

Local Board Approved	
Initial Submission	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2010 AYP Report

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this School been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2010-11 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2010-11 State Improvement Status	

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		77.5			77.5			91		80	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	83.0		Yes	85.3		Yes	95.4	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	84.6		Yes	87.4		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	78.3		Yes	82.2		Yes				
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American													
Multiracial/Ethnic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	88.5		Yes	85.9		Yes			
LEP													
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	47.9	61.4	No	57.3	65.4	No	94.4		
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	76.2		Yes	75.9		Yes			

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

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. ***
3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 91% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 80% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2009.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 77.5% or above are not printed.

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2010 AMAO Report

Schools are not accountable for AMAO. This is a district level requirement only.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 3 - School Information

School Information	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Attendance Rate (%)	94.6	95.2	95.1	95.3	94.7	95.5	95.6	95.4
Truancy Rate (%)	1.5	2.1	0.4	0.0	1.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
Mobility Rate (%)	19.8	21.9	18.5	10.8	11.6	11.0	9.3	8.9
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	842	821	775	711	698	712	738	794
Low Income (%)	35.7	38.6	40.8	37.0	36.8	44.8	43.0	50.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	2.5	0.2	0.5	0.6	1.3	1.8	1.8	2.0
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.5
White, non-Hispanic (%)	72.8	73.0	71.2	70.2	66.9	64.2	63.7	62.7
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	4.9	4.5	1.9	2.3	3.3	3.2	3.4	3.1
Hispanic (%)	21.6	22.0	19.4	19.5	21.2	22.8	21.4	22.0
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.9	0.6	0.7	0.3
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.4
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	7.0	7.3	7.7	9.0	10.7	11.5

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

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	2000	75.2	3.6	19.4	1.1	0.6	-
	2001	72.5	4.9	20.7	1.4	0.5	-
	2002	73.7	4.2	20.4	1.2	0.5	-
	2003	72.8	4.9	21.6	0.7	-	-
	2004	73.0	4.5	22.0	0.5	-	-
	2005	71.2	1.9	19.4	0.5	-	7.0
	2006	70.2	2.3	19.5	0.7	-	7.3
	2007	66.9	3.3	21.2	0.9	-	7.7
	2008	64.2	3.2	22.8	0.6	0.3	9.0
	2009	63.7	3.4	21.4	0.7	0.1	10.7
	2010	62.7	3.1	22.0	0.3	0.4	11.5
D I S T R I C T	2000	74.5	3.7	20.4	1.0	0.4	-
	2001	73.9	3.7	21.0	1.0	0.3	-
	2002	73.4	3.9	21.4	0.9	0.4	-
	2003	73.0	4.4	21.5	0.8	0.3	-
	2004	71.2	4.3	23.5	0.8	0.3	-
	2005	67.9	2.7	21.5	0.6	0.3	7.0
	2006	66.3	3.0	21.8	0.6	0.1	8.2
	2007	64.4	3.2	21.7	0.5	0.1	10.1
	2008	63.9	3.4	21.3	0.5	0.2	10.7
	2009	62.3	3.4	21.4	0.6	0.2	12.1
	2010	62.2	3.3	21.4	0.3	0.2	12.5
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

S T A T E	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5
	2010	52.8	18.8	21.1	4.2	0.2	2.9

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 5 - Educational Environment

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	1.3	28.5	85.5	94.3	10.4	24	3.0	-	-
	2001	3.0	31.4	100.0	93.7	23.8	14	1.7	-	-
	2002	4.2	31.6	100.0	94.5	20.2	10	1.2	-	-
	2003	2.5	35.7	96.0	94.6	19.8	13	1.5	-	-
	2004	0.2	38.6	96.9	95.2	21.9	17	2.1	-	-
	2005	0.5	40.8	97.0	95.1	18.5	3	0.4	-	-
	2006	0.6	37.0	100.0	95.3	10.8	-	-	-	-
	2007	1.3	36.8	100.0	94.7	11.6	7	1.0	-	-
	2008	1.8	44.8	100.0	95.5	11.0	1	0.1	-	-
	2009	1.8	43.0	100.0	95.6	9.3	1	0.1	-	-
2010	2.0	50.4	100.0	95.4	8.9	1	0.1	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	2.2	27.2	98.4	93.5	9.9	57	1.6	7.1	78.6
	2001	2.7	30.1	98.2	93.3	14.0	41	1.2	7.9	77.2
	2002	3.4	33.0	98.4	94.1	14.3	46	1.3	4.3	78.5
	2003	2.1	35.1	97.5	94.3	14.9	127	3.5	6.9	75.4
	2004	1.5	36.2	99.2	94.5	16.4	33	1.0	8.0	74.2
	2005	1.7	40.6	99.3	94.6	15.2	53	1.6	4.0	80.8
	2006	1.7	34.1	100.0	94.4	16.5	69	2.1	4.0	82.6
	2007	2.3	37.0	100.0	94.6	14.2	75	2.3	4.8	81.5
	2008	3.5	42.6	100.0	94.6	15.5	84	2.6	4.9	83.1
	2009	3.0	45.4	100.0	94.9	14.5	52	1.6	3.3	82.2
2010	4.0	50.2	100.0	94.9	12.4	60	1.8	4.2	86.6	
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2

S T A T E	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
	2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1
	2010	7.6	45.4	96.2	93.9	13.0	72,383	3.6	3.8	87.8

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

Section I A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 6 - Enrollment Trends

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2000	799	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	812	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	824	-	-	-	281	269	-
	2003	842	-	-	-	274	286	-
	2004	821	-	-	-	294	275	-
	2005	775	-	-	-	259	286	-
	2006	711	-	-	-	227	248	-
	2007	698	-	-	-	222	223	-
	2008	712	-	-	-	244	227	-
	2009	738	-	-	-	238	248	-
	2010	794	-	-	-	255	248	-
D I S T R I C T	2000	3,558	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	3,563	266	296	269	268	253	248
	2002	3,529	252	269	290	285	275	270
	2003	3,505	257	250	269	283	293	290
	2004	3,556	249	232	233	294	275	257
	2005	3,457	246	247	231	259	286	265
	2006	3,612	254	250	262	227	248	281
	2007	3,362	269	257	250	222	223	249
	2008	3,269	237	256	260	244	227	246
	2009	3,225	256	244	263	238	248	209
	2010	3,308	272	257	236	255	248	204
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-

S T A T E	2003	2,044,539	164,413	157,570	159,499	160,924	156,451	138,559
	2004	2,060,048	161,329	160,246	158,367	162,933	160,271	139,504
	2005	2,062,912	156,370	158,622	160,365	162,047	162,192	142,828
	2006	2,075,277	155,155	154,372	158,822	160,362	160,911	147,500
	2007	2,077,856	155,356	153,480	154,719	162,594	159,038	150,475
	2008	2,074,167	155,578	152,895	153,347	160,039	161,310	149,710
	2009	2,070,125	156,512	152,736	152,820	155,433	158,700	144,822
	2010	2,064,312	155,468	154,389	152,681	154,465	154,982	146,919

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 7 - Educator Data

Educator Data is available only for district level

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	222	17	43,592	64	36	18	19	-	-
	2001	231	17	45,075	66	35	17	20	-	-
	2002	233	17	49,593	66	34	17	19	1	-
	2003	225	17	50,031	66	34	18	20	2	-
	2004	202	17	51,768	63	37	19	23	2	-
	2005	189	17	53,133	66	35	20	22	1	-
	2006	199	15	51,314	70	30	19	23	1	-
	2007	215	14	52,031	72	28	17	21	2	-
	2008	206	14	53,405	69	31	19	21	1	-
	2009	215	13	54,954	53	47	19	18	1	-
2010	219	12	54,789	51	49	19	19	1	-	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1
2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1	

	2010	132,502	13	63,296	42	57	18	18	1	1
--	------	---------	----	--------	----	----	----	----	---	---

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 8a - Assessment Data (Reading)

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2005-2010																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	-	75.1	72.4	86.7	83.0	84.3	-	73.8	72.0	80.8	78.8	74.7	76.8	79.1	84.5	86.6	84.0	86.8
White	-	79.2	74.4	89.5	83.8	85.7	-	76.3	75.9	84.8	83.7	77.4	82.4	80.1	85.9	89.7	87.2	89.7
Black	-	-	50.0	-	-	90.0	-	-	-	72.7	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	70.0	-
Hispanic	-	68.9	64.3	77.0	82.9	77.2	-	61.5	61.0	68.9	66.7	72.0	64.2	78.6	75.7	77.5	71.2	76.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	69.2	89.5	93.1	86.9	89.2	-	80.0	81.3	85.7	77.4	75.0	72.3	81.0	83.4	100.1	100.0	93.1
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	28.9	34.9	63.9	47.4	41.3	-	20.0	28.9	53.7	48.6	25.0	35.9	35.5	31.0	61.9	57.5	61.8
Low Income	-	66.6	59.2	81.4	71.9	79.4	-	56.0	62.6	73.1	69.1	62.9	68.6	68.2	71.0	84.1	76.6	79.8

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 8b - Assessment Data (Mathematics)

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2005-2010																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	-	80.8	88.0	89.2	84.0	85.4	-	75.6	78.1	84.9	86.7	81.0	58.6	80.9	87.8	87.0	86.4	86.5
White	-	86.2	88.9	91.5	85.1	88.1	-	80.9	82.7	88.1	91.9	82.5	63.4	82.9	89.3	91.0	89.1	91.0
Black	-	-	70.0	-	-	90.0	-	-	-	72.7	-	-	-	-	-	40.0	70.0	-
Hispanic	-	67.4	86.0	88.7	79.6	77.4	-	65.0	71.2	75.8	81.5	80.0	46.4	76.8	83.8	81.7	78.0	81.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	76.9	94.8	82.8	95.6	86.5	-	56.3	81.3	95.3	74.2	90.0	58.8	76.1	83.3	93.8	95.2	79.3
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	70.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	37.5	72.1	66.7	60.6	39.2	-	16.7	40.0	59.5	59.5	50.0	36.8	40.0	46.7	52.4	53.9	58.8
Low Income	-	72.6	81.9	85.1	72.4	76.8	-	60.0	62.2	77.6	80.6	69.4	45.5	70.6	80.2	78.7	74.7	77.6

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Data - What do the School Report Card data tell you about student performance in your school? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are indicated?

Overall performance in **reading** on ISAT 2010 was 83% Meets/Exceeds as compared to previous two years. (83.4% M/E in 2009, 85.2% M/E in 2008)

Overall performance in **mathematics** on ISAT 2010 was 85.% Meets/Exceeds as compared to previous two years. (86.4% M/E in 2009, 88% M/E in 2008)

Strengths for Overall Disaggregated Data:

Growth on standardized testing performance for **overall performance of Hispanic Reading** as measured by the comparison of 2009-2010 ISAT report. (75.% - 78.3%)

Growth on standardized testing performance for **overall performance of Hispanic Mathematics** as measured by the comparison of 2009-2010 ISAT report. (80.1% - 82.2%)

Growth on standardized testing performance for **overall performance of Economically Disadvantaged** as measured by the comparison of 2009-2010 ISAT report. (75.3% - 76.2%)

Strengths for Reading Performance Disaggregated by Grade Level and Subgroups

Growth on standardized test performance of students by grade level and subgroups in the area of reading as measured by comparison on 2009-2010 ISAT. (see charts below)

Reading	2009	2010
Grade 6 All	83%	84.3%
Grade 6 White	83.8%	85.7%
Grade 6 Multiracial/Ethnic	86.9%	89.2%
Grade 6 Low Income	71.9%	79.4%

Reading	2009	2010
Grade 7 Hispanic	66.7%	72%

Reading	2009	2010
Grade 8 All	84%	86.8%
Grade 8 White	87.2%	89.7%
Grade 8 Hispanic	71.2%	76.4%
Grade 8 Low Income	76.6%	79.8%

Strength for Reading Extended Response Score Performance

Growth on standardized testing performance of students in 6th grade in the area of Reading Extended Response scores in the highest category of 4 as measured on 2009-2010 ISAT report. (1.2% - 10.7%)

Growth on standardized testing performance of students in 8th grade in the area of Reading Extended Response scores in the highest category of 4 as measured on 2009-2010 ISAT report. (.45 - 3.7%)

Growth on standardized testing performance of students in 8th grade in the area of Reading Extended Response scores in the category of 3 as measured on 2009-2010 ISAT report. (16.8%-26%)

Strengths for Math Performance Disaggregated by Grade Level and Subgroup Performance

Growth on standardized testing performance of students by grade level and subgroups in the area of mathematics as measured by comparison of 2009-2010 ISAT report. (see chart below)

Mathematics	2009	2010
Grade 6 All	84%	85.4%
Grade 6 White	85.1%	88.1%
Grade 6 Low Income	72.4%	76.8%

Mathematics	2009	2010
Grade 7 Multiracial/Ethnic	74.2%	90%

Mathematics	2009	2010
-------------	------	------

Grade 8 All	86.4%	86.5%
Grade 8 White	89.1%	91%
Grade 8 Hispanic	78%	81.1%
Grade 8 Students w/Disabilities	53.9%	58.8%
Grade 8 Low Income	74.7%	77.6%

Weaknesses

There is a decline in standardized testing performance of cohort group of students in the area of reading and mathematics as measured by the 2009-2010 ISAT report from 6th grade to 7th grade, and then standardized testing performance improves from 7th to 8th grade. (see charts below)

Class of 2014	6th Grade-2008	7th Grade-2009	8th Grade-2010
Reading	87%	79%	86%
Math	89%	87%	86%

SHS Class of 2015	6th Grade-2009	7th Grade-2010
Reading	83%	74%
Math	84%	81%

SHS Class of 2016	5th Grade-2009	6th grade-2010
Reading	89%L 78%W	83%
Math	93%L 88%W	84%

Eighth grade performance shows growth in reading and math meets/exceeds and exceeds categories as measured by 2009 and 2010 ISAT.

Seventh grade performance shows decrease in reading and math meets/exceeds and exceeds categories as measured by 2009 and 2010 ISAT.

Sixth grade results are mixed; their performance in reading and math categories for meets/exceeds shows growth as measured by 2009 and 2010 ISAT. However, **when comparing**

the exceeds category there is a decline in performance as measured by 2009 and 2010 ISAT.

In general, exceeds category in reading decreases from 6th-8th grade.

In general, exceeds category in math increases from 6th-8th grade.

Grade 8 Reading	ISAT 2009	ISAT 2010
M & E	84%	86.8%
Exceeds	4.8%	7.9%
Grade 7 Reading		
M & E	78.8%	74.7%
Exceeds	17.1%	12.8%
Grade 6 Reading		
M & E	83.9%	84.3%
Exceeds	23.5%	20.4%

Grade 8 Math	ISAT 2009	ISAT 2010
M & E	86.3%	86.5%
Exceeds	21.7%	21.7%
Grade 7 Math		
M & E	86.7%	80.9%
Exceeds	20.7%	19.5%
Grade 6 Math		
M & E	83.9%	85.4%

Exceeds	14.9%	13.6%
Grade 6 Writing		
M & E	64%	59.3%
Exceeds	4%	2.9%
Grade 8 Writing		
M & E	47.3%	63.6%
Exceeds	3.3%	7.6%

Weakness on standardized testing performance of students in Grade 6 subgroups in the area of Reading and Mathematics as measured by comparison of the 2009-2010 ISAT report. (see charts below)

Achievement gap weakness on standardized testing performance of students in Grade 6 subgroups/non subgroups, especially Low Income/non Low Income, and IEP/Non IEP as measured on 2009 and 2010 ISAT report.

Gr. 6 Reading	2009	2010	Gr. 6 Math	2009	2010
Hispanic	83%	77.1%		79.6%	77.5%
White	83.8%	85.7%		85%	88.1%
Multiracial/Ethnic	87%	89.2%		95.7%	86.5%
Low Income	71.9%	79.5%		72.4%	76.8%
Non Low Income	90.1%	89.9%		91.4%	95.3%
Students w/ Disab.	47.4%	41.4%	*	*	60.5% 39.3%
Non IEP	89.5%	89.25		88.2%	90.5%

Weakness on standardized testing performance of students in Grade 7 subgroups in the areas of Reading and Mathematics as measured by the comparison of 2009-2010 ISAT report. (see chart below)

Achievement gap weakness on standardized testing performance of students in Grade 7 subgroups/non subgroups for Reading and Mathematics Low Income/non Low Income, and IEP/non IEP as measured on 2009 and 2010 ISAT report.

Grade 7 Reading	2009	2010	Grade 7 Math	2009	2010
-----------------	------	------	--------------	------	------

Hispanic	66.7%	72%			81.5%	80%
White	83.7%	77.4%			91.95	82.5%
Multiracial/Ethnic	77.4%	75%			74.2%	90%
Low Income	69.2%	62.9%			80.6%	69.4%
Non Low Inc.	86.5%	85.7%			91.7%	91.7%
IEP	48.6%	25%	**	**	59.5%	50%
Non IEP	84.2%	83.9%			91.7%	86.6%

Weakness on standardized testing performance of students in Grade 8 subgroups in the area of Reading and Mathematics as measured by the comparison of 2009-2010 ISAT report. Achievement gap weakness on standardized testing performance of students in Grade 8 subgroups/non groups such as Low Income/Non Low Income and IEP/Non IEP as measured on 2009 and 2010 ISAT report. (see chart below)

Grade 8 Reading	2009	2010	Grade 8 Math	2009	2010
Hispanic	71.2%	76.5%		78%	81.1%
White	87.3%	89.7%		89.1%	91%
Multiracial/Ethnic	100%	93.1%		95.2%	79.3%
Low Income	76.5%	79.8%		74.8%	77.6%
Non Low Inc.	90.4%	93%		96.3%	94.5%
IEP	57.5%	61.8%		53.8%	58.8%
Non IEP	89%	90.9%		92.4%	91%

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

Factor 1: RtI Implementation of Interventions and Screener

Complying with RtI mandates during the last two years required many changes in our school. In a short period of time we have added interventions in both reading and math. We are using the AIMSweb universal screening process to identify students with skill deficits. Reading interventions include AutoSkill, Reading Advantage, and SRA Corrective Reading. Math interventions are provided through AutoSkill. A strong commitment to professional development by the district and collaboration time available for staff have moved our staff through the steep learning curve of RtI implementation.

Factor 2: The Interventionist

The role of Interventionist was further defined in 2010-11. Becky Haas has trained staff on administering the AIMSweb screener for reading and math. She trained staff on how to run reports, how to administer the progress monitoring and how to record all data. She leads the Quarterly Data meetings at for all grade levels. Becky has also been instrumental in leading teachers through the problem solving process.

Factor 3: New ELA Curriculum

Our district implemented the SpringBoard English Language Arts curriculum in our high school in 2009-10. Challand Middle School followed with implementation in 2010-11. Currently a team of teachers is collaborating to more clearly define the second block of daily ELA instruction.

Factor 4: CBM in Reading and Math

All language arts teachers received training in administration of CBM (Curriculum Based Measurement) screening in reading. The CBM is a general reading screener that is normed and includes benchmarks for each grade level. Students are tested in oral fluency and comprehension. Grade level teams analyze reading screening results at Quarterly Data Meetings and place students in appropriate interventions. Students who fall below the 25th percentile begin a reading intervention based on their skill deficits. Students are then progress monitored for 6-8 weeks.

Current reading interventions include Reading Advantage (Tier 2), AutoSkills computer based program (Tier 2), and SRA Corrective Reading (Tier 3).

SRA Read to Achieve, a content reading intervention, will be added in 2011-12.(Tier 2) five days each week. This intervention provides additional reading material for students at their level.

Thinking Reader will also be added in 2011-12. (Tier 2).

In math, students are screened using the AIMSweb MCAP and MCOMP.

In 2011 a diagnostic component to MCAP will be implemented in order to more accurately place students into an intervention that meets their needs.

In 2011, math teachers will work with small groups to address specific skill deficits for a like group of students. Students will be progress monitored bi-weekly using AIMSweb.

Factor 5: AVID Program

AVID program for 7th and 8th grade students who are in accelerated classes with support.

Factor 6: PBIS Implementation

Challand Middle School is working toward full certification as a PBIS school. This year our school was named an "Emerging PBIS School." We are proud of this accomplishment and continue to improve through the work of our universal team and our newest team added this year, the secondary team. A CMS school counselor leads each of these teams. Building relationships and supports for students is important to their academic success.

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

Professional development in best practices of instruction to meet academic achievement needs of all students, especially the students with deficiencies in Meets/Exceeds as measured on 2010 ISAT report, including Students with Disabilities, Low Income, and Hispanic subgroups at all grade levels. These subgroups also represent the achievement gap groups.

Reading CBM and Interventions

Continue using AIMSweb universal screening for fluency and comprehension (MAZE) three times at fall, winter, and spring. Students falling below 25th percentile will begin a reading intervention based on individual skill deficits.

Continue Reading Advantage (Tier 2) two days per week for 30 minutes each day.

Continue AutoSkill reading interventioin (Tier 2) three days per week for 30 minutes each day.

Continue SRA Corrective Reading (Tier 3) five days per week, 45 minutes each day.

Implementation of SRA Read to Achieve (additional Tier 2 reading program) a content reading intervention for students with disabilities and those at risk of failure as measured by

AIMSweb screening in reading five days per week/45 min. per day.

Implementation of Thinking Reader (additional Tier 2 reading intervention).

Implementation of Reading Success (Tier 2) 3 days per week for 30 minutes each day.

Math CBM and Interventions

Students will be screened using AIMSweb MCAP (with diagnostic reporting component added) and MCOMP. Students will begin math intervention based on diagnostic report.

Continue AutoSkill as math intervention for students falling below 25th percentile only on the MCOMP.

Small Groups for Math:

Math teachers will instruct small groups of students working on the same skills during STAR strategies period on Monday. Teachers will reference the diagnostic intervention recommendation and correlate this to the Glencoe Math curriculum in order to specifically teach to the students' needs. Students will be progress monitored bi-weekly using AIMSweb progress monitors.

Students will practice skills Tuesday-Friday with assistance from teacher.

Teachers have own students.

Students not in small groups receive assistance from Math teacher when teacher is not doing small groups.

Professional development in use of common assessments in reading and math for the purpose of increasing student achievement in reading and mathematics.

Professional development in Common Core State Standards as it relates to reading and math curriculum.

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data (Optional)

Data - Briefly describe the relevant local assessment data used in this plan. What do these data tell you? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are apparent?

A reading benchmark was obtained for all students using AIMSweb CBM for reading fluency and comprehension. The screener is given in fall, winter, and spring. The grade level teachers meet at Quarterly Data Meetings to place students into appropriate interventions. Students who are a reading intervention are progress monitored.

Reading Strengths:

Growth in fluency by 6th grade students at Tier 1 level from fall to winter 2010. (78.8 -80.2)

Same percentage in comprehension by 6th grade students at Tier 1 level from fall to winter 2010. (80%)

Growth in fluency by 7th grade students at Tier 1 level from fall to winter 2010. (85.25 - 89%)

Growth in fluency by 7th grade cohort at Tier 1 level from winter 2009-winter 2010. (83.7% - 89%)

Growth in comprehension by 7th grade cohort at Tier 1 level from winter 2009-winter 2010. (81.1% -85%)

Growth in comprehension by 8th grade students at Tier 1 level from fall to winter 2010. (87% - 89%)

Growth in comprehension by 8th grade cohort at Tier 1 level from winter 2009 to winter 2010. (85.3% - 89%)

Math Strengths

Growth in math concepts and application by 7th grade students at Tier 1 from fall to winter 2010. (83.4% - 85.2%)

Growth in math concepts and application by 7th grade cohort students from winter 2009 to winter 2010. (73% - 85.2%)

Growth in math concepts and application by 8th grade students at Tier 1 from fall to winter 2010. (76% - 81%)

Math Weaknesses

Decline in math concepts and applications by 6th grade students at Tier 1 from fall to winter 2010. (75% - 72%)

Math COMP results for winter 2010: Gr. 6 73.45% Gr. 7 75.1% Gr. 8 73.8%

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

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

Factor 2:
Students in Tier 2 receive interventions in Reading Advantage (guided reading groups) and AutoSkill Reading Academy (computer based intervention).
Students in Tier 3 receive interventions in AutoSkill Reading Academy and SRA Corrective Reading (direct instruction in decoding and comprehension skills).
Currently 59 students are in SRA Corrective Reading and 50 are special education students.

Factor 3:
For Math, students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 receive intervention through AutoSkill Math Academy. Teachers in 8th grade also work with students in small, flexible groups based on skill deficits.

Factor 4:
M-COMP (math computation) was administered for first time during winter 2010 screening. All three grade levels scored lower at Tier 1 than 80%. Grade 6--73.4% Grade 7--75.1% Grade 8 73.8%

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

Reading-CBM

Students at all grade levels are achieving in the core curriculum (Tier 1 instruction) as measured by the AIMSweb universal screening data for reading fluency and comprehension.

Cohort group of students in 7th grade are achieving in fluency over time from the previous year as measured by AIMSweb CBM.

Cohort groups of students in 7th and 8th grade are achieving in comprehension over time from the previous year as measured by AIMSweb MAZE (comprehension) CBM.

Reading Interventions

Continue to use AIMSweb as universal screener.

Continue Reading Advantage (Tier 2) two days per week for 30 minutes each day.

Continue AutoSkill computer program (Tier 2) three days per week for 30 minutes per day.

Continue SRA Corrective Reading (Tier 3) five days a week for 45 minutes per day.

Implement SRA Read to Achieve content reading intervention (Tier 2) five days per week 45 minutes per day.

Implement Thinking Reader (Tier 2) intervention

Implement Reading Success (Tier 2) intervention three days per week for 30 minutes each day.

Math CBM

Students at 7th grade and 8th grade levels are achieving in the core curriculum (Tier 1 instruction) as measured by the AIMSweb universal screening data for math concepts and application.

Cohort groups of students in 7th and 8th grades are achieving in math concepts and application over time from the previous year as measured by MCAP.

All grade levels took Math COMP for first time in winter 2010. All scored below Tier 1 percentile.

Grade 6-- 73.45 Grade 7 -- 75.1% Grade 8 -- 73.8%

The Math COMP will help the grade level data teams make better diagnostic decisions for interventions.

Math Interventions

Continue to use AIMSWeb universal screener for MCAP and MCOMP.

A diagnostic reporting component of MCAP will be used to more accurately diagnose students' skill deficits.

Continue to use AutoSkill intervention for students who fall below the 25th percentile only on the MCOMP.

Math Small Groups

Based on the MCAP diagnostic report, the Math teacher will provide an intervention for small groups of students working on same skills on Monday during STAR strategies period. Math teachers will cross reference the diagnostic intervention recommendation with curriculum material in Glencoe Math books in order to teach to the students' needs. Students will be progress monitored bi-weekly using AIMSWeb. On Tuesday-Friday, students will practice skills taught on Monday.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional) Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

Data - Briefly describe attributes and challenges of the school and community that have affected student performance. What do these data and/or information tell you?

CMS was designated as an "Emerging School" by Illinois State Board of Education Positive Behavior Supports and Intervention (PBIS) program. School-wide common expectations for student behavior is clearly defined for all areas of the building.

Data on student discipline referrals is kept in SWIS. In the fall of 2010, 96% of students at CMS had three or less office referrals for discipline. In the winter of 2010, 92% of students at CMS had three or less office referrals.

Office referrals decreased during 3rd quarter of 2010 as compared to 3rd quarter of 2011 as measured by SWIS data. (512 - 440)

Average Referrals per day decreased during the following months in 2010-11 as compared to the same months in 2009-10.

	2009-10	2010-11
October	12	8
December	16	14
February	16	12
March	10	9

Impact of Interventions Data:

November: 10 students enrolled in CICO. 6 of the 10 students received 80% or better on their DPR Card for 4 consecutive weeks, with an accompanying 40% reduction in ODR's for the 10 students.

December: 14 students enrolled in CICO. 5 of the 14 students received 80% or better on the DPR Card for 4 consecutive weeks, with an accompanying 64% reduction in ODR's for the 14 students.

January: 17 students were enrolled in CICO. 7 of the 17 students received 80% or better on their DPR Card for 4 consecutive weeks, with an accompanying 75% reduction in ODR's for the 17 students.

February: 16 students were enrolled in CICO for the month of February. 4 of the 16 students received 80% or better on their DPR Card for 4 consecutive weeks, with an accompanying 51% reduction in ODR's for the 16 students.

March: 19 students enrolled in CICO for March. 4 students received 80% or better on their DPR Card for 4 consecutive weeks, with an accompanying 61% reduction in ODR's for those 19 students.

Data Summary for Problem Solving Instructional Group: 16 of 18 students have not received additional OSS for peer aggression.

PBIS Review of 2010-11

There were 13 members of the PBIS Universal Team.

Accomplishments:

1. See Chart above for reduction in Office Daily Referrals per day by months as compared to previous year.

2. Referrals by Behavior

Tardies reduced from previous year: 699 to 610

Physical aggression reduced from previous year: 184 to 111

3. Referrals by Location

Classroom decreased from 975 to 912

Playground decreased from 103 to 97

4. Referrals for Students with 5+ Referrals reduced # from 113 students to 107 students

What we need to work on for 2011-12:

1. Reduce the number of Office Daily Referrals in the months of September (11), November (16), January (9), and April (13).

2. Reduce the number of Referrals by Behavior specifically for disrespect (384).

3. Reduce the number of Referrals by Location for Office (417) and Hallway (123).

4. Reduce the number of Referrals by Time for Lunchtime, both indoors and outdoors (732).
5. Reduce Referrals for Students with 10+ Major and Minor ODR's from 57 and 1124 respectively.
6. Reduce the number of All Behavior Referrals Major and Minor from 1,853.

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

Factor 1: PBIS Universal Team

PBIS Universal team developed new plan for teaching school-wide expectations at each location in the building during the first week of school. This plan was repeated at the start of the second semester.

PBIS Newsletter sent to families quarterly.

PBIS Universal team provided training for staff on implementation of Cool Tools.

PBIS Universal team planned and provided reward system, prizes, quarterly celebrations with student input.

Factor 2: PBIS Secondary Team Identified

The CMS PBIS Secondary team leader was identified and teachers for the team were also identified.

PBIS Secondary team attended training in Rockford.

Factor 3: Tier 2 interventions added this year include small groups led by CMS counselors.

SAIG proposal for 2011-12

Tier 2 intervention added this year for Check In/Check Out (CICO).

Tier 2 intervention for Guided Studies added during third nine weeks.

Factor 4: Advisory Explored

Universal Advisory/Homeroom as a Tier 1 intervention for all students took place in December.

A staff survey indicates that 76% of staff "think that advisory time was beneficial." The same percentage agree that "having an advisory throughout the year is a good idea."

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

PBIS Universal Team

Universal Advisory Tier 1 intervention for all students was piloted in December, 2010 and subsequent staff survey indicated 76% agree that advisory time "was beneficial and having advisory throughout the year is a good idea."

PBIS Universal team implemented Cool Tools to address specific student behavior (tardy to school and class). data was kept and compared pre/post teaching of a Cool Tool to address specific behavior. Results indicated tardies dropped by 33%. Universal team leader trained staff on Cool Tools at staff meetings.

1. PBIS Universal Team will continue with Boot Camp to teach school-wide expectations.
2. **PBIS Universal Team will continue with parent involvement by hosting a family BBQ at beginning of school year.**
3. PBIS Universal Team will continue with parent involvement by providing coffee/hot chocolate days in front drive of school.
4. PBIS Universal Team will continue with Gotchas and PBIS store (rewards).
5. PBIS Universal Team will continue with quarterly Celebrations.
6. PBIS Universal Team will seek student input on Rewards and Celebrations.
7. PBIS Universal Team will implement schedule and topics for twice monthly student Advisory group using Cool Tools and/or lessons based upon data and student needs.
8. PBIS Universal Team will implement Common Minor Referral Form for use at all grade levels in order to promote school-wide consistency in application and documentation of minor classroom conflict issues.
9. **PBIS Universal Team will develop plan to distribute CMS PBIS Expectation posters and Gotcha rewards to local businesses and community events to promote positive behavior in public.**

PBIS Universal and Secondary teams to share data with staff on monthly basis.

PBIS Secondary Team Goals:

1. CMS Counselors developed new Tier 2 interventions for students including: a) Social Academic Intervention Groups (SAIG) small groups.
2. PBIS Secondary Team to continue Check In Check Out as Tier 2 intervention.
3. **PBIS Secondary Team to continue to collect Tier 2 intervention data for SAIG groups and CICO.**
4. PBIS Secondary Team to continue reporting data to staff during staff meetings.

Additionally:

PBIS Teams will implement Parent Cafes in partnership with Sinnissippi Centers and Strengthening Families Illinois.

Sterling Public Schools will implement the AIMSweb universal behavior screener for all grades at CMS. SPS will provide training for all staff on the screener.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)
Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

Data - Briefly describe data on educator qualifications and data and/or information about staff capacity and professional development opportunities related to areas of weakness and strength. What do these data and information tell you?

100% of the Challand Middle School staff is highly qualified to teach in their assigned areas. Currently, 51% of the district's teachers have a BS degree and 49% have a Master's degree. Sterling Public Schools is a strong proponent for professional development for all staff. The district provides 8 professional development days monthly following early student dismissal. The district also partners with ROE offices in several counties to provide multiple learning opportunities for staff during the summer including workshops, seminars, classes for in-district credit, and online classes.

The professional development plan for CMS staff is directly related to the strategies and activities for staff and parents that are included in the 2010-11 SIP and included:

- **June 15-18, 2010: Training on new SpringBoard LA curriculum for 25 staff including teachers and administrators**
- **August 18, 2010: Re-training on SRA Corrective Reading Program for special education teachers.**
- **September 15, 2010:**
 - a. **Study Island (Tier 1) training provided for LA, Math, Special Ed., Bilingual teacher.**
 - b. **Reading Strategies in Content Areas training provided for Social Studies, Science, PE/Health, Encore, Music teachers provided by Cheryl Robinson.**
 - c. **Reading Advantage training for Tier 2 reading intervention teachers.**
 - d. **Peaceful Classroom training for CMS ESP staff and Counselors.**
- **October 13, 2010:**
 - a. **Socratic Seminars, Philosophical Chairs, Costa's Levels of Questioning, Cornell Notetaking training provided by CMS AVID teachers.**
 - b. **SEL training on PBIS Cool Tools presented by Mr. Birdsley and PBIS Universal Team.**

- c. **Suicide Talk presented to district ESP's by Cheryl Robinson, Director of Curriculum-SPS.**
- **November 17, 2010:**
 - a. **Fitness Curriculum training for PE/Health teachers at SHS.**
 - b. **First Aid training for 7 staff members.**
 - c. **Strategic vertical discussion re: SpringBoard LA curriculum implementation between CMS and SHS LA teachers, CMS and SHS music teachers, CMS and SHS Bilingual teachers, all district Counselors**
 - d. **Guided Reading Awareness training for LA staff presented by Cheryl Robinson, District Curriculum Director.**
 - e. **Developing Math Common Assessments for CMS Math Department.**
- **December 8, 2010:**
 - a. **ASSETS Overview and Training for CMS ESP's presented by Jason Austin and Janet Freed, SHS.**
 - b. **Organizing Advisories training presented by CMS PBIS Universal Team.**
 - c. **CMS PBIS Secondary System training presented by Mark Morris, PBIS Secondary Team Coordinator.**
- **January 7, 2011:**
 - a. **Content Reading Strategies training presented by Phyllis Hostmeyer**
 - b. **Common Core Standards Analysis for math teachers.**
 - c. **Diversity Training for ESP's, Counselors, PE teachers, Encore teachers presented by YWCA staff.**
- **February 16, 2011:**
 - a. **Parent Teacher Conference Hours to accommodate parents who may not attend during traditional evening hours. Data comparing parent attendance at Feb. conferences in 2010 and 2009 showed almost identical participation %.**
- **March 16, 2011:**
 - a. **Functional Behavioral Assessments and Behavior Intervention Plans training by Laurie Heston, Bi-County Asst. Director.**
 - b. **Topics in Special Education training for CMS ESP's presented by Sherry White-NIA.**
- **April 13, 2011:**
 - a. **Rtl and Special Education: The Problem Solving Process Using Data, Collaboration, and Progress Monitoring training for all staff presented by Sara Dail, Director of Student Services-SPS.**
 - b. **AimsWeb Training Part 2: Progress Monitoring and Goal Setting in Reading training for LA, Special Ed. teachers presented by Becky Haas, CMS Interventionist.**
 - c. **Problem-Solving: Teacher Resources Menu of Tier 1 Interventions training presented by Kathy Howard, Principal.**

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

Professional development focused on improved teaching strategies as outlined by Response to Intervention and listed in the 2010-11 SIP plan in the instructional strategies and activities, accompanying professional development activities and the parent strategies and activities. Providing interventions for students with skill deficits improved their academic performance as described in Section 1B Data & Analysis-Local Assessment Data. The universal screener, given in fall, winter, and spring identifies students with skill deficits. Students are placed into interventions where they are progress monitored.

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

Continued professional development for staff will develop strategies that will improve student learning through screening and interventions. The last two years have focused on RtI activities such as data driven decision-making, implementing interventions with integrity, providing training for staff on interventions, and implementing the school and district problem solving models.

At CMS, embedded collaboration time for cores of teachers provides opportunities for teams to evaluate curriculum, analyze individual and group data and performance, and use the problem solving model in discussions of students who have deficiencies academically or behaviorally.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)
Item 3 - Parent Involvement

Data - Briefly describe data on parent involvement. What do these data tell you?

Challand Middle School offers many opportunities for parent involvement. Parent Teacher conferences are held twice annually. In the fall of 2010, 44% of parents attended conferences. In February of 2011, we offered extended hours for conferences which included early afternoon hours to try and raise the parent participation. In comparing the results to the previous February, there is a negligible difference with 36% of parents attending in each of the years.

Other opportunities for parents to proactively support the school include:

1. Core meetings with teachers

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

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

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

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

The CMS School Improvement Plan for 2011-12 indicates that parents are important partners with the school in improving student learning. For each of the three SIP Objectives, parent strategies and activities are offered.

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

From the factor pages (I-A, I-B, and I-C), identify key factors that are within the school's capacity to change or control and which have contributed to low achievement. What conclusions about next steps have you reached from reviewing available data and information and about all the factors affecting student achievement?

Professional development in best practices of instruction to meet academic achievement needs of all students, including the students with deficiencies in ISAT Meets/Exceeds range as measured on 2010 ISAT report in the all subgroups at all grade levels.

Continue AIMSweb universal CBM and MAZE screening three times a year for every student.

Continue reading interventions.

Continue math interventions.

Implement Math Small Groups (flexible grouping)

Implement SRA Read to Achieve as Tier 2 intervention in reading.

Implement SRA Reading Success as Tier 3 intervention in reading.

Implement Thinking Reader as Tier 2 intervention in reading.

The CMS School Improvement Plan for 2011-12 indicates that parents are important partners with the school in improving student learning. For each of the three SIP Objectives, parent strategies and activities are offered.

Our next steps as a professional learning community are to reflect on the following questions regarding student learning:

1. What is it that we want our students to learn?
2. How will we know that the students have learned this?
3. What will we do when they have NOT learned the knowledge and skills we have identified?
4. What will we do When they HAVE learned the knowledge and skills we have identified?

With respect to #1, we need to focus on the new Common Core State Standards for reading and math. Teachers in the language arts and math departments will identify the similarities and differences with the Illinois Learning Standards. They will cross walk the new CCSS with the curriculum in language arts (SpringBoard) and math.

We will continue to focus on identifying students' skill deficits through universal screening and assessments. Assigning interventions to help them learn will continue to be a focus also.

Question #4 will challenge us all to offer enrichment opportunities for all students.

The two deficiencies noted in the 2010 AYP Report pertain to the subgroups of students with disabilities. Closer monitoring of these students by special education teachers will

be in place to improve academic performance.

Continued PBIS supports and interventions will foster social emotional growth and development.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Students deficient on reading in the Meets/Exceeds range for ISAT with an emphasis on students wtih disabilities.	1,
2	Students deficient in math in meets/exceeds range for 2010 ISAT with an emphasis on students with disabilities.	2,
3	Social Emotional: Improve the culture and climate through PBIS; improve student academic performance by building relationships and supports for students through the Illinois Social Emotional Standards.	1,2,

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

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Students deficient on reading in the Meets/Exceeds range for ISAT with an emphasis on students wtih disabilities.

Objective 1 Description

Presently, on the 2010 reading ISAT, 83% of all students at CMS scored in the meets/exceeds range including subgroup scores of: 84.6% White, 78.3% Hispanic, 88.5% Multiracial/ethnic, 47.9% Students with Disabilities, and 76.2% Economically Disadvantaged. On the 2012 reading ISAT, 92.5% of all students, including each subgroup, will score in the meets/exceeds range, or will meet Safe Harbor provisions.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- b 1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- e 2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students deficient on reading in the Meets/Exceeds range for ISAT with an emphasis on students with disabilities.

	Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	All students will be benchmarked three times (fall, winter, spring) using AIMSweb universal screener for reading fluency (R-CBM) and comprehension (MAZE).	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Closer monitoring of special education students by special education teachers monitoring weekly academic progress of workload and class load special education students in reading interventions and all classes	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	Special education teachers will teach in team taught classes for full 90 minute block.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	Define clear instructional roles for teachers in team taught language arts and math classes.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	Implement SRA Read to Achieve as Tier 2 Reading intervention.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	Implement SRA Reading Success as Tier 3 Reading intervention.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
7	Implement Thinking Reader as Tier 2 intervention.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
8	Teachers differentiating instruction to address intervention, enrichment, and acceleration.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
9	Acquire a clear understanding of the new Common Core State Standards in terms of design, organizational features, and content.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	

10	Teachers comparing current grade level standards with CCSS.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
11	Teachers making/using common assessments to identify learning needs of all students.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students deficient on reading in the Meets/Exceeds range for ISAT with an emphasis on students with disabilities.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Professional development for teachers on system of accountability for special education student progress.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Professional development for team teachers on teacher roles in team taught classes.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	Peer professional development provided by CMS Interventionist on new SRA Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading interventions.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	Peer professional development provided by CMS Interventionist on Thinking Reader as Tier 2 intervention.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	Peer professional development on differentiating instruction to address intervention, enrichment, and acceleration.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	Provide training for all staff on Common Core State Standards expectations.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
7	Teachers to examine current units of study to determine what it takes to reach the level of rigor and thinking expected in CCSS.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
8	Teacher book study using Rethinking HOMEWORK: Best Practices That Support diverse Needs by Cathy Vatterott to develop more common grading policies, including: amount of homework, late work, homework as % of final grade, role of homework in formative and summative assessments.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title :

Students deficient on reading in the Meets/Exceeds range for ISAT with an emphasis on students with disabilities.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Increase number of parents signed up for Edline to monitor student academic progress.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Host Scholastic Book Fair in October during Parent Teacher Conferences to promote reading.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	Parents receive students' AIMSweb reading screening results three times annually with letter of explanation.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	Interventionist to create informational Podcasts for parents to view on CMS website in English and Spanish.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	Academic Recognition Nights for Honor Roll students and families as celebration.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	After School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Students deficient on reading in the Meets/Exceeds range for ISAT with an emphasis on students with disabilities.

Monitoring - Include the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities for the objective and identify the person(s) responsible for overseeing the work. Describe the process and measures of success of this objective. (How will school personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

Monitoring the progress of the CMS School Improvement Plan is the responsibility of the Sterling Public Schools District RtI Team and the Challand Middle School RtI Team.

Members of the Challand Middle School RtI Team include the following staff:

Kathy Howard-Principal

Chris Palmer-Assistant Principal

Ron Rick-Assistant Principal

Callista Derrer-8th Grade Algebra I teacher

Liz Engstrom-8th Grade Language Arts teacher
Keith Kiper-8th Grade Counselor
Kristen Shumard-7th Grade Math teacher
Mary Kay Bohms-7th Grade Language Arts teacher
Suzanne Palumbo-6th Grade Language Arts/Science teacher
Joan Schrinier-6th Grade Language Arts/Science teacher
Becky Haas, Interventionist

District RtI/SIP meetings take place quarterly. In the interim months, the CMS SIP Team meets to discuss the progress of the strategies and activities in the plan, to analyze the new assessment data for the current school year, and to analyze the screening data, and the PBIS/SWIS data. Coordination of information takes place at the the District RtI/SIP meetings.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	Name	Title
1	Kathleen Howard	Principal
2	Chris Palmer	Assistant Principal
3	Becky Haas	Interventionist

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2

Students deficient in math in meets/exceeds range for 2010 ISAT with an emphasis on students with disabilities.

Objective 2 Description

Presently on the 2010 math ISAT, 85.3% of all students at CMS scored in the meets/exceeds range including subgroup scores of: 87.4% White, 82.2% Hispanic, 85.9% Multiracial/ethnic, 57.3% Students with Disabilities, and 75.9% Economically Disadvantaged. On the 2012 math ISAT, 92.5% of all students, including each subgroup, will score in the meets/exceeds range, or will meet Safe Harbor provisions.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- e 1. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- b 2. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

Objective 2 Title :

Students deficient in math in meets/exceeds range for 2010 ISAT with an emphasis on students with disabilities.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Students will be benchmarked three times (fall, winter, spring) using AIMSweb screener for math (MCAP and MCOMP).	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Implement diagnostic component of MCAP.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	Closer monitoring of special education student by special education teachers monitoring weekly academic progress of workload and class load of special education students in math intervention and all classes.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	Define clear expectations for teacher roles in team taught math classes.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	All teachers differentiating instruction to address intervention, enrichment, and acceleration.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	Teachers using flexible grouping for intervention, enrichment, and acceleration.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
7	Acquire a clear understanding of the Common Core State Standards in terms of design, organizational features, and content.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
8	Compare current grade level standards with those of CCSS.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
9	Teachers making common assessments to identify learning needs of all students.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title :

Students deficient in math in meets/exceeds range for 2010 ISAT with an emphasis on students with disabilities.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Professional development on system of accountability for special education student progress.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Peer professional development for team teachers on teacher roles in team taught classes.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	Peer professional development on differentiating instruction to address intervention, enrichment, and acceleration.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	Provide training for stff on Accelerated and Gifted Student characteristics.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	Provide professional development for teachers on flexible grouping as teaching strategy for intervention, enrichment, acceleration.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	Provide training for all staff on Common Core State Standards expectations.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
7	Teachers to examine current units of study and determine what it will take to reach level of rigor and thinking expected in the CCSS.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
8	Provide mini professional development sessions during core and department times.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
9	Teachers in book study group using Rethinking HOMEWORK: Best Practices That Support Diverse Needs by Cathy Vatterott to develop more common grading policies, including homework, late work, homework as % of final grade, homework as formative and summative assessment.	06/08/2011	06/29/2011	Summer School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title :

Students deficient in math in meets/exceeds range for 2010 ISAT with an emphasis on students with disabilities.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Increase number of parents who use Edline to monitor student academic progress.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Parents receive AIMSweb reading screening result three times annually with letter of explanation.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	Interventionist to create informational Podcasts for parents to view on CMS website in English and Spanish.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	Increase number of parents who attend Parent Teacher Conferences in fall and late winter.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	Host Academic Recognition Nights for all Honor Roll students and families.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

Students deficient in math in meets/exceeds range for 2010 ISAT with an emphasis on students with disabilities.

Monitoring - Include the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities for the objective and identify the person(s) responsible for overseeing the work. Describe the process and measures of success of this objective. (How will school personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

Progress on Objective #2 will be monitored by the CMS SIP team at the quarterly district SIP team meetings and also at the quarterly CMS SIP team meetings at CMS. Administrators, teachers, and a Board of Education liaison are all members of the CMS SIP team. All members will monitor the instructional strategies/activities, professional development, and parent involvement strategies/activities for this objective. All staff are informed of the progress of the SIP plan.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	Name	Title
1	Kathleen Howard	Principal

2	Chris Palmer	Assistant Principal
3	Ron Rick	Assistant Principal
4	Becky Haas	Interventionist

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3

Social Emotional: Improve the culture and climate through PBIS; improve student academic performance by building relationships and supports for students through the Illinois Social Emotional Standards.

Objective 3 Description

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) will improve the culture and climate at CMS by building relationships and supports for students through the Social Emotional Standards so that 92.5% of students, including each subgroup, will score in the meets/exceeds range on the 2012 ISAT, or meet the Safe Harbor provisions.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

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

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

Objective 3 Title :

Social Emotional: Improve the culture and climate through PBIS; improve student academic performance by building relationships and supports for students through the Illinois Social Emotional Standards.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	AIMSweb universal behavior screener will be implemented in all grades at CMS.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	PBIS Universal Team will teach explicit PBIS School-Wide Expectations during "boot camp" regularly.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	PBIS Universal Team will implement student Advisory groups.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	PBIS Secondary Team will implement (with counselors) systematic Tier 2 interventions: 1) Check In/Check Out; 2) Small Academic Intervention Groups; 3) Guided Studies Groups.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	Re-define STAR Strategies as instructional time, as I-Block time to address interventions, enrichment, organizational/study skills.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	Common strategies for dealing with minor student misbehavior in classroom and documentation of minor student misbehavior in the classroom will be implemented.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
7	CMS Guidance Counselors will "loop" with their grade level of students in order to build consistent relationships and supports.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
8	Grade level cores will develop common grading policies, including homework, late work, homework as a % of final grade, formative and summative assessments during 2011-12 to be implemented in 2012-13.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
9	CMS Guidance Counselors will re-locate their offices in proximity to their assigned grade level of students.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 3 Title :

Social Emotional: Improve the culture and climate through PBIS; improve student academic performance by building relationships and supports for students through the Illinois Social Emotional Standards.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Professional development by district and CMS counselors on AIMSweb universal behavior screener.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	State Funds	
2	Professional development by CMS PBIS Universal Team on PBIS School-Wide Expectations during opening TI Day schedule.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	Professional development by CMS PBIS Universal Team on student Advisory groups.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	Professional development by PBIS Secondary Team and CMS counselors on the implementation of systematic Tier 2 interventions to include Check In/Check Out, Small Academic Intervention Groups, and Guided Studies groups.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	Professional development for teachers on re-defined STAR Strategies as instructional time for intervention, enrichment, small flexible groups.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	Professional development by PBIS Universal Team for all staff on dealing with minor student misbehavior in the classroom and how to document.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
7	Teachers in book study reading Rethinking HOMEWORK: Best Practices That Support Diverse Needs by Cathy Vatterott to develop more common grading policies, including for homework, late work, homework as % of final grade, formative and summative assessments.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
8	Review of ruby Payne Framework for Understanding Poverty training for all staff.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 3 Title :

Social Emotional: Improve the culture and climate through PBIS; improve student academic performance by building relationships and supports for students through the Illinois Social Emotional Standards.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents will receive information regarding new AIMSweb universal behavior screener.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	PBIS Secondary Team will provide parents with information on implementation of systematic Tier 2 interventions.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	PBIS Teams will publish and send monthly newsletter to families with data and information about PBIS successes.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	PBIS Universal Team to host Back to School Staff/Family BBQ.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	PBIS Universal Team to host coffee/hot chocolate early am for parents.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	Parent Cafes will be implemented in partnership with Sinnissippi Centers and Strengthening Families Illinois.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	
7	Each core of teachers to set up system of communication with families (email, etc) to facilitate information sharing during the core meeting time.	08/17/2011	05/22/2012	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 3 Title :

Social Emotional: Improve the culture and climate through PBIS; improve student academic performance by building relationships and supports for students through the Illinois Social Emotional Standards.

Monitoring - Include the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities for the objective and identify the person(s) responsible for overseeing the work. Describe the process and measures of success of this objective. (How will school personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

Progress for Objective #3 will be monitored by the CMS PBIS Universal Team during monthly meetings, the CMS Secondary Team during monthly meetings, and the CMS SIP team at

their district level meetings and their school level meetings. Information about all instructional strategies/activities, professional development, and parent strategies/activities will be shared out with staff at staff meetings and with families and public on the CMS website.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	Name	Title
1	Kathleen Howard	Principal
2	Chris Palmer	Assistant Principal
3	Ron Rick	Assistant Principal
4	Becky Haas	Interventionist

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation
Part A. Parent Notification*

This section describes how the plan has been developed and reviewed and identifies the support in place to ensure implementation.

Parent Notification - Describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand. (**Requirement for Title I Schools only.*)

The state report card is available on the CMS website and the State of Illinois Board of Education website. Individual ISAT Student Reports are mailed home as soon as they are received, along with a letter of explanation from the principal at CMS. Letters are mailed in both English and Spanish to students who are in the bilingual program. The CMS School Improvement Plan for 2011-12 is available for public viewing as a link on the CMS website, along with SIP meeting agendas and minutes for 2011-12. Additionally, the local newspaper prints the results of ISAT tests for each school annually.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation
Part B. Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder Involvement - Describe specifically how stakeholders (including parents, school staff, and outside experts) have been consulted in the development of the plan. The names and titles of the school improvement team or plan developers must be identified here.

The CMS School Improvement Plan for 2011-12 is the result of data driven decision-making and collaboration among stakeholders including administration at district and school level, staff, community members, parents, and Sterling Public Schools Board of Education. The CMS SIP Team met at both the district level and school level during 2010-11. At the district meetings, we collaborated with the Sterling High School SIP Team to discuss language arts, math, and social emotional curriculum topics. At the school level meetings, the CMS SIP team analyzed standardized achievement data and local universal screening data. The CMS SIP team also monitored the progress of the 2010-11 SIP plan in terms of the instructional strategies/activities, professional development, and parent involvement strategies/activities in order to complete the required SIP Quarterly Reports and the End of Year Report to the district administration and Board of Education.

	Name	Title
1	Kathleen Howard	Principal
2	Matt Birdsley	Assistant Principal
3	Chris Palmer	Dean of Students
4	Becky Haas	Interventionist
5	Keith Kiper	8th Grade Counselor
6	Callista Derrer	8th Grade Algebra I Teacher
7	Liz Engstrom	8th Grade Language Arts Teacher
8	Mary Kay Bohms	7th Grade Language Arts Teacher
9	Kristen Shumard	7th Grade Math Teacher
10	Suzanne Palumbo	6th Grade LA/Science Teacher
11	Roy Calkins	6th Grade LA/Social Studies Teacher
12	Joan Schriner	6th Grade LA/Science Teacher
13	Kelly Martinez	Parent
14	Jim McPherson	Board of Education Liaison
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		

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

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

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

The 2011-12 CMS School Improvement Plan is reviewed by the district administration including the Superintendent of Schools, the Assistant to the Superintendent for Finance, the Director of Curriculum, the Director of Student Services, the Director of Human Services, and the Director of Technology. Additionally, the Education sub-committee, along with the entire Sterling Public Schools Board of Education, will review the CMS 2011-12 School Improvement Plan. Highlights of the plan will be featured during a SPS BOE meeting in the fall.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation
Part D. Teacher Mentoring Process

Teacher Mentoring Process - Describe the teacher mentoring program. Mentoring programs pair novice teachers with more experienced professionals who serve as role models and provide practical support and encouragement. Schools have complete discretion in deciding what else the teacher mentoring program should provide.

Teachers new to Sterling Public Schools participate in a two year mentoring program pairing them with an experienced teacher. The Teacher Induction and Mentoring Program provides ongoing support and assistance to all novice teachers. The outcome of the program is that each teacher will move from the Illinois Initial Teaching Certificate to the Illinois Standard Certificate.

Mentor Program Description

Each new teacher in the district is provided with a teacher mentor. The mentor is selected by principals, must meet district criteria, and participates in the district's Mentor Training Program. Throughout the school year, the mentor and his/her mentee must meet regularly with one another. Each quarter, the mentor/mentee team will meet with the

principal or assistant principal to communicate progress.

Mentors and mentees follow a Mentor/Mentee Scope and Sequence which is based upon the work of Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teaching*. This is a research based framework and is correlated to the Sterling Public Schools' Teacher Evaluation Tool, also based on the Danielson model. The focus of the Mentor/Mentee Scope and Sequence is on the four domains of: 1) Planning and Preparation, 2) Classroom Management, 3) Instruction, and 4) Professional Development.

Goals of the Mentor Program

The goals of the Sterling Public Schools Mentoring Program are: 1) to improve the quality of classroom instruction by ensuring that the new teacher is provided with a research-based, best practices for teaching model, 2) to provide academic and personal support for new teachers, and 3) to acquaint each mentee with tools and information that will assist them "on the job." The latter includes the prevailing culture of our school, the district evaluation procedure, the union contract, and district policies affecting teachers and teaching.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part E. District Responsibilities

District Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that the district has provided to revise the plan and other services that the district will provide toward implementation of strategies and activities. District technical assistance should include data analysis, identification of the school's challenges in implementing professional development requirements, the resulting need-related technical assistance and professional development to effect changes in instruction, and analysis and revision of the school's budget (NCLB, Section 1116). If applicable, identify corrective actions or restructuring options taken by the district.

Services and resources provided by Sterling Public Schools to implement the CMS School Improvement Plan include:

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

The principal meets annually with the district administrative team to present the proposed School Improvement Plan. The plan is reviewed in terms of curriculum, instruction

(teaching and learning), technical support, data analysis supporting the plan, human resources needed to accomplish the plan, professional development activities required by the plan for all staff, student services required to complete the plan, and financial support necessary for the plan to be successful.

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

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

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

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

- e governance and management, and/or
- e financing and material resources, and/or
- e staffing.

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

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

The Illinois State Board of Education and the Whiteside Regional Office of Education provide support services to Sterling Public Schools in terms of the development and review of this School Improvement Plan. The Illinois Interactive Report Card provides a wealth of data that is used in the development of this plan.

	Name	Title
1		

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:

A. ASSURANCES

1. The district has provided written notice in a timely manner about the improvement identification to parents of each student enrolled in the school, in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand (NCLB, Section 1116(c)(6)).
2. Strategies and activities have been founded in scientifically based research as required by NCLB, Section 1116(b)(3)(A)(i) and as defined in NCLB, Section 9101(37).
3. Technical assistance provided by the district serving the school is founded on scientifically based research (NCLB, Section 1116(b)(4)(C)) as defined in NCLB, Section 9101(37).
4. The plan includes strategies and activities that support the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards and ensures alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessments with the Illinois Learning Standards.
5. The school will spend at least 10 percent of the funds made available under Section 1113 of NCLB for the purpose of providing teachers and the principal high-quality professional development. (Title I schools only.)

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

By submitting the plan on behalf of the school the district superintendent certifies to ISBE that all the assurances and information provided in the plan are true and correct and that the improvement plan has been duly approved by the local school board. By sending e-mail notification of the plan completion from the **Submit Your Plan** page (Section IV-C) the plan shall be deemed to be executed by the superintendent on behalf of the school.

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Yes No

Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified? [C]

Yes No

Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness? [C]

Yes No

Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students? [C]

Yes No

Does the analysis, along with other optional data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities? [C]

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

If included, is there evidence that the SIP team analyzed optional data to clarify the areas of weakness?

Yes No N/A

Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?

Yes No N/A

Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes No N/A

If included, has the SIP team analyzed other available data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities?

Yes No N/A

Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?

Yes No N/A

Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

Yes No Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance? [C]

Yes No Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control? [C]

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

Yes No Has the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan? [C]

Yes No N/A Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency? [C]

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

Yes No Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?

Yes No Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement? [C]

Yes No Are the strategies and activities measurable? [C]

Yes No Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified? [C]

Yes No Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear? [C]

Yes No N/A Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students? [C]

Yes No N/A Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status or in special education non-compliance?

Yes No N/A Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities for students? [C]

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]
MONITORING	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers? [C]

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only) [C]
---	---

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the SIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes? [C]

PEER REVIEW

Yes No

Is the peer review process described and is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have “the greatest likelihood” of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP? [C]

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS Yes No

Is it clear how the school is ensuring that teachers are receiving the support needed for their professional growth and to retain them in the profession? [C]

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES Yes No

Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]

 Yes No N/A

If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES Yes No

Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation? [C]

SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM Yes No N/A

Have the names and titles of School Support Team members been listed in the plan? Does the team appear to have the expertise to support this school in regards to the school improvement plan? [C]

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD Yes No

The plan indicates the approval date of this plan. [C]

PART II - COMMENTS