

Local Board Approved	10/19/2011
Initial Submission	12/01/2011
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	110150010261002		
District Name:	Charleston CUSD 1	School Name:	Charleston Middle School
Superintendent:	Mr. Jim Littleford	Principal:	Mr. Brad Oakley
District Address:	410 W Polk Ave	School Address:	920 Smith Dr
City/State/Zip:	Charleston, IL 61920 2557	City/State/Zip:	Charleston, IL 61920 2913
District Telephone#:	Label 2176391000 Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	2176396000 Extn:
District Email:	littlefordj@charleston.k12.il.us	School Email:	
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2011 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	2011-12 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2011-12 State Improvement Status	

	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
Student Groups	%	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	100.0	Yes	91.3		Yes	94.6		Yes	95.8	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	91.6		Yes	94.9		Yes				
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian														

American Indian													
Two or More Races													
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	66.7	74.4	No	80.4		Yes	92.9		
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	82.8		Yes	87.5		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 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

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Attendance Rate (%)	95.6	95.8	96.4	95.6	95.4	95.3	95.2	95.8
Truancy Rate (%)	0.9	17.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.2	0.5
Mobility Rate (%)	11.4	17.1	17.4	12.6	7.6	8.2	9.5	7.8
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	455	452	429	433	411	412	432	384
Low Income (%)	30.3	30.5	29.6	26.3	29.2	31.8	35.4	38.0
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.5
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	17.1	15.1
White, non-Hispanic (%)	94.5	92.7	92.8	93.1	91.7	93.4	93.5	93.5
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	3.1	4.0	3.7	3.7	5.1	2.7	2.5	2.9
Hispanic (%)	2.0	2.0	1.6	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.9	1.3
Asian (%)	0.4	0.9	1.6	0.9	1.0	1.5	1.2	1.3
American Indian(%)	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.3
Two or More Races (%)	-	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.7	0.8
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 (%)
S C H O O L	2000	96.4	1.8	1.0	0.8	-	-	-
	2001	96.2	1.7	1.3	0.8	-	-	-
	2002	97.0	1.8	0.4	0.8	-	-	-
	2003	95.3	2.8	1.1	0.9	-	-	-
	2004	94.5	3.1	2.0	0.4	-	-	-
	2005	92.7	4.0	2.0	0.9	-	0.4	-
	2006	92.8	3.7	1.6	1.6	0.2	-	-
	2007	93.1	3.7	1.4	0.9	0.5	0.5	-
	2008	91.7	5.1	1.5	1.0	0.2	0.5	-
	2009	93.4	2.7	1.5	1.5	-	1.0	-
	2010	93.5	2.5	1.9	1.2	0.2	0.7	-
2011	93.5	2.9	1.3	1.3	0.3	0.8	-	
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	-
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 (%)
S C H O O L	2000	-	18.7	98.3	95.2	18.1	4	0.8	-	-
	2001	-	22.3	99.1	95.6	15.8	2	0.4	-	-
	2002	-	21.1	98.0	94.9	13.2	3	0.6	-	-
	2003	-	25.5	98.2	95.3	17.1	1	0.2	-	-
	2004	-	30.3	98.0	95.6	11.4	4	0.9	-	-
	2005	-	30.5	100.0	95.8	17.1	80	17.9	-	-
	2006	0.2	29.6	100.0	96.4	17.4	-	-	-	-
	2007	0.5	26.3	100.0	95.6	12.6	-	-	-	-
	2008	-	29.2	100.0	95.4	7.6	-	-	-	-
	2009	-	31.8	100.0	95.3	8.2	3	0.7	-	-
	2010	0.2	35.4	100.0	95.2	9.5	1	0.2	-	-
2011	0.5	38.0	100.0	95.8	7.8	2	0.5	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	2000	-	19.5	89.5	94.2	16.3	36	1.2	3.3	84.2
	2001	-	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)
S C H O O L	2000	497	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	471	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	497	-	-	-	247	250	-
	2003	470	-	-	-	225	245	-
	2004	455	-	-	-	240	215	-
	2005	452	-	-	-	222	230	-
	2006	429	-	-	-	217	212	-
	2007	433	-	-	-	221	212	-
	2008	411	-	-	-	196	215	-
	2009	412	-	-	-	227	185	-
	2010	432	-	-	-	209	223	-
2011	384	-	-	-	181	204	-	
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	
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-

S T A T E	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

Educator Data is available only for district level

	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	-	-
	2001	196	17	40,782	36	64	18	20	-	-
	2002	192	16	42,395	38	63	19	20	-	-
	2003	191	17	44,700	35	65	19	20	1	-
	2004	185	16	44,576	35	65	20	20	-	3
	2005	181	16	45,498	36	64	19	23	1	-
	2006	179	15	46,068	36	64	20	23	1	-
	2007	187	15	45,983	40	60	18	22	1	1
	2008	184	15	47,897	39	61	19	22	1	-
	2009	189	15	48,475	39	61	18	19	-	1
	2010	180	15	50,336	37	63	20	20	-	-
2011	167	16	51,346	38	62	20	23	-	-	
	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

S T A T E	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
	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					
	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	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: 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																		
	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	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: 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?

The school report card indicates that Charleston Middle School has consistently met/exceeded AYP standards in math and reading scores within the two sub-groups and overall. **Although 90+% of the CMS students met or exceeded the state standards, CMS did not make AYP in the area of Reading for the special education sub-group.**

Students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students currently are the two sub-groups at CMS.

Trend data shows that attendance rate exceeds the state standards with a 95.8% in 2011.

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

Contributing factors for positive school report card include professional development focusing on math and reading curriculum alignment, ISAT preparation skills, and increased collaboration time within the math department. The special education department focuses on inclusion, but provides a full continuum of services for all areas.

Professional growth for staff included learning about adolescent learners and using best middle-level practices for this age group.

A system is in place to help students who have attendance issues.

Faculty members are more familiar with data regarding CMS students and the staff uses the data to drive instructional decisions.

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

CMS staff is working to align the math and reading curriculum within the building and district wide.

CMS has a Language Arts team who is working with Eastern Illinois University to align our curriculum with the Illinois Learning Standards and best practices for the middle school level.

The schedule we have in place provides staff and students the flexibility for all students to learn grade level curriculum from content area specialists with LBS 1 support.

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?

CUSD #1 has implemented and will continue to use the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) testing as the district universal screener.

MAP was administered to all 7th and 8th Graders in September 2011.

The MAP test will be administered three times each year. CMS staff uses the data from the MAP test to determine if students may have problems in one or more of the following areas: Mathematics, Reading, or Language Arts.

CMS has MAP building leaders who have helped the staff in understanding and using the data gathered from the MAP test.

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

Core teachers collaborate and share lesson plans and instructional activities each week during team planning time.

Staff attends professional development opportunities that relate to best practices in reading and math.

The new MAP data will provide information to assist students that do not meet standards on the test. This information will help the teachers develop plans and interventions to help the students.

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

CMS will continue to use MAP testing data to help staff develop lesson plans and interventions for students who did not meet standards.

CMS will continue to provide training for staff in using and understanding the MAP data that is aligned with the common core standards.

CMS will continue to research and collaborate to determine best instructional strategies for use in our language arts, reading and math curriculum.

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?

Charleston Middle School in 2011 had a 7.8% mobility rate. The rate is slightly lower than the 2010 rate of 9.5%. The low-income rate was 38%, which is an increase from 2010 (35.4%).

CMS has maintained an attendance rate of 95% for several years.

A challenge facing CMS is the modification of the schools behavior management system and increasing test scores in the special education sub-group.

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

The low-mobility rate and the high attendance rate are attributes of CMS. When students are in school, they have a much better chance of learning the material.

Positive student behavior is needed for an effective school climate. CMS staff members are working with students to help provide this positive school environment.

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

The low mobility rate provides continuity in the learning environment for our students.

CMS will continue to gather data on our behavior plan and how it is communicated between administration and staff.

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?

The average teaching experience for the Charleston School District is 16 years, while the state average is 13 years.

The percent of teachers with a Masters Degree is 62% at CUSD #1, which is greater the state average of 60%.

Staff members are working on graduate level coursework at EIU with assistance from tuition waivers provided by EIU to cooperating teachers.

Opportunities for professional growth are provided to staff members regarding best practices for middle-level education.

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

Professional development keeps the CMS staff educated on current adolescent practices in the social and instructional setting.

The high percentage of staff members with advanced coursework shows their dedication to the profession and to their students.

The collaboration between staff members on a daily basis provides a quality education for CMS students.

Support staff provide service to the students and assist teachers with interventions.

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

CMS will continue to provide teachers with professional development and educational opportunities.

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?

The data shows that CMS has 100% parent contact throughout the year. Parent teacher conferences are scheduled for October 18, 19, 20.

Student-led conferences are held for the 7th graders.

Teachers meet with parents during team plan for requested conferences.

CMS has a parent orientation the first week of school. Each team made a presentation to the students and parents on their team.

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

Parental involvement is necessary for student success. CMS strives to involve parents in the educational process to help student's academic achievement.

Parents feel more connected to the activities and academic assignments at CMS. The CMS schedule allows teachers to meet with parents on a daily basis if needed.

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

CMS needs to continue to strive to involve parents in the educational process.

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?

Percentage of students who met/exceeded StateStandards:

7th Grade Reading- 90%

7th Grade Math- 94%

8th Grade Reading-92%

8th Grade MATH-95%

CMS needs to continue to focus on the special education sub-group to make AYP in 2012.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Improvement in Special Education Reading	1,

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

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1

Improvement in Special Education Reading

Objective 1 Description

The goal for 2011-2012 is to improve reading scores in the special education sub-group.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

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

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improvement in Special Education Reading

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Inclusion Reading	08/17/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	After School Tutoring for Students	09/19/2011	05/25/2012	After School	Other	

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improvement in Special Education Reading

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Professional Development	11/10/2011	11/12/2011	After School	Title II	1,500

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

Objective 1 Title :

Improvement in Special Education Reading

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Parent/Teacher Meetings -TCT -Team Meetings _Parent/Teacher Conferences	09/12/2011	05/25/2012	During School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Improvement in Special Education Reading

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?)

The special education staff will meet with the district special education coordinator to problem solve issues/concerns within the building and district.

The success will be determined by how the CMS students perform on the 2012 state test.

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	Brad Oakley	Principal
2	Robert Lynn	Special Education Teacher
3	Charity Sanders	Special Education Teacher
4	Kim Schaefer	Special Education Teacher
5	Blain Mayhall	Special Education Teacher
6	Crisy McMillan	Special Education Teacher

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.*)

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 staff meets to discuss the needs/goals of our building in the spring of each year.

The staff is surveyed to determine goals for the following year.

The core team then takes the surveys and the ISAT data to determine the goals for 2011-2012.

	Name	Title
1	Brad Oakley	Principal
2	Patti Murphy	Reading
3	Tracy Valinevicius	Guidance Counselor
4	Robert Lynn	Special Education Teacher

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.

District Administrators meet to discuss and evaluate the individual building school improvement plans. The administrators use a checklist to evaluate each plan. The peer review for CUSD #1 will take place on October 12, 2011.

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.

CUSD #1 provides a New Teacher Induction Program. The program is a two day training and provides new teachers with information that is needed at the district and building level.

The new staff members go through a training at central office that allows them to get to know each other and their mentor. New staff members go through information that is needed at the district level. (ex. payroll, sick days, personal leave, etc.)

The staff members then come to their buildings to meet with building level administrators to go over process and procedures for their specific building.

The new staff members also have a question/answer session with recent hires to the district.

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.

A quarterly review of the SIP will be completed by using the district monitoring checklist. The process of sharing progress with all stakeholders will be monitored for each revision.

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:
 - governance and management, and/or
 - financing and material resources, and/or
 - 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.

Title II funds will allow staff members to attend professional development opportunities linked to the area of reading and mathematics improvement.

	Name	Title
1	Brad Oakley	CMS Principal
2	Chad Burgett	Elementary Principal
3	Todd Vilaro	Assistant Superintendent
4	Pati Murphy	CMS Reading Teacher
5	Trevor Doughty	CHS Principal
6	Bud McMillan	Special Education Coordinator
7	Rob Ulm	Elementary Assistant Principal

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 10/19/2011

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