

An Integrated School Improvement Plan for

West Central Middle School

West Central School District #235

July 1, 2011– June 30, 2012

**PROVIDING OPPORTUNITY,
EXPECTING EXCELLENCE**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	
1.1	SCHOOL COMMUNITY	P. 3
1.2	SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT TEAM	P. 4
1.3	OTHER INFORMATION	P. 5
II.	DATA COLLECTION, ORGANIZATION AND TRENDS	P. 5
2.1	DATA COLLECTION METHODS	P. 5
2.2	DISTRICT ASSESSMENT DATA	P. 7
2.3	DEMOGRAPHIC DATA	P. 25
2.4	PROGRAM DATA	P. 30
2.5	PERCEPTION DATA	P. 37
III.	PROBLEM STATEMENTS AND HYPOTHESES	P. 39
IV.	GOALS, STRATEGIES, AND INTEGRATED ACTION PLAN	P. 42
V.	REFLECTION, EVALUATION AND REFINEMENT	P. 52
5.1	SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT TEAM MEETING SCHEDULE	P. 52
5.2	MONITORING	P. 52
5.3	COMMUNICATION PLAN	P. 54
REFERENCES		
LIST OF TABLES AND CHARTS		
Table 1:	School Improvement Team	P. 4
Table 2:	Data Collection Method	P. 6
Table 3:	District: ISAT	P. 7
Table 4a:	School: ISAT – Special Education Subgroup	P. 10
Table 4b:	ISAT – Low Income Subgroup	P. 12
Table 4c:	ISAT – Gender Subgroup Scores	P. 14
Table 4d:	Students meeting or exceeding 70% on report card grades	P. 17
Table 4e:	Explore test results	P. 18
Table 4f:	Explore test results by subject and gender	P. 19
Table 4g:	Explore test results special education subgroup	P. 21
Table 4h:	Learnia Test Scores	P. 22
Table 4i:	Learnia – Special Education subgroup	P. 23
Table 4j:	Reading Fluency	P. 24
Table 5:	Disciplinary Referrals by type of specific infraction	P. 25
Table 6:	Disciplinary Referrals by grade and gender	P. 26
Table 7:	General School Data	P. 27
Table 8:	Student Attendance Record	P. 28
Table 9:	Enrollment Data	P. 28
Table 10:	Student Special Education Subgroup Enrollment	P. 29
Table 11:	Educator Data	P. 30
Table 12:	Professional Growth Data	P. 31
Table 13:	After School Tutoring Participation Chart	P. 36
Table 14:	Patterns of Strengths and Challenges	P. 39
Table 15:	Problem Statements, Hypotheses, and Data Sources	P. 40
Table 16:	Strategies, Baseline Data, Annual Targets and Documentation	P. 42
Table 17:	Professional Development Schedule	P. 51
Table 18:	Monitoring Schedule	P. 52

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 SCHOOL COMMUNITY

West Central Middle School is located at 215 West South Street in the town of Stronghurst, Illinois, and serves Grades 6, 7, and 8. Enrollment at the Middle School on our Fall Housing Report 2010, was 223 students; of this, 104 are male and 119 are female. Sixth grade consists of 71 students; 7th grade consists of 75 students; and 8th grade consists of 77. All grades are currently divided into four sections. Thirty students have Individualized Education Plans. One student receives instruction from the resource room for at least 20% of the day. Students are served by Administration, faculty, and staff numbering 39: Students are divided into academic teams for instruction in core areas 20 full-time teachers, 2 special education teachers, 1 Title teacher, 1 library supervisor, 2 custodians, 3 kitchen staff, 2 secretaries, 3 paraprofessionals, 1 part-time psychologist, 1 part-time social worker, and 1 part-time behavior interventionist. The students are also served by a staff member who teaches part time and assists with administrative duties and a full time building principal. The academic program includes the core areas of English (subdivided into language arts and literature), mathematics, social studies, general science, and physical education. In addition to these areas, students in all 3 grades have classes in computer technology and art. Grade level exploratory classes are offered that include; "Choices," which is a program taught one day a week through Bridgeway that addresses drug education, math enrichment and music enrichment for the 6th grade. Seventh grade is offered health for a semester and "Choices," and 8th grade has career exploration and math enrichment classes.

The school offers a wide range of extra-curricular activities. Some of these activities include basketball, baseball, track, football, volleyball, speech, science olympiad, scholastic bowl, art club, drama, cheerleading, enrichment program, and student council. All students are provided the opportunity of taking band and chorus.

The majority of our students are from Henderson County with a small percentage coming from Warren and McDonough Counties. The largest percentage of the students is Caucasian and three students are Hispanic. Forty-five percent of the middle school students live below the poverty line.

West Central Middle School has an after school math tutorial program and a homework assistance program offered 5 nights per week. These programs, plus monthly educational enhancement opportunities, are provided through the 21st Century Grant administered through the Regional Office of Education. An enrichment program is also being offered on a weekly basis.

School Strengths

- As a building all students met AYP in all areas on the 2010 ISAT assessment.
- The Regional Office of Education recognizes 100% of teachers as highly qualified in their subject area.
- We have increased our tutoring/homework assistance programs from two to five nights a week.
- Use of the Middle School Concept allows for daily collaboration between staff members for student and curriculum issues.
- Certified staff members participate regularly in professional development activities focusing on identified areas of weakness.
- Introduction and use of differentiated teaching strategies continues.
- Staff has received instruction on Reading in the Content Areas.
- All middle school teachers have received Teacher Academy training, (Best teaching practices).

- One middle school teacher has pursued National Board Teacher Certification.
- Eight middle school teachers have received state mentoring certification.
- A productive RTI (Response to Intervention) team has been established for the past five years and consists of volunteer teachers.
- The District provides family access to student grades, homework assignments, discipline, lunch account and attendance through Skyward internet access. Beginning second semester the students will also be able to access this information.
- The District utilizes Connect-Ed to provide information to members of the community in a timely manner. (This is a mass form of communication through telephone and/or e-mail.)

School Challenges

- One of the biggest challenges facing the school continues to be economic hardships in the area. Forty-five percent of the students live below the poverty line. The region has lost many factories, which has caused economic hardships on the residents and has increased some issues with student mobility.
- The district was affected by a record flood in the summer of 2008. Some students' families are still impacted by lost or reduced income.
- Special education scores did not meet AYP in any area. (Not a subgroup) Table 4a
- The percentage of low income students increased by 1% over the previous year.
- The percentage of Special education students in the middle school remains consistent at approximately 13.45%.
- Providing coverage for special education students participating in general education classes remains a challenge. We now have two full time special education teachers as opposed to the three the first year after consolidation.
- Closing the gap between the target scores and our students' achievement scores in science remains our greatest challenge, according to EXPLORE Test results.
- Thirty percent of full time faculty members have a Master's Degree.

1.2 School Improvement Team

The School Improvement Team is seated on a voluntary basis. Their length of terms was decided in a full building meeting. Replacement team members are selected from volunteers.

Table 1 School Improvement Team

TEAM MEMBER	POSITION	ROLE	LENGTH OF SERVICE	# OF YEARS ON TEAM
Jeff Nichols	Principal	Chairperson	Constant	6
Karen Rima	Administrator	Data Analysis	Constant	4
Jamie Farniok	Spec Ed Coordinator	Consultant	Constant	4
Jeanne Serven	Curriculum Coordinator	Consultant	Constant	5
Kayty Boyd	Literature	Professional Development	2009-2013	2
Jeanne Barber	Math	Data Collection	2007-2011	4
Vicky Keever	Technology	Data entry	2008-2012	3
Terri Copeland	Language arts	Surveys	2010-2011	4
Natalie Ensminger	Literature	Assessments	2010-2011	4
Byron Helt	Science	Data Entry	2010-2012	1
Jeremy Hennings	Math	Data Collection	2010-2012	1

1.3 OTHER INFORMATION

- Prior to the 2005 school year, our district was comprised of Southern Community School District for the southern part of Henderson County and Union Community School District that served the northern part of the county.
- West Central Middle School is a 6-8th grade school.
- At the beginning of the 2006-07 school year, we switched to a middle school.
- The school serves as the only middle school for the district.
- Students are bused to the campus by school provided buses.
- The facility was constructed in 1925, with an addition being built in 1955. It currently meets all life safety standards.
- The plumbing has been upgraded in the handicapped accessible restrooms.
- In June of 2008, our district was affected by major flooding. Twenty-seven thousand acres were flooded, along with major highways and county roads that were unusable for an extended period time. Several communities in the district were affected by the flood, requiring evacuation and displacement of students and their families. Forty students lost their permanent residence and have been designated as homeless. Family and district income and economic status were directly impacted by the flood.

II. DATA COLLECTION, ORGANIZATION AND TRENDS

2.1 Data Collection Methods

We used a variety of sources to gather information that would give us the clearest indication of areas of strength and weakness including surveys, ISAT scores, professional development, and demographic information. We also use Learnia testing as another indicator of student strengths and weaknesses for the 6th and 7th grade. EXPLORE testing is administered to 8th grade students to determine additional needs of students before they enter high school. However, because we are a relatively new district, we are still developing trends that continue to shape our plans.

Table 2: Data Collection

TYPE	TITLE	TIME FRAME	REPOSE RATE	PURPOSE
Survey	Parent Survey	Sept. 2007 August 2008 October 2009 October 2010	61% 39% 22% 54%	To identify parent concerns.
Survey	Student Survey	October 2007 August 2008 October 2009 October 2010	98% 92% 100% 97%	To identify student concerns.
Survey	Staff Survey	October 2007 August 2008 October 2009 October 2010	100% 100% 100% 100%	To identify staff concerns.
Formal Assessment	ISAT Overall Scores	2004-2005 2005-2006 2006-2007 2007-2008 2008-2009 2009-2010	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%	To identify strengths and areas of concern.
Formal Assessment	Learnia Tests	Nov. 2006 yr 1 Sept. 2007 yr 2 April 2008 yr 2 Sept. 2008 yr 3 March 2009 yr 3 Nov. 2009 yr 4 April 2010 yr 4 Sept. 2010 yr 5 April 2011 yr 5	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%	To identify for strengths and weakness for Title 1 students.
Formal Assessment	EXPLORE Test	Jan. 2007 yr 1 Sept. 2007 yr 2 April 2008 yr 2 Sept. 2008 yr 3 April 2009 yr 3 Sept. 2009 yr 4 April 2010 yr 4 Sept. 2010 yr 5 April 2011 yr 5	100% 100% 98.7% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%	To identify 8 th grade high school readiness and areas of concern for 8 th grade students.
Documents	Teacher Certificates	2005-2006 2006-2007 2007-2008 2008-2009 2009-2010 2010-2011	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%	To determine that all teachers are certified and highly qualified to teach in their subject area
Documents	Fall Housing Report	2005-2011	NA	To identify individual students and special needs.
Documents	WCSD #235 Consolidation Demographic Document.	2005-2011	NA	To identify area demographics.

2.2 Assessment Data

Table 3

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS DATA						
BASED ON ISAT & PSAE MEETS and EXCEEDS						
All Subjects & Subgroups required to be 77.5% or above						
Updated January 3, 2011						
	West Central 2006	West Central 2007	West Central 2008	West Central 2009	West Central 2010	West Central 2011
3rd Grade						
Reading -All	65%	62%	69%	70%	84%	
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	59% 70%	58% 65%	53% 82%	76% 63%	83% 85%	
Reading – IEP/ Others	17% 74%	43% 67%	23% 79%	46% 75%	63% 87%	
Math – All	89%	86%	84%	82%	93%	
Math – Low Inc/ Others	84% 93%	84% 88%	78% 90%	80% 84%	91% 96%	
Math – IEP/ Others	58% 94%	71% 90%	46% 93%	61% 86%	75% 95%	
Writing				52%	44%	
4th Grade						
Reading - All	79%	75%	79%	81%	75%	
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	63% 91%	73% 78%	79% 79%	66% 93%	73% 77%	
Reading – IEP Others	50% 86%	7% 89%	62% 83%	59% 86%	50% 81%	
Math - All	91%	91%	96%	95%	93%	
Math – Low Inc Others	84% 95%	95% 88%	93% 98%	91% 98%	90% 97%	
Math – IEP/ Others	56% 100%	54% 99%	77% 100%	83% 97%	93% 93%	
Science - All	92%	83%	87%	91%	82%	
Science – Low Inc/ Others	84% 98%	82% 85%	82% 91%	84% 95%	81% 83%	
Science-IEP Others	75% 97%	46% 91%	62% 93%	75% 94%	57% 88%	
5th Grade						
Reading - All	74%	79%	79%	72%	85%	
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	69% 78%	50% 98%	79% 78%	69% 76%	74% 93%	
Reading – IEP/ Others	32% 87%	33% 90%	14% 92%	54% 76%	71% 86%	
Math - All	86%	90%	92%	88%	93%	
Math – Low Inc Others	77% 92%	77% 98%	94% 90%	91% 85%	97% 91%	
Math – IEP/ Others	63% 93%	53% 98%	64% 97%	77% 91%	86% 94%	
Writing		42%	43%	70%	67%	

Table 3	West Central 2006	West Central 2007	West Central 2008	West Central 2009	West Central 2010	West Central 2011
6th Grade						
Reading – All	81%	75%	95%	79%	76%	
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	69% 89%	61% 86%	93% 96%	79% 79%	72% 81%	
Reading – IEP/ Others	40% 90%	20% 91%	82% 97%	36% 87%	20% 85%	
Math – All	80%	76%	91%	81%	91%	
Math – Low Inc Others	66% 89%	68% 82%	82% 96%	76% 85%	90% 92%	
Math – IEP/ Others	53% 87%	30% 90%	36% 100%	36% 90%	50% 97%	
Writing			63%	66%	68%	
7th Grade						
Reading – All	68%	76%	76%	86%	77%	
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	58% 77%	68% 81%	61% 85%	72% 94%	70% 83%	
Reading – IEP/ Others	25% 80%	53% 81%	29% 84%	55% 91%	10% 87%	
Math – All	76%	81%	79%	89%	82%	
Math – Low Inc/ Others	63% 88%	74% 85%	61% 91%	80% 94%	73% 90%	
Math – IEP/ Others	20% 92%	47% 89%	29% 89%	36% 98%	20% 91%	
Science – All	81%	91%	85%	89%	81%	
Science – Low Inc/ Others	70% 92%	87% 94%	79% 89%	88% 90%	76% 85%	
Science – IEP/ Others	50% 90%	73% 95%	43% 93%	55% 94%	20% 90%	
8th Grade						
Reading – All	75%	74%	83%	84%	82%	
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	81% 70%	58% 89%	65% 90%	78% 89%	71% 89%	
Reading – IEP/ Others	50% 83%	32% 86%	36% 91%	60% 89%	40% 88%	
Math – All	65%	65%	75%	81%	82%	
Math – Low Inc/ Others	61% 88%	51% 78%	63% 81%	69% 89%	71% 89%	
Math – IEP/ Others	20% 79%	11% 80%	42% 81%	33% 91%	20% 91%	
Writing		61%	67%	60%	71%	

Table 3	West Central 2006	West Central 2007	West Central 2008	West Central 2009	West Central 2010	West Central 2011
11th Grade - PSAE						
Reading	52%	46%	56%	38%	51%	
Reading – Low Inc Others	29% 58%	19% 62%	43% 64%	36% 40%	33%	
Reading – IEP/ Others	8% 62%	7% 54%	10% 66%	8% 45%	0%	
Math	36%	31%	37%	24%	36%	
Math – Low Inc/ Others	7% 43%	10% 43%	24% 44%	16% 30%	13%	
Math – IEP/ Others	8% 42%	0% 37%	0% 45%	0% 29%	0%	
Science	42%	45%	47%	35%	45%	
Science – Low Inc Others	27% 45%	23% 59%	38% 53%	29% 40%	30%	
Science – IEP/ Others	8% 49%	0% 54%	10% 55%	0% 43%	0%	
Writing		54%	54%	44%	53%	
ACT Summary						
Composite	17.9	18.4	18.9	17.7	19.0	
English	17.1	18.5	18.6	17.0	18.7	
Math	17.5	17.3	17.7	16.9	18.6	
Reading	18.0	18.5	19.3	18.2	19.1	
Science Reasoning	18.5	18.8	19.0	18.0	19.0	
Percent Tested on ACT	100%	100%	100%	98.6%	97.4%	
Number Tested	67	84	57	72	78	

Observations (Table 3)

2008-2009

- The percentage of IEP students who met or exceeded reading standards increased from 14% in 5th grade in 2008 to 36% in 6th grade in 2009.
- The percentage of students who met or exceeded standards in math decreased from 92% in 5th grade in 2008 to 81% in 6th grade in 2009.
- The percentage of low income students who met or exceeded for the 2009 6th grade decreased 18 percentage points in math from the 2008 5th grade.
- The percentage of IEP students who met or exceeded math standards decreased 25 points for 2009 6th grade when compared to 2008 5th grade test results.
- The percentage of students who met or exceeded writing standards increased 23 percentage points for 6th graders in 2009 as compared to 5th graders in 2008.
- The percentage of students who met or exceeded reading standards remained the same for the 2009 6th graders from 2008 5th graders.
- The percentage of students who met or exceeded reading standards decreased in all subgroups for 2009 7th graders as compared to 2008 6th grade results.

- The percentage of students who met or exceeded standards in math remained consistent for the 2009 7th grade when compared to the 2008 6th grade results.
- The percentage of IEP students meeting or exceeding standards in science decreased from 75% as 2008 6th graders to 55% as 7th graders in 2009.
- The percentage of students meeting or exceeding in math and reading for the 2009 8th grade increased over the 2008 7th grade scores in every subgroup.
- 2008 low income 7th graders scored at 72% as 6th graders they were at 93% and as 5th graders they were at 50%.

2009-2010

- Writing is not figured in AYP. However, scores are tracked and data is used to guide instruction.
- In 2010 the IEP students collectively did not meet AYP in all tested areas at all grade levels.
- 6th grade IEP students from 2009 to 2010 dropped 27 percentage points in math compared to their 5th grade test.
- The percentage of 8th graders improving math scores has increased each year from 2007-2010.
- Although the Class of 2015 has always made AYP in math, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding has decreased or shown little growth every year in math.
- The class of 2015 has improved in reading only one of the past five years.
- Science met AYP every year.
- Low income students scored lower in every area in every grade than non-low income students on the 2010 ISAT.

Summary (Table 3a)

- Eighth grade students increased both math and reading scores over the past three years.
- Seventh grade students have increased reading scores over the past three years.

Table 4a School ISAT Special Education Subgroup Results

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
AYP Goal	47.5%	55%	62.5%	70%	77.5%	
6 th Grade Reading	40%	20%	82%	36%	20%	
6 th Grade Math	53.3%	30%	36%	36%	50%	
6 th Grade Writing	NA	NA	NA	15.4%	68%	
7 th Grade Science	50%	73%	43%	55%	20%	
7 th Grade Reading	25%	53%	29%	36%	10%	
7 th Grade Math	20%	47%	29%	55%	20%	
8 th Grade Reading	50%	32%	36%	60%	40%	
8 th Grade Math	20.0%	11%	42%	33%	20%	
8 th Grade Writing	NA	NA	NA	26.7%	71%	

Special Education Subgroup based on ISAT meets and exceeds. Notes: In 07-08, 08-09, and 09-10 special Education was not a designated subgroup for the middle school due to the lower number of students enrolled in special education.

Observations (Table 4a)

2008-2009

*** West Central Middle School did not have a special education subgroup.**

- 36% of 6th grader IEP students met or exceeded standards in reading and math.
- IEP students who met or exceeded standards in reading for the 2009 6th grade increased 22 percentage points over their 2008 5th grade from 14% to 36%.
- 36% of the 2009 7th grade IEP students met or exceeded reading standards; this is a 46 percentage point drop from the 2008 6th grade results.
- 60% of the 2009 8th grade IEP students met or exceeded reading standards.
- 2009 8th grade IEP students' meeting or exceeding standards in reading increased 31 percentage points over the 2008 test results.
- The number of 2009 6th grade IEP students who met or exceeded math standards decreased by 28 percentage points from the 2008 5th grade test results.
- 36% of 2009 7th grade IEP students met or exceeded standards in math.
- The number of 2009 7th grade IEP students meeting or exceeding in math is the percent as the 2008 6th IEP math test results.
- 33% of 2009 8th grade IEP students met or exceeded math standards.
- The number of 2009 8th grade IEP students meeting or exceeding in math increased 4 percentage points as compared to the 2008 7th grade test results.
- 43% of the 2009 7th grade IEP students met or exceeded science standards.

2009-2010

- The middle school does not have an IEP subgroup. The collective IEP group did not meet AYP. However, scores are tracked and data is used to guide instruction.
- IEP students collectively scored highest on the writing portion of the ISAT.

Table 4aa ISAT Special Education Subgroup (Individual) Results)

8 th Grade	Math	Rdg.		7 th Grade	Math	Rdg.		6 th Grade	Math	Rdg.
Student				Student				Student		
1	+ 4	- 3		1	+11	- 17		1	+25	+24
2	+24	- 7		2	+ 3	+ 3		2	+22	- 13
3	+27	+16		3	- 12	+10		3	+ 2	- 21
4	+16	- 21		4	- 2	+ 7		4	- 4	- 3
5	+ 2	+ 2		5	+ 9	=		5	- 4	+ 5
6	NA	NA		6	- 1	- 7		6	- 1	+25
7	+21	+24		7	+18	- 9		7	- 6	- 23
8	+31	+ 7		8	NA	NA		8	- 6	+15
9	+ 2	+15		9	+ 3	- 5		9	- 7	- 11
10 No services	- 9	- 4		10	- 17	+ 8				
				11	+ 2	+23				

* = Indicates no change in score

Observations (Table 4aa)

2009-2010

8th Grade

- One student was not tested.
- One student (#10) did not receive services.
- Eight out of nine students increased in math, four by over twenty-one points.
- Four out of nine went down in reading; three were by seven or less points.
- Three increased reading scores by fifteen or more points.

7th Grade

- One student participated in the alternative test.
- One student showed a twenty-three point increase in reading.
- One student's reading score remained unchanged.
- Four out of ten student scores went down in reading. (Two by twelve points or more).
- Four out of ten student scores went down in math by five or more points.
- Three students' math scores increased by nine or more points.

6th Grade

- Six out of nine students went down in math (all seven or less points)
- Five out of nine students went down in reading (four over eleven points)
- Two math scores increased by twenty-two or more points.
- Two reading scores increased by twenty-four or more points.

Overall

- Sixty-one percent of IEP students increased ISAT math scores.
- Fifty percent of IEP students increased ISAT reading scores and one was unchanged.

Table 4b ISAT Low Income Subgroup

	Rdg 05/06	Rdg 06/07	Rdg. 07/08	Rdg 08/09	Rdg 09/10	Math 05/06	Math 06/07	Math 07/08	Math 08/09	Math 09/10	Sci 05/06	Sci 06/07	Sci 07/08	Sci 08/09	Sci 09/10
6 th	69%	61%	93%	79%	72%	66%	68%	82%	76%	90%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
7 th	58%	68%	61%	72%	70%	63%	74%	61%	80%	73%	70%	87%	79%	88%	76%
8 th	81%	58%	65%	78%	71%	61%	51%	63%	69%	71%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note: The percentage of students, in the middle school, designated as low income increased from 35.9% in 2007-2008 to 43% in 2008-2009. In 2009-2010 46.3% of students were low income.

Observations (Table 4b)

2008-2009

- The percentage of the 6th grade low income subgroup met AYP reading (79%) and math (76%).
- The 7th grade low income subgroup met AYP in reading (72%) and in math (80%).
- The 8th grade low income subgroup met AYP in reading (78%).
- The percentage of the 6th grade low income subgroup who met AYP decreased in both reading (14%) and in math (6%) from the previous year.

- 7th grade low income subgroup met AYP in reading 72%, math 80% and in science 88%.
- The percentage of the 7th grade low income subgroup meeting AYP increased in reading (11%), math (19%) and in science (9%) from the previous year.
- The percentage of the 8th grade low income subgroup met AYP in reading 78%.
- The percentage of the 8th grade low income subgroup meeting AYP in math was 69%.
- 8th grade low income subgroup meeting AYP in reading increasing 13%) and math 6%.

2009- 2010

- Low income students in the class of 2015 math scores decreased each of the past three years.
- Low income students in the class of 2016 math scores decreased each of the past four years.
- Low income students in the class of 2016 reading scores increased every year prior to 2010.

Table 4c ISAT Gender (Male) Subgroup Score

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS DATA														
Data shows % of students who MEETS or EXCEEDS on ISAT & PSAE														
	2006 WC Male	2006 State Male		2007 WC Male	2007 State Male		2008 WC Male	2008 State Male		2009 WC Male	2009 State Male		2010 WC Male	2010 State Male
3 rd Grade														
Reading	53.5%	66.5%		54.8%	69%		38%	68%		61%	69%		78%	74%
Math	86%	85%		90.3%	77%		84%	85%		83%	85%		88%	86%
4 th Grade														
Reading	73%	68.3%		68.2%	71%		55%	70%		82%	70%		95%	86%
Math	86.5%	84.1%		90.1%	86%		97%	84%		95%	85%		93%	86%
Science	86.5%	79.4%		82.%	80%		90%	76%		92%	77%		82%	77%
5 th Grade														
Reading	73.3%	64.7%		69.4%	66%		55%	70%		57%	70%		81%	71%
Math	84.5%	78.2%		81.%	81%		82%	80%		93%	81%		86%	82%
6 th Grade														
Reading	76.9%	68.2%		72.9%	70%		73%	76%		72%	77%		64%	78%
Math	79.5%	77.6%		77.1%	80%		79%	81%		76%	81%		93%	83%
7 th grade														
Reading	70.9%	68.2%		73.8%	69%		58%	74%		79%	73%		69%	74%
Math	72.9%	74.6%		81.%	78%		79%	79%		79%	81%		76%	83%
Science	83.4%	79.7%		90.5	79%		88%	79%		85%	79%		71%	82%
8 th Grade														
Reading	76.1%	76.1%		70.5%	78%		73%	78%		87%	80%		74.%	81%
Math	60.8%	76.8%		61.4%	80%		75%	79%		81%	81%		71%	82%
11 th Grade														
Reading	52.9%	55.7%		37%	51%		47%	51%		31%	55%			
Math	47.1%	56.1%		27%	56%		38%	56%		25%	54%			
Science	53%	54.9%		42%	54%		50%	54%		31%	54%			

Table 4c ISAT Gender (Female) Subgroup Scores

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS DATA														
Data shows % of students who MEETS or EXCEEDS on ISAT & PSAE														
	2006 WC Female	2006 State Female		2007 WC Female	2007 State Female		2008 WC Female	2008 State Female		2009 WC Female	2009 State Female		2010 WC Female	2010 State Female
3 rd Grade														
Reading	78.4%	75.1%		67.5%	86%		79%	76%		81%	76%		89%	77%
Math	91.9%	86.3%		82.5%	87%		79%	85%		81%	85%		97%	86%
4 th Grade														
Reading	84.2%	77.8%		82.4%	77%		78%	77%		81%	77%		81%	77%
Math	94.8%	85.6%		91.2%	87%		93%	85%		95%	87%		91%	87%
Science	97.4%	80.3%		85.3	80%		85%	76%		89%	77%		81%	77%
5 th Grade														
Reading	75.7%	72.4%		87.8%	74%		80%	77%		83%	77%		89%	79%
Math	87.8%	79%		98.%	84%		90%	82%		85%	84%		100%	84%
6 th Grade														
Reading	86.1%	77.5%		76.9%	77%		93%	83%		87%	83%		85%	85%
Math	80.6%	80.6%		74.4%	83%		95%	85%		87%	84%		89%	86%
7 th grade														
Reading	65.1%	75.8%		77.8%	78%		74%	82%		93%	82%		86%	82%
Math	79%	77.6%		81.%	81%		79%	82%		98%	85%		89%	86%
Science	79.1%	82.1%		92.%	80%		82%	79%		93%	80%		92%	82%
8 th Grade														
Reading	73%	82.4%		77.3%	86%		81%	86%		79%	87%		88%	88%
Math	70.3%	79.8%		68.2%	83%		75%	82%		79%	83%		90%	86%
11 th Grade														
Reading	51.6%	61.1%		56%	57%		68%	55%		46%	59%			
Math	24.2%	51.3%		35%	50%		36%	51%		23%	49%			
Science	30.3%	46.8%		49%	48%		44%	48%		40%	47%			

Observations (Table 4c)

2008-2009

- With the exception of 8th grade, West Central male reading percentages are lower than female reading percentages across grade levels.
- Eighth grade male reading scores increased dramatically from their previous year's test. From 58% meet or exceed to 87% meet or exceed.

- The seventh grade girls' percentage of meeting or exceeding in math continued to be higher than the boys.
- The current eighth grade boys' and girls' math percentage of meeting or exceeding remained about the same.
- 7th and 8th grade math scores remain consistent.
- The 2009 8th grade and 11th grade female scores have been below the state average for the past four years with one exception, reading 2008.
- 4th grade and 5th grade scores for girls have exceeded the state average in every tested area for the past 4 years.
- 6th grade girls have exceeded the state average in reading 3 out of the last four years
- 6th grade girls have exceeded the state average in math 2 yrs, equaled the state average once and been below the average 1 year.
- 7th grade girls have exceeded the state average in science 3 out of 4 years.
- 8th grade girls have scored lower than the state average for the past 4 years in reading and math.
- 4th grade boys have exceeded state averages in math and science each of the last 4 years.
- 4th grade boys have exceeded state averages in reading in 2006 and 2009 and were below the state average in 2007 and 2008.
- 5th grade boys math scores exceeded the state average 3 years and equaled it the 4th year.
- 6th grade boys math scores were below the state average the last 3 years.
- 7th grade boys reading scores exceeded the state average each year except 2008.
- 7th grade boys math scores exceeded the state average in 2007, equaled the state average in 2008, and were below the state average in 2006 and 2009.
- The 8th grade male scores have been below or equal to the state average in every category except reading in 2009.
- The 11th grade male scores have been below the state average in every area for the past 4 years.
- 11th grade score showed a substantial decline in both math and reading when compared to their 8th grade ISAT scores.
- PSAT 11th grade scores for females had a greater decline than males in math and reading when compared to their 8th grade ISAT scores.
- 2009 6th, 7th and 11th grade girls outscored males on ISAT in all areas with the exception of 11th grade math.
- 2009 reading and math scores on the 11th grade PSAT dropped substantially from the same students' 8th grade ISAT scores.

Observations (Table 4c)

2009-2010

- Females outscored males in all areas except 6th grade math.
- No female scores for 2010 were below the state average.
- Male ISAT scores for 2010 are below the state average in all areas except 6th grade math.
- Both male and female 6th graders' scores have decreased over the past three years in reading.
- Males' 7th grade science scores have decreased over the past 3 years.

Table 4d-1: Percentage of students meeting or exceeding 70% on End of the Year Report Card
(Based on grade level)

	Language Arts				Literature				Math				Science				Social Studies			
SY	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10
Class	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
2017				100				100				100				100				100
2016			99	99			99	100			99	99			100	100			93	99
2015		85	95	97		89	100	100		93	100	100		83	100	100		87	100	99
2014	96	97	92	97	93	99	97	99	93	84	93	99	99	99	98	99	98	99	99	100

Observations (Table 4d-1)

2008-2009

- Report card scores show current 8th grade class strong in all areas with at least 92% of students achieving above 70 %.
- Current 7th grade class dropped from 99% to 95% grade average in Language Arts.
- Current 7th grade class grade average remained the same in all other areas.
- Current 8th grade class showed substantial improvement in all subject areas with the exception of math which remained the same.
- The end of the year report card scores are inconsistently higher than ISAT , Learnia, and EXPLORE results.
- 2008-2009 8th grade students meeting or exceeding increased in every subject area from the previous year with the exception of math which stayed at 93%.

Observation (Table 4d-1)

2009-2010

- 8th grade class increased the number of students meeting or exceeding from the previous year in language arts. They remained the same in Social Studies and went down in Literature, Math and Science by one percentage point.
- 7th grade class went down in Language Arts by two percentage points and went up in all other areas except science where they remained at 100%. The largest increase (6%) was in Social Studies.
- 6th grade class met or exceeded in all subjects at 99% or higher.

Table 4d-2 Gender – Male End of the Year Report Card Grade 70% or Higher Average

	Language Arts Male				Literature Male				Math Male				Science Male				Social Studies Male			
SY	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10
	%	%	%		%	%	%		%	%	%		%	%	%		%	%	%	
2017				100				100				99				100				100
2016			100	99			97	100			100	99			100	99			97	99
2015		98	98	97		95	96	97		93	98	100		100	100	100		100	89	99
2014	97	100	91	99	100	100	100	99	100	100	100	99	100	100	100	99	100	97	100	99
2013	98	82	96		94	88	96		100	90	90		96	80	98		96	86	98	

Table 4d -3 Gender – Female End of the Year Report Card Grade 70% or Higher Average

	Language Arts Female				Literature Female				Math Female				Science Female				Social Studies Female			
SY	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10
Class of	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
2017				100				100				99				100				100
2016			100	100			100	100			100	100			100	100			97	100
2015		100	100	100		100	100	100		100	100	100		100	100	100		100	97	100
2014	100	100	100	99	100	98	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2013	100	92	100		97	92	97		100	97	97		97	86	97		100	86	100	

Observations 4d-2 & 4d-3

2008-2009

- A greater percent of females scored consistently higher than 70 percent at all levels.
- A greater percentage of students in 6th and 7th grades received an end of year report card grade of 70% or higher than the 8th graders.

2009-2010

- A greater percent of females scored consistently higher than 70 percent at all levels.

Table 4e EXPLORE Test (Administered to 8th grade only)

	Target	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Subject Results		Fall	Fall	Fall	Fall	Fall	Spring	Spring	Spring	Spring	Spring
English	13	NA	13.9	14.5	15.0	13.7	14.5	16.0	16.1	16.5	
Math	17	NA	15.3	15.3	16.3	14.8	15.4	16.8	16.8	17.1	
Reading	15	NA	14.8	15.1	15.8	14.4	14.7	16.9	16.3	17.2	
Science	20	NA	16.9	16.6	16.7	16.1	16.6	18.0	18.0	17.6	
Composite	15	NA	15.3	15.5	16.0	14.9	15.4	17.1	17.0	17.2	

EXPLORE is based on college readiness standards not Illinois Learning Standards.

The EXPLORE test is part one of a three test sequence. The other two tests are administered in the 10th grade (PLAN) and 11th grade (ACT). The purpose of the EXPLORE test is to determine student readiness for high school when considering college track coursework.

Target scores are based on the spring testing.

Observations (Table 4e)

2008-2009

- 8th grade students as a group are below target scores in math and science based on end of year expectations.
- English is the area students scored the highest.
- The 2009 Spring composite score at 17.0 is comparable to the previous Spring score of 17.1.
- The composite scores improved in all areas from fall testing to spring testing.
- The class composite score was higher than the target composite score.
- Closing the gap between the target scores and our students' achievement science scores remains our greatest challenge according to EXPLORE Test results.
- Scores in English and math maintained or improved from fall 2007 to spring 2009.
- Math and science scores have not met target score from 2006 through 2009.
- Math scores have been consistent or risen every year from fall testing to spring testing.
- Overall, all fall scores are increasing each year.

2009-2010

- All scores increased from fall to spring.
- 8th grade students met in all areas except science on the spring assessment.
- 8th grade students surpassed the target score by the greatest margin in English.
- 8th grade students achieved higher scores than all previous classes in all areas except science.
- Science was the highest score in the fall 2009 testing.

2010-2011 (Fall)

- The average scores of 8th graders in the fall of 2010 are lower in every area than the 8th graders in the fall of 2009.
- Even though English scores in the fall of 2010 were lower than the fall of 2009, they were still above the target.

Table 4f EXPLORE Test Results by Subject and Gender

	Target			Local		Local		Local		Local		Local	
		NA		2007-2008 Fall		2008-2009 Fall		2009-2010 Fall		2010-2011 Fall		2011-2012 Fall	
				Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem
Eng	13			13.5	14.3	14.3	14.8	13.6	16.1	12.6	15.0		
Math	17			15.8	14.8	15.9	14.6	16.1	16.4	14.6	15.1		
Rdg	15			14.9	14.6	15.1	15.0	14.8	16.5	13.4	15.6		
Sci	20			16.9	16.9	16.5	16.7	15.9	17.3	15.6	16.8		
Comp	15			15.4	15.3	15.7	15.4	15.1	16.7	14.1	15.8		

	Target	Local		Local		Local		Local		Local		Local	
		2006-2007 Spring		2007-2008 Spring		2008-2009 Spring		2009-2010 Spring		2010-2011 Spring		2011-2012 Spring	
		Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem				
Eng	13	13.8	15.1	15.2	16.7	16.1	16.2	14.9	17.0				
Math	17	14.7	16.0	16.8	16.9	17.2	16.3	16.0	17.5				
Rdg	15	14.1	15.0	17.2	16.7	16.2	16.5	15.3	17.8				
Sci	20	16.3	17.0	18.2	17.8	18.0	18.1	16.6	17.9				
Comp	15	14.8	16.0	17.1	17.1	17.0	16.9	15.9	17.6				

Observations (Table 4f)

2008-2009 Fall Testing

- On average, males scored 1.3 points higher than females in math.
- Four of the areas show comparable scores between males and females.

Observations (Table 4f)

2008-2009 Spring Testing

- Local gender groups are comparable.
- Males met all target scores except in science in spring 2008-2009.
- Females met all target scores except in math and science for the past three years.
- Both gender groups met composite score target.

Observations (Table 4f)

2009-2010 Fall Testing

- Females scored higher in every category than the females of fall of 2007 and 2008.
- Females scored higher than males in every category.
- Males scored higher in math than the 2 previous years.
- Males scored lower in science and reading than the 2 previous years.

Observations (Table 4f)

2009-2010 Spring Testing

- Scores increased in every category (except males in math).
- Females scored higher than males in every category.
- Males increased 1.3 in English from fall to spring; females increased 0.9 in English.
- The gender gap increased.
- Males' scores dropped in all areas from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010.
- Females met all target areas except science.
- Males met target in English and reading.
- Males increased in all areas from fall to spring except in math.
- Females increased in all areas from fall to spring.

Observations (Table 4f)

2010-2011 Fall Testing

- Males did not make target score in any area.
- Males scored lower than any other year.
- Females scored lower this year than last year.
- Females did achieve target scores in English, reading, and composite.

Table 4g EXPLORE Test: Special Education Subgroup

Explore Test Results by Subject	Target Score		Fall 2007 2008	Fall 2008 2009	Fall 2009 2010	Fall 2010 2011		Spring 2007 2008	Spring 2008 2009	Spring 2009 2010	Spring 2010 2011
English	13		10.3	10.52	9.6	10.5		11.18	11.40	10	
Math	17		10.3	8.88	6.3	10.1		13.45	10.66	9.9	
Reading	15		11.1	10.5	10.4	11.5		11.81	11.58	11.9	
Science	20		11.8	12.71	10.7	12.6		14.9	13.80	13.3	
Composite	15		11.0	10.86	9.4	11.4		13.0	12.0	11.5	

Observations (Table 4g)**2008–2009 Fall Test – Special Education**

- Special education students score below the target scores in all areas.

Observations (Table 4g)**2008–2009 Spring Test – Special Education**

- Special education students score below the target in all areas.
- Special education student scores improved from fall testing to spring testing in all areas.
- Scores for English showed consistent improvement from fall 2007 to spring 2009.

Observations (Table 4g)**2009–2010 Fall Test – Special Education**

- Lower in every category compared to the past 2 years.
- Special education students score below the target scores in all areas.

Observations (Table 4g)**2009–2010 Spring Test – Special Education**

- Biggest gains were in math and science.
- Special education students score below the target scores in all areas.
- All areas showed improvement from fall testing.
- Compared to the previous year 2008-2009, the scores are lower except in reading.
- Composite scores have decreased every year.

Observations (Table 4g)**2010–2011 Fall Test – Special Education**

- This group's composite score was higher than those for the past 3 years.
- Students scored higher in the fall of 2010 than they did in the fall of 2009 in every area.
- Although no one met the target score the students came closest in English.
- Students continue to have their lowest scores in science.

Table 4h Learnia test scores Non-IEP (Should show a decrease in warning from fall to spring)

6th Grade Non-IEP Math	2006-2007	2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011	
	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Exceed	0%	0%	10%	1%	10%	1%	7%	0%	
Meet	8%	8%	41%	0%	44%	17%	56%	12%	
Does Not Meet	92%	9%	23%	14%	17%	31%	14%	23%	
Warning	NA	83%	26%	84%	29%	51%	23%	65%	
6th Grade Non-IEP Reading.	2006-2007	2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011	
	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Exceed	15%	30%	33%	14%	17%	25%	36%	19%	
Meet	45%	31%	40%	40%	46%	39%	38%	31%	
Does Not Meet	40%	8%	6%	10%	12%	18%	11%	33%	
Warning	NA	31%	21%	36%	25%	18%	15%	17%	
7th Grade Non-IEP Math	2006-2007	2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011	
	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Exceed	0%	0%	1%	0%	9%	0%	0%	0%	
Meet	49%	1%	22%	8%	38%	6%	31%	11%	
Does Not Meet	51%	12%	30%	25%	29%	18%	36%	20%	
Warning	NA	87%	47%	67%	24%	76%	33%	69%	
7th Grade Non-IEP Reading.	2006-2007	2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011	
	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Exceed	14%	9%	16%	21%	37%	16%	37%	0%	
Meet	35%	37%	53%	41%	31%	44%	37%	8%	
Does Not Meet	51%	16%	7%	12%	14%	22%	11%	23%	
Warning	NA	38%	24%	25%	18%	18%	15%	69%	

Observations (Table 4h)**2008-2009**

- The percentage of 6th grade non-IEP students meeting and exceeding in math increased from 1% of our students in the fall to 54% of our 6th grade students in the spring.
- The percentage of 6th grade non-IEP students meeting and exceeding in reading increased 9%.
- The percentage of 7th grade non-IEP students meeting and exceeding in math increased from 8% of our students in the fall to 47% of our 7th grade students in the spring.
- The percentage of 7th grade non-IEP students meeting and exceeding in reading increased 6%.
- The percentage of meets and exceeds went up over two years of data, in all categories.

2010-2011

- Original test results for fall 2010-2011 were void due to technological error. Scores reflect second test attempt.

- Overall math scores from spring 2009-2010 to fall 2010-2011 in the “Does Not Meet and Warning” categories increased from 37% to 90%.
- Percentage of non-IEP students meeting or exceeding in Math and Reading appears to be consistent with previous classes.

Table 4i Learnia test scores (IEP) (Should show a decrease in warning from fall to spring)

6th Grade IEP Math	2006-2007	2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011	
	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Exceed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Meet	0%	8%	8%	0%	7%	0%	11%	0%	
Does Not Meet	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Warning	NA	92%	92%	100%	93%	100%	89%	100%	
6th Grade IEP Reading	2006-2007	2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011	
	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	
Exceed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Meet	16%	8%	8%	9%	7%	0%	0%	0%	
Does Not Meet	79%	0%	0%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Warning	NA	92%	92%	82%	93%	100%	0%	100%	
7th Grade IEP Math	2006-2007	2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011	
	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	
Exceed	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	0%	0%	0%	
Meet	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Does Not Meet	100%	0%	19%	0%	0%	0%	9%	0%	
Warning	NA	100%	81%	100%	90%	100%	91%	100%	
7th Grade IEP Reading	2006-2007	2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011	
	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	
Exceed	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%	9%	0%	
Meet	7%	11%	19%	10%	10%	0%	0%	0%	
Does Not Meet	93%	0%	0%	10%	10%	0%	0%	0%	
Warning	NA	89%	75%	80%	80%	100%	91%	100%	

Observations (Table 4i)

2008-2009

- IEP students showed growth in math, 6th grade (7% increase) and 7th grade (10% increase).
- 7th grade showed growth in math with a 7% increase.

2009-2010

- 100% of IEP students were in academic warning.

Table 4j Reading Fluency

	2007-2008			2008-2009			2009-2010			2010-2011		
	Fall	Winter	Spring	Fall	Winter	Spring	Fall	Winter	Spring	Fall	Winter	Spring
6 th Grade Target	125	140	150	125	140	150	125	140	150	125	140	150
# tested							74	75	74	73	73	
# met							12	6	3	10	9	
% met							16%	8%	4%	14%	12%	
7 th Grade Target	125	140	150	125	140	150	125	140	150	125	140	150
# tested				79	82	82	80	78	78	73	73	
# met				3	1	1	28	21	30	27	37	
% met				4%	1%	1%	35%	27%	38%	40%	51%	
8 th Grade Target	130	140	150	130	140	150	130	140	150	130	140	150
# tested		76	76	73	75	74	78	77	76	76	76	
# met		3	12	33	41	38	47	47	45	33	33	
% met		4%	16%	45%	55%	51%	61%	61%	59%	43%	43%	

Note: Reading Fluency program was started in 2007-2008 with 8th graders. As additional grades were added, the number of evaluators and methods of interpretation of data differed. As of 2010-2011 one individual is responsible for interpretation of data for the middle school.

Observations (Table 4j)

2007-2009

- Target Fluency Test scores for 6th and 7th grade increased 15 words per minute from fall to winter testing from 125 to 140 and increased an additional 10 words a minute between winter and spring testing from 140 to 150.
- Target Fluency Test scores for 8th grade increased 10 words a minute between fall and winter testing from 130 to 140 and increased an additional 10 words per minute between winter and spring testing from 140 to 150.
- In the 2009-2010 school year, 16% of the current 6th graders met the fall fluency test target and 8% met the winter fluency target.
- In the 2008-2009 school year, 4% of the current 7th graders met the fall fluency target and 1% met the winter and spring target. In 2009-2010, 37% of the current 7th graders met the fall fluency target and 27% met the winter fluency target.
- The 2007-2008 school year was the first year of implementing reading fluency into the reading program. Students were tested twice during the first year. In 2007-2008, 4% of the current 8th graders met the winter target and 16% met the spring target. In the 2008-2009 school year, 45% of the current 8th graders met the fall target, 55% met the winter target and 51% met the spring target. In 2009-2010 61% of the current 8th graders met the target of 130 words per minutes and 63% of the students met the winter target of 140 words per minute.

Observations (Table 4j)

2009-2010

- Approximately 25% of the 7th graders in 2009-2010 met the target compared to the 7th grade in 2008-2009
- Approximately 50% of the 8th graders in 2009-2010 met the target compared to their previous year scores

Observations (Table 4j)

2010-2011

- Current 7th graders meeting recommended fluency target increased from 8% to 51% from the winter 2010 to the winter 2011.
- The current 8th graders meeting recommended fluency target increased from 27% to 43% from the winter 2010 to the winter 2011.

SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT

Our middle school scores on ISAT for boys and girls fall behind the state average in nearly all areas starting in 6th grade. Extended response in both reading and math continues to be a challenge for the middle school. Four out of five years we have had a new 6th grade math teacher. Science scores continue to exceed the state average on the ISAT. The percentage of students meeting on our end-of-year report card grades does not reflect the same student performance on ISAT and other assessments.

2.3 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Table 5 Discipline Referrals by Type of Infraction

	2005-2006			2006-2007			2007-2008			2008-2009			2009-2010		
P=passive aggressive VA=verbal aggressive PA=physical aggressive	P	VA	PA	P	VA	PA	P	VA	PA	P	VA	PA	P	VA	PA
Bus	0	8	29	1	7	11	20	16	21	28	14	17	12	14	18
Class room	53	46	14	83	74	34	121	37	59	88	52	14	49	70	33
Playground	0	0	3	0	0	2	1	0	5	1	3	2	3	1	6
Cafeteria	0	4	0	0	7	4	3	1	3	4	7	1	4	6	1
Hallway										4	4	16	4	3	9
Locker Room										1	2	0	2	0	1
Restroom										4	0	1	0	0	1
Confirmed incidents of bullying	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	6	15	6	8	1	0	8	2
Other/Non-aggressive/Disruptive	6	16	4	1	6	18	9	4	11	0	0	0	89	0	0
Total infractions Per category	59	74	60	85	94	69	154	64	116	137	91	52	163	102	71
Total infractions Per year			193			248			334			280			336

These numbers are totals for 6-8 grades.

Passive aggressive is defined as a student who repeatedly refuses to do what is asked when asked.

They resent responsibility, are intentionally inefficient and will do their work incorrectly to show their anger at being told what to do. Other can be defined as infractions such as cell phone use, minor language, etc.

Observations (Table 5)

2008-2009

- Most offenses take place in the classroom (55%).
- According to office records there were fifteen confirmed incidents of bullying.
- There were fewer referrals in 2008-2009 than in 2007-2008.
- Physical disciplinary referrals have dropped from a total of 88 in 2007-2008 to 34 in 2008-2009.
- Passive aggressive disciplinary referrals have dropped from 144 in 2007-2008 to 121 in 2008-2009.
- Verbal aggressive disciplinary referrals increased from 54 in 2007-2008 to 76 in 2008-2009.

2009-2010

- Most offenses are reported from the classroom.
- There were more referrals in 2009-2010 than all previous years.
- Verbal aggression offenses increased in 2009-2010 from 2008-2009.
- Passive Aggressive offenses in the classroom decreased by over 50% from 208-2009 to 2009-2010.
- There is no change in reported incidents in the restroom.
- There was a significant increase in “other” infractions.
- Significantly less passive-aggressive bus and classroom referrals from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010
- Significant increase in physical referrals from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010
- Most offenses take place in the classroom (45%). 10% decrease from 2008-2009.
- Confirmed incidences of bullying have decreased by 33% from 2008-2009
- Data does not tell us how many individual students were given a discipline referral

Table 6 Discipline Referral Totals by Grade and Gender

	05-06 Males	06-07 Males	07-08 Males	08-09 Males	09-10 Males		05-06 Females	06-07 Females	07-08 Females	08-09 Females	09-10 Females
6 th	51	57	13	42	45		2	42	11	7	27
7 th	24	75	136	46	91		12	11	47	14	23
8 th	66	38	92	124	136		16	17	22	42	14

OLWEUS implemented November 7, 2007. Identification methods differ from earlier data.

Observations (Table 6)

2008-2009

- 8th grade males had a high number of referrals over the 4 year period covered by the chart.
- Totals from table 4j and 4k will not match as multiple types of infractions may have been counted per referral.
- The majority of infractions occurred at the 8th grade level.

Observations

2009-2010

- Difficult to tell from the data whether more students received referrals or few students received multiple referrals
- The majority of referrals for males in 2009-2010 were in the 8th grade
- The majority of referrals for females in 2009-2010 were in the 6th grade

Table 7 General School Data – Based on End of Year Report

	WEST CENTRAL 2005-2006		WEST CENTRAL 2006-2007		WEST CENTRAL 2007-2008		WEST CENTRAL 2008-2009		WEST CENTRAL 2009-2010	
Total School Population	259	100%	256	100%	242	100%	245	100%	233	100%
Average Daily Attendance	248	96%	243	95%	230	95%	233	95.2%	230	94.4%
Truancy Rate	13.5	5.2%	5	2.0	2	.9%	1	0.4%	3	0.9%
Mobility Rate	20.2	7.8%	20	7.8	20	8.5%	16	6.6%	7	3.1%
Suspension Rate	1	.38%	6	2.0	8	3.4%	48	19.6%	41	17.4%
Expulsion Rate	1	.38%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Low Income Rate	--	45%	--	43.7%	--	42.6%	--	35.9%	--	47%
Transfers/Withdrawal	23	8.9%	12	4.7	16	7%	6	2.45%	7	3.1%
Promotion Rate	256	99%	255	99.6	235	99.6%	244	99.59%	233	100%
Retention Rate	.38%	1	1	.4	1	.4%	1	0.4%	0	0%
Gender	F- 124	M - 135	F - 121	M - 135	F - 113	M - 123	F – 117	M - 128	F-126	M-107
Caucasian	99.1%	99%	99%	99%	233	98.7%	236	96.4%	224	97.4%
African-American	2	0.8%	0	0	0	0	1	0.4%	1	0.4%
Hispanic	0	1	1	.003%	2	.9%	5	2.0%	3	1.3%
Other (American Indian)	0	1	1	.003%	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Multi	0	1	1	.003%	1	.4%	3	1.2%	2	.8%

Observations (Table 7)

2008-2009

- According to the end of year report total school population is up three students.
- Attendance rate has been 95% or higher since consolidation.
- Truancy rate has declined for the fourth consecutive year.
- Transfers/Withdrawals are at a four year low.
- Total student population continues to remain predominately Caucasian.
- Our Hispanic population has doubled from the previous year.

Observations (Table 7)**2009-2010**

- Average daily attendance has remained steady over the past 5 years
- Mobility rate has declined to 3.1%. The lowest rate since consolidation.
- Low income rate in 2009-2010 is the highest in 5 years
- Promotion rate continues to be above 99%.

Table 8 Attendance Record

SY	Overall average attend rate for year.	Non-IEP Students Attend Rate	IEP Students Attend Rate
2007 2008	94.4%	85.5%	78.5%
2008 2009	95.2%	85.0%	85.0%
2009 2010	94.4%	96.4%	92.4%

Observations (Table 8)**2008-2009**

- Overall Attendance rate rose slightly from 2008 to 2009.
- Students with IEPs attendance rate increased from 78.5% to 85%

2009-2010

- IEP student attendance has improved. Partial inclusion was implemented in the 2008-2009 and full inclusion was implemented in 2009-2010.
- Non-IEP student attendance rose significantly from the previous two years.

Table 9 Enrollment Data (From Fall Housing Report)

	WEST CENTRAL 2005-06		WEST CENTRAL 2006-07		WEST CENTRAL 2007-08		WEST CENTRAL 2008-09		WEST CENTRAL 2009-2010		WEST CENTRAL 2010-2011	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Population	259	100	256	100	243	100	246	100	233	100	223	100%
Grade 6	79	31%	88	35%	77	32%	82	34%	76	33%	71	32%
Grade 7	92	36%	77	30%	91	37%	75	30%	80	34%	75	34%
Grade 8	84	33%	91	35%	75	31%	88	36%	77	33%	77	34%

*In 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 the building housed a fifth grade ED student.

Observations (Table 9)**2008-2009**

- Overall middle school enrollment has increased from 2007-2008.
- Our current 6th grade enrollment increased by 6 students.
- Current 7th grade enrollment decreased by 16 students from the previous year's 7th grade class.
- The number of 8th grade students increased 13 students over the previous year's 8th grade class.

2009-2010

- Enrollment has declined by 26 students from 2005 to the fall of 2009.
- 6th grade has the fewest number of students

2010-2011

- Student enrollment has declined by 36 students from the fall of 2005 to the fall of 2010.
- Enrollment has declined by 10 students since the fall of 2010.
- The number of 8th grade students being promoted has declined due to lower enrollment for four of the first five years of the newly consolidated district.

Table 10 Student IEP Subgroup Enrollment

	2005-2006		2006-2007		2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total Building Population	259	100	256	100	243	100	246	100	233	100	223	100
Total Special Education*	51	20	60	23	41	17	38	15.4	36	15	30	13.5
Cognitive Disability	5	2.0	7	3.0	6	2.5	6	2.4	8	22	9	4
Hearing Impaired	1	.4	0	0	2	.82	1	.4	1	1.7	0	0
Speech/Language Impairment	3	1.0	4	2.0	5	2.0	1	.4	0	0	0	0
Visual Impairment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emotionally Disturbed	4	2.0	5	2.0	2	2.0	2	.8	0	0	1	0.5
Orthopedic	0	0	0	0	1	.41	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Health Impairment	7	3.0	10	4.0	7	.28	5	2	8	22	9	4
Specific Learning Disability (see LI)	27	0.4	34	13	20	8.0	23	9.3	17	47	10	4
Multiple Disabilities	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Deaf/Blindness	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Autism							1	.4	2	.05	1	0.5

Note:

**Students with IEPs; Numbers submitted by Special Education.*

**Percentage based on total building population.*

**The 2009-2010 percentages are based on November 4th numbers.*

Observations (Table 10)**2008-2009**

- Number of students in each category remains consistent with the exception of Speech/Language impairment. There were 4 fewer students in that category.
- One student is identified in the Autism category for 2008-2009.
- The special education percentage of the total population has decreased the past 3 years.

2009-2010

- The highest percent of students with IEPs are classified as having a specific learning disability.
- The special education numbers continue to decrease.

2010-2011

- The number of IEP students continues to decline.

Summary of Demographic

Most of our demographic data has remained constant over the last three years. Fewer students are being enrolled in special education programs. Number of students qualifying as low-income continues to increase.

2.4 PROGRAM DATA

Table 11 Educator Data *Includes all Middle School Staff except Administrators

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Total Full Time Classroom Teachers	17	22	21	19	18	21
Average Years Teaching for All Teachers in the Building	14.9	14.8	14.15	16	16.3	14.4
# Teachers New to Building	15	3	5	1	2	4
# First Year Teachers	1	2	4	1	1	3
% with B.A./B.S. Degree	90%	86%	69.2%	79%	83%	76.5%
% with M.A. & Above	10%	14%	36.8%	20%	17%	23.5%
# with Emergency/Provisional Cert.	0	0	0	0	0	0
# Teachers Working Out of Field	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Teacher Attendance	95%	94.8%	95.5%	95%	96.9%	96%
% Caucasian Teachers	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Male Teachers	18%	14%	14%	12%	17%	23.5%
% Female Teachers	82%	86%	86%	83%	83%	76.5%
% Highly qualified Teachers	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
# Total Paraprofessionals	5	4	5	5	3	3
# Total Counselors	.20	.20	.20	.20	0	0
# Total Librarians	As needed	1	1	1	1	1
# Total Social Workers/Psychologists	.40	.40	.40	.40	3 part-time	3 part-time
# Total Other Staff	4	10	10	9	8	12

Table 11 Clarification

Out-of-field means that a teacher is teaching a class for which he/she has no certification, academic major or endorsement with sufficient credit hours in the content area taught.

There was not an increase in teachers hired for 2010-2011. The numbers now reflect all certified teachers in the building assigned to full-time teaching positions.

Other Staff includes part-time teachers, custodial, cooks and secretaries.

Observations (Table 11)

2008-2009

- 100% of staff is highly qualified.
- The total number of full time classroom teachers has decreased since 2006-2007 school year.

2009-2010

- 100% of staff is highly qualified.
- The total number of full time classroom teachers has decreased since 2008-2009 school year.
- The number of male faculty has increased by one teacher.
- The percentage of teacher attendance is higher than it has been in the past four years

Table 12a 2008 - 2009 Professional Growth Data

Topic	Mo/Year	Grade Level	# of Participants	School Wide	Format
Poverty Simulation	August 18, 2007	K – 12	20	Yes	Simulation Exercise
Science, Math, LA = Achievement	March 2008	6-12	1	No	Interactive Workshop
MS PD Collaborative Sharing Sessions	April & May 2008	6-8	20	Yes (Bldg)	Collaborative Discussions
Writing Workshop	May 2008	K – 12	3	Yes	Interactive Discussion
RTI – WCISCC	July 2008	K-12	1	No	Interactive Workshop
SIP Leaders Training	August 5 & 6 2008	K – 12	7	No	Interactive Work Sessions
MS/HS PD Collaborative Sharing Sessions	October 2008	6-12	20	No	Collaborative Discussions
Science, Math, LA = Achievement	November 2008	6-12	1	No	Interactive Workshop
Motivating Algebra Students	November 2008	6-12	1	No	Interactive Workshop
SIP Team Leader Training	January 2009	K – 12	6	No	Demonstration & Interactive
M.S. SOCS Training	January 2009	6-8	20	Yes (Bldg)	Demonstration & Interactive
Writing Follow-up Workshop	January 2009	6-12	3	Yes	Interactive Workshop
Improving ISAT Scores	February 2009	K-8	2	No	Interactive Workshop
Cooperative Learning	February 2009	K-12	1	Yes	Interactive Workshop

Table 12b 2009 - 2010 Professional Growth Data

Topic	Mo/Year	Grade Level	# of Participants	School Wide	Format
Cooperative Learning Workshop	February 2009	K-12	1	Yes	Interactive Workshop
Math Across the Curriculum	February 2009	K-12	4	Yes	Interactive Workshop
Higher Order Thinking	February 2009	K-12	21 (MS)	Yes	Collaborative Discussions
Writing Workshop	February 2009	K-12	21 (MS)	Yes	Collaborative Discussions
SIP Training	April 2009	K-12	21 (MS)	Yes	Collaborative Discussions
Writing Sample Analysis Discussion	June 2009	K-12	9 (MS)	Yes	Interactive Workshop
Understanding Poverty-Economic Differences	June 2009	K-12	21	Yes	Collaborative Discussion
Math Curriculum Mapping	July 2009	K-12	1	Yes	Interactive Workshop
Algebraic Thinking Workshop	August 2009	K-12	5	Yes	Interactive Workshop
Math Manipulatives	August 2009	K-12	5	Yes	Interactive Workshop
Reading in the Content Area	September 2009	6-8	21	No	Collaborative Discussion
ICTM Conference	October 2009	K-12	2	No	Interactive Workshop
Writing to Learn	November 2009	K-12	21	Yes	Interactive Workshop
NCLB Conference	February 2010	K-12	3	No	Collaborative Discussion
Teacher Academy Training	March-May 2010	6-8	21	Yes	Collaborative Discussions
Reading Conference	March 2010	K-12	3	No	Collaborative Discussion

Table 12c 2010 – 2011 Professional Growth Data

TOPIC	MO./YEAR	GRADES	# PARTICIPANTS	SCHOOL-WIDE	FORMAT
District Writing Analysis	June 2010	K-12	4	No	Interactive
Math Curriculum Alignment Workshop	July 2010	6-12	3	No	Interactive
SOCS Training for District website	Aug. 2010	K-12	2	Yes	Interactive
Four Block Training	Aug 2010	K-5	1	Yes	Interactive
Co-Teaching in Inclusion Classroom	Aug 2010	PreK-12	17	Yes	Interactive
Use of Differentiation Instructional Practices	Aug 2010- May 2011	6-8	22	No	Interactive
AR Webinar	Sept 2010	K-6	2	Yes	Lecture
Improving curriculum & Instruction with District coaches	Sept 2010	6-12	5	No	Interactive
SIP Team Leader Trng	Sept 2010	K-12	6	No	Interactive
District Book Study	Sept 2010 – Apr 2011	K-12	3	Yes	Discussion
Smartboard Training	Oct 2010	K-12	4	Yes	Interactive
Reading and ISAT	Oct. 2010	K-8	6	Yes	Lecture
Extended Response & ISAT	Nov. 2010	K-8	5	Yes	Lecture
SIP Team Leader Trng	Jan. 2011	K-12	7	No	Interactive
Mobile Lab Trainings	Dec– Jan. 2011	K-8	8	Yes	Interactive

Observations (Table 12a)**2008-2009**

- 100% of the teachers continue to take advantage of professional development opportunities provided by the district as well as through the ROE, Special Ed. Coop., and ISBE.
- Staff continues to advance their knowledge in technology and technology instruction.
- The staff continues to collaborate at monthly departmental meetings.
- Focus continues in providing teachers with strategies for differentiating instruction.
- Eight professional development opportunities were given to staff in math.
- Twelve professional development opportunities were offered in Language Arts.

Observations (Table 12b)**2009-2010**

- Twenty-one staff members attended training on Higher Order Thinking Skills, Writing Workshop, Understanding poverty, Reading in Content Areas, Writing To Learn, and the Teacher Academy.

Observations (Table 12c)**2010-2011**

- Co-teaching in the classroom and Differentiated instruction were the main emphasis of the middle school professional development for the 2010-2011 school year.
- Professional development opportunities were provided by West Central employees.

Curriculum Implementation Data

This is our sixth year of existence and our fifth year with the Middle School concept. The curriculum, schedule, course offering and room arrangements have been adjusted to meet the total needs of the students. This concept provides a daily common planning time for grade level teachers to meet and discuss strengths and needs of individual students. To address student needs outside of the curriculum, we have implemented a homeroom/advisory period to begin each day. We provide common grade level tutorial times where students can receive individual assistance. Student needs, based on grades and behavior, are used to determine the assigned tutorial. A free after school tutoring program, funded through the 21st Century grant, is offered five days a week for additional help. Following tutoring, shuttle buses return children to three of the towns serviced by the district.

The school offers regular education and special education classes. The school is departmentalized in the following areas: fine arts (band, chorus, and art), language arts, literature, mathematics, physical education, science, social studies, and technology. Students are served by Administration, faculty, and staff numbering 39: Students are divided into academic teams for instruction in core areas. There are 20 full-time teachers, 2 special education teachers, 1 Title teacher, 1 library supervisor, 2 custodians, 3 kitchen staff, 2 secretaries, 3 paraprofessionals, 1 part-time psychologist, 1 part-time social worker, and 1 part-time behavior interventionist. The students are also served by a staff member who teaches part time and assists with administrative duties and a full time building principal. The schedule consists of a five-day school week with 8 period days of 40 minutes each and includes a set time for silent sustained reading each day. All students have access to two state of the art computer labs supervised by a certified teacher and a portable computer lab. The Title I teacher also has a portable computer lab for student use. There are 8 Smartboards in use in classrooms and a portable Smartboard is shared by the remaining staff.

Each subject area's philosophy is based on the premise that all children have the ability to acquire the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to become productive members of our society. Although a text is identified in some content areas, teachers are focusing more on the standards and assessment information to guide instructional planning. In the past, the text served as a basis of the curriculum; now it is viewed as a resource, along with a variety of other supplemental printed and electronic materials to provide support for the academic standards being addressed.

The sixth, seventh and eighth grade students are taught by a core team of teachers. The curriculum is aligned to Illinois Learning Standards, and we continue to work toward vertical alignment across grades. All subject areas have developed and implemented sixteen exit outcomes in order to assess students' progress.

To promote reading strategies, the middle school continues to use differentiated instructional strategies such as CRISS Strategies. The CRISS Strategies to be used are determined by departments and administration and implemented in each classroom. Examples of each of the strategies are posted and student work demonstrates their understanding of the strategies.

Social Studies

The seventh and eighth grade social studies department covers American History using the text book *Creating America*. Eighth grade students also study government, including the Federal and Illinois constitutions. The sixth grade focus is on World History and geography.

English

English is broken down into two content areas: language arts and literature.

Language Arts focuses on grammar and writing skills. Teachers draw from a variety of sources that focus on strengthening student skills that are evaluated on ISAT. We have aligned our curriculum to emphasize writing skills and teach grammar and the mechanics of writing through writing practices. We focus primarily on persuasive and narrative essays. A new approach to writing, gained from Writers' Workshop, was implemented in the 2008-2009 school year. This approach extends student opportunities to write for varied audiences and purposes.

Literature in the middle school literature curriculum is aligned to the Illinois State Standards. Teachers use both the Glencoe textbook and novel-based instruction. The main focuses are on vocabulary, literary elements, and comprehension skills. Students identified as needing help with reading are provided supplemental assistance through our Title I program. These students are provided specific instruction to address their individual needs and are taught strategies to help them improve their comprehension skills as well as fluency. Students identified for Title assistance receive an extra reading class during the school day.

Science

The Science curriculum is departmentalized into three disciplines: sixth grade earth science, seventh grade physical science, and eighth grade life science. This sequence will better prepare them for the standardized tests in science. The department's focus is on experiential and inquiry-based activities, using the Glencoe and Prentice Hall textbook series as a supplement to labs.

Math

Sixth grade math classes utilize the Mastering Math program. Beginning this year, all seventh graders take Pre-Algebra using a curriculum based on the state learning standards. 8th graders who have not had Pre-Algebra as 7th graders are enrolled in Algebra using a McDougal Little text. Beginning with the 2011-2012 year, it is planned that all 8th graders will take Algebra. The sixth and eighth grades also have quarter long ISAT preparation math exploratory classes. Math Wednesday, a program designed to incorporate math across the curriculum, is used in every classroom each Wednesday as a "bell ringer" exercise, rotating the hour it is used weekly. We do not provide Title I assistance to students with math deficiencies due to unavailability of staff, but do offer after school math tutoring.

Middle School-Parent Compact

Each year the middle school-parent compact is distributed at registration as part of the Student Handbook. The compact can be used to verify student and parent knowledge of the school's expectations. The document can be used if disciplinary action is necessary.

Program Comparisons and Trends

2005-2006

As this is our first year of existence, we are currently using data from the former districts to find trends and we are closely monitoring the new districts trends to see what changes have occurred because of the recent consolidation.

2006-2007 SY: After a year to evaluate data and monitor student needs, we have changed to middle school philosophy and added curricular choices to expand the students' learning experience and meet their needs. Curriculum alignment is nearing completion and paired with set quarterly exit outcomes in every content area, they have become the driving force behind our teaching.

2007-2008

After collecting and analyzing two years worth of data from the West Central we can begin looking for possible trends. It should be noted that trends cannot be verified after only two years but can be used to develop a baseline.

2008-2009

We now have three years of data collected from the West Central District and can compare previously collected data to current data to see trends. From this analysis we can adjust our curriculum and teaching strategies to address areas of concern.

2009-2010

- This is the fourth year of the implementation of the Middle School Concept.
- This is the second full year of the OLWEUS (Anti-bullying program) being offered in the Middle School.
- Last year's 8th graders were the first group to have spiraling math as 6th, 7th and 8th graders.
- All middle school teaching and administrative staff has gone through training on best instructional practices.
- All middle school teaching and administrative staff has been instructed in reading in the content areas.
- IEP students have been scheduled in general education classes whenever possible.
- This is the third year of the implementation of the 6 Minute Fluency Reading Program for all students.
- The middle school is being assisted by curriculum consultants specializing in the areas of math, reading and special education.
- The middle school has a new 6th grade math, 8th grade science and reassigned a teacher to 7th grade science.

2010-2011

- The middle school staff continues to emphasize differentiated instruction.
- IEP students continue to receive instruction in general education classrooms whenever possible. One IEP student receives instruction in a resource room in two subjects.
- The students have five opportunities a week for homework assistance and tutoring.
- Availability of technology for student use has increased from the previous year.
- Every 7th grade student is receiving pre-algebra instruction for the first time.

- This is the fourth year of the 6 Minute Fluency Reading Program. However some sections did not receive daily opportunities for participation.
- The 6th grade has first year literature and math teachers.
- The 6th grade has had 5 different math teachers in the 6 years the district has existed.
- The special education department had a first year teacher for the 2010-2011 year.
- Students identified with a reading disability receive an additional reading class during the school day.

Table 13a After School Tutoring Program (All)

School Year	Avg. total student population	Total number of tutoring sessions	Total number of student participation	Percent of participation based on total student population
2007/08	247	68	21	8.5%
2008/09	247	24	25	10.0%
2009/10	233	113	134	57.5%
2010/11				

Table 13b After School tutoring Program Regular Education Students

School Year	Regular education student population	Total number of tutoring sessions attended by regular ed. Students	Total number of regular education students participation	Percent of regular ed. students participation based on total regular ed. population
2007/08	206	53	15	7.3%
2008/09	209	24	19	9.1%
2009/10	197	113	116	58.9%
2010/11				

Table 13c After School Tutoring Program Special Education Students

School Year	IEP student population	Total number of tutoring sessions attended by IEP students	Total number of students with IEP's participation	Percent of IEP student participation based on total IEP population
2007/08	41	15	6	14.6%
2008/09	38	15	6	15.8%
2009/10	36	113	18	50.0%
2010/11				

Observations (Table 13a, 13b, & 13c)

2008-2009

- Overall participation in the after school tutoring program increased from previous year.
- Participation for regular education students increased 1.8% from the previous year.
- Participation for student with IEPs increased 1.2% from the previous year.

Observations (Table 13a, 13b, & 13c)

2009-2010

- The middle school implemented four nights per/week of homework assistance and math tutoring as funded by the 21st Century grant.
- Overall participation in the after school tutoring program increased in 2009-2010.

Observations (Table 13a, 13b, & 13c)

2010-2011

(Information not available until May 2011)

2.5 PERCEPTION DATA

Student Survey

2010-2011 203 students responded to the survey.

How safe do students feel?

- 63% of these students always feel safe on the bus.
- 66% said they always feel safe in the locker room.
- 76% stated they always feel safe in the classroom.
- 60% of these students always feel safe in the hallway.
- 75% said they always feel safe in the restroom.
- 72% stated they always feel safe at recess.

What would be the most helpful in becoming a more successful student?

- 30% believed that an approachable teacher was most important.
- 19% believed that being organized.
- 16% stated being prepared and on time for class.
- 15% stated that having more one on one help from the teacher.
- 10% said that knowing how to study.
- 10% said that regular attendance was most important.

When a student has a problem.

- 69% of the students felt that when they have a problem that there is an adult at school that they would feel comfortable talking to.

Student's responses to greatest and least obstacles for taking advantage of peer tutoring.

- 35% stated that available time was the greatest obstacle.
- 23% believed that embarrassment was the greatest obstacle.
- 7% felt that the greatest obstacle was unavailable tutors.
- 30% felt that peer tutoring was not helpful.

Students were asked, "If a teacher wants me to stay for after school tutoring, what would keep me from participating?"

- 43% said available time.
- 13% stated embarrassment.
- 6% said unavailable tutors.
- 16% stated not helpful.
- 22% stated transportation.

Staff Survey 2010-2011

35 staff members responded to the survey.

- 100% stated that they understand their job expectations.
- 91% feel that they are a valued staff member.
- 94% feel that the expectations for students create a culture of achievement.
- 83% believe that there are adequate opportunities for staff to collaborate.
- 100% feel that they address all student needs.
- Rating importance, in a scale of 1-4 with 1 being the most important, in terms of improving instruction, staff responses were as follows:

	1	2	3	4
Overall atmosphere	75%	7%	4%	14%
Resources	7%	43%	25%	25%
Availability of technology	7%	21%	29%	43%
- Professional development opportunities

	4%	32%	46%	18%
--	----	-----	-----	-----
- Staff responses to having the opportunity to communicate with others on a regular basis:
83%-with team members, 80% with general staff, 63% between teams, 77% departmentally, 91% with parents, and 97% with administration.

Parent Survey 2010-2011

One hundred twenty one parents responded to the survey.

- 88% stated that their child shared their successes in the classroom with them.
- 79% said that their students had less than 1 hour of homework a night.
- 75% see no barriers to their children staying for tutoring.
- 84% stated that their child has access to technology at home.
- 92% have received information or have discussed OLWEUS with their child.
- 92% believe that educational needs of their children are being met at the school.
- 98% said their children feel safe at school.

Perception Data Summaries Summary 2010-2011

Based on Parent surveys, students feel safe and successful at school. This demonstrates a continuing trend with previous years' surveys. Most homes have available technology for student use. Parents feel comfortable helping students with homework in most subjects. Parents also indicate they would utilize the after school tutoring program if their children needed it.

Based on student surveys students indicated hallways was the area they felt the least safe. The students did not equate regular attendance at school with achieving success. They reported teacher availability was the most important factor in achieving success. Nearly one third of the students indicated they did not feel comfortable approaching an adult in the building with a concern. The students indicated lack of time was the main reason for not participating in tutoring opportunities. The majority of students would not feel embarrassed if they used tutoring.

Based on staff surveys, opportunities for communication within the building remains a strength. Staff feels that adequate opportunity is given for them to collaborate with their peers. They indicated they continue to feel that job expectations are clear, and they are valued employees. The staff indicated they feel they address the individual needs of their students.

III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses

Table 14 Patterns of Strengths and Challenges

Patterns of Strengths	Data
Over 80% of students at all three grade levels met or exceeded on the Math portion of 2010 ISAT.	Table 3
Over 76% of students at all three grade levels met or exceeded in Reading on the 2010 ISAT.	Table 4d
91% of current 7 th grade students met or exceeded on the 2010 ISAT	Table 3
Math tutoring is offered after school five nights a week.	21 st Century Records
Math Wednesday has been revamped to mirror ISAT content.	Curriculum Implementation
76% of our current 7 th grade, over 70% of our low income, and 77% of our current 8 th grade students met or exceeded on 2010 ISAT in Reading.	Table 3
Bus referrals for 2009-2010 decreased from the previous year by 15 referrals.	Table 5
Confirmed incidents of bullying went down by 5 from the previous year.	Table 5
The availability of technology has increased for middle school students and staff.	Technology inventory
Core subjects provide support labs during school hours for identified students lacking skills.	Pre and post assessments
Patterns of Challenges	Data
On 2010 ISAT Math Data Analysis Statistics, & Probability, scores were 63% for 6 th grade, 69% for 7 th , and 60% for 8 th grade.	ISAT Item Analysis
On the 2010 ISAT Math Measurement scores were 68% for 6 th grade, 53% for 7 th grade, and 50% for 8 th grade.	ISAT Item Analysis
In the explanation portion of Math Extended Response on the 2010 ISAT, 24% of 6 th grade, 20% of 7 th graders and 17% of 8 th grade scored a two on a scale of possible four.	ISAT Item Analysis
Our IEP population continues to not meet or exceed in math. Of the IEP population 50% of 6 th graders, 20% of 7 th graders and 20% of current 8 th graders didn't or meet state math standards.	Table 3
The scores of our low income students continue to be a concern. Of our low income population 72% of 6 th graders, 70% of 7 th graders and 71% of 8 th graders met or exceeded in Reading.	Table 3
Our IEP population continues to not meet or exceed in reading; 20% of 6 th graders, 10% of 7 th graders and 80% of 8 th graders did not or meet or exceed state reading standards	Table 3
The majority of our students scored a 2 out of possible 4 on the extended response in Reading	ISAT Item Analysis
6 th and 8 th grade males scored 7 percentage points lower than females in Reading.	Table 4c
Total number of discipline infractions in 2009-2010 increased by 8% from the previous year.	Table 5
122 parents out of 223 students participated in the school improvement survey.	Parent Survey
The percentage of students meeting on local assessments does not correspond with ISAT and other standardized assessments.	End of year grades and ISAT data

Table 15 Problem Statements, Hypotheses, and Data Source

A large number of hypotheses were examined but those listed below were accepted.

Problem Statement 1 (Math) (2011 AYP is 85%) 2010 ISAT scores show that within our non-IEP population, 6% of our current 6th graders, 3% of our current 7 th graders and 9% current of 8 th graders did not meet or exceed state math standards. In our IEP population, 14% of our current 6th graders, 50% of current 7 th graders, and 80% of the current 8 th graders did not meet or exceed state math standards.				
Hypothesis	Accept/Reject	Data Source 1	Data Source 2	Data Source 3
Many non-IEP students fail to take advantage of support in remediation of math deficiencies.	Accept	After school math tutoring attendance sheets	Student grades	Test Results: ISAT, Explore and Learnia
IEP students don't receive Title I math assistance.	Accept	Title I schedule	Students' Individual Educational Plans	Classroom schedule
The majority of IEP students fail to take advantage of after school homework assistance.	Accept	After school tutoring attendance sheet	Students' grades	Record of individual missing assignments
A high percentage of IEP students lack reading fluency which affects written response in math.	Accept	Fluency test results	Students' grades	Test results: ISAT Explore test Learnia test
The math exploratory curriculum previously had not addressed areas of ISAT deficiencies.	Accept	Curriculum Guide	ISAT Scores	Student Grades

Problem Statement 2 (Reading) 2009-2010 ISAT scores show that within our non-IEP population, 15 % of 6th graders, 13% of 7 th graders and 12% of 8 th graders did not meet or exceed state reading standards. In our IEP population, 80% of 6th graders, 90% of 7 th graders and 60% of 8 th graders did not meet or exceed state reading standards				
Hypothesis	Accept/Reject	Data Source 1	Data Source 2	Data Source 3
Inclusion instruction was not offered for all IEP students in reading until 2010-2011.	Accept	Master Schedule	Students' Individual Educational Plans	Students' schedules
Although some books were purchased, it is reported there aren't enough reading materials available/present that are of high interest to boys.	Accept	Selected readings for literature class.	Library listings and Class Discussions.	Classroom materials available for SSR.
Multiple teachers teach 7 th grade literature creating a variation in instructional emphasis.	Accept	Master Schedule	Lesson Plans	Evaluation tools
Prior to spring of 2011 there was a lack of a consistent approach in teaching writing extended responses across grades.	Accept	Departmental meeting discussions	Teacher Curriculum / Staff Discussions	Observations
High percentage IEP students lack oral reading fluency.	Accept	Fluency Test results	Students' grades	Test results: ISAT Explore test Learnia test

Problem Statement 3 (Anti-bullying) Behavior inappropriate for a school setting continues to be a concern according to 2009-2010 Skyward records.				
Hypothesis	Accept/Reject	Data Source 1	Data Source 2	Data Source 3
Students believe their reported concerns are not addressed.	Accept	Student surveys	Homeroom discussions	Self Reporting
Students do not recognize their role in preventing bullying from taking place.	Accept	Student OLWEUS Surveys	Class discussion	Conferences with administrators or social worker
Students do not practice skills to deal with bullies.	Accept	Student OLWEUS Surveys	Class discussion	Conferences with administrators/social worker

IV. Goals, Strategies, and Integrated Action Plan

Table 16 Strategies, Baseline Data, Annual Targets and Documentation

Improvement Goal 1a (Math) The percentage of all students, including those with disabilities, meeting and exceeding standards on the 2012 ISAT math test will increase to the AYP of 92.5% or Safe Harbor.				
Current Conditions and Data Sources 2010 ISAT scores show that within our non-IEP population, 6% of our current 6th graders, 3% of our current 7 th graders and 9% current of 8 th graders did not meet or exceed state math standards. In our IEP population, 14% of our current 6th graders, 50% of current 7 th graders, and 80% of the current 8 th graders did not meet or exceed state math standards.				
Specific Action 1 We will incorporate the use of higher order thinking skills in all content areas.				
Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Continue to monitor teachers' implementation of higher order thinking skills in lessons.	August 2011	Administrator/ Principal	Purchase flip charts for all teachers who do not have one. Purchase wall posters for each classroom. \$100 – Title I	Use checklist to monitor implementation. Quarterly report to staff on skills observed, and discussion with teachers who were not identified as using them. Random submission of questions used within a specific lesson.
Continue the use of set quarterly differentiated strategies, i.e. CRIS.	August 2011 – May 2012	All teachers	None	Literacy checklist, walk-about, lesson plans. Students use of strategies will be observable in work completion and notes.
Provide training to teachers on peer observations and feedback.	August 2011	Administration	None	Implementation of program and feedback form
Implement peer to peer observations to provide teachers an opportunity to observe lessons with higher order thinking skills used.	August 2011	Administrator/ Principal/Curriculum Coordinator	Building Professional Development fund \$500 – Sub Costs	Post observation analysis and feedback form

Incorporate assessment of higher order thinking skills on exit outcome quizzes.	By end of each quarter	Math department	None	Exit outcome results.
Teachers will provide evidence of using higher order questions.	Daily	Teachers, Administration	None	Random sampling of lesson plans or documented questions.

Improvement Goal 1b (Math)				
The percentage of all students, including those with disabilities, meeting and exceeding standards on the 2012 ISAT math test will increase to the AYP of 92.5% or Safe Harbor.				
Current Conditions and Data Sources				
2010 ISAT scores show that within our non-IEP population, 6% of our current 6th graders, 3% of our current 7 th graders and 9% current of 8 th graders did not meet or exceed state math standards. In our IEP population, 14% of our current 6th graders, 50% of current 7 th graders, and 80% of the current 8 th graders did not meet or exceed state math standards.				
Specific Action 2				
We will continue to use differentiated instruction in all classes to address the varied needs of the students.				
Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
We will continue our fourth year of the spiraling math curriculum with Scan Tron used for data analysis.	August 2011 May 2012	Math Department	Building Funds \$800.00 - materials	Lesson plans/Student Evaluations
Continue to analyze ISAT math deficiencies and specifically address them through Math Wednesday and curriculum.	Begin September 2011	Math Department	\$300 Stipends (Math Dept. Summer Meetings)	Document outline of Math Wednesday and curriculum revisions
Meet with all students to review previous year's test and contact parents encourage use of after school tutoring emphasizing math as needed.	August 2011	SIP Team Administration Math Teachers	\$1800 Tutoring (21 st Century)	List of weaknesses
Algebra will be offered to all 8 th grade students prior to high school.	August 2011 May 2012	Math and Special Ed Teachers	Building textbook funds – \$4500 est.	Master schedule
Analyze assessment results to identify students who did not meet standards in math and determine appropriate intervention placement.	August 2011 May 2012	Math Department	0	Pre and post assessments

Math lab offered one day a week in all 3 grade levels during study hall for identified students.	August 2011 May 2012	Math Department	0	Attendance sheet Workshop Evaluation
Continue differentiated instruction to address individual learning styles and needs.	August.2011 May 2012	Math and Special Ed Teachers	0	Lesson plans/administrative walk- abouts
Monitor student use of technology in all classrooms.	August 2011	Administration	None	Walk-about checklist
Increase the use of manipulatives by math teachers to address differentiation.	August 2011	Administration	None	Lesson plans/administrative walk-about
Provide students observable opportunities to practice writing extended responses throughout the year.	August– May 2011-2012	Math Teachers	0	Administrative walk- about checklist
Attend available conferences to address specific needs as indicated on state assessments pending available funding.	2011-2012	Administration	\$500 Title 1	Strategies learned will be implemented by the math department.
Use Iowa Algebra Aptitude Test to determine placement and monitor progress.	Spring 2011	Math Department	\$200 – Title I Scan Tron cards	Student placement
Provide support for those teachers continuing to pursue National Board Teacher Certification	Aug 2011- May 2012	Administration	0	Staff communication

Improvement Goal 1c (Math)

The percentage of all students, including those with disabilities, meeting and exceeding standards on the 2012 ISAT math test will increase to the AYP of 92.5% or Safe Harbor.

Current Conditions and Data Sources

2010 ISAT scores show that within our non-IEP population, 6% of our current 6th graders, 3% of our current 7th graders and 9% current of 8th graders did not meet or exceed state math standards. In our IEP population, 14% of our current 6th graders, 50% of current 7th graders, and 80% of the current 8th graders did not meet or exceed state math standards.

Specific Action 3 We will continue working to increase communication with parents and provide them with ideas and information on developing math skills.

Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Publish math articles in school newspaper and website.	August 2011- May 2012	Newspaper staff	\$600-supplies 21 st Century 1000-stipend	Finished product
Plan details, determine activities and acquire needed materials for the Family Math and Science Night and offer the activity.	September 2011	Math, Science, and Special Ed Departments	\$250 Title I	The receipts for expenditures will be filed. Workshop Evaluation
Review individual standardized scores with parents and students.	Fall 2011	Homeroom Teachers	0	Parent contact logs
Plan and offer ISAT Math night to provide parents and students strategies for success on ISAT.	Winter 2012	Math Department	\$250 Title I	The receipts for expenditures will be filed. Workshop Evaluation

Improvement Reading Goal Worksheets

Improvement Goal 2a (Reading)

The percentage of all students, including those with disabilities, meeting and exceeding standards on the 2012 ISAT reading test will increase to the AYP of 92.5% or Safe Harbor.

Current Conditions and Data Sources

2009-2010 ISAT scores show that within our non-IEP population, 15 % of 6th graders, 13% of 7th graders and 12% of 8th graders did not meet or exceed state reading standards. In our IEP population, 80% of 6th graders, 90% of 7th graders and 60% of 8th graders did not meet or exceed state reading standards

Specific Action 1

We will provide opportunities for students to increase performance in reading.

Specific Steps in	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Incorporate 6 Minute Fluency in Literature classes and test students 3 times annually.	Sept. Jan. Apr. for testing	Title I / Lit. Teachers	0	Scores will be documented and trends evaluated
Continue the use of set quarterly differentiated instruction i.e. CRISS strategies.	August 2011 –May 2012	All teachers	0	Literacy checklist/walk-about, lesson plans. Students use of strategies in work completion/notes.
Use strategies such as Write to Learn in the content areas to practice extended responses for ISAT.	August 2011-May 2012	Science, math, SS, LA and Lit. teachers	0	Teachers will document and share during weekly meetings and SIP time.
Analyze assessment results to identify students who did not meet standards in reading and determine appropriate intervention placement.	August 2011	Title I & Lit teachers – ISAT scores	Stipend - \$100 x 4 teachers – Bldg PD Funds	Listing of identified students
Place IEP students in Title I for reading if numbers allow.	Sept. 2011	Title I	0	Title I student records
Continue Lexia and Reading Plus in Title I program.	Sept 2011	Title I	0	Title I assessments
Adjust master schedule to allow for one 7 th grade literature teacher if possible.	April 2011	Building principal	0	Master schedule

Offer student book clubs.	October 2011-April 2012	Lit teachers	21 st Century has already purchased books.	Participation records
Continue use of Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS)	August 2011-May 2012	All teachers	0	Random sampling of lesson plans or documented questions.
Purchase 3 Smartboards and 3 Elmos to increase student interest and provide for differentiated instruction.	August 2011	Administration / Technology Coordinator	Dependent on current prices from district technology budget	Purchase and installation

Improvement Goal 2b (Reading) The percentage of all students, including those with disabilities, meeting and exceeding standards on the 2012 ISAT reading test will increase to the AYP of 92.5% or Safe Harbor.				
Current Conditions and Data Sources 2010 ISAT scores show that within our non-IEP population, 15 % of 6th graders, 13% of 7 th graders and 12% of 8 th graders did not meet or exceed state reading standards. In our IEP population, 80% of 6th graders, 90% of 7 th graders and 60% of 8 th graders did not meet or exceed state reading standards				
Specific Action 2 We will increase teacher knowledge and skills in providing reading instruction across the curriculum for all students.				
Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Discuss fluency implementation within the literature department.	April-May 2011	Lit. Teachers / Bldg. principal/Title I teacher/ Curriculum Director	½ day for subs-PD Fund.	Minutes of meeting.
Plan cross-curricular incorporation of extended response practice.	April-May 2011	Literature Department	Combined with ½ day subs above 3 subs x \$80	Copy of plan created including timelines for implementation
Provide a HOTS refresher training to all teachers.	April-May 2011	Curriculum director/bldg principal	0	Evaluation form from training
Provide a “Write to Learn” refresher training to all teachers.	Prior to Sept. 2011	Curriculum director/ bldg principal/district consultant	Consultant Title I	Evaluation form from training.
Provide support for those teachers continuing to pursue National Board Teacher Certification	Aug 2011-May 2012	Administration	0	Staff communication

Improvement Goal 2c (Reading)

The percentage of all students, including those with disabilities, meeting and exceeding standards on the 2012 ISAT reading test will increase to the AYP of 92.5% or Safe Harbor.

Current Conditions and Data Sources

2009-2010 ISAT scores show that within our non-IEP population, 15 % of 6th graders, 13% of 7th graders and 12% of 8th graders did not meet or exceed state reading standards. In our IEP population, 80% of 6th graders, 90% of 7th graders and 60% of 8th graders did not meet or exceed state reading standards

Specific Action 3

We will utilize human resources (speakers, presenters, volunteers) to enrich our reading programs.

Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Host a Literature night to promote community involvement for support of reading.	April 2012	Lit teachers	\$300 Title I	Evaluation form completed by participants
Host a career fair to stress the value of reading skills in various jobs.	September 2011	SIP Team	\$300 Title I	Evaluation tool for students and speakers and staff

Improvement Goal 3 (Anti-bullying) We will continue to work to eliminate bullying from the social climate of the middle school and decrease office referrals by 20%.				
Current Conditions and Data Sources According to student and teacher surveys along with disciplinary referrals, bullying continues to be a concern in the middle school.				
Specific Action 1 Continue to promote the OLWEUS Anti-bullying Program				
Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Provide an orientation (Jumpstart Program) for incoming sixth graders and students new to the middle school.	August 2011	Administration and Staff	Century 21 \$100 Supplies	Attendance record Workshop Evaluation
Provide students new to the middle school with orientation throughout the year.	August – May 2011-2012	Grade Level Teams	0	Team minutes
Inform the community of OLWEUS activities in local newspapers and on the district website.	September-May 2011-2012	OLWEUS Committee and Staff	0	Newspaper articles District website Parent survey
Hold a kick-off to promote the OLWEUS program.	September 2011	Staff	Participation Rewards \$500 Title Funds pending availability.	Student will demonstrate knowledge of the aspects and consequences of bullying by answering questionnaire.
Offer a monthly incentive activity for those who participate weekly and have no recorded behavior infractions during the previous month.	September - May 2011-2012.	Administration & OLWEUS Committee	Incentive Fund	Newspaper articles hallway promotions
Provide shirts for student unity.	September 2011	OLWEUS Committee	\$1500 Donations/or budget	Student participation in wearing shirts.
Hold student drawings for participation in weekly activities.	September – May 2011-2012	OLWEUS Committee	Incentive Funds	Monitoring of weekly participation by teachers
Explore ways to relieve congestions in hallways.	August-May 2011-2012	Administration and Staff	0	Decline in Discipline Referrals.

Review acceptable hallway/stairway behavior.	August – May 2011-2012	Administration and Staff	0	Reflected in Team minutes of each grade level.
Establish a hallway monitoring program for students.	September-May 2011-2012	Administration, Staff, OLWEUS Committee	0	Reflected in Team minutes of each grade level.
Monitor hallways during passing times.	August-May 2011-2012	Administration and Staff	0	Administrative Walk-about.
Develop a Check & Connect Program to foster relationships between staff and students.	August – May 2011-2012	Administration and Staff	0	Check & Connect meeting agendas.
Provide speakers/programs to promote positive behavior in students.	August – May 2011-2012	OLWEUS Committee	Pending Available Funds	Newspaper & District Website.

Table 17: Professional Development Schedule 2011-2012

TOPIC	DAY/MO./YEAR	GRADE LEVELS	FORMAT
Develop Check and Connect	April-May 2011	6-8	Committee Mtgs.
Higher Order Thinking Skills refresher.	April-May 2011	6-8	Teachers' Mtgs.
Initiate discussions on alignment of exit outcomes with Common Core Standards.	May 2011	6-8	Mtgs./Institute
Finalize and implement Check and Connect	May/August 2011	6-8	Mtgs./Institute
Participate in discussions on grades vs assessment results	May/August 2011	6-8	Mtgs./ SIP
Write to Learn training.	May/Sept. 2011	6-8	SIP / In-service
Share what you know (Technology Focus)	May 2011	6-8	Workshop
Train teachers on peer to peer observations.	August 2011	6-8	Workshop
Share differentiated instruction lessons	August 2011	6-8	Workshop
Set department CRISS Strategies	May/August 2011	6-8	Workshop
Conduct 2011 ISAT Data walk-about and review SIP Activities for FY 2012	Sept.2011	6-8	SIP Day
Identify strategies to address deficiencies on the 2011 ISAT and identify needed PD.	August-Sept.2011	6-8	SIP Day
Review/begin implementation of 2011 SIP	August 2011	6-8	Institute
Provide staff PD based on 2011 ISAT	October 2011	6-8	SIP Day
Continue discussions on Common Core Standards	November 2011	6-8	SIP Day
Collaborate on 2012 SIP	January 2012	6-8	SIP Day
Continue staff PD based on 2011 ISAT	February 2012	6-8	SIP Day
Continue collaboration on 2012 SIP draft	February 2012	6-8	SIP Day
Continue shared instructional strategies	March 2012	6-8	Workshop
Participate in District Institute Day	May 2012	6-8	Institute

V. REFLECTION, EVALUATION, REFINEMENT

5.1 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT TEAM MEETING SCHEDULE

- The School Improvement Team will meet twice each month during the academic year.
- Sub-committees that will provide support for the SIP consist of faculty and staff and will meet quarterly. They will evaluate assigned programs and report progress on implementation of the School Improvement Plan activities.

5.2 MONITORING

The School Improvement Team will:

- Monitor progress toward results, goals, and activities of the plan monthly.
- Evaluate the implementation of the school's plan based on students' assessments (ISAT, Learnia, EXPLORE, mid-term reports, and report card grades)
- Review and revise School Improvement Plan monthly. Review district and school tests to determine progress of students.
- Monitor current programs for effectiveness.
- Review the strategies/actions of the SIP quarterly.
- Analyze annual surveys conducted at the school.
- Continue to adhere to effective meeting management guidelines.

Table 18 Monitoring Schedule

Monitoring	Responsible	Monthly	Quarterly	Semi-annually	Annually
Monitoring goals and activities	teachers, school coordinators, SIP team	April-March			
Evaluation, implementation	SIP team, teachers, consultants		September, December, April, June		
Evaluate students' results	teachers, SIP team		September, December, April, June		
Review School Improvement Plan (SIP)	SIP team, teachers, support staff parents	April-March			
Revise School Improvement Plan (SIP)	SIP team	April-March			
Review tests	counselors, SIP team, teachers, consultants			May, September	
Monitor programs	SIP team		September, December, April, June		
Report to stakeholders	SIP team				June
Review strategies/actions	SIP team, teachers		September, December, April, June		
Analyze surveys of stakeholders	SIP team		September, December, April, June		
Adhere to effective meeting guidelines	SIP team	August-June			

*SIP-School Improvement Plan

5.3 COMMUNICATION PLAN

The West Central Middle School believes that the success of the School Improvement Plan is contingent upon efforts of all members of the community. The community includes school employees, students, community partners, and the entire West Central School District community. In order for the improvement plan to have a positive impact on the students' achievement, timely communication of the plan and its components needs to be established.

These methods have been described below:

- Students:**
- What is Reported:** Achievement test scores, ISAT, Learnia, EXPLORE, and report card averages.
 - How Reported?** Individual Test Report, Progress Report, School Report Card, Honor Roll recognition, and meetings with Teacher Teams.
 - When Reported?** Quarterly, mid-marking period, beginning and ending of school year.
 - Who is Responsible?** District, teachers, counselors, school personnel and administrative/office staff.
- Staff:**
- What is Reported?** Achievement test scores, ISAT, Learnia, EXPLORE, learning standards, upcoming school activities, demographic data outcomes, and SIP.
 - How Reported?** Individual test reports, School Report Card, grade level meetings, school team meetings, and faculty meetings.
 - When Reported?** As achievement data becomes available.
 - Who is Responsible?** Principal, district coordinators, and school committee.
- Parents:**
- What is Reported?** Achievement test scores, ISAT, Learnia, EXPLORE, upcoming school activities, end-of-the-year averages, learning standards, and student expectations.
 - How is it Reported?** Yearly progress reports, individual student report cards, School Report Card, Parent/Teacher conferences, open house, school publications, local media, PTC meetings, and assemblies.
 - When Reported?** PTC meetings, marking periods, open house, and Parent/Teacher conferences.
 - Who is Responsible?** School personnel, principal, administration/office staff, school staff, and PTC officers.
- Media:**
- What is Reported?** Achievement Data and Demographics
 - How Reported?** Newspapers, school publications, school board minutes.
 - When Reported?** When applicable
 - Who is Responsible?** School personnel, principal, administration/office staff, and school staff.

West Central Community/Families:

What is Reported? Demographics, School programs/activities, Student Achievement Data, and School Safety Assessments.

How Reported? Media, newspapers, school publications, and PTC meetings.

When Reported? Throughout the school year.

Who is Responsible? Administration, staff, and SIP

Community Partners:

What is Reported? Achievement Data and SIP

How Reported? Monthly joint meetings and media, newspapers and school publications, and PTC meetings.

When Reported? Monthly and throughout the school year.

Who is Responsible? Administration and SIP team

