

An Integrated School Improvement Plan for

West Central Middle School

West Central School District #235

July 1, 2014– June 30, 2015

**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. 6
2.3	DEMOGRAPHIC DATA	P. 24
2.4	PROGRAM DATA	P. 29
2.5	PERCEPTION DATA	P. 36
III.	PROBLEM STATEMENTS AND HYPOTHESES	P. 39
IV.	GOALS, STRATEGIES, AND INTEGRATED ACTION PLAN	P. 43
V.	REFLECTION, EVALUATION AND REFINEMENT	P. 48
5.1	SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT TEAM MEETING SCHEDULE	P. 48
5.2	MONITORING	P. 48
5.3	COMMUNICATION PLAN	P. 49
REFERENCES		
LIST OF TABLES AND CHARTS		
Table 1:	School Improvement Team	P. 4
Table 2:	Data Collection Method	P. 5
Table 3:	District: ISAT – Adequate Yearly Progress Data	P. 6
Table 4a:	School: ISAT – Special Education Subgroup	P. 11
Table 4b:	ISAT – Low Income Subgroup	P. 14
Table 4c:	ISAT – Gender Subgroup Scores	P. 15
Table 4d:	Students meeting or exceeding 70% on report card grades	P. 17
Table 4e:	Explore test results	P. 19
Table 4f:	Explore test results by subject and gender	P. 20
Table 4g:	Explore test results special education subgroup	P. 21
Table 4h:	Reading Fluency	P. 23
Table 5:	Disciplinary Referrals by type of specific infraction	P. 24
Table 6:	Disciplinary Referrals by grade and gender	P. 25
Table 7:	General School Data	P. 26
Table 8:	Student Attendance Record	P. 27
Table 9:	Enrollment Data	P. 27
Table 10:	Student Special Education Subgroup Enrollment	P. 28
Table 11:	Curriculum Implementation Data	P. 30
Table 12:	Professional Growth Data	P. 33
Table 13:	After-School Tutoring Participation Chart	P. 35
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. 43
Table 17:	Professional Development Schedule	P. 47
Table 18:	Monitoring Schedule	P. 48

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 2013 was 201 students; of this, 104 are male and 97 are female. Sixth grade consists of 62 students; 7th grade consists of 74 students; and 8th grade consists of 63. All grades are currently divided into three sections. 21 students have Individualized Education Plans. Students are served by Administration, faculty, and staff numbering 35: Students are divided into academic teams for instruction in core areas 18 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 2 administrators. 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, 6th grade students 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 as well as one American Indian student, one black student and six Hispanic/Latino students. 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

- Two administrators are certified in the new teacher evaluation system.
- Increased emphasis on enhancing professional practice identified by Charlotte Danielson.
- The Regional Office of Education recognizes 100% of teachers as highly qualified in their subject area.
- We offer tutoring/homework assistance program five nights a week.
- Use of the Middle School Concept allows for daily collaboration between staff members for student and curriculum issues.
- RTI (Response to Intervention) responsibilities are addressed through grade level teams.
- Beginning implementation of PBIS to support character education and an anti-bullying program.
- District provides professional development activities focusing on identified areas of weakness.
- Continue emphasis on differentiation, data driven instruction, higher order thinking, and student engagement.
- All middle school teachers have received Teacher Academy training, (Best teaching practices).
- Two teachers are currently enrolled in the master’s degree for administrative certification.
- Six middle school teachers have received state mentoring certification.
- Team time provides opportunities for RtI (Response to Intervention).
- The District provides family and student access to student grades, homework assignments, discipline, lunch account and attendance through Skyward internet access.
- The District utilizes a form of mass communication called Connect-Ed, to provide information to members of the community in a timely manner.

- The school offers a full time Title I teacher and two part-time Title I teachers to address reading deficiencies.
- On site 21st Century After-School opportunities are offered nightly.
- Continued emphasis on increasing student use of technology. Available technology includes: One classroom computer lab, three mobile labs, SMART Boards, document cameras, computer tablets, e-readers at each grade level, and video cameras.
- Implementation of the 1:1 initiative has provided individual Chromebooks to every 8th grade student beginning in January 2014.
- 30% of full time faculty members have a Master’s Degree.
- 6th grade continues to support the community through visits to the local nursing/care facilities.
- All grade levels continue to support the community through canned food drives for the FOCC.

School Challenges

- One of the biggest challenges facing the school continues to be economic hardships in the area. 59% of the students are identified as low income. The region has lost many factories, which has caused economic hardships on the residents and has increased some issues with student mobility. Filling the needs of low-income students, impacts school resources.
- Daily enrollment at the Middle school has decreased since the 2008-2009 school year.
- The need to promote individual academic growth for all students by continuing to identify and implement strategies and techniques designed to improve student engagement is a challenge.
- According to ISAT scores, specific areas in both math and reading need more individual and/or small group instruction.
- There is inadequate time and trained personnel for small group instruction of social skills.
- According to teacher and student surveys and disciplinary referrals, inappropriate behavior continues to be a concern.
- Special education scores did not meet AYP in any area. (However there are not enough IEP students to qualify as a subgroup) Table 4a
- Providing adult coverage for special education students participating in general education classes (push in) remains a challenge.
- Common Core has created gaps in academic progress and assessment.

1.2 School Improvement Team

Table 1 School Improvement Team

TEAM MEMBER	POSITION	# OF YEARS ON TEAM
Jeff Nichols	Principal	9
Chris Conlee	Administrator	1
Jamie Farniok	Spec Ed Coordinator	7
Terri Copeland	Language arts	8
Natalie Ensminger	Literature	8
Byron Helt	Science	4
Jeremy Hennings	Math	4
Tammy Rankin	Science	7
Lisa Lox	Social Studies	1

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

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 adopted the middle school philosophy.
- 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.
- Upgrades are made to the facility to meet Life Safety Standards.

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. EXPLORE testing is administered to 8th grade students to determine additional needs of students before they enter high school. We are currently looking at diagnostic tests available for math. 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	RETURN RATE	PURPOSE
Survey	Parent Survey	October 2009 October 2010 October 2011 October 2012	22% 54% 49% 56%	To identify parent concerns.
Survey	Student Survey	October 2009 October 2010 October 2011 October 2012	100% 97% 100% 100%	To identify student concerns.
Survey	Staff Survey	October 2009 October 2010 October 2011 October 2012	100% 100% 100% 100%	To identify staff concerns.
Formal Assessment	ISAT Overall Scores	2006-2007 2007-2008 2008-2009 2009-2010 2010-2011 2011-2012	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%	To identify strengths and areas of concern.
Formal Assessment	EXPLORE Test	Sept. 2009 yr 4 April 2010 yr 4 Sept. 2010 yr 5 April 2011 yr 5 Sept. 2011 yr 6 April 2012 yr 6 Sept. 2012 yr 7 Jan. 2013 yr 7	100% 100% 100% 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	2008-2009 2009-2010 2010-2011 2011-2012 2012-2013	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	2005-2013	NA	To identify individual students and special needs.

2.2 District Assessment Data

West Central School District #235 ISAT/PSAE Longitudinal Data Report for 2012-2013 ISAT & PSAE Assessments

Note: Shaded areas in tables are non-testing years for students. Numbers given are the percentage who meet and/or exceed standards in the total class for the given year. In 2012-2013 the state cut-scores were raised.

Class of 2014

ISAT/PSAE Area Tested	2005 (3 rd)	2006 (4 th)	2007 (5 th)	2008 (6 th)	2009 (7 th)	2010 (8 th)	2011 (9 th)	2012 (10 th)	2013 (11 th)	2014 (12 th)
Reading		79%	80%	95%	86%	82%			71%	
Math		91%	90%	91%	89%	82%			51%	
Writing			42%	63%		71%			DNT	
Science		92%			89%				48%	

Class of 2015

ISAT/PSAE Area Tested	2006 (3 rd)	2007 (4 th)	2008 (5 th)	2009 (6 th)	2010 (7 th)	2011 (8 th)	2012 (9 th)	2013 (10 th)	2014 (11 th)	2015 (12 th)
Reading	65%	74%	79%	79%	77%	82%				
Math	89%	91%	92%	81%	82%	76%				
Writing			43%	65%		DNT				
Science		83%			81%					

Class of 2016

ISAT/PSAE Area Tested	2007 (3 rd)	2008 (4 th)	2009 (5 th)	2010 (6 th)	2011 (7 th)	2012 (8 th)	2013 (9 th)	2014 (10 th)	2015 (11 th)	2016 (12 th)
Reading	62%	79%	72%	76%	77%	84%				
Math	86%	96%	88%	91%	88%	85%				
Writing			70%	68%		DNT				
Science		87%			87%					

Class of 2017

ISAT/PSAE Area Tested	2008 (3 rd)	2009 (4 th)	2010 (5 th)	2011 (6 th)	2012 (7 th)	2013 (8 th)	2014 (9 th)	2015 (10 th)	2016 (11 th)	2017 (12 th)
Reading	69%	81%	85%	92%	85%	58%				
Math	84%	95%	93%	90%	88%	38%				
Writing			67%	DNT		DNT				
Science		80%			88%					

Class of 2018

ISAT/PSAE Area Tested	2009 (3 rd)	2010 (4 th)	2011 (5 th)	2012 (6 th)	2013 (7 th)	2014 (8 th)	2015 (9 th)	2016 (10 th)	2017 (11 th)	2018 (12 th)
Reading	70%	75%	78%	71%	35%					
Math	81%	93%	87%	73%	45%					
Writing	51%	DNT	DNT	DNT	DNT					
Science		82%								

Class of 2019

ISAT/PSAE Area Tested	2010 (3 rd)	2011 (4 th)	2012 (5 th)	2013 (6 th)	2014 (7 th)	2015 (8 th)	2016 (9 th)	2017 (10 th)	2018 (11 th)	2019 (12 th)
Reading	84%	89%	89%	50%						
Math	93%	100%	94%	62%						
Writing	44%	DNT	DNT	DNT						
Science		92%								

Class of 2020

ISAT/PSAE Area Tested	2011 (3 rd)	2012 (4 th)	2013 (5 th)	2014 (6 th)	2015 (7 th)	2016 (8 th)	2017 (9 th)	2018 (10 th)	2019 (11 th)	2020 (12 th)
Reading	73%	85%	66%							
Math	95%	96%	77%							
Writing	DNT	DNT	DNT							
Science		87%								

Class of 2021

ISAT/PSAE Area Tested	2012 (3 rd)	2013 (4 th)	2014 (5 th)	2015 (6 th)	2016 (7 th)	2017 (8 th)	2018 (9 th)	2019 (10 th)	2020 (11 th)	2021 (12 th)
Reading	84%	58%								
Math	88%	73%								
Writing	DNT	DNT								
Science		85%								

Class of 2022

ISAT/PSAE Area Tested	2013 (3 rd)	2014 (4 th)	2015 (5 th)	2016 (6 th)	2017 (7 th)	2018 (8 th)	2019 (9 th)	2020 (10 th)	2021 (11 th)	2022 (12 th)
Reading	63%									
Math	62%									
Writing	DNT									
Science										

DNT = Did Not Test due to cut backs in state spending

Table 3

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS DATA					
BASED ON ISAT & PSAE MEETS and EXCEEDS					
All Subjects & Subgroups required to be 92.5% or above					
Updated August 2013					
	West Central 2009	West Central 2010	West Central 2011	West Central 2012	West Central 2013
Annual Target	70%	77.5%	85%	92.5%	92.5%
3rd Grade					
Reading – All	70%	84%	73%	84%	63%
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	76% 63%	83% 85%	65% 84%	77% 90%	58% 77%
Reading – IEP/ Others	46% 75%	63% 87%	40% 78%	67% 86%	46% 67%
Math – All	82%	93%	95%	88%	62%
Math – Low Inc/ Others	80% 84%	91% 96%	87% 100%	85% 90%	53% 76%
Math – IEP/ Others	61% 86%	75% 95%	100% 98%	67% 90%	46% 65%
Writing	52%	44%	DNT	DNT	DNT
4th Grade					
Reading – All	81%	75%	89%	85%	58%
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	66% 93%	73% 77%	88% 91%	83% 87%	55% 62%
Reading – IEP Others	59% 86%	50% 81%	40% 93%	83% 85%	67% 57%
Math – All	95%	93%	99%	96%	73%
Math – Low Inc Others	91% 98%	90% 97%	98% 100%	97% 96%	71% 76%
Math – IEP/ Others	83% 97%	93% 93%	100% 100%	100% 96%	67% 72%
Science – All	91%	82%	89%	87%	85%
Science – Low Inc/ Others	84% 95%	81% 83%	88% 94%	87% 88%	77% 62%
Science-IEP Others	75% 94%	57% 88%	60% 93%	100% 85%	50% 89%

5th Grade					
Reading – All	72%	85%	78%	89%	66%
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	69% 76%	74% 93%	82% 61%	86% 91%	58% 75%
Reading – IEP/ Others	54% 76%	71% 86%	57% 79%	60% 91%	33% 71%
Math – All	88%	93%	87%	94%	77%
Math – Low Inc Others	91% 85%	97% 91%	84% 68%	92% 97%	67% 89%
Math – IEP/ Others	77% 91%	86% 94%	86% 87%	80% 95%	33% 83%
Writing	43%	67%	DNT	DNT	DNT
6th Grade					
Reading – All	79%	76%	92%	71%	50%
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	79% 79%	72% 81%	86% 95%	67% 77%	47% 60%
Reading – IEP/ Others	36% 87%	20% 85%	40% 95%	0% 77%	33% 67%
Math – All	81%	91%	90%	73%	62%
Math – Low Inc Others	76% 85%	90% 92%	83% 95%	64% 85%	50% 71%
Math – IEP/ Others	36% 90%	50% 97%	40% 94%	0% 79%	50% 75%
Writing	66%	68%	DNT	DNT	DNT
7th Grade					
Reading – All	86%	77%	77%	85%	35%
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	72% 94%	70% 83%	74% 81%	73% 93%	30% 48%
Reading – IEP/ Others	55% 91%	10% 87%	25% 87%	40% 89%	14% 37%
Math – All	89%	82%	88%	88%	45%
Math – Low Inc/ Others	80% 94%	73% 90%	87% 89%	85% 90%	43% 71%
Math – IEP/ Others	36% 98%	20% 91%	42% 97%	20% 93%	14% 48%
Science – All	89%	81%	87%	88%	73%
Science – Low Inc/ Others	88% 90%	76% 85%	87% 86%	77% 95%	72% 82%
Science – IEP/ Others	55% 94%	20% 90%	67% 90%	40% 92%	29% 76%
8th Grade					
Reading – All	84%	82%	82%	84%	58%
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	78% 89%	71% 89%	79% 85%	84% 84%	49% 71%
Reading – IEP/ Others	60% 89%	40% 88%	36% 90%	42% 92%	29% 48%
Math – All	81%	82%	76%	85%	38%
Math – Low Inc/ Others	69% 89%	71% 89%	69% 83%	81% 89%	32% 47%
Math – IEP/ Others	33% 91%	20% 91%	18% 85%	33% 95%	14% 41%
Writing	60%	71%	DNT	DNT	DNT

2012-2013 (Table 3)

- Observations recorded in other tables with duplicate data.

2011-2012 (Table 3)

- Reading and Math scores have dropped for the class of 2017 from 6th to 7th grade.
- Reading and Math scores dropped for the class of 2018 from 6th to 7th grade.

- Three out of the last four years student math scores have decreased from 7th grade to 8th grade.

2010-2011 (Table 3)

- The past five years 8th grade Non-IEP students met ISAT Reading standards at 86% or above.
- Since going to spiraling math program 8th grade math scores show 81% meeting or exceeding in 2009, 82% in 2010, and 76% in 2011.
- The 6th grade students who met or exceeded standards in reading increased 8 percentage points while there was a 1 percentage point decrease in math scores when compared to 2010 ISAT
- The 2011 6th grade IEP subgroup ISAT reading test scores indicated that three of the five students showed positive growth in reading, while one of the same five students showed growth in math compared to their 2010 ISAT scores.
- The scores for the 2011 6th grade subgroup containing students with IEP's decreased in reading by 31 percentage points and 46 percentage points in math when compared to 2010 ISAT scores.
- The 2011 7th grade IEP subgroup ISAT reading test scores indicated that six of the nine students showed positive growth in reading, while six of the same nine students showed growth in math compared to their 2010 ISAT scores.
- The number of 7th grade students with IEP's increased in reading by 5 percentage points while there was an 8 percentage point decrease in math when compared to the 2010 ISAT scores for the same subgroup.
- The 2011 8th grade IEP subgroup ISAT reading test scores indicated that twelve of the thirteen students showed positive growth in reading, while twelve of the same thirteen students showed growth in math compared to their 2010 ISAT scores.
- The 6th grade students met AYP in reading with 92% meeting or exceeding on ISAT.
- The 7th grade students did not meet AYP in reading with 77% meeting or exceeding on ISAT.
- The 8th grade students did not meet AYP in reading with 82% meeting or exceeding on ISAT.
- The 6th grade students met AYP in math with 90% meeting or exceeding on ISAT.
- The 7th grade students met AYP in math with 88% meeting or exceeding on ISAT.
- The 8th grade students did not meet AYP in math with 76% meeting or exceeding on ISAT.

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.

	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

AYP Goal	70%	77.5%	85%	92.5%	92.5%
6 th Grade Reading	36%	20%	40%	0%	0%
6 th Grade Math	36%	50%	40%	0%	20%
6 th Grade Writing	15.4%	68%	NA	NA	NA
7 th Grade Science	55%	20%	67%	40%	33%
7 th Grade Reading	55%	10%	25%	40%	0%
7 th Grade Math	36%	20%	42%	33%	0%
8 th Grade Reading	60%	40%	36%	42%	20%
8 th Grade Math	33%	20%	18%	33%	0%
8 th Grade Writing	26.7%	71%	NA	NA	NA

Table 4a School ISAT Special Education Subgroup Results

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

2012-2013 Observations (Table 4a)

- Students with IEPs continue to score below the benchmark.

2011-2012 Observations (Table 4a)

- Math scores went down from the 6th grade to 8th grade for the class of 2016.
- Reading scores went up from 6th grade to 8th grade for the class of 2016.
- Math scores decreased three out of the last four classes from 6th grade to 8th grade.

2010-2011 Observations (Table 4a)

- The past 5 years the percentage of IEP students meeting or exceeding standards in math in the 6th grade decreased for the same groups of students on the 7th grade test with the exception of 2009.
- The percentage of IEP students meeting or exceeding standards in math in the 7th grade decreased for the same group of students on the 8th grade test with the exception of 2009.
- Percentage of IEP students meeting or exceeding 5th grade math decreased the past five years.
- The percentage of IEP students meeting or exceeding standards in reading in the 6th grade decreased the last three years for the same groups of students on the 7th grade test.
- The percentage of 8th grade IEP students meeting or exceeding on ISAT has decreased.
- 40% of 2011 6th grader IEP students met or exceeded standards in reading and math. In reading, this shows an increase of 20 percentage points from the 2010 test.
- 67% of 2011 7th grade IEP students met or exceeded in science up 47% points from 2010.
- 25% of 2011 7th grade IEP students met or exceeded in math.
- The number of 2011 8th grade IEP students who met or exceeded math standards decreased by 4 percentage points compared to the 2010 8th grade IEP students.
- The percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards in math in the 6th grade decreased for the same groups of students on the 7th grade test. One class remained the same while the percentage of students meeting or exceeding decreased.

2009-2010 (Table 4a)

- 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 2011-2012 ISAT Special Education Subgroup Growth Chart

Class of 2016	Math			Reading			Class of 2017	Math			Reading		
Student	6 th	7 th	8 th	6 th	7 th	8 th	Student	6 th	7 th	8 th	6 th	7 th	8 th
16013	+35 M	-2 M	+2 M	+24 M	+6 M	-2 M	17018	-20 B	+7 B	+10 W	-17 B	+2 B	+17 B
16027	+22 M	-9 M	+13 M	-15 B	+14 M	+2 B	17033	-3 B	+15 B	+19 W	+23 B	-23 B	+37 W
16029	+2 M	+19 M	-2 M	-21 B	+10 B	+28 M	17034	-31 B	+23 B	+6 W	-25 B	+37 B	+15 B
15004	-4 B	+10 B	+12 B	-3 B	+16 B	+0 B	17046	-5 M	+3 M	-1 B	+1 M	+21 M	-9 B
13082	+4 B	-9 W	+17 B	+5 M	-34 B	+44 M	17047	+11 M	+3 B	+10 M	+10 M	-8 M	+9 B
16076	+1 B	+10 B	+11 B	+25 B	-28 B	+31 B	17015	NA	NA	+0 M	NA	NA	-38 M
16060	-6 M	+14 M	+0 M	-23 B	+10 B	+10 B							
15007	-6 W	+19 B	+14 B	+15 B	-7 B	+10 B							
16066	-7 B	+30 B	+5 B	-11 B	+15 B	+5 B							
15104	+9 B	+18 B	-8 B	+4 B	+0 B	-3 B							
15105	+12 B	-22 W	+35 B	+25 B	+1 B	+32 M							

Table 4aa 2011-2012 ISAT Special Education Subgroup Growth Chart

Class of 2018	Math			Reading			Class of 2019	Math			Reading		
Student	6 th	7 th	8 th	6 th	7 th	8 th	Student	6 th	7 th	8 th	6 th	7 th	8 th
18085	-50 B	+6 W		-9 B	+38 B		18003	-42 E			-13 M		
18014	-38 B	+25 B		-40 B	+6 B		19104	-6 W			+6 B		
18019	-10 B	+2 W		-10 B	-16 W		19103	NA			NA		
17002	-25 B	-16 W		-54 B	+25 W		19075	-5 W			-20 W		
17003	NA E	-24 M		-60 M	+28 M		19077	-72 M			-37 M		
							19062	-15 M			-4 B		

To preserve student autonomy, numbers are used as opposed to student names. Growth was calculated by using the student's previous year's ISAT score and either adding or subtracting points.

2012-2013 Observations (Table 4aa)

- For the past three years, only one student score improved on the sixth grade math test from their fifth grade year.
- For the past three years, four out of fifteen student scores improved on the sixth grade reading test from their fifth grade year.
- For the past two years, only one student score decreased on the seventh grade math test from their sixth grade year.
- For the class of 2017, four out of five student scores improved on the eighth grade reading and math test from their seventh grade score.

- For the class of 2018, three out of four student scores improved on the seventh grade reading and math test from their sixth grade year.
- For the class of 2019, one out of four student scores improved on the sixth grade reading test from their fifth grade year.

2011-2012 Observations (Table 4aa)

- For the class of 2016, eight out of eleven student scores improved on the eighth grade reading test from their seventh grade score.
- For the class of 2016, eight out of eleven student scores improved on the eighth grade math test from their seventh grade score.
- For the class of 2017, three out of five student scores improved on the seventh grade reading test from their sixth grade score.
- All five student scores from class of 2017 improved in reading from sixth grade to seventh grade.
- For the class of 2018, sixth grade scores dropped in both math and in reading.

2010-2011 Observations (Table 4aa)

- 67% of the current eighth grade class showed improvement in math and in reading (6 out of 9).
- 60% of the current seventh grade students with an IEP increased in reading (3 out of 5).
- 20% of current seventh graders' scores increased in math on the 2011 ISAT (1 out of 5).
- 12 out of 13 IEP students (class of 2014) who were tested showed growth in math and reading.
- Four current freshmen with an IEP increased their ISAT reading scores by 20 or more points.
- Five current freshmen with an IEP increased their ISAT math scores by 20 or more points.
- Six current 8th graders with an IEP increased their ISAT math scores by 10 or more points.
- Five current 8th graders with an IEP increased their ISAT reading scores by 10 or more points.
- Two current 7th graders with an IEP increased their ISAT reading scores by 10 or more points.
- Three current 7th graders with an IEP decreased their ISAT math scores by 20 or more points.
- Two current 7th graders with an IEP decreased their ISAT reading scores by 15 or more points.

2009-2010 Observations (Table 4aa)

8th Grade

- One student was not tested and 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 (percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards)

	Rdg 08/09	Rdg 09/10	Rdg 10/11	Rdg 11/12	Rdg 12/13	Math 08/09	Math 09/10	Math 10/11	Math 11/12	Math 12/13	Sci 08/09	Sci 09/10	Sci 10/11	Sci 11/12	Sci 12/13
6th	79%	72%	86%	67%	47%	76%	90%	83%	85%	50%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
7th	72%	70%	74%	73%	30%	80%	73%	87%	85%	43%	88%	76%	87%	77%	72%
8th	78%	71%	79%	84%	49%	69%	71%	68%	81%	32%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

2012-2013 (Table 4b)

- Low income scores have dropped in every area for every grade level.
- Low income scores have dropped at least 20% in every area.

2011-2012 (Table 4b)

- Math scores went down from the 6th grade to 8th grade for the class of 2016.
- Reading scores went up from 6th grade to 8th grade for the class of 2016.
- Over the past 6 years the percentage of 7th grade low income students meeting or exceeding math standards has decreased from their 6th grade scores.
- 5 of the past 6 years the percentage of 8th grade low income students meeting or exceeding math standards has decreased from their 7th grade scores.

2010-2011

- Over the past 5 years the percentage of 7th grade low income students meeting or exceeding math standards has decreased from their 6th grade scores.
- 4 of the past 5 years the percentage of 8th grade low income students meeting or exceeding math standards has decreased from their 7th grade scores.
- 4 of the past 5 years the percentage of 6th grade low income students meeting or exceeding math standards has decreased from their 5th grade scores.
- The percentage of the 2011 6th grade low income subgroup met AYP at 86% in reading; this is a 12 percentage point increase from the 2010 5th grade low income subgroup.
- The percentage of the 2011 6th grade low income subgroup did not meet AYP in math; this is a 7 percentage point decrease from the 2010 6th grade low income subgroup.
- The 2011 7th grade low income subgroup met AYP in math 87%.
- The 2011 7th grade low income subgroup did not meet AYP in reading at 74%; this is a 2 percentage point increase from the 2010 6th grade low income subgroup in reading.
- The 2011 8th grade low income subgroup did not meet AYP (85%) in reading due to 79% of students meeting or exceeding. However, there was a 9 percentage point increase from the 2010 7th grade low income subgroup in reading.

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

	2009 WC Male	2009 State Male		2010 WC Male	2010 State Male		2011 WC Male	2011 State Male		2012 WC Male	2012 State Male		2013 WC Male	2013 State Male
3rd Grade														
Reading	61%	69%		78%	74%		71.5%	71.6%		81.8%	72.8%		64%	54%
Math	83%	85%		88%	86%		100%	86.8%		84.9%	87.5%		67%	56%
4th Grade														
Reading	82%	70%		95%	86%		86.1%	71.2%		86.2%	72%		50%	56%
Math	95%	85%		93%	86%		100%	86.9%		93.1%	87.1%		68%	60%
Science	92%	77%		82%	77%		97.1%	79.2%		93.1%	79.7%		85%	81%
5th Grade														
Reading	57%	70%		81%	71%		67.6%	73.9%		82.0%	74.3%		67%	56%
Math	93%	81%		86%	82%		89.2%	82.9%		87.2%	82.4%		77%	59%
6th Grade														
Reading	72%	77%		64%	78%		88.9%	80.6%		59.0%	78.4%		49%	54%
Math	76%	81%		93%	83%		88.9%	82.5%		69.2%	83.7%		60%	58%
7th grade														
Reading	79%	73%		69%	74%		63%	74.5%		75.0%	74.4%		29%	54%
Math	79%	81%		76%	83%		81.5%	82.2%		83.3%	82.6%		37%	57%
Science	85%	79%		71%	82%		92.6%	80.9%		80.6%	78.2%		74%	77%
8th Grade														
Reading	87%	80%		74%	81%		79.2%	81.9%		77.4%	82.6%		40%	55%
Math	81%	81%		71%	82%		68.2%	84.4%		74.2%	82.8%		26%	57%

Table 4c ISAT Gender (Female) Subgroup Scores

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS DATA

Data shows % of students who MEETS or EXCEEDS on ISAT & PSAE

	2009 WC Female	2009 State Female		2010 WC Female	2010 State Female		2011 WC Female	2011 State Female		2012 WC Female	2012 State Female		2013 WC Female	2013 State Female
3rd Grade														
Reading	81%	76%		89%	77%		75.0%	98%		88.4%	79.5%		63%	64%
Math	81%	85%		97%	86%		89.3%	87.8%		92.3%	88.0%		56%	54%
4th Grade														
Reading	81%	77%		81%	77%		91.9%	78.4%		84.4%	80.2%		69%	63%
Math	95%	87%		91%	87%		100%	88.6%		93.8%	89.2%		81%	61%
Science	89%	77%		81%	77%		86.5%	79.4%		78.2%	79.8%		85%	81%

5th Grade														
Reading	83%	77%		89%	79%		90%	79.6%		91.4%	81.5%		65%	62%
Math	85%	84%		100%	84%		83.3%	85.1%		100%	84.8%		77%	60%
6th Grade														
Reading	87%	83%		85%	85%		94.2%	87.8%		87.1%	85%		59%	64%
Math	87%	84%		89%	86%		91.5%	85.5%		80.6%	86.3%		65%	61%
7th grade														
Reading	93%	82%		86%	82%		85.1%	83.4%		84.3%	82.0%		43%	63%
Math	98%	85%		89%	86%		91.5%	86.5%		89.4%	86.7%		55%	61%
Science	93%	80%		92%	82%		83%	83%		89.5%	81.6%		71%	81%
8th Grade														
Reading	79%	87%		88%	88%		88.2%	88.3%		87.5%	90.0%		78%	65%
Math	79%	83%		90%	86%		85.3%	88.2%		87.6%	87.2%		50%	60%

2012-2013 Observations (Tables 4c)

- More females met or exceeded on the 2013 ISAT in all areas except science (3% more males met).
- 6th grade males and females scored above the state average in math.
- 8th grade females scored above the state average in reading.

2011-2012 Observations (Tables 4c)

- The number of sixth grade males' that met or exceeded in both math and reading dropped from their fifth grade year.
- Seventh grade males scored above state average in math, reading and science.
- Seventh grade girls scored above state average in math, reading and science.
- Over the last three years, each eighth grade class's math scores have decreased from the previous year.

2010-2011 Observations (Table 4c)

- 6th grade male math and reading scores were the same at 88.9%
- 7th grade reading scores for males were 22 points lower than for girls.
- 7th grade males scored nearly 10 points higher than girls in science.
- 6th, 7th, and 8th grade girls scored higher than males in every area except science.
- 6th, 7th, and 8th grade females scored higher than the state average in every area except 8th grade math.

2009-2010 Observations (Table 4c)

- 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

School Year	Language Arts					Literature					Math					Science					Social Studies				
	08 09	09 10	10 11	11 12	12 13	08 09	09 10	10 11	11 12	12 13	08 09	09 10	10 11	11 12	12 13	08 09	09 10	10 11	11 12	12 13	08 09	09 10	10 11	11 12	12 13
Class	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
2019					82					86					96					70					82
2018			100	100	86			100	99	95			99	94	98			100	99	100			99	99	84
2017		100	97	92	96		100	100	96	96		100	100	99	75		100	100	97	80		100	99	99	92
2016	99	99	96	97		99	100	97	95		99	99	97	92		100	100	99	84		93	99	99	93	
2015	95	97	99			100	100	100			100	100	98			100	100	91			100	99	99		

*Based on Grade Level

2012-2013 Observation (Table 4d-1)

- Over the past 7 years, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding on the end of year report card grades is higher than percentage of students meeting or exceeding on ISAT.
- The percentage of students who met or exceeded 70% on End of Year Report card in Social Studies has dropped or remained consistent in the past three years.
- 70% of 6th grade class of 2019 scored 70% or higher in science.
- The percentage of students who met or exceeded 70% on End of Year Report card dropped for all three grade levels from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013.

2011-2012 Observation (Table 4d-1)

- Over the past 6 years, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding on the end of year report card grades is higher than percentage of students meeting or exceeding on ISAT.

2010-2011 Observation (Table 4d-1)

- Over the past 5 years, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding on the end of year report card grades is higher than percentage of students meeting or exceeding on ISAT.

2009-2010 Observation (Table 4d-1)

- 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 went down in Language Arts and went up in all other areas except science which was at 100%. The largest increase, 6 percentage points, came in Social Studies.
- 6th grade class met or exceeded in all subjects at 99% of students or higher.

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

SY	Language Arts Male				Literature Male				Math Male				Science Male				Social Studies Male			
	09 10	10 11	11 12	12 13	09 10	10 11	11 12	12 13	09 10	10 11	11 12	12 13	09 10	10 11	11 12	12 13	09 10	10 11	11 12	12 13
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
2019				79				85				95				66				84
2018		100	100	76		100	99	91		99	96	85		100	100	100		99	99	76
2017	100	97	91	97	100	100	96	95	99	100	100	65	100	100	99	76	100	99	99	92
2016	99	97	97		100	97	97		99	97	93		99	99	90		99	99	93	
2015	97	99			97	100			100	98			100	91			99	99		
2014	91	99			100	99			100	99			100	99			100	99		

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

SY	Language Arts Female				Literature Female				Math Female				Science Female				Social Studies Female			
	09 10	10 11	11 12	12 13	09 10	10 11	11 12	12 13	09 10	10 11	11 12	12 13	09 10	10 11	11 12	12 13	09 10	10 11	11 12	12 13
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
2019				86				89				100				74				79
2018		100	100	97		100	100	100		100	99	100		100	99	100		100	100	93
2017	100	100	100	95	100	100	100	97	99	100	99	82	100	100	99	84	100	100	99	92
2016	100	100	100		100	99	100		100	100	99		100	100	93		100	100	100	
2015	100	100			100	100			100	100			100	100			100	100		
2014	100	99			100	100			100	100			100	100			100	100		

2012-2013 Observations Tables 4d-2 & 4d-3

- LA, Lit, and SS show no significant gap between academic performance by gender.
- Females’ earned a higher percentage than males in all areas (except Social Studies).

2011-2012 Observations Tables 4d-2 & 4d-3

- Females’ earned a higher percentage than males in all areas.

2010-2011 Observations Tables 4d-2 & 4d-3

- Females remain stronger than males in all areas.

2009-2010 Observations Tables 4d-2 & 4d-3

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

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

**The second assessment was changed from March to January. Students are expected to meet the target scores at the end of 8th.*

	Target	2009 2010	2010 2011	2011 2012	2012 2013	2013 2014		2009 2010	2010 2011	2011 2012	2012 2013	2013 2014
Subject		Fall	Fall	Fall	Fall	Fall		Spring	Spring	Spring	*Winter	*Winter
English	13	15.0	13.7	13.3	13.2	13.1		16.5	14.6	14.6	14.2	14
Math	17	16.3	14.8	14.6	14.3	14.2		17.1	15.5	15.3	14.9	14.9
Reading	15	15.8	14.4	14.3	14.5	13.8		17.2	15.4	15.2	15.1	14.2
Science	20	16.7	16.1	15.9	16.2	15.7		17.6	16.9	16.6	16.8	16.2
Composite	15	16.0	14.9	14.6	14.7	14.4		17.2	15.7	15.5	15.3	15

Five year trend (Table 4e)

- For 5 years spring EXPLORE scores have exceeded targets in English, reading, and composite.
- Over the past 5 years fall EXPLORE test scores have not met target scores in math and science.
- Over the past 5 years, spring EXPLORE composite scores have increased over fall scores.

2012-2013 (Fall) Table 4e

- Overall class fall scores have decreased each year.

2012-2013 (Winter) Table 4e

- This is the first year that students have taken the EXPLORE test in January as compared to April in previous years.
- Showed growth in every area from fall 2012 to winter 2013.
- Students met the benchmark scores in English, Reading and Composite on January assessment.

2011-2012 (Fall) (Table 4e)

- The average scores of 8th graders in the fall 2011 are lower in every area than the 8th grades in the fall of 2010.
- 8th graders only met the target for English in the fall of 2011.

2011-2012 (Spring) (Table 4e)

- In each class scores increased from fall to spring in all subjects every year.
- Average scores in English, reading, and composite exceeded target scores.

2010-2011 (Fall) (Table 4e)

- Average scores of 8th graders in the fall of 2010 are lower in every area than fall of 2009.

2010-2011 (Spring) (Table 4e)

- On the spring 2011 EXPLORE Test as compared to the Fall 2010 testing the English scores increased 0.9 points, math scores 0.7, reading 1.0, science 0.8 and composite 0.8 points.
- 8th graders met in English and reading in the spring of 2011.
- 8th grade students surpassed the target score by the greatest margin in English.
- All scores increased from fall to spring.
- Even though English scores in the fall of 2010 were lower than the fall of 2009, they were still above the target.

2009-2010 (Table 4e)

- On the spring 2010 EXPLORE Test as compared to the Fall 2009 testing the English scores increased 1.5 points, math scores 0.8, reading 1.4, science 0.9 and composite 1.2 points.
- For the past four years scores in all areas of EXPLORE have increased from fall to spring.
- Students met in all areas except science on the spring assessment.
- Students surpassed the target score by the greatest margin in English.
- Students achieved higher scores than all previous classes in all areas except science.
- Science was the highest score in the fall 2009 testing.

Table 4f EXPLORE Test Results by Subject and Gender

	Target	Local		Local		Local		Local		Local	
		2009-2010 Fall		2010-2011 Fall		2011-2012 Fall		2012-2013 Fall		2013-2014 Fall	
		Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem
Eng	13	13.6	16.1	12.6	15.0	12.0	14.1	11.8	14.6	12.4	13.7
Math	17	16.1	16.4	14.6	15.1	14.0	15.0	13.5	15.0	14.0	14.5
Rdg	15	14.8	16.5	13.4	15.6	12.5	15.3	12.4	16.4	13.2	14.5
Sci	20	15.9	17.3	15.6	16.8	15.0	16.3	15.5	16.8	15.0	16.3
Comp	15	15.1	16.7	14.1	15.8	13.5	15.2	13.5	15.8	13.8	14.9
	Target	2009-2010 Spring		2010-2011 Spring		2011-2012 Spring		2012-2013 Winter		2013-2014 Winter	
		Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem
Eng	13	14.9	17.0	13.6	15.9	13.0	15.4	12.9	15.5	13.4	14.6
Math	17	16.0	17.5	15.3	15.9	14.6	15.7	14.4	15.4	14.6	15.2
Rdg	15	15.3	17.8	14.2	16.8	13.5	16.0	13.0	17.2	13.6	14.8
Sci	20	16.6	17.9	16.3	17.6	15.7	17.1	16.0	17.6	15.9	16.5
Comp	15	15.9	17.6	15.0	16.7	14.4	16.2	14.2	16.5	14.5	15.5

Observations: Explore Test Table 4f Subject/Gender**2013-2014 (Table 4f)**

- Males and Females scores increased from Fall to Winter.
- Females exceeded the target score in composite.
- Males and Females exceeded the target score in English.
- Changing the test from April to January did not result in a significant decline in growth.

2012-2013 Fall Testing (Table 4f)

- Males' scores decreased in three out of five categories over the past five years.

2012-2013 Winter Testing (Table 4f)

- Females scored higher than males in all areas.
- The average girls' score met benchmarks in English, reading and composite.
- The average scores of males did not meet benchmarks in English, reading, and composite.

2011-2012 Fall Testing (Table 4f)

- Males and females scored lower this year than last year.
- Males did not meet in any areas.
- Females met in English and reading.

2011-2012 Spring Testing (Table 4f)

- Three out of four years female scores have decreased in all areas.
- Male scores decreased every year for the past four years.

2010-2011 Fall Testing (Table 4f)

- 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.

2010-2011 Spring Testing (Table 4f)

- Females scored higher than males in every category.
- Males and females scored higher in all categories from fall to spring.
- Males made target score in English and composite.
- Females made target score in English, reading and composite.
- All scores for males and females dropped in all areas from 2009-2010 to 2010-2011.

2009-2010 Fall Testing (Table 4f)

- 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.

2009-2010 Spring Testing (Table 4f)

- 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.

2008-2009 Fall Testing (Table 4f)

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

2008-2009 Spring Testing (Table 4f)

- 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.

Table 4g EXPLORE Test: Special Education Subgroup

Explore Test Results by Subject	Target Score		Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013		Spring 2009	Spring 2010	Spring 2011	Winter 2012	Winter 2013
			2010	2011	2012	2013	2014		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
English	13		9.6	10.5	9.1	9.2	11.3		10	9.3	10.6	9.5	10
Math	17		6.3	10.1	11.2	12.1	12		9.9	11.1	11.3	12.0	12
Reading	15		10.4	11.5	10.3	10.3	10.3		11.9	11.0	10.4	11.8	10.67
Science	20		10.7	12.6	13.7	13.0	15		13.3	13.4	12.5	13.1	11.67
Composite	15		9.4	11.4	11.3	11.3	12.3		11.5	11.3	11.3	11.8	10.67

Observations (Table 4g)

2013-2014 Fall Test – Special Education (Table 4g)

- As compared to the Fall of 2013, student scores dropped in three of the five areas (English, science, and composite), stayed the same in one area (math) and showed .44 improvement in reading.

2013-2014 Fall Test – Special Education (Table 4g)

- Fall scores reflect the highest scores of special education subgroup over the past five years.

2012–2013 Fall Test – Special Education (Table 4g)

- English and math scores were higher than the prior fall scores.
- Composite score remained the same.
- Fall scores are at least four points below the target score in all categories.

2012-2013 Spring Test – Special Education (Table 4g) *Second assessment was taken in January

- There was slight growth in every area except math.
- On average students did not hit benchmarks in any area.

2011–2012 Fall Test – Special Education (Table 4g)

- Students scored lower in the fall of 2011-2012 in English and reading than the previous year.
- Students scored higher in math and science in fall of 2011-2012 than the 4 previous years.

2011-2012 Spring Test – Special Education (Table 4g)

- Student composite scores from fall to spring remain below target score.

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

- 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.

2010–2011 Spring Test – Special Education (Table 4g)

- Student scores improved from fall to spring in math and science.
- Students scored below the target scores in all areas.
- Composite scores have decreased every year.
- Compared to the previous year 2009-2010, the scores are lower in English and reading.

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

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

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

- 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.

	2009-2010			2010-2011			2011-2012			2012-2013			2013-2014		
	Fall	Wint	Spr	Fall	Wint	Spr	Fall	Wint	Spr	Fall	Wint	Spr	Fall	Wint	Spr
6 th Grade Target	125	140	150	125	140	150	125	140	150	125	140	150	125	140	150
# tested	74	75	74	73	73	71	72	73	70	74	76	74	62	64	
# met	12	6	3	10	9	8	10	10	9	9	8	8	14	11	
% met	16%	8%	4%	14%	12%	11%	14%	14%	13%	12%	11%	11%	23%	17%	
7 th Grade Target	125	140	150	125	140	150	128	136	150	128	136	150	128	136	150
# tested	80	78	78	73	73	73	71	73	72	62	63	64	74	76	
# met	28	21	30	27	37	51	35	34	33	28	33	29	39	41	
% met	35%	27%	38%	40%	51%	70%	49%	47%	49%	45%	52%	45%	53%	54%	
8 th Grade Target	130	140	150	130	140	150	130	140	150	133	146	151	133	146	151
# tested	78	77	76	76	76	79	76	78	76	73	74	74	62	62	
# met	47	47	45	33	33	45	33	38	41	35	34	42	34	38	
% met	61%	61%	59%	43%	43%	57%	43%	49%	54%	48%	46%	57%	59%	61%	

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.

2012-2013 (Table 4h)

- No significant growth from Fall to Winter at any grade level.
- The percentage of students who met the benchmark decreased from Fall to Winter for 6th grade students.

2011-2012 (Table 4h)

- There was 33% drop from the class of 2017 from spring of their 7th grade year to the fall of 8th grade.

2010-2011 (Table 4h)

- 8th grade fluency increased from 7th grade in all three seasons, fall, winter, and spring from 8% to 19% when compared to 2009-2010 scores.
- 7th grade fluency increased from 6th grade dramatically compared to 2009-2010 scores.
- 6th grade students meeting fluency decreased 3% from fall to spring.
- 7th grade fluency increased 30% and 8th grade increased 14%.
- 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.

2009-2010 (Table 4h)

- 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

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. Science scores have exceeded the state average on the ISAT every year except 2012-2013. 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

	2008-2009			2009-2010			2010-2011			2011-2012			2012-2013		
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	28	14	17	12	14	18	1	11	14	11	29	53	33	13	26
Class Room	88	52	14	49	70	33	1	24	19	42	70	46	155	41	31
Cafeteria	4	7	1	4	6	1	1	5	5	0	10	8	7	8	0
Hallway	4	4	16	4	3	9	3	6	6	3	6	13	8	2	8
Locker Room	1	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	5	1	0	5	0	1	1
Restroom	4	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Phone							15	0	0	13	0	0	35	NA	NA
Confirmed incidents of bullying	6	8	1	0	8	2	0	0	0	14	10	0	5	9	0
Tardies resulting in det.							42	0	0	NA	0	0	10	NA	NA
Total Per category	137	91	52	163	102	71	160	46	55	225	125	125	253	74	66
Yearly Totals	280			336			261			475			393		

Passive aggressive is defined as a student who repeatedly refuses to do what is asked when asked. Other can be defined as infractions such as cell phone use, minor language, etc.

2012-2013 (Table 5)

- Confirmed incidents of bullying are down from the previous year.
- Classroom disciplinary referrals have increased (recorded differently).

2011-2012 (Table 5)

- Tardies tripled from the previous year. *We now count lunch detentions.
- Passive/aggressive classroom referrals have significantly increased since 07-08.
- Passive /aggressive confirmed incidents of bullying has increased from previous years.

2010-2011 (Table 5)

- Most of our discipline referrals occur on phones.
- Total infractions decreased by 75 incidents from 2009-2010.
- Most physical aggressive infractions happened in the classroom
- Incidents of bullying decreased from 2009-2010 to 2010-2011 by 10 incidents.
- Total discipline infractions decreased from 2009-2010 to 2010-2011.

2009-2010 (Table 5)

- 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 classrooms went down over 50% from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010.

- 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

Table 6 Discipline Referral Totals by Grade and Gender

	Males 2008 2009	Males 2009 2010	Males 2010 2011	Males 2011 2012	Males 2012 2013		Females 2008 2009	Females 2009 2010	Females 2010 2011	Females 2011 2012	Females 2012 2013
6 th	42	45	55	188	104		7	27	32	57	11
7 th	46	91	59	103	72		14	23	15	77	27
8 th	124	136	98	85	98		42	14	5	24	38

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

2012-2013 (Table 6)

- Over the last five years, males received more referrals than females.
- Class of 2018 had fewer referrals than the previous years.

2011-2012 (Table 6)

- Males had more discipline referrals than females.
- 6th grade male (in general) total referrals have increased each year.
- Male discipline referrals increased as they got older.

2010-2011 (Table 6)

- Males continue to have a higher number of referrals than females.
- 2010-2011 8th graders had more referrals than the other grades.

2009-2010 (Table 6)

- Hard to tell 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 2008-2009		WEST CENTRAL 2009-2010		WEST CENTRAL 2010-2011		WEST CENTRAL 2011-2012		WEST CENTRAL 2012-2013	
Total School Population	245	100%	233	100%	223	100%	219	100%	201	100%
Average Daily Attendance	233	95.2%	230	94.4%	211	94.8%	208	95.1%	190	95%
Truancy Rate	1	0.4%	3	0.9%	3	1.3%	8	4.6%	8	4%
Mobility Rate	16	6.6%	7	3.1%	16	7.2%	28	12.8%	14	7%
Suspension Rate	48	19.6%	41	17.4%	45	20%	48	22%	41	19%
Expulsion Rate	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Low Income Rate	--	35.9%	--	47%	105	47.1%	115	52.5%	119	59%
Transfers/Withdrawal	6	2.45%	7	3.1%	7	3.14%	10	4.6%	14	7%
Promotion Rate	244	99.59%	233	100%	223	100%	217	99%	199	99%
Retention Rate	1	0.4%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%
Gender	F – 117	M - 128	F-126	M-107	F-119	M-107	F-117	M-102	F-97	M-104
Caucasian	236	96.4%	224	97.4%	212	95.1%	217	95.9%	190	94.4%
African-American	1	0.4%	1	0.4%	0	0%	0	0	1	0.5%
Hispanic	5	2.0%	3	1.3%	6	2.7%	5	2.3	6.6	3.3%
Other (American Indian)	0	0	0	0%	2	.9%	0	0	0	0
Multi	3	1.2%	2	.8%	3	1.3%	4	1.8	3.8%	1.9%

2012-2013 (Table 7)

- Total school population continues to decrease.
- Low income rate continues to increase.
- Ethnic diversity has increased.

2011-2012 (Table 7)

- The average daily attendance rate has increased the last three years.
- Truancy rate has increased the last four years.
- The mobility rate has increased the last three years.
- The low income rate has increased the last four years.

2010-2011 (Table 7)

- Total school population has declined four out of the past six years.
- Low income percentages have increased five out of six years.

2009-2010 (Table 7)

- 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

School Year	Yearly Rate	Non-IEP Students Attendance	IEP Students Attendance
2008-2009	95.2%	85.0%	85.0%
2009-2010	94.4%	96.4%	92.4%
2010-2011	94.8%	95.0%	93.2%
2011-2012	95.1%	87.9%	82.3%
2012-2013	94.8%	94.9%	93.9%

2012-2013

- Non-IEP students had a better rate of attendance than the IEP students did.

2011-2012 (Table 8)

- Over-all attendance rate improved from the previous year.
- IEP students' attendance rate decreased from the previous year.
- Non-IEP students' attendance rate decreased from the previous year.

2010-2011 (Table 8)

- Attendance rates for IEP have increased by nearly fifteen percentage points since 2007-2008.
- Attendance rates for non-IEP students have increased nearly ten percentage points since 2007-2008.

2009-2010 (Table 8)

- IEP student attendance has improved. Partial inclusion was implemented in the 2008-2009 and full inclusion was implemented in 2009-2010.

Table 9 Enrollment Data (From Fall Housing Report)

	WEST CENTRAL 2009-2010		WEST CENTRAL 2010-2011		WEST CENTRAL 2011-2012		WEST CENTRAL 2012-2013		WEST CENTRAL 2013-2014	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
	233	100	223	100	221	100	213	100	201	100
6 th	76	33	71	32	72	33	74	34	62	31%
7 th	80	34	75	34	71	32	63	30	74	37%
8 th	77	33	77	34	78	35	76	36	65	32%

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

2012-2013 (Table 9)

- Enrollment has declined for the fifth straight year.
- 6th grade enrollment decreased by 12 students.
- 7th grade enrollment has increased by 11 students.
- 8th enrollment has decreased by 11 students.

2011-2012 (Table 9)

- Enrollment has declined by 35 students from fall of 2006 to the fall of 2011.
- 2011 6th grade has increased by 2 students from the fall 6th grade class of 2010.
- The number of 7th graders decreased from 75 in 2010 to 71 in 2011.

2010-2011 (Table 9)

- 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

2009-2010 (Table 9)

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

Table 10 Student IEP Subgroup Enrollment

	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total Building Population	233	100	223	100	221	100	213	100%	201	100%
Total Special Education*	36	15	30	13.5	26	11.8	17	8	21	10.4
Cognitive Disability	8	22	9	4	4	1.8	3	1.8	3	14.
Hearing Impaired	1	1.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speech/Lang Impairment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Visual Impairment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emotionally Disturbed	0	0	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	1	4.7
Orthopedic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Health Impairment	8	22	9	4	9	4	6	3.5	6	28.57
Specific LD	17	47	10	4	9	4	7	4.1	10	47.6
Multiple Disabilities	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	0
Deaf/Blindness	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Autism	2	.05	1	0.5	1	0.45	1	0.5	2	95

2013-2014 (Table 10)

- Total number of IEP students increased from the previous year.
- Specific learning disability continues to be the largest disability category.

2012-2013 (Table 10)

- The number and percentage of students with an IEP has decreased for the past six years.

2011-2012 (Table 10)

- The number of IEP students decreased from the previous year.
- The largest decrease by disability is in students with cognitive disabilities.
- Specific learning disability continues to be the largest disability category.

2010-2011 (Table 10)

- The number of IEP students continues to decline.

2009-2010 (Table 10)

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

Summary of Demographic

Most of our demographic data remained constant over the last five years. Fewer students are 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)

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Total Full-Time Teachers	18	17	17	17	14
Total Part-Time Teachers	5	5	5	4	4
Average Years Teaching	16.3	14.4	15.3	13.52	12.9%
Teachers New to Building	2	4	1	3	1
First Year Teachers	1	3	1	3	1
Teachers with B.A./B.S. Degree (%)	83%	76.5%	76.5%	76.5%	71.4%
Teachers with M.A. & Above (%)	17%	23.5%	23.5%	23.5%	28.6%
Teachers with Emergency/Provisional Cert.	0	0	0	0	0
Teachers Working Out of Field	0	0	0	0	0
Teacher Attendance (%) – End of Year	96.9%	96%	96%	97.4%	NA
Caucasian Teachers (%)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Male Teachers (%)	17%	23.5%	23.5%	29.4%	21%
Female Teachers (%)	83%	76.5%	76.5%	70.6%	79%
Highly qualified Teachers (%)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total Paraprofessionals	3	3	4	3.5	4.5
Total Counselors	0	0	0	0	0
Total Librarians	1	1	1	.5	.5
Total Social Workers/Psychologists	3 part-time	3 part-time	2 part-time	2 part-time	2 part-time
Total Other Staff	8	12	7	12.5	7

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 assigned to full-time teaching positions in the building. Other Staff includes custodial, cooks and secretaries.

2013-2014

- Average years of experience continues to decrease.
- Percentage of teachers with master's degrees has increased.
- The total faculty numbers have decreased.
- While we have one more paraprofessional, two of those are one to one associates.
- We reduced the number of special education teachers from 2 to 1.5.
- We reduced technology instruction from half-time to 6th grade only for one period per day.
- Sections were reduced from 4 per grade level to 3 per grade level requiring fewer teachers.

2012-2013 (Table 11)

- Average years of experience decreased from 15.3 to 13.52.

2011-2012 (Table 11)

- The total number of social workers/psychologists has declined from three to two.
- The number of highly qualified teachers remains at 100%.

2010-2011 (Table 11)

- We have 3 more full time teachers in 2010-2011.
- Our average years teaching dropped 2.1 years.
- More of our staff have Masters degrees in 2010-2011.
- We have increased other staff by 3 persons.
- We have 2 fewer paraprofessionals in 2010-2011.

2009-2010 (Table 11)

- 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

Curriculum Implementation Data

This is our seventh year of existence and our sixth 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 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, staff, totaling 37. Students are divided into academic teams for instruction in core areas. There are 21 certified teachers four of which are shared with other buildings. We have 1 part time library supervisor, 2 custodians, 3 kitchen staff, 2 secretaries, 3.5 paraprofessionals, 1 part-time psychologist, 1 part-time social worker. The schedule consists of 8 period days of 40 minutes with each day beginning with a homeroom. All students have access to one state of the art computer lab supervised by a certified teacher and two portable computer labs. The Title I teacher also has a portable computer lab for student use. 10 SMART Boards are also utilized in classrooms.

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 standards.

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 engage student learning, the middle school continues to use differentiated instructional strategies such as CRISS Strategies. The strategies 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 sixth grade focus is on Ancient Civilizations through the Middle Ages using the textbook as well as supplemental materials. The seventh and eighth grade, both study American History using the text *Creating America*. Both grades also supplement with the use of tradebooks and internet resources. Eighth grade students also study government, including the Federal and Illinois Constitutions.

Language Arts

Language arts focus on grammar and writing skills. Teachers draw from a variety of sources that focus on strengthening student skills that meet core standards. We have aligned our curriculum to emphasize writing skills and teach grammar and the mechanics of writing through writing practices. We focus on expository, persuasive and narrative essays. A new approach to writing, gained from Writers' Workshop, is implemented in seventh and eighth grade. This approach extends student opportunities to write for varied audiences and purposes.

Literature

The middle school literature curriculum is aligned to the Common Core 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 and through reading labs. 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

This is the second year implementing the Common Core standards into the math curriculum. Sixth grade math classes have a strong focus on ratios and proportional relationships as well as the introduction to algebra concepts. The seventh grade curriculum is a combination of seventh and eighth grade Common Core standards. All eighth grade students take Algebra I which follows along with the High School Algebra I Common Core standards. All grade levels have one quarter of math enrichment as a part of their Explore class rotation. We do not provide Title I assistance to students with math deficiencies due to unavailability of staff, but do offer after-school math tutoring each day as well as math labs throughout the week. Math labs are offered to students who have shown patterns of deficiencies in specific math areas and have been identified through data analysis.

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.

Program Comparisons and Trends

2013-2014

- Average years of teachers experience has decreased over the last four years.
- Enrollment continues to decline.
- Classroom teachers continue to implement Common Core
- Class size has increased due to reduction in grade level sections.

2012-2013

- In general, the average years of teachers' experience has decreased over the last four years.
- The number of male teachers has increased over the last five years.
- Enrollment has decreased over the last five school years.

2011-2012

- Average daily attendance has increased three out of the last four years; the other year it remained the same.
- The Middle School has met AYP each year since 2007 with the exception of 2012.
- Over the past four years the Middle School students have scored below target scores on the Spring EXPLORE Test in the areas of science and math.

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.

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.

FORMAT	SCHOOL-WIDE	PARTICIPANTS FROM THE MIDDLE SCHOOL	GRADES	MO./YEAR	TOPIC
Interactive	Yes	4	K-12	March 2013	Danielson Framework Part 3
Interactive	Yes	4	K-12	March 2013	Connecting Danielson to the Common Core
Interactive	No	2	K-12	April 2013	Mining the Common Core Through Technology
Lecture	Yes	24	K-12	August 2013	Bloodborne Pathogens
Interactive	No	6	K-12	August and January	District SIP Leadership Training
Interactive	No	4	3-9	August 2013-May 2014	1:1 Initiative
Interactive	Yes	24	6-8	September	IIRC Data Mining
Interactive	Yes	24	K-12	November 2013	Active Shooter-North Campus
Interactive	Yes	24	6-8	December 2013	Active Shooter-South Campus
Interactive	Yes	4	K-12	November 2013	Danielson Student-Centered Instruction
Interactive	No	4	K-12	October 2013-March 2014	Teacher Evaluation Planning Committee
Interactive	No	1	6-8	August 2013	CPI Training

Interactive	No	1	K-12	2013	Next Generation Science Standards
Interactive	No	1	6-8	January 2014	Integrated Math Forum
Interactive	No	1	6-8	Fall 2013	PARCC Math (ROE)
Interactive	Yes	24	6-8	December 2013	Reading Strategies
Interactive	No	1	k-12	Summer	Buchanan Art Center
Interactive	Yes	2	k-12	Summer	Cyber Camp
Interactive	Yes	4	k-12	January 2014	Danielson Training-Differentiated Instruction
Interactive	Yes	5	K-12	February 2014	Danielson Training-HOTS

2013-2014

- Significant amount of PD opportunities were offered for the Danielson Framework; attendance by middle school staff was low.

2011-2012 (Table 12a)

- Common Core in the classroom was the main emphasis of the middle school professional development for the 2011-2012 school year.
- PBIS was introduced and implemented throughout the Middle School.
- Differentiated instruction and differentiated assessment remain a focus to improve student engagement and teacher effectiveness.
- Strategies in co-teaching continue to be offered to staff.
- Peer observation training and implementation is being practiced and is on-going.
- Writing in the content areas has been implemented by members of the staff.

2010-2011 (Table 12b)

- 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.
- Twelve professional development opportunities were offered in Language Arts.

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
2008/09	247	24	25	10.0%
2009/10	233	113	134	57.5%
2010/11	223	167	147	65.9%
2011/12	219	156	163	74.4%
2012/13	213	138	182	85.4%

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
2008/09	209	24	19	9.1%
2009/10	197	113	116	58.9%
2010/11	197	167	128	65%
2011/12	194	156	142	73%
2012/13	198	169	169	92.95%

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
2008/09	38	15	6	15.8%
2009/10	36	113	18	50.0%
2010/11	26	167	19	73.1%
2011/12	25	156	21	84%
2012/13	15	412	15	100%

**Table 13a, 13b, & 13c
2012-2013**

- 100% of IEP students participated in the program.
- Student participation has increased by approximately 10% each of the past four years.
- The percentage of general education students participating in tutoring increased by nearly 20% from the previous year.
- The number and percentage of students using the After-School program has increased over the past six years.

2011-2012

- The number and percentage of students using the After-School program has increased each of the past five years.

**Table 13a, 13b, & 13c
2010-2011**

- The total number of sessions attended by students has increased over the last four years from a low of 24 sessions to 167 sessions in 2010-2011.

- IEP students attending tutoring increased each of the past four years even though the total number of students receiving special education services has decreased.
- The total percentage of student participation over the past four years has risen from 8.5% to 65.9% indicating that the program has become a positive addition to the school day and is providing multiple students assistance in a variety of areas, both academic and in areas of enrichment.

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.

2.5 PERCEPTION DATA

Student Survey

2012-2013 Observations

- Most student feel they can confide in an adult at our school
- Time and family obligations are the biggest reasons for not using the after-school program.
- Most students feel safe in the classroom.
- Males feel least safe in the locker room.

2011-2012 Observations

- A significant number of students believe they are not given enough opportunity to discuss their emotions.
- A majority of students feel the adults in the building have high expectations for their behavior and school work.
- A significant number of students feel they have not been adequately taught ways to resolve disagreements so that everyone is satisfied with the outcome.

Parent Survey 2012-2013 (114 Parent Responses)

	6 th Grade	7 th Grade	8 th Grade
1. From what source do you get most of your information about our school?			
Newsletter	26%	28%	30%
Children	72%	91%	60%
Teachers	15%	19%	26%
Principal	3%	9%	0%
Friends	13%	16%	9%
Newspaper	0%	0%	9%
2. As a parent/guardian, do you have trouble with any of the following?			
Your child's homework	21%	31%	28%
Discipline	8%	16%	12%
Spending enough time with your child	0%	3%	12%
Dealing with your child's problems	0%	3%	9%
Motivating your child to do well in school	15%	22%	16%
Working with the school and teachers	3%	3%	5%
Understanding the school district's programs	3%	9%	5%
3. Would you be interested in attending a class or session on how parents or family members can help their children learn at home?			
Yes	18%	28%	33%
No	74%	63%	58%

4. If you checked “yes” in question 3, please indicate below any workshop that you would be interested in attending to help your child learn.			
Helping with homework	8%	19%	16%
Improving reading skills	5%	0%	2%
Improving math skills	3%	13%	9%
Improving your child’s self-image	13%	6%	16%
Building your own parenting skills	5%	9%	21%
Communicating with the school	8%	0%	7%
5. Would you recommend this school district to others?			
Yes	92%	97%	81%
No	0%	0%	5%

Parent Survey Observations

2012-2013

- 90% of parents who took the survey would recommend West Central.
- 2% of parents would not recommend West Central
- 8% of parents did not answer the questions
- Parents/guardians of all grade levels learn the most about our school through their children.
- Parents/guardians of all grade levels have the most trouble with their child’s homework and motivating their child to do well.
- Parents/guardians have the most difficulty helping their child with homework but most say they would not want to take a class to learn how to help with homework.

Staff Survey 2013-2014

	Yes		No	
1. I understand my job related expectations.	30		0	
2. I feel I am a valued member of the staff.	27		6	
3. I believe the rules are enforced consistently throughout the school.	18		12	
4. I feel that I have adequate resources to satisfy my job expectations.	22		8	
5. There are adequate staff development opportunities for me.	25		3	
6. I believe there are enough opportunities for staff to collaborate.	24		6	
7. I have adequate resources to provide accommodations for IEP students.	Yes 16	No 4	Sometimes 9	
8. How would you rate each of the following in terms of improving instruction?	Needs Improvement	Average	Above average	
Overall atmosphere	4	16	8	
Resources	1	23	4	
Availability of technology	8	9	11	
Professional development opportunities	0	15	12	

9. Please rate your communication with:	Needs Improvement	Average	Above Average
Administration	1	13	15
Fellow staff	3	13	13
Parents	0	21	8
What change(s) would you recommend to improve the overall atmosphere and educational opportunities: Individual comments are available in the school office.			

Staff Survey Observations

2013-2014

- Everyone understands their job expectations
- 88% of staff feel they have an adequate amount of resources, availability of technology, and professional development opportunities.
- 81% of staff feel they are a valued member of the staff.
- 95% of staff feel there is good communication with the administration.
- 100% of staff feel they have good communication with parents.
- 12 out of 18 staff members feel the rules are not enforced consistently

2012-2013

- Everyone understands their job expectations.
- Ten out of thirty-four staff members do not regularly attend extra-curricular activities.
- Ten out of thirty-four report they do not have enough time for collaboration.
- All staff members agree on items 6, 7, and 8.

Perception Data Summaries

Summary 2012-2013

- Based on Parent surveys, students feel safe and successful at school. This demonstrates a continuing trend with previous years' surveys. 90% of parents say they would recommend West Central. Parents biggest concern was their inability to help students with their homework but they were not willing to take a class if offered.
- Student surveys indicate that students would benefit from more training on conflict resolution and increased opportunities to learn strategies to cope with emotions. Students believe the staff at West Central Middle School have high expectations for their achievement.
- The majority of the staff have a clear understanding of their job expectations. The staff indicated they foster an environment of mutual respect, have high expectations for student achievement, and work well as a team.

III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses

Table 14a (2013-2014)

Patterns of Strengths	Data
In all grade levels Non-IEP students have met on ISAT in math, reading and science in at least four out last five years.	Table 4c
Push in special education students have increased individual academic achievement based on ISAT.	4aa
Attendance has increased four of the past five years.	Table 8
21 st Century After-School opportunities continue, and attendance has increased each year for the last six years.	Sign-in sheets
The availability of technology has increased for middle school students and staff.	Technology inventory
Staff continue to implement methods to improve school environment (i.e. PBIS and Check & Connect)	Meeting minutes
Staff continues to implement inter-disciplinary units.	Team meeting minutes
Staff continue to involve the community in the learning environment and the methods of communicating with Parents/Guardians continue to increase	Veteran's Day Program; Immigration Unit
Evidence shows that Reading Title I services have increased.	Schedule

Table 14b (2011-2012)

Patterns of Challenges	Data
Continuing to increase rigor and implement common core without having adequate time to bridge the gap.	IL standards vs. Common Core
Five out of seven years 8 th grade math scores on ISAT were lower than state average for females.	Table 4c
Six out of seven years the 8 th grade male ISAT math and reading scores were lower than the state average.	Table 4c
Integrating IEP students into the regular classroom through (Push-in) has limited the availability of special education staff to provide assistance to all IEP students at one time.	Master Schedule
Addressing the discrepancy between ISAT, Exit Outcomes, and classroom grades.	End of year grades and ISAT data
Student enrollment continues to drop.	End of Year Report
Discipline issues, including acts of bullying, are a concern.	OLWEUS Student Survey
Poverty rates continue to increase.	End of Year Report

Table 15 Problem Statements, Hypotheses, and Data Source *(2013 AYP was 92.5%)

Math

Problem Statement 1: According to the IIRC, math students have, on average, shown deficiencies in:

1. Data, Statistics, and Probability
2. Number sense
3. Algebra
4. Measurement

Hypothesis	Accept/Reject	Data Source 1	Data Source 2	Data Source 3
Need for continuous K-12 Common Core vertical alignment.	Accept	Common Core Standards	Curriculum Guide	Exit Outcomes
The math exploratory curriculum does not specifically address areas of deficiencies.	Accept	Curriculum Guide	ISAT Scores	Student Grades
Current curriculum does not place enough emphasis on identified deficiencies.	Accept	Curriculum Guide	ISAT Scores	Exit Outcomes
Alignment of curriculum being provided has not aligned with standardized tests.	Accept	Curriculum Guide	ISAT Scores	Exit Outcomes
We do not have a dedicated lab time and specific curriculum for all students with reading deficiencies.	Accept	Master Schedule	Lack of identified or accepted curriculum for labs	Team/departmental meetings

Reading

Problem Statement 2: According to IIRC, a trend has developed that indicates the following areas of deficiency:

1. Implementation of Reading Strategies is an area of concern at all three grade levels.
2. Identification of literary devices.
3. Reading comprehension.

Hypothesis	Accept/Reject	Data Source 1	Data Source 2	Data Source 3
Reading strategies are not repeatedly reinforced across the curriculum.	Accept	Team meeting minutes	Lesson Plans	Lit/LA Department Meetings
Some of the individual deficiencies in reading are not being addressed consistently through the Special Ed. Department due to availability and strategies used.	Accept	Curriculum Guide	Lesson Plans	Lit/LA Department Meetings
We do not have a dedicated lab time and specific curriculum for all students with reading deficiencies.	Accept	Master Schedule	Lack of identified or accepted curriculum for labs	Lit/LA Department Meetings
Need for continuous K-12 Common Core vertical alignment.	Accept	Departmental meeting discussions	Teacher Curriculum / Staff Discussions	Observations
Curricular inconsistencies due to multiple teachers teaching the same subject at 6 th /7 th grade.	Accept	Master Schedule	Lesson Plans	Lit/LA Department Meetings

Problem Statement 3 (School Climate)

Inappropriate behavior, including bullying, in the school setting continues to be a concern according to 2012-2013 Skyward records and SWISS.

Hypothesis	Accept/ Reject	Data Source 1	Data Source 2	Data Source 3
Students believe their reported concerns are not addressed.	Accept	Student Survey	Advisory Discussions	Self-Reporting
Some students have not applied the strategies to deal with bullying situations.	Accept	Student Survey	Class Discussion	Conferences with administrators/social worker
Staff has not been sufficiently trained in PBIS and/or Anti-Bully strategies.	Accept	Teacher Meetings	Professional Development Schedule	Number of Referrals
Staff is not consistently recognizing and rewarding appropriate behavior.	Accept	Teacher Comments	Supply of colored paper	Formal Observations
All staff is not consistently utilizing PBIS/Anti-Bully meeting time to present a structured lesson dealing with appropriate behavior.	Accept	Team Meetings	Informal Observations	Student Surveys
Lack of buy-in from the entire staff.	Accept	Informal Observations	Formal Observations	Teacher Meetings

IV. Goals, Strategies, and Integrated Action Plan

Table 16 Strategies, Baseline Data, Annual Targets and Documentation

Math

Improvement Goal 1: Improve student math scores in the areas where trends have indicated a deficiency. For the upcoming school year, our students should meet or exceed state target scores.

Current Conditions and Data Sources

IIRC data over the last four years shows math deficiencies in:

- Data, Statistics, and Probability
- Number sense
- Algebra
- Measurement

Specific Action 1

Develop and implement math labs at each grade level to address deficiencies.

Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Develop or obtain a proper assessment to identify the students to be in the lab classes. (step1)	Prior to June 13, 2014	Mr. Hennings, Ms. Halcomb, Mr. Rakestraw, Mr. Harris	Stipend paid (TBD) to attending teachers. 8hrs. at \$400 (3 steps combined)	Assessment submitted to Mr. Nichols
Develop or obtain a curriculum for the lab classes. (step 2)	Prior to June 13, 2014	Mr. Hennings, Ms. Halcomb, Mr. Rakestraw, Mr. Harris	Stipend paid (TBD) to attending teachers. 8hrs at \$400 (3 steps combined)	Curriculum submitted to Mr. Nichols
Develop or obtain a proper assessment to provide the opportunity to exit the lab classes. (step 3)	Prior to June 13, 2014	Mr. Hennings, Ms. Halcomb, Mr. Rakestraw, Mr. Harris	Stipend paid (TBD) to attending teachers. 8 hrs at \$400 (3 steps combined)	Assessment submitted to Mr. Nichols
Utilize the assessment to analyze student growth through the process of the lab classes.	August - May 2014	Math Lab teachers/ Mr. Nichols	0	Math Lab teacher record assessment result and submit the first day of each month to Mr. Nichols and identify the students exiting the lab
Track math scores of students originally assigned to the lab at midterm and at the end of each quarter	August - May 2014	Math Lab teachers/ Mr. Nichols	0	Scores compiled by lab teachers and submitted to Mr. Nichols

Goals, Strategies, and Integrated Action Plan

Reading

Improvement Goal 2: Improve students' reading scores in the areas where trends have indicated a deficiency. For the upcoming school year, our students will meet or exceed state target scores.

Current Conditions and Data Sources

IIRC data over the last five years shows reading deficiencies in:

- Implementation of Reading Strategies
- Identification of literary devices
- Reading comprehension

Specific Action 1

Develop and implement reading labs at each grade level to address deficiencies.

Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Develop or obtain a proper assessment to identify the students to be in the lab classes. (step 1)	June 2014	ELA Department/ELA Consultant Mrs.Ensminger, Ms. Reynolds, Mrs. Chandler, Mrs. Slater, Mrs. Lox, and Mrs. Copeland	Stipend paid (TBD) to attending teachers. 8hrs. at \$600 (3 steps combined)	Assessment submitted to Administration
Develop or obtain a curriculum for the lab classes. (step 2)	June 2014	ELADepartment /ELA Consultant Mrs.Ensminger, Ms. Reynolds, Mrs. Chandler, Mrs. Slater, Mrs. Lox, Mrs. Copeland	Stipend paid (TBD) to attending teachers. 8hrs. at \$600 (3 steps combined)	Curriculum submitted to Administration
Develop or obtain a proper assessment to provide the opportunity to exit the lab classes. (step 3)	June 2014	ELA Department /ELA Consultant Mrs.Ensminger, Ms. Reynolds, Mrs. Chandler, Mrs. Slater, Mrs. Lox, and Mrs. Copeland	Stipend paid (TBD) to attending teachers. 8hrs. at \$600 (3 steps combined)	Assessment submitted to Administration
Track reading scores of students originally assigned to the lab at midterm and at the end of each quarter	August – May 2015	ELA Department / Reading Lab Teachers	0	Scores compiled by lab teachers and submitted to Administration

Specific Action 2

Provide students of all grade levels with effective reading strategies.

Specific Steps in	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Use authentic text/non-fiction (material in all content areas) in all classes to reinforce reading strategies.	August 28-2014-May 2015	Mrs. Copeland	0	Teacher meeting presentation Identified in Teacher Meeting Minutes
Provide professional development for content area teachers for reading text structures and features during teachers' meetings.	September 4, 2014	Mrs. Ensminger	0	Teacher meeting presentation identified in Teachers Meeting Minutes
Develop and implement Tier 1/2/3 vocabulary strategies in all content areas.	September 18, 2014	Mrs. Rankin	0	Teacher meeting presentation identified in Teachers Meeting Minutes
Increase student reading materials for each grade level.	September 5, 2014	Literature teachers submit requests to Administration	\$2000	Book order being placed through Mrs. Bigger Purchase Orders

Goals, Strategies, and Integrated Action Plan

Improvement Goal 3 (School Climate)

We will continue to strive towards creating a safe, positive learning environment that will promote pride and respect among students and staff.

Current Conditions and Data Sources

Skyward referrals show the following areas of concern from 2012-2013:

- Classroom
- Hallway
- Bus

Specific Action 1

Provide activities to continue to promote a positive school climate through the PBIS/Anti-bullying program.

Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Each grade level will incorporate specific elements of Anti-Bullying into Weekly PBIS Meetings.	August 2014 – May 2015	Committee and Grade Level Teams	0	Curriculum being submitted to administration for approval and Grade Level Meeting Minutes
Inform the community of efforts to promote a positive school climate in local newspapers and on the district website.	August-2014-May 2015	PBIS Committee and Staff	0	Newspaper articles District website Parent survey
Offer weekly/monthly incentive activities for eligible students	September 2014- May 2015.	Administration & PBIS Committee	Incentive Fund	Newspaper articles District Website Hallway Promotions
Provide shirts for unity.	September 2014	PBIS Committee	\$1500 Donations/or budget	Student participation in wearing shirts.
Improve the Check & Connect Program to better foster relationships between staff and students.	August 2014 - May 2015	Administration and Staff	0	Check & Connect meeting agendas.
Provide speakers/programs to promote positive behavior for students.	August 2014 - May 2015	PBIS Committee	Pending Available Funds	Newspaper & District Website.
Provide additional training to teachers and staff to improve student behavior through the PBIS/Anti-Bullying program.	August 2014 - September 2015	PBIS Coaches	0	Sign-in sheets/ Evaluations/ Staff Surveys
All staff provide positive reinforcement of appropriate behavior with Heat Bucks, staff modeling, and other forms of recognition.	August 2014 – May 2015	All Staff	0	Heat Buck distribution/ Informal and Formal Observations

Explore possibilities to create the time for the PBIS Coaches to further develop the PBIS/Anti-Bullying Program	August 2014 – May 2015	PBIS Committee/ Administration	0	Master Schedule/ PBIS Committee Minutes
Identify Internal Coaches and provide Professional Development for PBIS Coaches	Prior to August	PBIS Committee/ Administration	Pending Available Funds/Activity	Master Schedule/ PBIS Committee Minutes

Goals, Strategies, and Integrated Action Plan

Improvement Goal 4				
We will continue to provide opportunities to improve instruction strategies to increase student achievement.				
Current Conditions and Data Sources				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructional practices and requirements need to evolve as current educational practices change. 				
Specific Action 1 Provide professional development and activities to address educational advancements.				
Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Offer training and implementation for the five identified district initiatives.	August 2014- May 2015	SIP Committee (training provided by staff)	?	Agenda/ Sign-In Sheets
Offer training and implementation of the Danielson Framework. (voluntary attendance offered outside of the school day, with CPDUs provided if possible)	August 2014- May 2015	SIP Committee (training provided by staff who attended the Danielson workshops)	0	Agenda/ Sign-In Sheets
Peer to peer observation/coaching training sessions to focus on the five identified district initiatives. (voluntary attendance offered outside of the school day, with CPDUs provided if possible)	August 2014-May 2015	SIP Committee (training provided by staff)	0	Sign-up Sheet
Research and explore options for a computerized assessment tool and training.	July 2014	Administration/ Evaluation Committee	0	Recommendations for final assessment tool to be considered.
Plan details, determine activities, and acquire needed materials for the Showcase Night and offer activities.	April 2015	Departments/ Administration	\$500	News articles in HEAT and area newspapers Exit Survey

Table 17: Professional Development Schedule 2013-2014

TOPIC	DAY/MO./YEAR	GRADE LEVELS	FORMAT
Check and Connect	August 2014 - May 2015	6-8	Committee Mtgs.
Common Core Standards/Next Generation Science Standards	August 2014 - May 2015	6-8	Mtgs./Institute
Assessments	August 2014 - May 2015	6-8	Mtgs./ SIP
Staff Presented Monthly PLC (Addressing Staff Identified Needs)	August 2014- May 2015	6-8	PLC Sessions
Share what you know (Technology Focus)	August 2014 - May 2015	6-8	Teachers' Mtgs
2014 ISAT Data and SIP Activities for FY 2015	September 2014	6-8	SIP Day
Strategies to address deficiencies on the 2014 ISAT	August-Sept.2014	6-8	SIP Day
Review/begin implementation of 2014-2015 SIP	August 2014	6-8	Institute
Start the 2015 SIP	August 2014	6-8	SIP Day
Participate in District/Regional Institute Day	March 2015	6-8	Institute
Analyze PARCC vs ISAT assessments	September 2014	6-8	Teachers' Mtgs
Peer to Peer Observations	November 2014	6-8	Teachers' Mtgs
Data Driven Decisions	October 2014	6-8	SIP Day
Content area reading/writing strategies	September 2014	6-8	Teachers' Mtgs.
Reading Strategies	Sept-Oct 2014	6-8	Teachers' Mtgs.
Differentiated Instruction	November 2014	6-8	SIP Day
Math and Reading Lab curriculum alignment	August 2014 – September 2014	K-12	Dept. Mtgs/ Team Mtgs
Anti-Bullying/PBIS Lesson development	August 2014 - May 2015	6-8	Team Meetings
Anti-Bullying/PBIS Training for all staff (internal coach/team?)	May 2014	6-8	SIP Day
Student driven learning environment training	October 2014	6-8	SIP Day
Curriculum Alignment	May 2014	K-12	Dept. Meetings

V. REFLECTION, EVALUATION, REFINEMENT

5.1 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT TEAM MEETING SCHEDULE

- The School Improvement Team will meet at least twice per month during the academic year.
- Sub-committees meet quarterly and will provide support for the SIP consists of faculty and staff. 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, 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, 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? Reports are issued quarterly, mid-marking period, and the beginning and ending of school year.
Who is Responsible? The district administration, teachers, counselors, school personnel and building administrative/office staff are responsible.
- Staff:** **What is Reported?** Achievement test scores, ISAT, 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, 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? Grading periods, open house, and Parent/Teacher conferences.
Who is Responsible? All school personnel, principal, administration/office staff, school staff.
- Media:** **What is Reported?** Achievement data and demographics
How Reported? Newspapers, school website, 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? Reports are provided through newspapers, website, and school publications
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
When Reported? Monthly and throughout the school year

Who is Responsible? Administration and SIP team

