

Board of Education of the
City of Chicago

In Re: The Matter of
The Proposed Reconstitution of
William W. Carter Elementary School

Before
Margaret C. Fitzpatrick
Independent Hearing Officer

Background

Introduction

On or about April 3, 2013, the undersigned was retained by the Chief Executive Officer (“CEO”) of the Chicago Public Schools to serve as an Independent Hearing Officer in this matter. On Thursday, May 2, 2013, a hearing was convened at the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, 125 South Clark Street, Chicago, Illinois. The purpose of the hearing was to enable the Hearing Officer to receive public comments from concerned persons, specifically including representatives of the CEO, members of the local school council, parents, students, members of the school’s staff, the Principal, representatives of the Chicago Teachers’ Union, and interested members of the public, concerning the CEO’s proposal to Turnaround Carter Elementary School via Reconstitution. Notice of the hearing was served on the parents, staff members, principals, and members of the local school councils via U.S. Mail, and/or personal service through CPS Mail.

Pursuant to the directives provided in the document entitled **“PROCEDURES FOR HEARINGS ON PROPOSED SCHOOL RECONSTITUTIONS”** the undersigned summarizes below the input received at the Public Hearing.

Relevant Statutory Provisions and Board Policies/Procedures

The relevant statutory provisions include, but are not necessarily limited to the following, which state in pertinent part:

Sec. 34 – 8.3. Remediation and probation of attendance centers

* * * *

- (d) Schools placed on probation that, after a maximum of one year, fail to make adequate progress in correcting deficiencies are subject to the following action by the general superintendent with the approval of the board, after opportunity for a hearing: ...

- (4) Reconstitution of the attendance center and replacement and reassignment by the general superintendent of all employees of the attendance center.

Sec.34-18. Powers of the Board.

The board shall exercise general supervision and jurisdiction over the public education and the public school system of the city, and, except as otherwise provided by this Article, shall have power:

- 7. to apportion the pupils to the several schools; provided that no pupil shall be excluded from or segregated in any such school on account of his or her color, race, sex, or nationality. The board shall take into consideration the prevention of segregation and the elimination of separation of children in public schools because of color, race, sex, or nationality.

- 24. To develop a policy, based on the current state of existing school facilities, projected enrollment and efficient utilization of available resources, for capital improvement of schools and school buildings within the district, addressing in that policy both the relative priority for major repairs, renovations and additions to school facilities, and the advisability or necessity of building new school facilities or closing existing schools to meet current or projected demographic patterns within the district;

The Board's School Performance, Remediation and Probation Policy for the 2012-2013 School Year provides in part:

That the Chicago Board of Education adopt a School Performance, Remediation and Probation Policy for the 2011-2012 School Year.

I. Purpose and Goals

This policy shall establish the standards and criteria for placing a school on Remediation or Probation for the 2011-2012 school year based on assessments administered in spring 2011 and other performance data from prior school years. A school's accountability status from the 2010-2011 school year shall remain in effect until such time as the school is notified of their new status issued in accordance with this policy.

This policy sets out a systematic means for identifying schools in need of remedial assistance and increased oversight due to insufficient levels of achievement. Section 5/34-8.3 of the Illinois School Code provides for the remediation and probation of attendance centers and for the Chief Executive Officer to monitor the performance of each school using the criteria and rating system established by the Board to identify those schools in which: (1) there is a failure to develop, implement, or comply with the school improvement plan; (2) there is a pervasive breakdown in the educational program as indicated by various factors such as the absence of improvement in reading and math achievement scores, an increased drop-out rate, a decreased graduation rate, or a decrease in the rate of student attendance, or (3) there is a failure or refusal to comply with the provisions of the School Code, other applicable laws, collective bargaining agreements, court orders, or with applicable Board rules and policies.

The Board recognizes that an effective and fair school remediation and probation system considers student test score performance, student growth and progress trends. Therefore, this policy establishes a comprehensive system to assess school performance in order to identify, monitor and assist schools with low student test scores as well as schools with stagnant or insufficient rates of student improvement.

II. Scope of the Policy

All Chicago Public Schools ("CPS") shall be subject to this policy, except charter schools under contract with the Board. A charter school shall receive an accountability designation using the criteria hereunder for purposes of comparison to other CPS schools and public reporting. A decision to renew or revoke a school's charter is governed by the terms of a school's applicable performance agreement and accountability plan with the Board. Schools newly established by the Board shall receive an accountability designation after the third year of operation or at such time as adequate measures of student achievement become available.

III. Definitions

Remediation: An accountability designation assigned to schools where the Chief Executive Officer ("CEO") determines that a school's budget or any amendment thereto may compromise the implementation of the school's No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) Corrective Action measures or Restructuring Plan.

Probation: An accountability designation assigned to non-performing schools where the CEO determines, utilizing the criteria set out in this policy, that a school requires remedial probation measures as described in this policy, including increased oversight, to address performance deficiencies.

Good Standing: An accountability designation assigned to schools where the CEO determines, based on the criteria set out in this policy, that student performance and improvement meets or exceeds district standards.

Adequate Yearly Progress: School rating issued by the Illinois State Board of Education that identifies if students are improving their performance based on the established annual targets.

Achievement Level 1: Shall mean the rating for:

- an elementary school with a total performance score of thirty (30) or above or with at least 71% of the available performance points; or
- a high school that obtains a total performance score of twenty-eight (28) or above or with at least 66.7% of the available performance points.

Achievement Level 2: Shall mean the rating for:

- an elementary school with a total performance score of twenty-one (21) to twenty-nine (29) or with 50%-70.9% of the available performance points; or
- a high school that obtains a total performance score of eighteen and two-thirds (18.67) to twenty-seven and two-thirds (27.67) or with 44%-66.6% of the available performance points.

Achievement Level 3: Shall mean the rating for:

- an elementary school that obtains a total performance score of twenty (20) or below or with less than 50% of the available performance points; or
- a high school that obtains a total performance score of eighteen and one-third (18.33) or below or with less than 44% of the available performance points.

Value-Added: Shall mean the metric that assesses school effects on students' academic growth, controlling for student characteristics, grade level, and prior performance through a regression methodology. Academic growth is measured by the change in scale score points on the ISAT from one year to the next.

ISAT: means the Illinois Standards Achievement Test.

ISAT Composite: means the composite score from ISAT Reading, Mathematics and Science test results.

PSAE: means the Prairie State Achievement Examination.

PSAE Composite: means the composite score from PSAE Reading, Mathematics and Science test results.

EPAS: means the series of three assessments (Explore, PLAN and ACT) that are administered to high school students in the following order: (1) Explore – administered to high school freshmen, (2) PLAN – administered to high school sophomores, and (3) ACT – administered to high school juniors. Freshmen On Track: Shall mean the percentage of first-time freshmen students who earn five credits in their freshman year and fail no more than one semester core course (English, Mathematics, Science and Social Science).

One-Year Drop-out Rate: Shall mean the percentage of students who drop-out in a given year who have not previously dropped out.

Membership Days: Shall mean the number of days that the students on a school's enrollment register should be in attendance.

Membership days will end for 8th and 12th graders on the date of

graduation authorized by the Board and shall be adjusted for students with medically fragile conditions.

Attendance Rate: Shall mean the total number of actual student attendance days divided by the number of total student membership days.

Advanced Placement (AP) Class: Shall mean a college-level course approved by the College Board to be designated as AP in accordance with established requirements.

AP Exam: Shall mean the end of course exam established by the College Board that is administered upon completion of an AP Class.

IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM

A. Calculation of Score

Every school shall receive a performance score based upon its level of current performance, trend over time and student growth as described in Section V below. A school will be evaluated on each of the accountability indicators identified in Section V using best available data and will receive a score for each indicator as well as a total performance score that accounts for the school's overall performance on all accountability indicators. The total performance score will be used to determine whether a school qualifies for an Achievement Level 1, 2 or 3 rating. A school shall receive an accountability status hereunder whereby the school shall be identified as either on Probation, in Good Standing or in Remediation, as further described herein.

B. Determinations

1. Scoring Exceptions: Schools that do not qualify for all performance points hereunder due to the following circumstances shall have their Achievement level determinations based on the percentage of available points earned rather than the actual points earned: (a) if data for the two previous years is not available for a particular metric measuring change over time, the school will not get a score for that metric; (b) if data is available but not reliable due to no fault of the school, the Chief Executive Officer may remove the affected metric from consideration and the school will not get a score for that metric. ISAT and PSAE scores of students who are English Language Learners in program years 0-5 will not be factored into current status or trend scores hereunder.

2. Accountability Status Determination: A school with an Achievement Level 3 score hereunder shall receive Probation status. A school with an Achievement Level 1 score or an Achievement Level 2 score hereunder shall receive Good Standing status, except for the following which shall receive Probation status hereunder:

- a. A school that has not satisfied the following minimum ISAT or PSAE composite score requirement:
 - i. Elementary school minimum 2011 ISAT Composite score - 50% meeting or exceeding state standards
 - ii. High school minimum 2011 PSAE Composite score - 10% meeting or exceeding state standards.
- b. A school that has not satisfied all applicable sustained academic improvement requirements set out in Section VII. as follows:
 - i. A school with a prior Probation status must receive an Achievement Level 1 rating or Achievement Level 2 rating for 2 consecutive years to be removed from Probation; or
 - ii. A school where the Board has taken an action under 105 ILCS 5/34-8.3(d)(2) or (4) must remain on Probation for a minimum of 5 years or until the school has made Adequate Yearly Progress for 2 consecutive years, whichever occurs later. Notwithstanding the foregoing, a school with Good Standing status may be placed in

Notwithstanding the foregoing, a school with Good Standing status may be placed in Remediation in accordance with Section IV.B.3.

3. NCLB School Improvement Status: For schools not on Probation but that have either “Corrective Action”, “Restructuring Planning” or “Restructuring Implementation” status under NCLB, the CEO reserves the right to place the school in Remediation status at any time if the CEO determines that the school’s budget or any amendment thereto may compromise the implementation of the school’s NCLB Corrective Action or Restructuring Plan.

V. ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATORS, STANDARDS AND SCORING

A. Elementary School Indicators, Standards and Scoring

An elementary school may receive a total performance rating score ranging from zero (0) to forty-two (42). For the 2011-2012 school year, the current status, trend and growth indicators and standards that

determine an elementary school's performance score shall be as follows:

1. ISAT Mathematics – 6 possible points

a. Current Status - An elementary school shall be evaluated on the percentage of students *meeting or exceeding* state standards as indicated by the school's ISAT Mathematics results. Current status is determined by averaging the school's ISAT Mathematics results from tests administered in Spring 2010 and Spring 2011. If the school does not have two years of data, one year of data will be used. A school shall receive points towards its overall performance score as follows:

80% or more meeting or exceeding = 3 points

70%-79.9% meeting or exceeding = 2 points

50%-69.9% meeting or exceeding = 1 point

Under 50% meeting or exceeding = 0 points

b. Trend - An elementary school shall be evaluated on improvement in the percentage of students *meeting or exceeding* state standards on ISAT Mathematics. Improvement trend is determined by comparing the 2011 score with the average score of the three previous years. If the school does not have three previous years of data, the previous two years will be used. A school shall receive points as follows:

- For schools with 0%-89.9% of students meeting or exceeding state standards on the 2011 ISAT Mathematics assessment, points are earned as follows:

No Improvement = 0 points

Improvement of at least 0.1 but under 3.0 percentage points = 1 point

Improvement of at least 3.0 but under 6.0 percentage points = 2 points

Improvement of at least 6.0 percentage points = 3 points

- Schools with 90% or more of students meeting or exceeding state standards on the 2011 ISAT

Mathematics assessments automatically earn 3 points regardless of improvement.

2. ISAT Reading – 6 possible points

a. Current Status - An elementary school shall be evaluated on the percentage of students *meeting or exceeding* state standards as indicated by the school's ISAT Reading results. Current status is

determined by averaging the school's ISAT Reading results from tests administered in Spring 2010 and Spring 2011. If the school does not have two years of data, one year of data will be used. A school shall receive points towards its overall performance score as follows:

80% or more meeting or exceeding = 3 points

70%-79.9% meeting or exceeding = 2 points

50%-69.9% meeting or exceeding = 1 point

Under 50% meeting or exceeding = 0 points

b. Trend - An elementary school shall be evaluated on improvement in the percentage of students *meeting or exceeding* state standards on ISAT Reading. Improvement trend is determined by comparing the 2011 score with the average score of the three previous years. If the school does not have three previous years of data, the previous two years will be used. A school shall receive points as follows:

- For schools with 0%-89.9% of students meeting or exceeding state standards on the 2011 ISAT Reading assessment, points are earned as follows:

No Improvement = 0 points

Improvement of at least 0.1 but under 3.0 percentage points = 1 point

Improvement of at least 3.0 but under 6.0 percentage points = 2 points

Improvement of at least 6.0 percentage points = 3 points

- Schools with 90% or greater of students meeting or exceeding state standards on the 2011 ISAT Reading assessment automatically earn 3 points regardless of improvement.

3. ISAT Science - 6 possible points

a. Current Status - An elementary school shall be evaluated on the percentage of students *meeting or exceeding* state standards as indicated by the school's ISAT Science results. Current status is determined by averaging the school's ISAT Science results from tests administered in Spring 2010 and Spring 2011. If the school does not have two years of data, one year of data will be used. A school shall receive points towards its overall performance score as follows:

80% or more meeting or exceeding = 3 points

70%-79.9% meeting or exceeding = 2 points

50%-69.9% meeting or exceeding = 1 point

Under 50% meeting or exceeding = 0 points

b. Trend - An elementary school shall be evaluated on improvement in the percentage of students *meeting or exceeding* state standards on ISAT Science. Improvement trend is determined by comparing the 2011 score with the average score of the three previous years. If the school does not have three previous years of data, the previous two years will be used. A school shall receive points as follows:

- For schools with 0%-89.9% of students meeting or exceeding state standards on the 2011 ISAT Science assessment, points are earned as follows:

No Improvement = 0 points

Improvement of at least 0.1 but under 3.0 percentage points = 1 point

Improvement of at least 3.0 but under 6.0 percentage points = 2 points

Improvement of at least 6.0 percentage points = 3 points

- Schools with 90% or greater of students meeting or exceeding state standards on the 2011 ISAT Science assessment automatically earn 3 points regardless of improvement.

4. ISAT Composite - All Grades - 6 possible points

a. Current Status - An elementary school shall be evaluated on the percentage of students in all grades who are *exceeding* state standards as indicated by the school's ISAT Composite. Current status is determined by averaging the school's ISAT Composite results from tests administered in Spring 2010 and Spring 2011. If the school does not have two years of data, one year of data will be used. A school shall receive points towards its overall performance score as follows:

25% or more exceeding = 3 points

15%-24.9% exceeding = 2 points

5%-14.9% exceeding = 1 point

Under 5% exceeding = 0 points

b. Trend - An elementary school shall be evaluated on improvement in the percentage of students in all grades who are *exceeding* state standards on ISAT Composite. Improvement trend is determined by comparing the 2011 score for all students with the average score of the three previous years. If the school does not have three previous

years of data, the previous two years will be used. A school shall receive points as follows:

- For schools with 0%-89.9% of students in all grades exceeding state standards on the 2011 ISAT Composite, points are earned as follows:

No Improvement = 0 points

Improvement of at least 0.1 but under 3.0 percentage points = 1 point

Improvement of at least 3.0 but under 6.0 percentage points = 2 points

Improvement of at least 6.0 percentage points = 3 points

- Schools with 90% or greater of students in all grades exceeding state standards on the 2011 ISAT Composite automatically earns 3 points regardless of improvement.

5. ISAT Composite - Highest Grade Students - 6 possible points

a. Current Status - An elementary school shall be evaluated on the percentage of students in the school's highest grade level who are *exceeding* state standards as indicated by the school's ISAT Composite. Current status is determined by averaging the school's ISAT Composite results for students in the highest grade from tests administered in Spring 2010 and Spring 2011. If the school does not have two years of data, one year of data will be used. A school shall receive points towards its overall performance score as follows:

25% or more exceeding = 3 points

15%-24.9% exceeding = 2 points

5%-14.9% exceeding = 1 point

Under 5% exceeding = 0 points

b. Trend - An elementary school shall be evaluated on improvement in the percentage of students in the school's highest grade level who are *exceeding* state standards on ISAT Composite. Improvement trend is determined by comparing the 2011 score for students in the highest grade with the average score of the three previous years. If the school does not have three previous years of data, the previous two years will be used. A school shall receive points as follows:

- For schools with 0%-89.9% of students in the highest grade exceeding state standards on the 2011 ISAT Composite, points are earned as follows:

No Improvement = 0 points

Improvement of at least 0.1 but under 3.0 percentage points = 1 point

Improvement of at least 3.0 but under 6.0 percentage points = 2 points

Improvement of at least 6.0 percentage points = 3 points

- Schools with 90% or greater of students in the highest grade exceeding state standards on the 2011 ISAT Composite automatically earn 3 points regardless of improvement.

6. Attendance – 6 possible points

a. Current Status - An elementary school shall be evaluated on its average attendance rate from the two most recent school years. To determine current status, a school's average attendance rates from the 2007-2010 school year and from the 2010-2011 school year will be averaged. If two years of data are not available, one year of data will be used. A school shall receive points towards its overall performance score as follows:

95% or more attendance rate = 3 points

93%-94.9% attendance rate = 2 points

90%-92.9% attendance rate = 1 point

Under 90% attendance rate = 0 points

b. Trend - An elementary school shall be evaluated on improvement of its average attendance rate. Improvement trend is determined by comparing the 2010-2011 attendance rate with the average rate of the three previous years. If the school does not have three previous years of data, the previous two years will be used. A school shall receive points as follows:

- For schools with a 2010-2011 attendance rate of 0%-94.9%, points are earned as follows:

No Improvement = 0 points

Improvement of at least 0.1 but under 0.5 percentage points = 1 point

Improvement of at least 0.5 but under 1.0 percentage points = 2 points

Improvement of at least 1.0 percentage points = 3 points

- Schools with a 2010-2011 attendance rate of 95% or greater earn 3 points regardless of improvement.

7. Value-Added - ISAT Reading - 3 possible points

Current Status - An elementary school shall be evaluated on its Value-Added scale score gain for ISAT Reading and shall receive points towards its overall performance score as follows:

At least one standard deviation above the district average in 2011 = 3 points

Greater than or equal to the district average, but less than one standard deviation above the district average in 2011 = 2 points

Below the district average, but by no more than one standard deviation in 2011 = 1 point

More than one standard deviation below the district average in 2011 = 0 points

8. Value-Added - ISAT Mathematics - 3 possible points

Current Status - An elementary school shall be evaluated on its Value-Added scale score gain for ISAT Mathematics and shall receive points towards its overall performance score as follows:

At least one standard deviation above the district average in 2011 = 3 points

Greater than or equal to the district average, but less than one standard deviation above the district average in 2011 = 2 points

Below the district average, but by no more than one standard deviation in 2011 = 1 point

More than one standard deviation below the district average in 2011 = 0 points

* * * *

VI. SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED AS NEEDING REMEDIAL ASSISTANCE

On a date to be determined by the CEO or his designee, after school performance data is available, schools will be notified as to their accountability designation hereunder.

A. Schools Placed on Remediation

Any school that receives a Remediation status as described in Section IV.B. hereunder shall participate in a remedial program in which a Remediation Plan is developed by the CEO. A Remediation Plan may include one or more of the following components:

1. Drafting a new school improvement plan;
2. Additional training for the local school council;

3. Directing the implementation of the school improvement plan; and
4. Mediating disputes or other obstacles to reform or improvement at the school.

In creating a Remediation Plan, the CEO or designee shall monitor and give assistance to these schools to ensure that all aspects of the plan, including the school budget, address the educational deficiencies at these schools and ensure the development and full implementation of a school's NCLB Corrective Action measures and/or Restructuring plan.

For all schools placed on Remediation, the CEO or designee shall approve the final Remediation Plan, including the school budget.

B. Schools Placed on Probation

1. School Improvement Plan and Budget: Each school placed on Probation shall have a school improvement plan and a school budget for correcting deficiencies identified by the Board. The CEO or designee shall develop a school improvement plan that shall contain specific steps that the local school council and the school staff must take to correct identified deficiencies. The school budget shall include specific expenditures directly calculated to correct educational and operational deficiencies identified at the school.

In creating or updating the required plan, the CEO or designee shall give assistance to Probation schools to ensure that all aspects of the plan, including the school budget, reflect and are tailored to the individual needs of the school and that the plan addresses the educational deficiencies at these schools. For schools with a federal school improvement status for failure to make adequate yearly progress (AYP), the school improvement plan shall also include strategies and activities to achieve AYP and ensure the development and full implementation of the school's NCLB Corrective Action measures and/or Restructuring plan, as applicable.

The Board shall approve school improvement plans and budget for all schools, including schools placed on Probation, as part of the annual school fiscal year budget resolution. Any updates to such school improvement plan or school budget to address new data on the deficiencies at Probation schools and schools with a federal school improvement status shall be approved by the Board in accordance with the state's timeline for Board approval of federal

school improvement plans. Thereafter, any amendments to the school improvement plan or budget shall be approved by the CEO or designee.

Except when otherwise specified by the CEO, the Chief of Schools and designees of the Chief of Schools shall serve as the probation team that will identify the educational and operational deficiencies at Probation schools in their Network to be addressed in the school improvement plan and budget presented to the Board for approval.

2. Monitoring: The CEO or designee shall monitor each Probation school's implementation of the final plan and the progress the school makes toward implementation of the plan and the correction of its educational deficiencies.

3. Additional Corrective Measures: **Schools placed on Probation that, after at least one year, fail to make adequate progress in correcting deficiencies are subject to the following actions by the approval of the Board, after an opportunity for a hearing:**

- a. Ordering new local school council elections;
- b. Removing and replacing the principal;
- c. Replacement of faculty members, subject to the provisions of Section 24A-5 of the Illinois School Code;
- d. Reconstitution of the attendance center and replacement and reassignment by the CEO of all employees of the attendance center;
- e. Intervention under Section 34-8.4 of the Illinois School Code;
- f. Operating an attendance center as a contract turnaround school;
- g. Closing of the school; or
- h. Any other action authorized under Section 34-8.3 of the Illinois School Code

The Law Department shall develop and disseminate hearing procedures for hearings required before taking any of the corrective actions specified above.

* * * *

Finally, the role of the hearing officer, and manner in which he or she is to receive comments, are set forth in the **“PROCEDURES FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS ON PROPOSED RECONSTITUTIONS.”** Those Procedures state:

1. Upon considering to recommend to the Chicago Board of Education (“Board”) that a school be closed, consolidated with another school, co-located, phased-out, reconstituted or subject to reassignment boundary change, an independent hearing officer shall be appointed consistent with 105 ILCS 5/34-230(f) to conduct a public hearing.
 - a. The hearing will commence and conclude at the time designated in the notice of hearing;
 - b. The hearing will be transcribed;
 - c. The hearing officer will be solely responsible for conducting the hearing and will conduct the hearing in an efficient and impartial manner.
2. Chief Executive Officer’s Presentation
 - a. An attorney will present the Chief Executive Officer’s proposal by making an opening statement and submitting evidence in support of the proposal to be considered by the hearing officer.
 - b. The attorney may also introduce witnesses, who will present statements regarding the proposal. The hearing officer may ask the witnesses questions to clarify any statements they made.
3. Public Participation
 - a. The hearing officer will receive relevant statements, comments, documents or written proposals from members of the public.
 - b. All those wishing to comment on the mater being considered will be required to sign up to do so as provided in the notice of hearing.
 - i.Registration must be made in person by the individual who will be commenting on the proposal; and
 - ii.An individual may not complete a speaker registration on behalf of another person.
 - c. The hearing officer will determine the order of speakers.
 - d. When called by the hearing officer to speak, the speaker shall proceed promptly to the microphone area where s/he will have two minutes to present his/her remarks and materials to the hearing officer.
 - e. The total number of persons speaking at the hearing will be subject to the sole discretion of the hearing officer.

- f. The hearing officer may impose any other reasonable procedures or limitations necessary to ensure that the proceedings are orderly and efficient.
 - g. Courteous, respectful and civil behavior is expected from all speakers and all persons attending a hearing, and individuals who are disruptive may be removed from a hearing.
4. Hearing officer's Written Report
- a. Following the hearing the hearing officer will prepare and submit to the Chief Executive Officer a written report summarizing the public comments and the documents received at the hearing.
 - b. The hearing officer's report will also determine whether the Chief Executive Officer complied with the requirements of 105 ILCS 5/34-230 and the Chief Executive Officer's Guidelines for School Actions.

SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE

Testimony Received at the Public Hearing

Name

Affiliation

Kathleen Crawford

Assistant Attorney, CPS

Ms. Crawford presented a binder containing documents prepared in support of the Proposal to Reconstitute Carter School. She read into the record the Table of Contents and introduced speakers representing CPS.

John Barker

Chief Accountability Officer, CPS

Mr. Barker addressed the proposed reconstitution of Carter School. He testified as follows:

Good evening Madame Hearing Officer. My name is John Barker and I am the Chief Accountability Officer for the Chicago Public Schools. I have been in this position since December of 2012. In this position, I oversee the District's accountability systems and am responsible for data analysis and research necessary to support and understand student growth patterns. Prior to this, I was the Chief of Staff and head of Research, Evaluation, Assessment and Student Information for the Memphis school district. I have a Bachelor's degree, a Master's in Public Policy and a Ph.D. in Education and Human Development.

I am appearing before you today to present specific data highlighting the low academic performance of William W. Carter Elementary School. This data will be displayed on the PowerPoint presentation currently being shown.

The Chief Executive Officer's proposed recommendation that Carter be reconstituted is based on section 34-8.3 of the Illinois School Code. There is a copy of the statute in the binder of documents that you have received in support of this proposal. Section 8.3 grants the Chief Executive Officer and the Board of Education the authority to take certain corrective measures with respect to schools with academic deficiencies. One of those measures is placing schools on probation, which allows the Chief Executive Officer and the Board of Education to take additional corrective actions intended to correct the school's academic deficiencies. Specifically, section 8.3 allows the Chief Executive Officer, with the approval of the Board of Education, and after a hearing, to reconstitute the school if, after a maximum of one year, the school has failed to make adequate progress in correcting its academic deficiencies.

The Board of Education has adopted policies setting forth the criteria for determining when a school is subject to being placed on probation and when it can be removed from that status. Specifically, the Performance Policy is the District's school accountability policy. Under this policy, each school receives an annual rating based on its performance on a variety of student outcome measures, including standardized test scores and student attendance. This rating is based on a point system. Points are received for the school's current level of performance and improvement over time on standardized tests and attendance, as well as the growth of individual students from year-to-year on the state test. There are 14 separate metrics on which schools are evaluated, each worth up to three points, for a total of 42 available points. Elementary schools that receive less than 50% of the total available points earn a rating of Level 3 and are placed on probation.

CPS began using this structure for the Performance Policy in 2008. As you can see, in each of the last five years Carter has been a Level 3 school. In the 2007-2008 school year, Carter received 21.4% of available points. In the 2008-2009 school year, it received 21.4% of available points. In the 2009-2010 school year it received 31% of available points. In the 2010-2011 school year, it received 28.6% of available points. In the 2011-2012 school year, it received 38.1% of available points. Prior to five years ago, CPS still had a policy determining a school's accountability status. Carter has been on probation for the past six consecutive school years. The notices of Carter's Performance Policy status for the last five school years, which were sent to the Carter principal, are included in the binder of documents that you have received.

The next slide shows the results of the Illinois Standards Achievement Test, or ISAT, for the 2011-2012 school year for Carter, the geographic network in which Carter is located, and the District. Carter is located in the Burnham Park network. The term “geographic network” refers to the schools that are currently in the Burnham Park Elementary School network, as well as elementary schools located within the community, but managed independently, such as charter schools. The calculations used in this testimony exclude full-site selective enrollment schools. The reason for using geographic network in this calculation was to show how Carter is performing compared to all other schools within its community.

As you can see, Carter’s 2011-2012 ISAT Meets or Exceeds Composite score, which is the combined result of the ISAT reading, mathematics, and science assessments, was 58.6%, compared to a geographic network average of 70.8% and a District average of 76.4%. In reading, the percent of Carter students meeting or exceeding state standards was 57%, compared to a geographic network average of 68% and a District average of 73.4%. In mathematics Carter’s performance was 66.7%, compared to a geographic network average of 74.9% and a District average of 80.5%. In science Carter’s performance was 37.3%, compared to a geographic network average of 66.8% and a District average of 72.9%.

The next few slides show Carter’s performance over time on the metrics used in the Performance Policy. These slides demonstrate that the performance gap between Carter and other schools in the network and across the District has been persistent over time. Carter’s ISAT Composite Meets or Exceeds score was 4.6 percentage points below the geographic network average in 2005-2006 and 12.2 percentage points below the geographic network average in 2011-2012. Carter’s ISAT Composite Meets or Exceeds score was 8.8 percentage points below the District average in 2005-2006 and 17.8 percentage points below the District average in 2011-2012.

In addition to measuring the percentage of student meeting state standards, CPS also measures the percentage of students exceeding state standards. In 2011-2012 Carter’s ISAT Composite Exceeds score was 8.2%, compared to a geographic network average of 14%, and a District average of 18.9%. Carter’s Composite Exceeds score was 2.3 percentage points below the geographic network average in 2005-2006 and 5.8 percentage points below the geographic network average in 2011-2012. Carter’s Composite Exceeds score was 4.5 percentage points below the District average in 2005-2006 and 10.7 percentage points below the District average in 2011-2012.

Another measure on the Performance Policy is the percent of students exceeding state standards on the ISAT at the school's highest grade level. This allows us to see how well students are doing as they exit the school. In 2011-2012 Carter's ISAT Composite Exceeds score for its 8th graders was 6.7%, compared to a geographic network average of 8%, and a District average of 15.8%. Carter's 8th Grade Composite Exceeds score was 2.1 percentage points below the geographic network average in 2005-2006 and 1.3 percentage points below the geographic network average in 2011-2012. Carter's 8th Grade Composite Exceeds score was 5.4 percentage points below the District average in 2005-2006 and 9.1 percentage points below the District average in 2011-2012.

The performance gap between Carter and the District is consistent across subjects. Carter's ISAT Reading Meets or Exceeds score was 6.4 percentage points below the geographic network average in 2005-2006 and 11 percentage points below the geographic network average in 2011-2012. Carter's Reading score was 18.9 percentage points below the District average in 2005-2006 and 16.4 percentage points below the District average in 2011-2012.

Carter's ISAT Mathematics Meets or Exceeds score was 3 percentage points below the geographic network average in 2005-2006 and 8.2 percentage points below the geographic network average in 2011-2012. Carter's Mathematics score was 8.3 percentage points below the District average in 2005-2006 and 13.8 percentage points below the District average in 2011-2012.

Carter's science scores decreased substantially between 2006 and 2012. Carter's ISAT Science Meets or Exceeds score was 3.9 percentage points below the geographic network average in 2005-2006 and was 29.5 percentage points below the geographic network average in 2011-2012. Carter's Science score was 10.2 percentage points below the District average in 2005-2006 and 35.6 percentage points below the District average in 2011-2012.

In addition to standardized test scores, the CPS Performance Policy evaluates schools on attendance rate. The attendance rate for Carter has been consistently lower than the District average. Carter's attendance rate has not been higher than 92.1% in the last seven years and was 91.9% in 2011-2012, which was in the bottom 9% of attendance rates among elementary schools. Since the 2005-2006 school year, the District average for elementary schools has been consistently above 94%, and was 95.3% in 2011-2012.

The Value-Added metric, which is a component of the Performance Policy, compares student academic growth on the ISAT at a school with the growth of similar students across the District. This is done through a regression methodology that controls for nine student-level factors, including grade level,

prior performance on the ISAT, free or reduced lunch eligibility, race or ethnicity, mobility, participation in the Students in Temporary Living Situations program, Individualized Education Program (or IEP status), English Language Learner status, and gender. Controlling for these factors allows us to see how much impact the school had on its average student over the past year. Because we control for prior performance, this metric allows us to identify schools with low test scores where growth is rapid, and schools with high test scores where growth is slow.

The Value-Added metric is a standardized measure with a mean of zero. Standardization means that the score is reported in standard deviation units, which is a measure of how far away the school's score is from the District average. A positive number means that students at the school are growing at a faster pace than similar students in the District. For example, a positive 1 indicates that the school is one standard deviation above the mean, meaning that the school's students are growing at a faster pace than approximately 84% of schools in the District. A score near zero means that students at the school are growing at about the same pace as similar students in the District. And a negative score means that students at the school are growing at a slower pace than similar students in the District.

Carter's reading value-added score was -0.8 in 2009-2010, -1.2 in 2010-2011 and -0.1 in 2011-2012. Its mathematics value-added score was -0.1 in 2009-2010, -0.2 in 2010-2011 and -0.8 in 2011-2012. This means that, on average, students at Carter grew at a below-average pace in reading and mathematics in all three years. As a point of reference, Carter's reading value-added score of -0.1 in 2011-2012 was in the 48th percentile and its math value-added score of -0.8 was in the 19th percentile.

To conclude, Carter Elementary School is on probation in accordance with state law and the Performance Policy. The school has low performance, this performance is consistently low across subject areas, and the school is not making sufficient progress in catching up to the District.

Thank you, Madame Hearing Officer. This concludes my statement.

John Price

**Chief of Schools, Burnham Park, Elementary
Network, CPS**

Good evening. My name is John Price. I am employed by the Board of Education of the City of Chicago as the Chief of Schools for the Burnham Park Elementary School Network. Chicago Public Schools are divided up into

Networks, managed by a Chief, and provide support and oversight for the schools assigned to them on behalf of the CEO. William W. Carter Elementary School is within the Burnham Park Elementary School Network and I am responsible for the support and oversight of Carter on behalf of the CEO. I have been the Chief of Carter since March of 2012.

By way of background, I have been an educator for approximately 18 years. I began working as a teacher in 1995. I have taught at the elementary, middle school and college levels. I have also worked as an Assistant Principal and Principal where I led efforts to significantly close the achievement gap for students. Currently, I serve as the Chief of Elementary Schools for the Burnham Park Network, managing 35 schools with approximately 13,000 students. I hold a bachelor's degree from Stanford University and a Masters of Education in Administration and Leadership from the University of Illinois at Chicago.

Carter has been on probation for five consecutive school years for failing to meet the CPS required standards for minimum student performance. As my colleague, John Barker, testified, the school has demonstrated low academic performance across subject areas, and students are not growing at a rate consistent with other comparable schools in the geographic network and the District. Based on the Performance Policy and my observations, the CEO has concluded that Carter has made insufficient progress in improving student academic achievement.

Through my review of the Carter School Improvement Plans, Continuous Improvement Work Plan, information I have gained from Network staff, my own knowledge of the District's initiatives, and my work with Carter since 2012, I am aware of how the District has supported Carter in an attempt to correct its deficiencies during the last several years with programmatic, professional development and leadership coaching.

Since Carter has been on probation, the District has provided oversight of its discretionary budget to ensure funds are allocated in line with the goals for improved student outcomes. Prior to this school year, this was done through the School Improvement Plan for Advancing Academic Achievement, or SIPAAA. The SIPAAA was created with input from data and several stakeholders to identify the key areas where the school needed improvement, plan interventions to support the school, and allocate funds accordingly. The Chief provided input in the creation of the SIPAAA, and the Board of Education approved the SIPAAA. Copies of the SIPAAA for 2010 through 2012 and Board Reports adopting them are located in your binder at tabs 12 and 13.

The Network has provided additional support to Carter in an effort to correct academic deficiencies at the school. During the 2011-2012 school year, the Network provided additional support to Carter in the following ways:

- Carter's principal and assistant principal received approximately fourteen professional development opportunities on key District and Network

- priorities, such as Common Core State Standards and integration of technology; as well as observation of instructional practices.
- Network staff hosted three workshops for Carter kindergarten through second grade teachers to support technology integration into lesson plans to provide students with better access to technology in the classroom.
 - Carter's principal received one-on-one coaching on seven occasions from the Network's Deputy Chief and on one occasion from the Network Chief regarding issues such as setting expectations and facilitating staff planning; implementing rigorous lessons across all grade levels and content areas; analyzing instruction through qualitative observations of teacher pedagogical practice; and facilitating ongoing professional development that allows teachers to utilize data to reflect on and improve their practice in the classroom.
 - The Network's Deputy Chief held approximately two to three small group planning sessions, which included various principals in the Network, including Carter's principal. These planning sessions addressed implementation and support of the goals and action plans outlined in the SIPAAA. Further, the planning sessions included providing oversight of Carter's discretionary budget to ensure funds were allocated in line with the goals for improving student outcomes.

Beginning this school year, the District began providing oversight of Carter's discretionary budget and goals for improved student outcomes through the Continuous Improvement Work Plan, or CIWP. The CIWP is a two-year strategic plan, created by a team of participants at the school level with support and guidance from the Network Chief. A CIWP team consists of 6 to 12 committed stakeholders, including parents, teachers, the principal, and other members of the school community such as Local School Council representatives. The CIWP team uses data and self-evaluation to set student performance goals, develops strategic priorities, identifies milestones and creates an action plan for each priority, and allocates funds in the budget to align with its goals and strategic priorities. The Network Chief provides input throughout the planning process and also approves the CIWP upon completion on behalf of the District. The Board of Education also approves the CIWP, and copies of the Board Report approving the Carter 2012-2014 CIWP is located in your evidence binder at tab 14.

The Carter CIWP set the following strategic priorities to improve student achievement and created an action plan for each.

- The first goal was to integrate and align content area curriculum based on the Common Core State Standards to help prepare students to achieve their full academic potential and expand their knowledge so as to allow the students to become college and career ready.

- The second goal was to foster a safe and secure learning environment for all learners to improve student connection and a positive educational climate.
- The third goal was to make sure students are efficient in the use of technology to broaden their learning in order for them to compete in the global market.
- The fourth goal was to encourage the school environment and community to develop a healthy lifestyle.

The Network has provided additional support to Carter this school year in an effort to correct academic deficiencies in the following ways:

- Network Instructional Support Leaders visited Carter one to two days per week to support the implementation of the school and Network CIWP goals and action plans for improving student outcomes. Carter received more visits than a typical Network school during this school year.
- Carter's principal and assistant principal received more than fifteen professional development opportunities on key District and Network priorities, such as school culture and climate, early childhood literacy, and data management and usage.
- Network staff hosted two mathematics instructional workshops for Carter upper-grade teachers.
- Carter's principal received one-on-one coaching on six occasions from the Network's Deputy Chief and on one occasion from the Network Chief regarding issues such as: setting expectations and facilitating staff planning; implementing rigorous lessons across all grade levels and content areas; analyzing instruction through qualitative observations of teacher pedagogical practice; and facilitating ongoing professional development that allows teachers to utilize data to reflect on and improve their practice in the classroom.

Despite the supports provided by the District in recent years, student academic growth at the school has not kept pace with District averages. In fact, based on 2012-2013 mid-year data, it appears that student achievement is falling farther behind national averages. As John Barker testified, the gap between Carter and other schools in the geographic network and District has increased in the past five years. For individual students and for the community, there is an urgent need for the performance of Carter to improve and to improve quickly. Accordingly, the CEO is recommending that Carter be turned around.

If the Board approves the proposed turnaround of Carter, students will not be displaced from the school. Instead, a new team of administrators, faculty and support personnel will be staffed at the school. You will hear testimony from Pamela Creed next, who will explain the turnaround method and why the CEO believes it will result in better educational outcomes at Carter.

In conclusion, there is an urgent need to accelerate student achievement at Carter, and prior supports and interventions have not produced satisfactory results. The CEO believes that a turnaround will accelerate student achievement and provide Carter students with better educational opportunities. Thank you for your time and attention. This concludes my statement.

**Pamela Creed Principal of Harvard Elementary School of Excellence,
Academy of Urban School Leadership**

Good evening, Madame Hearing Officer. My name is Pamela Creed. I am employed by the Academy of Urban School Leadership as the Principal of Fuller School of Excellence.

The CEO has asked me to appear at this hearing today to convey to you, and the Carter school community, as well as interested members of the public in attendance, information on the Academy of Urban School Leadership, otherwise known as AUSL.

By way of background, I have been the Principal of Fuller School of Excellence, an AUSL school, since 2012, and was the Principal of Dulles School of Excellence, another AUSL school, from 2009-2012. Prior to joining AUSL, I served as Director of Chicago International Charter School-Washington Park Campus for three years; Principal-in-Residence of Belmont-Cragin Elementary School for one year; and have five years of experience as a teacher. I also have over twenty years of experience in the private sector in various leadership roles, including six years as academic advisor and counselor roles at the college level. By way of education, I have three Master's degrees in Education, Counseling and Guidance; Business Administration, Management and Administration; and Teaching. Further, I have a Certificate of Advanced Study in Administration and Supervision.

AUSL is a non-profit agency that partners with CPS to manage schools. AUSL is a proven turnaround provider that has a great deal of experience improving student achievement at chronically underperforming Chicago Public Schools. AUSL manages 25 schools and 7 are "dual mission" CPS schools, which include training academies that equip teachers to work specifically in turnaround settings. The remaining 18 schools are turnarounds; 16 elementary schools and 2 high schools.

While the turnaround process is a multi-year journey, experience has shown that AUSL turnaround strategies create higher performing schools with accelerated student academic growth and other indicators of good schools. AUSL has transformed schools with disorderly school environments and persistently low student achievement into schools with positive school climates that are inviting and conducive to increasing student achievement and accelerating student academic growth.

The PowerPoint presentation currently being shown illustrates AUSL's multi-year success in implementing turnaround strategies. The first slide compares the percentage of students meeting or exceeding state standards before AUSL managed the school to the same schools' performance in the 2011-2012 year. As you can see, AUSL turnarounds have produced the following results:

- At Howe School of Excellence, only 42.8 percent of students were meeting or exceeding state standards on the ISAT before the turnaround. In year four, 70.2 percent of students were meeting or exceeding state standards.
- At Morton School, only 41 percent of students were meeting or exceeding state standards on the ISAT prior to the turnaround. At year four of the turnaround, 78.2 percent of the students were meeting or exceeding state standards.
- At Dulles School of Excellence, only 48.5 percent of students were meeting or exceeding state standards on the ISAT before the turnaround. In year three, 70.1 percent of students were meeting or exceeding state standards.

The second slide compares the schools' performance growth for the last 6 years to that of the District. As you can see, every year since 2007, AUSL's average yearly increase in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding on the ISAT has more than doubled the average yearly increase at CPS.

AUSL has developed a data driven framework that is the basis for its plan to improve academic performance outcomes at Carter, including:

1. First, the development of rigorous, transparent goals for schools, teams, and individuals, including a high expectations and no excuses climate and culture;
2. Second, the use of performance management systems with cycles of inquiry and data driven intervention;

3. Third, the inclusion of high-quality instruction through implementation of Common Core State Standards to ensure a rigorous instructional program that gives students the knowledge and skills needed to be college and career ready;
4. Fourth, efforts to recruit, retain, and motivate high-quality staff to meet the needs of the school community, including educators with the appropriate bilingual language skills and special education training;
5. Fifth, intervention and tutoring services for students who need extra support in reading and math;
6. Sixth, advanced data systems and aligned assessments that allow staff to identify students who need additional assistance early and give them the help they need to stay on track;
7. Seventh, after school programs to give students access to additional instruction time to further accelerate student achievement;
8. Eighth, professional development and coaching that give teachers the strategies and tools needed to address diverse needs of students in challenged urban environments; and
9. Finally, extensive curricular enhancements, including fine and performing arts and athletics, to round out the curriculum and extend the students' time at school learning.

AUSL's full school turnaround plan also includes improvements emphasizing students' social-emotional behavior, with:

- Effective attendance and discipline policies;
- Safe and orderly school and classroom environments;
- Focus on skills related to self-management, responsible decision making, empathy toward others, establishing positive interpersonal relationships, and determining positive goals; and
- Partnerships with outside agencies that provide additional supports to students and their families.

As you can see, AUSL's full school turnaround plan is designed to be a comprehensive approach to teaching and learning. If the Board approves this proposal, AUSL would welcome the opportunity to serve the Carter school community.

Thank you, Madame Hearing Officer. This concludes my statement.

Whereupon the hearing was opened up for public comment.

John Simmons

Strategic Learning Initiatives

Mr. Simmons is the president of Strategic Learning Initiatives (SLI). For 23 years, his organization has been supporting over 60 schools in Chicago's lowest income neighborhoods. Carter School voted to ask CPS for a less disruptive alternative and one that would be one-fifth the cost of the AUSL model. The State of Illinois has used the CPS model to transform student achievement in failing high schools in Decatur, Springfield, Depue and East St. Louis. CPS' transformation model costs less than \$200,000 a year while AUSL costs over a million dollars a year.

Mariama Cosey

Teacher

Ms. Cosey presented a proposal. (See Exhibit 1) The data presented by Mr. Barker and Mr. Price represents an outgoing administration. She would like to focus on accomplishments of the current administration, and requests that SLI be allowed to work at Carter. Charessa McNeal and Pam Malone, administrators from higher performing schools have been recruited to address the challenge of transforming Carter School.

Deborah Pope

CTU

Ms. Pope is not only concerned about teacher's jobs, but also about the children. She has a Master's degree in family therapy and children in high stress, high poverty and high violent neighborhoods need stability. Teachers provide this stability. AUSL uses mostly new teachers. A school should be multigenerational with some experienced and some younger teachers. AUSL's staff does not last long. Teachers at Carter represent dedicated professionals who have given their lives to CPS and to the children. A school is not just test results, it is the human beings from the lunchroom, to security, to everyone who cares and nurtures the children.

Audra Ward**Teacher**

Ms. Ward has been at Carter two years. The old administration was stagnant, but the new administration implanted many beautiful programs. The school still has weaknesses and an SLI program would help. There have been improvements, but it will take time. There are new attendance procedures and policies. The school is developing clear expectations. AUSL is given 3 years to make gains and she feels Carter can do the same with the SLI program.

Pamela Malone**Teacher**

Ms. Malone is the curriculum coordinator at Carter. She invites Barbara Byrd-Bennett and Andrea Zopp to visit the school and witness the turnaround that has occurred in the past 7 months. Mr. Moore and Mrs. McNeal have focused on instruction, professional development and analyzing test data. The administration and staff are prepared to continue to do the work necessary to improve the school if given a chance.

Anjail Kenyatta**Counselor/Case Manager**

Ms. Kenyatta has been at Carter for 11 years. Carter has a new comprehensive counseling program focusing on grades 6 through 8. Through Individual Learning Plans, (ILP) students will be able to track and graph their own data and show personal growth. Carter may be able to grow without AUSL, under the new administration, and with the necessary resources.

Zulekha Robinson**Teacher**

The new administration envisioned reinstating the preschool program which was closed in 2010 by the former administration. A lot of prep work went into starting this program successfully. Students exposed to preschool have a better foundation for kindergarten. Carter is a staple in the community and a turnaround would be an injustice to the students.

Dr. Lamont Kidd**Teacher**

Dr. Kidd invites Barbara Byrd-Bennett and Andrea Zopp to come to Carter unannounced to see the improvements under Mr. Moore's administration. The special ed students are more actively involved in all school activities. The awards for good behavior are trips, ice cream socials, and dances. There is a Boys and Girls Club, football, basketball, softball, and track, all activities that keep students away from stray bullets.

Laverne Browne**Teacher**

Ms. Browne has taught at Carter for 13 years and has seen the attendance go from 865 to 300. She believes this has to do with the administration. There have been more parents in the building in the last year than in all the time she has been at the school.

Latice Wilkins**Parent**

Ms. Wilkins would like to see the current staff stay in place. Mr. Moore has Carter pointed in the right direction. There are Boys and Girls Clubs, new computer labs, Aquaponics, Reach for Girls, Young Entrepreneur Club, Grub Club, Uniform Bank, Parent Resource Center, Skype Club, Head Start, and a Cheerleader Prep Squad. Carter has five Promethean Boards, a partnership with Coppins and Good Shepherd Church, Literacy Night, History Fair and Science Fair, Father/Daughter dance, Back to School picnic and an annual Meet and Greet and soon a chess club.

Robert Coffee**Boys and Girls Club Director**

The Mayor has recognized this organization as one of the top non-for-profit after- school organizations in the City. The Carter Club is number one out of all other school-based clubs. Attendance is over 90 kids a day. Carter has already turned around in the last seven months with Mr. Moore. Mr. Coffee invites all to come and see in order to make an informed decision.

Sophia Ragland**LSC President**

Ms. Ragland invites Barbara Bennett and Andrea Zopp to come and see Carter before the vote. Ms. Ragland has four children at Carter. The Principal has been working hard to bring new programs to Carter. In the past 7 months, children's attitudes have changed; they are more respectful. Students have an opportunity to talk to staff about problems at home. To start all over with new teachers is time wasted.

Desirae Brown**Parent**

Ms. Brown's son came to Carter with behavioral problems. Now he is growing and getting better. He is reading and loves to go to school. He loves his teacher. Ms. Brown does not want this school to be subjected to turnaround.

Summary of Documents Received

Documents Submitted By CPS

The CEO, through the Law Department, submitted several documents to the hearing officer that were received and made a part of the record in this case. Those documents included:

- 1) copies of the notice letters advising of the hearing sent to the school communities including the Principals, LSCs, parents, and teachers and staffs, and an affidavit regarding the same;
- 2) the Board's Policies on Performance;
- 3) the Procedures for the Hearing;
- 4) a copy of the relevant statutory provisions;
- 5) the CPS witnesses' written testimony and related Power Point presentations.

Documents Submitted In Opposition To the Turnaround of Carter School

Several documents were submitted to the hearing officer that were received and made a part of the record in this case. Those documents included:

- 1) A binder which included a letter from Stanley Coleman, Coach and a Proposal including a) a School Profile; b) Goals and an Action plan; c) Data Analysis; d) Carter's list of strengths under the new administrative team; e) a list of weaknesses f) a proposed approach to address the weaknesses by Strategic Learning Initiative, including a 28 page presentation;
- 2) A letter from Sophia Ragland, LSC President;
- 3) A written statement from Latice Wilkins, parent;
- 4) A letter from Pamela Malone, Curriculum Coordinator at Carter

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

1. Proper notice of the Public Hearing was given as required by Illinois law, the Chicago Board of Education's School Performance, Remediation and Probation Policy for the 2011-2012 School Year, and the Chief Executive Officer's Procedures for Public Hearings on Proposed Reconstitution. The purpose of the Public Hearing was to give representatives of the Chief Executive Officer ("CEO"), members of the local school council, parents, students, members of the school's staff, the principal, representatives of the Chicago Teachers' Union, and interested members of the public, an opportunity to comment on the CEO's proposal to Turnaround Carter Elementary School via Reconstitution.

2. On Thursday, May 2, 2013, a public hearing was held at the Board of Education, 125 South Clark, Chicago, Illinois. The public hearing required to be conducted prior to reconstituting a school has taken place in this case, and all of the other aspects of the applicable Board's Policies have been fully complied with.

3. Under the statutory scheme contained in Section 5/34-8.3 (d) of the Illinois School Code, the CEO and the Chicago Board of Education are granted the authority to take certain corrective measures with respect to schools with academic deficiencies. One of those measures is placing schools on probation, which allows the CEO and the Board to take additional corrective actions intended to correct the school's academic deficiencies. Any school placed on probation is subject to several courses of action by the CEO, with the approval of the Board, after an opportunity for hearing. Section 5/34-8.3 (d) (4) specifically includes "Reconstitution of the attendance center and replacement and reassignment by the general superintendent of all employees of the attendance center" as an action available to the CEO in said cases.

4. Carter Elementary is located at 5740 S. Michigan Ave. Chicago, IL.

5. If approved by the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, the following would occur as a result of the reconstitution of Carter Elementary School: All students currently enrolled in Carter or eligible to enroll in Carter this coming fall would continue as students at the school; All staff including the faculty would be removed and replaced; Carter and its new administration and staff would be supported by the Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL).

6. The Chicago Board of Education's School Performance, Remediation and Probation Policy for the 2011-2012 School Year (Policy Manual Section 302.6A, Board Report 10-0728-PO4), is the CPS School Accountability Policy. Under this Policy, each school receives an annual rating based on its performance on a variety of student outcome measures, including standardized test scores and student attendance. This rating is based on a point system. Points are received for the school's current level of performance and improvement over time on standardized tests and attendance, as well as the growth of individual students from year-to-year on the state test. There are 14 separate metrics on which schools are evaluated, each worth up to three points, for a total of 42 available points. Elementary schools that receive less than 50% of the total available points earn a rating of Level 3 and are placed on probation. CPS began using this structure for the Performance Policy five years ago. In all five years, Carter has been a Level 3 school. In the 2007-2008 school year, Carter received 21.4% of available points. In the 2008-2009 school year, it received 21.4% of available points. In the 2009-2010 school year it received 31% of available points. In the 2010-2011 school year, it received 28.6% of available points. In the 2011-2012 school year, it received 38.1% of available points. Prior to five years ago, CPS still had a policy determining a school's accountability status. Carter has been on probation for the past six consecutive school years.

7. ISAT performance is used as a part of the elementary school scoring in the CPS Performance Policy. Carter's 2011-2012 performance on the

ISAT composite, which is the combined result of the ISAT reading, mathematics, and science assessments, was 58.6%, compared to a District average of 76.4%. In reading, the percentage of Carter students meeting or exceeding state standards was 57%, compared to a district average of 73.4%. In mathematics Carter's performance was 66.7%, compared to a District average of 80.5%. In science Carter's performance was 37.3%, compared to a District average of 72.9%.

8. The gap between Carter and the District has been persistent over time, and in recent years has been widening. After the 2005-2006 school year, when the District as a whole, showed improvements in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding state standards, the District has continued to improve, from 61.8% in 2005-2006 on the ISAT composite to 76.4% in 2011-2012, an increase of 14.6 percentage points. During 2005-06, Carter's Composite Exceeds score was 8.8 percentage points below the District average and 17.8 percentage points below the District average in 2011-12. The performance gap between Carter and the District is consistent across subjects. Carter's Reading score was 6.4 below the geographic network average in 2005-2006 and 11 percentage points below the geographic network in 2011-2012. Carter's reading score was 18.9 percentage points below the District average in 2005-2006 and 16.4 percentage points below the district average in 2011-2012. Carter's ISAT Math Meets or Exceed score was 3 percentage points below the geographic network average and 8.3 percentage points below the district average in 2005-06 and 8.2 percentage points below the geographic network average and 13.8 percentage points below the District average in 2011-12. Carter's science score decreased between 2006 and 2012. Carter's Meets or Exceed Score was 3.9 percentage points below the geographic network average in 2005-2006 and was 29.5 percentage points below the geographic network average in 2011-2012. Carter's Science score was 10.2 percentage points below the District average in 2005-06 and 35.6 percentage points below the District average in 2011-12.

9. Carter's attendance rate was in the bottom 9% of attendance rates

among elementary schools in 2011-2012 at 91.9% compared to the District average of 95.3%.

10. CPS uses a metric to measure student growth from year to year on the ISAT. This metric, called the Value-Added metric, which is a component of the CPS Performance Policy, compares student academic growth at a school with the growth of similar students across the District. This is done through a regression methodology that controls for eight student-level factors, including grade level, prior performance on the ISAT, free or reduced lunch eligibility, mobility, participation in the Homeless Education Program, Individualized Education Plan (or IEP), English Language Learner status, and gender. The value-added metric is measured in ISAT scale score points. A positive number means that students at the school are growing at a faster pace than similar students in the District. A score near zero means that students at the school are growing at about the same pace as similar students in the District. A negative score means that students at the school are growing at a lesser pace than similar students in the District. Carter's 2009-2010 reading Value-Added score was -0.8, in 2010-2011 it was -1.2, and in 2011-2012 it was -0.1. Its mathematics Value-Added score was -0.1 in 2009-2010, and -0.2 in 2010-2011, and -0.8 in 2011-2012. This means that on average, students at Carter grew at a below-average pace in reading and math all three years. Carter's 2011-2012 score in reading was in the 48th percentile and in math it was in the 19th percentile.

11. The District has provided resources and supports to remediate the school's performance deficiencies. These professional development and mentoring supports include:

- Prior to this current year, oversight of discretionary budget was provided through the SIPAAA to identify key areas where the school needs improvement, plan interventions to support the school and allocate funds accordingly;
- This school year, the District provided oversight of the

discretionary budget and goals for improved student outcomes through the Continuous Improvement Work Plan (CIWP), a two-year plan created by a team of participants at the school level with support and guidance from the Network;

- Carter's principal and assistant principal received 14 professional development opportunities;
- Network staff hosted three workshops for Carter K-2 teachers to support technology integration into lesson plans;
- The Network's Deputy Chief held 2-3 small group planning sessions addressing implementing and support of goals and action plans outlined in the SIPAAA;
- This school year, Network Instructional Support Leaders visited Carter one to two days per week to support the implantation of the School and Network CIWP goals to support personnel with skills, to analyze student work, and assess student needs;
- Carter's principal and assistant principal received more than fifteen professional development opportunities;
- The network staff hosted two math instructional workshops for Carter upper-grade teachers;
- This school year, Carter's principal received one-on-one coaching on six occasions from the Network's Deputy Chief and on one occasion from the Network Chief regarding issues such as setting expectations and facilitating staff planning, implementing rigorous lessons, analyzing instruction through qualitative observations of teacher pedagogical practices and facilitating ongoing professional development.

12, In spite of the additional measures afforded to the staff at Carter

School, students have continued to perform below standards set by both the State of Illinois and the Chicago Public School system as a whole. Student achievement is falling farther behind national averages, based on 2012-2013 mid-year data. The gap between Carter and other schools in the geographic network and District has increased in the past five years.

13. The School has received annual notice of its Level 3 status, making the school eligible for further actions under Section 34-8.3 (d) of the Illinois School Code. The CEO has concluded that Carter has made insufficient progress in improving student academic achievement, and the evidence presented supports this conclusion.


14. Illinois law, and all the Chicago Public School Policies and Guidelines applicable to the CEO's proposed action in this case have been complied with in their entirety, specifically including, but not limited to the School Performance Policy for the 2011-2012 school year.

RECOMMENDATION

The Hearing Officer hereby recommends that the Board approve the CEO's proposal to Reconstitute Carter Elementary School. Carter is eligible for reconstitution under the Illinois School Code, 105 ILCS Section 5/34-8.3(d)(4) because it has been on probation for at least one year and has failed to make adequate progress to meet the Chicago Public School's required standards for minimum student performance.

FURTHER THE HEARING OFFICER SAYETH NOT.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Margaret C. Fitzpatrick". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large loop at the end.

Margaret C. Fitzpatrick
Hearing Officer

May 7, 2013