

JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL

Restructuring Plan 2007

Board Approval Date:	4/22/2008
Plan Submission Date & Ref No:	4/23/2008 - RES07 - 002062
ISBE Monitoring Date:	ISBE Monitoring Not Started.

JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

School & District Information

RCDTS Code Number : 041012050252041

District Name: ROCKFORD SD 205

School Name : JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL

Superintendent: Mrs. Linda Hernandez

Principal :Prudence Court

District Address: 201 S MADISON ST

School Address : 2603 CLOVER AVE

City/State/Zip : ROCKFORD, IL 61104

City/State/Zip : ROCKFORD, IL 61102

District Phone : (815) 966-3101

School Phone : (815) 966-3285

District Email :

School Email : courtp@rps205.com

Is this for a Title I School? Yes

JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 1 - Adequate Yearly Progress Report for 2007

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	Restructuring
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2007-08 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status

	Percent Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
Student Groups	%	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		55.0			55.0			90.0		72.0	
All	99.5	Yes	99.5	Yes	41.5		No	49.1		Yes	94.0	Yes		
White														
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	30.0	42.6	No	36.7		No	94.0			
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	50.7		Yes	56.0		Yes				
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial Ethnic														
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes										
Students with Disabilities														
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	40.1	46.4	No	48.1		No	94.0			

JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 2 - Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives Report for 2007

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

JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 3 - School Information

Basic Information	2001 - 2002	2002 - 2003	2003 - 2004	2004 - 2005	2005 - 2006	2006 - 2007
Attendance Rate (%)	94.3	94.0	93.3	93.4	93.3	94.0
Truancy rate (%)	4.5	4.4	11.3	5.9	8.1	2.3
Mobility rate (%)	14.3	26.3	25.8	31.7	17.6	13.3
Expulsion rate (%)						
Retention rate, if applicable (%)						
HS graduation rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
HS dropout rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Teachers working out-of-field (#)						
Paraprofessionals in Title I funded programs and/or schools designated as school-wide with less than 2 years of training and/or education degree (#)						
School Population (#)	359	366	394	358	400	425
Economically disadvantaged (%)	86.6	91.8	76.1	86.9	92.0	92.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) (%)	35.7	29.0	33.5	36.0	40.8	43.5
Students with disabilities (%)						
White, non-Hispanic (%)	30.4	24.6	22.3	18.2	14.0	12.0
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	28.7	33.9	33.5	34.6	32.5	31.3
Hispanic (%)	40.1	41.0	43.9	46.9	53.3	55.1
Native American or Alaskan Native (%)	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 4 - Race/Ethnicity

	Year	White(%)	Black(%)	Hispanic(%)	Asian(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
S C H O O L	2001	38.3	26.9	33.5	-	1.2	-
	2002	30.4	28.7	40.1	-	0.8	-
	2003	24.6	33.9	41.0	-	0.5	-
	2004	22.3	33.5	43.9	-	0.3	-
	2005	18.2	34.6	46.9	-	0.3	-
	2006	14.0	32.5	53.3	-	-	0.3
	2007	12.0	31.3	55.1	-	-	1.6
D I S T R I C T	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
S T A T E	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

JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 5 - Educational Environment

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income(%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truancy (%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2001	29.6	80.5	100.0	92.8	20.0	12.0	3.6	-	-
	2002	35.7	86.6	100.0	94.3	14.3	17.0	4.5	-	-
	2003	29.0	91.8	100.0	94.0	26.3	17.0	4.4	-	-
	2004	33.5	76.1	100.0	93.3	25.8	47.0	11.3	-	-
	2005	36.0	86.9	100.0	93.4	31.7	21.0	5.9	-	-
	2006	40.8	92.0	100.0	93.3	17.6	34.0	8.1	-	-
	2007	43.5	92.7	100.0	94.0	13.3	10.0	2.3	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2001	9.0	53.3	99.5	91.8	16.6	2,562.0	10.3	6.7	73.9
	2002	10.3	56.9	95.7	93.1	16.8	2,248.0	8.3	6.0	74.9
	2003	6.5	56.9	96.3	92.8	16.8	1,717.0	6.2	7.8	81.3
	2004	12.2	55.1	99.8	92.7	19.0	2,306.0	8.3	6.6	69.4
	2005	12.0	57.6	98.2	91.5	20.9	2,436.0	9.6	8.9	73.1
	2006	12.0	65.7	99.0	92.3	18.1	2,626.0	9.4	3.0	71.0
	2007	12.3	68.4	91.9	92.6	15.0	1,868.0	6.6	3.2	75.0
S T A T E	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813.0	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225.0	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.9	94.0	16.4	37,525.0	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764.0	2.1	4.6	86.5
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152.0	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836.0	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056.0	2.5	3.5	85.9

JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 6 - Enrollment Trends

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2001	334	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	359	73	42	55	-	-	-
	2003	366	60	66	43	-	-	-
	2004	394	59	61	65	-	-	-
	2005	358	73	47	54	-	-	-
	2006	400	70	69	43	-	-	-
	2007	425	65	70	71	-	-	-
D I S T R I C T	2001	26,502	2,094	2,177	2,242	1,966	2,002	1,170
	2002	26,674	2,158	2,121	2,118	2,165	1,929	1,506
	2003	27,330	2,109	2,200	2,149	2,221	2,124	1,531
	2004	27,576	2,083	2,120	2,172	2,227	2,164	1,552
	2005	27,464	2,061	2,107	2,102	2,105	2,141	1,483
	2006	27,456	2,097	2,055	2,053	2,094	2,044	1,443
	2007	27,787	2,197	2,100	2,092	2,072	2,137	1,541
S T A T E	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2,044,539	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	2,060,048	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	2,062,912	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	2,075,277	136,123	139,619	146,935	153,566	154,856	-
	2007	2,077,856	-	-	-	-	-	-

JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 7 - Educator Data

	Year	Total Tchr FTE (N)	Avg. Tchr Exp.(Yrs)	Avg. Teacher Sal (\$)	Tchrs w/Bach.Deg (%)	Tchrs w/Mast.Deg (%)	Pupil-Tchr Ratio (EI)	Pupil-Tchr Ratio (HS)	Emgncy or Prvsl Creds(%)	Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
D I S T R I C T	2001	1,765.0	17.3	50,543	33.9	66.0	18.6	21.8	-	-
	2002	1,758.0	17.2	50,685	34.0	65.9	19.0	21.8	3.3	1.4
	2003	1,750.0	17.2	52,459	33.8	66.1	19.8	22.7	3.1	2.0
	2004	1,700.0	17.7	56,305	30.8	69.1	19.2	23.9	-	2.9
	2005	1,635.0	18.5	62,144	27.7	72.3	20.3	24.6	2.9	0.6
	2006	1,721.0	15.4	58,512	34.3	65.7	19.3	22.1	2.9	4.7
	2007	1,766.0	15.4	60,203	35.2	64.8	19.2	22.3	2.2	2.6
S T A T E	2001	125,735.0	14.5	47,929	53.8	46.0	19.1	18.0	-	-
	2002	126,544.0	14.2	49,702	53.9	46.0	19.1	18.3	2.4	2.3
	2003	129,068.0	13.9	51,672	53.9	46.0	18.4	18.2	2.5	2.1
	2004	125,702.0	13.8	54,446	51.3	48.6	19.4	18.8	1.7	1.8
	2005	128,079.0	13.6	55,558	50.1	49.1	18.9	18.4	1.9	1.9
	2006	127,010.0	13.0	56,685	49.3	50.6	19.1	18.9	1.6	1.4
	2007	127,010.0	12.9	58,275	47.6	52.3	18.8	18.8	1.5	3.2

Note: Hyphens in the table indicate that data are not relevant for your plan.

JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 8a - Assessment Data (Reading)

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading By Grades 3-5-8, 2002-2007

Groups	Grade 3 - Reading					Grade 5 - Reading					Grade 8 - Reading				
	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07
All	-	20.0	46.9	38.0	25.0	28.5	38.5	50.0	27.8	37.3	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	36.4	63.2	46.6	-	41.7	46.6	-	-	47.1	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	6.7	33.4	39.1	18.2	28.6	41.7	50.0	20.0	21.7	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	27.3	-	-	23.1	53.3	31.3	47.3	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multi-racial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students w/Disabilities	-	10.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.1	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	21.9	42.2	39.6	25.0	23.5	36.2	40.0	31.3	35.2	-	-	-	-	-

JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 8a - Assessment Data (Reading)

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading all Grades 2006-2007

Groups	Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Grade 8	
	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007
All	38.0	25.0	43.6	43.9	27.8	37.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	46.6	-	60.0	41.7	-	47.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	39.1	18.2	34.8	52.0	20.0	21.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	27.3	-	41.2	41.2	31.3	47.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	10.0	-	-	9.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	39.6	25.0	40.4	42.6	31.3	35.2	-	-	-	-	-	-

JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 8a - Assessment Data (Mathematics)

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics By Grades 3-5-8, 2002-2007

Groups	Grade 3 - Mathematics					Grade 5 - Mathematics					Grade 8 - Mathematics				
	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07
All	-	45.7	53.0	60.8	32.5	46.3	55.7	61.9	55.6	44.1	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	72.7	57.9	62.6	-	66.6	66.7	-	-	58.8	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	33.3	50.0	60.9	27.3	42.9	50.0	61.2	53.3	26.1	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	63.6	-	-	53.9	66.6	56.3	52.7	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multi-racial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students w/Disabilities	-	40.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18.2	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	43.8	53.4	63.2	33.3	48.5	53.2	57.1	59.4	42.6	-	-	-	-	-

JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 8a - Assessment Data (Mathematics)

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics all Grades 2006-2007

Groups	Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Grade 8	
	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007
All	60.8	32.5	61.8	56.2	55.6	44.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	62.6	-	60.0	58.3	-	58.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	60.9	27.3	52.1	52.0	53.3	26.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	63.6	-	76.5	64.7	56.3	52.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	20.0	-	-	18.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	63.2	33.3	59.6	55.6	59.4	42.6	-	-	-	-	-	-

JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section II-A Plan Activities - Restructuring Options

Plan Requirements - District and school planners should consider what has occurred in a school that has brought it to restructuring. The restructuring plan should take into account the actions initiated in prior years. The actions required under the restructuring plan may be seen as deeper, broader, or more targeted to meet identified needs. Each restructuring plan must be submitted to ISBE with the approval of the local board no later than six months after the district's receipt of formal notification regarding the school's AYP status.

2.replacing all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school's inability to make AYP,

4.implementing any other major restructuring of the school's governance that makes fundamental reform in:

- i. governance and management, and/or

JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section II-B Plan Activities - Plan Description

A. Restructuring Plan Description

Describe the plan for restructuring the school.

Rockford Public Schools, District 205, has embarked on a multi-faced, multi-year reformation project to create more effective schools. The District is committed to restructuring curricula, staff, programming, professional development, and resource allocations to ensure all schools meet or exceed achievement targets established by the Illini Plan to meet NCLB mandates (annual AYP targets) and to foster personal development for all students in 2008, 2009, and beyond. Rockford Public Schools has created District-wide, tier-of-school level, and building level strategies, activities, and programming changes to create more positive and productive schools. Our Restructuring Plan for Lathrop is crafted to meet District goals within the culture, climate, and specific needs of the school.

Lathrop School failed to meet the 2007 AYP target for Reading in the following groups: All, Black, and Economically Disadvantaged. The school failed to meet the Mathematics target with the Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. Lathrop's ISAT scores have fluctuated significantly during the past five years. There is no discernible trend in the achievement data.

Lathrop's demographic data has changed considerably during the past five years. The school had its highest Free and Reduced Lunch count in 2007. The Economically Disadvantaged subgroup has ranged from a low of 76.1% to the current high of 92.7%. The challenges associated with reaching the AYP targets for children in poverty are a unifying theme for Lathrop. Dr. Ruby Payne's work, *A Framework for Understanding Poverty*, offers insight on the issue. The school started the decade with the following representation among the subgroups: White 38.3%, Black 26.9%, and Hispanic at 33.5%. In 2007, the percentages had changed, respectively, to: 12.0%, 31.3%, and 55.1%

Lathrop's Principal was replaced in 2006; the principal is now Ms. Prudy Court. 85% of the teaching staff has been changed during the past three years. All faculty members are now Highly Qualified under NCLB parameters.

We believe the committed principal and faculty will be able to effectively implement the broad-ranging reforms contained within this plan at Lathrop. The widespread deficits in student achievement argue that a comprehensive reform plan is appropriate.

All previously applied measures, including Choice, SES, etc. will continue at Lathrop until the school meets the AYP targets for at least two years. The school staff members, utilizing their Data Teams and Data Coach from the RESPRO, have also detailed specific strategies that are contained within their School Improvement Plan.

It is significant to note that the District's reformation plan, called, "Steps to Restructured Success," believes improving each school and the

District is a long-range process. There are no quick fixes. Substantive school reform takes at least three to five years of intensive intervention from expert practitioners (Guiding Principles . . . Research-Based Solutions for 21st Century Schools, 2003). Our elementary schools are in the 4th year of reform efforts and have seen District-wide averages on the ISAT increase in Reading from 45% meet/exceeds to 57% and from 60% meet/exceeds in Mathematics to 75%. Our middle schools are in the third year and have seen District-wide averages on the ISAT increase in Reading from 49% meet/exceeds to 63% and from 37% meet/exceeds in Mathematics to 65%. Our high schools are in the first year of the reforms intended to alter their composition, practices, and culture. We are making substantial progress across the District, with most schools making double digit gains in student achievement. We believe these gains will continue as better prepared students matriculate through the entire system and our reforms take deep root in the culture and climate of each school, the District, and our community.

Rockford Public Schools is providing a two-tier administrative professional development program for its administrators in FY2008. One tier of programming this year has been an Administrators Academy series, which has provided inservice on legal requirements, RPS205 policies and procedures, and various student services. The goal of the AA series has been to provide workable knowledge on a range of topics to daily practitioners in our schools. The second tier of programming has been with principals at tier-level meetings. Curriculum Coordinators and Supervisors have provided training to principals at their monthly meetings.

The District is changing to a single-tier professional development plan in FY2009 to broaden the reach of Curriculum Coordinators and Supervisors' expert training in their curricular areas. The new program will be entitled Leadership Seminars and will feature major curriculum presentations to tier-level (elementary, middle, and high) administrators five times during the school year. This change in curriculum presentations from FY2008 will increase the knowledge of approximately 130 administrators versus the 52 who now receive the training. It is expected that as all administrators become better versed in the curricular areas, they will be better able to assist and evaluate teachers in their instructional efficacy, which in turn should lead to higher student achievement. School principals will be trained and/or updated in management and procedural issues at their monthly, tier-level meetings.

Rockford Public Schools has partnered with our RESPRO to provide high quality, research-based professional development for its administrators led by consultants from the Center for Performance Assessment, now called the Leadership and Learning Center. In 2006, 2007, and 2008, Doug Reeves, Larry Ainsworth, and other consultants have led development activities for District administrators in Instruction Strategies, Assessment Strategies (ILS-based), and Data Teams, and formed Leadership Cadres, which focused on change leadership, implementation of the strategies and data-driven decision-making.

The CPA/LLC training provided, and will continue to provide, a common vocabulary, base knowledge in school improvement and expert analysis for effective implementation on the several facets of school reform presented. The training continues through FY2008. The RESPRO and District leadership are awaiting notification of the FY2009 budget before revising our jointly-produced administrative professional development plan.

Rockford Public Schools, in 2008, is in the third year of a four-year plan to restructure all elementary schools. These District-wide, tier-specific changes address Response to Intervention, English Language Arts, Social Studies, Mathematics, and Student Assignment. Each of the changes have been contemplated and/or implemented to provide better vertical articulation of curriculum, greater Standards acquisition by students through tighter alignment with ILS, increased demonstration of usable skills through inter-disciplinary strategy usage, and improved development opportunities through greater connectivity between students and families and their schools.

In 2007, a group of community members, led by two principals, studied current student assignment practices (parent/guardian choice) and developed a student assignment process based on zones. The Board of Education reviewed the proposal and was unable to address all unknown elements within a short timeframe and decided to delay adoption. The student assignment process will be brought before the BOE in April 2008 for further study and possible implementation of zoned attendance centers for August 2009.

It is believed that zoned attendance centers for elementary students will improve student achievement and development due to the following factors:

- Instructional organization is determined by student need, not the current choice system
- Manages transiency issues at the zone and school level
- Facilitates long term planning with information from the Operations and Student Services offices, as opposed to the current one-year focus
- Allows for schools to adjust to enrollment peaks at grade levels, rather than the current strand approach that is inflexible
- Allows schools to tailor services and programs to particular community needs
- Allows support services to follow families through feeder patterns
- Bus ride times should decrease, resulting in better use of time and fewer disciplinary referrals
- Supports parental involvement by creating common learning communities within contained geographical areas
- Mobile and new residents can relocate with confidence about school assignment and build positive relationships
- Builds parental commitment on facts, not perceptions
- Parents/guardians and students can contact other like stakeholders in an easier, more direct way than the current city-wide choice system
- Promotes long range investment and commitment to the child's schools
- Unites community groups with common missions and focuses resources
- Establishes the school as a "center" for community activities and growth

Parents/guardians would still be afforded some choices for their child's education through NCLB transfers and possible enrollment in Citywide Schools of Choice, which are sometimes referred to as Magnet Schools. The Citywide Schools of Choice for elementary education are: Barbour (Spanish Language Immersion program), Montessori (PreK-6 program using the Maria Montessori method), and Washington (Gifted program).

Our students have shown the greatest challenge in meeting Reading benchmarks, as measured on the ISAT. The vast majority of our students meet/exceed AYP Targets in mathematics. To better assist students in Reading, we have restructured our English Language Arts

curriculum, adopted different assessment tools, revamped our Report Cards to parents, and will be teaching Reading strategies in Social Studies classes starting in FY2009. We believe these various activities have started to make a positive impact and will enable students to meet AYP Targets as more interventions and inter-disciplinary time augments ELA class periods' teaching.

In 2006, we adopted On the Mark as our common assessment tool for elementary reading classes. Teachers utilized the assessment to obtain greater insight into each student's specific need(s), better communicate to parents as to how they could assist their child learn more, and re-group students into the most appropriate instructional level. In 2007, a team of educators revised the number of assessments utilized from OTM to lessen the time effects of testing while gaining much of the data needed to accurately meet students' needs. A team, organized by Anita Hughes and Karen Ruffner, led by Marcia Strothoff continue to analyze the most effective packet of assessments.

In 2006, we added three (3) intervention levels to our Reading program. Soar to Success 3, 4, and 5 curricula were purchased and implemented with students who were one to three years below grade level in reading. In 2007, we added the Early Success intervention curriculum to meet the needs of students who scored below the Soar to Success levels. These four additional intervention curricula have started affecting student achievement levels as evidenced by District TIE and ISAT scores (composite).

In the winter/spring of 2008, District administrators began to research and finalize the selection of a Universal Screening Tool to use for the implementation of the Response to Intervention pedagogical framework. It is anticipated that select schools in the District will begin with initial implementation of the RTI model in 2009. This shift to RTI will produce quicker and better intervention services to all students, and should assist students who have or obtain an IEP to an even greater degree as there will not be the lag between identification and service that now exists in law.

In the fall of 2007, a team of educators began to research literacy strategy-based Social Studies textbooks, under the leadership of Kathy Cassioppi, Social Studies Curriculum Coordinator, with assistance from Anita Hughes, Elementary Reading Coordinator. A new series from Houghton Mifflin was selected and purchased in winter of 2008. Staff development activities will be conducted in summer 2008, and the new series utilized beginning August 2008. We believe using common literacy strategies across another curricular area will assist all students master the strategies and improve their skills in reading through more experiences with each one (Marzano, et al.).

These reforms in English Language Arts build upon each other and are common to all of our elementary schools. We expect our reading scores to continue to increase across all grade levels and subgroups due to this substantive restructuring of content, sequence, and delivery.

We have been using Everyday Math as our core text resource in mathematics for fourteen years. We have seen scores increase steadily over time and our composite scores have increased almost 15% over the past four years, to 75%. To continue our gains, the District is creating a website for parents to use with their students at home. The site should be fully operation in the 2008-2009 school year. Research has begun on utilizing various media (video, DVD, etc.) to allow parents to view "Parent Night Presentations" at a place and time of their

choosing. It is believed that more parents will be active participants in supporting the math curriculum if we can transcend time and space barriers (Schmitt, Expanding the Base Committee, 2008).

We have adopted the Third Revision of the Everyday Math series in February 2008 for usage starting in August 2008. Sue Mainville, Elementary Math Coordinator, will organize professional development activities to occur in summer 2008 to ensure a seamless and effective implementation of the revised series.

We believe the increase in composite math scores will continue unabated due to our professional development, adoption of the more-tightly-aligned-to-ILS Third Edition of Everyday Math, and involvement of parents/guardians. These District-wide reforms are augmented by building-specific activities and strategies.

Each school in any Restructuring phase will be an active participant in a Behavior and Development Task Force during the summer of 2008. Dr. John Wessels in his seminal work, Teaching and Enforcing Positive and Productive Behavior (Ten Sigma, 1995), demonstrates the necessity of improving student behavior. His research, replicated by others, suggests that up to 13% more instructional time can be gained through proper student and teacher behaviors. Behavior management in schools with less efficient plans lose up to 18% of instructional time, whereas efficient plans reduce the loss to 5-6% of instructional time. Improving attendance, gaining up to 13% more instructional time, and improving the climate and culture of the school should lead to greater achievement levels.

Rockford's 3 Rs Restructuring Plan F.A.Q.

1. Why form Behavior and Development Task Forces?

Because, what we're doing is not working effectively or efficiently. When one looks at the decade's attendance rate, graduation rate, attendance rate, truancy rate, etc. one sees fluctuations, but not significant, long-term improvements across the District in behavioral issues. Standardized test scores are up significantly in grades 3-8.

2. What will the Task Forces do?

They will survey nearly 200 programs to find the best match(es) for Rockford Public Schools. The input from various stakeholders will assist the Task Forces in selecting the best interventions from cognitive-behavioral methodology plans, instructional plans, school and discipline management plans, and therapeutic plans.

3. What is the rationale for this approach rather than doing what we have always done, e.g. stiffer punishments?

Positive changes are made through connecting students to school, giving them hope in their future, and sharing American ideals and values with them. The solution to large, long-term behavioral problems is found in a holistic, student-centered approach that builds from birth through successful adulthood.

“Today’s large, impersonal high schools were designed for a different era and a different economy, and they are leaving far too many young people behind. We are asking teachers to succeed in a system that is broken. Millions of young people are drifting through high school without adult attention or the relevant, rigorous coursework necessary to keep them engaged. Consequently, students – particularly African Americans and Hispanics – are dropping out at alarming rates.”(High School for the New Millennium, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation)

“Students who are impulsive, are weakly attached to their schools, have little commitment to achieving educational goals, and whose moral beliefs in the validity of conventional rules for behavior are weak are more likely to engage in crime than those who do not possess these characteristics. To the extent that schools can influence these risk factors for criminal activity, they can reduce crime in general.” (Gottfredson, Wilson, and Najaka, p. 149)

Rockford’s 3 Rs Restructuring Plan

Action Plan

1. Select Behavior and Development Task Force Leaders
 - a. Hire 4 elementary principals for 10 additional days in summer 2008 to lead groups of 9 or 10 elementary schools in B&D Task Force work
 - b. Designate 1 middle school principal as leader of the Middle School B & D Task Force
 - c. Designate 1 high school principal as leader of the High School B & D task Force
2. Form Task Forces (to consist of administrators, parents/guardians, teachers, and interested community members) in June 2008
3. Research relevant programs and strategies to increase students’ connectedness to school, perceptions of relevancy between schools’ lessons and life, and improve school climate and culture
4. Make recommendations to Education Committee and/or Board of Education in August or September 2008
5. Implement programs as expediently as possible
6. Track relevant data for first semester FY2009
7. Report to Board of Education in January 2009
8. Track relevant data for second semester FY2009
9. Report to Board of Education in June 2009

Rockford’s 3 Rs Restructuring Plan

READY for School

- Prepared with materials
- Prepared with right frame of mind
- Prepared with background knowledge
- Prompt

RESPECT

- For oneself
- For others
- For school
- For community

REACHING Higher

- For next grade level
- For next tier level
- For next opportunity
- For college, career, and life

Rockford Public Schools will require a new accountability report at Lathrop, starting in September 2008. This new report, entitled, "Data Dashboard," will be submitted to Linda Hernandez, Superintendent, and/or her designee by each District School in Restructuring phases. The Data Dashboard will monitor the attendance rate, discipline referrals, and proficiency targets in English Language Arts and Mathematics. This brief report will increase accountability and ensure monthly tracking of key performance and development data.

Elementary School Action Plan

Time Period: Activity: Person(s) Responsible: Costs/Source:

Summer 2007 Community Committees research zoned attendance proposals Pam Laughlin and Sue Haney Bauer Supplies covered by Fund 10

August 2007-June 2008 Pilot Standards-based report card, On the Mark used to document grades Building Principals and Assessment

Committee Fund 10

August-October 2007 and August-October 2008 Teacher-Student Goal Setting Conferences: *writing *Making Meaning *Behavior
Classroom teachers none

August 2007-August 2008 Define and develop Response to Intervention. Expand second tier offerings, e.g. Early Success and SOAR 3
Colleen Cyrus, Asst. Supt., and Marcia Strothoff, Asst. Supt. No costs associated with planning and development. Costs will be incurred for implementation.

August 2007- March 2008 Research a literacy-based series for new Social Studies series Kathy Cassioppi, Social Sciences Coordinator \$
540,000 for textbooks, covered by Illinois Textbook Loan Program and Fund 10.

August 2007-June 2008 and August 2008-June 2009 Reading Coaches devote time to working with students identified by RTI Building
Principals, Anita Hughes, and Reading Coaches None

August 2007-June 2008 and August 2008-June 2009 Teachers work to form common assessments and utilize Data Teams to focus
instruction Building Principals, classroom teachers, and Data Team Coaches None

June-August 2008 Develop a plan to better connect students with their schools through various intervention programs. Administrators will
lead Behavior and Development Committees for tier level intervention plans. Administrators selected by the District Cabinet \$15,000, Fund
10

June-August 2008 Multiple development opportunities for staff in Reading, Writing, Special Education, and new Social Studies series
Colleen Cyrus and Marcia Strothoff Various grants cover the cost of stipends and presenters' fees

June – October 2008 Reevaluate Elementary Student Assignment process, final decision by BOE in fall 2008 Linda Hernandez,
Superintendent and designees Supplies to be covered by Fund 10

August 2009-June 2009 Initial implementation activities for Response to Intervention program Colleen Cyrus and Special Education
Administrators All costs to be borne by IDEA grant

August 2009 Implement finalized Student Assignment process Assistant Superintendents and Building Principals none

August 2009-June 2010 Implement refined Response to Intervention plan Colleen Cyrus, Special Education Administrators, and Building
Principals IDEA grant and Fund 10

JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by School Board : 4/22/2008

SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

By submitting this plan on behalf of the district, the district superintendent certifies to the Illinois State Board of Education that all the assurances and information provided in this plan are true and correct and that the improvement plan has been duly approved by the local school board.

Signature of LEA Superintendent

JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

ISBE Monitoring - Part I