

## Guilford High School

### School Improvement Plan 2008

Local Board Approved	12/19/2008
Submitted	12/24/2008
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	2/2/2009

**PRELIMINARY INFORMATION**

RCDT Number	041012050250003		
District Name	ROCKFORD SD 205	School Name	GUILFORD HIGH SCHOOL
Superintendent	LINDA HERNANDEZ	Principal	MICHAEL J. VALENTINE
District Address	201 S MADISON ST	School Address	5620 SPRING CREEK RD
City/State/Zip	ROCKFORD,IL 61104 2092	City/State/Zip	ROCKFORD,IL,61114 6498
District Telephone#	8159663000 Extn:3101	School Telephone#	8156544870 Extn:0
District Email	hernandl@rps205.com	School Email	valentm@rps205.com

**Is this plan for a Title I School?** False

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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2007-08 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2007-08 State Improvement Status	academic watch status year 3

	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	99.3	Yes	99.3	Yes	47.1		No	34.6		No			80	Yes
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	59.3		Yes	45.9	61.8	No			83.0	
Black	97.9	Yes	97.9	Yes	21.1	35.2	No	9.2	30.3	No			80.1	
Hispanic	98.5	Yes	98.5	Yes	29.0	40.5	No	22.6	33.2	No			67.4	
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities	96.2	Yes	96.2	Yes										
Economically Disadvantaged	98.5	Yes	98.5	Yes	24.4	42.9	No	14.5	40.3	No			75.6	

**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 (%)	90.9	92.8	92.7	96.4	92.0	92.3	92.2	91.3
Truancy Rate (%)	12.6	24.3	8.1	9.3	9.0	8.8	8.4	10.0
Mobility Rate (%)	12.9	12.6	11.0	11.7	9.3	11.8	7.1	19.7
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	79.2	85.0	83.4	77.3	81.5	83.4	81.2	80.0
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	3.7	1.8	2.9	2.7	3.2	1.6	0.7	2.6
School Population (#)	1772	1769	1906	1974	2146	2187	2084	1997
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	25.2	32.8	34.2	30.7	37.0	39.6	44.7	49.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	5.5	6.4	2.9	8.9	10.2	11.2	12.0	11.3
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	61.4	60.7	59.3	59.2	58.1	56.1	54.5	50.9
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	28.0	26.4	25.9	24.2	23.1	22.7	23.0	26.3
Hispanic (%)	6.8	9.3	10.1	11.2	13.7	15.6	16.4	16.3
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	3.7	3.5	4.5	5.2	5.0	5.2	5.3	4.6
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	-	0.2
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	0.8	1.7

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(%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	1999	61.6	27.5	5.8	5.1	0.1	-
	2000	63.3	26.4	6.2	4.0	-	-
	2001	61.4	28.0	6.8	3.7	0.1	-
	2002	60.7	26.4	9.3	3.5	0.1	-
	2003	59.3	25.9	10.1	4.5	0.2	-
	2004	59.2	24.2	11.2	5.2	0.2	-
	2005	58.1	23.1	13.7	5.0	0.1	-
	2006	56.1	22.7	15.6	5.2	0.1	0.2
	2007	54.5	23.0	16.4	5.3	-	0.8
	2008	50.9	26.3	16.3	4.6	0.2	1.7
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	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(%)
<b>S T A T E</b>	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(%)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	1999	4.3	21.7	83.8	90.2	15.2	342	22.5	8.9	85.1
	2000	5.2	26.9	86.8	92.1	14.7	172	11.0	3.4	76.3
	2001	5.5	25.2	100.0	90.9	12.9	187	12.6	3.7	79.2
	2002	6.4	32.8	87.5	92.8	12.6	404	24.3	1.8	85.0
	2003	2.9	34.2	71.9	92.7	11.0	155	8.1	2.9	83.4
	2004	8.9	30.7	100.0	96.4	11.7	181	9.3	2.7	77.3
	2005	10.2	37.0	100.0	92.0	9.3	179	9.0	3.2	81.5
	2006	11.2	39.6	94.0	92.3	11.8	193	8.8	1.6	83.4
	2007	12.0	44.7	93.0	92.2	7.1	178	8.4	0.7	81.2
	2008	11.3	49.4	82.7	91.3	19.7	204	10.0	2.6	80.0
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	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(%)
<b>S T A T E</b>	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)
<b>S C H O O L</b>	1999	1620	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1634	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1772	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	1769	-	-	-	-	-	376
	2003	1906	-	-	-	-	-	405
	2004	1974	-	-	-	-	-	405
	2005	2146	-	-	-	-	-	453
	2006	2187	-	-	-	-	-	417
	2007	2084	-	-	-	-	-	509
	2008	1997	-	-	-	-	-	422
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	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)
<b>S T A T E</b>	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(%)
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	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
<b>S T A T E</b>	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)**

<b>PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grade 11</b>						
<b>Groups</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
AYP Benchmark   % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	48.4	57.8	57.9	53.4	50.2	46.3
White	59.2	67.7	70.3	64.5	61.5	58.6
Black	14.1	25.8	25.7	30.6	27.7	22.4
Hispanic	47.6	48.4	38.2	45.4	33.8	29.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	37.6	61.9	73.9	42.4	50.0	56.5
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	0.0	4.0	21.4	14.0	10.9	10.3
Economically Disadvantaged	20.3	34.1	40.2	36.6	33.9	25.5

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

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grade 11						
Groups	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark   % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	45.1	55.2	47.7	44.2	45.4	32.9
White	55.1	64.6	61.0	56.0	56.0	43.8
Black	11.3	24.2	16.2	13.6	23.4	10.6
Hispanic	33.4	38.7	27.2	30.9	23.6	20.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	56.3	71.4	47.8	57.5	66.7	43.5
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	0.0	0.0	21.4	6.0	10.9	2.6
Economically Disadvantaged	25.3	36.5	24.8	25.6	32.3	14.7

**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?*

Guilford has seen a decline in reading and math test scores over the last three years, with only the white subgroup making AYP in reading.

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

The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged children has increased from 39.6 in 2006 to 49.4 in 2008. The mobility rate has increased from 11.8 in 2006 to 19.7 in 2008. The truancy rate has increased from 8.8 in 2006 to 10 in 2008. The attendance rate has dropped from 92.3 in 2006 to 91.3 in 2008. Failure rates remain high in core classes and because students are having difficulty with the curriculum, there has been a lowering of some expectations and classroom curriculum instruction is not always rigorous. There is little parent involvement in school activities, while there seems to be a core of parents involved in their student's lives, a larger percentage of students have little if any support from home. The students at Guilford have a feeling that the only important part of the PSAE is the ACT. Many of the students do not make a strong effort on the Work Keys portion of the test.

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

Guilford needs to develop strategies to improve the reading and math abilities of all students. Improvement in curriculum design and implementation will need to be made. The Guilford staff will need to work to stress the importance of both the ACT and Work Keys portions of the PSAE. Staff will need to make connections with students doing everything they can to improve interest and involvement in school. The Guilford staff needs to find ways to improve parental support and involvement.

**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?

Guilford will need to provide its staff with training in the new math and reading strategies to improve our students' performance in their classes. We will need to make both days of testing important to the students. We will need to develop strong relationships with the students by knowing, valuing, and inspiring every learner in the building. We need to create a culture of tutoring. We need to focus on making sure the students learn what is being taught. We will need to identify and target students who are struggling with the curriculum and look for opportunities to reteach and improve the students' skills. We will need to increase the amount of content area reading across the curriculum. We need to celebrate student achievement and focus on making sure the student learns the material, regardless of how much time it takes to learn it. Teachers need to make sure that they "begin with the end in mind". Lessons plans and teaching need to be designed to make sure that the students are learning what is being taught and have the ability to use that knowledge in their lives. Rigor needs to be reinserted into all areas of the curriculum and expectations need to be high for all students.

**Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies**

Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Guilford students are not making AYP in reading.	1,4,6,8,
2	Guilford students are not making AYP in Math	2,3,5,7,9,

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	School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds	
3	White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds	
4	Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds	
5	Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds	
6	Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds	
7	Hispanic students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds	
8	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds	
9	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds	

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

**Objective: 1**

Guilford students are not making AYP in reading.

**Objective 1 Description:**

Guilford as a school has only 47.1% of students making AYP in reading. The Black sub-group is at 21.1%, the Hispanic sub-group is at 29%, and the Economically Disadvantaged sub-group is at 24.4%. The school as a whole and each sub-group will reach AYP goals of 70% or Safe Harbor in 2009, and 77.5% or Safe Harbor in 2010.

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	Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
4	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

**Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities**

Objective 1 Title : Guilford students are not making AYP in reading.						
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Tutoring will be provided for those students who are not proficient on the Thinklink assessment.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	2500
2	ELO(Extended Learning Opportunity) will be available to 9th grade students to have an additional chance to obtain proficiency in their classes.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	2500
3	Reading strategies will be implemented in all content areas.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
4	All entering 9th grade students will receive an orientation that will include reading and study strategies	8/25/2009	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	2000
5	Students who are not making progress in the classroom and have had various interventions via the classroom teacher, will be referred for specific tutoring.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	2000
6	Students will receive instruction on the identified skills they need to master.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
7	Students will take the ThinkLink test to assess the areas of strengths and weaknesses each has.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
8	Work keys test preparation will occur in all content area classes on a monthly basis.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	During School	Local Funds	0

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

<b>Objective 1 Title : Guilford students are not making AYP in reading.</b>						
	<b>Strategies and Activities</b>	<b>Start Date</b>	<b>End Date</b>	<b>Time Line</b>	<b>Fund Source</b>	<b>Amount (\$)</b>
1	Professional development will be provided on content area reading strategies for all teachers during monthly faculty meetings.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	0
2	Teachers will be trained in RTI Models and interventions in the classroom.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	2500
3	Training will be given to the staff on what is on the Work Keys test and how to prepare the students.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	Before School	Local Funds	
4	Teachers will receive training in working with diverse populations; including understanding poverty training.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	Before School	Local Funds	5000
5	Teachers will be trained on the ThinkLink test to be able to interpret and determine how to use the student data to provide classroom interventions.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	2500
6	Professional development will be provided to ELL staff on sheltered instruction. (Bilingual)	12/1/2008	12/19/2008	Before School	Other	0
7	Teachers will receive training in increasing lesson rigor and making their lessons relevant.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	Before School	Local Funds	2000

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

<b>Objective 1 Title : Guilford students are not making AYP in reading.</b>						
	<b>Strategies and Activities</b>	<b>Start Date</b>	<b>End Date</b>	<b>Time Line</b>	<b>Fund Source</b>	<b>Amount (\$)</b>
1	An open house will be held to introduce 9th grade parents to the school and classes their student will be taking.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	1000
2	An emphasis will be made to increase parent participation in Parent/Teacher Conferences, by using mailings, signage, and teacher contacts.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	1000
3	We will increase the use of technology to improve the communication between the school; email between teachers and parents, website, and new student information system.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	0
4	Parents will be given a Involvement survey once in the fall and once in the spring each school year to assess school climate and perceived needs.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	1000
5	An emphasis will be placed on recruiting parents to all school events: ie. Athletics, Dramatics, Music, Academic Ceremonies, etc.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	0
6	We will use the outlet of the monthly Booster Club meeting to relay school information and academic alerts.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Other	0
7	Through the use of a quarterly newsletter. We will give parental homework tips for parents to help their students.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	3000

**Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring**

**Objective 1 Title :** Guilford students are not making AYP in reading.

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

All strategies will be monitored by evaluating all test results, professional development activities, and parental involvement on a continuous basis to determine what strategies are working and what the improvements are that need to be made.

**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
Michael J. Valentine	Principal
Matt Cascio	Assistant Principal
Amanda Hayes	Assistant Principal
Kaaryn Kennington	Assistant Principal
Kristin Paulsgrove	Assistant Principal
William Trow	Assistant Principal
Brad Witt	Assistant Principal

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

**Objective: 2**

Guilford students are not making AYP in Math

**Objective 2 Description:**

Guilford as a whole has only 34.6% of students meeting AYP. The White sub-group is at 45.9%, the Black sub-group is at 9.2%, the Hispanic sub-group is at 22.6% and the Economically Disadvantaged sub-group is at 14.5%. All sub-groups at Guilford will meet AYP targets of 70% or Safe Harbor in 2009 and 77.5% or Safe Harbor in 2010.

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

**Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities**

Objective 2 Title : Guilford students are not making AYP in Math						
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Tutoring will be provided for those students who are not proficient on the Thinklink assessment.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	2500
2	ELO(Extended Learning Opportunity) will be available to 9th grade students to have an additional chance to obtain proficiency in their classes.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	2500
3	Students will receive additional instruction on the identified mathematics skills they need to be proficient in.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
4	Students will take the ThinkLink test to assess the areas of strengths and weaknesses each has.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
5	All entering 9th grade students will receive instruction in studying and questioning strategies	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
6	Teachers will utilize pre and post-testing of the district's core curriculum to continuously evaluate the students' performance and to evaluate deficiencies and areas that may need to be re-taught.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
7	Work Keys test preparation will occur in all content area classes on a monthly basis.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	During School	Local Funds	0

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

Objective 2 Title : Guilford students are not making AYP in Math						
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Professional development opportunities will be taken to improve the use of manipulatives and new strategies using best practices.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	5000
2	Teachers will be trained in RTI Models and interventions in the classroom.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	2500
3	Training will be given to the staff on what is on the Work Keys test and how to prepare the students.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	Before School	Local Funds	0

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
4	Teachers will be trained on the ThinkLink test to be able to interpret and determine how to use the student data to provide classroom interventions.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	2500
5	Teachers will receive training in working with diverse populations; including understanding student of poverty.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	Before School	Local Funds	5000
6	Professional development will be provided to the ELL staff on Sheltered instruction.	12/1/2008	8/25/2010	Before School	Other	0
7	Teachers will receive training in increasing lesson rigor and making their lessons relevant.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	2000

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

**Objective 2 Title :** Guilford students are not making AYP in Math

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	An open house will be held to introduce 9th grade parents to the school and classes their student will be taking.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	1000
2	An emphasis will be made to increase parent participation in Parent/Teacher Conferences, by using mailings and signage.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	1000
3	We will increase the use of technology to improve the communication between the school and parents.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	Before School	Local Funds	0
4	Parents will be given a Involvement survey once in the fall and once in the spring each school year to assess school climate and percieved needs.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	0
5	An emphasis will be placed on recruiting parents to all school events: ie. Athletics, Dramatics, Music, Academic Ceremonies, etc.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	0
6	We will use the outlet of the monthly Booster Club meeting to relay school information and academic alerts.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Other	0
7	Through the use of a quarterly newsletter. We will give parental homework tips for parents to help their students.	8/25/2008	8/25/2010	After School	Local Funds	3000

**Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring**

**Objective 2 Title :** Guilford students are not making AYP in Math

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

All strategies will be monitored by evaluating all test results, professional development activities, and parental involvement on a continuous basis to determine

what strategies are working and what the improvements are that need to be made.

**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
Michael J. Valentine	Principal
Matt Cascio	Assistant Principal
Amanda Hayes	Assistant Principal

**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.*)

Parent notification is accomplished through quarterly report cards, quarterly progress reports, bi-annual parent-teacher conferences, monthly booster club meetings, annual standardized testing reports, student handbooks, phone calls, e-mail, marquee outside the school and quarterly school newsletters.

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

**Stakeholder Involvement** - Describe specifically how stakeholders (including parents, school staff, and outside exerts) 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.

Teachers have worked on evaluating school data and worked cooperatively to determine what can be done to improve student achievement. The SIP team has met regularly to develop the plan and make some decisions on what can be utilized to implement the plan. Questions and comments from parents were brought to the SIP committee about curricular issues and school to home communication. Those thoughts were addressed and it is the hope of the SIP team to get more parents involved in the SIP process.

**Names and titles of school improvement team or plan developers:**

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
1	Michael J. Valentine	Principal
2	Kristin Paulsgrove	AP
3	Amanda Hayes	AP
4	Matt Cascio	AP
5	Clark Fabert	Teacher
6	Nate Kirschmann	Teacher
7	Barb Klaas	Teacher
8	Maria Robles	Teacher
9	Jeff Rush	Teacher
10	Pete Herren	Parent
11	Diane Conklin	RESPRO Coach

**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 reviewers in October and November 2008. Ongoing support from the ROE will support the correct and effective evaluation of School Improvement Plans. SIP teams will pair with other schools in their tier level during November 2008 to review and refine their plans. Representatives of SIP Teams will submit their peer-reviewed SIP to the District Review Team prior to November 24, 2008. Schools then will submit their final plans 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, Ms. 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 a 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 include incorporation of Response to Intervention (RtI) Plans and the Ten Components of a Schoolwide Title I Program (where applicable).

### 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 (IPTTS) 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 I 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		

---

**Section IV-A Local Board Action**

---

**DATE APPROVED** by Local Board:12/19/2008

**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

No	Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified?
No	Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness?
No	Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students?
No	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

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

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

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

No	Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?
Yes	Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement?
Yes	Are the strategies and activities measurable?
No	Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified?
No	Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear?

Yes	Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students?
Yes	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?
No	Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities? for students?
No	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
No	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?
MONITORING	
Yes	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?
No	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?

**PART I - COMMENTS**

**Overall**

This plan does not provide evidence of data analysis to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities. Some of the key factors (students being valued, increasing expectations) are not addressed in the action plans. The majority of student activities take place outside of the regular school day. Those taking place during the school day are vague (“students will receive instruction on the identified skills they need to master”). Parent involvement strategies do not reflect true parent engagement in supporting the learning process. Effective monitoring measures and processes that include input from all stakeholders need to be identified. Student strategies and activities need to be significantly strengthened for improved student achievement to occur. It is apparent this school has not responded to sections of the plan per the stated prompts and is missing critical pieces of information that are required for them be in compliance.

**Analysis of Data**

**Section I – Data**

**Pages 15-16:**

No apparent review or analysis of the report card data evident.

**Identification of Key Factors**

Only required data has been used to determine key factors. This section needs to be expanded. For example, the decrease of 13% or more in several subgroups in math is significant, but specific key factors contributing to this decrease have not been identified. No reference to parent involvement as a key factor.

**Section II – Action Plan**

**Pages 18-22:** Objectives are well written but need to be stated as a complete SMART goal, including “as measured by PSAE tests” at the end of each objective.

Activities listed under the student activities section do not include a response to the following key factors identified on p. 17: increasing curriculum rigor, high expectations, and developing strong relationships with the students.

Five of the eight student strategies occur outside of the school day. This plan needs a stronger emphasis on classroom strategies, curriculum alignment and student engagement. This is reflective in your statement that entering 9<sup>th</sup> grade students will receive an orientation. In reality they should receive a well-structured, intensive, on-going tiered intervention based on identified student needs.

Expectations for classroom behavior and practice are not clearly articulated.

**Alignment of Activities**

Professional Development strategies do not address the emotional investment of students, increasing curriculum rigor and high expectations, developing strong relationships with the students (key factors identified on p. 17 of plan).

Parent activities need to be strengthened and support student learning. Parent involvement strategies describe one-way communication system, not true parent involvement – signage and mailings will increase parent attendance at conferences? What about transportation? Are students involved in conferencing process? How are parents supported in encouraging students to participate in after school activities described in student action plan? How is parent input sought? Review Epstein model for parent involvement.

Five of the eight student strategies occur outside of the school day. The burden of this plan rests on students coming after school. The strength of this plan should rely on students' success in the classroom during the school day.

**Monitoring**

This section lacks specificity and clarity. Processes and measures of success are not described.

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN	
PARENT NOTIFICATION	
NA	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? <font color="red">(Title I Schools Only)</font>
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT	
Yes	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?
Yes	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	
Yes	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	
Yes	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	
Yes	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?
No	If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school?
STATE RESPONSIBILITIES	
Yes	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	
No	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	

Yes	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.
-----	--

**PART II - COMMENTS**

Feb. 2, 2009

**The Guilford High School, Rockford District 205 improvement plan is recommended for implementation after revision/consultation with your area RESPRO. Updates to the improvement plan should be completed in the same template section(s) as the original submission by February 23, 2009. Dating of each revision to the plan is required so that updates are readily apparent. After you update the school improvement plan, request that your area RESPRO update the ISBE monitoring prompt as this is the official state monitoring record. Carol Diedrichsen, ISBE**

Your team needs to make several additions before resubmitting the plan. These include the following: Since your school is in restructuring you need to include in Section III Part E the restructuring options the district has taken and in Section III Part G insert the name and title for each person.

**Stakeholder Involvement**

**Page 23-24:** Stakeholder involvement in SIP development activities is evident.

**Mentoring Program**

**Page 25:** Mentoring program for new teachers described provides practical support and encouragement.

**District Responsibilities**

**Pages 26:** District responsibilities are described in detail. Some of this could be included in the monitoring section.

1/27/09 Revision to #2 submitted by T. Parker Respro Coordinator-Please note that Guilford High School is not a Title I school and not required to complete the Restructuring section of the plan. The district is using Option 4 in the District 205 Restructuring plan.