

An Integrated School Improvement Plan for

West Central Middle School

West Central School District #235

July 1, 2012– June 30, 2013

**PROVIDING OPPORTUNITY,
EXPECTING EXCELLENCE**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	
1.1	SCHOOL COMMUNITY	P. 3
1.2	SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT TEAM	P. 5
1.3	OTHER INFORMATION	P. 5
II.	DATA COLLECTION, ORGANIZATION AND TRENDS	P. 6
2.1	DATA COLLECTION METHODS	P. 6
2.2	DISTRICT ASSESSMENT DATA	P. 7
2.3	DEMOGRAPHIC DATA	P. 27
2.4	PROGRAM DATA	P. 33
2.5	PERCEPTION DATA	P. 40
III.	PROBLEM STATEMENTS AND HYPOTHESES	P. 43
IV.	GOALS, STRATEGIES, AND INTEGRATED ACTION PLAN	P. 50
V.	REFLECTION, EVALUATION AND REFINEMENT	P. 62
5.1	SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT TEAM MEETING SCHEDULE	P. 62
5.2	MONITORING	P. 62
5.3	COMMUNICATION PLAN	P. 64
	REFERENCES	
	LIST OF TABLES AND CHARTS	
	Table 1: School Improvement Team	P. 5
	Table 2: Data Collection Method	P. 6
	Table 3: District: ISAT – Adequate Yearly Progress Data	P. 7
	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. 18
	Table 4e: Explore test results	P. 20
	Table 4f: Explore test results by subject and gender	P. 22
	Table 4g: Explore test results special education subgroup	P. 23
	Table 4h: Reading Fluency	P. 25
	Table 5: Disciplinary Referrals by type of specific infraction	P. 27
	Table 6: Disciplinary Referrals by grade and gender	P. 28
	Table 7: General School Data	P. 29
	Table 8: Student Attendance Record	P. 30
	Table 9: Enrollment Data	P. 31
	Table 10: Student Special Education Subgroup Enrollment	P. 32
	Table 11: Educator Data	P. 33
	Table 12: Professional Growth Data	P. 34
	Table 13: After School Tutoring Participation Chart	P. 39
	Table 14: Patterns of Strengths and Challenges	P. 43
	Table 15: Problem Statements, Hypotheses, and Data Sources	P. 46
	Table 16: Strategies, Baseline Data, Annual Targets and Documentation	P. 50
	Table 17: Professional Development Schedule	P. 61
	Table 18: Monitoring Schedule	P. 63

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 2011 was 221 students; of this, 101 are male and 120 are female. Sixth grade consists of 72 students; 7th grade consists of 71 students; and 8th grade consists of 78. All grades are currently divided into four sections. Twenty five students have Individualized Education Plans. Students are served by Administration, faculty, and staff numbering 39: Students are divided into academic teams for instruction in core areas 20 full-time teachers, 2 special education teachers, 1 Title teacher, 1 library supervisor, 2 custodians, 3 kitchen staff, 2 secretaries, 3 paraprofessionals, 1 part-time psychologist, 1 part-time social worker, and 1 part-time PBIS external coach. The students are also served by a staff member who teaches part time and assists with administrative duties and a full time building principal. The academic program includes the core areas of English (subdivided into language arts and literature), mathematics, social studies, general science, and physical education. In addition to these areas, students in all 3 grades have classes in computer technology and art. Grade level exploratory classes are offered that include; "Choices," which is a program taught one day a week through Bridgeway that addresses drug education, math enrichment and music enrichment for the 6th grade. Seventh grade is offered health for a semester and "Choices," and 8th grade has career exploration and math enrichment classes.

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

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

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

School Strengths

- The middle school met AYP in all areas since Spring of 2007 including the 2011 ISAT assessment.
- Daily attendance at the Middle school has increased or remained the same since 2007-2008.
- The Regional Office of Education recognizes 100% of teachers as highly qualified in their subject area.
- We have increased our tutoring/homework assistance programs from two to five nights a week.
- Use of the Middle School Concept allows for daily collaboration between staff members for student and curriculum issues.
- RTI (Response to Intervention) responsibilities are addressed through grade level teams.
- PBIS has been introduced and beginning stage of implementation has begun.
- Certified staff members participate regularly in professional development activities focusing on identified areas of weakness.
- Continue emphasis on the use of differentiated teaching strategies.

- Staff has received instruction on Reading and instruction on Writing in the Content Areas.
- Staff has received instruction on Co-teaching.
- All middle school teachers have received Teacher Academy training, (Best teaching practices).
- One middle school teacher has pursued National Board Teacher Certification.
- Eight middle school teachers have received state mentoring certification.
- RTI (Response to Intervention) responsibilities are addressed through grade level teams.
- The District provides family access to student grades, homework assignments, discipline, lunch account and attendance through Skyward internet access.
- The District utilizes the Connect-Ed phone messaging system to provide information to members of the community in a timely manner. (This is a mass form of communication through telephone and/or e-mail.)
- Beginning 2010-2011 the school offered a full time Title I teacher 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: Four on site computer labs (one mobile lab), Smartboards, document cameras, computer tablets, and a video camera.
- 30% of full time faculty members have a Master's Degree.

School Challenges

- One of the biggest challenges facing the school continues to be economic hardships in the area. 45% 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.
- 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 for the school.
- 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.

- Over the past four years Spring EXPLORE Test scores have been below the target scores in math and science.
- Over the past four years the our 8th grade students have not met the expected target scores in science on the Spring EXPLORE Test
- Three out of the last four years 8th grade students have not met the target score in math on the Spring EXPLORE Test.
- Over the past four years our 8th grade males are not meeting the expected target scores on science, math, and reading on the Spring EXPLORE Test.
- For the past four years our 8th grade IEP students are not meeting the expected target scores on the Spring EXPLORE Test.

1.2 School Improvement Team

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

Table 1 School Improvement Team

TEAM MEMBER	POSITION	LENGTH OF SERVICE	# OF YEARS ON TEAM
Jeff Nichols	Principal	Constant	7
Karen Rima	Administrator	Constant	5
Jamie Farniok	Spec Ed Coordinator	Constant	5
Kayty Wilson	Literature	2009-2013	3
Terri Copeland	Language arts	2010-2014	6
Natalie Ensminger	Literature	2010-2014	5
Byron Helt	Science	2010-2014	2
Jeremy Hennings	Math	2010-2014	2
Tammy Rankin	Science	2011-2015	5

1.3 Other Information

Prior to the 2005 school year, our district was comprised of Southern Community School District for the southern part of Henderson County and Union Community School District that served the northern part of the county.

- West Central Middle School is a 6-8th grade school.
- At the beginning of the 2006-07 school year, we switched to a middle school.
- Students are bused to the campus by school provided buses.
- The facility was constructed in 1925, with an addition being built in 1955. It currently meets all life safety standards.
- The plumbing has been upgraded in the handicapped accessible restrooms.
- In June of 2008, our district was affected by major flooding. Twenty-seven thousand acres were flooded, along with major highways and county roads that were unusable for an extended period time. Family and district income and economic status were directly impacted by the flood.

II. DATA COLLECTION, ORGANIZATION AND TRENDS

2.1 Data Collection Methods

We used a variety of sources to gather information that would give us the clearest indication of areas of strength and weakness including surveys, ISAT scores, professional development, and demographic information. 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	REPOSE RATE	PURPOSE
Survey	Parent Survey	August 2008 October 2009 October 2010 October 2011	39% 22% 54% 49%	To identify parent concerns.
Survey	Student Survey	August 2008 October 2009 October 2010 October 2011	92% 100% 97% 100%	To identify student concerns.
Survey	Staff Survey	August 2008 October 2009 October 2010 October 2011	100% 100% 100% 100%	To identify staff concerns.
Formal Assessment	ISAT Overall Scores	2005-2006 2006-2007 2007-2008 2008-2009 2009-2010 2010-2011	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%	To identify strengths and areas of concern.
Formal Assessment	Learnia Tests	Sept. 2008 yr 3 March 2009 yr 3 Nov. 2009 yr 4 April 2010 yr 4 Sept. 2010 yr 5 April 2011 yr 5 2011-2012	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% NA	To identify for strengths and weakness for Title 1 students.
Formal Assessment	EXPLORE Test	Sept. 2008 yr 3 April 2009 yr 3 Sept. 2009 yr 4 April 2010 yr 4 Sept. 2010 yr 5 April 2011 yr 5 Sept. 2011 yr 6 April 2012 yr 6	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	2007-2008 2008-2009 2009-2010 2010-2011 2011-2012	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	2005-2012	NA	To identify individual students and special needs.
Documents	WCSD #235 Consolidation Demographic Document.	2005-2012	NA	To identify area demographics.

2.2 Assessment Data

Table 3

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS DATA						
BASED ON ISAT & PSAE MEETS and EXCEEDS						
All Subjects & Subgroups required to be 85% or above						
Updated August 16, 2011						
	West Central 2006	West Central 2007	West Central 2008	West Central 2009	West Central 2010	West Central 2011
3rd Grade						
Reading –All	65%	62%	69%	70%	84%	73%
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	59% 70%	58% 65%	53% 82%	76% 63%	83% 85%	65% 84%
Reading – IEP/ Others	17% 74%	43% 67%	23% 79%	46% 75%	63% 87%	40% 78%
Math – All	89%	86%	84%	82%	93%	95%
Math – Low Inc/ Others	84% 93%	84% 88%	78% 90%	80% 84%	91% 96%	87% 100%
Math – IEP/ Others	58% 94%	71% 90%	46% 93%	61% 86%	75% 95%	100% 98%
Writing				52%	44%	NA
4th Grade						
Reading – All	79%	75%	79%	81%	75%	89%
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	63% 91%	73% 78%	79% 79%	66% 93%	73% 77%	88% 91%
Reading – IEP/ Others	50% 86%	7% 89%	62% 83%	59% 86%	50% 81%	40% 93%
Math – All	91%	91%	96%	95%	93%	99%
Math – Low Inc Others	84% 95%	95% 88%	93% 98%	91% 98%	90% 97%	98% 100%
Math – IEP/ Others	56% 100%	54% 99%	77% 100%	83% 97%	93% 93%	100% 100%
Science – All	92%	83%	87%	91%	82%	89%
Science – Low Inc/ Others	84% 98%	82% 85%	82% 91%	84% 95%	81% 83%	88% 94%
Science-IEP Others	75% 97%	46% 91%	62% 93%	75% 94%	57% 88%	60% 93%
5th Grade						
Reading – All	74%	79%	79%	72%	85%	78%
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	69% 78%	50% 98%	79% 78%	69% 76%	74% 93%	82% 61%
Reading – IEP/ Others	32% 87%	33% 90%	14% 92%	54% 76%	71% 86%	57% 79%
Math – All	86%	90%	92%	88%	93%	87%
Math – Low Inc Others	77% 92%	77% 98%	94% 90%	91% 85%	97% 91%	84% 68%
Math – IEP/ Others	63% 93%	53% 98%	64% 97%	77% 91%	86% 94%	86% 87%
Writing		42%	43%	70%	67%	NA

Table 3	West Central 2006	West Central 2007	West Central 2008	West Central 2009	West Central 2010	West Central 2011
6th Grade						
Reading – All	81%	75%	95%	79%	76%	92%
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	69% 89%	61% 86%	93% 96%	79% 79%	72% 81%	86% 95%
Reading – IEP/ Others	40% 90%	20% 91%	82% 97%	36% 87%	20% 85%	40% 95%
Math – All	80%	76%	91%	81%	91%	90%
Math – Low Inc Others	66% 89%	68% 82%	82% 96%	76% 85%	90% 92%	83% 95%
Math – IEP/ Others	53% 87%	30% 90%	36% 100%	36% 90%	50% 97%	40% 94%
Writing			63%	66%	68%	NA
7th Grade						
Reading – All	68%	76%	76%	86%	77%	77%
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	58% 77%	68% 81%	61% 85%	72% 94%	70% 83%	74% 81%
Reading – IEP/ Others	25% 80%	53% 81%	29% 84%	55% 91%	10% 87%	25% 89%
Math – All	76%	81%	79%	89%	82%	88%
Math – Low Inc/ Others	63% 88%	74% 85%	61% 91%	80% 94%	73% 90%	87% 89%
Math – IEP/ Others	20% 92%	47% 89%	29% 89%	36% 98%	20% 91%	42% 95%
Science – All	81%	91%	85%	89%	81%	86%
Science – Low Inc/ Others	70% 92%	87% 94%	79% 89%	88% 90%	76% 85%	87% 89%
Science – IEP/ Others	50% 90%	73% 95%	43% 93%	55% 94%	20% 90%	67% 92%
8th Grade						
Reading – All	75%	74%	83%	84%	82%	82%
Reading – Low Inc/ Others	81% 70%	58% 89%	65% 90%	78% 89%	71% 89%	79% 85%
Reading – IEP/ Others	50% 83%	32% 86%	36% 91%	60% 89%	40% 88%	36% 90%
Math – All	65%	65%	75%	81%	82%	76%
Math – Low Inc/ Others	61% 88%	51% 78%	63% 81%	69% 89%	71% 89%	68% 85%
Math – IEP/ Others	20% 79%	11% 80%	42% 81%	33% 91%	20% 91%	18% 85%
Writing		61%	67%	60%	71%	NA

Table 3	West Central 2006	West Central 2007	West Central 2008	West Central 2009	West Central 2010	West Central 2011
11th Grade – PSAE						
Reading	52%	46%	56%	38%	51%	50.7%
Reading – Low Inc Others	29% 58%	19% 62%	43% 64%	36% 40%	33%	36.8%
Reading – IEP/ Others	8% 62%	7% 54%	10% 66%	8% 45%	0%	0%
Math	36%	31%	37%	24%	36%	45.2%
Math – Low Inc/ Others	7% 43%	10% 43%	24% 44%	16% 30%	13%	31.6%
Math – IEP/ Others	8% 42%	0% 37%	0% 45%	0% 29%	0%	0%
Science	42%	45%	47%	35%	45%	42.5%
Science – Low Inc Others	27% 45%	23% 59%	38% 53%	29% 40%	30%	36.8%
Science – IEP/ Others	8% 49%	0% 54%	10% 55%	0% 43%	0%	0%
Writing		54%	54%	44%	53%	
ACT Summary						
Composite	17.9	18.4	18.9	17.7	19.0	20.2
English	17.1	18.5	18.6	17.0	18.7	19.9
Math	17.5	17.3	17.7	16.9	18.6	19.3
Reading	18.0	18.5	19.3	18.2	19.1	20.7
Science Reasoning	18.5	18.8	19.0	18.0	19.0	20.1
Percent Tested on ACT	100%	100%	100%	98.6%	97.4%	100%
Number Tested	67	84	57	72	78	66

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

- The percentage of IEP students who met or exceeded reading standards increased from 14% in 5th grade in 2008 to 36% in 6th grade in 2009.
- The percentage of students who met or exceeded standards in math decreased from 92% in 5th grade in 2008 to 81% in 6th grade in 2009.
- The percentage of low income students who met or exceeded for the 2009 6th grade decreased 18 percentage points in math from the 2008 5th grade.
- The percentage of IEP students who met or exceeded math standards decreased 25 points for 2009 6th grade when compared to 2008 5th grade test results.
- The percentage of students who met or exceeded writing standards increased 23 percentage points for 6th graders in 2009 as compared to 5th graders in 2008.
- The percentage of students who met or exceeded reading standards remained the same for the 2009 6th graders from 2008 5th graders.
- The percentage of students who met or exceeded reading standards decreased in all subgroups for 2009 7th graders as compared to 2008 6th grade results.
- The percentage of students who met or exceeded standards in math remained consistent for the 2009 7th grade when compared to the 2008 6th grade results.
- The percentage of IEP students meeting or exceeding standards in science decreased from 75% as 2008 6th graders to 55% as 7th graders in 2009.
- The percentage of students meeting or exceeding in math and reading for the 2009 8th grade increased over the 2008 7th grade scores in every subgroup.
- 2008 low income 7th graders scored at 72% as 6th graders they were at 93% and as 5th graders they were at 50%.
- Eighth grade students increased both math and reading scores over the past three years.
- Seventh grade students have increased reading scores over the past three years.

Table 4a School ISAT Special Education Subgroup Results

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
AYP Goal	47.5%	55%	62.5%	70%	77.5%	85%
6 th Grade Reading	40%	20%	82%	36%	20%	40%
6 th Grade Math	53.3%	30%	36%	36%	50%	40%
6 th Grade Writing	NA	NA	NA	15.4%	68%	NA
7 th Grade Science	50%	73%	43%	55%	20%	67%
7 th Grade Reading	25%	53%	29%	55%	10%	25%
7 th Grade Math	20%	47%	29%	36%	20%	42%
8 th Grade Reading	50%	32%	36%	60%	40%	36%
8 th Grade Math	20.%	11%	42%	33%	20%	18%
8 th Grade Writing	NA	NA	NA	26.7%	71%	NA

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.

Observations (Table 4a)

2010-2011

- Over 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.
- The percentage of IEP students meeting or exceeding in 5th grade math has decreased each of 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 each year since 2008 in math. (From 42% on the 2008 math test to 18% on the 2011 test.)
- 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; this is a 47 percentage point increase from the 2010 7th grade IEP results.
- 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.

2008-2009 (Table 4a)

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

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

Table 4aa 2010-2011 ISAT Special Education Subgroup Growth Chart

8 th Grade	Math	Rdg.	7 th Grade	Math	Rdg.	6 th Grade	Math	Rdg.
Student			Student			Student		
1	+22	+40	1	- 2	+ 6	1	-20	- 17
2	+21	+17	2	- 9	+14	2	-23	+23
3	+17	+23	3	+19	+10	3	-31	- 25
4	+19	+ 2	4	+10	+16	4	- 5	+ 1
5	+17	+31	5	- 9	- 34	5	+11	+10
6	+24	+ 5	6	+10	- 28			
7	+14	- 21	7	+14	+10			
8	+ 7	+18	8	+19	- 7			
9	+27	+19	9	+30	+18			
10	- 6	+14						
11	+26	+19						
12	+ 7	+28						
13	+14	+ 5						

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.

2010-2011 Observations (Table 4aa)

8th Grade

- 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).
- 92% of current freshmen with an IEP who were tested on the 2011 ISAT showed growth in math and reading (12 out of 13).
- 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.

Table 4aa 2009-2010 ISAT Special Education Subgroup Growth Chart (Individual Student results from the Spring 2011 ISAT as compared to individual student scores for the 2010 ISAT)

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

* = Indicates no change in score

Observations (Table 4aa)

2009-2010

8th Grade

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

7th Grade

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

6th Grade

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

Overall

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

Table 4b ISAT Low Income Subgroup (percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards)

	Rdg 06/07	Rdg. 07/08	Rdg 08/09	Rdg 09/10	Rdg 10/11	Math 06/07	Math 07/08	Math 08/09	Math 09/10	Math 10/11	Sci 06/07	Sci 07/08	Sci 08/09	Sci 09/10	Sci 10/11
6th	61%	93%	79%	72%	86%	68%	82%	76%	90%	83%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
7th	68%	61%	72%	70%	74%	74%	61%	80%	73%	87%	87%	79%	88%	76%	87%
8th	58%	65%	78%	71%	79%	51%	63%	69%	71%	68%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note: The percentage of students, in the middle school, designated as low income increased from 35.9% in 2007-2008 to 43% in 2008-2009. In 2009-2010, 46.3% of students were low income. In 2010-2011 47.1% of students were low income. In 2011-2012, 45% of students were low income.

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.

2008-2009 (Table 4b)

- The percentage of the 6th grade low income subgroup met AYP reading (79%) and math (76%).
- The 7th grade low income subgroup met AYP in reading (72%) and in math (80%).
- The 8th grade low income subgroup met AYP in reading (78%).
- The percentage of the 6th grade low income subgroup who met AYP decreased in both reading (14%) and in math (6%) from the previous year.
- 7th grade low income subgroup met AYP in reading 72%, math 80% and in science 88%.
- The percentage of the 7th grade low income subgroup **meeting** AYP increased in reading (11%), math (19%) and in science (9%) from the previous year.
- The percentage of the 8th grade low income subgroup met AYP in reading 78%.
- The percentage of the 8th grade low income subgroup meeting AYP in math was 69%.
- 8th grade low income subgroup meeting AYP in reading increasing 13%) and math 6%.

Table 4c

ISAT Gender (Male) Subgroup Score

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS DATA

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

	2007 WC Male	2007 State Male		2008 WC Male	2008 State Male		2009 WC Male	2009 State Male		2010 WC Male	2010 State Male		2011 WC Male	2011 State Male
3rd Grade														
Reading	54.8%	69%		38%	68%		61%	69%		78%	74%		71.5%	71.6%
Math	90.3%	77%		84%	85%		83%	85%		88%	86%		100%	86.8%
4th Grade														
Reading	68.2%	71%		55%	70%		82%	70%		95%	86%		86.1%	71.2%
Math	90.1%	86%		97%	84%		95%	85%		93%	86%		100%	86.9%
Science	82.2%	80%		90%	76%		92%	77%		82%	77%		97.1%	79.2%
5th Grade														
Reading	69.4%	66%		55%	70%		57%	70%		81%	71%		67.6%	73.9%
Math	81.1%	81%		82%	80%		93%	81%		86%	82%		89.2%	82.9%
6th Grade														
Reading	72.9%	70%		73%	76%		72%	77%		64%	78%		88.9%	80.6%
Math	77.1%	80%		79%	81%		76%	81%		93%	83%		88.9%	82.5%
7th grade														
Reading	73.8%	69%		58%	74%		79%	73%		69%	74%		63%	74.5%
Math	81.1%	78%		79%	79%		79%	81%		76%	83%		81.5%	82.2%
Science	90.5	79%		88%	79%		85%	79%		71%	82%		92.6%	80.9%
8th Grade														
Reading	70.5%	78%		73%	78%		87%	80%		74.4%	81%		79.2%	81.9%
Math	61.4%	80%		75%	79%		81%	81%		71%	82%		68.2%	84.4%
11th Grade														
Reading	37%	51%		47%	51%		31%	55%		49%	51%		49%	48%
Math	27%	56%		38%	56%		25%	54%		34%	55%		57%	54%
Science	42%	54%		50%	54%		31%	54%		49%	55%		54%	52%

Table 4c1

ISAT Gender (Female) Subgroup Scores

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS DATA

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

	2007 WC Female	2007 State Female		2008 WC Female	2008 State Female		2009 WC Female	2009 State Female		2010 WC Female	2010 State Female		2011 WC Female	2011 State Female
3rd Grade														
Reading	67.5%	86%		79%	76%		81%	76%		89%	77%		75.0%	98%
Math	82.5%	87%		79%	85%		81%	85%		97%	86%		89.3%	87.8%
4th Grade														
Reading	82.4%	77%		78%	77%		81%	77%		81%	77%		91.9%	78.4%
Math	91.2%	87%		93%	85%		95%	87%		91%	87%		100%	88.6%
Science	85.3	80%		85%	76%		89%	77%		81%	77%		86.5%	79.4%
5th Grade														
Reading	87.8%	74%		80%	77%		83%	77%		89%	79%		90%	79.6%
Math	98.%	84%		90%	82%		85%	84%		100%	84%		83.3%	85.1%
6th Grade														
Reading	76.9%	77%		93%	83%		87%	83%		85%	85%		94.2%	87.8%
Math	74.4%	83%		95%	85%		87%	84%		89%	86%		91.5%	85.5%
7th grade														
Reading	77.8%	78%		74%	82%		93%	82%		86%	82%		85.1%	83.4%
Math	81.%	81%		79%	82%		98%	85%		89%	86%		91.5%	86.5%
Science	92.%	80%		82%	79%		93%	80%		92%	82%		83%	83%
8th Grade														
Reading	77.3%	86%		81%	86%		79%	87%		88%	88%		88.2%	88.3%
Math	68.2%	83%		75%	82%		79%	83%		90%	86%		85.3%	88.2%
11th Grade														
Reading	56%	57%		68%	55%		46%	59%		59%	56%		53%	54%
Math	35%	50%		36%	51%		23%	49%		41%	51%		34%	49%
Science	49%	48%		44%	48%		40%	47%		44%	50%		32%	46%

2010-2011 Observations (Table 4c)

- 2010-2011 6th grade male math and reading scores were the same at 88.9%
- 2010-2011 7th grade reading scores for males were 22 points lower than for girls.
- 2010-2011 7th grade males scored nearly 10 points higher than girls in science.
- 2010-2011 6th, 7th, and 8th grade girls scored higher than males in every area except science.
- 2010-2011 6th, 7th, and 8th grade females scored higher than the state average in every area except 8th grade math.

2009-2010 (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.

2008-2009 (Table 4c)

- With the exception of 8th grade, West Central male reading percentages are lower than female reading percentages across grade levels.
- Eighth grade male reading scores increased dramatically from their previous year's test. From 58% meet or exceed to 87% meet or exceed.
- The seventh grade girls' percentage of meeting or exceeding in math continued to be higher than the boys.
- The current eighth grade boys' and girls' math percentage of meeting or exceeding remained about the same.
- 7th and 8th grade math scores remain consistent.
- The 2009 8th grade and 11th grade female scores have been below the state average for the past four years with one exception, reading 2008.
- 4th grade and 5th grade scores for girls have exceeded the state average in every tested area for the past 4 years.
- 6th grade girls have exceeded the state average in reading 3 out of the last four years
- 6th grade girls have exceeded the state average in math 2 yrs, equaled the state average once and been below the average 1 year.
- 7th grade girls have exceeded the state average in science 3 out of 4 years.
- 8th grade girls have scored lower than the state average for the past 4 years in reading and math.
- 4th grade boys have exceeded state averages in math and science each of the last 4 years.
- 4th grade boys have exceeded state averages in reading in 2006 and 2009 and were below the state average in 2007 and 2008.
- 5th grade boys math scores exceeded the state average 3 years and equaled it the 4th year.
- 6th grade boys math scores were below the state average the last 3 years.
- 7th grade boys reading scores exceeded the state average each year except 2008.
- 7th grade boys math scores exceeded the state average in 2007, equaled the state average in 2008, and were below the state average in 2006 and 2009.
- The 8th grade male scores have been below or equal to the state average in every category except reading in 2009.
- The 11th grade male scores have been below the state average in every area for the past 4 years.
- 11th grade score showed a substantial decline in both math and reading when compared to their 8th grade ISAT scores.
- PSAE 11th grade scores for females had a greater decline than males in math and reading when compared to their 8th grade ISAT scores.
- 2009 6th, 7th and 11th grade girls outscored males on ISAT in all areas with the exception of 11th grade math.
- 2009 reading and math scores on the 11th grade PSAE dropped substantially from the same students' 8th grade ISAT scores.

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

SY	Language Arts					Literature					Math					Science					Social Studies				
	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	10 11	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	10 11	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	10 11	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	10 11	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	10 11
Class	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
2018					100					100					99					100					99
2017				100	97				100	100				100	100				100	100				100	99
2016			99	99	96			99	100	97			99	99	97			100	100	99			93	99	99
2015		85	95	97	99		89	100	100	100		93	100	98		83	100	100	91		87	100	99	99	
2014	96	97	92	97		93	99	97	99		93	84	93	99		99	99	98	99		98	99	99	100	

*Based on Grade Level

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.

2008-2009 Observations (Table 4d-1)

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

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						
	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	10 11	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	10 11	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	10 11	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	10 11	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	10 11		
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		
2018					100					100					99					100					99		
2017				100	97				100	100					99	100					100	100				100	99
2016			100	99	97			97	100	97			100	99	97			100	99	99			97	99	99		
2015		98	98	97	99		95	96	97	100		93	98	100	98		100	100	100	91		100	89	99	99		
2014	97	100	91	99		100	100	100	99		100	100	100	99		100	100	100	99		100	97	100	99			
2013	98	82	96			94	88	96			100	90	90			96	80	98			96	86	98				

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

SY	Language Arts Female					Literature Female					Math Female					Science Female					Social Studies Female						
	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	10 11	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	10 11	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	10 11	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	10 11	06 07	07 08	08 09	09 10	10 11		
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		
2018					100					100					100					100					100		
2017				100	100				100	100					99	100					100	100				100	100
2016			100	100	100			100	100	99			100	100	100			100	100	100			97	100	100		
2015		100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100		100	97	100	100		
2014	100	100	100	99		100	98	100	100		100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100			
2013	100	92	100			97	92	97			100	97	97			97	86	97			100	86	100				

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.

2008-2009 Observations Tables 4d-2 & 4d-3

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

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

	Target	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Subject		Fall	Fall	Fall	Fall	Fall	Spring	Spring	Spring	Spring	Spring
English	13	13.9	14.5	15.0	13.7	13.3	16.0	16.1	16.5	14.6	
Math	17	15.3	15.3	16.3	14.8	14.6	16.8	16.8	17.1	15.5	
Reading	15	14.8	15.1	15.8	14.4	14.3	16.9	16.3	17.2	15.4	
Science	20	16.9	16.6	16.7	16.1	15.9	18.0	18.0	17.6	16.9	
Composite	15	15.3	15.5	16.0	14.9	14.6	17.1	17.0	17.2	15.7	

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

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

Four year trend (Table 4e)

- Over the past 4 years spring EXPLORE test scores have exceeded the target in English, reading, and composite.
- Over the past 4 years spring EXPLORE test scores have not met target scores in math and science.
- 2011-2012 fall EXPLORE scores in all areas are the lowest in a 5 year period.
- Over the past 4 years, spring EXPLORE composite scores have increased over fall scores.

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)**

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 points, reading 1.0 points, 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.

2010-2011 (Fall) (Table 4e)

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

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 points, reading 1.4 points, science 0.9 and composite 1.2 points.
- For the past four years scores in all areas of the EXPLORE test have increased from fall to spring testing.
- 8th grade students met in all areas except science on the spring assessment.
- 8th grade students surpassed the target score by the greatest margin in English.
- 8th grade students achieved higher scores than all previous classes in all areas except science.
- Science was the highest score in the fall 2009 testing.

2008-2009 (Table 4e)

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

Table 4f

EXPLORE Test Results by Subject and Gender

	Target	NA		Local		Local		Local		Local		Local	
		NA		2007-2008 Fall		2008-2009 Fall		2009-2010 Fall		2010-2011 Fall		2011-2012 Fall	
				Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem
Eng	13			13.5	14.3	14.3	14.8	13.6	16.1	12.6	15.0	12.0	14.1
Math	17			15.8	14.8	15.9	14.6	16.1	16.4	14.6	15.1	14.0	15.0
Rdg	15			14.9	14.6	15.1	15.0	14.8	16.5	13.4	15.6	12.5	15.3
Sci	20			16.9	16.9	16.5	16.7	15.9	17.3	15.6	16.8	15.0	16.3
Comp	15			15.4	15.3	15.7	15.4	15.1	16.7	14.1	15.8	13.5	15.2
	Target	Local		Local		Local		Local		Local		Local	
		2006-2007 Spring		2007-2008 Spring		2008-2009 Spring		2009-2010 Spring		2010-2011 Spring		2011-2012 Spring	
		Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem
Eng	13	13.8	15.1	15.2	16.7	16.1	16.2	14.9	17.0	13.6	15.9		
Math	17	14.7	16.0	16.8	16.9	17.2	16.3	16.0	17.5	15.3	15.9		
Rdg	15	14.1	15.0	17.2	16.7	16.2	16.5	15.3	17.8	14.2	16.8		
Sci	20	16.3	17.0	18.2	17.8	18.0	18.1	16.6	17.9	16.3	17.6		
Comp	15	14.8	16.0	17.1	17.1	17.0	16.9	15.9	17.6	15.0	16.7		

Observations

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Table 4g EXPLORE Test: Special Education Subgroup

Explore Test Results by Subject	Target Score		Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011		Spring 2007	Spring 2008	Spring 2009	Spring 2010	Spring 2011
			2008	2009	2010	2011	2012		2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
English	13		10.3	10.52	9.6	10.5	9.1		11.18	11.40	10	9.3	
Math	17		10.3	8.88	6.3	10.1	11.2		13.45	10.66	9.9	11.1	
Reading	15		11.1	10.5	10.4	11.5	10.3		11.81	11.58	11.9	11.0	
Science	20		11.8	12.71	10.7	12.6	13.7		14.9	13.80	13.3	13.4	
Composite	15		11.0	10.86	9.4	11.4	11.3		13.0	12.0	11.5	11.3	

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

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.

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.

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.

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 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.

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

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

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

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

Table 4h

Reading Fluency

	2007-2008			2008-2009			2009-2010			2010-2011			2011-2012		
	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	
# met							12	6	3	10	9	8	10	10	
% met							16%	8%	4%	14%	12%	11%	14%	14%	
7 th Grade Target	125	140	150	125	140	150	125	140	150	125	140	150	128	136	150
# tested				79	82	82	80	78	78	73	73	73	71	73	
# met				3	1	1	28	21	30	27	37	51	35	34	
% met				4%	1%	1%	35%	27%	38%	40%	51%	70%	49%	47%	
8 th Grade Target	130	140	150	130	140	150	130	140	150	130	140	150	133	146	151
# tested		76	76	73	75	74	78	77	76	76	76	79	76	78	
# met		3	12	33	41	38	47	47	45	33	33	45	33	38	
% met		4%	16%	45%	55%	51%	61%	61%	59%	43%	43%	57%	43%	49%	

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.

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

2007-2009 (Table 4h)

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

SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT

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

2.3 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Discipline Referrals by Type of Infraction

Table 5

	2006-2007			2007-2008			2008-2009			2009-2010			2010-2011		
	P	VA	PA	P	VA	PA	P	VA	PA	P	VA	PA	P	VA	PA
P=passive aggressive VA=verbal aggressive PA=physical aggressive															
Bus	1	7	11	20	16	21	28	14	17	12	14	18	1	11	14
Class room	83	74	34	121	37	59	88	52	14	49	70	33	1	24	19
Playground	0	0	2	1	0	5	1	3	2	3	1	6	0	0	6
Cafeteria	0	7	4	3	1	3	4	7	1	4	6	1	1	5	5
Hallway							4	4	16	4	3	9	3	6	6
Locker Room							1	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	5
Restroom							4	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0
Phone													15	0	0
Confirmed incidents of bullying	NA	NA	NA	0	6	15	6	8	1	0	8	2	0	0	0
Other/Non-aggressive/Disruptive	1	6	18	9	4	11	0	0	0	89	0	0	95	0	0
Tardies													42	0	0
Total infractions Per category	85	94	69	154	64	116	137	91	52	163	102	71	160	46	55
Total infractions Per year			248			334			280			336	261		

These numbers are totals for 6-8 grades. Passive aggressive is defined as a student who repeatedly refuses to do what is asked when asked. They resent responsibility, are intentionally inefficient and will do their work incorrectly to show their anger at being told what to do. Other can be defined as infractions such as cell phone use, minor language, etc.

2011-2012 OLWEUS Student Survey (may be viewed in MS office)

- 100% of 6th grade boys and girls feel accepted by at least one other student.
- 97% of 7th grade boys feel accepted by one other student.
- 94% of 7th grade girls feel accepted by at least one other student.
- 93% of 8th grade boys feel accepted by at least one other student.
- 98% of 8th grade girls feel accepted by at least one other student.
- 30% of 6th grade girls felt they had been threatened or forced to do things they did not want to do at least one time.
- 42% of 8th grade girls have been bullied with mean names, comments, or gestures with sexual meaning at least once.
- 25% of 6th grade girls were bullied by someone outside of their grade level.
- 26% of 8th grade girls being bullied said it had lasted for several years.
- 64% of eighth grade boys feel that adults try to stop it when a student is bullied.
- 81% of 8th grade girls feel that adults at school try to stop it when a student is bullied.
- 58% of 7th grade boys feel that adults at school try to stop it when a student is bullied.
- 71% of 7th grade girls feel that adults at school try to stop it when a student is bullied.
- 27% of 6th grade boys feel that adults at school try to stop it when a student is bullied.
- 29% of 6th grade girls feel that adults at school try to stop it when a student is bullied.
- Over all three grade levels on average 58% of middle school students believe other students try to stop it when a student is being bullied at school.

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

2008-2009 (Table 5)

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

Table 6 Discipline Referral Totals by Grade and Gender

	06-07 Males	07-08 Males	08-09 Males	09-10 Males	10-11 Males		06-07 Females	07-08 Females	08-09 Females	09-10 Females	10-11 Females
6 th	57	13	42	45	55		42	11	7	27	32
7 th	75	136	46	91	59		11	47	14	23	15
8 th	38	92	124	136	98		17	22	42	14	5

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

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)

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

2008-2009 (Table 6)

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

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

	WEST CENTRAL 2006-2007		WEST CENTRAL 2007-2008		WEST CENTRAL 2008-2009		WEST CENTRAL 2009-2010		WEST CENTRAL 2010-2011	
Total School Population	256	100%	242	100%	245	100%	233	100%	223	100%
Average Daily Attendance	243	95%	230	95%	233	95.2%	230	94.4%	211	94.8%
Truancy Rate	5	2.0	2	.9%	1	0.4%	3	0.9%	3	1.3%
Mobility Rate	20	7.8	20	8.5%	16	6.6%	7	3.1%	16	7.2%
Suspension Rate	6	2.0	8	3.4%	48	19.6%	41	17.4%		%
Expulsion Rate	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Low Income Rate	--	43.7%	--	42.6%	--	35.9%	--	47%	105	47.1%
Transfers/Withdrawal	12	4.7	16	7%	6	2.45%	7	3.1%	7	3.14%
Promotion Rate	255	99.6	235	99.6%	244	99.59%	233	100%	223	100%
Retention Rate	1	.4	1	.4%	1	0.4%	0	0%	0	0%
Gender	F - 121	M - 135	F - 113	M - 123	F - 117	M - 128	F-126	M-107	F-119	M-107
Caucasian	99%	99%	233	98.7%	236	96.4%	224	97.4%	212	95.1%
African-American	0	0	0	0	1	0.4%	1	0.4%	0	0%
Hispanic	1	.003%	2	.9%	5	2.0%	3	1.3%	6	2.7%
Other (American Indian)	1	.003%	0	0	0	0	0	0%	2	.9%
Multi	1	.003%	1	.4%	3	1.2%	2	.8%	3	1.3%

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%.

2008-2009 (Table 7)

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

Table 8 Attendance Record

SY	Overall average attend rate for year.	Non-IEP Students Attend Rate	IEP Students Attend Rate
2007 2008	94.4%	85.5%	78.5%
2008 2009	95.2%	85.0%	85.0%
2009 2010	94.4%	96.4%	92.4%
2010 2011	94.8%	95.0%	93.2%

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.

2008-2009 (Table 8)

- Overall Attendance rate rose slightly from 2008 to 2009.
- Students with IEPs attendance rate increased from 78.5% to 85%
- Non-IEP student attendance rose significantly from the previous two years.

Table 9 Enrollment Data (From Fall Housing Report)

	WEST CENTRAL 2006-07		WEST CENTRAL 2007-08		WEST CENTRAL 2008-09		WEST CENTRAL 2009-2010		WEST CENTRAL 2010-2011		WEST CENTRAL 2011-2012	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Population	256	100	243	100	246	100	233	100	223	100	221	100
Grade 6	88	35%	77	32%	82	34%	76	33%	71	32%	72	33%
Grade 7	77	30%	91	37%	75	30%	80	34%	75	34%	71	32%
Grade 8	91	35%	75	31%	88	36%	77	33%	77	34%	78	35%

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

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

2008-2009 (Table 9)

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

Table 10**Student IEP Subgroup Enrollment**

	2006-2007		2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total Building Population	256	100	243	100	246	100	233	100	223	100	221	100
Total Special Education*	60	23	41	17	38	15.4	36	15	30	13.5	26	11.8
Cognitive Disability	7	3.0	6	2.5	6	2.4	8	22	9	4	4	1.8
Hearing Impaired	0	0	2	.82	1	.4	1	1.7	0	0	0	0
Speech/Language Impairment	4	2.0	5	2.0	1	.4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Visual Impairment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emotionally Disturbed	5	2.0	2	2.0	2	.8	0	0	1	0.5	0	0
Orthopedic	0	0	1	.41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Health Impairment	10	4.0	7	.28	5	2	8	22	9	4	9	4
Specific Learning Disability (see LI)	34	13	20	8.0	23	9.3	17	47	10	4	9	4
Multiple Disabilities	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Deaf/Blindness	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Autism					1	.4	2	.05	1	0.5	1	0.45

*Students with IEPs; Numbers submitted by Special Education.

*Percentage based on total building population.

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

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

2008-2009 (Table 10)

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

Summary of Demographic

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

2.4 PROGRAM DATA

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

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Total Full Time Teachers	22	21	19	18	17	17
Total Part-time Teachers					5	5
Average Years Teaching for All Teachers in the Building	14.8	14.15	16	16.3	14.4	15.3
# Teachers New to Building	3	5	1	2	4	1
# First Year Teachers	2	4	1	1	3	1
% with B.A./B.S. Degree	86%	69.2%	79%	83%	76.5%	76.5%
% with M.A. & Above	14%	36.8%	20%	17%	23.5%	23.5%
# with Emergency/Provisional Cert.	0	0	0	0	0	0
# Teachers Working Out of Field	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Teacher Attendance	94.8%	95.5%	95%	96.9%	96%	NA
% Caucasian Teachers	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Male Teachers	14%	14%	12%	17%	23.5%	23.5%
% Female Teachers	86%	86%	83%	83%	76.5%	76.5%
% Highly qualified Teachers	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
# Total Paraprofessionals	4	5	5	3	3	4
# Total Counselors	.20	.20	.20	0	0	0
# Total Librarians	1	1	1	1	1	1
# Total Social Workers/Psychologists	.40	.40	.40	3 part-time	3 part-time	2 part-time
# Total Other Staff	10	10	9	8	12	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 part-time teachers, custodial, cooks and secretaries.

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

2008-2009 (Table 11)

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

Table 12a 2009 - 2010**Professional Growth Data**

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

Table 12b 2010 – 2011**Professional Growth Data**

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

Table 12c 2011 – 2012**Professional Growth Data**

TOPIC	MO./YEAR	GRADES	# PARTICIPANTS	SCHOOL-WIDE	FORMAT
Math Curriculum Alignment Workshop	August-2011	5-8 8-12	9 5	No	Interactive
SOCS Training for District website	August 2011 May 2012	K-12		Yes	Interactive
Co-Teaching in all Middle School classrooms	August 2011 May 2012	6-8	24	No	Interactive
Use of Differentiation Instructional Practices	August 2011 May 2012	6-8	24	No	Interactive
Improving curriculum & Instruction with District coaches	August 2011 May 2012	6-12	24	No	Interactive
SIP Team Leader Training	October 2011 January 2012	K-12	9	No	Interactive
District Book Study		K-12		Yes	Discussion
Smartboard Training	August 2011 May 2012	K-12		Yes	Interactive
Writing in the Content Areas	December 2011	6-8	24	No	Lecture
Extended Response & ISAT	February 2012	6-8	24	No	Lecture
Mobile Lab Trainings	May 2011 August 2011	6-8		No	Interactive
Common Core/Gap Analysis training	August 2011	6-8	24	No	
Curriculum Alignment to Common Core	February 2012	K-12	24	Yes	Interactive
Peer Observation Training	January 2012	6-8	24	No	Interactive
PBIS Training	September 2012	6-8	24	No	Interactive
Skyward Peer Share	August 2011 May 2012	6-8	24	No	Interactive
HOTS refresher training	August 2011	6-8	24	No	Interactive

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.

2009-2010 (Table 12c)

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

2008-2009 (Table 12 – Reference SIP plan 2009-2010)

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

Curriculum Implementation Data

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

The school is departmentalized in the following areas: fine arts (band, chorus, and art), language arts, literature, mathematics, physical education, science, social studies, and technology. Students are served by Administration, faculty, and 37 staff. Students are divided into academic teams for instruction in core areas. There are 23 certified teachers four of which are shared with other buildings. We have 1 library supervisor, 2 custodians, 3 kitchen staff, 2 secretaries, 3 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 two state of the art computer labs supervised by a certified teacher and a portable computer lab. The Title I teacher also has a portable computer lab for student use. 10 Smartboards 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 the academic standards being addressed.

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

To 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 primarily on persuasive and narrative essays. A new approach to writing, gained from Writers' Workshop, is implemented in sixth 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 Illinois State Standards. Teachers use both the Glencoe textbook and novel-based instruction. The main focuses are on vocabulary, literary elements, and comprehension skills. Students identified as needing help with reading are provided supplemental assistance through our Title I program. These students are provided specific instruction to address their individual needs and are taught strategies to help them improve their comprehension skills as well as fluency. Students identified for Title assistance receive an extra reading class during the school day.

Science

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

Math

Sixth grade math classes utilize the Mastering Math program. Seventh grade students take Pre-Algebra; 8th grade students take Algebra, and all math classes focus on spiraling math. The sixth and eighth graders also have one quarter of math enrichment. Math Wednesday, a program designed to incorporate math across the curriculum, is provided during homeroom. 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 school day.

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

2011-2012 (Through the first semester)

- 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.
- 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.

2008-2009

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

2007-2008

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

2005-2006

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

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

Table 13a After School Tutoring Program (All)

School Year	Avg. total student population	Total number of tutoring sessions	Total number of student participation	Percent of participation based on total student population
2007/08	247	68	21	8.5%
2008/09	247	24	25	10.0%
2009/10	233	113	134	57.5%
2010/11	223	167	147	65.9%

Table 13b After School tutoring Program Regular Education Students

School Year	Regular education student population	Total number of tutoring sessions attended by regular ed. Students	Total number of regular education students participation	Percent of regular ed. students participation based on total regular ed. population
2007/08	206	53	15	7.3%
2008/09	209	24	19	9.1%
2009/10	197	113	116	58.9%
2010/11	197	167	128	65%

Table 13c After School Tutoring Program Special Education Students

School Year	IEP student population	Total number of tutoring sessions attended by IEP students	Total number of students with IEP's participation	Percent of IEP student participation based on total IEP population
2007/08	41	15	6	14.6%
2008/09	38	15	6	15.8%
2009/10	36	113	18	50.0%
2010/11	26	167	19	73.1%

Table 13a, 13b, & 13c

2011-2012 (*Information not available until May 2012*)

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.

Table 13a, 13b, & 13c

2008-2009

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

2.5 PERCEPTION DATA

Student Survey

2010-2011 (203 students responded to the survey.)

How safe do students feel?

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

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

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

When a student has a problem.

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

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

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

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

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

Staff Survey

2010-2011 (35 staff members responded to the survey)

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

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

	4%	32%	46%	18%
--	----	-----	-----	-----
- Staff responses to having the opportunity to communicate with others on a regular basis:

83%-with team members, 80% with general staff, 63% between teams, 77% departmentally, 91% with parents and 97% with administration.

Parent Survey

2010-2011 (121 parents responded to the survey)

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

Perception Data Summaries

Summary 2010-2011

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

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

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

III. Problem Statements and Hypotheses

Table 14 (2010-2011)

Patterns of Strengths	Data
Our Middle School ISAT scores for girls have met or exceeded average state scores in both reading and math for the past four years with the exception of 2010 when they were equal in reading.	Table 4c
Four out of five years 7 th grade girls ISAT scores in science have exceeded the state average and equaled the state average the fifth year.	Table 4c
The last three years the 7 th grade girls' ISAT math scores have exceeded the state average.	Table 4c
Three out of the 1st four years the 7 th grade boys' science scores have exceeded the state average.	Table 4c
Overall, female students achieved at a higher rate than state average in every area but one.	Table 3
Push in special education students have increased in academic achievement.	State Tests
Attendance has increased three of the past four years and remained the same the other year.	Table 8
21 st Century after school opportunities continue.	Sign-in sheets
After implementing a fluency program scores increased.	Pre and post assessments
Overall, 8 th grade extended response scores improved from 09-10 to 10-11	ISAT
The availability of technology has increased for middle school students and staff.	Technology inventory
Confirmed incidents of bullying continue to decline for the 2 nd consecutive year.	Table 5
Labs were provided in core subjects to provide support during school hours for identified students lacking skills in some areas.	Team meeting minutes
Staff continue to implement methods to improve school environment (i.e. PBIS and Check & Connect)	Meeting minutes
Staff continue to implement inter-disciplinary units.	Team meeting minutes
Staff continue to involve the community in the learning environment	Veteran's Day Program; Immigration Unit
There are a wide variety of opportunities offered outside of the school day.	Schedules, Sign-in sheets, announcements
The methods of communicating with Parents/Guardians continue to increase.	Skyward
Evidence shows that an increased number of students are receiving Title I services. Evidence further shows growth in reading when analyzing various assessments.	Assessment results

Patterns of Challenges	Data
Based on the 2010-2011 ISAT, Math scores continue to be the lowest area of achievement.	Table 3
Four out of five years 8 th grade math scores on ISAT were lower than state average for females.	Table 4c
Four out of five 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
The percentage of students meeting on local assessments does not correspond with ISAT and other standardized assessments.	End of year grades and ISAT data
Student enrollment continues to drop.	End of Year Report
The overall student average attendance rate for 2010-2011, was 94.8%. This low of a percentage remains a challenge.	Table 8
Discipline issues, including acts of bullying, are a concern.	OLWEUS Student Survey
Poverty rates continue to increase.	End of Year Report
8 th grade did not meet state standards in math.	Table 3
7 th grade did not meet state standards in reading	Table 3

Table 14 (2009-2010)

Patterns of Strengths	Data
Over 80% of students at all three grade levels met or exceeded on the Math portion of 2010 ISAT.	Table 3
Over 76% of students at all three grade levels met or exceeded in Reading on the 2010 ISAT.	Table 4d
91% of current 7 th grade students met or exceeded on the 2010 ISAT	Table 3
Math tutoring is offered after school five nights a week.	21 st Century Records
Math Wednesday has been revamped to mirror ISAT content.	Curriculum Implementation
76% of our current 7 th grade, over 70% of our low income, and 77% of our current 8 th grade students met or exceeded on 2010 ISAT in Reading.	Table 3
Bus referrals for 2009-2010 decreased from the previous year by 15 referrals.	Table 5
Confirmed incidents of bullying went down by 5 from the previous year.	Table 5
The availability of technology has increased for middle school students and staff.	Technology inventory
Core subjects provide support labs during school hours for identified students lacking skills.	Pre and post assessments

Patterns of Challenges	Data
Based on ISAT, students achieved at a lower rate in math than in reading.	ISAT Item Analysis
On the 2010 ISAT Math Measurement scores were 68% for 6 th grade, 53% for 7 th grade, and 50% for 8 th grade.	ISAT Item Analysis
In the explanation portion of Math Extended Response on the 2010 ISAT, 24% of 6 th grade, 20% of 7 th graders and 17% of 8 th grade scored a two on a scale of possible four.	ISAT Item Analysis
Our IEP population continues to not meet or exceed in math. Of the IEP population 50% of 6 th graders, 20% of 7 th graders and 20% of current 8 th graders didn't or meet state math standards.	Table 3
The scores of our low income students continue to be a concern. Of our low income population 72% of 6 th graders, 70% of 7 th graders and 71% of 8 th graders met or exceeded in Reading.	Table 3
Our IEP population continues to not meet or exceed in reading; 20% of 6 th graders, 10% of 7 th graders and 80% of 8 th graders did not or meet or exceed state reading standards	Table 3
Males scored lower than females in reading on the 2010 ISAT.	Table 4c
Total number of discipline infractions in 2009-2010 increased by 8% from the previous year.	Table 5
122 parents out of 223 students participated in the school improvement survey.	Parent Survey
The percentage of students meeting on local assessments does not correspond with ISAT and other standardized assessments.	End of year grades and ISAT data

Table 15 Problem Statements, Hypotheses, and Data Source

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

Problem Statement 1 (Math) (2011 AYP is 85%)				
Historically, math scores have been an area of concern. The 2011 ISAT scores evidence the continuation of this trend. Within our non-IEP population, 13% of our current 6th graders, 6% of our current 7 th graders and 5% current of 8 th graders did not meet or exceed state math standards. In our IEP population, 14% of our current 6th graders, 60% of current 7 th graders, and 58% of the current 8 th graders did not meet or exceed state math standards.				
Hypothesis	Accept/Reject	Data Source 1	Data Source 2	Data Source 3
Many non-IEP students did not attend after-school math tutoring.	Accept	After school math tutoring attendance sheets	Student grades	Test Results: ISAT, Explore and Learnia
No Title I math program available.	Accept	Title I schedule	Students' Individual Educational Plans	Classroom schedule
Many IEP students did not attend after-school math tutoring.	Accept	After school tutoring attendance sheet	Students' grades	Record of individual missing assignments
A high percentage of IEP students lack reading skills which affects written response in math.	Accept	Reading test results	Students' grades	Test results: ISAT Explore test Learnia test
The math exploratory curriculum does not specifically address areas of deficiencies.	Accept	Curriculum Guide	ISAT Scores	Student Grades

Problem Statement 2 (Reading)

Historically, reading scores have been an area of concern. The 2011 ISAT scores evidence the continuation of this trend. 2010-2011 ISAT scores show that within our non-IEP population, 21 % of 6th graders, 5% of 7th graders and 11% of 8th graders did not meet or exceed state reading standards. In our IEP population, 43% of 6th graders, 60% of 7th graders and 75% of 8th graders did not meet or exceed state reading standards

Hypothesis	Accept/Reject	Data Source 1	Data Source 2	Data Source 3
Opportunities for students to improve nonfiction/technical reading skills are not provided.	Accept	Curriculum	ISAT scores	Library Listings
There is no clear team identified daily goal in SSR.	Accept	Team meeting minutes	Walk-a-bouts	Teacher meeting discussions and noted in meeting minutes
Multiple teachers teach 7 th grade literature creating a variation in instructional emphasis.	Accept	Master Schedule	Lesson Plans	Evaluation tools
Prior to spring of 2011 there was a lack of a consistent approach in teaching writing extended responses across grades.	Accept	Departmental meeting discussions	Teacher Curriculum / Staff Discussions	Observations
Many IEP students lack reading skills and strategies.	Accept	Fluency Test results	Teacher observations/assessments	Test results: ISAT Explore test

Problem Statement 3 (Anti-bullying)

Behavior inappropriate for a school setting continues to be a concern according to 2010-2011 Skyward records.

Hypothesis	Accept/ Reject	Data Source 1	Data Source 2	Data Source 3
Students believe their reported concerns are not addressed.	Accept	Student surveys	Homeroom discussions	Self Reporting
Students do not utilize skills to deal with bullies.	Accept	Student OLWEUS Surveys	Class discussion	Conferences with administrators/social worker
Teachers lack a strong foundation in appropriate techniques for dealing with bullying situations.	Accept	Surveys	Teacher discussion	Lack of recent professional development opportunities scheduled
Staff has not been sufficiently trained in PBIS.	Accept	Team meetings	PD schedule	Number of referrals
Staff is not consistently recognizing and rewarding appropriate behavior.	Accept	Referrals	Walk-a-bouts	There is a small number of redeemed incentives
There is inadequate time and specialized personnel for small group instruction of social skills.	Accept	Master schedule	Referrals	Surveys

Problem Statement 4 (Staff Professional Development)

Over the next 3-5 years staff will need to be provided professional development opportunities in several areas to ensure compliance with Common Core Standards, Career Readiness Standards RTI, and Best Teaching Practices.

Hypothesis	Accept/ Reject	Data Source 1	Data Source 2	Data Source 3
Teachers lack experience in developing and using computerized classroom assessments.	Accept	Number of computers available for use at one time.	Team discussions	Building SIP discussions
Teachers lack experience using the MAP test for assessment.	Accept	Team discussions	Building SIP discussions	Conferences with administrators
Adequate time is not provided for teachers to meet and work on vertical and horizontal alignment of the new curriculum.	Accept	Team discussion	Building SIP discussions	Lack of recent professional development opportunities scheduled
There is not enough time scheduled weekly for the school psychologist to meet with RTI teams.	Accept	Team discussion	Referrals	
Teachers are not trained in developing student driven lessons.	Accept	Team discussion	SIP discussions	Lack of recent professional development opportunities scheduled

IV. Goals, Strategies, and Integrated Action Plan

Table 16 Strategies, Baseline Data, Annual Targets and Documentation

<p>Improvement Goal 1a (Math) The percentage of all students, including those with disabilities, meeting and exceeding standards on the 2012 ISAT math test will increase to the AYP rate of 92.5% or Safe Harbor.</p>				
<p>Current Conditions and Data Sources 2011 ISAT scores show that within our non-IEP population, 13% of our current 6th graders, 6% of our current 7th graders, and 5% of our current 8th graders did not meet or exceed state math standards. In our IEP population, 14% of our current 6th graders, 60% of current 7th graders, and 58% of the current 8th graders did not meet or exceed state math standards.</p>				
<p>Specific Action 1 We will incorporate the use of higher order thinking skills in all content areas.</p>				
Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Continue to monitor teachers' implementation of higher order thinking skills in lessons.	August 2012 – May 2013	Administrator/ Principal	Purchase or print wall posters for each classroom. \$100 – Title I	Use checklist to monitor implementation. Quarterly report to staff on skills observed, and discussion with teachers who were not identified as using them. Random submission of questions used within a specific lesson.
Continue the use of set quarterly differentiated strategies, i.e. CRISS.	August 2012 – May 2013	All teachers	None	Literacy checklist, walk-abouts, lesson plans. Students use of strategies will be observable in work completion and notes.
Continue peer to peer observations to provide teachers an opportunity to observe lessons with higher order thinking skills used.	August 2012	Administrator/ Principal/Curriculum Coordinator	Building Professional Development fund \$500 – Potential Sub Costs	Post observation analysis and feedback form and sign up sheet.
Continue assessment of higher order thinking skills on exit outcome quizzes.	By end of each quarter	Math department	None	Exit outcome results.
Teachers will provide evidence of using higher order questions.	Daily	Teachers, Administration	None	Random sampling of lesson plans or documented questions.

Improvement Goal 1b (Math)

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

Current Conditions and Data Sources

2011 ISAT scores show that within our non-IEP population, 13% of our current 6th graders, 6% of our current 7th graders, and 5% of our current 8th graders did not meet or exceed state math standards. In our IEP population, 14% of our current 6th graders, 60% of current 7th graders, and 58% of the current 8th graders did not meet or exceed state math standards.

Specific Action 2

We will continue to use differentiated instruction in all classes to address the varied needs of the students.

Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
We will continue our fourth year of the spiraling math curriculum with Scan Tron used for data analysis.	August 2012 May 2013	Math Department	Building Funds \$800.00 materials	Lesson plans/Student Evaluations
Continue to analyze ISAT math deficiencies and specifically address them through Math Wednesday and curriculum.	Begin September 2012	Math Department	\$300 Stipends (Math Dept. Summer Meetings)	Document outline of Math Wednesday and curriculum revisions
Continue to meet yearly with all students to review previous year's test and contact parents to encourage use of after school tutoring emphasizing math as needed.	August 2012	SIP Team Administration Math Teachers	\$1800 Tutoring (21 st Century)	List of weaknesses
Increase the use of student technology through the purchase of remote system. "Clickers"	August 2012	Technology Coordinator	\$1000x3 (One set per grade level)	Observation of classroom use through walk-about and observations.
Analyze assessment results to identify students who did not meet standards in math and determine appropriate intervention placement.	August 2012 May 2013	Math Department	0	Pre and post assessments
Math lab offered one day a week in all 3 grade levels during study hall for identified students.	August 2012 May 2013	Math Department	0	Attendance sheet Workshop Evaluation
Explore possibility of implementing Title I Math Program.	May 2012	Math Department and District Math Consultant	0	Report Submitted
Continue differentiated instruction to address individual learning styles and needs.	August.2012 May 2013	Math and Special Ed Teachers	0	Lesson plans & administrative walk- abouts

Monitor student use of technology in all classrooms.	August 2012	Administration	None	Walk-about checklist
Increase the use of manipulatives by math teachers to address differentiation.	August 2012	Administration	None	Lesson plans & administrative walk-about
Provide students observable opportunities to practice writing extended responses throughout the year.	August– May 2012-2013	Math Teachers	0	Administrative walk-about checklist
Attend available conferences to address specific needs as indicated on state assessments pending available funding.	2012-2013	Administration	\$500 Title 1	Strategies learned will be implemented by the math department.
Use Iowa Algebra Aptitude Test to determine future placement for high school and monitor progress.	Spring 2012	Math Department	\$200 – Title I Scan Tron cards	Student placement
Explore standardized assessment instrument to evaluate and monitor student growth.	Spring 2012	Administration and Consultants	0	An assessment will be selected
Provide support for those teachers continuing to pursue National Board Teacher Certification	Aug 2012- May 2013	Administration	As per board agreement	Staff communication

Improvement Goal 1c (Math)

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

Current Conditions and Data Sources

2011 ISAT scores show that within our non-IEP population, 13% of our current 6th graders, 6% of our current 7th graders, and 5% of our current 8th graders did not meet or exceed state math standards. In our IEP population, 14% of our current 6th graders, 60% of current 7th graders, and 58% of the current 8th graders did not meet or exceed state math standards.

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

Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Publish one math article per grade level in school newspaper and website.	August 2012- May 2013	Math Teachers	0	Finished product
Plan details, determine activities and acquire needed materials for the Showcase Night and offer activities.	September 2012	All participating departments and administration.	\$500 Title I	The receipts for expenditures will be filed. Exit Survey
Review individual standardized scores with parents and students.	Fall 2012	Homeroom Teachers	0	Parent contact logs
Plan and offer ISAT Math night to provide parents and students strategies for success on ISAT.	Winter 2012	Math Department	\$250 Title I	The receipts for expenditures will be filed. Exit Survey

Improvement Goal 2a (Reading)

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

Current Conditions and Data Sources

The 2011 ISAT scores evidence the continuation of this trend. 2010-2011 ISAT scores show that within our non-IEP population, 21 % of 6th graders, 5% of 7th graders, and 11% of 8th graders did not meet or exceed state reading standards. In our IEP population, 43% of 6th graders, 60% of 7th graders, and 75% of 8th graders did not meet or exceed state reading standards.

Specific Action 1

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

Specific Steps in	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Explore different strategies to incorporate fluency such as 6 Min Fluency, Modeling Good Oral Reading, Reader's Theater, Informal Oral Reading, Paired Reading, Radio Reading.	August 2012	Title I / Lit. Teachers	0	Fluency testing 3 times per year.
Continue the use of set quarterly differentiated instruction i.e. CRISS strategies.	August 2012 –May 2013	All teachers	0	Literacy checklist/walk-about, lesson plans. Students use of strategies in work completion/notes.
Use strategies such as Writing in the Content Areas to practice extended responses for ISAT.	August 2012-May 2013	All teachers	0	Teachers will document and share during weekly meetings and SIP time.
Identify students who did not meet standards in reading and determine appropriate intervention placement.	August 2012	Title I & Lit teachers – ISAT scores	0	Listing of identified students
Place IEP students in Resource Room during 5 th Hour for extra reading instruction.	August 2012	Special Ed Dept.	0	IEP student assessments
Continue Lexia and Reading Plus in Title I program.	Sept 2012	Title I	0	Title I assessments
Adjust master schedule to allow for one 7 th grade literature teacher if possible.	April 2012	Building principal	0	Master schedule
Offer student book clubs.	October 2012-April 2013	Lit teachers	21 st Century stipend for facilitator	Participation records

Continue use of Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS)	August 2012-May 2013	All teachers	0	Random sampling of lesson plans or documented questions.
Continue to purchase technology to increase student interest and provide for differentiated instruction.	August 2011	Administration / Technology Coordinator	Dependent on current prices from district technology budget	Purchase and installation
Increase reading materials for regular education and Title I.	August 2012	Title I	Title I \$2000	Materials received

Improvement Goal 2b (Reading)

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

Current Conditions and Data Sources

The 2011 ISAT scores evidence the continuation of this trend. 2010-2011 ISAT scores show that within our non-IEP population, 21 % of 6th graders, 5% of 7th graders, and 11% of 8th graders did not meet or exceed state reading standards. In our IEP population, 43% of 6th graders, 60% of 7th graders, and 75% of 8th graders did not meet or exceed state reading standards

Specific Action 2

We will increase teacher knowledge and skills in providing reading instruction across the curriculum for all students.

Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Incorporate extended response strategies in content areas.	April-May 2012	Literature Department	Combined with ½ day subs above 3 subs x \$80	Copy of plan created including timelines for implementation
Provide support for those teachers continuing to pursue National Board Teacher Certification	Aug 2011-May 2012	Administration	As per board agreement	Staff communication
Provide refresher training to all teachers in extended response strategies	Dec. 2012	Literature Dept.	0	Exit Slips
Offer professional book study opportunities	Sept.2012 – May 2013	SIP/English/Title I Administration	Title I \$500 for books	Sign in sheets
Provide an E-reader in each English classroom.	August 2012-2013	Title I/English Teachers	Title I \$400	Purchase orders
Attend Illinois Reading Conference	Spring 2013	Reading Teachers	District PD funds if available	Report out to staff
Attend Illinois Writing Conference	Spring 2013	Language Arts Teachers	District PD funds if available	Report out to staff

Improvement Goal 2c (Reading)

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

Current Conditions and Data Sources

The 2011 ISAT scores evidence the continuation of this trend. 2010-2011 ISAT scores show that within our non-IEP population, 21 % of 6th graders, 5% of 7th graders, and 11% of 8th graders did not meet or exceed state reading standards. In our IEP population, 43% of 6th graders, 60% of 7th graders, and 75% of 8th graders did not meet or exceed state reading standards

Specific Action 3

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

Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Host a Showcase Night/ Career and College Readiness fair to promote community involvement for support of reading. These two events will alternate yearly.	Beginning Spring 2012	Staff	\$500 Title I	Evaluation form completed by participants

Improvement Goal 3 (Anti-bullying)

We will continue to work to eliminate bullying from the social climate of the middle school and decrease office referrals by 20%.

Current Conditions and Data Sources

According to student and teacher surveys along with disciplinary referrals, bullying continues to be a concern in the middle school.

Specific Action 1

Continue to promote the OLWEUS Anti-bullying program and continue incorporating elements of PBIS.

Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Provide an orientation (Jumpstart Program) for incoming sixth graders and students new to the middle school.	August 2012	Administration and Staff	21 st Century \$100 Supplies	Attendance record Workshop Evaluation
Provide students new to the middle school with orientation throughout the year.	August – 2012 May 2013	Grade Level Teams	0	Team minutes
Inform the community of OLWEUS/PBIS activities in local newspapers and on the district website.	September- 2012-May 2013	OLWEUS/PBIS Committee and Staff	0	Newspaper articles District website Parent survey
Hold a kick-off to promote the OLWEUS/PBIS program.	September 2012	OLWEUS/PBIS Committee and Staff	Participation Rewards \$500 Title Funds pending availability.	Student will demonstrate knowledge of the aspects and consequences of bullying by answering questionnaire.
Offer a monthly incentive activity for those who participate weekly and have no recorded behavior infractions during the previous month.	September 2012- May 2013.	Administration & OLWEUS Committee	Incentive Fund	Newspaper articles hallway promotions
Provide shirts for student unity.	September 2012	OLWEUS Committee	\$1500 Donations/or budget	Student participation in wearing shirts.
Hold student drawings for participation in weekly activities.	September 2012 – May 2013	OLWEUS Committee	Incentive Funds	Monitoring of weekly participation by teachers
Review acceptable hallway/stairway behavior.	August 2012 May 2013	Administration and Staff	0	Reflected in Team minutes of each grade level.
Develop grade level plans to ensure safety by monitoring hallways during passing times.	August 2012 May 2013	Administration and Staff	0	Administrative Walk- abouts.

Improve the Check & Connect Program to foster relationships between staff and students.	August 2012 May 2013	Administration and Staff	0	Check & Connect meeting agendas.
Provide speakers/programs to promote positive behavior in students.	August 2012 May 2013	OLWEUS Committee	Pending Available Funds	Newspaper & District Website.
Conduct weekly OLWEUS/PBIS meetings to address concerns from students.	August 2012 May 2013	Staff	0	Team minutes
Provide additional training to teachers to improve student behavior through the PBIS program.	August – September 2012	Coop External Coaches/ Mr. Harris (Internal Coach)/ PBIS Team	0	Sign-in sheets Evaluations
Provide time for PBIS/Olweus team members to create lesson plans based on our PBIS matrix.	Summer 2012	PBIS Team/ Olweus Team	\$100/participant	PBIS Matrix Lessons
Provide additional training to teachers and staff to improve student behavior through the PBIS program.	August – September 2012	Coop External Coaches/ Mr. Harris (Internal Coach)/ PBIS Team	0	Sign-in sheets Evaluations
Provide SWIS training in order to analyze behavior data.	May 2012	PBIS Coach, Administration, and Office Secretaries	\$200	Reports generated to monitor student behavior

Improvement Goal 4 (General School Improvement Strategies)

Over the next 3-5 years students and staff will focus on strategies for implementation of Common Core Standards, Career Readiness Standards, RTI, Best Teaching Practices, and Assessment Strategies.

Current Conditions and Data Sources

Teachers have not been provided enough time and opportunities to learn and develop new skills that correlate to the new standards and the technology they will need to ensure that their students show continual growth through the learning process.

Specific Action 1 Continue to provide professional development opportunities for staff on the topics listed in Goal 4 to increase awareness of these topics.

Specific Steps	Timeline	Person/Group Responsible	Cost & Funding Source	Evaluation
Provide opportunities for students and staff to become familiar with computer generated assessments.	August 2012 – May 2013	Technology/ Administrator	0	Attendance record Workshop Evaluation
Provide instruction on how to analyze data from formal assessments, and how to use this data to individualize instruction.	August – May 2013	Departmental Teams	TBD	Meeting minutes
Explore financing opportunities to provide every student access to a computer or tablet to be used throughout the day and during testing. Incorporation of this technology should be targeted prior to 2014.	August 2012 May 2013	Technology/ Administrator	TBD	Meeting minutes
Provide teachers' opportunities to analyze the Danielson model to ensure their understanding of the new teacher evaluation process.	March 2012	ROE/Administration	District	Attendance record Workshop Evaluation
Offer training and implementation for developing a student driven learning environment.	September 2012- May 2013.	Jodi Scott Mrs. Rankin	?	Administrative Walk- abouts
Provide discussion opportunities for teachers concerning curricular issues across building levels.	March 2012-May 2013	Administration	0	Sign-in sheets and evaluations at early outs, late starts, SIP days, teacher institutes, or common preps.

In an effort to support student needs in math, reading, and behavior, the school psychologist will meet with grade level teams at the middle school an additional two times a month to provide RTI strategies. (Days determined by schedule)	August 2012-May 2013	Psychologist/ Administration	0	Sign-in sheets and meeting minutes
Create a list of learning goals for individual students.	May 2012	Grade Level Teams/ Homeroom teachers	0	Finished product submitted to administration

Table 17: Professional Development Schedule 2012-2013

TOPIC	DAY/MO./YEAR	GRADE LEVELS	FORMAT
Improve Check and Connect	April-May 2012	6-8	Committee Mtgs.
Higher Order Thinking Skills refresher.	April-May 2012	6-8	Teachers' Mtgs.
Transitioning to Common Core Standards.	March 2012 - May 2013	6-8	Mtgs./Institute
Participate in discussion on weight of grades and assessments.	April-August 2012	6-8	Mtgs./ SIP
Participate in discussions on grades vs assessment results	May/August 2012	6-8	Mtgs./ SIP
Share what you know (Technology Focus)	May 2012-May 2013	6-8	Workshop
Conduct 2012 ISAT Data and review SIP Activities for FY 2013	Sept.2012	6-8	SIP Day
Identify strategies to address deficiencies on the 2012 ISAT and identify needed PD.	August-Sept.2012	6-8	SIP Day
Review/begin implementation of 2012-2013 SIP	August 2012	6-8	Institute
Collaborate on 2013 SIP	January 2013	6-8	SIP Day
Participate in District/Regional Institute Day	May 2013	6-8	Institute

V. REFLECTION, EVALUATION, REFINEMENT

5.1 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT TEAM MEETING SCHEDULE

- The School Improvement Team will meet twice each month during the academic year.
- Sub-committees 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, Learnia, EXPLORE, and report card averages.
 - How Reported?** Individual Test Report, Progress Report, School Report Card, Honor Roll recognition, and meetings with Teacher Teams.
 - When Reported?** 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?** PTC meetings, marking periods, open house, and Parent/Teacher conferences.
 - Who is Responsible?** All school personnel, principal, administration/office staff, school staff, and PTC officers.
- Media:**
- What is Reported?** Achievement data and demographics
 - How Reported?** Newspapers, school publications, school board minutes.
 - When Reported?** When applicable
 - Who is Responsible?** School personnel, principal, administration/office staff, and school staff.

West Central Community/Families:

What is Reported? Demographics, school programs/activities, student achievement data, and school safety assessments.

How Reported? Reports are provided through various forms of media such as: newspapers, school publications, and PTC meetings.

When Reported? Throughout the school year

Who is Responsible? Administration, staff, and SIP

Community Partners:

What is Reported? Achievement Data and SIP

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

When Reported? Monthly and throughout the school year

Who is Responsible? Administration and SIP team

