

## Whitehead Elem School

### School Improvement Plan 2008

Board Approval Date	12/19/2008
Plan Submission Date	12/24/2008
ISBE Monitoring Completed	1/6/2009

**PRELIMINARY INFORMATION**

RCDT Number	041012050252066		
District Name	ROCKFORD SD 205	School Name	WHITEHEAD ELEM SCHOOL
Superintendent	LINDA HERNANDEZ	Principal	JOHN ULFERTS
District Address	201 S MADISON ST	School Address	2325 OHIO PKWY
City/State/Zip	ROCKFORD,IL 61104 2092	City/State/Zip	ROCKFORD,IL,61108
District Telephone#	8159663000 Extn:3101	School Telephone#	8152292840 Extn:0
District Email	hernandl@rps205.com	School Email	ULFERTJ@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?	Yes	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	59.4		Yes	77.2		Yes	93.9	Yes		
White	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	66.7		Yes	85.9		Yes				
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	47.2		No	60.4		Yes				
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities														
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	54.1	51.7	Yes	73.3		Yes	93.3			

**Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress**

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. \*\*\*
3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 75% graduation rate for high schools.

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

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

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

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

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

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

School Information								
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Attendance Rate (%)	93.3	93.9	94.0	93.9	92.5	93.0	93.8	93.9
Truancy Rate (%)	4.6	3.8	5.9	5.2	10.2	12.9	5.7	0.5
Mobility Rate (%)	16.3	11.5	15.9	15.2	16.5	15.4	12.2	28.4
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	308	295	300	330	389	400	411	395
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	46.4	49.8	62.7	59.1	62.7	60.0	71.5	77.0
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	3.2	3.1	-	3.6	2.8	3.8	2.7	3.0
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	63.3	62.4	67.3	66.4	63.8	57.5	51.8	50.9
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	24.4	23.1	19.7	19.4	20.1	22.3	26.0	27.1
Hispanic (%)	11.0	12.2	11.3	11.5	12.1	12.3	13.1	13.2
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	1.0	1.7	1.3	2.7	1.8	3.5	3.6	3.3
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.3	0.7	0.3	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	2.3	4.5	5.4	5.6

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	65.8	26.4	6.2	1.0	0.5	-
	2000	64.1	27.9	6.8	1.2	-	-
	2001	63.3	24.4	11.0	1.0	0.3	-
	2002	62.4	23.1	12.2	1.7	0.7	-
	2003	67.3	19.7	11.3	1.3	0.3	-
	2004	66.4	19.4	11.5	2.7	-	-
	2005	63.8	20.1	12.1	1.8	-	2.3
	2006	57.5	22.3	12.3	3.5	-	4.5
	2007	51.8	26.0	13.1	3.6	-	5.4
	2008	50.9	27.1	13.2	3.3	-	5.6
<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	4.5	19.2	100.0	93.3	18.8	31	7.8	-	-
	2000	2.8	49.5	100.0	94.3	17.0	17	5.3	-	-
	2001	3.2	46.4	100.0	93.3	16.3	14	4.6	-	-
	2002	3.1	49.8	100.0	93.9	11.5	12	3.8	-	-
	2003	-	62.7	100.0	94.0	15.9	19	5.9	-	-
	2004	3.6	59.1	100.0	93.9	15.2	18	5.2	-	-
	2005	2.8	62.7	100.0	92.5	16.5	39	10.2	-	-
	2006	3.8	60.0	100.0	93.0	15.4	56	12.9	-	-
	2007	2.7	71.5	100.0	93.8	12.2	25	5.7	-	-
2008	3.0	77.0	100.0	93.9	28.4	2	0.5	-	-	
<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	

Whitehead 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	401	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	323	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	308	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	295	49	48	52	-	-	-
	2003	300	50	55	52	-	-	-
	2004	330	52	44	59	-	-	-
	2005	389	51	59	60	-	-	-
	2006	400	50	48	59	-	-	-
	2007	411	78	59	59	-	-	-
	2008	395	75	69	60	-	-	-
<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)**

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	43.5	56.0	54.9	51.8	49.3	57.7	-	-	-	57.1	55.0	59.7	54.0	54.2	47.4	53.5	55.0	61.0
White	53.4	68.6	63.6	65.6	54.6	69.4	-	-	-	64.7	62.9	65.0	74.2	60.5	56.7	63.8	59.4	63.6
Black	16.7	-	-	26.7	31.3	50.0	-	-	-	-	40.0	31.3	-	28.5	20.0	27.3	28.6	50.0
Hispanic	-	-	30.0	-	-	45.5	-	-	-	41.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	63.6	60.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	20.0	-	-	-	-	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	10.0	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	27.8	58.0	45.0	44.7	43.4	53.8	-	-	-	53.7	47.5	52.8	35.7	44.8	39.1	52.3	46.4	57.5
	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	58.7	78.0	72.6	61.1	74.6	71.8	-	-	-	71.5	71.6	82.1	68.0	69.5	56.1	63.8	76.7	72.9
White	70.0	91.4	75.7	68.8	77.3	83.3	-	-	-	79.4	74.3	82.5	71.0	76.4	70.3	83.3	87.5	84.9
Black	33.3	-	-	40.0	62.6	57.2	-	-	-	-	60.0	75.1	-	57.1	33.3	36.4	42.9	42.9
Hispanic	-	-	80.0	-	-	72.7	-	-	-	50.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	81.8	70.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	40.0	-	-	-	-	10.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	44.5	74.2	65.0	55.2	69.8	67.7	-	-	-	63.4	65.0	79.3	64.3	63.1	48.8	59.0	73.2	67.5
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark   % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

### Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

The School Report Card data for 2008 gave Whitehead Elementary School cause for celebration but also revealed the challenges ahead. Whitehead Elementary School achieved its best scores ever in both ISAT Reading and Math not only for our composite scores but for all of our subgroups as well. In particular, the Economically Disadvantage group, which we targeted with our RTI interventions, increased 8 percentage points in reading which is statistically relevant. Whitehead received the highest scores it has ever had in both Reading and Math for every past/current subgroup: All, White, and Economically Disadvantaged. However, Whitehead still did not make Adequate Yearly Progress. In 2008, our Black student population increased and became a recognized subgroup. This subgroup did not perform as well on ISAT with 47.20% proficient in Reading. Thus, Whitehead did not make AYP in Reading. This subgroup, as well as all the rest of our subgroups and composite groups, made AYP in Math.

The graph below summarizes Whitehead's ISAT performance since 2003.

#### ISAT Reading

	All	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Native American	Multi-Racial	LEP	Students with Disabilities	Economically Disadvantaged
2008	59.4%	66.7%	47.2%							54.1%
2007	53.2%	57.9%								46.3%
2006	56.9%	66%								53.8%
2005	50.9%	60.9%								42.5%
2004	54.8%	66.2%								49.3%
2003	50.0%	65%								32.6%

## ISAT Math

	All	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Native American	Multi-Racial	LEP	Students with Disabilities	Economically Disadvantaged
2008	77.2%	85.9%	60.4%							73.3%
2007	75%	80%								71.3%
2006	66%	78.7%								59.6%
2005	64.2%	73.9%								57.5%
2004	72.1%	82.4%								67.2%
2003	64.9%	71.7%								56.5%

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

There are a number of factors that contribute to Whitehead's ISAT performance.

#### Internal Factors

There are many significant internal factors that contribute to Whitehead's ISAT test results. In 2008 Whitehead made AYP and received its highest ever scores in ISAT reading and math for both composite and subgroup scores. However, 2008 was the first year African American students became a subgroup. They achieved AYP in Math, but failed to do so in Reading.

Whitehead's considerable gains in 2008 were likely a result of an increased focus on literacy. Every teacher had a two hour literacy block during the 2007-08 school year. Best practices of literacy instruction are included in literacy blocks. Vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, phonics, spelling, phonemic awareness, and word study are all emphasized. Literacy instruction methods include shared reading, guided reading with reciprocal teaching and QAR, independent reading, and Making Meaning instruction.

Obviously, a major internal factor to Whitehead's success is attracting high quality, highly qualified teachers. The placement process for teachers in Rockford Public Schools is based largely on seniority as defined in the teacher contract. However, Whitehead is able to influence the decision through its advertisement for teacher vacancies. Care has been taken in preparing a description for teacher vacancy in the Communicator. The *Communicator* describes the professional training and proven classroom success that preferred candidates must have. Whitehead's official description in the district teacher vacancy bulletin is as follows: *Whitehead Elementary School is implementing Response to Intervention and providing our students with three tiers of instructional support in reading, mathematics, and social development. Whitehead expects staff to have demonstrated success in working with both culturally diverse and special needs student population, utilizing a well defined and successful classroom management plan, and employing effective conflict resolution strategies, all of which result in a well run student centered classroom. All staff are expected to implement strategies from personal, building and district professional development, and provide instruction within the tier model. Preferred applicants will have formal training and demonstrated success in the following: Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS), Standards-based integrated instruction, Balanced Literacy best practices, EveryDay Math, Cooperative Learning, Differentiated instruction, Integrated Technology Instruction, Study Island, Waterford, and Soar to Success. Applicants should have formal training, or be willing to be trained in Response to Intervention, Reading Rescue and Shurley English. PLEASE NOTE: While all classroom teachers are encouraged strongly to participate in The Reading Rescue In-school tutoring program, Reading Rescue In School Tutoring is a part of the daily program of instruction for all 1st grade teachers.* Under the terms of the Rockford Public School teacher contract, a rationale can be written for a preferred applicant even if they are a less senior candidate if they have specific training or proven success in the programs mentioned in the school description as listed in the vacancy bulletin. By having this description, Whitehead is able to better ensure that it selects highly qualified, high quality teachers. In addition, teacher applicants are interviewed by a committee of educators including the principal and grade level teachers using questions derived from Teacher Perceiver themes and correlated to best practices in literacy instruction. Responses are then rated and tallied using a point continuum to select the most highly qualified, high quality teachers.

Data teams played an important role in our increased ISAT performance. Data teams are an additional internal factor. Teachers meet a minimum of once a month either during shared planning periods or after school to review and analyze achievement classroom data and collaborate at grade levels to set goals for improvement. These goals are reviewed as student performance is assessed. Goals and results are posted throughout the building so that all stakeholders are aware of student progress. Teachers lasered in on academic deficiencies as they analyzed data, formulating goals, devising new instructional methods, and tracking whether interventions worked effectively. Students identified as in need of reading or math support were referred to Tier Two and Tier Three interventions. Students in Tier Two and Tier Three reading received additional intensive reading support daily on top of their Tier One classroom reading instruction.

Whitehead has sharply increased its number of high poverty students by nearly 50 percentage points in the last ten years. This has enabled Whitehead to acquire a Title One budget. A significant internal factor that has contributed to Whitehead achieving AYP has been its usage of Title One funds to secure highly qualified retired teachers to serve as instructional tutors in Reading and Math during the school day. These tutors have implemented a Response to Intervention program at Whitehead using data to target specific students who are at risk and subgroups that need additional assistance. From 2007 to 2008 the Whitehead RTI program targeted the economically disadvantaged subgroup and enabled this subgroup to raise its achievement by 2% in Math and 7.8% in Reading. During the 2008-2009 school year, changes have been made in the Whitehead RTI program to strengthen curriculum. However, decreases in the Title One budget have also reduced the number of tutors and thus, the ability to service students.

Another Internal Factor contributing to Whitehead's performance is the high quality on going professional development to equip teachers to enable all children to meet Illinois Learning Standards. At the beginning of the 2008-09 school year, the Whitehead Professional Development Committee surveyed certified staff to determine their professional development priorities. In-services have been conducted and will continue to be held throughout the year based upon these

priorities. Title One funds also partially provides a highly qualified Reading Coach who models and teaches literacy strategies to both students and staff.

An additional internal factor contributing to Whitehead's performance is the on-going universal and screening assessments the school utilizes. In 2008-2009 teachers began administering Fountas and Pinnell reading assessments as well as ThinkLink math and reading testing. Results from these assessments will be used to determine the areas of needs for student learning which will guide teacher instruction.

Tutors specifically targeted economically disadvantaged students since this subgroup had not made AYP the year before. Their focus on this group increased their Reading score by eight percentage points and their Math score by two percentage points. This subgroup has increased their performance in Reading by 22 points since 2003 demonstrating remarkable improvement.

A final internal factor affecting Whitehead is its plan for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs to elementary school programs. Whitehead follows the Rockford Public Schools transition plan for IFSP services from birth-3 early intervention programs. This plan is described in length by the district. Additionally, Whitehead helps to ease the transition of its Kindergartners in several ways. First, Kindergarten students are invited to a special Kindergarten Round Up in August before school starts. Parents and their kindergarten students have the opportunity to meet their classroom teacher and learn about program expectations even before the first school day. Kindergarten teachers generally write letters to all of their students, and some even make home visits, in addition to the round up activity. Parents who miss the round up have another opportunity to meet with Kindergarten teachers at Open House. Finally, the principal sends a special letter home specifically to Kindergarten parents and has additional information on the school website to assist pre-school and first time parents in the transition to elementary school.

#### External Factors

As with any school, there are a multitude of external factors that effect student achievement at Whitehead Elementary School. According to Jones and Hagar (The Academic Achievement Gap: Where is the Sense of Urgency?, Missouri Youth Initiative, 2007) external student factors are responsible for 75 to 80% of a student's achievement. Therefore, Whitehead's staff recognizes that they must concentrate on the 20% of factors they control. However, since external factors are to be addressed in this section, there are three primary factors Whitehead has identified affecting our achievement:

1. In the past nine years, Whitehead's economically disadvantaged percentage has increased 58 points from 19.2% in 1999 to 77% in 2008. This has had considerable impact on our school.
2. Between 2001 and 2007, the school had a chronic truancy rate considerably higher than the state average. Although this too has been targeted, and has showed incredible improvement going from 5.7% in 2007 to .5% in 2008 moving below the state average for the first time in seven years. The value that parents place on education is an external factor reflected in the truancy rate. Whitehead hopes that the chronic truancy rate will continue to decline in the future.
3. Larger than district average class sizes have also impacted Whitehead.
4. Increased mobility also hurt the school's achievement as a whole and the Black subgroup. Mobility more than doubled at Whitehead in 2008 from 12.2% to 28.4%. A U.S. General Accounting Office 1994 national study of 3rd grade students found "...that frequent school changes were associated with a host of problems, including nutrition and health problems, below-grade-level reading scores, and retention in grade." (**Student Mobility and Academic Achievement, ERIC Digest**, Russell W. Rumberger). Another 1999 Rumberger study in California and quoted in Educational Encyclopedia State University.com found "...school personnel characterized the overall affects of student mobility at the school level as a "chaos" factor that affects classroom learning activities, teacher morale, and administrative burdens—all of which can influence the learning and achievement of all students in the school. Teachers were very adamant about

how disruptive and difficult it is to teach in classrooms with constant student turnover. Similarly, a Chicago study by Julia Smith, Bets Ann Smith, and Anthony Byrk found that the pace of instruction was slower in schools with high rates of student mobility. School administrators reported how time-consuming it is to simply process students when they enter and exit a school."

A significant external factor is the rising percentage of economically disadvantaged students both at Whitehead as well as in the district as a whole. In 2008, our economically disadvantaged students reached 77% almost six percentage points above the district average and 36 percentage points above the state average. There is a great body of research indicating the effect economic deprivation has on school achievement. In his 2002 study, *Closing the Illinois' Achievement Gap*, former Illinois State Superintendent Glenn McGee wrote "...a mere 40 of the 915 (4.5%) high poverty elementary schools have had an average of two-thirds of their students meeting state standards over the past three years." This was compared to 72.1% of other elementary schools. Whitehurst 2001 cited Hart and Riley in noting, "The professional families' children at age three actually had a larger recorded vocabulary than the welfare families' parents."

Jones and Hagar wrote "Hart and Riley indicate that children from a lower socio-economic home have experienced about 250,000 utterances in a year. On average, a preschooler from a professional family experienced about 4,000,000 utterances per year. It would appear that this difference in oral language experiences not only begins the school experience at a disadvantage, but also the effect is cumulative over years. McREL trainers indicated that their view of the research indicated that children from a lower socio-economic family experienced a 5,000 word deficit in vocabulary when they enter school."

While poverty presents challenges, and has a predictable impact on school achievement, it is not deterministic. When Whitehead focused on this subgroup in 2008 their achievement rose eight percentage points.

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

Considering that many Economically Disadvantaged and Black students may already enter school linguistically behind, Whitehead will continue to focus its reading interventions particularly on this population. Whitehead Elementary will focus on the factors within our capacity to control. These are the factors described in the internal section. Whitehead will continue to analyze its achievement data and use it in a explicit and systematic way to move us forward. Whitehead is continuing to use Title One funding to provide Response to Intervention tier levels for all students. Response to Intervention will continue to incorporate scientifically proven research based instructional programs such as Trailblazers, Pathfinders, Soar to Success, Making Meaning, Harcourt Collections/Trophies, Six Trait Writing, and specific reading strategies to enhance understanding.

**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?

Key factors explain why deficiencies in student achievement occur. In Whitehead's case, the key factor we must address is why students in our Black subgroup were reading in 2008 at 47.2% proficient - 15.3 points below the state's required proficiency of 62.5%

In reviewing our data, **Key Factor #1 is poverty negatively impacts all Whitehead students, including the Black student subgroup, placing them linguistically behind when they start school.** While poverty itself is an external factor beyond the school's control, we know that students in poverty start off school significantly behind and will need additional interventions such as those in key factor two to increase their proficiency levels. There are action steps that Whitehead can initiate to improve the achievement of its composite and all subgroups, especially the Black subgroup, in reading.

**Key factor #2 is Black student achievement is negatively impacted by not identifying more students for Tier One and Tier Two literacy intervention.** Last year, this group was not targeted - Whitehead's Economically Disadvantaged subgroup was targeted instead. The Economically Disadvantaged subgroup demonstrated significant progress increasing eight percentage points when they were focused on. Therefore, by targeting the Black student achievement group for reading intervention, their score, too, should increase.

**Key factor #3 is all Whitehead student achievement, including Black student achievement, is negatively impacted by higher than normal student mobility.** Rumberger's research indicates that student mobility is most often associated with students changing residences due to parent's seeking employment and welfare reform. Because student mobility is an external factor beyond the school's control, Whitehead's action plan steps focus more on key factor two which will assist these students.

The following action steps are within the school's capacity to change and control: Tier One literacy block implementation and delivery, data team analysis of

reading data and goal setting, Tier Two and Tier Three literacy instruction and delivery, and use of universal and screening assessment tools such as Think Link and Fountas and Pinnell adopted by the district in the 2008-2009 school year. Student selection for tier intervention is also within our control. Because of the key factors discussed, the Black subgroup will now be focused on for this intervention.

Although 2008-2009 is a baseline for data collection in Think Link and Fountas and Pinnell, the district's universal and screening assessment tools, they will provide critical data in the selection of students for intervention.

A targeted action for school improvement is our Tier One literacy block implementation and delivery since all students in both the composite and subgroups, such as the Black subgroup, receive this instruction for two hours a day.

1st Conclusion for Next Step to meet Adequate Yearly Progress or Safe Harbor: Improve Tier One Reading instruction for composite and all subgroups, especially the Black subgroup.

- Increase professional development to enhance literacy instructional practices that support composite and all subgroups, especially the Black subgroup who do not meet standards
- Increase the efficiency of grade level data teams in assessing, collecting data, analyzing, setting goals, implementation, and monitoring of student reading achievement to increase achievement of composite and all subgroups, especially the Black subgroup.

Another targeted action is Tier Two and Tier Three literacy instruction and delivery which can improve the reading achievement of composite and subgroups, such as the Black subgroup, and was demonstrated with the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup.

2nd Conclusion for Next Step to meet Adequate Yearly Progress or Safe Harbor: Improve Tier Two and Tier Three Reading Response to Intervention instruction for composite and all subgroups especially the Black subgroup.

- Frequent progress monitoring using Think Link to assess student achievement in Tier Two and Three and determine program effectiveness for composite and all subgroups especially the Black subgroup.
- Utilize Title One funding to maximize number of highly qualified reading instructional tutors to deliver Tier Two and Three reading instructional support to all composite and subgroups especially the Black subgroup.
- Focus on the Black subgroup for student selection for Tier Two and Tier Three reading support

**Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies**

Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed
1	Increased ISAT Reading Achievement for composite and all subgroups especially the Black subgroup will make Adequate Yearly Progress or Safe Harbor.	1,

The following deficiencies [not objectives] have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for your school.

1	Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
---	---

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

**Objective: 1**

Increased ISAT Reading Achievement for composite and all subgroups especially the Black subgroup will make Adequate Yearly Progress or Safe Harbor.

**Objective 1 Description:**

Whitehead's 2008 composite Reading Achievement was at 59.4% Meets/Exceeds with 47.2% Meets/Exceeds for Whitehead's Black subgroup. The composite and all subgroups, especially the Black subgroup, will make AYP of at least 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 or make Safe Harbor.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency	
1	Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

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

<b>Objective 1 Title : Increased ISAT Reading Achievement for composite and all subgroups especially the Black subgroup will make Adequate Yearly Progress or Safe Harbor.</b>						
	<b>Strategies and Activities</b>	<b>StartDate</b>	<b>EndDate</b>	<b>TimeLine</b>	<b>Fund Source</b>	<b>Amount</b>
1	Students in the composite and in all subgroups, especially students identified as deficient in reading, will participate in Making Meaning on a regular basis to Meets/Exceeds performance on ISAT.	9/2/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
2	Students in the composite and in all subgroups, especially students identified as deficient in reading, will participate in Guided Reading/Literature Circles to increase reading comprehension as evident in Fountas/Pinnell scores and Meets/Exceeds performance on ISAT.	9/2/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
3	Students in the composite and in all subgroups, especially students identified as deficient in reading, in Tier 2 Reading Instruction meeting 30 minutes a day in groups of 4-5 students using either Soar to Success, Pathfinders, or Trailblazers to increase reading comprehension as evident in Fountas/Pinnell scores and Meets/Exceeds performance on ISAT.	10/6/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Title I	1100000
4	Students in the composite and in all subgroups, especially students identified as deficient in reading, will participate in Tier 3 Reading Instruction meeting 45 minutes a day in groups of 2-3 students using either Soar to Success, Pathfinders, Trailblazers, and elements of Reading Rescue as evident in Fountas/Pinnell scores and Meets/Exceeds performance on ISAT.	10/6/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Title I	110000

	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
5	Students in the composite and in all subgroups especially students identified as deficient in reading will partate in literacy based technological instruction such as Think Link, Study Island, Waterford and literacy websites to increase reading achievement as evident in Fountas/Pinnell scores and Meets/Exceeds performance on ISAT.	10/6/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Title I	3000
6				Before School	Title I	

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

**Objective 1 Title :** Increased ISAT Reading Achievement for composite and all subgroups especially the Black subgroup will make Adequate Yearly Progress or Safe Harbor.

	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
1	School improvement coach will lead staff development in effective data team practices and assist data teams in self-sufficient practices	9/11/2008	6/4/2010	After School	Other	0
2	Reading coach will provide professional development in effective literacy best practice techniques to help reach district reading goals	8/26/2008	6/4/2010	After School	Title I	70000
3	Grade level data teams will meet at least once per month to analyze achievement data, set goals, and plan instruction.	9/11/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
4	Workshop on how to navigate the Illinois Interactive Report Card website in order to analyze data in areas of weakness to aid instructional practices	10/10/2008	10/10/2008	During School	Local Funds	0
5	Workshops on ISAT data analysis given by the school improvement coach for examination of ISAT reading achievement weaknesses.	10/10/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Other	0
6	District held professional development on Fountas and Pinnell literacy assessment implementation	8/22/2008	8/22/2008	During School	Local Funds	0
7	District held and building level professional development on Think Link data analysis and instructional strategies	11/1/2008	6/4/2010	Before School	Title I	

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

**Objective 1 Title :** Increased ISAT Reading Achievement for composite and all subgroups especially the Black subgroup will make Adequate Yearly Progress or Safe Harbor.

	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
1	Whitehead teachers will offer grade level reading curriculum nights three times a year providing parents with effective tools to help their own children at home.	12/1/2008	6/4/2010	After School	Title I	2000

	Strategies and Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	Fund Source	Amount
2	Title One Parent Liaison will offer a Book Club for parents to assist them in supporting the reading achievement of their children at home.	9/6/2008	6/4/2010	During School	Title I	15000
3	Principal will plan a parent workshop that will be held prior to the ISAT test presenting test content, format, preparation, and test taking strategies.	2/19/2009	2/18/2010	After School	Title I	200
4	Whitehead will continue a school website, monthly principal newsletter, and classroom newsletters to inform parents of school news and initiatives.	8/1/2008	6/4/2010	After School	Local Funds	5000
5	Whitehead will launch a Read-a-Thon fundraiser to build a new school playground and promote reading achievement with parent and community involvement.	10/15/2008	12/18/2008	After School	Other	30000

### Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 1 Title :** Increased ISAT Reading Achievement for composite and all subgroups especially the Black subgroup will make Adequate Yearly Progress or Safe Harbor.

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

There are multiple stakeholders who will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities supporting this objective: principal, teachers, students, parents, and community leaders.

Teachers will administer a screening assessment, Fountas and Pinnell, to students three times a year. Teachers will also give a universal screening assessment three times a year: Think Link assessments. In addition, teachers will participate in grade level data teams creating common formative assessments using the Think Link assessment programs. As teachers collect the assessment data from these new assessment initiatives adopted in the 2008-09 school year, they will be better equipped to make informed instructional decisions.

Tier Two and Tier Three teachers will also participate in biweekly progress monitoring using the Think Link program. This assessment data will be used to determine whether a change in student intervention placement is needed.

The principal will continue ongoing monitoring of the objective by reviewing data, observation of strategy implementation, and conducting ongoing professional development on how best to use Think Link assessment data.

Students will take ownership of their own achievement by reviewing their own reading progress with their teacher, graphing their progress on specific goals, and reviewing the class/grade level progress towards goal completion.

Parents will be given multiple opportunities to monitor student and school progress towards the success of the objective: to review student report card and achievement data at parent teacher conferences, participate in reading curriculum nights, attend ISAT preparation meeting, and the School Improvement Plan review meeting.

Interested community members could also attend the curriculum nights, ISAT preparation, and School Improvement Plan meetings.

**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
John Ulferts	Principal
Renee Guse	Reading Coach
Joan Tunnell	School Improvement Coach

### 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 of Whitehead Elementary's academic status identification in a language that parents can understand has occurred in several ways.

First, the Rockford Public School District #205 has sent home a letter to all Whitehead Elementary School parents indicating that the school is in Year One State Academic Early Warning. Because Whitehead is a Title One school, all parents were sent home a letter offering school choice.

Second, Whitehead Elementary School has a website which has links to the Illinois Interactive School Report Card website as well as to the Whitehead Elementary School State Report card. In addition, the school's monthly Principal newsletter, the *Chalkdust*, has also featured articles about the school's improvement status. This newsletter is also posted on the website.

Finally, a series of parent meetings will be held to share this School Improvement Plan with parents and to inform them of the school's improvement status. The parent meetings for sharing the School Improvement Plan were held during Parent Teacher Conferences to ensure a larger turn-out. In addition, a Title One Informational Meeting will be held in conjunction with Open House for each year that the School Improvement Plan is in effect. The Title One Informational Meeting will feature several components but will include discussion of the school Title One Parent Compact, scientifically-based researched methods and strategies employed in the school, highly qualified teacher status, ongoing professional development activities planned at the school for the staff and parents aligned to Illinois Learning Standards, how the school attracts high quality, highly qualified teachers, parent involvement possibilities, transition from preschool

to elementary school, explanation of teacher led data teams and how they make decisions regarding academic assessments, Tier support for students experiencing difficulty in mastering state standards, and how federal, state, and local services support the school.

### 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.

Stakeholder involvement has been fostered in the development of this plan in a variety of ways.

First, the entire Whitehead certified staff reviewed assessment data by cohort, subgroup, gender, and grade level, educator data, financial, demographic data, and enrollment data from the Illinois Interactive School Report Card website. The staff also reviewed the School Improvement Template. From there, volunteers to serve on the School Improvement team were recruited. Two staff members - Renee Guse, Reading Coach, and Nick Letsinger, 5th grade teacher - joined Principal John Ulferts on the School Improvement Team. RESPRO funded School Improvement Coach Joan Tunnell assisted in the process. Informally, other RESPRO staff were also invited to look at the initial draft of the plan and offered their suggestions.

Once a draft of the School Improvement Plan was completed it was shared with the Whitehead Elementary School community. Certified and noncertified staff were invited to a School Improvement Plan meeting to share and receive input on the document. Then, a similar meeting was held with parents and interested community stakeholders during conferences. They too were invited to give their input on the plan.

The School Improvement Plan was then submitted to the Rockford Public School Peer Review process. After meeting with approval from this Peer Review, it was submitted to the School Board for Superintendent approval. Then, it was submitted to the Illinois State Board of Education for their certification.

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

	Name	Title
1	John Ulferts	Principal
2	Renee Guse	Reading Coach
3	Nick Letsinger	5th Grade Classroom Teacher
4	Joan Tunnell	RESPRO School Improvement Coach
5	Dave Finley	Parent
6	Frank Djika	Community Member

**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. Whitehead Elementary School will be paired with Hillman Elementary School which failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress for the first time in 2008. Hillman is not yet in Academic Early Warning 1 as is Whitehead, but is only one year away from it. Hillman is also approximately the same size as Whitehead and is in the same general neighborhood. 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 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 (Rtl) 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 RESPRO has provided data and SIP team coaching, technical assistance, and offers numerous staff development opportunities. The RESPRO 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 staff have historically provided assistance to school personnel to implement the SIP. We expect the same will continue during the implementation of this plan.

Additionally, specific to Whitehead Elementary School, RESPRO has provided Joan Tunnell, a School Improvement Coach, to assist in the development of this plan. Additionally, the local RESPRO offered training in the School Improvement Plan process. The RESPRO staff also offered us a facility and technology to utilize in writing the plan. Then, the RESPRO offered their expertise in reviewing a draft of the plan and offered their suggestions for revision which were incorporated in the plan. Finally, ISBE was given the responsibility of approving the 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.

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
1	Anita Hughes	District Reading Coordinator
2	Lori Whitman	RESPRO consultant
3	Jen Wood	RESPRO consultant

---

### 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?
Yes	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?
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**

**Comprehensive data analysis, identification of factors within the school’s capacity to change and a corresponding action plan, supported by research and a clear monitoring process is evident in your well-written School Improvement Plan.**

<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?
DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES	
Yes	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?
NA	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	
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?
APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD	
Yes	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.

#### PART II - COMMENTS

**Whitehead's School Improvement Plan clearly involves all stakeholders in its development and interpretation. The plan is well developed and thoughtful and should have a powerful impact on student performance.**

**GREEN Language: Implementation**

*January 6, 2009*

**The Whitehead Elementary School improvement plan is recommended for implementation with the assistance of your area RESPRO. No further updates to your improvement plan are necessary at this time. If you choose to revise or update your plan, you may request that your area RESPRO update the ISBE monitoring prompt as this is the official state monitoring record.**