

District Improvement Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring	
Local Board Approved	11/16/2011
District Plan Submitted	12/01/2011
District Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE District Improvement Plan Monitoring Completed	

Additional Compliance Submissions by District	
RtI Compliance Submission	12/01/2011
Special Education Compliance Submission	12/01/2011
Title III Compliance Submission	

 District Information

RCDT Number:	110150010260000		
District Name:	Charleston CUSD 1	Superintendent:	Mr. Jim Littleford
District Address:	410 W Polk Ave	Telephone:	2176391000
City/State/Zip:	Charleston, IL 61920 2557	Extn:	0
Email:	littlefordj@charleston.k12.il.us		
Is this for a Title I district ?		<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No
Is this for a Title III district that did not meet AMAO?		<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2011 AYP Report

Is this District making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this District been identified for District Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this District making AYP in Reading?	No	2011-12 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this District making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2011-12 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		85.0			85.0			91.0		82.0	
All	100.0	Yes	99.9	Yes	84.9		Yes	87.8		Yes	94.6	Yes	84.5	Yes
White	100.0	Yes	99.9	Yes	85.3		Yes	88.3		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian														
American Indian														

Two or More Races														
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	58.0	63.4	No	68.2	71.4	No	94.0		78.7	
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	99.8	Yes	77.1	77.4	No	83.5		Yes	94.3		76.8	

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

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

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







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

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2011 AMAO Report

2011 AMAO Report will be available soon.

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

District Information								
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Attendance Rate (%)	94.9	94.6	94.6	94.5	94.6	94.8	94.3	94.6
Truancy Rate (%)	0.8	3.7	1.2	1.2	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.6
Mobility Rate (%)	11.1	13.8	12.2	16.9	13.1	9.4	13.9	10.3
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	85.3	87.3	90.3	91.6	88.8	88.0	82.4	84.5
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	4.3	2.1	1.8	2.5	3.1	2.7	2.7	2.7
District Population (#)	2,952	2,922	2,902	2,859	2,881	2,776	2,853	2,849
Low Income (%)	29.5	30.2	27.6	31.4	33.9	35.2	37.6	36.2
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.5
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	18.2	18.5
White, non-Hispanic (%) 	94.3	93.0	93.2	91.9	91.0	91.0	90.6	90.3
Black, non-Hispanic (%) 	3.2	3.3	2.9	3.0	3.6	3.1	2.8	3.2
Hispanic (%) 	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.2
Asian (%) 	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.3	1.1
American Indian (%) 	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.5
Two or More Races (%)	-	0.9	1.4	2.4	2.4	3.0	3.4	3.6
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%) 	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0

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

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	American Indian (%)	Two Or More Races (%)	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	95.4	2.8	0.9	0.8	0.1	-	-
	2001	94.6	3.2	0.8	1.3	0.1	-	-
	2002	95.0	3.0	0.9	1.0	0.1	-	-
	2003	94.8	2.8	1.2	1.1	0.1	-	-
	2004	94.3	3.2	1.2	1.2	0.1	-	-
	2005	93.0	3.3	1.4	1.2	0.1	0.9	-
	2006	93.2	2.9	1.4	1.0	0.1	1.4	-
	2007	91.9	3.0	1.4	1.0	0.2	2.4	-
	2008	91.0	3.6	1.8	1.0	0.3	2.4	-
	2009	91.0	3.1	1.7	1.0	0.2	3.0	-
	2010	90.6	2.8	1.7	1.3	0.2	3.4	-
2011	90.3	3.2	1.2	1.1	0.5	3.6	0	
S T A T E	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7	-
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8	-
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2	-
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7	-
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5	-
	2010	52.8	18.8	21.1	4.2	0.2	2.9	-
2011	51.4	18.3	23.0	4.1	0.3	2.8	0.1	

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truancy (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	0	19.5	89.5	94.2	16.3	36	1.2	3.3	84.2
	2001	0	23.5	99.2	94.4	15.0	33	1.1	3.5	87.5
	2002	0.3	24.7	98.4	94.4	14.1	33	1.1	4.3	85.8
	2003	0.2	25.8	98.3	94.4	12.6	65	2.2	2.6	92.6
	2004	0.3	29.5	97.8	94.9	11.1	22	0.8	4.3	85.3
	2005	0.4	30.2	99.8	94.6	13.8	106	3.7	2.1	87.3
	2006	0.4	27.6	99.8	94.6	12.2	34	1.2	1.8	90.3
	2007	0.4	31.4	99.8	94.5	16.9	34	1.2	2.5	91.6
	2008	0.5	33.9	100.0	94.6	13.1	18	0.7	3.1	88.8
	2009	0.3	35.2	100.0	94.8	9.4	17	0.6	2.7	88.0
	2010	0.5	37.6	100.0	94.3	13.9	20	0.7	2.7	82.4
2011	0.5	36.2	99.6	94.6	10.3	17	0.6	2.7	84.5	
S T A T E	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
	2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1
	2010	7.6	45.4	96.2	93.9	13.0	72,383	3.6	3.8	87.8
2011	8.8	48.1	96.0	94.0	12.8	63,067	3.2	2.7	83.8	

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

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

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
D I S T R I C T	2000	3,166	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	3,017	226	238	223	249	233	238
	2002	3,083	224	218	217	247	250	241
	2003	2,993	227	220	220	225	245	224
	2004	2,952	218	218	223	240	215	208
	2005	2,922	245	216	219	222	230	233
	2006	2,902	213	244	208	217	212	228
	2007	2,859	184	208	237	221	212	217
	2008	2,881	211	192	203	196	215	210
	2009	2,776	212	217	187	227	185	204
	2010	2,853	207	216	227	209	223	202
2011	2,849	213	204	213	181	204	198	
S T A T E	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2,044,539	164,413	157,570	159,499	160,924	156,451	138,559
	2004	2,060,048	161,329	160,246	158,367	162,933	160,271	139,504
	2005	2,062,912	156,370	158,622	160,365	162,047	162,192	142,828
	2006	2,075,277	155,155	154,372	158,822	160,362	160,911	147,500
	2007	2,077,856	155,356	153,480	154,719	162,594	159,038	150,475
	2008	2,074,167	155,578	152,895	153,347	160,039	161,310	149,710
	2009	2,070,125	156,512	152,736	152,820	155,433	158,700	144,822
	2010	2,064,312	155,468	154,389	152,681	154,465	154,982	146,919
2011	2,074,806	153,516	153,301	154,241	153,981	153,986	151,059	

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

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

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials (%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	194	17	39,593	36	64	19	21	0	0
	2001	196	16	40,782	36	64	18	20	0	0
	2002	192	16	42,395	38	62	19	20	0	0
	2003	191	17	44,700	35	65	19	20	0	0
	2004	185	16	44,576	35	65	20	20	0	3
	2005	181	16	45,498	36	64	19	23	1	0
	2006	179	15	46,068	36	64	20	23	1	0
	2007	187	15	45,983	40	60	18	22	0	1
	2008	184	15	47,897	39	61	19	22	0	0
	2009	189	15	48,475	39	61	18	19	0	1
	2010	180	15	50,336	37	63	20	20	0	0
2011	167	16	51,346	38	62	20	23	0	0	
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	0	0
	2001	125,735	14	47,929	54	46	19	18	0	0
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	2	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	12	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1
	2010	132,502	13	63,296	42	57	18	18	0	1

	2011	128,262	13	64,978	40	60	19	19	1	1
--	------	---------	----	--------	----	----	----	----	---	---

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2006-2011																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
Groups	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	75.4	77.1	75.8	79.8	82.7	83.6	78.1	80.9	81.9	82.0	83.2	86.8	76.7	72.1	84.5	84.8	86.6	87.0
White	76.6	77.4	76.4	80.1	82.8	83.8	79.3	81.5	81.2	82.0	83.9	87.2	76.8	74.2	84.3	84.3	88.4	87.7
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80.0	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	34.9	38.1	46.9	59.4	61.3	58.8	34.9	36.9	51.5	50.0	60.0	57.5	40.7	26.8	42.3	54.6	64.6	44.4
Low Income	59.5	62.3	68.1	70.7	70.9	76.6	66.2	68.5	62.3	74.4	76.4	75.6	56.1	51.4	75.0	67.2	81.6	79.3
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Groups	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	86.7	82.4	87.0	91.9	88.2	89.2	85.6	88.5	91.5	86.6	93.9	89.6	89.3	87.1	93.8	93.5	89.8	92.1
White	87.2	83.2	87.0	91.9	88.1	89.9	85.3	89.6	92.4	87.5	93.4	89.5	89.3	87.3	94.3	94.0	90.5	92.8
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	90.0	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	40.6	48.3	50.0	67.8	53.9	60.0	59.6	60.6	65.2	59.1	64.7	60.0	64.3	54.3	82.8	70.0	71.7	52.6
Low Income	82.1	64.5	76.0	86.0	73.9	80.7	73.6	77.3	80.7	76.1	90.0	74.1	73.7	76.6	94.4	88.6	85.3	88.4
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[Note: for High Schools, High School Districts, or Unit Districts Only]

PSAE - % Meets & Exceeds Reading grade 11

Groups	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	61.4	54.4	72.8	63.5	61.6	64.4
White	61.1	56.8	72.7	62.9	63.3	64.8
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	58.3
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	22.8	28.5	48.0	14.7	10.0	30.0
Low Income	41.0	34.7	59.1	44.1	39.2	44.2
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2006-2011																		
Groups	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	86.7	90.4	89.6	92.0	89.9	92.3	92.7	93.6	95.6	95.6	96.7	93.6	88.3	90.2	91.1	97.2	91.3	92.5
White	86.8	91.0	90.2	91.6	88.3	92.7	93.1	93.1	95.2	95.8	96.9	94.4	90.1	91.2	91.5	97.5	91.0	92.8
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80.0	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	58.1	76.2	77.6	83.8	75.5	76.4	74.4	73.7	85.3	83.4	86.1	84.6	66.7	63.4	69.2	90.7	68.7	70.4
Low Income	77.2	82.6	84.6	89.0	86.0	86.3	83.8	87.6	88.1	91.9	94.7	88.5	79.0	81.1	83.1	94.6	87.9	89.7
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Groups	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	90.4	93.8	90.8	95.0	92.7	88.7	89.0	91.2	93.0	91.5	96.9	94.2	94.2	91.4	92.8	94.0	89.3	94.8
White	90.7	93.3	90.6	95.6	92.3	88.4	89.9	91.6	93.0	92.8	97.2	93.8	94.7	91.4	93.3	94.6	90.1	95.5
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	90.0	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	56.3	70.0	59.5	78.6	69.2	56.0	61.9	66.7	60.9	70.4	88.3	80.0	76.2	71.4	72.4	70.0	63.0	73.7
Low Income	88.1	88.7	87.8	90.1	83.1	81.9	81.1	83.0	87.7	86.6	95.8	86.2	82.4	85.0	87.0	86.8	83.8	88.4
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[Note: for High Schools, High School Districts, or Unit Districts Only]

PSAE - % Meets & Exceeds Mathematics grade 11

Groups	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5	85.0
All	49.1	45.6	62.7	53.3	56.3	57.2
White	49.0	47.4	65.7	53.4	57.4	59.2
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	41.6
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	11.4	8.1	12.0	14.7	3.3	13.3
Low Income	30.8	20.4	43.2	23.5	33.4	37.2
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

Despite increases in the district's percentage of low income students, state achievement test performance continues to remain strong at all grade levels. The 2011 district average for students who meet or exceed on the ISAT (90.55%) is 8.55% above the state's average (82.0%). The 2011 district average for students who meet or exceed on the PSAE (59.8%) is 9.3% above the state's average (50.5%). When comparing 2010 and 2011 PSAE results, district students increased in the meets/exceeds category by 3.1%. When comparing 2010 and 2011 ISAT results, district schools averaged improvement in the following categories: math (.8%), reading (1.4%), IEP math (2.3%), and economically disadvantaged reading (2.8%). The percentage of district students with disabilities who met or exceeded reading and mathematics standards on 2011 state standardized tests was 58.4%, 14.03% higher than the state's average.

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

All of the district's teachers are "highly qualified" by state definition. The attendance (94.6%) and graduation (84.5%) rates remained high and above the state's average. The truancy rate (0.6%) was below the state's average (3.2%). The district's dropout rate matched the state's average (2.7%). While state standardized test scores remain high, it appears that, as they advance in grade level, students are less likely to perform as well on state standardized tests when compared to the scores of students at lower grade levels. Possible contributing factors to this phenomenon include the following:

- an increase in test item difficulty;
- excessive testing, resulting in test "burn out" or test apathy;
- the extent to which test items measure the existing enacted curriculum; and
- students coming to the realization that test results have little impact on their grades or personal lives.

According to Reid Lyon, who summarized 130 studies over a ten year period, "Approximately 80 percent of students with learning disabilities have been described as reading disabled" (1996). This data is a possible contributing factor to the district's lower reading scores among students with disabilities when compared to their non-disabled peers. The historical increases in reading scores of students with disabilities, however, are likely to be attributed to the district's increasing efforts to expose students with disabilities to the general education curriculum.

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

Charleston High School administration and staff have developed and begun to implement several strategies to improve achievement scores. Some of these, outlined in its restructuring plan, include professional development focused on differentiation and use of data to plan for instruction as well as the addition of academic literacy and numeracy courses for incoming freshmen student not meeting standards. The elementary and middle schools continue to explore strategies to help students be more successful, including the use of data to make school-level and classroom-level decisions aimed at improving student achievement. Current practices continue to be included in new teacher orientation sessions and building inservices. The district has taken steps to increase its focus on professional development activities and protocols that are aimed at helping improve achievement levels for student with disabilities.

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data**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?**

Charleston CUSD #1 assesses its students using growth model tests. Assessments begin at the kindergarten level and are administered as follows:

- K students are assessed three times a year using AIMSweb;
- students in grades 1-11 are assessed three times a year using Measures of Academic Progress (MAP);
- high school students are also assessed at grade 9 using the EXPLORE test, grade 10 using the PLAN test, and departmental common assessments

are used in grades 9-12 in English and mathematics.

In addition to these formal assessments for all students, schools administer more indepth informal assessments with struggling students (e.g. Quantitative Reading Inventory, Reading Recovery Assessment).

Data from these local assessments indicate that our students are likely to perform as well as or slightly better than past years on state achievement tests. More importantly, local assessments indicate areas of strength and of needed improvement for individual students.

RtI

AIMSweb and MAP data tell us which students are at risk of failure in reading, language usage and mathematics. They can also be used to identify areas of strength and needed improvement in the district's curriculum. Explore and PLAN are currently being used to identify students who are not meeting state standards in some curricular areas and are in need of interventions.

Behavior—currently there is a district wide discipline plan which includes expected behaviors and consequences. From this plan, data has been extracted that indicates building level success.

DATA: In 2005-06, Teacher Collaboration Teams were implemented across the district to encourage staff to utilize interventions prior to making a referral to special education. In 2004-05, 47 of 47 students referred for a full and individual evaluation were found eligible for special education. In 2007-08, 18 students were found eligible for special education. Trend data regarding TCT indicates that more boys than girls are referred and about half had qualified for free and reduced meals.

DATA: Prior to the 2009-2010 academic year, universal screeners were not consistent and diagnostic instruments had not been identified; therefore, targeted interventions were challenging to develop. Beginning in 2009-10, however, screening, diagnostic and progress monitoring instruments have been identified and are being implemented. Data from these tools will be used by Teacher Collaboration Teams to aid in the problem-solving process for student academic improvement.

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

The current K-11 local assessments begun during the 2009-2010 school year will be evaluated for their effectiveness. Improved and differentiated delivery of instruction to students and high expectations of all certified and non-certified staff would be significant factors in the improvement of student achievement. Frequent parent communications and parental involvement add greatly to the learning communities at the elementary and middle school levels. Supported by historical trend data, as students advance in grade level, they become less likely to be motivated to do well on the various local assessments.

RtI

FACTORS: A district wide assessment plan, allowing for the measurement of the implementation and integrity of the curriculum, is being finalized during 2009-10. The current lack of consistent trend data makes drawing conclusions unreliable. Currently character education and conflict resolution is being taught in the elementary levels. Social workers, psychologists, and counselors directly address individual and small group needs of all students and make referrals to outside agencies. The middle school has an advisory program,

as well as a defined behavior matrix which establishes behavioral expectations. The high school has a student interventionist who works directly with students who need additional instruction.

FACTORS: As inclusive options have increased, referrals for evaluations have been reduced. Professional development on Differentiated Instruction was provided and monitored. Intervention programs have been developed. Parents are invited to attend all problem solving meetings. In 07-08, 72% of the parents attended. A "pyramid of interventions" framework available in all buildings. All staff members have been trained in Response to Intervention and understand that general education teachers are the key to success.

FACTORS: The district continues to develop systemic protocols for monitoring students' progress and movement among tiers. The district is developing a plan for identifying and implementing interventions.

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

The district is committed to practicing research-based instructional strategies at all levels. Instructional coaches, teacher leaders, Reading Recovery and Title I staff, and reading intervention groups continue to build strong learners. Building level and grade level meetings and inservices center on "best practices." In 2010-11, collaboration time will continue to be available to review what is working and how it can be made even better. Paraprofessionals will continue to be inserviced so they are more proficient in helping students read, learn and experience success. Charleston High School's administration is committed to making improvements in the classroom delivery of instruction and to helping all students learn and succeed. This administration will be using the information from the MAP, PLAN and EXPLORE tests more effectively to gauge what individual students need. Their regular, schoolwide use of newly designed and implemented WORKKEYS style problems that stress of vocabulary and root words should produce positive results. Strategies continue to be developed to improve the testing climate for all students and to send a strong message about the importance of all portions of the PSAE. Close scrutiny is also being given to significantly delayed students that would profit from taking the IAA.

RtI

CONCLUSIONS: A district assessment plan that includes universal screening, diagnostic, and progress monitoring tools for all grade levels is being finalized in 2009-10. The district's assessments will be used to contribute to program evaluation. Low rate of suspensions, expulsions, and alternative placements indicate successful interventions and instruction.

CONCLUSIONS: Improved scientifically based reading research (SBRR) strategies and progress monitoring tools need to continue to be implemented as "standard practices" in the district. Effective use of data from district-wide local assessments in order to differentiate instruction and aid in problem solving needs to continue to be stressed among district staff.

CONCLUSIONS: The district's Assessment Committee has developed assessment tools that are currently in use. The committee will need to study the effectiveness of the district's assessment tools during 2010-2011. Ongoing professional development on SBRR should be made available to staff. School's systems for identifying needed interventions should be finalized and communicated to school's staff and parents.

Section I-C. Data & Analysis - Other Data

Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

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

Charleston, Illinois is a progressive city of over 21,000 persons located in East Central Illinois. Rich in the history of Abraham Lincoln, the city features a balance of industrial, agricultural, educational and cultural opportunity. Located on Highway 16, just 10 miles east of Interstate 57, Charleston is the county seat for Coles County and is the center of government and commerce for the predominantly rural and agricultural region surrounding Coles County. With nearly 183,000 people residing within a thirty-five mile radius of Charleston, a capable and willing workforce is readily available for business and industrial firms located here. Charleston is a city where the work ethic remains strong and the spirit of community support is high.

Eastern Illinois University (EIU), located in Charleston, is the largest employer with a staff of approximately 1,800 and an enrollment of over 11,000 students. The Charleston Community Unit School District #1 benefits from hundreds of EIU practicum students and observers each year as well as the various student teachers who have dedicated hours to serving Charleston students as they prepare for their own careers in education. Fine arts opportunities are abundant in the community due to its close proximity to EIU and the interest and support of community members.

With its close proximity to large metropolitan areas, access to recreational sites, business and employment opportunities, Charleston provides its citizens with a full range of living experiences that are generally found in much larger communities. Highway 16 is the primary retail corridor in Charleston with a peak ADT of 25,000 vehicles per day. The industrial area is located along Illinois Route 130 and Eastern Illinois Railroad on the north side of town.

Today, Charleston is a community providing more than 300 stores and a wide variety of services in the downtown square shopping district and Lincoln Avenue commercial areas. The city's industrial complex is home to several national and international manufacturing firms. The Coles Business Park and East Side Commercial Area offer various opportunities for retail, service and industrial businesses. Surrounded by family farms and rich soils, Charleston's economy is bolstered by agriculture. The county's more than 900 farms produce 15.3 million bushels of corn and 4.6 million bushels of soybeans each year (information from the Charleston Chamber of Commerce).

Charleston and Mattoon High Schools collaborate on educational endeavors, allowing the districts to pool staff development resources for the benefit of all students. In the past, Charleston was involved with the Lumpkin Family Foundation in the *Soaring Schools!* initiative. This initiative led to Charleston High School joining the High Schools That Work (HSTW) network directed by the Southern Regional Education Board. Through this affiliation, Charleston has implemented the *HSTW Key Factors* for student success at the high school level.

Charleston Middle School (CMS) serves students in grades 7-8. CMS utilizes the *Turning Points Model* which is endorsed by the Association of Illinois Middle Schools. The six Turning Points practices are: Improving Learning, Teaching and Assessment for all students, Building Leadership Capacity and a Professional Collaborative Culture, Data-Based Inquiry and Decision Making, Creating a School Culture to Support High Achievement and Personal Development, Networking with Like-Minded Schools, and Developing District Capacity to Support School Change.

Jefferson Elementary School serves students in grades 4-6. The school's vision and mission are reflected in its three school improvement goals: balanced literacy/numeracy, student support services, and providing a connected community. Jefferson students have experienced academic success in part due to the utilization of the following initiatives: 6 Traits Writing Program, Readers' and Writers' Workshop, extensive data analysis, an after-school support program, Reading Recharge Afterschool Program for targeted students, Qualitative Reading Inventory, Sitton Spelling, extensive word study, and access to an extensive collection of trade books for all reading levels.

The primary (grades K-3) centers utilize Reading Recovery, Title I schoolwide services, after-school programs, the America Reads Program, the Buddy Reading Program, and an extensive group of community and EIU volunteers to support literacy.

Student learning in Charleston is affected by the poverty and student mobility rates. The low income rate in the Charleston School District has increased over each of the last six years, reaching a high of 37.6% of the students qualifying for free/reduced meals in 2009-10. The student mobility rate in the district is 11.7%, a decrease of 5.2% since an all-time high of 16.9% in 2006-07.

Due to the larger workforce of college students and locals and the community's accepting attitude, many agencies, group homes and work stations for the developmentally delayed have located in Charleston. For a city of its size, Charleston has a disproportionate percentage of individuals under 22 years of age with significant learning and physical disabilities.

Rtl

DATA: Parent Involvement Parent participation in Problem Solving meetings is strong—2%.

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

Students in the district's elementary grades have shown continuous success over the previous years. All of the aforementioned programs and initiatives have worked toward this goal as well as the consistent efforts to include parents and the community in literacy activities. Building level efforts to promote collaboration and to design schedules and inservices that feature "best practices" and curriculum articulation not only build the professionals' knowledge and skills but send a strong message on their value to the school community as a whole.

Rtl

FACTORS: Staff members communicate frequently and positively with parents during the entire year, so parents feel welcome and as equal participants in the education process. Parents are now initiating contact with school staff to access interventions.

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

All of the aforementioned programs will be continued and expanded, as financially possible, to further enhance students' chances for success.

Rtl

Curriculum is aligned with state standards. The district's Assessment Committee will be evaluating various universal screenings, progress monitoring, and diagnostic tools to be used at all grade levels to assure implementation integrity of the core curriculum.

CONCLUSIONS: Additional communication with parents and community about the interventions being offered and how they are implemented needs to occur. Additional information about curriculum changes, interventions, strategies will be provided to parents.

Section I-C. Data & Analysis - Other Data**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 tell you?**

All certified staff and all paraprofessionals meet the state and federal guidelines for being "Highly Qualified". Teachers in the Charleston CUSD #1 have an average of 15.8 years of teaching experience and 62.3% of the certified staff have a master's degree or above. All staff members continue to meet CPDU and CEU requirements. The district has offered professional development for all staff including, but not limited to, the areas of working with students with disabilities, differentiated instruction, use of assessment data, and school safety. Thirteen teachers have attained National Board Certification, which is the highest number per district of any in this Regional Office of Education.

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

Professional development opportunities are planned at the beginning of each year, monthly for a hour and half, and at the end of the year. New teacher training is held prior to the beginning of school with periodic after school sessions during their first two years of service. As needed, special education inservice is also provided for classroom teachers as well as special educators. A full continuum of special education services is provided for the study body. Paraprofessionals receive inservices in literacy and numeracy instructional support as well as the special needs of the students they serve.

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

The professional development, schoolwide model of inservice, collaboration, training and time to practice what staff learn have been most beneficial. The district will need to continue to place professional development emphasis on meeting each student's educational needs, through an understanding of and ongoing development of a standards based curriculum, the effective use of assessment data, the setting of high expectations and goals with students, and planning for and implementation of differentiated instruction. A particular professional development focus will be on serving the needs of students with disabilities.

Section I-C. Data & Analysis - Other Data
Item 3 - Parent Involvement

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

Parental involvement opportunities vary between buildings and grade levels. All schools host orientations and open houses, have updated websites, communicate with parents electronically (that chose to accept this option), and have weekly-monthly written updates. Staff in grades K-8 host fall and spring parent/teacher conferences. Staff in grades K-6 promote their school's programs through PTA organizations, and schools that serve grades 7-12 have a variety of parent booster groups (e.g. art, music, athletics). Parents are solicited to volunteer in the classrooms, media centers and with extra curricular activities. Parental input is also sought through a variety of surveys and committees (e.g. Parent-Teacher Advisory, special education, assessment, gifted, Title I, wellness, calendar).

Rtl

Currently, student's parents are members of problem solving teams (TCT) at each building level. Parents are involved in the decision-making process across all tiers. Parents are represented on the district's Rtl Committee.

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

Increased parental involvement has promoted a feeling of familiarity with the schools, leading to a readiness to share strengths and concerns so these can be addressed for the benefit of students and programs. When parents demonstrate a interest in and value of learning and the schools, students will, in all probability, share these values.

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

Continuing to keep a variety of communication methods and participation opportunities available to parents should increase their knowledge about the learning that is taking place in the schools and the value of the schools in their families' lives.

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

Section I-D - Key Factors - From the preceding screens (I-A, I-B, I-C), identify key factors that are within the district'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?

It is within the district's control to use data from AIMSweb, MAP, EXPLORE, PLAN and other assessments to help refine individual instruction. The district has also made a concerted effort to implement district-wide approaches, through its Comprehensive Literacy Model, to promote research based literacy instruction. While research shows that "of those children who are reading disabled in the third grade, approximately 74% continue to read significantly below grade level in the ninth grade" (Lyon, 1996), research also indicates that students with learning disabilities can improve reading skills through a combination of multisensory phonics approaches, meaning-based approaches, and interventions to address comprehension problems. Indicating that no single reading method will be effective for all students with learning disabilities, research supports the differentiated instruction practices that the district continues to embrace.

RtI

Access to general education curriculum by all students has increased in the past three years. All buildings participate in inclusive options. The use of universal screening tools for grades K-11 can now contribute to the identification of students who need further support. Professional development will continue to be needed in differentiated instruction, scientifically based reading instruction, assessment, progress monitoring, collaborative practices, and inclusive efforts.

Section II-Action Plan

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed	
		AYP	AMAO
1	Response to Intervention (RtI) Implementation	3,	
2	Improvements in Literacy	1,	

3 Improvements in Numeracy

2,

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

1 Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

2 Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

3 Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO Report.

This district is not accountable for AMAO for this year

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1 Title :

Response to Intervention (Rtl) Implementation

Objective 1 Description :

By the 2013-14 academic year, consistent mechanisms will be in place for students to move from one tier to another.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

3 Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

No Deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO report.

This district is not accountable for AMAO this year

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

Objective 1 Title :

Response to Intervention (Rtl) Implementation

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Consistent and reliable tools across the district are being implemented to accurately monitor and diagnose learning difficulties. Interventions to align with diagnostic information need to be identified and implemented with integrity. Some are being piloted and evaluated.	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	3000
2	Parent representatives will be added to the district's Rtl Committee.	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 1 Title :

Response to Intervention (Rtl) Implementation

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Gen ed, special ed, paraprofessionals, and parents will be offered opportunities for professional development.	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Title II	5000
2	Curriculum mapping committees and the District Literacy Team will continue to align materials with research.	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Title II	8000
3	Documentation of parent notification and involvement are embedded in the Problem Solving Team process.	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
4	Continuous training on RTI and differentiated instruction will be provided for all staff.	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Title II	4000
5	Some early dismissal time and released time will be used for professional development on RTI, including collaboration across grade	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0

levels.					
---------	--	--	--	--	--

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

Objective 1 Title :

Response to Intervention (RtI) Implementation

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parent representatives will be added to the district's RtI Committee.	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Response to Intervention (RtI) Implementation

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 for this objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

A formal system of monitoring the effectiveness of RtI interventions and determining the need for changes will need to be developed by the district's RtI Committee. This work will be initially supervised by the district's special education coordinator and assistant superintendent. A district instructional coach who has extensive expertise in RtI chairs the district's RtI Committee.

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	E. E. McMillan	Special Education Coordinator
2	Todd J. Vilaro	Assistant Superintendent
3	Kristen Holly	Instructional Coach

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2 Title :

Improvements in Literacy

Objective 2 Description :

Students in grades 3-8 will maintain or continue to make reading improvements on the ISAT in reading meets/exceeds at 92.5% for all students or make Safe Harbor. Charleston High School will improve literacy scores to meet the 92.5% benchmark for all students or make Safe Harbor.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

1 Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

**No Deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO report.
This district is not accountable for AMAO this year**

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

Objective 2 Title :

Improvements in Literacy

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Inclusionary services for students identified by the IEP/MDC team	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	3000
2	Coteaching reading activities	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	3000
3	Use of short-term assessments to determine student progress and plan interventions	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Title II	3000

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

Objective 2 Title :

Improvements in Literacy

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Continue training of regular education and special education staff members on the use of inclusionary practices, including the mentoring of new staff.	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Title II	3000
2	Training new staff and collaboration with experienced staff on the use of co-teaching.	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Title II	2000
3	Training new and experienced staff in the use of diagnostic assessment and additional resources for addressing student learning needs.	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Title II	4000
4	Design, develop, and implement K-12 English Language Arts Curriculum Mapping.	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Title II	8000

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

Objective 2 Title :

Improvements in Literacy

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Continue to involve parents, staff and administrators in the special education improvements being handled via a variety of committees.	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Providing parents with a list of acronyms used for IEPs and more thorough explanation of the process prior to the actual IEP meeting.	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	1000
3	Involve parents in their children's learning and reading at home and at school.	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Title I	2000

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

Improvements in Literacy

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 for this objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

Monitoring of the plans will include regular meetings among the special education coordinator and staff, district RtI Committee, building administrators, and Title I staff. Input from teacher leaders and paraprofessionals will also be used in determining which approaches are the most beneficial for student learning and the delivery of services.

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	E. E. McMillan	Special Education Coordinator
2	Todd J. Vilardo	Assistant Superintendent
3		

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3 Title :

Improvements in Numeracy

Objective 3 Description :

Students in grades 3-8 will maintain or continue to make numeracy improvements on the ISAT in mathematics meets/exceeds at 92.5% for all students or make Safe Harbor. Charleston High School will improve numeracy scores to meet the 92.5% benchmark for all students or make Safe Harbor.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

2 Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

No Deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO report.

This district is not accountable for AMAO this year

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

Objective 3 Title :

Improvements in Numeracy

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Inclusionary services for students identified by the IEP/MDC team	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Local Funds	2000
2	Use of shortterm assessments to determine student progress and plan interventions	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Title II	3000
3	Professional development sessions focused on improving teaching strategies in presentation of mathematics curriculum including the differentiated formatting of questions	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Other	2000
4	Tutorial time staffed by mathematics teachers for students who are struggling in their mathematics classes	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Other	0

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

Objective 3 Title :

Improvements in Numeracy

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Teachers attend a variety of workshops presented locally and nationally and then share information with their colleagues.	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	During School	Title II	6000

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

Objective 3 Title :

Improvements in Numeracy

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parents receive information via a variety of methods regarding ways they can help their children with mathematics.	08/16/2011	05/31/2013	After School	Local Funds	500

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 3 Title :

Improvements in Numeracy

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 for this objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

The continued growth/success of the students in grades 3-8 and the improved scores of all 9-11 grade students will be the benchmark for determining the success of the efforts and whether they should be maintained for the following year.

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	E. E. McMillan	Special Education Coordinator
2	Todd J. Vilardo	Assistant Superintendent
3		

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation
A. 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 district improvement team or plan developers are identified here.

Input from building administrators, central office administration, Title I staff, regular and special education staff, the special education coordinator, special education consultants, curriculum councils (elementary, middle and high school) and parents has been solicited via a variety of meetings and inservices. The district improvement team consists of the following: Todd Vilardo, assistant superintendent; Bud McMillan, special education coordinator and elementary principal; Diane Hutchins, secondary principal; Brad Oakley, middle level principal; Debbie Poffinbarger, elementary principal; Chad Burgett, elementary principal; and Terry Diss, elementary principal.

Rtl

Central office and building level leadership is very supportive of RTI efforts across the district. A collaborative model is currently in place. A plan to provide information to internal and external stakeholders has been implemented. Parents are underrepresented in plan development. Parents will be added to the district's Rtl Committee. The district's Rtl plan is being integrated into various school-based teams (e.g. curriculum councils, curriculum mapping and common assessment teams, district literacy team).

Rtl Committee members include: Chad Burgett, elementary principal; Terry Diss, elementary principal; Katie Williams, school psychologist; Amanda Gentry, elementary teacher; Tyler Hanner, district numeracy coach; Kristen Holly, instructional coach; Ruth Hughes, literacy coach; Diane Hutchins/Trevor Doughty, secondary principal; Linda Kirby, secondary teacher; Rita McCollum, school psychologist; Kristen McDevitt, social worker; Bud McMillan, special education coordinator; Chris Bily, elementary teacher; Carla Robison, elementary LBS; Brad Oakley, middle level principal; Kelly Bacon/Katie Lancaster, elementary teacher; Debbie Poffinbarger, elementary principal; Jennifer Shuler, elementary LBS; Kathy Bossert, social worker; Rud Watson, SLP; Tracy Valinevicius, guidance counselor; Todd Vilardo, assistant superintendent

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation
B. 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 responsibilities include providing technical assistance to the schools including data analysis, identification of the district'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 district's budget to ensure that funds provided under Title I and Title III supplement, not supplant, non federal funds, and that services provided with these funds are comparable with the services in schools that are not receiving funds under Title I (NCLB, Section 1116 and 1120A).

Title I funds have been exclusively in Mark Twain, Ashmore, Carl Sandburg, and Jefferson Elementary Schools. The programs and services offered are so important to student growth and literacy that Title I and local funds are also used to enable the district to offer the current services and their related professional development. Title II funding is needed to provide the staff release time for the ongoing development and writing of the K-12 reading and math curriculum and other professional development that enhanced the

delivery of services and learning to students. The funding source for technology, administration and special education consultants is provided by local funding.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation
C. State Responsibilities

State Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that ISBE, RESPROS/ISCs, and other service providers have provided the district 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 district, if requested, to develop and implement the district plan and work with schools needing improvement. Such technical assistance shall be supported by effective methods and instructional strategies based on scientifically based research. The technical assistance shall address problems, if any, implementing the parental involvement activities described in NCLB, Section 1118, and the professional development activities described in NCLB, Section 1119. [NCLB, Section 1116(c)(9)(B)].

While suspended during the 2010-2011 school year, RESPRO was available to Charleston High School for the implementation of additional strategies for higher student success in literacy and numeracy. The Eastern Illinois Education for Employment System has also assisted the high school in providing resources for assisting freshmen learning and goal setting. The K-8 building administrators work closely with parents and staff to continually improve services and communications for all of their students and families. Technical assistance for district improvement plan monitoring will be provided through online resources obtained through the ISBE's website (e.g. monitoring prompt). Technical assistance for parental involvement activities will be provided through the ISBE's link to an online parent involvement data analysis tool and other resources.

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 11/16/2011

A.Assurances

1. 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).
2. Technical assistance provided by the district serving its school is founded on scientifically based research (NCLB, Section 1116(b)(4)(C)) as defined in NCLB, Section 9101(37).
3. The plan includes strategies and activities that support the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards and ensures alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with the Illinois Learning Standards.
4. The district will spend at least 10 percent of the funds made available under Title I, Part A, subpart 2 of NCLB, for the purpose of providing high-quality professional development. (Title I districts only.)

B.Superintendent's Certification

By submitting the plan on behalf of the district, 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 plan completion from the **Submit Your Plan** page the plan shall be deemed to be executed by the superintendent on behalf of the district.

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 DIP 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 data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?[C]

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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

OTHER DATA

Yes No

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

Yes No

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 DIP team stated measurable objectives that promote continuous and substantial progress to ensure that students in each subgroup meet the State’s target (e.g., in delivering tiered services or differentiated instruction)?

Yes No

Has the DIP 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 and AMAO deficiency?[C]

Yes No N/A

Do the objectives address the areas of special education compliance?

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?

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 special education non-compliance?

Yes No N/A

Do the parent involvement strategies and activities clearly align with the strategies and activities for students?[C]

Yes No 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="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?[C]
MONITORING	
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?[C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> 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	
METHODS OF PLAN DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, AND IMPLEMENTATION	
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT	
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?[C]
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Does the DIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that best effect necessary changes?[C]
DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES	
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?[C]
STATE RESPONSIBILITIES	
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> 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]
APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD	
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.[C]

PART II - COMMENTS