

Lewis Lemon Elementary

School Improvement Plan 2008

Local Board Approved	
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number	041012050252084		
District Name	ROCKFORD SD 205	School Name	LEWIS LEMON GLOBAL STUDIES ACAD
Superintendent	LINDA HERNANDEZ	Principal	Theresa Harvey
District Address	201 S MADISON ST	School Address	1993 MULBERRY ST
City/State/Zip	ROCKFORD,IL 61104 2092	City/State/Zip	ROCKFORD,IL,61101
District Telephone#	8159663000 Extn:3101	School Telephone#	8159678000 Extn:0
District Email	hernandl@rps205.com	School Email	harveyt@rps205.com

Is this plan for a Title I School? True

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

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

	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	36.8		No	72.0		Yes	93.8	Yes		
White														
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	37.4	45.8	No	71.8		Yes	93.7			
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities														
Economically Disadvantaged	99.5	Yes	99.5	Yes	36.9	45.4	No	72.7		Yes	93.8			

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 (%)	94.6	95.0	94.9	95.0	93.8	92.8	93.9	93.8
Truancy Rate (%)	1.4	2.2	4.0	2.6	7.3	7.8	5.0	2.1
Mobility Rate (%)	11.1	12.5	12.7	11.0	8.7	10.5	9.2	33.5
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	364	386	412	414	408	461	443	405
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	84.9	87.6	85.0	87.2	93.4	93.7	94.1	97.3
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	2.2	1.8	-	1.7	1.2	0.9	0.5	0.7
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	36.8	26.4	18.9	13.8	8.8	6.5	5.6	13.1
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	56.6	66.3	75.0	80.4	81.1	83.9	87.6	79.8
Hispanic (%)	6.0	6.2	5.3	5.3	4.7	4.6	3.2	2.7
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	-	-	-	-
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	0.5	0.2	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	5.4	5.0	3.6	4.4

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 O L	1999	43.5	50.4	5.0	1.1	-	-
	2000	37.0	55.7	5.7	0.9	0.7	-
	2001	36.8	56.6	6.0	0.5	-	-
	2002	26.4	66.3	6.2	0.5	0.5	-
	2003	18.9	75.0	5.3	0.5	0.2	-
	2004	13.8	80.4	5.3	0.5	-	-
	2005	8.8	81.1	4.7	-	-	5.4
	2006	6.5	83.9	4.6	-	-	5.0
	2007	5.6	87.6	3.2	-	-	3.6
	2008	13.1	79.8	2.7	-	-	4.4
D I S T R I C T	1999	55.2	29.6	11.8	3.2	0.2	-
	2000	53.0	30.5	13.1	3.1	0.2	-
	2001	51.0	31.1	14.5	3.1	0.2	-
	2002	49.1	31.5	16.1	3.1	0.2	-
	2003	47.7	31.8	17.2	3.1	0.2	-
	2004	46.0	32.3	18.3	3.2	0.2	-
	2005	44.3	31.0	19.2	3.1	0.1	2.3
	2006	42.5	30.5	20.6	3.1	0.2	3.2
	2007	40.7	30.8	21.5	3.0	0.1	4.0
	2008	39.3	30.3	22.1	3.0	0.1	5.1

	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	2.2	42.0	100.0	96.3	9.3	21	4.5	-	-
	2000	2.1	80.4	100.0	96.5	6.7	18	4.3	-	-
	2001	2.2	84.9	100.0	94.6	11.1	5	1.4	-	-
	2002	1.8	87.6	100.0	95.0	12.5	9	2.2	-	-
	2003	-	85.0	100.0	94.9	12.7	17	4.0	-	-
	2004	1.7	87.2	100.0	95.0	11.0	11	2.6	-	-
	2005	1.2	93.4	99.0	93.8	8.7	30	7.3	-	-
	2006	0.9	93.7	100.0	92.8	10.5	39	7.8	-	-
	2007	0.5	94.1	100.0	93.9	9.2	24	5.0	-	-
2008	0.7	97.3	100.0	93.8	33.5	9	2.1	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	1999	6.9	46.0	96.4	90.8	16.4	2938	11.7	10.9	73.6
	2000	8.2	52.6	97.0	91.4	15.8	2981	11.9	7.4	74.7
	2001	9.0	53.3	99.5	91.8	16.6	2562	10.3	6.7	73.9
	2002	10.3	56.9	95.7	93.1	16.8	2248	8.3	6.0	74.9
	2003	6.5	56.9	96.3	92.8	16.8	1717	6.2	7.8	81.3
	2004	12.2	55.1	99.8	92.7	19.0	2306	8.3	6.6	69.4
	2005	12.0	57.6	98.2	91.5	20.9	2436	9.6	8.9	73.1
	2006	12.0	65.7	99.0	92.3	18.1	2626	9.4	3.0	71.0
	2007	12.3	68.4	91.9	92.6	15.0	1868	6.6	3.2	75.0
2008	13.8	71.5	95.7	92.4	28.4	1624	5.8	2.2	71.8	

	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	462	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	424	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	364	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	386	74	57	58	-	-	-
	2003	412	52	79	58	-	-	-
	2004	414	73	56	67	-	-	-
	2005	408	69	80	52	-	-	-
	2006	461	76	84	77	-	-	-
	2007	443	75	79	80	-	-	-
2008	405	71	75	73	-	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	1999	26547	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	26436	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	26502	2094	2177	2242	1966	2002	1170
	2002	26674	2158	2121	2118	2165	1929	1506
	2003	27330	2109	2200	2149	2221	2124	1531
	2004	27576	2083	2120	2172	2227	2164	1552
	2005	27464	2061	2107	2102	2105	2141	1483
	2006	27456	2097	2055	2053	2094	2044	1443
	2007	27787	2197	2100	2092	2072	2137	1541
2008	27622	2293	2163	2088	2015	2076	1526	

	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	1662	19	49181	27	73	20	23	-	-
	2000	1691	17	49048	32	68	19	23	-	-
	2001	1765	17	50543	34	66	19	22	-	-
	2002	1758	17	50685	34	66	19	22	3	1
	2003	1750	17	52459	34	66	20	23	3	2
	2004	1700	18	56305	31	69	19	24	-	3
	2005	1635	19	62144	28	72	20	25	3	1
	2006	1721	15	58512	34	66	19	22	3	5
	2007	1766	15	60203	35	65	19	22	2	3
	2008	1833	15	61177	35	65	19	21	2	6
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	78.4	67.1	54.2	49.3	40.0	27.1	-	-	-	39.2	38.8	39.2	28.6	30.4	42.6	24.0	34.6	40.5
White	76.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50.0	-	-	-	-	-
Black	77.2	67.9	55.0	51.4	39.0	26.1	-	-	-	38.7	41.7	38.4	18.9	25.4	43.6	25.8	31.1	42.0
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	10.0	-	8.3	-	-	-	-	-	7.1	0.0	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	77.6	67.8	53.8	49.4	37.9	26.4	-	-	-	38.4	40.3	38.6	23.4	27.8	43.1	23.5	32.5	39.4
	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**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	95.9	83.6	68.6	73.5	68.5	66.3	-	-	-	54.6	69.1	64.9	58.6	44.9	72.7	25.4	61.9	74.3
White	92.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	88.9	-	-	-	-	-
Black	97.0	83.0	66.7	75.8	67.8	66.2	-	-	-	52.6	70.9	61.5	46.2	36.3	75.0	22.4	59.5	75.4
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	40.0	-	25.0	-	-	-	-	20.0	21.4	30.0	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	95.8	83.0	67.2	72.7	68.2	66.6	-	-	-	52.6	69.2	64.3	55.1	41.0	71.2	22.1	59.7	74.6
	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Data – *What do the School Report Card data tell you about student performance in your school? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are indicated?*

The spring 2008 ISAT data defined the students' performance in mathematics to meet and exceed the NCLB guidelines. The third grade students scored 67% proficiency; the fourth grade students scored 64% overall; and the fifth grade students scored 75% on the mathematics battery of tests.

However; the spring 2008 data also represented on the ISAT reflects under performing scores relative to AYP or the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) guidelines. The student in grades 3-5 compiled a composite reading score of 36.8%. The third grade students scored 27.1%, fourth grade scored 39.2%, and the fifth grade scored 40.5%.

The student population is comprised of 97.3% economically disadvantaged students and 79.8 Black students. Both of these subgroups nearly represent the entire school population. No other subgroups are represented according to the NCLB parameters established for defining such groups. According to the ISAT item analysis summary, the following represents our areas of weakness.

3rd Grade Reading**State Goal 1: Reading****Vocabulary Development**

- 1.3.07 Determine the meaning of unknown words using within-sentence clues.
- 1.3.08 Determine the meaning of an unknown word using word, sentence, and cross-sentence clues.

Reading Strategies

- 1.3.12 Activate prior knowledge to establish purpose for reading a given passage.
- 1.3.13 Identify probable outcomes or actions.
- 1.3.14 Use information in illustrations to help understand a reading passage.
- 1.3.17 Identify explicit and implicit main ideas.

Reading Comprehension

- 1.3.20 Determine the answer to a literal or simple inference question regarding the meaning of a passage.
- 1.3.23 Identify or summarize the order of events in a story.
- 1.3.24 Draw inferences, conclusions, or generalizations about text, and support them with textual evidence and prior knowledge.

1.3.28 Identify the author's purpose for writing a fiction or nonfiction text, (e.g., to entertain or to inform).

State Goal 2: Literature

2.3.07 Determine what characters are like by what they say or do; by how the author or illustrator portrays them.

2.3.08 Determine character motivation.

2.3.10 Identify the following forms and genres: myths or legend, short story, folk tale, nonfiction, poem.

4th Grade Reading

State Goal 1: Reading

Vocabulary Development

1.4.01 Determine the meaning of an unknown word using knowledge of common prefixes, suffixes, and word roots (see Roots and Affixes list) (e.g., using knowledge of the suffix -ish to determine the meaning of foolish).

1.4.02 Identify the word base of familiar words with affixes from Roots and Affixes list (e.g, precooked, realistic).

1.4.04 Determine the meaning of an unknown word using word, sentence, and cross-sentence clues.

Reading Strategies

1.4.09 Activate prior knowledge to establish purpose for reading a given passage.

1.4.13 Distinguish between minor and significant details in a passage.

1.4.16 Make comparisons across reading passages (e.g., topics, story elements).

Reading Comprehension

1.4.17 Determine the answer to a literal or simple inference question regarding the meaning of a passage.

1.4.19 Identify the main idea of a selection when it is not explicitly stated (e.g., by choosing the best alternative title from among several suggested for a given passage).

1.4.21 Identify or summarize the order of events in a story.

State Goal 2: Literature

2.4.11 Identify and interpret figurative language (e.g., metaphor, simile, idiom).

2.4.13 Identify the following forms and genres: myths or legend, short story, folk tale, nonfiction, poem.

5th Grade Reading

State Goal 1: Reading**Vocabulary Development**

1.5.02 Determine the meaning of an unknown word using word, sentence, and cross-sentence clues.

Reading Strategies

1.5.11 Distinguish between minor and significant details in a passage.

1.5.13 Demonstrate understanding by using sophisticated graphic organizers (e.g., cause-effect organizers, semantic webs) to represent passage content.

Reading Comprehension

1.5.19 Summarize a story or nonfiction passage, or identify the best summary.

1.5.27 Determine the author's purpose for writing a fiction or nonfiction text (e.g., to entertain, to inform, to persuade).

State Goal 2: Literature

2.5.02 Identify events important to the development of the plot and subplot.

2.5.15 Identify whether a given passage is narrative, persuasive, or expository.

5th Grade Reading

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

- The school had transitioned to a new district wide reading program, which is a Balanced Literacy Approach (BLA). The adoption of a BLA involves a plethora of training and staff development and a time frame that advances along the continuum of a bell shaped curve. Proficiency in teaching vocabulary development, reading strategies, reading comprehension, phonics, phonemic awareness and fluency are successfully accomplished or improved within varying time frames when implemented with integrity. Many of the skills intertwined in the BLA program include skills the students are weak in.
- Lack of professional development in Balanced Literacy is still evidenced among staff. Professional Development in the area of Balanced Literacy is on-going.
- Compounding the problem is the lack of continuity of staff. Many teachers for one reason or another opt to seek positions in other schools. The average experience of our staff is 10 years less than the district average.
- The school has also lacked continuity at the administrative level. Over the course of 3 years the school has been assigned eight building level leaders. The lack of continuity has led to a lack of vision, which was evidenced by the staff's failure to articulate the school's directions.
- Disciplinary issues affect the amount of instruction students receives and/or the teacher gives. Some of the new staff have had little or no experience

- teaching students from our demographics who are dealing with a host of social and economic issues.
- The mobility rate increased from 9.2% in 2007 to 33.5% in 2008.
 - Often times students from pre-school enter elementary school with no previous educational experience, lack of vocabulary, little or no social skills, and they are not achieving at a kindergarten entry level. Eventually, as their age increases without closing the gap, the gap widens.

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

The students are meeting and exceeding AYP in mathematics. The success experienced in mathematics may be directly related to the consistent implementation of the Everyday Math Program and the math coach.

An emphasis must be placed on improving instruction to address low reading scores. We must use a Response to Intervention (RTI) model for identified, under performing readers, based on local formative, and normative assessments, in the areas of vocabulary, reading comprehension, fluency, literary genres, phonics, word study, sight words, understanding the author's purpose, and extended response writing. All of the above are specific challenges that we will need to approach through a horizontally aligned delivery system. One of the evidenced issues was the staff's lack of dedicated time to meet with grade level teams to analyze data, create common assessments, and use the data to drive instruction.

The data showed the disparity between economically disadvantaged performance in reading which leads us toward addressing the dismal scores of 36.8% in grades three through five. This evidence revealed our need to increase staff professional development in the areas of balanced literacy, and monitor its implementation to ensure it is implemented with integrity.

To help improve our data driven decision-making, we need to use common planning periods to regularly compile formative assessments, which targets student deficiencies. We will also have to increase reading opportunities using individualized or small group instruction, utilizing centers to differentiate instruction in the area of balanced literacy, requiring students to read while waiting during bathroom breaks, giving students the opportunity to take books home, and by decreasing down time during the school day. Our data revealed a lack of formal training and experience in reading instruction. We will also utilize the reading coach to assist the teachers in the area of balanced literacy and guided reading.

There is a need for consistencies in administration, as well as, the utilization of teacher's expertise which will attract high quality, highly qualified teachers, as well as, retain those that are presently assigned to Lewis Lemon.

There is a need for elementary schools to communicate with the preschools to vertically align academics, so that preschools are aware of the expected academic level upon entry into kindergarten. Also, we have to think about a transition plan that allows for visitation to the elementary school where the preschooler will enroll. With school choice this will be difficult.

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data (Optional)

Data - Briefly describe the relevant local assessment data used in this plan. What do these data tell you? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are apparent?

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

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

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)**Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges**

Data - Briefly describe attributes and challenges of the school and community that have affected student performance. What do these data and/or information tell you?

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

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

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)**Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development**

Data - Briefly describe data on educator qualifications and data and/or information about staff capacity and professional development opportunities related to areas of weakness and strength. What do these data tell you?

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

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

**Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)
Item 3 - Parent Involvement**

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

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

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

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

Section I-D - Key Factors – From the preceding screens (I-A, I-B, I-C-1, 2, 3) identify key factors that are within the school’s capacity to change or control and which have contributed to low achievement. What conclusions about next steps have you reached from reviewing available data and information and about all the factors affecting student achievement?

The following are key factors, within our control, which have contributed to low achievement:

- Lack of teacher training in diagnosing (including a system for progress monitoring) student strengths and deficiencies.
- Lack for an intervention team to take the lead in early identification of at risk students and development of individualized interventions.
- Lack of formal teacher training for all staff in balanced literacy and all of its components.
- Lack of teacher training in Response to Intervention.
- Lack of training in teaching social skills and problem solving skills.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Reading Achievement will increase to 70% in 2009, 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor will be attained among All, Blacks and Economically Disadvantaged Students.	1,2,3,

The following deficiencies [not objectives] have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for your school.	
1	School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2	Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
3	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective: 1

Reading Achievement will increase to 70% in 2009, 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor will be attained among All, Blacks and Economically Disadvantaged Students.

Objective 1 Description:

Our current achievement in reading is 36.8 % meeting/exceeding for all students on the ISAT, however, these subgroups will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77% in 2010 or Safe Harbor.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency	
1	School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2	Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
3	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 1 Title : Reading Achievement will increase to 70% in 2009, 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor will be attained among All, Blacks and Economically Disadvantaged Students.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Using periodic assessments and analyzing the data, students will be placed in appropriate reading groups.	10/14/2008	6/1/2010	During School	Other	0
2	Using periodic assessment tools, specific skills that students are weak in will be identified. These students will receive differentiated instruction specific to their needs.	10/14/2008	6/1/2010	During School	Other	0

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
3	100% of students will receive instruction using strategies provided through balanced literacy (District wide reading curriculum). These include; Making meaning, Guided Reading, Reciprocal Teaching, Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA), Question Answer Relationship (QAR), and the Balanced Literacy Instructional Guides (BLIGS). Use of these strategies will be supported by the reading coach.	9/1/2008	6/1/2010	During School	Other	0
4	Students will be given the opportunity to enroll in an after school program for 2 hours, 4 times a week that focuses on vocabulary and reading comprehension skills based on the areas of weakness as identified in the ISAT Item Analysis Summary. The tutors will be certified teachers.	10/1/2008	6/1/2010	After School	Title I	20000
5	Students will have the opportunity to accompany their parents to Curriculum Nights where reading strategies are modeled for parents, parents then work with students on the modeled reading strategies. This will enable parents to become reading coaches for their students in the home environment.	10/1/2008	4/30/2010	After School	Title I	16800
6	Students will be given the opportunity to use the computers in class and in the lab weekly to access software that focuses on reading comprehension and vocabulary development.	9/5/2008	6/1/2010	During School	Other	0
7	Students' reading volume will increase to 450 minutes a week.	1/5/2009	6/1/2009	During School	Title I	5000
8	Students will take home books in a bag with a parental guide to increase reading volume at home.	2/14/2009	5/14/2010	After School	Title I	2000
9	Students will participate in the school wide agenda program. Students will take agendas home daily and have parents record reading minutes.	9/5/2008	6/1/2010	Before School	Title I	3650
10	Bathroom books-Students select a book from the browsing bag (bag with books they have read from the Guided Reading group) to take to whole class bathroom breaks which occurs two times a day. This will increase volume reading by 200 minutes a week.	12/8/2008	6/1/2010	During School	Title I	0
11	The Math and Reading coaches will facilitate small group interventions for students identified as needing second tier interventions.	11/14/2008	5/30/2010	During School	Title I	0

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

Objective 1 Title : Reading Achievement will increase to 70% in 2009, 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor will be attained among All, Blacks and Economically Disadvantaged Students.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	All staff will receive training in utilizing and analyzing the RTI Think Link assessments.	1/16/2009	5/1/2009	During School	Local Funds	750
2	All staff will receive training in school wide reading strategies DRTA, QAR, and Reciprocal Teaching.	10/8/2008	6/1/2010	After School	Title I	2000
3	All staff will receive training in all components of Balance Literacy to include Guided Reading.	9/10/2008	6/1/2010	After School	Title I	0
4	The school reading coach, who will receive support from the district reading coach, will provide training to the staff in the classroom in the area of DRTA, QAR, and Reciprocal Teaching.	9/10/2008	6/1/2010	During School	Title I	0

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
5	Teachers will be given three common planning periods a week to ensure they have the opportunity to meet as data teams to analyze the RTI Think Link assessments, class work samples, and plan instructions based on data.	9/1/2008	6/1/2010	During School	Other	0
6	The Regional Office Of Education's Data Coach will work with grade level data teams Bi-monthly to assist teachers to gain increased knowledge on analyzing data to drive instruction.	10/5/2008	5/1/2010	During School	Other	0
7	An optional second staff meeting will be utilized to train staff on reading strategies. Staff expertise will be utilized at these meeting as they will facilitate some of the trainings. (e.g., staff attending the Raising the Student Achievement Conference will utilize second staff meeting to train other staff).	9/1/2008	6/1/2010	After School	Other	0
8	Staff will be given the opportunity to attend workshops based on increasing student achievement in reading and in return train other building staff.	10/10/2008	5/1/2010	During School	Title I	2000
9	Staff will be given the opportunity to receive district wide training on district wide reading initiatives.	6/2/2009	6/1/2010	Summer School	Other	0
10	A voluntary book study group will be offered to staff after school.	1/5/2009	6/1/2010	After School	Title I	1000

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

Objective 1 Title : Reading Achievement will increase to 70% in 2009, 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor will be attained among All, Blacks and Economically Disadvantaged Students.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	The school will form a new PTO and encourage parent involvement in PTO by recruiting at registration, parent/teacher conferences, increased communication regarding meeting dates and times through personal phone calls and school newsletters.	8/12/2008	6/1/2010	After School	Title I	300
2	The school will encourage 100% participation in the "Book in a Bag" program enabling all students to take home quality literature and parent guide to share with their family.	2/5/2009	5/1/2010	After School	Title I	7000
3	The school established a Curriculum Night that provides modeling to parents and students in an effort to help parents become reading coaches for their children.	10/14/2008	5/14/2010	After School	Title I	3000
4	Read with parents day where parents come in and read with their child.	1/14/2009	5/14/2010	During School	Other	0
5	Establishment of a school wide agenda program to encourage 100% of the students to read between 10 to 30 minutes at night, depending on the grade level. Parents record reading minutes in the agenda and provide their signature as an indicator that the families are sharing the reading logs with the school.	9/5/2008	6/1/2010	After School	Title I	3700
6	100% of parents will participate in Friday Fun Nights. Fun Friday Nights are a vehicle used to get parents in the school to engage in educational games with their children as a way to foster interest in the educational process.	9/5/2008	6/1/2010	After School	Title I	2000
7	100% of parents will be encouraged to participate in parent/teacher conferences.	11/1/2008	6/1/2010	After School	Other	0

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
8	All parents will receive a monthly newsletter which will include reading strategies and Title one information.	9/5/2008	6/1/2010	After School	Title I	1000
9	All parents will receive and sign a Title 1 compact outlining the school, child, and family responsibilities in reading instruction.	9/1/2008	4/1/2009	After School	Title I	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title : Reading Achievement will increase to 70% in 2009, 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor will be attained among All, Blacks and Economically Disadvantaged Students.

Monitoring - Describe the process and measures of success for the identified objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

- The principal and the reading coach will monitor the utilization of the district RTI assessment.
- The principal and the reading coach will monitor the implementation of the district mandated reading program.
- The classroom teacher and the reading coach will monitor students' reading progress as measured by the Fountas & Pinnel reading assessment and the district RTI assessment (Think Link). Depending on student progress, the classroom teacher and the reading coach will determine the appropriate guided reading group placement and the RTI intervention.
- The principal and the reading coach will keep staff aware of professional development opportunities pertaining to reading and instructional strategies mandated by the district.
- The principal, classroom teachers and student support specialist will monitor the participation rate of parents.
- The principal, the SIP committee, reading coach, and the student support specialist will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities by meeting each trimester for an informal review of all strategies and activities.
- The reading coach will conduct a needs assessment of the staff each tri-mester to monitor professional development needs.
- Grade level data teams will provide the principal with minutes of the grade level data team meetings.
- The principal will monitor lesson plans weekly to determine the inclusion of district mandates reading programs, 450 volume minutes of reading, and other reading strategies.
- A Title 1 compact will be administered twice yearly to monitor parents understanding of and responsibility for students' learning.
- The principal will conduct a needs assessment of the parents yearly to monitor parental needs as it relates to their child's education.

Monitoring Persons - List the individuals and designate the role of each person (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

Name	Title
Theresa Harvey	Principal
Valerie Simon	Reading Coach
Rhonda Robinson	Student Support Specialist

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

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

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

- Monthly newsletters that include reading strategies and information about Title one.
- Title 1 compact. The compact notifies parents of their responsibility, the students' responsibility, the teacher's responsibility, and the school's responsibility regarding reading.
- Monthly calendar that includes school activities to encourage parents to become partners with the school.
- Title 1 meeting (annually) to inform parents how Title 1 funds are spent to assist in the effort to increase student achievement.
- In compliance with NCLB and the District, through the Title 1 Office Lisa Wentland, mailed out parent notification of choice and SES on September 2008.
- Open House
- School Registration
- Flyers notifying parents of school activities
- Written reminders are sent home for PTO meetings and other activities
- Grade level newsletters
- Telephone calls
- Report Cards (on a tri-mester basis)

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation
Part B. Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder Involvement - Describe specifically how stakeholders (including parents, school staff, and outside experts) have been consulted in the development of the plan. The names and titles of the school improvement team or plan developers must be identified here.

The Lewis Lemon SIP committee consist of the principal, staff members, and the PTO president. The SIP committee was organized on SIP day 2008-2009 school year. The committee met to review the data from the State Report Card, and to outline the SIP plan in October on SIP day. All certified staff participated in grade level teams to collaborate in an effort to determine areas of need, strengths, and plans for future improvement. The data collected on SIP day was used to develop Section 1 and Section 2 of the SIP plan. The plan was presented a required monthly staff meeting and at a PTO meeting for review. The final plan will be presented to the entire staff and will be posted on the Lewis Lemon website for parent and community review.

Names and titles of school improvement team or plan developers:

	Name	Title
1	Theresa Harvey	Principal
2	Valerie Simon	Reading Coach
3	Denise Cacciapaglia	5th Grade Teacher
4	Beth Ackerman	3rd Grade Teacher
5	Rhonda Robinson	Student Support Specialist
6	Mandy Barksdale	PTO President

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation
Part C. Peer Review Process

Peer Review - Describe the district's peer review and approval process. Peer review teams should include teachers and administrators from schools and districts similar to the one in improvement, but significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students. As appropriate, peer reviewers may be teachers from other schools, personnel from other districts, Regional Office of Education staff, Intermediate Service Center staff, RESPRO staff, university faculty, consultants, et al., or combinations thereof. RESPRO staff serving on a School Support Team should not serve on a peer review team in the same district. Peer review and subsequent local board approval must be completed within 45 days of receiving the school improvement plan.

For further description of the peer review process see LEA and School Improvement: Non-Regulatory Guidance, July 21, 2006, at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

Describe the peer review process including participants and date(s) of peer review.

The Regional Office of Education (ROE) will provide training in the SIP process in September and October 2008. SIP Monitoring/Scoring training will be provided to reviewer in October and November 2008. Ongoing support from the ROE will support the correct and effective evaluation of School Improvement Plans. Lewis Lemon SIP team will pair with Haskell and Ellis School during November 2008 to review and refine their plans. Representatives of SIP Team will submit their peer-reviewed SIP to the District Review Team prior to November 24, 2008. Lewis Lemon will then submit the final plan to Dr. Thomas Schmitt for processing to the Board of Education on or before December 1, 2008.

The District Review Committee shall consist of Ms. Marcia Strothoff, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, Mrs. Colleen Cyrus, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services, and Dr. Thomas Schmitt, Assistant Superintendent for Community Outreach and Procedures. All members of the District Review Committee will be trained in the SIP process by ROE staff. School Improvement Plans based on 2008 Data will be submitted to the Board of Education for final approval on December 18, 2008. Approved School Improvement Plans will be submitted to the Illinois State Board of Education following approval by the Rockford Public Schools' Board of Education, prior to December 23, 2008.

All schools in Rockford Public Schools have produced a School Improvement Plan based on 2008 data to included incorporation of Response to Intervention (RTI)Plans and the Ten Components of a Schoolwide Title 1 Program.

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation

Part D. Teacher Mentoring Process

Teacher Mentoring Process - Describe the teacher mentoring program. Mentoring programs pair novice teachers with more experienced professionals who serve as role models and provide practical support and encouragement. Schools have complete discretion in deciding what else the teacher mentoring program should provide.

The major focus of the RPS new teacher induction program is the work of mentors trained in the Frameworks for Professional Teaching available through the New Teacher Center in Santa Cruz, California. Our Illinois partner for training and implementation is The Consortium For Educational Change (CEC). The program is based on the acquisition of Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS) taught through the use of Danielson's Frameworks Induction Program. This program incorporates Danielson's Four Domains of Professional Practice: 1) Planning and Preparation, 2) The Classroom Environment, 3) Instruction, and 4) Professional Responsibilities. These domains include methods of inquiry for content knowledge, an understanding of human development, approaches to learning that address diverse learner needs, planning for instruction, the creation of engaging and stimulating learning environments, a range of models for instructional delivery, the development of a range of communication skills, the use of formal and informal assessment strategies to support student academic development, the nurturing of collaborative relationships, and an emphasis on high standards of professional conduct.

In line with the above research and standards, this project values: (1) teaching as a career-long developmental process; (2) teaching as a continuous cycle of teaching, assessment, reflection, and re-teaching; (3) professional standards and a focus on student achievement as central to the improvement of practice; (4) teacher development as occurring best in a collegial environment where the sharing of expertise is valued; and (5) a teacher's professional growth as central to the improvement of student achievement.

All mentors are retired teachers who complete a 12 day training program provided by CEC in the Frameworks program. In addition, mentors attend monthly support sessions to improve their practice. Each mentor is assigned 3-5 new teachers to guide during the year. Mentors schedule an average of 1.5 hours of work with new teachers each week. Professional development is offered to teachers in specific grade level and subject areas during the year. Professional development is provided by the RPS curriculum department, school-based coaching, the Regional Office of Education, Golden Apple Foundation as well as the RPS induction program.

A final evaluation of the mentoring project is submitted the Illinois State Board of Education each summer. Mentors maintain time logs that document the time spent each week with each of their protégés and the topic of their sessions. The time logs are submitted to the grant manger for tabulation and review and do not contain confidential information. Time logs will be used for formative assessment during year two of the project. An annual survey of participants is completed to inform the evaluation report. All RPS mentoring services are voluntary for first and second year teachers.

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation
Part E. District Responsibilities

District Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that the district has provided to revise the plan and other services that the district will provide toward implementation of strategies and activities. District technical assistance should include data analysis, identification of the school's challenges in implementing professional development requirements, the resulting need-related technical assistance and professional development to effect changes in instruction, and analysis and revision of the school's budget (NCLB, Section 1116). If applicable, identify corrective actions or restructuring options taken by the district.

The School Improvement Plan for each district building was developed with support and services provided by the Rockford School District. District assistance and participation in the plan included provision of data, data analysis, technical assistance, assessment coordination, intervention design, funding support, professional development opportunities, collaboration with community and curricular support. The following representatives from Rockford District 205 provided resources for the development and implementation of the plan:

The Rockford Board of Education

Mrs. Linda Hernandez, Superintendent of Schools

Mr. Thomas Hoffman, Chief Operations Officer

Ms. Colleen Cyrus, Assistant Superintendent of Student Support

Ms. Pamela Laughlin, Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources

Dr. Thomas Schmitt, Assistant Superintendent of Community Outreach and Procedures

Ms. Marcia Strothoff, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum & Instruction

Mr. Edward Portillo, Executive Director of Research, Federal Programs and Grants

Dr. Vinest Steele, Director of Title I

Mr. Paul Yankee, Director of Bilingual Education

Mr. Bob Corder, Director of Human Resources

Mr. Frank Schepley, Assessment Specialist

Ms. Shirley Chrestman, Special Education Assistant Director

Mrs. Linda Oshita, Title I Curriculum Coordinator

Mrs. Anita Hughes, Reading Coordinator

Mrs. Sue Mainville, Math coordinator

Mr. Ed Hayden, Coordinator of Social Work

Ms. Maggie Kempel, Project Coordinator

Ms. Sherrie Bias, NCLB Officer

The primary support intervention for all schools throughout the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 school years will be a systematic, continuous monitoring of school implementation by the District Leadership Team. Reading and Mathematics progress is summarized on a trimester basis for elementary schools and a quarterly basis for secondary schools and then presented to the District Leadership Team.

Implementation progress and goal achievement of each plan shall be reviewed, evaluated, and modified on an ongoing basis. The timeline for these reviews is as follows:

Elementary Schools – first Tuesday of each month, September – May;

Middle Schools – first Wednesday of each month, September – May; and

High Schools – first Friday of each month, September – May.

School teams are required to present implementation progress on the various components and goals of the SIP. The progress will be reported to the entire SIP Team, parent organization(s), community stakeholders, and faculty members on a quarterly basis via formal meetings. Input received via the meetings will be reviewed for possible inclusion in the SIP as an amendment. Stakeholder groups must agree upon the proposed revision(s) to the SIP document prior to its/their inclusion in the SIP document.

Corrective Actions taken by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress for a fourth annual calculation (Corrective Action Status) should be aligned with the strategies and activities of this plan. The district must take one or more of the following actions in such a school per NCLB, Section 1116(b)(7)(C)(iv).

Restructuring Options (allowed in Illinois) selected by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress for a fifth annual calculation (Restructuring Status) should be aligned with the strategies and activities of this plan. The district must take one or more of the following options in such a school.

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation Part F. State Responsibilities

State Responsibilities - *Specify the services and resources that ISBE, RESPROS, and other service providers have provided the school during the development and review of this plan and other services that will be provided during the implementation of the plan. ISBE shall provide technical assistance to the school if district fails to do so.*

The Illinois State Board of Education has provided several resources to Rockford Public Schools and this school to assist in the school improvement process. ISBE has provided timely student achievement data in 2008. Results from standardized tests proctored in spring 2008 were provided, preliminarily, in June 2008 and were made public in October 2008. ISBE and its partner, Northern Illinois University, have provided the Interactive Illinois Report Card, the School Improvement Plan template, and supporting documents. Individuals from ISBE and NIU have provided technical assistance in using the aforementioned documents.

Our RESPRO staff, led by Terry Parker, has collaborated with school faculty and the SIP team in data analysis, previous SIP review, and development of this SIP. The RESPRO has also provided financial resources to produce our SIP (stipends for SIP team members, if applicable), provide staff development opportunities, and purchase requisite supplies and materials.

Our Regional Office of Education has provided data and SIP team coaching, technical assistance, and offers numerous staff development opportunities. The ROE offers materials for teachers and administrators to utilize for professional development activities as well. Lori Fanello, Assistant Superintendent, has provided consistent support and assistance to District leadership, which in turn, provided the information to SIP writers.

The RESPRO and ROE staffs have historically provided assistance to school personnel to implement the SIP. We expect the same will continue during the implementation of this plan.

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

State Responsibilities – List the names and identify the roles (e.g., distinguished educator, district curriculum coordinator, university partner, or RESPRO consultant) of the School Support Team. If applicable, School Support Teams are assigned to schools in corrective action to provide sustained and intensive support for those schools to make adequate yearly progress. Note: School Support Teams are not the same as school improvement teams or the school planning team. Schools in academic watch, restructuring, or restructuring implementation status should have School Support Teams. Some schools in Choice, SES, or academic early warning status also have School Support Teams.

	Name	Title
1	Linda Oshita	Curriculum Coordinator
2	Sue Mainville	Math Coordinator
3	Anita Hughes	Reading Implementer
4	Bess Bloyer	ROE Support Person (Data Coach)
5	Dr. Thomas Schmitt	Executive Director of Schools and Operations

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:

A. ASSURANCES

1. The district has provided written notice in a timely manner about the improvement identification to parents of each student enrolled in the school, in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand (NCLB, Section 1116(c)(6)).
2. Strategies and activities have been founded in scientifically based research as required by NCLB, Section 1116(b)(3)(A)(i) and as defined in NCLB, Section 9101(37).
3. Technical assistance provided by the district serving the school is founded on scientifically based research (NCLB, Section 1116(b)(4)(C)) as defined in NCLB, Section 9101(37).
4. The plan includes strategies and activities that support the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards and ensures alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessments with the Illinois Learning Standards.
5. The school will spend at least 10 percent of the funds made available under Section 1113 of NCLB for the purpose of providing teachers and the principal high-quality professional development. (Title I schools only.)

B.SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

By submitting the plan on behalf of the school the district superintendent certifies to ISBE that all the assurances and information provided in the plan are true and correct and that the improvement plan has been duly approved by the local school board. By sending e-mail notification of the plan completion from the **Submit Your Plan** page (Section IV-C) the plan shall be deemed to be executed by the superintendent on behalf of the school.

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

- Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified?
- Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness?
- Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students?
- Does the analysis, along with other optional data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

- If included, is there evidence that the SIP team analyzed optional data to clarify the areas of weakness?
- Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?
- Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

- If included, has the SIP team analyzed other available data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities?
- Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?
- Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

- Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance?
- Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control?

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

- Has the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan?
- Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency?

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

- Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?
- Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement?
- Are the strategies and activities measurable?
- Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified?
- Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear?

	Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students?
	Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status or in special education non-compliance?
	Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities? for students?
	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?
MONITORING	
	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?
	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION	
	Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only)
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT	
	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?
	Does the SIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that will best effect necessary changes?
PEER REVIEW	
	Is the peer review process described and is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have "the greatest likelihood" of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP?
TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS	
	Is it clear how the school is ensuring that teachers are receiving the support needed for their professional growth and to retain them in the profession?
DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES	
	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?
	If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school?
STATE RESPONSIBILITIES	

	Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation?
SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM	
	Have the names and titles of School Support Team members been listed in the plan? Does the team appear to have the expertise to support this school in regards to the school improvement plan?
APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD	
	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.

PART II - COMMENTS