

Local Board Approved	11/18/2009
Submitted	11/19/2009
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	11/24/2009

## PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number:	140161300021001		
District Name:	Cook County SD 130	School Name:	Everett F Kerr Middle School
Superintendent:	Dr Raymond A Lauk	Principal:	Carl Gmazel
District Address:	12300 S Greenwood Av	School Address:	12915 Maple Ave
City/State/Zip:	Blue Island,IL 60406 1558	City/State/Zip:	Blue Island,IL 60406 2014
District Telephone#:	Label 7083856800                      Extn: 0	School Telephone#:	7083855959                      Extn: 0
District Email:	kduba@district130.org	School Email:	cgmazel@district130.org
Is this plan for a Title I School? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No			

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 1 - 2008 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?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	Restructuring
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2009-10 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status Year 2

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		70.0			70.0			90.0		78.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	64.6		No	74.1		Yes	94.1			
White														
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	58.0	66.7	No	52.9	63.4	No	89.3			
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	63.7		No	77.4		Yes				
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic													
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	49.4	53.4	Yes	75.9		Yes	96.1		
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	34.2	42.6	No	50.7	55.0	Yes	94.6		
Low Income	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	63.4		No	72.8		Yes			

**Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress**

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 70% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 70% 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 70% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 78% graduation rate for high schools.

\* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2008.

\*\* Safe Harbor Targets of 70% 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.

<b>DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATION</b>
---

The Differentiated Accountability classification for the school is:	Comprehensive
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in reading?	No
Is this school making AYP in the ALL subgroup in math?	Yes

In 2008, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) was one of 6 states to be chosen by the US Department of Education to participate on the Differentiated Accountability Pilot Program. The Differentiated Accountability classification applies only to schools in federal improvement status.

The classification is a descriptor (i.e., focused or comprehensive) that is added to a school's improvement status. Current Title I requirements do not change.

The classification will assist in distinguishing between schools that need focused supports versus more comprehensive interventions.

Focused-School does not make AYP overall, but does make AYP in the "ALL" students subgroup in both reading and math.

Comprehensive-School does not make AYP overall and does not make AYP in the "ALL" students subgroup in either reading or math.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 2 - 2008 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								
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Attendance Rate (%)	95.4	95.4	95.5	94.9	95.1	93.9	94.9	94.1
Truancy Rate (%)	5.9	1.4	1.4	2.3	2.7	1.6	3.3	1.6
Mobility Rate (%)	14.0	16.3	12.7	10.4	11.2	19.7	10.3	15.0
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	374	350	370	380	402	437	420	373
Low Income (%)	75.1	82.0	83.0	84.5	81.8	87.2	84.5	88.2
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	15.5	13.4	16.2	20.3	16.4	15.8	20.2	21.2
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	21.7	18.3	14.3	14.7	15.7	11.9	9.3	9.9
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	11.2	10.9	15.1	13.2	13.4	14.4	15.2	14.2
Hispanic (%)	67.1	70.9	70.3	72.1	70.4	73.0	74.8	73.7
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	-	0.3	-	-	-	-	-
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	0.5	0.7	0.7	2.1

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

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	1999	27.6	17.7	54.7	-	-	-
	2000	25.6	16.1	58.3	-	-	-
	2001	22.5	15.8	61.5	0.2	-	-
	2002	21.7	11.2	67.1	-	-	-
	2003	18.3	10.9	70.9	-	-	-
	2004	14.3	15.1	70.3	0.3	-	-
	2005	14.7	13.2	72.1	-	-	-
	2006	15.7	13.4	70.4	-	-	0.5
	2007	11.9	14.4	73.0	-	-	0.7
	2008	9.3	15.2	74.8	-	-	0.7
2009	9.9	14.2	73.7	-	-	2.1	
D I S T R I C T	1999	37.3	26.6	35.8	0.2	-	-
	2000	36.0	26.1	37.6	0.2	0.1	-
	2001	33.0	25.7	40.7	0.5	-	-
	2002	29.8	26.7	43.3	0.3	-	-
	2003	28.3	25.6	45.7	0.4	-	-
	2004	25.8	25.0	48.7	0.4	-	-
	2005	24.5	24.4	50.1	0.4	0.1	0.5
	2006	22.4	25.3	50.8	0.5	-	1.1
	2007	20.0	25.0	53.3	0.5	0.1	1.2
	2008	17.3	25.9	53.7	0.5	0.1	2.5

	2009	15.5	27.4	53.4	0.5	0.1	3.0
S T A T E	1999	62.0	20.8	13.9	3.2	0.2	-
	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

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

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

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	1999	8.0	54.1	95.5	95.2	13.1	1	0.2	-	-
	2000	7.3	62.4	93.6	94.0	14.2	4	0.8	-	-
	2001	8.5	70.0	100.0	93.7	14.0	47	10.3	-	-
	2002	15.5	75.1	100.0	95.4	14.0	22	5.9	-	-
	2003	13.4	82.0	100.0	95.4	16.3	5	1.4	-	-
	2004	16.2	83.0	100.0	95.5	12.7	5	1.4	-	-
	2005	20.3	84.5	100.0	94.9	10.4	9	2.3	-	-
	2006	16.4	81.8	100.0	95.1	11.2	11	2.7	-	-
	2007	15.8	87.2	100.0	93.9	19.7	7	1.6	-	-
	2008	20.2	84.5	100.0	94.9	10.3	14	3.3	-	-
2009	21.2	88.2	100.0	94.1	15.0	6	1.6	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	1999	11.6	49.5	93.9	95.0	16.8	21	0.6	-	-
	2000	15.5	59.2	92.7	95.0	20.2	28	0.8	-	-
	2001	14.4	62.9	97.5	94.6	17.5	72	2.1	-	-
	2002	16.9	70.6	98.0	95.4	17.8	114	3.4	-	-
	2003	15.9	64.9	99.7	95.3	19.0	66	2.0	-	-
	2004	19.7	74.2	99.7	95.6	16.4	29	0.8	-	-
	2005	18.7	73.0	99.9	95.3	18.6	54	1.5	-	-
	2006	22.0	76.2	99.9	95.2	21.9	56	1.6	-	-
	2007	21.7	77.6	99.8	94.7	18.9	29	0.8	-	-
	2008	22.1	76.5	97.5	95.2	15.2	47	1.3	-	-
2009	24.3	82.5	98.2	94.9	16.5	26	0.7	-	-	

S T A T E	1999	6.4	36.1	96.1	93.6	18.1	43,332	2.3	5.9	81.9
	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	

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	1999	464	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	465	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	436	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	374	-	-	-	131	121	-
	2003	350	-	-	-	117	126	-
	2004	370	-	-	-	113	128	-
	2005	380	-	-	-	119	112	-
	2006	402	-	-	-	147	127	-
	2007	437	-	-	-	140	144	-
	2008	420	-	-	-	142	143	-
	2009	373	-	-	-	125	134	-
D I S T R I C T	1999	3,462	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	3,509	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	3,507	399	389	412	381	380	-
	2002	3,613	429	397	387	398	369	-
	2003	3,544	382	416	393	403	385	-
	2004	3,569	425	389	396	375	409	-
	2005	3,645	420	409	386	380	381	-
	2006	3,707	397	396	430	427	401	-
	2007	3,649	372	383	385	408	403	-
	2008	3,649	400	374	369	438	426	-
	2009	3,743	410	404	386	377	446	-

S T A T E	1999	1,962,026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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

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

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

\*\*Educator Data is available only for district level\*\*

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	1999	210	14	38,973	58	42	21	-	-	-
	2000	228	14	40,155	60	40	19	-	-	-
	2001	242	13	40,513	62	38	19	-	-	-
	2002	250	13	40,793	65	35	20	-	1	-
	2003	260	14	41,987	65	35	18	-	1	-
	2004	253	15	46,844	58	42	18	-	2	-
	2005	245	13	44,363	56	44	18	-	3	-
	2006	240	13	45,928	57	43	19	-	3	-
	2007	249	13	43,169	54	46	18	-	1	1
	2008	258	12	49,538	52	48	18	-	1	2
2009	280	13	51,655	48	52	16	-	1	2	
S T A T E	1999	119,718	15	45,337	53	47	20	18	-	-
	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	14	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	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

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, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>70.0</b>
All	-	-	66.4	52.7	65.9	70.1	-	-	74.6	72.3	63.8	59.6	52.7	63.1	69.7	75.5	74.8	64.4
White	-	-	82.3	64.2	92.3	78.6	-	-	65.2	77.8	90.9	90.0	72.3	85.7	84.2	66.7	81.3	83.3
Black	-	-	69.2	36.4	65.0	64.7	-	-	77.8	66.7	54.1	58.8	66.7	80.0	66.7	68.2	66.7	52.4
Hispanic	-	-	62.3	54.7	62.6	69.5	-	-	76.2	72.2	62.8	55.9	44.2	55.5	66.7	79.8	75.3	65.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	23.1	22.2	33.3	25.0	-	-	-	25.0	22.2	27.0	-	-	-	-	59.3	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	41.2	28.6	56.0	39.1	-	-	33.3	20.0	17.2	19.0	30.8	42.1	23.5	38.1	30.0	37.0
Low Income	-	-	65.9	49.5	67.3	71.4	-	-	73.0	71.3	60.2	59.1	48.9	59.6	66.2	74.8	76.6	60.9

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, 2004-2009																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0
All	-	-	79.3	66.9	73.7	73.3	-	-	75.4	88.4	68.3	78.8	36.0	45.1	67.0	75.7	84.1	66.2
White	-	-	82.4	92.8	84.6	71.4	-	-	72.7	94.5	90.9	90.0	50.0	42.8	78.9	66.7	87.6	81.8
Black	-	-	53.8	63.6	50.0	41.2	-	-	72.3	100.0	54.2	70.6	16.7	40.0	47.6	69.5	76.2	45.5
Hispanic	-	-	82.4	63.9	76.7	80.2	-	-	76.5	85.6	68.8	78.7	36.4	46.7	69.5	79.7	84.9	69.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	69.2	50.0	64.6	62.5	-	-	-	58.3	45.5	57.9	-	-	-	-	69.2	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	35.3	46.5	68.0	56.5	-	-	30.4	46.7	33.3	61.9	0.0	15.0	23.5	33.3	42.1	33.3
Low Income	-	-	79.8	63.4	75.5	75.0	-	-	76.0	88.9	64.6	79.1	35.9	43.3	62.9	74.8	81.5	61.3

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

### Section II-A Plan Activities - Restructuring Options

**Plan Requirements** - District and school planners should consider what has occurred in a school that has brought it to restructuring. The restructuring plan should take into account the actions initiated in prior years. The actions required under the restructuring plan may be seen as deeper, broader, or more targeted to meet identified needs. Each restructuring plan must be submitted to ISBE with the approval of the local board no later than six months after the district's receipt of formal notification regarding the school's AYP status.

**Restructuring Options** - Identify which option(s) the district will initiate with an affected school that does not make AYP for a sixth calculation. Each school restructuring plan must indicate that the district is undertaking one or more of the following actions in the affected school:

- 1. reopening the school as a public charter school, consistent with Article 27A of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art.271],
- 2. replacing all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school's inability to make AYP,
- 3. entering into a contract with an entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the school as a public school,
- 4. implementing any other major restructuring of the school's governance that makes fundamental reform in:
  - i. governance and management, and/or
  - ii. financing and material resources, and/or
  - iii. staffing

### Section II-B Plan Activities - Plan Description

**Restructuring Plan** - Describe the plan for restructuring the school discussing the rationale for option(s) selected, improvement actions prior to restructuring, progress in achieving AYP, timeline, measures for success and monitoring process.

#### Data Review:

Everett F. Kerr Middle School has not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in six years.

Everett F. Kerr Middle School did not make AYP in Reading in 2009.

Everett F. Kerr Middle School did not make AYP in Mathematics in 2009.

Everett F. Kerr Middle School has been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act. The status for 2009-10 for Everett F. Kerr Middle School for Federal Improvement is Restructuring. The Differentiated Accountability classification for the school is comprehensive. The school did not make AYP in the ALL subgroup in reading and did make AYP in the ALL subgroup in math. The last year that Kerr made AYP was 2003. Following is a chart illustrating the AYP results for Kerr since 2004.

#### Everett F. Kerr Middle School AYP Results

Year	AYP in Reading	Subgroups not making AYP in Reading	AYP in Math	Subgroups not making AYP in Math
2004	Yes		No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All</li> <li>• Hispanic</li> <li>• Low Income</li> </ul>
2005	Yes		No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All</li> </ul>
2006	Yes		No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IEP</li> </ul>
2007	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IEP</li> </ul>	Yes	
2008	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LEP</li> </ul>	Yes	
2009	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All</li> <li>• Black</li> <li>• Hispanic</li> <li>• IEP</li> <li>• Low Income</li> </ul>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Black</li> </ul>

Each year, since 2004, the school did not make AYP. In 2004-2006, though Reading AYP was made, Math was not made in different subgroups (noted above). In 2007-2008, the school made AYP in Math and did not make AYP in Reading in two different subgroups (noted above). The 2009 results are the most challenging because Kerr did not make AYP in both Math and Reading. Math results show the black subgroup not making AYP with two grade levels (6th and 8th) being over 25% below the meets and exceeds standard. Reading results show all subgroups not making benchmark with one subgroup (LEP) making AYP through Safe Harbor. In analyzing the data, several grade levels and subgroups showed a dramatic loss of in the percentage of students in the meets and exceeds category.

These results require a comprehensive approach to improve the school with both measured content areas (Reading and Math) being impacted and all subgroups in Reading not

meeting the target. To remedy the performance of the school and its students the approach chosen has to be aimed at all students at the school in reading and math. Though the school made AYP for all subgroups, except Black, in Math with the 2010 target of 77.5% none of the subgroups would meet or exceed.

The attendance rate from 2007 to 2009 has fluctuated between 93.9% (2007), 94.9% (2008) and going down in 2009 to 94.1%. The truancy rate improved in 2009 by 1.7%. from 2008 while the mobility rate for 2009 increased by 4.7% from 2008. The school population was at its lowest level since 2004 and the population of Limited English Proficient increased by 1% since 2008. While the white, non-Hispanic population and multiracial population grew slightly both the Black and Hispanic population dropped a small % from 2008. Between 1999 and 2009 student race/ethnicity has shifted dramatically at Everett F. Kerr Middle School. In addition, the low income population at the school has grown reaching the level of 88.2% for 2009. The teacher population has been stable at the school with new teachers replacing veteran teachers at their retirement. The review of AYP performance at grade levels by subgroups does not indicate a pattern of an upward trend. It indicates a fluctuating pattern of ups and downs for both grade levels and subgroups in both reading and mathematics. In addition, there is a pattern of large achievement gaps between ethnic subgroups in both reading and math.

In addition to the numerical data that was reviewed, the Everett F. Kerr District Restructuring Team (Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Administrator for Personnel, Administrator for Pupil Personnel Services, Director of Government Funded Programs, Designee ['10-'11] for Director of Government Funded Programs, AIMS Coach) interviewed the staff individually in October 2009. An identical interview protocol was used with each individual staff member and it follows:

<b>1. Why is Kerr at the point of restructuring?</b>
<b>2. Tell me about relationships in the Kerr building. Why? ....</b>
<b>3. How do YOU know if students (subgroups?) are learning and making progress?</b>
<b>4. Tell me about the children who attend Kerr . Why? ....</b>
<b>5. Tell me about the most effective support the students have at Kerr that helps them achieve academically. Why?</b>
<b>6. In what ways have you been able to make a difference in the lives of the children at Kerr?</b>
<b>7. Were you surprised that Kerr did not make AYP?</b>
<b>8. If you had a child in the middle school would you send them to Kerr? Why?</b>
<b>9. How can the district support Kerr during the restructuring process? Why?</b>
<b>10. What program or group has been the most effective in improving student achievement at Kerr?</b>
<b>11. Last year the LEP group made AYP and can you tell me about how that happened?</b>
<b>12. If you had the authority to change one thing to improve student achievement at Kerr, what would it be and why?</b>
<b>13. What have I not asked you that you think it is important that I know? Why?</b>

Following the interviews the Restructuring Team analyzed each set of answers looking for overall trends and patterns from the staff input through the interviews. As a result the Restructuring Team recommends that, in order to promote increased achievement, several deep actions are necessary. The school has been making incremental changes during the years of school improvement and these have produced some improvement but not sufficient to make AYP for all subgroups and all students. In the past, following ISAT results Kerr School concentrated on the deficient subgroup for additional resources and services. The other students (subgroups) continued receiving instruction and services in the pre test way.

Last year, the school blocked reading and language arts schedules so that they were back to back and one teacher instructed for both periods. Additional staff development for this new block scheduling opportunity was not provided in Language Arts/Reading. Additionally, in the 2008-09 school year the Special Education cross categorical students were connected to general education classrooms for opportunities to team teach. Additional staff development was not provided. The bilingual classes in 2008-09 were changed from an organization of grade level teachers to content level teachers teaching in their strengths. The pattern at the school has been to make structural changes in an effort to meet student needs. Staff Development sharing and showing how to make the best use of the new time and structure, matched to these changes, has not been provided. In an effort to build a Professional Learning Community approximately eight people attended intensive training in 2008-09. Upon return to Kerr, the science teachers began the implementation of the Professional Learning Community model. There is no evidence that other content or grade level teams implemented the practices shared at the training.

**In order to meet Adequate Yearly Progress at Everett F. Kerr School the following Restructuring Plan will be implemented.**

- replacing all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school's inability to make AYP.
- 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.

#### **Staffing:**

All of the current Kerr staff are not highly qualified. One component of the plan is implementing Option 2: replacing all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal. All Kerr staff interested in returning to the school next year must re-apply for their positions and be selected by the Superintendent. The order of interviews would be:

- 1.) Kerr Staff,
- 2.) District 130 staff,
- 3.) External candidates.

Interviews would begin immediately, beginning with candidates for Principal, Assistant Principal, and, a new position at the school, Literacy Coach. These individuals would be part of the interview team to select the rest of the staff.

- a. Interviews with staff would be conducted in December with the goal of appointments announced prior to winter break.
- b. Substitutes will be brought in to cover classes so teachers can attend the interview sessions.

The expectations and qualifications for staff include:

- a. Teachers must be Highly Qualified under federal and state laws.
- b. Staff must participate in regularly scheduled professional development programs to be designed with the input of the restructured Kerr staff .
- c. Staff must participate in Parent Outreach programs to be designed with the input of the restructured Kerr staff.
- d. Staff must participate in a three day summer planning academy.
- e. Staff must participate in the design and implementation of after school Community Center activities. Student participation rates should be:
  - i. Year 1 - 30% to 50%
  - ii. Year 2 - 40% to 70%
  - iii. Year 3 - 100%
- f. Staff must participate in the design and implementation of physical and aesthetic changes to the school building.
- g. Staff must understand and implement revised administrative systems that support student and staff success. (SOPs...returning students, struggling students, etc.)
- h. Staff must enthusiastically embrace and implement advanced technology for assessment, administrative, and instructional purposes.
- i. Staff must function as effective members of this new team focused on students.

The Literacy Coach position, a member of the Administrative Team indicated above, is a new full time position being added to the school staff.

Currently a Literacy Coach consultant provides monthly workshops for two grade levels of teachers at all Middle Schools. In addition, the current consultant makes limited classroom visitations to all reading classrooms in middle schools for demonstration and modeling purposes. Teachers must effectively monitor student assessments. The new Literacy Coach will be assigned only to Kerr Middle School to provide ongoing inservice embedded in the daily life of the school. The Literacy Coach will:

- a. Ensure that teachers are using student achievement data to drive their instructional decisions in the reading classroom and guide teachers in the collection and analysis of data to determine student needs and help teachers respond to those identified needs.
- b. Ensure that reading teachers are implementing the curriculum and its pacing guidelines and provide individualized classroom support.
- c. Provide support for teachers to align their instruction with the curriculum and meet the needs of students.
- d. Support teachers' use of a variety of resources to improve reading instruction to meet the needs of all students
- e. Support teachers to increase the quality and effectiveness of classroom instruction by modeling, demonstrating and providing appropriate teacher development.
- f. Ensure, with the principal, that teachers are effectively monitoring student assessments in reading.

The full time Literacy Coach will work with teachers to effectively monitor the results of all student reading assessments and ensure that teachers use the results to direct instruction. The school currently uses a large amount of fiction material for reading instruction and the use of non-fiction expository texts will be increased. The students at the school have underdeveloped academic vocabulary. A systematic approach to vocabulary instruction and vocabulary selection by grade level will be directed and monitored by the literacy coach and principal.

---

Measurement and accountability systems will be fully incorporated into all school design functions.

Paraprofessional positions will be filled once reduction in force decisions have been made in spring.

In addition, Option 4, the plan for ongoing governance, management, resources and staffing will be shared with current staff. Staff will be required to commit to the implementation of the new model. Critical decisions at the school will be reviewed by the District Restructuring Team (Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Administrator for Personnel, Administrator for Pupil Personnel Services, Director of Government Funded Programs, Designee ('10-'11) for Director of Government Funded Programs, AIMS Coach) with an ongoing process for developing the capacity of staff to serve as members of the School Leadership Team. Currently, as part of the monitoring practices of the district, the principal meets monthly with the District Team to review data regarding all aspects necessary to improve student academic achievement. This will be continued. The district team makes a commitment to have members on site weekly.

The Restructuring District 130 Team will work with the restructured staff to continue in the restructured Kerr Middle School to begin the specific planning necessary for the opening of a restructured Kerr Middle School in Fall 2010. These staff members will be grouped into "design teams" that focus on the critical components of the restructured school:

- Curriculum
- Professional Development
- Parent Outreach
- After-school Community Center Activities
- Physical and aesthetic changes to the Kerr building
- Administrative systems that support student and staff success including schedules
- Advanced technology for assessment, administrative and instructional purposes

Members of the Design teams will visit current middle schools in Illinois that have met AYP with similar demographics as models for the key focus areas (curriculum, professional development, parent outreach, after-school Community Center activities, physical and aesthetic changes to the Kerr building, administrative systems that support student and staff success, advanced technology for assessment, administrative and instructional purposes). Team members will visit at least two middle schools in Illinois in January 2010. The schools will have received state recognition (Illinois Spotlight School, Academic Achievement Award, Academic Excellence Award) and design team members will create a list of potential improvements for Kerr Middle School at the debrief meeting following the visits within three days. The District Restructuring team consists of the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Director of Pupil Personnel Student Services, Administrator for Personnel Services, Director of Government Funded Programs and the designee for Government Funded Programs (former Assistant Principal at Kerr) and the AIMS Coach for Kerr (former principal of a middle school in District 130). A member of the District Restructuring Team will be present at the visits. Design teams will review current research on successful middle schools focusing on practices related to the focus areas (curriculum, professional development, parent outreach, after-school Community Center activities, physical and aesthetic changes to the Kerr building, administrative systems that

support student and staff success, advanced technology for assessment, administrative and instructional purposes) by mid-February 2010. The teams will create short descriptions of research reviewed to share with all team members. A member of the District Restructuring Team will participate in the meeting regarding research reviewed. At least two research based studies will be reviewed in each of the focus areas noted. The short descriptions of the analysis of the research will be completed by February 15, 2010. Design teams will develop plans for the restructured Kerr Middle school in the key focus areas (curriculum, professional development, parent outreach , after-school Community Center activities, physical and aesthetic changes to the Kerr building, administrative systems that support student and staff success, advanced technology for assessment, administrative and instructional purposes). Members of the District Restructuring Team will participate in Design Team meetings as support. Members of Design Teams will meet monthly January 2010 to April 2010 to plan the restructured KerrMiddle School. All initial planning will be completed in writing by April 2010.

#### **Schedule:**

The restructured Kerr staff will study the current school schedule to analyze its ability to meet the needs of the current students at the school. For example, are students identified as needing additional support in reading and math programmed into double language arts or math periods to meet those needs? These staff members will work with the Kerr administration to develop a schedule that meets those needs for Fall 2010. The current daily schedule of the school will be expanded to provide continuing support for students before school (September 2010) and after school (January 2010)with individualized and small group support through tutoring and homework support using school,district and community support such as models as After the Bell). The school will extend the school year (June and July 2010) for selected students through focused modules of instruction that meet the student need in reading and/or mathematics. These students will be selected based on the ongoing monitoring of the AIMSWeb assessment results and the experience of students in Tier II and Tier III interventions. Interventions will be provided for both levels Tier II and Tier III in reading and mathematics (February 2010). In addition, current programs that are in place to support students, such as PITSCO and Lexia will be evaluated for effectiveness in enhancing student performance in reading and math.

#### **Professional Learning Community**

Staff interviews indicated an inconsistency regarding relationships in the building and varying perceptions of staff working together as a team. The school and all its staff will be required to commit to developing and implementing an effective professional learning community model. It will include the expectations of professional behavior described by Michael Fullan and Andy Hargreaves as demonstrating respect for each other and constructively analyzing and criticizing practices and procedures. More than this, the professional learning community model used for Kerr will follow the description outlined in Whatever It Takes: How Professional Learning Communities Respond When Kids Don't Learn. This book describes the development of consistent, systematic procedures that ensure each student is guaranteed additional time and support when needed and the staff responds to students communally rather than as individuals. The just in time training for the development of the professional learning community will be the responsibility of the District Restructuring Team working with the restructured school leaders and the reestablished Kerr School Improvement Team. It will be supported by the coach from AIMS. The purpose of the Professional Learning Community development is to guarantee improved results of all children learning and meeting or exceeding academic expectations as demonstrated by their performance on the ISAT test. AIMS membership (Title IIA) will continue to be supported and provide an ongoing support system for the school.

### **Curriculum and Testing Program**

Though other schools in the district have undertaken curriculum mapping projects, Kerr has not in the recent past. The district is undertaking a district curriculum mapping initiative leading to curriculum map for all content areas that includes pacing guides. Currently, the local assessments that are in place district wide are described by staff as not being aligned to state standards. Following the mapping, the district and its staff will work with a selected vendor to put in place local assessments aligned to state standards, that will be administered following a district schedule, analyzed with the intent of impacting classroom instruction for increased student learning.

Staff reported that data was not available and the habit of collecting, reviewing, and analyzing data is not currently part of the school culture. A data team model will be developed at the school that engages all teaching staff in reviewing student progress on a regular basis. The restructured staff will be required to engage in this professional behavior regularly and consistently. The results of the analysis of assessments will drive classroom instruction and inform the development of ongoing professional development for teachers and staff.

### **Staff Development**

Professional development will be embedded in the daily schedule of the school to provide support for effective first teaching. The focus will be raising expectations for all students with staff who have the belief that they will make the difference. The results of the assessments will be shared with students to enhance their goal setting in core curriculum areas and enable them to understand their personal educational status.

Teachers will be required to participate in ongoing professional development in reading, math, working with English Language Learners, and using effective instructional strategies (such as developing academic vocabulary, thinking and writing extended response in both reading and math).

The staff must participate in regularly scheduled professional development programs to be designed with the input of the restructured Kerr staff.

### **Culture/Climate of the School**

It was reported during interviews that there is a need to engage and build relationships with students and support for this staff capacity will be provided. There is an existing student council organization. Members of the council will be interviewed to analyze its effectiveness. Support systems designed by the restructured Kerr staff will build on the existing strengths of the council organization and continue to develop its influence in student leadership and student input. Studies of more than 2.2 million young people consistently show that the more assets (40 common sense, positive experiences and qualities that help influence choices young people make and help them become caring, responsible adults) young people have, the less likely that are to engage in a wide range of high-risk behaviors and the more likely they are to thrive. The District Restructuring Team will work with the restructured Kerr leadership and staff to implement an asset development initiative that engages teachers, staff, parents and the community in supporting Kerr students. The Search Institute has done research on this topic and its programs will be used as the model for building both internal and external support systems for

students. The student body will be assessed for the presence of assets in their life that support their success. Asset development will be planned for students with staff, parent and community partnerships. The district has adopted PBIS. Kerr' s level of implementation will be analyzed with the expectation that PBIS uniform implementation will be supported by the school administration and there will be an increased consistency across the school. The district's external coach will be used to implement the analysis. An action plan for complete implementation will be developed by members of the restructured Kerr staff.

#### **Parent-Community Connections**

One consistent message heard in the staff interviews was the relationships between the school and parents was not strong. Research shows that school, family and community partnerships are an essential component of school and classroom organization. Well-implemented , goal-oriented programs and practices of family and community involvement can help increase student learning and development. The National Network of Partnership Schools (NNPS) assists schools through their tools and services to develop school programs that create a welcoming school environment for families and engage families and the community in ways that support student achievement and success. The six types of involvement NNPS recommends are parenting skills, effective communication, volunteering, learning at home, participation as decision makers and collaborating with the community. The online tool for Illinois Schools for Parent Involvement Analysis will provide the baseline information for the development of the parent outreach plan to be developed by the restructured Kerr staff. Parents will be involved in supporting learning through regular parent involvement activities (scheduled quarterly beginning in January 2010).

---

**Section IV-A Local Board Action**

**DATE APPROVED** by Local Board:                   **10/15/2009**

By submitting the plan on behalf of the district, the district superintendent certifies to ISBE that all the information provided in the plan is true and correct and that the restructuring plan has been duly approved by the local 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.

**RESTRUCTURING DESCRIPTION** Yes  No

Does the plan describe an option for restructuring allowed in the law?

 Yes  No

Does the district make the case that the option selected is appropriate for the school?

 Yes  No

Does the plan explain corrective actions (Title I funded schools) or other district improvement strategies implemented at the school that will remain in place or be a part of the restructuring plan?

 Yes  No

Do state assessment data indicate that the school is showing progress from corrective actions? Is the continuation of these actions warranted or reasonable?

 Yes  No

Does the plan provide a timeline for implementing the restructuring option and the corrective actions that precede it?

 Yes  No  N/A

Does the plan identify the measures for success associated with the district's actions and restructuring strategy?

 Yes  No

What benchmarks of success are planned to monitor progress of this plan and who is responsible for overseeing the implementation and monitoring of this plan?

**APPROVAL DATE OF BOARD** Yes  No

This section includes the certification of local board approval and provides ISBE staff the opportunity to reflect on the school improvement plan overall.

**RESTRUCTURING PLAN COMMENTS**

November 24, 2009

This is a strong, clear restructuring plan and I look forward to talking with district staff about it. I would like to know more about corrective actions taken at this school and

benchmarks of success for implementation.

The final part of the review of this plan is a conversation with me. Will you give me a call or email me and let me know of a good time for us to talk? Thanks, Carol Diedrichsen  
217-524-1086 [cdiedric@isbe.net](mailto:cdiedric@isbe.net)

(Note: If you have done a presentation for your board or others about this plan and would like to present all or part of that to me in discussing your plan, please feel free to do so. While no formal presentation is required, I'm hoping to collect the ideas from schools in restructuring to share with others in the state. Policies and practices from those in the field have far more weight with school staffs. So, even if you have 3-5 PowerPoint slides that share your story and identify the key elements of your plan, I'd be grateful to see and share them.)