

| Plan Submission and ISBE Monitoring |            |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| Local Board Approved                | 10/15/2009 |
| Submitted                           | 10/19/2009 |
| Plan Resubmitted                    |            |
| ISBE Monitoring Completed           | 12/22/2009 |

## 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: | School Telephone#: | 7083855959                      Extn: 0 |
| District Email:  | rlauk@district130.org                       | School Email:      | cgmazel@district130.org                 |
| Is this plan for a Title I School? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |   |                    |   |

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 1 - 2009 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<br>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**<br>Harbor<br>Target | Met AYP | %           | Safe**<br>Harbor<br>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             | Yes     |                 |         |
| 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 - 2009 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<br>C<br>H<br>O<br>O<br>L           | 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<br>I<br>S<br>T<br>R<br>I<br>C<br>T | 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                      |
|                                      | 2000 | 61.1      | 20.9      | 14.6         | 3.3       | 0.2                 | -                        |



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

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<br>C<br>H<br>O<br>O<br>L           | 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<br>I<br>S<br>T<br>R<br>I<br>C<br>T | 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                 | -                   | -                      |
|                                      | 2000 | 6.1     | 36.7           | 97.2                     | 93.9           | 17.5         | 45,109              | 2.4                 | 5.8                 | 82.6                   |

|                       |      |     |      |      |      |      |        |     |     |      |
|-----------------------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|--------|-----|-----|------|
| S<br>T<br>A<br>T<br>E | 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<br>(N) | Grade 3<br>(N) | Grade 4<br>(N) | Grade 5<br>(N) | Grade 7<br>(N) | Grade 8<br>(N) | Grade 11<br>(N) |
|--|------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| <b>S<br/>C<br/>H<br/>O<br/>O<br/>L</b>             | 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            | -               |
| <b>D<br/>I<br/>S<br/>T<br/>R<br/>I<br/>C<br/>T</b> | 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            | -               |
|  | 2000 | 1,983,991     | -              | -              | -              | -              | -              | -               |
|  | 2001 | 2,007,170     | 164,791        | 161,546        | 162,001        | 151,270        | 148,194        | 123,816         |

|                       |      |           |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|-----------------------|------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| S<br>T<br>A<br>T<br>E | 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 (%) |
|--|------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>D<br/>I<br/>S<br/>T<br/>R<br/>I<br/>C<br/>T</b> | 2000 | 228                   | 14                             | 40,155                  | 60                                  | 40                                | 19                               | -                                | -                                    | -                                   |
|  | 2001 | 242                   | 13                             | 40,513                  | 63                                  | 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                   | 13                             | 49,538                  | 52                                  | 48                                | 18                               | -                                | 1                                    | 2                                   |
| 2009   | 280  | 13                    | 51,655                         | 48                      | 52                                  | 16                                | -                                | 1                                | 2                                    |                                     |
| <b>S<br/>T<br/>A<br/>T<br/>E</b>                   | 2000 | 122,671               | 15                             | 45,766                  | 53                                  | 47                                | 19                               | 18                               | -                                    | -                                   |
|  | 2001 | 125,735               | 15                             | 47,929                  | 54                                  | 46                                | 19                               | 18                               | -                                    | -                                   |
|  | 2002 | 126,544               | 14                             | 49,702                  | 54                                  | 46                                | 19                               | 18                               | 2                                    | 2                                   |
|  | 2003 | 129,068               | 14                             | 51,672                  | 54                                  | 46                                | 18                               | 18                               | 3                                    | 2                                   |
|  | 2004 | 125,702               | 14                             | 54,446                  | 51                                  | 49                                | 19                               | 19                               | 2                                    | 2                                   |
|  | 2005 | 128,079               | 14                             | 55,558                  | 50                                  | 49                                | 19                               | 18                               | 2                                    | 2                                   |
|  | 2006 | 127,010               | 13                             | 56,685                  | 49                                  | 51                                | 19                               | 19                               | 2                                    | 1                                   |
|  | 2007 | 127,010               | 13                             | 58,275                  | 48                                  | 52                                | 19                               | 19                               | 2                                    | 3                                   |
|  | 2008 | 131,488               | 12                             | 60,871                  | 47                                  | 53                                | 18                               | 18                               | 1                                    | 1                                   |

---

|  |      |         |    |        |    |    |    |    |   |   |
|--|------|---------|----|--------|----|----|----|----|---|---|
|  | 2009 | 133,017 | 13 | 61,402 | 44 | 56 | 18 | 18 | 1 | 1 |
|--|------|---------|----|--------|----|----|----|----|---|---|

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<br/>% 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<br/>% 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<br>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<br/>% 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<br/>% 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  | -           | -           | 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<br>Disabilities              | -           | -           | 35.3        | 46.5        | 68.0        | 56.5        | -           | -           | 30.4        | 46.7        | 33.3        | 61.9        | -           | 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 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?

Based on the 2008/2009 School Report Card data, the following are indicated as weaknesses in math and reading.

Based on the 2008/2009 ISAT data the following subgroups did not make 70% in math: 50.7% of the Students with Disabilities met or exceeded in mathematics reaching SafeHarbor: 56.5% of 6<sup>th</sup> grade, 61.9% of 7<sup>th</sup> grade, and 33.3% of 8<sup>th</sup> grade.

Based on the 2008/2009 ISAT data the following subgroups did not make 70% in reading:

Only 63.4% of the Low Income subgroup met or exceeded in reading: 71.4% of 6<sup>th</sup> grade, 59.1% of 7<sup>th</sup> grade, and 60.9% of 8<sup>th</sup> grade.

Only 51.6% of the Limited English Proficient subgroup met or exceeded in reading reaching SafeHarbor: 46.2% of 6<sup>th</sup> grade, 25% of 7<sup>th</sup> grade, 24% of 8<sup>th</sup>.

**Only 58% of the Black subgroup met or exceeded the standards in reading: 64.7% of 6<sup>th</sup> grade, 58.8% of 7<sup>th</sup> grade, and 52.4% of 8<sup>th</sup> grade**

**Only 52.9% of the Black subgroup met or exceeded the standards in mathematics: 41.2% of 6<sup>th</sup> grade, 70.6% of 7<sup>th</sup> grade, and 45.5% of 8<sup>th</sup> grade.**

**Only 63.7% of the Hispanic subgroup met or exceeded the standards in reading: 69.5% of 6<sup>th</sup> grade, 55.9% of 7<sup>th</sup> grade, and 65.9% of 8<sup>th</sup> grade.**

Based on the 2008/2009 School Report Card data, the following are indicated as strengths.

**There has been an increase from 48.2% to 51.6% in the meet and exceeds LEP group in Reading.**

LEP students made SafeHarbor in Reading.

All students met AYP in math except for the Black population.

2/7/2010 2:31:21 PM

Attendance for the school is 94.1%.

Based on the 2008/2009 ISAT data the following subgroups made 70% or more in math:

77.4% of the Hispanic subgroup met or exceeded the standards in mathematics.

75.9% of the LEP subgroup met or exceeded the standards in mathematics.

72.8% of the Low Income subgroup met or exceeded the standards in mathematics.

Based on the 2008/2009 data, student attendance exceeded the state benchmark of 90% with an overall attendance rate of 94.1%.

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

The following factors contributed to the school's results:

Home language

**Lack of parental involvement and awareness in school culture**

**Limited home resources including technology**

Premature exit from Transitional Bilingual Education program

Gap in intermediate and middle school skills that will be addressed with Professional Learning Communities and articulation meetings between feeder schools and the middle schools

**Lack of student participation in available academic assistance programs**

Inability to sustain focus while reading long passages

2/7/2010 2:31:21 PM

---

Lack of implementation of non-fiction materials that are focused in ISAT exam

Underdeveloped vocabulary

Low student/family expectations for academic achievement

Students/parents do not have an understanding of the importance of the test results

Test anxiety and disruptive behaviors

IEP students with 1-on-1 accommodation taking test with teachers who are not highly qualified in Special Education

Teachers not effectively monitoring students taking tests

**The implementation of a new standards based curriculum that aligns with state and ISAT standards.**

**Use of data driven assessments such as AIMSweb and Illinois Interactive Report Card to identify strengths and weaknesses and drive instruction**

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

There exists a gap between intermediate and middle school math skills. We need to provide additional math interventions, opportunities for re-teaching through Enrichment with emphasis placed on the black subgroups, and utilize RtI to bridge achievement gaps while continuing to improve scores for all students. **Staff from middle and feeder schools need to have time to consult on item analysis successes from ISAT, the use of these Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) will help facilitate conversation about staff success and weaknesses when planning for instruction. Monthly team/adm. meetings that will assess data of student progress and discuss interventions to be implemented to increase student performance.**

There is a need to provide additional vocabulary instruction, interventions in reading, and strategies for reading long passages for all students and all subgroups in reading. **The district is investigating vocabulary practices for all grade levels and the use of "word vines" and "word walls" throughout the classrooms, with these strategies being implemented for student viewing and reinforcement.**

The school needs to provide opportunities to educate and build partnerships with parents in order to increase expectations and student performance. Curriculum and Community Concept Nights are being implemented to allow parents and students time to work together to increase support and achievement.

### 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?

The Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) and the Logramos (Spanish achievement test) are used at the district level to assess achievement in reading and math prior to the ISAT results. This data is used as part of the district's promotion criteria. The ITBS is used for all general education students including part-time Transitional Bilingual Education students. The Logramos is the Spanish equivalent for the full-time TBE students.

Weaknesses:

The discrepancy in the ITBS data to the ISAT data suggests that the promotion criteria are being re-assessed at a district level to determine the effectiveness and alignment to state standards.

Based on the 2008/2009 ITBS math data, 1 in 4 students (25%) in 6<sup>th</sup> grade are not reaching a Stanine of 4 or above which is required for promotion.

The district has committees working on the alignment of assessments so that they are aligned with state standards.

Strengths:

The 2008/2009 Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) reading scores show that overall 79% of the student body is scoring a Stanine of 4 or above. This data is used as one of the student promotion criteria.

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

The following factors contributed to the school's results:

Gap in intermediate and middle school skills. There is a need for more frequent formal articulation between feeder schools and the middle schools in order to identify deficits in instructional practices so that interventions to address weaknesses may be identified and corrected.

District assessments have been rewritten to align with state standards in order to better address ISAT weaknesses.

The District curriculum has been reviewed and new math texts are in place that align with standards to address the areas of weaknesses that were identified through data analysis. Math teachers were inserviced on the new texts and trained in strategies for math instruction that reflect data driven instruction.

Scores are used as a promotion criteria which for 8<sup>th</sup> graders directly effects their graduation participation and for all students determines possible summer school admittance.

Full time TBE students take test in their native language.

Special education students take ITBS test one grade level lower in a survey format.

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

There exists a gap between intermediate and middle school math skills. We need to provide additional math interventions, opportunities for re-teaching through Enrichment, and utilize RtI to bridge achievement gaps while continuing to improve scores for all students.

Immediate feedback from the test in conjunction with the possibility of retention/summer school consequences encourages students to take test seriously.

**Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) need to be implemented at the school and district level to ascertain strengths and weaknesses of teaching methods throughout**



disciplines.

Our students need more consistent progress monitoring throughout school year to assess whether or not progress is being made, the AIMSweb progress monitoring will be implemented three times a year to measure growth or lack thereof. Black subgroup in math that are not making adequate yearly progress are being identified and addressed through the use of data from the Illinois Interactive Report Card data to drive instruction.

### Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data 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?

Attributes: After-school English as a Second Language tutoring, Response to Intervention (Rtl) Enrichment period for math and reading interventions, Lexia, mentoring, Title I tutoring, Attendance, Swis,(discipline data) teachers stay after for afterschool programs, PTO, Coffee w/ the principals, Family Fun Night, Student-Led Conferences, Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS), Extra-curricular activities and clubs, Spanish classes, new Math series that is aligned to ISAT and state standards, parent education nights where ISAT and writing rubrics and graphic organizers will be discussed and worked at the parent level, AIMSweb progress monitoring to measure reading fluency administered three times a year. Meetings with Adm./Staff to discuss progress monitoring and necessary interventions to promote student achievement in areas of concern

**25% of LEP students participated in after school ESL tutoring resulting in a 1.2% increase in reading and 1.7% increase in math resulting in SafeHarbor status. (a/c)**

**26.5% of students are participating in the Lexia program that allows students to work with phoenetic word structure that has increased their yearly academic performance in reading, although short of the average yearly progress mark.**

**The attendance rate has exceeded 94% for the last two years. (a)**

**Students' suspension rate has declined by 28% in the last year due to the implementatiopn of Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS) and Response to Intervention (Rtl). (a/c)**

**Approximately 5% of the school's families participated in the first Family Fun Night which was offered to alleviate any anxiety of parents may have had about the school setting allowing a more comfortable re;lationship with school personnel. (c)**

Parent participation at Student-Led Conferences exceeds 90% annually. (a)

Office Discipline Referrals decreased by 21.6% from 2007/08 to 2008/09 due to use of Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS) and Response to Interventions (RtI).

Students that have been in this school system throughout their entire academic career have shown steady, positive scores on ISAT exams.

Challenges: Language, poverty, attendance, tardies, high % of students with Individualized Educational Plans, mobility, parental involvement, SEL (poverty), drugs, outdated textbooks (LA, Rdg), cultural challenges, availability of technology, vocabulary, time for cross-grade level content collaboration

Parent attendance at Coffee with the Principals was approximately 1% (between 5 & 10 parents) each month which is more than previous years. (c)

Teacher retention in 2008/2009 was 100% from the previous school year with the addition of 1 new special education teacher and 1 additional social worker. (a)

The number of students from low income families increased 3.7% (from 84.5% to 88.2%) in the last year. (c)

Student mobility rate increased 4.7% in the last year. (c) The number of chronic truants went down from 14 in 07/08 to 6 in 08/09 which does not allow for a continuous scaffolding acquired skills that are taught in the school district. (a)

Only 60 of 352 students eligible for Supplemental Educational Service (SES) tutoring participated in the programs which is not a significant number to effect test results. (c)

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

Due to the high percentage and still increasing number of low income students, Kerr Middle School offers the students and parents opportunities to participate in: after school tutoring, Title I Parent Night, and other programs. However, the majority of the parents and students fail to participate in numbers that would help improve student performance results in reading and math. In addition, the mobility rate has increased by 4.7%. Another challenge we face is that the majority of LEP students enrolled at Kerr Middle School are not participating in after school tutoring which would increase student performance results in reading and math. We have an excellent daily attendance rate which greatly contributes to the positive testing and student performance results where students are showing growth from year to year, but not to acceptable ISAT performance levels. Our teacher retention rate offers consistency and experience from one grade level to the next which positively contributes to student performance results

in year to year growth, although there will be approximately nine new staff members added to the teaching staff next year due to retirement and restructuring. Our Student Led Conferences are a continuing success which greatly contributes to student performance in yearly growth and results due to student understanding of their own strengths and weaknesses. Due to the decrease in Office Discipline Referrals, the suspension rate, and SWIS data, through the use of Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS) and Response to Intervention (Rtl), we determine that there is a decrease in disruptive student behavior. The district is offering vocabulary inservices at the middle school level that our staff have participated in with the emphasis being placed on reading subgroups.

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

We will inform parents on the importance of after school tutoring and encourage our low income and Limited English Proficient (LEP) students to attend. We will reach out to our parents and community and seek their active involvement within our school. We can encourage students from low income families to participate in the free breakfast and lunch program. We will reach parents and educate them on ISAT, Data Analysis from Illinois Interactive Report Card Data importance, AIMSWeb progress monitoring, as well as, the realignment of assessments at the district level and the grade level curriculum nights where parent questions and concerns will be addressed in order to provide better instruction for all students. Curriculum, standards, writing rubrics, the Illinois Interactive Report Card site, and assessments will be addressed with parents at our curriculum nights and "Coffee with the Principals meetings. We continue to use the Illinois Interactive Report Card (IIRC) to address data driven instruction to determine areas of concern from the previous years ISAT data with all students and in particular all subgroups that have not shown adequate yearly progress. There is also professional development opportunities that will allow teachers to work on extended response, vocabulary workshops, for all students and subgroups in reading and math. Walkthroughs are being done throughout the school by administration and staff members to monitor best practices in instruction. Results of walkthroughs will be discussed at monthly faculty meetings to share findings with staff members.

## 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 and information tell you?*

Teacher retention in 2008/2009 was 100% from the previous school year with the addition of 1 new special education teacher and 1 additional social worker. The only staff members who left Kerr at the end of 2008/2009 were retirees. Those teachers were replaced with first-year teachers who had previous experience at KerrMiddle School

2/7/2010 2:31:21 PM

either student teaching or substitute teaching. All educators at KMS are Highly Qualified except for 3. One of these teachers is in an alternative certification program and working towards her bilingual endorsement. The other two teachers are in the Unified Arts program and need to be trained in Pitsco (technology labs that offer Family and Consumer Science and Industrial Technology courses). Overall, the school has a veteran staff that is very knowledgeable in the curriculum and teaching strategies, although the rate of retirees is increasing and new staff are being put in place due to the restructuring plan that will replace all or most of the staff, including the principal. There is a continuation of professional development activities that focus on instructional deficiencies in the areas of reading for all subgroups and the black subgroup in math through the use of data driven instruction. Our paraprofessionals are all highly qualified and are inserviced in best practices of instruction and working appropriately with bilingual students to bridge the language barrier.

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

Teachers have continued to participate in training and in-services related to engaging students in meaningful educational objectives. The training of staff in AIMSWeb progress monitoring and the introduction of Response to Intervention (RtI) tier two and three interventions will improve upon previous test results. There has been a turnover in staff due to retirement in the areas of math and reading. Staff members continue with literacy in-services and professional development activities are offered in ISAT reading, writing and math strategies. There has been a turnover of teachers due to retirement that has attributed to the decline in test results. These areas will show improvement for the 09-10 school year after new staff are provided relevant staff training with regards to extended response training in reading and math with the emphasis on all subgroups in reading and the black subgroup in math and staff will use assessment data from district assessments that correlate to state content standards. The staff is being restructured, replacing all or most of the staff, including the principal for the 2010-11 school year.

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

Staff will continue the implementation of AIMSWeb progress monitoring and will use these results to analyze data to determine appropriate interventions that will increase student test results for the 09-10 ISAT tests.

New staff members that are replacing retirees will be in-serviced in these procedures so that there is not a significant drop in test results.

Staff will use individualized progress monitoring sheets that will "chart" students throughout the year to drive classroom instruction and increase student test performance, the monitoring sheets will be updated as new monitoring assessments are given to students.

Use of data from Illinois Interactive Report Card site to drive instruction through the use of data that will be implemented and will help with the determination of student

areas of concerns that will be addressed as teachers monitor progress.

Professional development on ISAT extended response will be mandated for staff to participate. Curriculum alignment and district assessments that are aligned to state standards are being revised and implemented to increase the performance on the 09-10 ISAT exams.

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

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

Parent attendance at Coffee with the Principals was approximately 1% (between 5 & 10 parents) each month. (c)

Parent participation at Student-Led Conferences exceeds 90% annually. (a)

The number of chronic truants went down from 14 in 07/08 to 6 in 08/09. (a)

Approximately 5% of the school's families participated in the first Family Fun Night. (c)

Only 60 of 352 students eligible for SES tutoring participated in the programs. (c)

**Other than Student Led Conferences, parent participation is extremely low.**

**Parents (over 200) attended Hispanic Heritage Month celebration**

**The Parent Resource Room has been opened and several parents have used the information to help with their children**

**This data reflects the fact that although parent participation has not been as high as desired, there are signs that more parents are becoming involved and concerned about the success of their child and are willing to be informed as to the importance of their involvement to ensure their student's success.**

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

Student performance results in reading and math are negatively affected by the extremely low parent participation. Parents have not been overly concerned up to this point, but have started to show at meetings and celebrations, PTO's and parent nights. There was a Hispanic Heritage Night and the school had over 200 families attend.

**There is a concern from some Hispanic members of the community as to whether the school is reporting to the government as to the illegal status of some of the parents and guardians of our Hispanic students. This concern leads to some families not having adult representation for some of our students.**

**Curriculum nights for each grade level will allow parents to work with their students on ISAT reading and writing samples, rubrics, student data base and any other topic to ensure that parents/staff and students are clear about expectations.**

**The Community Center Concept has been approved and the school will be open for several hours after normal closing time to engage parents and students to work together for the understanding of school concepts. Parents have the resources of the school and school personnel at hand to help with their students. The library and computer center will be available for students as well as parents.**

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

**Kerr Middle School needs to continue reaching out to parents in the community to provide opportunities to become involved in their student's educational experiences. KMS has mandatory student-led conferences and at that time, parents will be informed of parental involvement activities that will include, but not be limited to: Coffee with the Principal, Parent Teacher Organization activities, school newsletter, Curriculum nights- (2) for each grade level, and parent in-services on the workings of PowerSchool, our data system for grades and parental contact. ISAT rubrics and Community Center Nights will allow for parents and their students to work together for increased awareness of educational requirements. There is a need for parent liasons to work with the community to bridge the language barrier and help to inform parents of positive ways to support their students through academic endeavors and sporting events.**

**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?*

Key factors:

Gap in intermediate and middle school skills that will be addressed with middle and feeder schools having content area meetings to discuss successes on ISAT item analysis information

Lack of parental involvement and awareness in school culture that will be addressed through on-going parent night curriculum events as well as Community Center Concept evenings where parents and their children can work in the school with staff support on areas of concern

Lack of student participation in available academic assistance programs which will be addressed by after school tutoring and mentoring as well as curriculum nights and community center concepts

Inability to sustain focus while reading long passages which will be addressed in class and in afterschool tutoring

Lack of implementation of non-fiction materials which will be addressed by using more non-fiction materials in class and in tutoring

Underdeveloped vocabulary which will be addressed by the use of vocabulary programs in all classrooms with reteaching and reinforcement of vocabulary throughout the year

Students/parents do not have an understanding of the importance of the test results which will be addressed by curriculum nights

Test anxiety and disruptive behaviors which will be addressed by student practice on standards in all classrooms

IEP students with 1-on-1 accommodation taking test with teachers who are not highly qualified in Special Education

Teachers not effectively monitoring students taking tests which will be addressed by staff being visible and monitoring the classrooms an students that are

testing.

Data driven instruction with the help of the Illinois Interactive Report Card and the use of staff/parent/student curriculum nights to allow for a better understanding of the criteria and ISAT rubrics and strategies.

The conclusions reached from these factors are that the school needs to provide more opportunities for parents to get involved in their students' education and a better system of communication about these events must be designed. In addition, parents and students must be informed on the significance of the test results, which will take place during school in student meetings as well as during curriculum nights at each grade level. Strategies and methods on test taking and on how to prepare (which lowers anxiety) for the test will benefit all. On the school's part, IEP students must be matched with highly qualified Special Education teachers for maximum benefit from accommodations. Teachers must also monitor students taking test to ensure students are on task and conducting the test correctly. Improvement in instructional strategies and delivery are also important in the areas of vocabulary, reading, and math. The gap between intermediate and middle school must be studied closely to find the discrepancies in math achievement between the middle school and the feeder school. This will be done by staff participating in Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) so that successes on item analysis will be shared. Grade level and cross-curricular meetings with staff will be held to increase articulation activities and monitor student achievement. Students will be taught with the Illinois Standards in mind. Staff development in vocabulary aquisition and usage are being implemented for all students as well as subgroups in reading. Tier I and Tier II Response to Intervention activities in math are being implemented to all students with a particular focus on the black subgroup in mathematics.



Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

| Objective Number | Title<br>(click the link to edit any objective)   | Deficiencies Addressed |
|------------------|---|------------------------|
| 1                | <a href="#">While our current achievement in reading for all students is 64.6% (58% for the Black subgroup, 63.7% for the Hispanic subgroup, 49.4% for the LEP subgroup, 34.2% for the Students with Disability subgroup, and 63.4% for the Low Income subgroup) meeting/exceeding for ISAT, these students will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.</a> | 1,2,4,5,6,3,           |

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

- 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 2. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 3. Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 4. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 5. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 6. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

**Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives****Objective 1**

While our current achievement in reading for all students is 64.6% (58% for the Black subgroup, 63.7% for the Hispanic subgroup, 49.4% for the LEP subgroup, 34.2% for the Students with Disability subgroup, and 63.4% for the Low Income subgroup) meeting/exceeding for ISAT, these students will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

**Objective 1 Description**

Students will take part in enrichment activities such as Lexia, and Tier I and Tier II interventions will reinforce math and reading strategies that have been identified as weaknesses from the data analysis based on previous ITBS and ISAT test results. These areas will be focused on all reading subgroups and the black math subgroup.

Staff will work on monitoring progress with the help of AIMSWeb, and continue Literacy Meetings. with consultant. Also, the implementation of enrichment activities focusing on reading and math interventions that reflect areas of improvement as determined from ISAT and ITBS data.

Parents will be in-serviced on school data system (PowerSchool) and the complexities of ISAT and the interpretation of data at several curriculum nights throughout first and second quarters of school year.

Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) will continue to meet at grade level, across grade level and throughout middle schools to share strategies that have proven successful as determined by the data from the Illinois Interactive Report Card (IIRC) site and the input of successful teaching strategies from staff at articulation meetings to share the instructional methods that produced positive results. AIMSWeb progress monitoring will be administered three times throughout the year to determine students that are in need of Response to Intervention (RtI) strategies that will include afterschool tutoring, the use of web based curriculum programs that are aligned to state standards and are available to all students in English and Spanish, and Supplemental Tutoring Services (SES) that are offered to students.

A new math series has been purchased by the district and is in place at all grade levels. This new math series is aligned to state standards and staff have been trained in its use.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

- b 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- b 2. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- b 3. Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- b 4. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- b 5. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- b 6. Low Income students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

While our current achievement in reading for all students is 64.6% (58% for the Black subgroup, 63.7% for the Hispanic subgroup, 49.4% for the LEP subgroup, 34.2% for the Students with Disability subgroup, and 63.4% for the Low Income subgroup) meeting/exceeding for ISAT, these students will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

|   |   | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|---|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities   | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | All students will participate three times a year in the AIMSWeb universal screener for RtI  | 09/01/2009 | 06/01/2011 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 2 | All students will participate in a daily Enrichment class that is structured by analysis of student ISAT and AIMSWeb results and will include research based programs including Study Island, Lexia, and A+, Brainpop and a-z reading programs. | 09/01/2009 | 06/01/2011 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 3 | All students will complete weekly extended responses in all content areas with the emphasis on all subgroups in reading and the black subgroup in math.   | 09/01/2009 | 06/01/2011 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 4 | All students have the opportunity to participate in Supplemental Educational Services (SES) or Title I afterschool tutoring to provide additional instructional time and focus on all subgroups in reading and                                  | 12/08/2009 | 05/14/2009 | After School  | Title I     |            |

the black subgroup in math.

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

While our current achievement in reading for all students is 64.6% (58% for the Black subgroup, 63.7% for the Hispanic subgroup, 49.4% for the LEP subgroup, 34.2% for the Students with Disability subgroup, and 63.4% for the Low Income subgroup) meeting/exceeding for ISAT, these students will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

|   |   | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---|---|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|   | Strategies and Activities   | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1 | Teachers will use the "Train the Trainer" model annually in September for the AIMSWeb universal screener and then will implement the screener three times a year.   | 09/01/2009 | 06/01/2011 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 2 | Local resources such as the ISC Center, RESPRO Team, AIMS Coach, and District 130 Literacy Coaches will provide teachers with training in vocabulary strategies which will then be implemented in the classrooms.   | 09/01/2009 | 06/01/2011 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 3 | Special Education teachers will push-in to the Regular Education setting and will team teach for the benefit of all students.   | 09/01/2009 | 06/01/2011 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 4 | The district Enrichment committee (comprised of middle school teachers from the 3 district middle schools) will meet monthly to share successful strategies and train their colleagues so the strategies can be implemented across the district.  | 09/01/2009 | 06/01/2011 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 5 | AIMS will be implemented which improves teacher's instructional skills through participation as members of a building based team, in high quality professional development, studying research-based best practices. Use of pedagogical skills to help close achievement gap for all students. | 09/01/2009 | 06/01/2011 | Before School | Title II    |            |
| 6 | ELL strategies that reinforce math, reading and writing interventions during school day and during afterschool tutoring   | 09/01/2009 | 06/01/2011 | During School | Title I     |            |
|   | Extended Response & Rubric training for staff and students that will  |            |            |               |             |            |

|    |   |            |            |               |             |  |
|----|---|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|--|
| 7  | focus on prewriting, writing and editing strategies that will focus on all students and suggroups in reading and the black subgroup in math.                                    | 09/01/2009 | 06/01/2011 | During School | Local Funds |  |
| 8  | New Math serieswill be aligned to Illinois Standards that all math instructors have been in-serviced and will result in a better understanding of ISAI and district standards.  | 09/01/2009 | 06/01/2011 | During School | Title I     |  |
| 9  | Math resource center has been developed in the media center for all teachers use so that all staff have access to manipulatives for classroom and afterschool instruction.      | 09/01/2009 | 06/01/2011 | During School | Local Funds |  |
| 10 | The district assessments have been realigned to reflect state standards, with staff throughout the district participating in the design model and implementation when approved. | 09/01/2009 | 06/01/2011 | After School  | Other       |  |

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

While our current achievement in reading for all students is 64.6% (58% for the Black subgroup, 63.7% for the Hispanic subgroup, 49.4% for the LEP subgroup, 34.2% for the Students with Disability subgroup, and 63.4% for the Low Income subgroup) meeting/exceeding for ISAT, these students will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

|                           |  | TimeLine   |            |               | Budget      |            |
|---------------------------|--|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
| Strategies and Activities |  | Start Date | End Date   |               | Fund Source | Amount(\$) |
| 1                         | Staff will train parents annually at Open House and Student-Led Conferences on how to access PowerSchool to monitor student progress, discipline, attendance, fees, and teacher comments.                  | 09/01/2009 | 06/01/2011 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 2                         | During curriculum nights at schools across the district, staff will provide information on Extended Response writing and ways parents can support writing in general.                                      | 09/01/2009 | 06/01/2011 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 3                         | ISAT/testing information will be made available for parents for understanding of ISAT data.  | 09/01/2009 | 06/01/2011 | During School | Local Funds |            |
| 4                         | Grade Level Parent Nights for writing rubric, understanding school data base system, ISAT presentation, and curriculum questions, school dances, Hispanic Heritage Night activities,school newsletter, and | 09/01/2009 | 06/01/2011 | After School  | Local Funds |            |

|                            |  |  |  |  |  |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| coffee with the principal. |  |  |  |  |  |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|

### Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

While our current achievement in reading for all students is 64.6% (58% for the Black subgroup, 63.7% for the Hispanic subgroup, 49.4% for the LEP subgroup, 34.2% for the Students with Disability subgroup, and 63.4% for the Low Income subgroup) meeting/exceeding for ISAT, these students will make AYP of at least 77.5% in 2010 and 85% in 2011 or Safe Harbor.

**School personnel will monitor the effectiveness of the reading and math strategies through the implementation of AIMSweb progress monitoring for reading and math at least (3) times per year. With these results, our staff can make informed decisions and interventions based on this data and identify areas of concern to address academic deficiencies.**

**Administrator and team members will conduct walkthroughs at least once a month to share with all staff what is occurring in classrooms.**

**Enrichment activities that focus on math and reading strategies aligned to standards and developed through data derived from the Illinois Interactive Report Card (IIRC) site will be reinforced each school day with progress of students monitored weekly through the use of individual progress monitoring sheets that each member of the grade level teams complete and review to monitor student progress.**

**Students will be assessed on district assessments and intervention from the Response to Interventions (RtI) criteria will be used to achieve success.**

**Students involved in Supplemental Educational Service (SES) and Title I afterschool tutoring will be assessed with a pre and post test to determine growth.**

**All students are now on progress monitoring sheets that grade level teams review to determine whether or not student progress is being achieved.**

**Parents and students will continue to be informed on the use of PowerSchool, the school data system, to monitor student progress on progress reports, missing assignments, attendance and report card data.**

**Website will be updated to reflect all activities for staff/parents/students to access information about the school and district activities.**

|   | Name         | Title                                  |
|---|--------------|--|
| 1 | Kathy Duba   | Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum |
| 2 | Cheryl Vacca | District Office liason                 |

---

|   |                    |                                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| 3 | Carl Gmazel        | Principal                      |
| 4 | Ives Munoz         | Assistant Principal            |
| 5 | Rosalba Provenzano | School Improvement Team/ Staff |
| 6 | Angie Zientek      | School Improvement Team/ Staff |
| 7 | Sandra Hock        | School Improvement Team/ Staff |
| 8 | Rebecca Buntin     | School Improvement Team/ Staff |
| 9 | Colleen Gallagher  | School Improvement Team/ Staff |

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

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

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

The district/school has informed parents of the school's academic status with the School Choice letter which was derived from ISBE site. The letter was given in both the English and Spanish languages . Letter handed out at Registration and Open House and is posted on school/district website.

### 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 stakeholders including parents, school staff, and outside experts such as a literacy consultant and three other schools with similar demographics and socioeconomic status and the RESPRO team, have all had input as to the writing and implementation of the plan during school improvement meetings. There have been four meetings with the stakeholders group as well as with individual parents and the school improvement teams from the three other schools. Suggestions from the stakeholders was discussed as to the appropriateness of suggestions and if warranted, added to the plan for implementation.



|    | Name               | Title                        |
|----|--------------------|------------------------------|
| 1  | Carl Gmazel        | Principal                    |
| 2  | Cheryl Vacca       | District Liason              |
| 3  | Ives Munoz         | Assistant Principal          |
| 4  | Rosalba Provenzano | Bilingual Staff              |
| 5  | Angie Zientek      | Reading/ Language Arts Staff |
| 6  | Sandra Hock        | Special Education Staff      |
| 7  | Rebecca Buntin     | Reading/ Language Arts Staff |
| 8  | Colleen Gallagher  | Social Sciences Staff        |
| 9  | Leslie Kennedy     | Parent                       |
| 10 | Rosalinda Mendez   | Parent                       |
| 11 | Lynda Sarabia      | Parent                       |
| 12 | Jerry Sarabia      | Parent                       |

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation

#### Part C. Peer Review Process

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

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

The staff members of two middle schools shall serve as peer review team. These schools have the comparable demographics and comparable curriculum, staff training, and resources. These schools had their administration as well as their school improvement teams review this SIP plan.

The SIP teams from Nathan Hale Middle School and Veterans Memorial Middle School (District #130) and Sutherland School (CPS) reviewed this plan prior to local board approval. Week of Sep. 28- Oct. 2, 2009, the school improvement teams and administrators reviewed the plan and offered suggestions that were taken into consideration for implementation. The teams gave valuable input to Kerr Middle School improvement team relating to data driven instruction, and the use of district assessments along with progress monitoring (AIMSWeb) in the areas of math and reading with an emphasis on all students and especially all subgroups in reading and the black subgroup in math.

### 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.

This school and district are partnered with GovernorsStateUniversity and the Mentor program. The Beginning Teacher Program (BTP) is offered to support 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year teachers in their schools and classrooms. Teachers that participate in this program are able to move from an initial to a standard certificate. These teachers have mentors and buddies within their grade level and discipline to offer support in the teachers' formative years. There are monthly peer support meetings for 1st and 2nd year staff to gain insight and support from peers. New mentors and mentees attend sessions beginning in August to prepare for the upcoming school year. This program is required of all teachers that have not had a previous teaching assignment.

### 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.

The district has provided data analysis as well as outside consultants to help with the planning and professional development activities such as in-services and conferences

---

related to the improvement of reading, math and writing. Changes in instructional practices have been implemented and are being evaluated through progress monitoring activities such as AIMSweb and individual student monitoring sheets that are reviewed once a month at administrative/team meetings to address areas of deficit. Community Center Concept is being implemented to address additional time at school for parents/students and staff to use school facilities and work together on student deficit. Use of Illinois Interactive Report Card data to drive instruction is being implemented. The school is being restructured with all or most of the staff being replaced including administration.

**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).

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

- e Reopening the school as a public charter school, consistent with Article 27A of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/Art. 27A.);
- b Replacing all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school's inability to make AYP;
- e 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.

The RESPRO team has been involved with the planning and implementation of school improvement plans over the past several years. Reading specialists from the district as well as from the RESPRO team have been secured to give literacy strategies to staff members. The district has installed the AIMSWeb progress monitoring component for the school and staff training has begun, with student assessment in progress. The school is being restructured and all or most of the staff are being replaced including the principal. the Supplemental Educational Service Providers (SES) and Title I after school tutoring are in use. The data driven instruction will be driven by the research of the Illinois interactive Report Card (IIRC) that will identify student achievement on previous ISAT exams to determine areas of concern and will focus on all students with an emphasis on all subgroups in reading and the black subgroup in math.

### Section III - Development, Review and Implementation Part G. School Support Team

---

|   | Name             | Title             |
|---|------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Bernie Ferreri   | RESPRO consultant |
| 2 | Gerald Lauritsen | RESPRO consultant |
| 3 | Sharon McGuire   | RESPRO consultant |

---

**Section IV-A Local Board Action**

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

**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

- 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

- 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]



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?

 Yes  No

Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]

**MONITORING** Yes  No

Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]

 Yes  No

Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers? [C]

**PART I - COMMENTS**

December 22, 2009

I concur with your area RESPRO that this plan is in compliance and is recommended for implementation. Your strategies and activities provide sufficiently clear expectations for who is expected to accomplish the strategies and activities. Since the key audience for the plan is the plan user, such clarity is for their benefit and for the benefit of those monitoring the plan. Also, I would recommend establishing clear benchmarks for success in your monitoring process. (This provides plan users guidance to know “that” they have accomplished the plan and “how well.”)

Carol Diedrichsen ISBE Innovation and Improvement

[cdiedric@isbe.net](mailto:cdiedric@isbe.net)

217-524-1086

**PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN**

**PARENT NOTIFICATION**

Yes  No  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**

Yes  No

Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]

Yes  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 RESPONSIBILITES**

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 RESPONSIBILITES**

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**

RESPRO area comments:

**Recommended for implementation**

School District #130's School improvement plan is recommended for implementation with the assistance of your area RESPRO. No further updates to your improvement plan are necessary at this time.

If you choose to revise or update your plan, you may request that your area RESPRO update the ISBE monitoring prompt as this is the official state monitoring record.