

## Beyer Elem School

### School Improvement Plan 2008

Local Board Approved	12/19/2008
Submitted	12/24/2008
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	2/20/2009

**PRELIMINARY INFORMATION**

RCDT Number	041012050252016		
District Name	ROCKFORD SD 205	School Name	BEYER ELEM SCHOOL
Superintendent	LINDA HERNANDEZ	Principal	WILLIAM SADLER
District Address	201 S MADISON ST	School Address	333 15TH AVE
City/State/Zip	ROCKFORD,IL 61104 2092	City/State/Zip	ROCKFORD,IL,61104 5194
District Telephone#	8159663000 Extn:3101	School Telephone#	8159663390 Extn:0
District Email	hernandl@rps205.com	School Email	SADLERB@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
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2007-08 State Improvement Status	academic early warning year 1

	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	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	42.7		No	53.8		No	92.2	Yes		
White														
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	32.8	36.8	Yes	39.1	49.5	No	91.7			
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities														
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	41.6	44.0	Yes	52.2	60.5	No	92.1			

**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**

<b>School Information</b>								
	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
Attendance Rate (%)	93.2	94.1	93.4	92.6	90.6	92.2	91.6	92.2
Truancy Rate (%)	5.2	3.4	7.0	6.7	12.6	9.4	10.3	2.4
Mobility Rate (%)	16.4	16.2	8.7	14.5	20.6	8.0	28.7	39.3
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	311	342	329	291	285	280	330	308
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	74.3	81.6	81.5	81.4	88.4	96.4	82.7	98.7
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	1.9	2.9	-	4.5	4.6	5.4	3.6	3.2
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	38.6	37.7	35.9	30.2	22.1	16.8	18.8	15.6
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	49.5	49.7	49.8	54.6	52.3	56.4	55.8	57.8
Hispanic (%)	9.6	9.9	10.3	10.7	11.6	13.6	13.3	13.6
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	1.9	2.3	3.3	4.1	3.5	2.5	1.8	1.3
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.3	-	-	0.6	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	10.5	10.7	9.7	11.7

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	42.6	47.9	8.5	0.8	0.3	-
	2000	40.4	49.4	8.3	1.6	0.3	-
	2001	38.6	49.5	9.6	1.9	0.3	-
	2002	37.7	49.7	9.9	2.3	0.3	-
	2003	35.9	49.8	10.3	3.3	0.6	-
	2004	30.2	54.6	10.7	4.1	0.3	-
	2005	22.1	52.3	11.6	3.5	-	10.5
	2006	16.8	56.4	13.6	2.5	-	10.7
	2007	18.8	55.8	13.3	1.8	0.6	9.7
	2008	15.6	57.8	13.6	1.3	-	11.7
<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

Beyer Elem School

School Improvement Plan 2008

	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	1.3	88.6	95.6	91.9	16.3	30	8.3	-	-
	2000	2.2	83.0	95.8	93.3	7.7	49	15.7	-	-
	2001	1.9	74.3	99.1	93.2	16.4	16	5.2	-	-
	2002	2.9	81.6	99.4	94.1	16.2	11	3.4	-	-
	2003	-	81.5	100.0	93.4	8.7	21	7.0	-	-
	2004	4.5	81.4	100.0	92.6	14.5	18	6.7	-	-
	2005	4.6	88.4	100.0	90.6	20.6	33	12.6	-	-
	2006	5.4	96.4	100.0	92.2	8.0	27	9.4	-	-
	2007	3.6	82.7	100.0	91.6	28.7	37	10.3	-	-
2008	3.2	98.7	100.0	92.2	39.3	8	2.4	-	-	
<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	

Beyer Elem School

School Improvement Plan 2008

	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	376	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	312	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	311	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	342	64	58	44	-	-	-
	2003	329	48	55	51	-	-	-
	2004	291	45	39	46	-	-	-
	2005	285	51	28	30	-	-	-
	2006	280	39	44	30	-	-	-
	2007	330	46	42	44	-	-	-
	2008	308	52	43	35	-	-	-
<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

Beyer Elem School

School Improvement Plan 2008

	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)**

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	43.2	51.2	56.8	43.2	30.8	49.1	-	-	-	52.5	40.0	40.9	34.1	26.7	56.6	73.0	36.2	44.4
White	64.3	60.0	58.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	35.7	-	-	-	-
Black	33.3	36.3	44.5	26.3	21.9	34.4	-	-	-	38.1	21.1	36.0	8.6	19.2	35.7	64.2	27.6	29.4
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	35.9	51.3	54.7	43.2	28.0	47.1	-	-	-	52.7	38.4	40.5	35.5	25.6	51.8	71.5	33.3	44.4
	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	63.7	58.1	79.5	64.8	57.7	63.7	-	-	-	57.5	62.5	45.4	33.3	40.0	66.7	84.6	48.9	55.6
White	92.8	50.0	91.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	45.0	42.8	-	-	-	-
Black	41.7	50.0	72.2	42.1	53.2	48.2	-	-	-	47.7	31.6	44.0	20.8	38.5	64.3	85.7	37.9	23.5
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	59.0	56.7	78.6	64.8	56.0	62.3	-	-	-	57.9	61.5	42.9	34.8	41.0	63.0	81.0	47.6	55.6
	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Beyer Elem School

School Improvement Plan 2008

5/21/2009 7:43:55 AM

Page 17 of 39

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 School Report Card indicates that Beyer Elementary School, after having made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for both 2005 and 2006, failed to make AYP for 2007 and 2008. More specifically, in 2008, Beyer Elementary School failed to make AYP in the areas of Reading for 'ALL' students (42.7%) however, our 'Black' (32.8%) and 'Economically Disadvantaged' (41.6%) subgroups have reached Safe Harbor targets. Furthermore, in the area of Math, Beyer Elementary School failed to make AYP for 'ALL' students (53.8%), 'Black' (39.1%) subgroup and the Economically Disadvantaged (52.2%) subgroup.

The AYP target for both reading and math was for 62.5% of students to meet or exceed state standards.

Reading area of strength was vocabulary development. Math area of strength was algebra.

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

There are several factors that have contributed to Beyer's testing performance. First, in 2005 and 2006, the two years Beyer made AYP, the Beyer school population averaged 282.5 students. In 2007, when Beyer failed to make AYP, the school population jumped to 330 students. In 2008, when Beyer failed to make AYP, the school population decreased to 308 students. Second, Beyer has a much higher than state average economically disadvantaged population. From 2004 – 2007, 87.2% of Beyer's students fit into the economically disadvantaged category, as compared to the state average of 40% and the district average of 61.8% over the same time period. In 2008, 98.7% of Beyer's students fit into the economically disadvantaged category, as compared to the state average of 41.1% and the district average of 71.5% over the same time period. In addition, the truancy rate at Beyer (9.8%) is higher than that of the district (8.5%) and the state (2.3%) over the same 4 year time period. Beyer's mobility rate from 2004 – 2007 was 17.9% which was slightly lower than the district average of 18.2% but higher than the state average of 16%. Of great significance is the fact that in 2007, the year Beyer failed to make AYP, the mobility rate was 28.7%. In 2008, Beyer's mobility rate was 39.3% which is 10.9% higher than the district average (28.4%) and 24.4% higher than the state average (14.9%). Finally, teacher turnover has a huge negative impact on student achievement, particularly when it occurs in the testing grades, grades 3- 5 in our case. Consider the fact that 13 of our current 18 classroom teachers (72.2%) were not on staff during the 2004 – 2005 school year. This includes 5 out of 6 teachers (83.3%) in the testing grades. The one teacher that was on staff in 2004 – 2005 was teaching a different grade level.

Factors that were likely to have contributed to weaknesses in reading were inconsistent usage of guided reading and limited parental involvement in the academic process. Factors that were likely to have contributed to weaknesses in math were limited exposure to measurement skills in the lower grades and limited parental involvement in the academic process.

Factors that were likely to have contributed to strengths in reading were Making Meaning. Factors that were likely to have contributed to strengths in math were

the repeated exposure to algebraic problem solving.

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

Based on the key factors, we infer that all Beyer students, including black and economically disadvantaged, will improve in the area of reading via the following: consistent usage of guided reading, increased parental involvement in the academic process, implementation of the Balanced Literacy Guide, "Making Meaning," data teams, additional learning opportunities for below grade-level readers., and recognizing and promoting achievement.

Based on key factors, we infer that all Beyer students, including black and economically disadvantaged, will improve in the area of math via the following: recognizing and promoting achievement, data teams, and additional learning opportunities below grade-level math students, and increased parental involvement in the academic process.

#### **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?

It is within Beyer's capacity to change the following key factors in reading:

1. Implementation of the Balanced Literacy Guide including consistent usage of guided reading.
2. Data Team process.
3. Additional learning opportunities for below grade-level readers.
4. Recognize and promote achievement.
5. Increase parental involvement in the academic process.

It is within Beyer's capacity to change the following key item factors in math:

1. Data Team process.
2. Additional learning opportunities for below grade-level math learners.
3. Recognizing and promoting achievement.
4. Increase parental involvement in the acadmic process.

Research shows that parental involvement increases academic achievement. The 2008-2009 school year will be utilized as a baseline for the aforementioned item. Data will be collected during the 2008 - 2009 school year and will serve as a baseline for subsequent years. Data collected will include parent sign-in sheets from curriculum nights and parent/teacher conferences.

**Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies**

Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Increased Reading Achievement for composite and all subgroups, especially Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor. Updated 2/3/09.	1,
2	Increased Math Achievement for composite and all subgroups, especially Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor. Updated 2/4/09	2,3,4,

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	Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
4	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective: 1**

Increased Reading Achievement for composite and all subgroups, especially Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor. Updated 2/3/09.

**Objective 1 Description:**

This objective covers the following AYP deficiency areas.

1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2. Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
3. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

**School**

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency	
1	School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

**Objective 1 Title :** Increased Reading Achievement for composite and all subgroups, especially Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor. Updated 2/3/09.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Students in the composite and in all subgroups, especially students identified as deficient in reading will participate in Balanced Literacy, Guided Reading and Making Meaning on a regular basis to achieve 70% of students reading at or above grade level as measured by Fountas & Pinnell Assessments, Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/3/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Teachers will meet monthly in grade level data teams to discuss student deficiencies, analyze student work, determine and implement appropriate research based teaching strategies, review and discuss post test data and graph and post results to achieve 70% of students reading at or above grade level as measured by Fountas & Pinnell Assessments, Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/3/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	0

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
3	Students in the composite, and in all subgroups, especially students identified as deficient in reading will participate in either additional Guided Reading groups, Soar to Success or Early Success to achieve 70% of students reading at or above grade level as measured by Fountas & Pinnell Assessments, Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/3/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Title I	17500
4	The teachers, with the assistance of the reading coach will recognize students who meet or exceeds standards on the Think Link Assessment or are reading at or above grade level as measured by Fountas and Pinnell assessments at an awards assembly to be held at the conclusion of each trimester. The goal is to have 70% of students reading at or above grade level as measured Fountas & Pinnell Assessments, Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/3/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Title I	400

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

**Objective 1 Title :** Increased Reading Achievement for composite and all subgroups, especially Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor. Updated 2/3/09.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Reading coach/district curriculum personnel will provide professional development in effective literacy best practice techniques to all classroom/special education resource teachers in QAR, DRTA, and reciprocal teaching. Reading specialist and principal will monitor classroom teacher in implementation of these strategies. The goal is to achieve 70% of students reading at or above grade level as measured by Fountas & Pinnell Assessments, Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/3/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Title I	0
2	Grade level data teams will meet at least once per month to analyze achievement data, sets goals, and plan instruction. The goal is to achieve 70% of students reading at or above grade level as measured by Fountas & Pinnell Assessments, Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/3/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Title I	0
3	All teachers will be encouraged to attend and participate in conferences and professional development opportunities aligned with ISAT deficiencies. Teachers will return being able to implement strategies and share information with colleagues. The goal is to achieve 70% of students reading at or above grade level as measured by Fountas & Pinnell Assessments, Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/3/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Title I	5000

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

**Objective 1 Title :** Increased Reading Achievement for composite and all subgroups, especially Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor. Updated 2/3/09.

	<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	Beyer teachers will offer a grade level Reading curriculum night providing parents with effective tools to help their own children at home. The goal is to achieve 70% of students reading at or above grade level as measured by Fountas & Pinnell Assessments, Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/3/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2008	After School	Title I	200
2	Beyer teachers will hold fall and spring parent/teacher conferences and discuss ways to encourage reading and to develop reading comprehension strategies at home. The goal is to achieve 70% of students reading at or above grade level as measured by Fountas & Pinnell Assessments, Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/3/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	After School	Title I	100
3	Beyer school will host a book fair for parents to purchase appropriate books to encourage additional reading practice at home to support reading achievement. The goal is to achieve 70% of students reading at or above grade level as measured by Fountas & Pinnell Assessments, Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/3/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	After School	Title I	0
4	Beyer teachers will hold an Open House to review reading learning standards and provide strategies to promote reading achievement. The goal is to achieve 70% of students reading at or above grade level as measured by Fountas & Pinnell Assessments, Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/3/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	After School	Title I	300
5	Beyer School will hold, at the conclusion of each trimester, an Academic Recognition Assembly, to promote continued academic achievement. The goal is to achieve 70% of students reading at or above grade level as measured by Fountas & Pinnell Assessments, Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Parents, community members and the media will be invited to attend. Updated 2/3/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Title I	400

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

**Objective 1 Title :** Increased Reading Achievement for composite and all subgroups, especially Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor. Updated 2/3/09.

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

Principal, RESPRO Coach, Reading Coach and SIP Team will meet monthly to monitor the implementation of the SIP process, making changes as needed.

Parents will be given multiple opportunities to monitor student progress towards the success of the objective: to review student progress reports, report cards

and achievement data at parent-teacher conferences, participating in curriculum night and ISAT prep newsletter.

During the monthly grade level meeting, teachers will review Think Link and Fountas & Pinnell Assessments and analyze student work in order to select strategies to address student needs.

**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
Bill Sadler	Principal
Betty Foss	Reading Coach
SIP/Curriculum/Recognition Committees	

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

**Objective: 2**

Increased Math Achievement for composite and all subgroups, especially Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor. Updated 2/4/09

**Objective 2 Description:**

**This objective covers the following AYP deficiency areas:**

1. School is deficient in Math Meets and Exceeds
2. Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Math Meets and Exceeds
3. Black students are deficient in Math Meets and Exceeds

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

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

3	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
---	--

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

**Objective 2 Title :** Increased Math Achievement for composite and all subgroups, especially Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor. Updated 2/4/09

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Teachers will meet monthly in grade level data teams to discuss student deficiencies, analyze student work, determine and implement appropriate research based teaching strategies, review and discuss post test data and graph and post results. The goal is to achieve 70% of students scoring at or above grade level as measured by Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/4/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	After School	Title I	
2	Students in the composite and in all subgroups, especially students identified as deficient in math will participate in additional math instruction based upon their individual needs as identified by ISAT and Think Link. The goal is to achieve 70% of students scoring at or above grade level as measured by Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Additional instruction to be provided by classroom teacher, Title I teacher, Title I tutor or volunteers. Updated 2/4/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Title I	
3	The teacher, with assistance from the reading coach will recognize students who meet or exceed standards as measured on the Think Link Assessment at an awards assembly to be held at the conclusion of each trimester. The goal is to achieve 70% of students scoring at or above grade level as measured by Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/4/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Title I	

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

**Objective 2 Title :** Increased Math Achievement for composite and all subgroups, especially Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor. Updated 2/4/09

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	District math coordinator will provide monthly training to all classroom teachers, including special ed. resource teachers, in areas of deficiency as identified by ISAT and Think Link data. Teachers will then be expected to implement these strategies in the classroom. The goal is to achieve 70% of students scoring at or above grade level as measured by Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/4/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Title I	
2	Grade level data teams will meet at least once per month to analyze achievement data, set goals and plan instruction. The goal is to achieve 70% of students scoring at or above grade level as measured by Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/4/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Title I	

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

**Objective 2 Title :** Increased Math Achievement for composite and all subgroups, especially Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor. Updated 2/4/09

	<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	Beyer teachers will offer a grade level math curriculum night providing parents with effective tools to help their own children at home. The goal is to achieve 70% of students scoring at or above grade level as measured by Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/4/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	After School	Title I	
2	Beyer teachers will hold fall and spring parent teacher conferences and discuss ways to encourage additional math practice at home to promote higher math achievement. The goal is to achieve 70% of students scoring at or above grade level as measured by Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/4/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	After School	Title I	
3	Beyer teachers will hold an open house to review math learning standards and provide strategies to promote math achievement. The goal is to achieve 70% of students scoring at or above grade level as measured by Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/4/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	After School	Title I	
4	Beyer School will hold, at the conclusion of each trimester, an Academic Awards Assembly, to promote continued academic achievement. Parents, community members and the media will be invited to attend. The goal is to achieve 70% of students scoring at or above grade level as measured by Think Link Assessments and Meets/Exceeds on ISAT. Updated 2/4/09.	8/25/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Title I	

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

**Objective 2 Title :** Increased Math Achievement for composite and all subgroups, especially Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups will make AYP of 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010, or Safe Harbor. Updated 2/4/09

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

Principal, RESPRO Coach, Reading Coach and SIP Team will meet monthly to monitor the implementation of the SIP process, making changes as needed.

Parents will be given multiple opportunities to monitor progress towards the success of the objective: to review student progress reports, report cards, and achievement data at parent-teacher conferences, participating in curriculum night and ISAT newsletter.

During monthly grade level meeting, teachers will review Think Link Assessments and analyze student work in order to select strategies to address student needs.

**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
Bill Sadler	Principal
Betty Foss	Reading Coach
SIP/Curriculum/Recognition Committees	

**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.*)

Beyer Elementary School will notify parents in the following ways:

1. On behalf of Beyer school, the district sent a letter to parents notifying them of AYP status.
2. The Beyer Elementary School State Report Card will notify parents regarding the school's AYP status.
3. School newsletter will provide AYP status information and will emphasize the need to increase reading and math achievement.
4. Parents can access the Beyer School State Report Card through the IIRC website.

**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 SIP committee consulted with school staff regarding objectives, strategies, and activities for the SIP plan. Outside experts, from RESPRO, were consulted in the designing of the SIP plan. Parents were consulted in the SIP planning process.

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

	Name	Title
1	Bill Sadler	Principal
2	Betty Foss	Reading Coach
3	Hope Cantwell	Parent/Teacher
4	Jeff Lash	Teacher
5	Nikki Lyons	Teacher
6	Linda Lanphier	RESPRO Consultant
7	Dick Kunnart	Stakeholder
8	Joyce Yates	Parent
9	Debbie Rogers	Parent

**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 (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.

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
1	Bill Sadler	Principal
2	Betty Foss	Reading Coach
3	Linda Lanphier	RESPRO Coach
4	Jeff Lash	Teacher
5	Hope Cantwell	Parent/Teacher
6	Nikki Lyons	Teacher
7	Debbie Rogers	PTO President/Parent
8	Joyce Yates	Parent
9	Dick Kunert	Stakeholder/Community Member

---

**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

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

## LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

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

## OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

NA	If included, has the SIP team analyzed other available data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities?
NA	Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?
NA	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

Yes	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?
Yes	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?
No	Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status or in special education non-compliance?
Yes	Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities? for students?
Yes	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
Yes	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?
<b>MONITORING</b>	
Yes	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?
Yes	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?

**PART I - COMMENTS**

**Analysis of ISAT was complete and met requirements. Factors that can be changed have been identified, but research to support this would improve plan.**

**The objectives listed have not been stated in measurable terms and in two year targets. Alignment of strategies and activities need to be measurable and have clear expectations for classroom implementation.**

**Alignment of professional development needs to include specific parameters of who will receive training, when that training takes place and what expectations are expected.**

**Alignment of parental activities need further explanations as to how they will impact student achievement.**

**Monitoring plan addressed the what and why of monitoring but fails to address what will be done with the monitoring data to cycle back into the school.**

<b>PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN</b>	
<b>PARENT NOTIFICATION</b>	
Yes	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>
<b>STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT</b>	

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?
<b>PEER REVIEW</b>	
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?
<b>TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS</b>	
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?
<b>DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES</b>	
Yes	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?
Yes	If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school?
<b>STATE RESPONSIBILITIES</b>	
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?
<b>SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM</b>	
Yes	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?
<b>APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD</b>	
Yes	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.

**PART II - COMMENTS**

**Sections III & IV meet requirements. It is obvious that the district employs an effective monitoring process.**

**Closing Comments:**

**The objectives must be stated in measurable terms, and strategies and activities span two year targets to indicate a two plan. Alignment of strategies and activities need to be measurable and have clear expectations for classroom implementation.**

**Alignment of professional development needs to include specific parameters of who will receive training, when that training takes place and what expectations are expected.**

**Provide further explanation as to how parental activities will impact student achievement. Explain how the monitoring data will be used to increase student achievement.**

**2/20/09 Beyer has submitted revisions and is currently working with the Respro coach to strengthen the plan based on the suggestions made.**

**February 20, 2009**

**The *Beyer Elementary School* 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.**