

McIntosh Science and Tech Magnet

Restructuring Plan 2008

Board Approval Date	2/10/2009
Plan Submission Date	2/11/2009
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number	041012050252043		
District Name	ROCKFORD SD 205	School Name	MCINTOSH SCIENCE AND TECH MAGNET
Superintendent	LINDA HERNANDEZ	Principal	Deborah D. Osborne
District Address	201 S MADISON ST	School Address	525 N PIERPONT AVE
City/State/Zip	ROCKFORD,IL 61104 2092	City/State/Zip	ROCKFORD,IL,61101 5094
District Telephone#	8159663000 Extn:3101	School Telephone#	8159663275 Extn:0
District Email	hernandl@rps205.com	School Email	osbornd@rps205.com

**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	Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes
2007-08 Federal Improvement Status	restructuring	2007-08 State Improvement Status	academic watch status year 2

Student Groups	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	49.1		No	67.7		Yes	94.2	Yes		
White														
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	38.8	46.2	No	56.5		Yes	93.8			
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities														
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	48.7	52.8	No	66.9		Yes	94.2			

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 (%)	92.8	92.7	93.5	93.8	93.5	93.4	93.5	94.2
Truancy Rate (%)	20.0	1.5	4.3	4.4	4.9	8.8	8.1	2.8
Mobility Rate (%)	24.2	22.3	23.9	21.1	13.1	16.7	17.8	35.5
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	299	300	284	364	471	433	418	388
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	84.3	86.0	86.6	81.9	94.3	87.1	96.4	94.3
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	22.1	22.7	22.9	23.1	25.1	7.2	5.7	6.4
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	39.1	29.3	25.4	20.1	17.2	22.4	23.0	20.4
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	32.4	40.7	44.0	45.1	44.4	51.7	54.1	54.6
Hispanic (%)	27.1	28.3	28.9	33.5	31.8	20.3	17.9	18.6
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	1.3	1.3	1.1	0.5	0.2	-	-	-
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	-	0.3	0.7	0.8	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.3
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	5.9	5.1	4.8	6.2

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

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 4 - Student Race/Ethnicity**

	Year	White(%)	Black(%)	Hispanic(%)	Asian/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
S C H O L	1999	40.6	36.3	21.3	1.2	0.6	-
	2000	40.2	34.7	24.2	0.9	-	-
	2001	39.1	32.4	27.1	1.3	-	-
	2002	29.3	40.7	28.3	1.3	0.3	-
	2003	25.4	44.0	28.9	1.1	0.7	-
	2004	20.1	45.1	33.5	0.5	0.8	-
	2005	17.2	44.4	31.8	0.2	0.4	5.9
	2006	22.4	51.7	20.3	-	0.5	5.1
	2007	23.0	54.1	17.9	-	0.2	4.8
	2008	20.4	54.6	18.6	-	0.3	6.2
D I S T R I C T	1999	55.2	29.6	11.8	3.2	0.2	-
	2000	53.0	30.5	13.1	3.1	0.2	-
	2001	51.0	31.1	14.5	3.1	0.2	-
	2002	49.1	31.5	16.1	3.1	0.2	-
	2003	47.7	31.8	17.2	3.1	0.2	-
	2004	46.0	32.3	18.3	3.2	0.2	-
	2005	44.3	31.0	19.2	3.1	0.1	2.3
	2006	42.5	30.5	20.6	3.1	0.2	3.2
	2007	40.7	30.8	21.5	3.0	0.1	4.0
	2008	39.3	30.3	22.1	3.0	0.1	5.1

McIntosh Science and Tech Magnet

Restructuring Plan 2008

	Year	White(%)	Black(%)	Hispanic(%)	Asian/Pacific Islander(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
S T A T E	1999	62.0	20.8	13.9	3.2	0.2	-
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7	

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

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 5 - Educational Environment**

	Year	LEP(%)	Low Income(%)	Parental Involvement(%)	Attendance(%)	Mobility(%)	Chronic Truants(N)	Chronic Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
S C H O O L	1999	19.6	87.1	99.9	91.6	24.2	8	2.3	-	-
	2000	21.8	81.3	100.0	92.8	19.3	9	2.7	-	-
	2001	22.1	84.3	100.0	92.8	24.2	61	20.0	-	-
	2002	22.7	86.0	100.0	92.7	22.3	5	1.5	-	-
	2003	22.9	86.6	100.0	93.5	23.9	13	4.3	-	-
	2004	23.1	81.9	100.0	93.8	21.1	17	4.4	-	-
	2005	25.1	94.3	100.0	93.5	13.1	23	4.9	-	-
	2006	7.2	87.1	100.0	93.4	16.7	41	8.8	-	-
	2007	5.7	96.4	66.0	93.5	17.8	35	8.1	-	-
2008	6.4	94.3	100.0	94.2	35.5	11	2.8	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	1999	6.9	46.0	96.4	90.8	16.4	2938	11.7	10.9	73.6
	2000	8.2	52.6	97.0	91.4	15.8	2981	11.9	7.4	74.7
	2001	9.0	53.3	99.5	91.8	16.6	2562	10.3	6.7	73.9
	2002	10.3	56.9	95.7	93.1	16.8	2248	8.3	6.0	74.9
	2003	6.5	56.9	96.3	92.8	16.8	1717	6.2	7.8	81.3
	2004	12.2	55.1	99.8	92.7	19.0	2306	8.3	6.6	69.4
	2005	12.0	57.6	98.2	91.5	20.9	2436	9.6	8.9	73.1
	2006	12.0	65.7	99.0	92.3	18.1	2626	9.4	3.0	71.0
	2007	12.3	68.4	91.9	92.6	15.0	1868	6.6	3.2	75.0
2008	13.8	71.5	95.7	92.4	28.4	1624	5.8	2.2	71.8	

McIntosh Science and Tech Magnet

Restructuring Plan 2008

	Year	LEP(%)	Low Income(%)	Parental Involvement(%)	Attendance(%)	Mobility(%)	Chronic Truants(N)	Chronic Truancy(%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate(%)
S T A T E	1999	6.4	36.1	96.1	93.6	18.1	43332	2.3	5.9	81.9
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42813	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.9	94.0	16.4	37525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40764	2.1	4.6	86.5
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49056	2.5	3.5	85.9
2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49858	2.5	4.1	86.5	

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

**Section I A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 6 - Enrollment Trends**

	Year	School(N)	Grade 3(N)	Grade 4(N)	Grade 5(N)	Grade 7(N)	Grade 8(N)	Grade 11(N)
S C H O O L	1999	342	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	326	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	299	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	300	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	284	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	364	92	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	471	89	97	-	-	-	-
	2006	433	74	64	78	-	-	-
	2007	418	73	62	71	-	-	-
2008	388	76	62	61	-	-	-	
D I S T R I C T	1999	26547	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	26436	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	26502	2094	2177	2242	1966	2002	1170
	2002	26674	2158	2121	2118	2165	1929	1506
	2003	27330	2109	2200	2149	2221	2124	1531
	2004	27576	2083	2120	2172	2227	2164	1552
	2005	27464	2061	2107	2102	2105	2141	1483
	2006	27456	2097	2055	2053	2094	2044	1443
	2007	27787	2197	2100	2092	2072	2137	1541
2008	27622	2293	2163	2088	2015	2076	1526	

McIntosh Science and Tech Magnet

Restructuring Plan 2008

	Year	School(N)	Grade 3(N)	Grade 4(N)	Grade 5(N)	Grade 7(N)	Grade 8(N)	Grade 11(N)
S T A T E	1999	1962026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1983991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2007170	164791	161546	162001	151270	148194	123816
	2002	2029821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2044539	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	2060048	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	2062912	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	2075277	136123	139619	146935	153566	154856	-
	2007	2077856	155356	153480	154719	162594	159038	150475
2008	2074167	155578	152895	153347	160039	161310	149710	

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

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 7 - Educator Data, Staff Capacity and Professional Development**

	Year	Total Teacher FTE(N)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary(\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree(%)	Teachers with Master's Degree(%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials(%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers(%)
D I S T R I C T	1999	1662	19	49181	27	73	20	23	-	-
	2000	1691	17	49048	32	68	19	23	-	-
	2001	1765	17	50543	34	66	19	22	-	-
	2002	1758	17	50685	34	66	19	22	3	1
	2003	1750	17	52459	34	66	20	23	3	2
	2004	1700	18	56305	31	69	19	24	-	3
	2005	1635	19	62144	28	72	20	25	3	1
	2006	1721	15	58512	34	66	19	22	3	5
	2007	1766	15	60203	35	65	19	22	2	3
	2008	1833	15	61177	35	65	19	21	2	6
S T A T E	1999	119718	15	45337	53	47	20	18	-	-
	2000	122671	15	45766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125735	15	47929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126544	14	49702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129068	14	51672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125702	14	54446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128079	14	55558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127010	13	56685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127010	13	58275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131488	12	60871	47	53	18	18	1	1

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

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 8a - Assessment Data (Reading)**

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	37.7	42.3	41.6	49.2	39.7	-	-	-	44.9	46.0	53.2	-	-	-	51.8	47.3	52.6
White	-	42.9	53.3	54.5	52.6	-	-	-	-	56.3	61.6	66.6	-	-	-	57.2	70.6	71.4
Black	-	31.0	41.0	32.4	53.1	31.1	-	-	-	37.8	33.3	48.1	-	-	-	37.8	35.9	35.5
Hispanic	-	46.2	33.3	46.7	33.3	63.6	-	-	-	50.0	50.0	42.8	-	-	-	75.0	40.0	66.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	0.0	-	-	-	-	7.7	-	14.3	-	-	-	-	0.0	0.0
Economically Disadvantaged	-	34.3	40.6	38.9	47.6	38.7	-	-	-	44.1	45.0	51.8	-	-	-	52.0	45.6	52.8
	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

McIntosh Science and Tech Magnet

Restructuring Plan 2008

2/11/2009 9:13:34 AM

Page 15 of 26

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	-	61.8	59.1	57.2	78.3	50.0	-	-	-	69.5	74.6	83.9	-	-	-	74.0	74.0	67.8
White	-	61.9	73.3	63.6	79.0	-	-	-	-	75.0	84.6	77.8	-	-	-	80.9	83.3	71.4
Black	-	57.1	51.3	45.9	78.2	35.6	-	-	-	62.2	63.7	81.5	-	-	-	62.2	64.1	58.0
Hispanic	-	75.0	58.3	73.3	73.4	81.8	-	-	-	83.3	85.8	92.9	-	-	-	87.6	90.0	83.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	41.2	-	-	-	-	23.1	-	64.3	-	-	-	-	21.4	20.0
Economically Disadvantaged	-	60.9	57.9	55.6	76.2	46.8	-	-	-	69.1	75.0	82.7	-	-	-	72.6	73.9	67.3
	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

McIntosh Science and Tech Magnet

Restructuring Plan 2008

2/11/2009 9:13:34 AM

Page 17 of 26

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

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.

Restructuring Options - Identify which option(s) the district will initiate with an affected school that does not make AYP for a sixth calculation. Each school restructuring plan must indicate that the district is undertaking one or more of the following actions in the affected school:

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,
 - i. governance and management, and/or

Section II-B Plan Activities - Plan Description

Restructuring Plan - Describe the plan for restructuring the school discussing the rationale for option(s) selected, improvement actions prior to restructuring, progress in achieving AYP, timeline, measures for success and monitoring process.

Rockford Public Schools, District 205, has embarked on a multi-faceted, 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 2009, 2010, 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 McIntosh School is crafted to meet District goals within the culture, climate, and specific needs of the school.

McIntosh School failed to meet the 2008 AYP target for Reading with its All, Black, and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. The Mathematics scores in 2008 met AYP targets in 2008, but will be a challenge in 2009 and 2010 without positive growth in the achievement level. The trend data is positive for McIntosh in Reading scores relative to the All and Economically Disadvantaged groups in the 4th and 5th grade levels, increasing each of the last three years. The Black subgroup achievement level has not demonstrated a trend to date.

McIntosh's demographic data has changed significantly during the past five years. The school had its second highest Free and Reduced Lunch count ever in 2008. The Economically Disadvantaged subgroup has ranged from a low of 81.9% to the current level of 94.3%. The challenges associated with reaching the AYP targets for children in poverty are a unifying theme for McIntosh. Dr. Ruby Payne's work, *A Framework for Understanding Poverty*, offers insight on the issue. The school also saw a marked increase in its mobility rate in 2008, reaching 35.5% from the 17.8% mark set in 2007.

McIntosh is currently served by its fourth principal in as many years. The principal is now Ms. Deborah Osborne. Ms. Osborne's appointment was made for strategic reasons. The 2008-2009 academic year began with a 40% certified staff turnover, mostly done for strategic reasons. Substantial attention and effort has been focused on establishing an effective, supportive learning environment where staff and students can thrive. The ability to maintain this group of highly effective teachers will positively impact student achievement. 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 McIntosh.

All previously applied measures, including Choice, SES, and Extended Day, etc. will continue at McIntosh until the school meets the AYP targets for at least two years. This includes an increase in instructional time for all students, totaling an equivalent of over 14 additional instructional days over the course of the school year. The interventions utilized during this time were designed with staff collaboration. In order to ensure vertical articulation, which has been absent in the past, the extended day interventions will focus on reading. 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 62% and from 60% meet/exceeds in Mathematics to 75%. McIntosh School, in large part due to the administrative changes, has not enjoyed the benefits of the district-wide reforms.

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.

The District has changed its professional development plan in FY2009 to broaden the reach of Curriculum Coordinators and Supervisors' expert training in their curricular areas. The new program is 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 Ms. Osborne, Principal of McIntosh, becomes better versed in the curricular areas, she will be better able to assist and evaluate teachers in their instructional efficacy, which in turn should lead to higher student achievement. The new professional development plan will also afford Ms. Osborne greater collaboration time with her colleagues in schools that have made achievement gains.

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. Starting in 2006, 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. Ms. Osborne is being trained in all of these areas by RPS205 staff and her mentor.

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 FY2010, as noted in the District's 2008-2011 Strategic Plan. The RESPRO and District leadership continue to work within our jointly-produced administrative professional development plan.

Rockford Public Schools, in 2009, is in the fourth year of a five-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 a revised proposal in 2008 and decided to table a decision until 2009. The student assignment process will be brought before the BOE for further study and possible implementation of zoned attendance centers for August 2010.

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 started teaching Reading strategies in Social Studies classes in August 2009 through a new textbook series. 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 2008, we adopted *Fountas and Pinnell* as our common assessment tool for elementary reading classes. Teachers are using 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. While the adoption of this new assessment does not allow longitudinal studies, it is believed that it will provide richer data to teachers.

McIntosh students, along with all RPS205 students, began taking assessments from the Discovery Education Assessments portfolio in 2008. These assessments serve as the Universal Screening Tool for *Response to Intervention* programming, are predictive of ISAT performance, and further assist teachers and tutors in designing effective remediation lessons and/or plans for students. 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 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).

McIntosh School has also adopted the following strategies for improving reading and writing through the use of the Daily 5 management system and the intervention plan designed and implemented during the 2008-2009 academic year. Reading interventions being utilized at McIntosh include: Michael Heggerty, Early Success, Soar to Success, Classworks, and second Guided Reading Groups. Writing interventions being utilized at McIntosh include: Six Trait Writing, Sitton Spelling, and Four Square Writing. The specialists, as well as outside trainers, will be model lessons for staff and support them in helping their students become effective readers and writers. Improvement of critical writing increases student achievement across all content areas (Reeves, 2001).

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 started in summer 2008 and are continuing during the 2008-2009 school year. 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 with the additional specific interventions mentioned for McIntosh. 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 15 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 became fully operation for 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 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 2008-2010 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.

McIntosh School is an active participant in a Behavior and Development Task Force project, which started in August 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.

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.

"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

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 McIntosh, starting in September 2009. This new report, entitled, "Data Dashboard," will be submitted to Linda Hernandez, Superintendent, and/or her designee. 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 2008-June 2009	Pilot Standards-based report card, <i>Fountas and Pinnell</i> used to document grades	Building Principals and Assessment Committee	Fund 10
August-October 2008 and August-October 2009	Teacher-Student Goal Setting Conferences: *Writing *Making Meaning *Behavior	Classroom teachers	none
August 2007-August 2010	Define and develop <i>Response to Intervention</i> . 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

McIntosh Science and Tech Magnet

Restructuring Plan 2008

			and Fund 10.
August 2008-June 2009 and August 2009-June 2010	Reading Coaches devote time to working with students identified by RTI	Building Principals, Anita Hughes, Elementary Reading Coordinator, and Reading Coaches	None
August 2008-June 2009 and August 2009-June 2010	Teachers work to form common assessments and utilize Data Teams to focus instruction	Building Principals, classroom teachers, and Data Team Coaches	None
August 2008 through June 2010	Develop a plan to better connect students with their schools through various intervention programs. Administrators will lead <i>Behavior and Development Committees</i> for tier level intervention plans.	Principal Osborne and grade-level Data Teams	\$5,000, Fund 10
June-August 2008 and June-August 2009	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 2009	Reevaluate Elementary Student Assignment process, final decision by BOE in fall 2009	Linda Hernandez , Superintendent and designees	Supplies to be covered by Fund 10
August 2008-June 2009	Initial design for implementation activities for <i>Response to Intervention</i> program	Colleen Cyrus and Special Education Administrators	All costs to be borne by IDEA grant
August 2010	Implement finalized Student Assignment process	Assistant Superintendents and Building Principals	none
August 2009-June 2010	Implement refined <i>Response to Intervention</i> plan	Colleen Cyrus , Special Education Administrators, and Building Principals	IDEA grant and Fund 10

Section III-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:2/10/2009 12:00:00 AM

By submitting the plan on behalf of the district, the district superintendent certifies to ISBE that all the information provided in the plan is true and correct and that the restructuring plan has been duly approved by the local board. By sending e-mail notification of plan completion from the Submit Your Plan page the plan shall be deemed to be executed by the superintendent on behalf of the district.

Section III-B ISBE Monitoring

RESTRUCTURING DESCRIPTION	
	Does the plan describe an option for restructuring allowed in the law?
	Does the district make the case that the option selected is appropriate for the school?
	Does the plan explain corrective actions (Title I funded schools) or other district improvement strategies implemented at the school that will remain in place or be a part of the restructuring plan?
	Do state assessment data indicate that the school is showing progress from corrective actions? Is the continuation of these actions warranted or reasonable?
	Does the plan provide a timeline for implementing the restructuring option and the corrective actions that precede it?
	Does the plan identify the measures for success associated with the district's actions and restructuring strategy?
	What benchmarks of success are planned to monitor progress of this plan and who is responsible for overseeing the implementation and monitoring of this plan?
APPROVAL DATE OF BOARD	
	This section includes the certification of local board approval and provides ISBE staff the opportunity to reflect on the school improvement plan overall.

RESTRUCTURING PLAN COMMENTS