | 59.2 | 81.4 | 71.9 | 79.4 | 88.8 | 56.0    | 62.6 | 73.1 | 69.1 | 62.9 | 75.7 | 68.2    | 71.0 | 84.1  | 76.6  | 79.8 | 70.9 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander           | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -     | -     | -    | -    |

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
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  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| White  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Black  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Hispanic   | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Asian  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| American Indian  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Two or More Races  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| LEP  | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Students with Disabilities   | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Low Income   | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| 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<br>% 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                                 | 80.8    | 88.0 | 89.2 | 84.0 | 85.4 | 84.5 | 75.6    | 78.1 | 84.9 | 86.7 | 81.0 | 84.3 | 80.9    | 87.8 | 87.0 | 86.4 | 86.5 | 82.2 |
| White                               | 86.2    | 88.9 | 91.5 | 85.1 | 88.1 | 81.4 | 80.9    | 82.7 | 88.1 | 91.9 | 82.5 | 84.6 | 82.9    | 89.3 | 91.0 | 89.1 | 91.0 | 83.1 |
| Black                               | -       | 70.0 | -    | -    | 90.0 | -    | -       | -    | 72.7 | -    | -    | 72.7 | -       | -    | 40.0 | 70.0 | -    | -    |
| Hispanic                            | 67.4    | 86.0 | 88.7 | 79.6 | 77.4 | 88.9 | 65.0    | 71.2 | 75.8 | 81.5 | 80.0 | 83.7 | 76.8    | 83.8 | 81.7 | 78.0 | 81.1 | 87.3 |
| Asian                               | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| American Indian                     | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Two or More Races                   | 76.9    | 94.8 | 82.8 | 95.6 | 86.5 | 91.6 | 56.3    | 81.3 | 95.3 | 74.2 | 90.0 | 91.6 | 76.1    | 83.3 | 93.8 | 95.2 | 79.3 | -    |
| LEP                                 | -       | -    | -    | -    | 70.0 | 72.7 | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | 72.7 | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Students with<br>Disabilities       | 37.5    | 72.1 | 66.7 | 60.6 | 39.2 | 59.4 | 16.7    | 40.0 | 59.5 | 59.5 | 50.0 | 36.7 | 40.0    | 46.7 | 52.4 | 53.9 | 58.8 | 47.3 |
| Low Income                          | 72.6    | 81.9 | 85.1 | 72.4 | 76.8 | 82.8 | 60.0    | 62.2 | 77.6 | 80.6 | 69.4 | 79.6 | 70.6    | 80.2 | 78.7 | 74.7 | 77.6 | 76.2 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific<br>Islander | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |

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

## Section I-A Data &amp; 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?

Overall performance in **reading** on ISAT 2011 was 84.9% Meets/Exceeds as compared to previous two years. ( 83% M/E in 2010, 83.4% M/E in 2009.

Overall performance in **math** on ISAT 2011 was 84.6% Meets/Exceeds as compared to previous two years.  
(85% M/E in 2010, 86.4% M/E in 2009)

**Strengths for Overall Trend Data and Disaggregated Subgroup Data in Reading:**

Growth over 3 years in Overall Reading as measured by the comparison of 2009-11 ISAT report

| 2009 Reading | 2010 Reading | 2011 Reading |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 83.4% m/e    | 83% m/e      | 84.9% m/e    |

--6th Grade Reading: 92% Meets/Exceeds

--6th Grade Reading: 92% Caucasian subgroup M/E

--6th Grade Reading: 93% Hispanic subgroup M/E

--6th Grade Reading: IEP subgroup increased from 41.5% to 62.5% M/E

--6th Grade Reading: Low SES subgroup increased from 79.5% to 89% M/E

--7th Grade Reading: Overall score improved 6% from 74% to 80% M/E

--8th Grade Reading: 8th Grade cohorts of students improved reading scores from their 7th grade scores over the last 5 years.

--8th Grade Reading: 8th Grade cohort in 2011 improved their reading score from 74% to 83% M/E

--8th Grade Reading: 8th Grade reading scores trend at 83% M/E for 5 years.

--8th Grade Reading: 8th Grade Hispanic subgroup increase from 76% in 2010 ISAT to 87% M/E in 2011 ISAT.

--8th Grade Reading: 8th Grade Hispanic cohort of students increased from 72% M/E 2010 to 87% M/E 2011.

**Strengths for Overall Trend Data and Disaggregated Subgroup Data in Math:**

--6th Grade Math: Hispanic subgroup score increased 11% to 89% m/e in 2011

--6th Grade Math: IEP subgroup score increased 20% to 59% m/e in 2011

--7th Grade Math: Caucasian/Hispanic subgroup gap closed

--7th Grade Math: Low SES subgroup increased 10% m/e

--7th Grade Math: Cohort group of students shows no decrease in math scores from 6th grade scores

--8th Grade Math: Hispanic subgroup increased m/e from 81% to 87% m/e

--8th Grade Math: 8th grade cohort students improved math scores for 5 years over their 7th grade scores

**Weaknesses for Overall Trend Data and Disaggregated Subgroup Data in Reading:**

--6th Grade Reading: IEP subgroup still low m/e

--7th Grade Reading: IEP subgroup drop in reading m/e

--8th Grade Reading: IEP subgroup scores decreased from 61% to 50% m/e

--8th Grade Reading: Caucasian subgroup lowest score in 5 years at 84% m/e

**Weaknesses for Overall Trend Data and Disaggregated Subgroup Data in Math:**

--6th Grade Math: Overall category scores declined slightly over last 3 years.

--7th Grade Math: IEP subgroup drop in math m/e

--8th Grade Math: Caucasian subgroup decrease from 59.5% to 47% m/e

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

The CMS SIP team discussed the factors that contributed to these results as follows:

1. Math scores in m/e category are fewer.
2. Low SES subgroup has increased at CMS from 48% to 54% of student population.
3. Hispanic subgroup scores have increased impressively in both reading and math at all three grade levels.
4. Caucasian subgroup scores have decreased in reading and math at 8th grade level.
5. IEP subgroup scores in reading and math at all grade levels continue to be a concern.

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

1. The CMS SIP team discussed the declining math scores in m/e category and suggested that more math minutes daily is needed. The master schedule currently has 45 minutes allocated for math daily at all grade levels. The state average for middle schools is 50-51 minutes. The current master schedule configuration does not allow for additional math minutes.
2. The Low SES subgroup made AYP on the 2011 ISAT Report through Safe Harbor provisions. At the 6th and 7th grade levels, this subgroup made gains in reading m/e; while this same subgroup made gains in 7th grade math m/e.
3. At the April Board of Education meeting, Principal Kathy Howard highlighted the closing of the achievement gap between Hispanic and Caucasian subgroups in Overall Reading as illustrated in the table:

| 2009                | 2010      | 2011      |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Hispanic 75.3% m/e  | 78.3% m/e | 84.4% m/e |
| Caucasian 85.8% m/e | 84.6% m/e | 86.2% m/e |

Conclusions drawn regarding this data include:

- Emergence of Bilingual program at CMS as TBE (over 20 students)
  - Adding 2 Bilingual teachers in the last 2 years
  - AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) Program that provides opportunities for students who need additional support to be enrolled in accelerated classes.
  - Early universal screening and interventions in reading and math
4. IEP students benefit from interventions in reading and math during their resource time

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?

A reading benchmark was obtained for all students using AIMSweb CBM for oral reading fluency and comprehension. This universal screener is given in fall, winter, and spring. Grade level teachers meet at Quarterly Data Meetings to place students into appropriate interventions. Students in reading and math interventions are progress monitored twice monthly.

**6th Grade Reading Strengths**

- Growth in fluency at Tier 1 level from fall to spring.
- Growth in comprehension (MAZE) at Tier 1 level from fall to spring (benchmark increases)

**6th Grade Math Strengths**

- Growth in math application at Tier 1 level from fall to spring

**6th Grade Math Weaknesses**

- Decline in math computation at Tier 1 level from fall to spring

| 6TH GRADE |                |                |                |                |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| MATH      | District       | Core 6 1       | Core 6 2       | Core 6 3       |
| MCAP      | f64% w61% s67% | f67% w71% s82% | f64% w53% s52% | f68% w69% s77% |
| MCOMP     | f83% w73% s68% | f89% w80% s75% | f79% w71% s64% | f90% w77% s71% |
| READING   | District       | Core 6 1       | Core 6 2       | Core 6 3       |
| R-CBM     | f74% w75% s75% | f83% w83% s79% | f68% w70% s71% | f79% w81% s84% |

|      |                |                |                |                |
|------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| MAZE | f76% w72% s76% | f82% w73% s78% | f70% w72% s75% | f83% w80% s85% |
|------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|

**7th Grade Reading Strengths**

Growth in oral fluency at Tier 1 level from fall to spring (see table below)

**7th Grade Math Strengths**

Growth in math application at Tier 1 level from fall to spring

Growth in math computation at Tier 1 level from fall to spring

| 7TH GRADE |                |                |                |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| MATH      | District       | Core 7 1       | Core 7 2       |
| MCAP      | f71% w72% s77% | f77% w69% s78% | f71% w78% s75% |
| MCOMP     | f78% w82% s79% | f75% w86% s84% | f84% w80% s78% |
| READING   | District       | Core 7 1       | Core 7 2       |
| R-CBM     | f76% w78% s80% | f77% w80% s82% | f80% w79% s83% |
| MAZE      | f82% w80% s77% | f85% w89% s80% | f83% w74% s79% |

**8th Grade Reading Strengths**

Growth in oral reading fluency at Tier 1 level from fall to spring

**8th Grade Math Strengths**

Scores for math application and math computation were 80% at Tier 1 level on winter screening

| 8TH GRADE |                |                |                |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| MATH      | District       | Core 8 1       | Core 8 2       |
| MCAP      | f78% w80% s74% | f77% w80% s79% | f81% w81% s71% |
| MCOMP     | f77% w70% s67% | f80% w67% s68% | f76% w74% s67% |
| READING   | District       | Core 8 1       | Core 8 2       |



|       |                |                |                |
|-------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| R-CBM | f81% w78% s82% | f79% w75% s78% | f84% w82% s88% |
| MAZE  | f85% w75% s75% | f85% w77% s77% | f88% w74% s76% |

School-wide intervention data for reading indicates that:

90% of 6th grade students in Tier 2 reading intervention showed individual growth toward grade level benchmarks on the R-CBM (fluency).

92% of 6th grade student in Tier 3 SRA reading intervention showed individual growth toward grade level benchmarks on the R-CBM.

91% of 7th grade students in Tier 2 reading intervention showed individual growth toward grade level benchmarks on the R-CBM.

88% of 7th grade students in Tier 3 SRA reading intervention showed individual growth toward grade level benchmarks on the R-CBM.

82% of 8th grade students in Tier 2 reading intervention showed individual growth toward grade level benchmarks on the R-CBM.

93% of 8th grade students in Tier 3 SRA reading intervention showed individual growth toward grade level benchmarks on the R-CBM.

The data for math interventions indicates the following % of studnets receiving math intervention who showed individual growth toward grade level benchmarks on the M-CAP.

6th grade=78%

7th grade=77%

8th grade=61%

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

**Factor #1.** The strength of the CMS core curriculum in reading and math is reflected in the CBM date for Tier 1 at each grade level.

**Factor #2.** Tier 1 instruction needs to be strengthened through improved instructional strategies.

**Factor #3.** Common Core State Standards to be implemented in full in 2012-13 in ELA, Math, Science

**Factor #4.** Tier 2 reading intervention is Reading Advantage (guided reading groups-skill based)

Tier 2 reading intervention is AutoSkill Reading Academy (computer based-skill based)

Tier 3 reading intervention is SRA Corrective Reading (direct instruction in decoding and comprehension skills. Special education students are in SRA Corrective Reading.

**Factor #5.** Math interventions are AutoSkill and flexible groups. A focused conversation on math interventions with the math department established needs for math interventionists and math interventions.

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

1. At all three grade levels, the Tier 1 curriculum in reading is established. This is the third year for the SpringBoard ELA curriculum which is based on the College Readiness Standards, which are closely aligned to the Common Core State Standards.
2. Tier 1 instruction continues to be the focus for improvement of instructional strategies.
3. Full implementation of the Common Core State Standards. A CMS Curriculum Development Team will create a Scope and Sequence for ELA and Math curriculum based on CCSS during June, 2012.
4. Continued improvement in delivery of interventions for reading and math.
5. Math screener is general. Need for more specific diagnoses regarding students' specific skill deficits. Need for math progress monitoring materials. Need for intervention calendar to help schedule progress monitoring.

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?

CMS continues to progress as an "Emerging School" as designated by the Illinois State Board of Education Positive Behavior Supports and Intervention (PBIS) program. CMS was designated by the ISBE as a demonstration site for legislators to visit. CMS was the only school in Whiteside County to receive this honor.

Data on student discipline is kept in SWIS according to PBIS guidelines for office referrals.

In 2011-12 student enrollment declined from 803 students to 772 students.

According to SWIS data, the number of students with 0-1 office referrals was 603, or 78% of students who met the Tier 1 classification according to 0-1 office referrals benchmark.

The AIMSweb Behavior Universal Screener was administered in the spring to 756 students. Results are divided into two indicators; one is for motivation to learn and one is for prosocial skills. Teams of teachers and aides rated the students.

For motivation to learn:

--52%% of students were in Tier 1

--44%% of students were in Tier 2

--4% of students were in Tier 3

For prosocial skills:

--55% of students were in Tier 1

--45% of students were in Tier 2

--5% of students were in Tier 3

2% or 16 students were in Tier 3 for both indicators.

Year end data from counselors shows that during the fourth quarter, 18 students were in the Check In/Check Out Tier 2 intervention. Also, in small group interventions at the Tier 2 level, there were 13 students.

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

**Factor 1. PBIS Universal Team**

PBIS Universal team met twice monthly after school to plan.

PBIS Universal team implemented Boot Camp for teaching the school-wide expectations at various locations throughout the building during the first week of school and again after the winter break.

PBIS Universal team planned a Back To School Parent BBQ.

PBIS Universal team planned quarterly celebrations.

**Factor 2: PBIS Secondary Team**

PBIS Secondary team met twice monthly before school to plan.

**Factor 3: Tier 2 interventions added this year included small Social Academic Intervention Groups (SAIG)**

**Factor 4: Advisory groups were implemented twice monthly this year in order to facilitate staff relationships with students. Staff were surveyed regarding the effectiveness of Advisory and voted to continue it as a school-wide initiative.**

Factor 5: Staff completed the School Wide Assessment System survey by May 4, 2012. Improvement in the following "High Priority" areas were identified by staff and communicated to staff at a final staff meeting:

- a. Problem behaviors receive consistent consequences.
- b. Procedures for expected and problem behaviors are consistent with school-wide procedures.
- c. A simple process exists for teachers to request assistance.
- d. A behavior support team responds promptly (within 2 working days) to students who present chronic problem behaviors.

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

1. PBIS Universal and Secondary team members will meet once a month independently and once a month together. in 2012-13.
2. Discussions with counselors and staff indicated the need to re-organize how Second Step lessons are delivered, how Cool Tools are implemented, and what topics are appropriate for Advisory.
3. Counselors re-tooled the Second Step lessons and created an instructional calendar for implementation.
4. Counselors re-organized the implementation of Cool Tools using data to guide what is reinforced.
5. Counselors set up an Advisory schedule of topics that relates to and follows the Second Step lessons.
  
6. PBIS Universal team and Secondary team will meet with CMS counselors during the summer of 2012 to create a Common Minor Referral form for use at all grade levels in order to promote school-wide consistency in managing minor classroom issues.
7. PBIS Universal team and Secondary team will continue efforts to involve parents by hosting the Back to School BBQ which is set for August 31, 2012.
8. PBIS Universal team and Secondary team will continue parent involvement efforts by hosting coffee/hot chocolate days in front of school twice yearly.
9. PBIS Universal team and Secondary team will share out referral data, intervention data at staff meetings once monthly.
10. PBIS Universal team and Secondary team and counselors will plan a parent involvement activity with the "Community That Cares" grant from Sinnissippi Centers.

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?

100% of the Challand Middle School staff is highly qualified to teach in their assigned areas. Currently 44 % of the district's teachers have a BS degree, and 56 % have a Master's degree, as compared to 54% and 60% respectively in the state. The average years of experience for SPS teachers is 13 years. The teacher/pupil ratio is 1:19 for elementary schools in the district and 1:22 for secondary schools.

Sterling Public Schools is a strong proponent for professional development as a factor for improved instruction and learning. The district provides professional development days during the school year on early dismissal days. The district partners with ROE offices to provide multiple learning opportunities for staff during the summer including workshops, seminars, online classes, and classes for in-district credit. This summer, the emphasis is on workshops in the Common Core Standards.

The professional development plan for CMS staff is directly related to the strategies and activities for staff and parents that are included in the 2011-12 SIP are as follows:

September 21, 2011

1. An Overview of the Illinois Common Core Standards
2. *Rethinking Homework: Best Practices That Support Diverse Needs* by Dr. Cathy Vatterott Book Study  
PLC Discussion by Cores with goal of creating consistent, school-wide policies on homework.

October 19, 2011

1. Gang Awareness
2. *Rethinking Homework* Book Study PLC Discussion by departments

November 16, 2011

1. YWCA Diversity Training
2. Common Core State Standards Unpacking Standards: LA and Math
3. Tech Training for ESP's
4. Bullying Training for Teachers

January 13, 2012

1. Presentation by author, Dr. Cathy Vatterott on her book, *Rethinking Homework*

February 15, 2012

1. YWCA Diversity Training
2. Tech Training

3. Role of Paraprofessionals NWIA

4. PBIS/SEL

March 21, 2012

1. "Common Core Snacks" presented by Cheryl Robinson-Director of Curriculum/SPS
2. CMS SEL Discussion on Second Step Lessons Implementation

April 18, 2012

1. Teams of teachers/aides completing the AIMSweb Behavior Screener for all students

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

Professional development focused on the introduction to and the implementation of the new Common Core State Standards. The entire staff at CMS came together as a professional learning community to discuss the issues around "homework" and how we would create a consistent, school-wide homework policy. We now have a policy that takes into consideration multiple factors that are driven by a changing population in our community and school. This new policy will be included, for the first time, in our Student Handbook. Students will now experience consistent expectations in terms of the purpose of homework, the amount of homework and the grading of homework with all teachers.

Universal screening and early intervention continue to be a focus for improved instruction and learning.

Professional development also focused on social-emotional factors that influence teaching and learning.

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

Continued staff development on the implementation of the Common Core State Standards will take place in 2012-13. Our district has implemented Curriculum Development Teams in each school. These teams will work on the scope and sequence for language arts and math this summer.

The science and social studies departments will work on the CCSS.

CMS will implement an Intervention/Enrichment schedule.

CMS will implement professional learning community practices during core and department meetings.

CMS will continue to use data to drive decisions.

---

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?

Challand Middle School offers opportunities for parent involvement. Parent-teacher conferences are held twice annually. Other opportunities for parents to participate proactively in their student's education include:

1. Core meetings with teachers
2. Back to School Night
3. Channel 11 slides on public television
4. Newsletters mailed home monthly
5. Universal screener results mailed home three times per year
6. Automatic phone call outs
7. Parent Teacher Organization meetings bi-monthly
8. Chaperones for class field trips
9. Back to School Dance sponsored by PTO
10. Fundraisers
11. CMS website
12. Edline to keep track of student academic progress online
13. Bilingual Family Nights
14. AVID Parent Night Meeting

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

Research shows that parent involvement in school activities increases their student's learning.

Bilingual teachers and aides encourage parent participation in their child's education.

Parents use Edline to monitor student grades.

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

The CMS School Improvement Plan for 2012-13 indicates that parents are important partners with the school in improving student learning. For each of the three SIP objectives, strategies and activities for parents are included.

#### 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 terms of standardized state testing, students will be taking the ISAT test for two more years in 2013 and 2014. After that the emphasis will be on formative and summative assessments done throughout the school year. To that point, our teachers will be working on the scope and sequence for language arts and math this summer in Curriculum Development Teams, with the additional goal of creating common assessments.

Data on the ISAT indicates that, while subgroup populations such as Hispanic students and Low Income students are growing, they are also achieving. Reading data for Hispanic students and Caucasion subgroups over three years show that there is no achievement gap. Improved instructional strategies for differentiation, the addition of two bilingual teachers, and the implementation of a more rigorous reading curriculum (SpringBoard) are some conclusions drawn from the data. Next steps include continued emphasis on the Common Core State Standards, continued universal screening along with early intervention, and the designated Intervention/Enrichment period.



The data from the state standardized assessment (ISAT) will continue to be disaggregated by the School Improvement Team in terms of trends over 3 years, subgroups and achievement gaps, and cohort data.

Data from the universal screeners will be analyzed by Data Teams, consisting of core teachers, counselors, and administrators. Students will continue to be placed into interventions using multiple data points according to a matrix. Data meetings are scheduled quarterly to review progress monitoring results and screening results. An instructional calendar will be created with specific dates for meetings, screenings, and progress monitoring.

The CMS Universal and Secondary PBIS Teams will combine next year. They will meet twice monthly to plan. The team is scheduled to share data on discipline and other PBIS initiatives at one staff meeting monthly.

The CMS counselors re-organized a Second Step lesson schedule to be taught by teachers school-wide. These lessons are included in the instructional calendar.

The CMS counselors re-organized a specific schedule for the teaching of Cool Tools and included this schedule on the Instructional Calendar also.

The CMS counselors re-organized the topics for Advisory, created a schedule for Advisory lessons to be taught twice monthly in small groups led by the entire staff. This schedule is also included in the Instructional Calendar.

SWIS data will continue to inform the need for Cool Tools lessons and PBIS school-wide expectations.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

| Objective Number | Title<br>(click the link to edit any objective)  | Deficiencies Addressed |
|------------------|--|------------------------|
| 1                | <a href="#">In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet grade level benchmarks on the reading screeners; 80% of the students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 will demonstrate individual growth over time from fall to spring toward grade level benchmarks.</a>  |                        |
| 2                | <a href="#">In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet grade level benchmarks on the math universal screeners; 80% of students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will demonstrate individual growth over time from fall to spring toward grade level benchmarks.</a>   | 1,                     |
| 3                | <a href="#">In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet Tier 1 criteria in one or more of the following areas: Behavior, Physical, and Social-Emotional development as determined by: Behavior: 0-1 office referrals (Tier 1) according to PBIS SWIS data Physical: Improve physical development in three areas in pre/post testing in physical education class; Social-Emotional: Tier 2 is CICO or small groups and Tier 3 is individual</a> |                        |

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

- 1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet grade level benchmarks on the reading screeners; 80% of the students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 will demonstrate individual growth over time from fall to spring toward grade level benchmarks.

**Objective 1 Description**

Presently, on the school-wide reading screener for oral reading fluency, 75% of 6th grade students, 80% of 7th grade students, and 82% of 8th grade students meet the grade level benchmark. For reading comprehension, 76% of 6th grade students, 77% of 7th grade students, and 75% of 8th grade students meet the grade level benchmark. On the 2012-13 reading screeners for oral reading fluency and comprehension, 80% of students will meet the grade level benchmark.

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

- Ⓔ 1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet grade level benchmarks on the reading screeners; 80% of the students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 will demonstrate individual growth over time from fall to spring toward grade level benchmarks.

|   |  | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities  | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Align reading curriculum to the Common Core State Standards.   | 06/04/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 2 | Establish CMS Curriculum Development Team to: create reading scope and sequence curriculum maps and create common reading assessments.   | 06/04/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 3 | Focus on improving instruction and learning through Professional Learning Communities during core and department meetings with an emphasis on data driven decisions and the four DuFour guiding questions. | 06/04/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 4 | Students start reading interventions immediately at the beginning of the year.   | 08/20/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |

|   |  |            |            |               |             |  |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|--|
| 5 | Add Enrichment to the Intervention period.       | 08/20/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |  |
| 6 | Academic vocabulary taught in all content areas. | 08/20/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |  |

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet grade level benchmarks on the reading screeners; 80% of the students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 will demonstrate individual growth over time from fall to spring toward grade level benchmarks.

|   |  | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities  | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Provide training for teachers on the content and instructional practices of the Common Core State Standards.   | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 2 | Provide training for all staff on attributes of Professional Learning Communities.                             | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 3 | Provide training for teachers on revised Core Meeting documentation and Problem Solving Process documentation. | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 4 | Provide training for teachers on academic vocabulary for all content areas.                                    | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet grade level benchmarks on the reading screeners; 80% of the students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 will demonstrate individual growth over time from fall to spring toward grade level benchmarks.

|   |   | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|---|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities   | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Inform parents about the new Common Core State Standards through website, brochures at Back to School Night, Parent Teacher | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |

|   |  |            |            |               |             |  |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|--|
|   | Conferences, monthly news letters.   |            |            |               |             |  |
| 2 | Sponsor a Scholastic Book Fair during fall Parent Teacher Conferences.   | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |  |
| 3 | Host quarterly Academic Recognition Nights for Honor Roll students and families to celebrate academic success. | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |  |
| 4 | Continue to send reading universal screener results home to parents with letter of explanation.                | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |  |

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 1 Title :**

In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet grade level benchmarks on the reading screeners; 80% of the students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 will demonstrate individual growth over time from fall to spring toward grade level benchmarks.

**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?)

The Challand Middle School SIP team meets quarterly during the school year to monitor the progress of the strategies and activities for each objective of the School Improvement Plan. **The Sterling Public School District SIP team meets four times annually to monitor the progress of the strategies and activities for each objective of the School Improvement Plan. Members of the CMS SIP Team for 2011-12 include:**

- Kathy Howard-Principal
- Ron Rick-Associate Principal
- Chris Palmer-Associate Principal
- Suzanne Palumbo-6th grade teacher LA/Science
- Joan Schriener-6th grade teacher LA/Science
- Samantha Celestino-7th grade LA teacher
- Mary Kay Bohms-7th grade LA teacher
- Kristen Shumard-7th grade Math teacher
- Roy Calkins-7th grade Social Studies teacher
- Liz Engstrom-8th grade LA teacher
- Callista Derrer-8th grade Math teacher
- Becky Haas, CMS Interventionist
- Alecia Weigle-6th grade Counselor

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 | Kathleen Howard | Principal           |
| 2 | Chris Palmer    | Associate Principal |
| 3 | Ron Rick        | Associate Principal |
| 4 | Becky Haas      | Interventionist     |

### Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

#### Objective 2

In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet grade level benchmarks on the math universal screeners; 80% of students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will demonstrate individual growth over time from fall to spring toward grade level benchmarks.

#### Objective 2 Description

Presently, 67% of 6th grade students, 77% of 7th grade students, and 74% of eighth grade students meet the grade level benchmark for math application. Presently 68% of 6th grade students, 79% of 7th grade students, and 67% of 8th grade students meet the grade level benchmark for math computation. 80% of students will meet their grade level benchmark in math application (MCAP) and math computation (MCOMP) over time from fall to spring 2012-13.

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

- B 1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet grade level benchmarks on the math universal screeners; 80% of students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will demonstrate individual growth over time from fall to spring toward grade level benchmarks.

|   |   | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|---|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities   | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Align math curriculum to Common Core State Standards.   | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 2 | Establish CMS Curriculum Development Team to create curriculum maps to include scope and sequence. Create common assessments.   | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 3 | Implement Enrichment as part of Intervention/Enrichment period.   | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 4 | Students start math interventions immediately at start of school year.  | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 5 | Create Instructional Calendar to include math progress monitoring dates for math interventions.   | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 6 | Math interventionists creating system of collecting student work samples to diagnose specific skill deficits, and to monitor progress.  | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 7 | Focus on improving instruction and learning through Professional Learning Community attributes during math department meetings with an emphasis on data driven decisions, and analyzing student work samples. | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet grade level benchmarks on the math universal screeners; 80% of students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will demonstrate individual growth over time from fall to spring toward grade level benchmarks.

|  |                           | TimeLine   |          |  | Budget      |            |
|--|---------------------------|------------|----------|--|-------------|------------|
|  | Strategies and Activities | Start Date | End Date |  | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |

|   |  |            |            |               |             |  |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|--|
| 1 | Provide training for all math teachers on content and instructional practices related to the math Common Core State Standards.   | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |  |
| 2 | CDT teachers to provide training for math department on attributes of Professional Learning Communities with an emphasis on using data to make decisions and reviewing student work. | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |  |
| 3 | Interventionist provides training for math interventionists on Instructional Calendar dates for progress monitoring, etc.  | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |  |
| 4 | Interventionist to provide training on SRA math materials.   | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |  |

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet grade level benchmarks on the math universal screeners; 80% of students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will demonstrate individual growth over time from fall to spring toward grade level benchmarks.

|   |  | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities  | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Inform parents about the Common Core State Standards through CMS website, brochures at Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, monthly newsletters about the math Common Core State Standards. | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 2 | Send results of math universal screener for math application and math computation by mail to parents.  | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 3 | Inform parents how to access new Skyward system for information on student grades and progress.  | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |



## Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 2 Title :**

In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet grade level benchmarks on the math universal screeners; 80% of students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will demonstrate individual growth over time from fall to spring toward grade level benchmarks.

**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?)

**Progress on Objective 2 will be monitored by the CMS School Improvement Team, the District School Improvement Team and the CMS Data Team at their quarterly meetings.** All staff and parents are provided minutes and agendas for the CMS School Improvement Team meetings on the CMS website.

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 | Kathleen Howard | Principal           |
| 2 | Ron Rick        | Associate Principal |
| 3 | Joshua Nichols  | Associate Principal |

## Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

**Objective 3**

In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet Tier 1 criteria in one or more of the following areas: Behavior, Physical, and Social-Emotional development as determined by: Behavior: 0-1 office referrals (Tier 1) according to PBIS SWIS data Physical: Improve physical development in three areas in pre/post testing in physical education class; Social-Emotional: Tier 2 is CICO or small groups and Tier 3 is individual

**Objective 3 Description**

Presently (2011-12), 78% of students have 0-1 **office referrals according to PBIS SWIS data.** In 2012-13, for behavior, 80% of students will have 0-1 office referrals according to PBIS SWIS data; or, 80% of students will improve in three areas of physical development from pre to post assessment data in physical education class; and/or 80% of students will be in Tier 1 according to social emotional criteria (Tier 2 is CICO and small groups, Tier 3 is for individual plans, supports).

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

1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet Tier 1 criteria in one or more of the following areas: Behavior, Physical, and Social-Emotional development as determined by: Behavior: 0-1 office referrals (Tier 1) according to PBIS SWIS data Physical: Improve physical development in three areas in pre/post testing in physical education class; Social-Emotional: Tier 2 is CICO or small groups and Tier 3 is individual

|   |  | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities  | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | AIMSweb universal Behavior Screener will be administered to all students in fall and spring.                                   | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 2 | Counselors will create an Instructional Calendar for Second Step lessons to be taught school-wide.                             | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 3 | Counselors will create an Instructional Calendar for PBIS Cool Tools to be taught school-wide.                                 | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 4 | Counselors will create an Instructional Calendar for Advisory lessons to be taught twice monthly in small groups by all staff. | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 5 | PBIS team will lead core teams in implementing mini celebration activities.  | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 6 | PE teachers to implement pre/post testing in 3 areas of physical development.  | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet Tier 1 criteria in one or more of the following areas: Behavior, Physical, and Social-Emotional development as determined by: Behavior: 0-1 office referrals (Tier 1) according to PBIS SWIS data Physical: Improve physical development in three areas in pre/post testing in physical education class; Social-Emotional: Tier 2 is CICO or small groups and Tier 3 is individual

|   |  | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities  | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Counselors will provide training for staff on teaching Second Step lessons.                      | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 2 | Counselors will provide training for staff on teaching PBIS Cool Tools lessons.                  | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 3 | Counselors will provide training for staff on revised Advisory activities.                       | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 4 | Counselors will provide training for staff on implementation of PBIS mini celebrations in cores. | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |

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

**Objective 3 Title :**

In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet Tier 1 criteria in one or more of the following areas: Behavior, Physical, and Social-Emotional development as determined by: Behavior: 0-1 office referrals (Tier 1) according to PBIS SWIS data Physical: Improve physical development in three areas in pre/post testing in physical education class; Social-Emotional: Tier 2 is CICO or small groups and Tier 3 is individual

|   |   | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|---|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities   | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | PBIS Team will organize Back to School Family Picnic.                           | 08/31/2012 | 05/23/2013 | After School  | Local Funds |            |
| 2 | PBIS Team will organize and host two Coffee/Hot Chocolate Early am for Parents. | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |            |

|   |  |            |            |               |             |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|
| 3 | Counselors will collaborate with Sinnissippi Centers "Community That Care" grant to plan parent activity at CMS. | 08/16/2012 | 05/23/2013 | During School | Local Funds |
|---|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 3 Title :**

In 2012-13, 80% of students at each grade level will meet Tier 1 criteria in one or more of the following areas: Behavior, Physical, and Social-Emotional development as determined by: Behavior: 0-1 office referrals (Tier 1) according to PBIS SWIS data Physical: Improve physical development in three areas in pre/post testing in physical education class; Social-Emotional: Tier 2 is CICO or small groups and Tier 3 is individual

**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?)

SWIS data is monitored by Mr. Ron Rick, Associate Principal at CMS. He reports the monthly and quarterly data to the counselors and administrative team at their meetings. Data can be broken out for specific grade levels, cores, type of behavior, location of behavior, and for individual students. The data is used to inform instruction using Cool Tools. Counselors report out on the strategies/activities, professional development, and parent strategies/activities at staff meetings. The CMS School Improvement Team meets quarterly to assess the progress of the strategies/activities, professional development, and parent strategies/activities. Principal Kathy Howard leads the CMS SIP Team. The SPS district SIP meetings are held quarterly where the progress of the SIP is monitored.

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 | Kathleen Howard  | Principal           |
| 2 | Ron Rick         | Associate Principal |
| 3 | Joshua Nichols   | Associate Principal |
| 4 | Becky Haas       | Interventionist     |
| 5 | Jennifer Dykeman | School Counselor    |
| 6 | Mark Morris      | School Counselor    |
| 7 | Alecia Weigle    | School Counselor    |
| 8 | Suzanne Palumbo  | SIP Team            |
| 9 | Joan Schriener   | SIP Team            |

---

|    |                    |          |
|----|--------------------|----------|
| 10 | Kristen Shumard    | SIP Team |
| 11 | Samantha Celestino | SIP Team |
| 12 | Mary Kay Bohms     | SIP Team |
| 13 | Liz Engstrom       | SIP Team |
| 14 | Callista Derrer    | SIP Team |

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 CMS School Improvement Plan team met during the 2011-12 school year to discuss progress on the school improvement strategies/activities, professional development, and parent activities. The CMS SIP team analyzed School Report Card data in order to develop the 2012-13 SIP. The SPS District SIP team met three times this year to discuss progress on the plan and to focus on initiatives for the new plan. The CMS SIP team discussed the Quarterly Reports which are sent to the district office to report on progress of the plan.

|   | Name               | Title                        |
|---|--------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | Kathleen Howard    | Principal                    |
| 2 | Ron Rick           | Associate Principal          |
| 3 | Chris Palmer       | Associate Principal          |
| 4 | Suzanne Palumbo    | 6th Grade LA/Science Teacher |
| 5 | Joan Schriener     | 6th Grade LA/Science Teacher |
| 6 | Kristen Shumard    | 7th Grade Math Teacher       |
| 7 | Mary Kay Bohms     | 7th Grade LA Teacher         |
| 8 | Samantha Celestino | 7th Grade LA Teacher         |

|    |                 |                                  |
|----|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| 9  | Roy Calkins     | 7th Grade Social Studies Teacher |
| 10 | Liz Engstrom    | 8th Grade LA Teacher             |
| 11 | Callista Derrer | 8th Grade Math Teacher           |
| 12 | Alecia Weigle   | 6th Grade Counselor              |
| 13 | Becky Haas      | Interventionist                  |

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation  
Part C. Peer Review Process

**Peer Review** - Describe the district's peer review and approval process. Peer review teams should include teachers and administrators from schools and districts similar to the one in improvement, but significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students. As appropriate, peer reviewers may be teachers from other schools, personnel from other districts, Regional Office of Education staff, Intermediate Service Center staff, RESPRO staff, university faculty, consultants, et al., or combinations thereof. RESPRO staff serving on a School Support Team should not serve on a peer review team in the same district. The peer review should precede the local board approval and must be completed within 45 days of receiving the school improvement plan. For further description of the peer review process see LEA and School Improvement: Non-Regulatory Guidance, July 21, 2006, at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

Description of peer review process including participants and date(s) of peer review.

The new 2012-13 School Improvement Plan is reviewed by the district administration including the Superintendent of Schools, the Assistant to the Superintendent for Finance, Director of Curriculum/Instruction, Director of Student Services, Director of Human Resources, and the Director of Technology. The Board of Education and the Education Committee will also review the plan. Highlights of the plan are presented to the BOE and public at one of the monthly BOE meetings.

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.

Teachers new to Sterling Public Schools participate in a two year mentoring program. Each new teacher receives an experienced teacher as a mentor. The Teacher Induction

and Mentoring Program provides ongoing support and assistance to all novice teachers. The outcome of the program is that each teacher will move from the Illinois Initial Teaching Certificate to the Illinois Standard Certificate.

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.

Services and resources provided by Sterling Public Schools to implement the CMS SIP include:

1. Professional development on Teacher Institute days and early release days.
2. Mentoring program for all new teachers.
3. Curriculum development opportunities for teachers, along with stipends, during the summer in order to improve curriculum.
4. Technical support to maintain student data base system and data analysis.
5. Student support services.
6. Financial support for PBIS initiative.
7. Financial support for all school improvement instructional strategies/activities, professional development, and parent strategies/activities.
8. Human Resource support for Mentoring Program.

The principal meets annually with the district administrative team to present the proposed School Improvement Plan. The plan is reviewed in terms of curriculum, instruction, technical support, data analysis supporting the plan, human resources needed to accomplish the plan, professional development activities required by the plan for staff, student services required to complete the plan, and financial support necessary for the plan to be successful.



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

- Require implementation of a new research-based curriculum of instructional program;
- Extension of the school year or school day;
- Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance;
- Significant decrease in management authority at the school level;
- Replacement of the principal;
- Restructuring the internal organization of the school;
- Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school.

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

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

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

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

The Illinois State Board of Education and the Whiteside Regional Office of Education provide support services to Sterling Public Schools which contribute to the development and review of the School Improvement Plan. The Illinois Interactive Report Card provides a wealth of data that is used in the analysis of instruction and learning, all contributing to the development of the School Improvement Plan.

|   | Name | Title |
|---|------|-------|
| 1 |      |       |

---

**Section IV-A Local Board Action**

**DATE APPROVED** by Local Board:

**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]   |
| <b>MONITORING</b>   |   |
| <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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No                              | 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] |
| <b>TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS</b>  |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No                              | Is it clear how the school is ensuring that teachers are receiving the support needed for their professional growth and to retain them in the profession? [C]  |
| <b>DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITES</b>   |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No                              | Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]   |
| <b>STATE RESPONSIBILITES</b>  |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No                              | Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation? [C]  |
| <b>SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM</b>  |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Have the names and titles of School Support Team members been listed in the plan? Does the team appear to have the expertise to support this school in regards to the school improvement plan? [C]                             |
| <b>APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD</b>   |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No                              | The plan indicates the approval date of this plan. [C]   |

PART II - COMMENTS