

Urbana Middle School

Restructuring Plan 2008

Board Approval Date	2/2/2009
Plan Submission Date	2/6/2009
ISBE Monitoring Completed	2/9/2009

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number	090101160221002		
District Name	URBANA SD 116	School Name	URBANA MIDDLE SCHOOL
Superintendent	Dr. PRESTON WILLIAMS	Principal	NANCY CLINTON
District Address	PO BOX 3039	School Address	1201 S VINE ST
City/State/Zip	URBANA,IL,61803	City/State/Zip	URBANA,IL,61801
District Telephone#	2173843600 Extn:0	School Telephone#	2173843685 Extn:0
District Email	pwilliams@usd116.org	School Email	

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 1 - 2008 AYP Report**

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No
2007-08 Federal Improvement Status		2007-08 State Improvement Status	academic watch status year 2

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		62.5			62.5			90.0		75.0	
All	99.6	Yes	99.6	Yes	73.3		Yes	72.3		Yes	93.2	Yes		
White	99.4	Yes	99.4	Yes	84.2		Yes	85.3		Yes				
Black	99.7	Yes	99.7	Yes	62.1		Yes	54.9	60.9	No	92.8			
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	64.8		Yes	79.6		Yes				
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	71.7		Yes	67.9		Yes				
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes										
Students with Disabilities	99.4	Yes	99.4	Yes	32.2	37.4	No	34.0	38.4	No	92.7			
Economically Disadvantaged	99.4	Yes	99.4	Yes	63.0		Yes	60.3		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 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. ***
3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 62.5% 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 75% graduation rate for high schools.

* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2007.

** Safe Harbor Targets of 62.5% or above are not printed.

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 2 - 2008 AMAO Report

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

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

School Information								
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Attendance Rate (%)	93.4	92.9	92.7	92.4	92.0	91.4	92.3	93.2
Truancy Rate (%)	1.4	5.9	2.8	1.3	2.9	4.7	5.1	2.0
Mobility Rate (%)	21.5	19.0	33.0	33.3	16.1	26.1	19.9	18.5
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	1016	1055	998	1017	1033	1000	932	817
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	39.7	43.9	46.7	50.7	55.6	60.2	64.9	66.2
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	2.5	2.6	5.0	2.6	2.9	4.6	6.4	7.0
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	61.3	58.9	55.7	52.6	50.1	47.8	44.6	41.0
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	30.5	31.9	33.6	37.9	33.4	36.3	38.1	37.8
Hispanic (%)	1.8	2.4	3.2	3.2	4.5	3.6	6.8	8.3
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	6.2	6.5	7.2	6.0	5.6	5.1	5.2	5.5
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	6.1	6.9	5.2	7.3

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/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
S C H O L	1999	64.6	27.6	1.1	6.3	0.4	-
	2000	62.2	29.9	1.7	6.0	0.3	-
	2001	61.3	30.5	1.8	6.2	0.2	-
	2002	58.9	31.9	2.4	6.5	0.3	-
	2003	55.7	33.6	3.2	7.2	0.3	-
	2004	52.6	37.9	3.2	6.0	0.3	-
	2005	50.1	33.4	4.5	5.6	0.2	6.1
	2006	47.8	36.3	3.6	5.1	0.3	6.9
	2007	44.6	38.1	6.8	5.2	0.2	5.2
	2008	41.0	37.8	8.3	5.5	-	7.3
D I S T R I C T	1999	62.2	28.2	2.2	7.2	0.3	-
	2000	59.9	29.6	2.5	7.6	0.3	-
	2001	59.3	30.7	2.5	7.3	0.3	-
	2002	56.8	32.7	3.0	7.3	0.2	-
	2003	55.4	33.3	3.2	7.9	0.2	-
	2004	52.4	36.5	4.3	6.6	0.2	-
	2005	50.1	33.3	4.3	6.1	0.2	6.0
	2006	49.6	33.6	4.5	5.7	0.3	6.3
	2007	48.1	35.1	5.6	5.7	0.3	5.3
	2008	45.4	33.8	6.3	6.2	0.4	7.9

	Year	White(%)	Black(%)	Hispanic(%)	Asian/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
S T A T E	1999	62.0	20.8	13.9	3.2	0.2	-
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7	

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

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

	Year	LEP(%)	Low Income(%)	Parental Involvement(%)	Attendance(%)	Mobility(%)	Chronic Truants(N)	Chronic Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
S C H O O L	1999	3.1	39.4	90.6	92.8	38.7	4	0.4	-	-
	2000	2.6	37.2	85.4	93.4	32.5	8	0.8	-	-
	2001	2.5	39.7	100.0	93.4	21.5	14	1.4	-	-
	2002	2.6	43.9	100.0	92.9	19.0	62	5.9	-	-
	2003	5.0	46.7	100.0	92.7	33.0	28	2.8	-	-
	2004	2.6	50.7	100.0	92.4	33.3	13	1.3	-	-
	2005	2.9	55.6	100.0	92.0	16.1	30	2.9	-	-
	2006	4.6	60.2	100.0	91.4	26.1	46	4.7	-	-
	2007	6.4	64.9	100.0	92.3	19.9	47	5.1	-	-
2008	7.0	66.2	100.0	93.2	18.5	17	2.0	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	1999	6.2	41.2	97.0	93.4	25.5	59	1.4	5.5	89.2
	2000	6.2	40.7	92.5	93.1	22.7	107	2.3	2.2	92.2
	2001	5.6	40.1	100.0	93.0	21.9	68	1.5	4.6	92.4
	2002	4.9	40.4	99.9	93.1	21.8	185	4.2	6.1	79.7
	2003	6.5	43.7	100.0	93.1	27.1	120	2.8	3.8	81.0
	2004	5.5	47.2	99.8	92.4	28.3	184	4.3	4.6	97.8
	2005	5.5	51.6	99.7	93.0	21.6	234	5.6	2.4	85.6
	2006	7.3	55.3	100.0	92.7	24.9	237	5.9	4.2	86.9
	2007	8.5	58.9	100.0	92.7	22.9	251	6.3	2.2	85.1
2008	9.2	60.3	100.0	93.8	20.7	84	2.2	2.0	92.0	

	Year	LEP(%)	Low Income(%)	Parental Involvement(%)	Attendance(%)	Mobility(%)	Chronic Truants(N)	Chronic Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
S T A T E	1999	6.4	36.1	96.1	93.6	18.1	43332	2.3	5.9	81.9
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.9	94.0	16.4	37525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40764	2.1	4.6	86.5
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49056	2.5	3.5	85.9
2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49858	2.5	4.1	86.5	

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

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

	Year	School(N)	Grade 3(N)	Grade 4(N)	Grade 5(N)	Grade 7(N)	Grade 8(N)	Grade 11(N)
S C H O O L	1999	998	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1068	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1016	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	1055	-	-	-	328	361	-
	2003	998	-	-	-	344	321	-
	2004	1017	-	-	-	328	357	-
	2005	1033	-	-	-	328	341	-
	2006	1000	-	-	-	355	322	-
	2007	932	-	-	-	315	330	-
2008	817	-	-	-	267	266	-	
D I S T R I C T	1999	4371	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	4551	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	4410	348	335	368	379	339	327
	2002	4424	361	344	324	328	361	339
	2003	4369	343	351	340	344	321	317
	2004	4309	324	332	345	328	357	324
	2005	4264	313	319	322	328	341	286
	2006	4128	313	292	305	355	322	248
	2007	4054	322	313	293	315	330	274
2008	3752	265	293	282	267	266	243	

	Year	School(N)	Grade 3(N)	Grade 4(N)	Grade 5(N)	Grade 7(N)	Grade 8(N)	Grade 11(N)
S T A T E	1999	1962026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1983991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2007170	164791	161546	162001	151270	148194	123816
	2002	2029821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2044539	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	2060048	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	2062912	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	2075277	136123	139619	146935	153566	154856	-
	2007	2077856	155356	153480	154719	162594	159038	150475
2008	2074167	155578	152895	153347	160039	161310	149710	

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, Staff Capacity and Professional Development**

	Year	Total Teacher FTE(N)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary(\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree(%)	Teachers with Master's Degree(%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials(%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers(%)
D I S T R I C T	1999	355	14	39591	37	63	16	16	-	-
	2000	359	15	40364	38	62	16	18	-	-
	2001	366	14	40868	40	60	15	18	-	-
	2002	359	15	44308	38	62	16	18	-	-
	2003	356	15	46348	39	62	16	18	0	-
	2004	330	16	49719	35	65	17	19	-	-
	2005	317	16	50858	38	63	17	20	1	-
	2006	329	16	51684	40	60	16	18	1	-
	2007	326	15	53545	42	58	15	18	3	-
	2008	337	14	52350	44	56	14	16	2	-
S T A T E	1999	119718	15	45337	53	47	20	18	-	-
	2000	122671	15	45766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125735	15	47929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126544	14	49702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129068	14	51672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125702	14	54446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128079	14	55558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127010	13	56685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127010	13	58275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131488	12	60871	47	53	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, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	69.0	63.6	69.2	-	-	-	61.1	68.2	73.0	60.3	70.0	63.5	67.6	76.0	74.8
White	-	-	-	83.1	79.2	83.6	-	-	-	69.5	80.5	91.4	71.4	81.5	78.7	79.1	82.5	80.2
Black	-	-	-	54.6	46.3	52.6	-	-	-	41.9	51.6	62.1	35.6	44.5	39.1	46.2	62.9	66.3
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	64.7	71.5	-	-	-	-	-	60.7	-	-	66.7	-	-	64.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	88.2	91.0	53.9	-	-	-	100.0	100.0	78.6	73.4	88.2	82.3	90.9	100.0	94.2
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	42.1	53.3	70.9	-	-	-	59.1	55.5	56.3	-	80.0	63.1	85.0	70.5	81.0
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	41.7	-	-	-	-	-	45.5	75.0	92.0	-	-	-	-

Urbana Middle School

Restructuring Plan 2008

2/9/2009 10:06:22 PM

Page 15 of 25

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	25.0	18.5	22.8	-	-	-	24.0	24.5	42.0	16.7	27.3	23.8	33.3	30.6	31.4
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	55.8	50.9	55.4	-	-	-	47.5	57.2	63.5	48.5	51.3	50.6	53.6	66.5	67.2

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

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	76.3	68.2	73.8	-	-	-	68.7	72.5	69.5	43.7	47.2	48.4	68.4	71.4	71.9
White	-	-	-	87.5	82.1	90.1	-	-	-	75.8	86.5	78.8	58.7	62.3	64.0	81.8	81.0	83.0
Black	-	-	-	62.5	51.0	53.5	-	-	-	55.9	56.2	56.1	13.6	17.6	21.0	50.0	55.3	56.4
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	76.4	81.0	-	-	-	-	-	78.6	-	-	44.4	-	-	85.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	94.1	100.0	77.0	-	-	-	90.9	93.3	92.8	73.3	82.4	88.9	81.8	90.0	94.1
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	65.0	60.0	66.7	-	-	-	54.6	57.9	68.8	-	20.0	38.9	70.0	58.8	61.9
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	66.7	-	-	-	-	-	72.7	64.3	60.0	-	-	-	-

Urbana Middle School

Restructuring Plan 2008

2/9/2009 10:06:22 PM

Page 17 of 25

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	40.3	33.4	36.8	-	-	-	20.0	27.5	36.7	10.8	19.7	11.3	35.2	18.0	22.4
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	66.0	55.7	60.4	-	-	-	60.0	61.7	60.4	25.4	26.9	28.0	55.0	59.7	61.1

Section II-A Plan Activities - Restructuring Options

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

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

4. implementing any other major restructuring of the school's governance that makes fundamental reform in:
 - i. governance and management, and/or
 - ii. financing and material resources, and/or
 - iii. staffing

Section II-B Plan Activities - Plan Description

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

Urbana School District #116

UMS Restructuring Plan

January 12, 2009

Introduction:

The federal No Child Left Behind legislation and the state procedures that are associated with it, require that any school district that has a school that has not made adequate yearly progress for five years to create a Restructuring Plan for that school. With the posting of the ISAT Scores for 2008, Urbana Middle School did not make AYP for its fifth year. The district created a Restructuring Planning Committee to help guide the development of the Restructuring Plan. This committee was made up of district administrators and program directors, building administration and teachers, parents, a representative from the

University of Illinois's Center for Education in Small Urban Communities and other University of Illinois College of Education representatives, a consultant from the Regional Office of Education, and an Urbana Board of Education member. NCLB requires the district to select from one of four options for restructuring the school. These options are:

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

The district chose to work under the provisions of the fourth option. Reopening as a charter school would drastically limit parent and student options for educational programs. Replacing all or most of the school staff would not be viable in a district of this size, because tenured teachers would have to be placed in positions for which they are highly qualified. Entering into a contract with a private management company was not deemed to be in the best interest of the students, parents, or community. The focus of the Restructuring Planning committee was on the fourth option. Specifically, the committee focused on making fundamental reforms in the governance/management and scheduling/staffing of the school.

The committee worked under a set of norms; the foremost among the norms is: We will focus our discussions on issues that will improve student learning. The committee used the ISBE Restructuring Plan Guide and Restructuring Monitoring Prompt as well as conversations with Kevin Seymour, the ROE SchoolWorks Director, in order to develop the guiding questions:

- Is the plan sufficient enough to bring about change in student learning and achievement?
- Is there data to back up the decisions and a plan for evaluating the changes?

What has brought UMS to Restructuring?

Urbana Middle School has failed to make AYP for five of the last six testing cycles. The school has always hit the AYP aggregate target, but specific subgroups

failed to meet standards in either Reading or Math. In 2003, 36.6% of African American students met standards in Reading, and 13.7% of African American Students met standards in Math. 17.5% of students with disabilities met standards in Reading, but only 9.7% of that subgroup met standards in Math. Additionally in 2003, 25% of Economically Disadvantaged students met standards in Math. In 2004, 17.1% of African American students met standards in Math, and 27% of economically disadvantaged students met standards in Math. In 2005, 21.2% of African American students, 28.5% of economically disadvantaged, and only 11.9% of students with disabilities met standards in Math. Students with disabilities were also only at 24.6% meeting or exceeding in Reading. In 2006, the school made AYP. That year, students with disabilities was the only subgroup that made AYP through safe-harbor, all of the rest of the subgroups were above the AYP target of 47.5%. In 2007, only 30.4% of Students with Disabilities met in Reading, and 31.5% of Students with Disabilities met in Math. Neither of these percentages met the safe harbor requirement of a 10% increase over the previous year. In 2008, UMS Students with Disabilities made small increases in both Reading and Math, but failed to reach safe harbor. Additionally, only 54.9% of African American students met or exceeded standards in Math.

Urbana Middle School has made substantial gains with the African American subgroup in both Reading (increasing from 36.6% meets and exceeds in 2003 to 62.1% meets and exceeds in 2008) and Math (increasing from 13.7% meets and exceeds in 2003 to 54.9% meets and exceeds in 2008). The gains have also been dramatic for Economically Disadvantaged students in Reading (increasing from 49.2% meets and exceeds in 2003 to 63% meets and exceeds in 2008) and Math (increasing from 25% meets and exceeds in 2003 to 60.3% meets and exceeds in 2008). Smaller gains have been made for Students with Disabilities in Reading (increasing from 17.5% meets and exceeds in 2003 to 32.2% meets and exceeds in 2008) and Math (increasing from 9.7% meets and exceeds in 2003 to 34% meets and exceeds in 2008). Despite these increases in all three of the subgroups, that have not made AYP in the past six years, the school has not been able to close the gaps as quickly as the Illini Equal Steps targets for AYP demand.

In the past three years, Urbana Middle School has implemented a variety of initiatives designed to improve teaching and learning. The 2008 Urbana Middle School - School Improvement Plan cites several initiatives that are designed to help improve the educational opportunities for Special Education students. Among these activities are: allowing Special Education students to enroll in reading and math connection classes that, up until the 2008-2009 school year, had been designed to support non-special education students who were struggling in meeting math and reading standards; Special Education teachers received additional training in Connected Mathematics; Special Education teachers received training and support in using AIMSWeb probes for and data website for progress monitoring caseload students. Additionally, two new reading interventions were added at each grade level for special education students.

The purpose of the restructuring process was not to dispose of all previous initiatives, nor to create more initiatives, but rather to put in place a system that focuses on student learning, increase support for students, and provide more monitoring and accountability of teaching and learning. All aspects of the Restructuring Plan are designed to shift the focus of the building to student learning and data-based decision making.

Restructuring Plan

Governance and Management

The Restructuring Planning Committee proposed four initiatives to meet the requirements for fundamental changes in governance and management. The

emphasis of these recommendations is to provide increased focus on student learning, a more systematic approach to analysis of student data, monitoring of school improvement initiatives, and a clear plan for evaluation of programs and activities related to school improvement. These initiatives include: becoming a Professional Learning Community; creating a School Improvement Team at the building level whose sole purpose is to revise and evaluate the School Improvement Plan; creating a Parent Advisory Committee that will allow parents to provide specific feedback about school improvement initiatives; and creating a system to implement Response to Intervention across both academic and social emotional/behavioral areas.

Professional Learning Communities. The first of these initiatives is to transition the building into a Professional Learning Community (see Eaker, Dufour, & Dufour, 2002). The Professional Learning Community model has been widely researched as a system change that focuses school improvement efforts on student learning. Starting in January of 2009, the entire staff will begin background reading about Professional Learning Communities and will dedicate one meeting per month to the discussion of the principles and philosophy of Professional Learning Communities. The district and the Regional Office of Education are fully supportive of the Professional Learning Community model and will assist with training opportunities as well as modeling Professional Learning Community principles in its decisions and actions.

School Improvement Team. The district will assist the school in creating a School Improvement Team that will be an elected representative decision making body whose primary purpose will be to revise and evaluate school improvement initiatives. This group will consist of building administrators and thirteen teachers who will be elected from across subject areas. They will be elected annually, but, in order to foster new ideas and transformational leadership, one individual cannot serve more than two consecutive years. The School Improvement Team will meet for two hours each month, and the agendas will all focus on school improvement initiatives. The School Improvement Team will have the authority to form a task force to examine specific questions related to school improvement activities, or proposed new initiatives. These Task Forces can consist of teachers from across the building, but will have at least one School Improvement Team member present. Task Forces are designed to be short-term groups, which examine limited and focused questions about school improvement and report back to the School Improvement Team with recommendations. The first elections for the School Improvement Team members will be in May, 2009, and the team will receive preliminary training in consensus decision making, data-based decision making, and group facilitation in May and August 2009. The planning committee made several recommendations during its deliberations that should be the focus of initial task forces. These include building climate and culture, flexible scheduling, quarter exam revisions, parent engagement, and benchmark assessments for Response to Intervention.

Parent Advisory Committee. Beginning with the 2009-2010 school year, Urbana Middle School will recruit a yearly Parent Advisory Committee that will meet quarterly with the building principal and two members of the School Improvement Team. The purpose of the Parent Advisory Committee is to provide direct input from a diverse group of parents to the school improvement process. Recruitment for the Parent Advisory Committee will start during centralized registration in August, and will continue through the first month of school. The district parent and community liaisons and the Urbana Middle School PTA will be asked to help the recruitment process. The concept behind the Parent Advisory Committee is to have a forum where parents can suggest ideas, voice concerns, and be an active part of the school improvement process. The quarterly meetings will be set by the building principal, and the agendas will be loosely based on the work of the School Improvement Team.

Response to Intervention. In accordance with the 2008 District Improvement Plan, Urbana Middle School will move toward full implementation of Response to Intervention (or RtI) during the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 school years. The school and district have already conducted several pre-implementation assessments and have identified many academic Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III interventions in both reading and math. The Restructuring Planning Committee recommends that prior to the start of the 2009-2010 school year, the Content Area Reading classes (Tier I) be redesigned to incorporate the recommendations

of the district's Writing Across the Curriculum Committee and create clear expectations for teachers and students about the content and skills in these courses. The Planning Committee also recommends revising the Reading and Math Connections (Tier II) classes in order to clearly define selection criteria and exit criteria.

On the social/emotional and behavioral side of Response to Intervention, the planning committee recommends training and implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (or PBIS). PBIS is a research-based approach to school wide expectations and interventions to reduce disruptive behaviors and allow increased time for instruction. In conjunction with PBIS, Urbana Middle School is part of the district's Social Emotional Learning Implementation grant, and will continue to work on creating a blended approach toward SEL/RtI/PBIS.

Staffing:

The Restructuring Planning Committee approached the requirement for substantial changes in staffing by focusing on the need to restructure the service delivery model for special education students. The Planning Committee recommends the creation of a department model approach to staffing special education (as opposed to team-based). This will allow more focused direct instruction in the deficit areas of reading, math, and writing. Special Education teachers will have areas of specialty in: Language! A-B, C-D, E-F; Rewards/Read Naturally; Corrective Reading; Math; and Writing. This change in staffing will increase the efficiency of service by assigning students to teachers who specialize in certain areas instead of assigning students to teams and asking one Special Education teacher to be a specialist in every content area. This model will also allow for an increase in co-teaching opportunities in general education reading and math classes.

Professional Development to Support Restructuring:

The district will continue to support content area literacy professional development through CRISS training and work with the UIUC Center for Education in Small Urbana Communities. District administration, the Regional Office of Education, and the Center for Education in Small Urban Communities will work with UMS administration and faculty to create a professional development plan that will focus on content area literacy, differentiation, RtI/PBIS/SEL, and Professional Learning Communities. The Regional Office of Education will provide training in the Instructional Practices Inventory and also provide RESPRO funds to help with the implementation process.

Instructional Practices Inventory:

As part of the 2008 Urbana High School Restructuring Plan, the district decided to implement the Instructional Practices Inventory, which is a non-evaluative walk-through that provides data to administrators and teachers about what type of teaching and learning is happening on any given day. Training for the Instructional Practices Inventory took place in the fall of 2008 with a group of 30 teachers and administrators, and UHS and UMS have already had one round of data collection.

The Instructional Practices Inventory is a process for profiling student learning experiences and engaging all faculty members in the analysis and use of data for school improvement. Effective, periodic analysis of IPI profiles can enhance school-wide and sub-group collaborative conversations about student learning and instruction. Engagement in collaborative conversations about learning and instruction can foster faculty commitment and help build a stronger professional community. The significance of these important school-wide characteristics is well documented in the school improvement and educational change literature. As school faculty members become more and more accustomed to collecting instructional data about student learning and using those data as a basis for collective reflection and problem-solving, the nature of student learning experiences evolve, most often shifting from higher to lower percentages of student seatwork and from lower to higher percentages of student engaged, higher-order learning.

Monitoring and Evaluation:

The group that will be responsible for monitoring the success of school improvement initiatives will be the District Improvement Monitoring Team. This team will be made up of the Superintendent, the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, the Assistant Superintendent for Special Services, the principal of the high school, the principal of the middle school, one principal from the elementary level, the Director of the Center for Education in Small Urban Communities, a Professor/Executive Associate Dean from the Bureau of Educational Research, and a school improvement consultant from the Regional Office of Education. This team will meet monthly in order to review and evaluate the impact of specific school improvement initiatives.

The District Improvement Monitoring Team will also work with the University of Illinois' Center for Education in Small Urban Communities to investigate possibilities for University of Illinois resources to provide technical assistance in data analysis and program evaluation. Additionally, during the 08-09 school year, the monitoring team will work to develop a more comprehensive plan for program evaluation in the future. The monitoring team will prepare regular reports for the Board of Education and building and district teachers and support personnel.

Section III-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:2/2/2009 12:00:00 AM

By submitting the plan on behalf of the district, the district superintendent certifies to ISBE that all the information provided in the plan is true and correct and that the restructuring plan has been duly approved by the local board. By sending e-mail notification of plan completion from the Submit Your Plan page the plan shall be deemed to be executed by the superintendent on behalf of the district.

Section III-B ISBE Monitoring

RESTRUCTURING DESCRIPTION	
Yes	Does the plan describe an option for restructuring allowed in the law?
Yes	Does the district make the case that the option selected is appropriate for the school?
	Does the plan explain corrective actions (Title I funded schools) or other district improvement strategies implemented at the school that will remain in place or be a part of the restructuring plan?
Yes	Do state assessment data indicate that the school is showing progress from corrective actions? Is the continuation of these actions warranted or reasonable?
	Does the plan provide a timeline for implementing the restructuring option and the corrective actions that precede it?
No	Does the plan identify the measures for success associated with the district's actions and restructuring strategy?
Yes	What benchmarks of success are planned to monitor progress of this plan and who is responsible for overseeing the implementation and monitoring of this plan?
APPROVAL DATE OF BOARD	
Yes	This section includes the certification of local board approval and provides ISBE staff the opportunity to reflect on the school improvement plan overall.

RESTRUCTURING PLAN COMMENTS

Feb. 9, 2009

District staff submitted this plan last Friday. I look forward to talking with district planners about restructuring for the middle school as that is the final part of the review of this plan. I have contacted Kevin Seymour, RESPRO consultant working with this school, about scheduling a time for me to talk with district and school staff about this plan. I do recommend it for implementation should that be required because of 2009 assessment results and the school's Adequate Yearly Progress report. The purpose of the meeting is to answer your questions and to discuss the plan you have submitted. Several topics to discuss with Urbana Middle School include: community support and response to this plan, least restrictive environment for students with disabilities, the school schedule and the professional learning community, the authority of the restructuring plan committee, district commitment to the required staffing proposed in this plan, the coordination of the professional learning community, RtI, and the instructional inventory. Also, I hope to hear about the district monitoring team's benchmarks of success/indicators of progress planned. Carol Diedrichsen, ISBE, cdiedric@isbe.net.