

Rockford SD 205

District Improvement Plan 2008

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

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number	041012050250000		
District Name	ROCKFORD SD 205	Superintendent	LINDA HERNANDEZ
District Address	201 S MADISON ST	Telephone	8159663000
City/State/Zip	ROCKFORD,IL 61104 2092	Extn:	3101
Email	hernandl@rps205.com		

Is this for a Title I District ? Yes

Is this for a Title III District that did not meet AMAO ? Yes

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

Is this District making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this district been identified for District Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this District making AYP in Reading?	No	2007-08 Federal Improvement Status	corrective action year 2
Is this District making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2007-08 State Improvement Status	academic watch status year 2

	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		62.5			62.5			90.0		75.0	
All	99.7	Yes	99.7	Yes	60.3		No	68.2		Yes	92.4	Yes	71.8	No
White	99.7	Yes	99.7	Yes	72.4		Yes	77.3		Yes				
Black	99.5	Yes	99.5	Yes	46.9	48.3	No	52.1	55.7	No	92.3		66.1	
Hispanic	99.8	Yes	99.8	Yes	54.0	61.8	No	70.5		Yes	94.6		65.5	
Asian/Pacific Islander	99.5	Yes	99.5	Yes	79.1		Yes	85.2		Yes				
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic	99.5	Yes	99.5	Yes	63.4		Yes	72.6		Yes				
LEP	99.8	Yes	99.8	Yes	38.1	60.8	No	67.8		Yes	95.4		54.3	
Students with Disabilities	99.3	Yes	99.3	Yes	24.3	28.4	No	37.8	38.7	No	92.0		63.7	
Economically Disadvantaged	99.6	Yes	99.6	Yes	53.6	57.2	No	63.3		Yes	93.0		65.9	

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**

Is this district meeting Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO)?: No
 English Proficiency Test Type : ACCESS for ELLs
 Minimum Target :

Attaining English Language Proficiency Target	Making Progress in English Target	Criterion 3:AYP-LEP Subgroup						Is this district meeting English Proficiency target?	Yes
		AYP-Participation Rate		AYP-Percent Meeting/Exceeding		AYP-Other Indicators percent			
		Reading	Mathematics	Reading	Mathematics	Attendance	Graduations	Is this district meeting Progress in English Target?	Yes
								Is this district meeting AYP for LEP Subgroup target?	No

ANNUAL MEASURABLE ACHIEVEMENT OBJECTIVES(AMAO) PERFORMANCE					
Criterion 1:Attaining Proficiency			Criterion 2: Making Progress in English		
Total Number of Students Tested	Number Attaining Proficiency	Percent Attaining Proficiency	Total Number of Students Tested	Number Making Progress	Percent Making Progress
		94.1	1965	553	28.1

There are no AMAO Status determinations for AMAO-Attaining Proficiency (Criterion 1) and AMAO-Progress (Criterion 2) if there are less than 30 students tested. A 95% confidence interval was applied to calculations of Criteria 1 and 2.

Criterion 3: Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP for LEP Subgroup)											
Percent Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards						Other Indicators (When Safe Harbor is Applied)	
Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate	Graduation Rate
%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target	Met AYP		
99.8	Yes	99.8	Yes	38.1	60.8	No	67.8		Yes	95.4	54.3

Three Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for LEP Subgroup.

1. At least 95.0% tested for Reading and Mathematics for the LEP Subgroup. If the current year's participation rates are less than 95%, the participation rate for AYP will be considered sufficient if the average of the current year and the preceding year is at least 95%, or if the average of the current year and the two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% but 'Met AYP' is 'Yes', it means the 95% condition was met by averaging.

2. At least 55.0% Meeting/Exceeding Standards for Reading and Mathematics for the LEP subgroup. For LEP subgroup under the 55.0% Meeting/Exceeding requirement, a 95% confidence interval has been applied; or meet Safe Harbor requirements.

3. At least 90.0% Attendance Rate for elementary school districts or at least 72.0% Graduation Rate for high school districts. Unit districts must meet both criteria.

AYP for LEP subgroup includes only students enrolled as of 5/1/06.

Safe Harbor Targets of 55.0% or above are not printed

LEP Subgroups with fewer than 45 students are not reported. Safe harbor only applies to subgroups. 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 school districts, graduation rate for high school districts, and attendance and graduation rates for unit school districts) for the subgroup. Safe harbor allows school districts an alternate method to meet subgroup minimum targets on achievement.

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

District Information								
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Attendance Rate (%)	91.8	93.1	92.8	92.7	91.5	92.3	92.6	92.4
Truancy Rate (%)	10.3	8.3	6.2	8.3	9.6	9.4	6.6	5.8
Mobility Rate (%)	16.6	16.8	16.8	19.0	20.9	18.1	15.0	28.4
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	73.9	74.9	81.3	69.4	73.1	71.0	75.0	71.8
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	6.7	6.0	7.8	6.6	8.9	3.0	3.2	2.2
District Population (#)	26502	26674	27330	27576	27464	27456	27787	27622
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	53.3	56.9	56.9	55.1	57.6	65.7	68.4	71.5
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	9.0	10.3	6.5	12.2	12.0	12.0	12.3	13.8
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	51.0	49.1	47.7	46.0	44.3	42.5	40.7	39.3
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	31.1	31.5	31.8	32.3	31.0	30.5	30.8	30.3
Hispanic (%)	14.5	16.1	17.2	18.3	19.2	20.6	21.5	22.1
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.0
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	2.3	3.2	4.0	5.1

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(%)
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
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(%)
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
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)
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
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	45.1	50.8	52.4	56.0	55.7	55.8	-	-	-	60.2	58.0	58.3	45.8	43.9	49.5	55.8	57.0	60.6
White	58.7	61.2	64.9	66.8	66.2	71.8	-	-	-	72.6	68.8	69.9	60.1	56.5	63.2	67.6	71.4	73.2
Black	26.9	34.3	34.6	40.9	40.6	41.9	-	-	-	42.0	40.2	44.8	27.1	28.5	31.8	36.0	38.3	46.5
Hispanic	41.5	49.2	50.4	52.4	53.4	47.1	-	-	-	58.7	60.7	54.0	35.3	41.0	44.5	57.1	55.5	53.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	77.8	80.7	77.2	84.9	72.9	78.3	-	-	-	86.5	86.3	76.8	73.2	63.6	78.2	81.5	79.2	83.3
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	45.2	55.9	61.6	55.8	-	-	-	57.3	59.8	61.1	-	-	52.1	55.1	48.4	66.3
LEP	61.5	72.7	53.0	85.7	-	29.9	-	-	-	-	-	36.3	20.8	25.6	23.0	69.2	-	26.8
Students with Disabilities	16.3	14.9	16.9	19.0	19.3	19.4	-	-	-	15.5	19.2	19.4	12.6	12.1	12.7	12.8	12.1	19.2
Economically Disadvantaged	37.3	42.8	44.1	49.2	48.1	48.5	-	-	-	52.6	51.3	52.1	34.3	33.8	40.4	47.8	48.4	53.7
	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	-	-	-	60.6	61.4	67.3	-	-	-	59.4	59.4	64.6	43.9	49.9	59.2	69.2	71.2	68.9
White	-	-	-	73.3	75.0	79.7	-	-	-	73.7	71.3	75.9	58.0	64.8	73.7	80.5	82.2	80.8
Black	-	-	-	44.5	44.9	53.6	-	-	-	43.3	45.0	51.9	26.4	29.9	42.5	55.1	58.8	56.4
Hispanic	-	-	-	59.6	54.6	60.6	-	-	-	55.1	55.4	59.3	30.9	40.0	49.4	60.8	67.6	64.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	77.6	91.9	91.7	-	-	-	72.4	83.3	82.1	69.8	64.9	78.1	90.0	79.7	83.1
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	56.9	68.3	72.4	-	-	-	68.7	69.4	66.3	-	-	56.3	81.5	87.9	69.2
LEP	-	-	-	30.6	18.6	33.3	-	-	-	23.5	25.9	25.8	0.0	5.6	0.0	31.0	39.4	26.8

Rockford SD 205

District Improvement Plan 2008

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	17.6	19.1	23.4	-	-	-	18.5	14.3	20.9	12.8	10.5	21.3	27.2	29.0	21.2
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	53.3	54.2	60.5	-	-	-	51.5	53.4	58.5	31.2	37.6	49.5	61.8	65.5	62.3
PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grade 11																		
Groups	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008												
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5												
All	43.9	49.9	59.2	69.2	71.2	68.9												
White	58.0	64.8	73.7	80.5	82.2	80.8												
Black	26.4	29.9	42.5	55.1	58.8	56.4												
Hispanic	30.9	40.0	49.4	60.8	67.6	64.6												
Asian/Pacific Islander	69.8	64.9	78.1	90.0	79.7	83.1												
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-												
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	56.3	81.5	87.9	69.2												
LEP	0.0	5.6	0.0	31.0	39.4	26.8												
Students with Disabilities	12.8	10.5	21.3	27.2	29.0	21.2												
Economically Disadvantaged	31.2	37.6	49.5	61.8	65.5	62.3												

**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	60.2	69.4	67.5	77.1	75.0	74.8	-	-	-	73.7	76.5	78.6	55.9	56.5	59.8	70.8	76.3	76.8
White	73.7	81.1	78.4	85.5	83.7	86.6	-	-	-	82.9	85.7	86.8	68.8	70.6	71.1	83.3	86.1	84.7
Black	41.1	51.0	49.9	62.1	61.7	57.5	-	-	-	57.1	61.9	66.1	36.0	36.3	40.8	49.1	60.7	64.1
Hispanic	60.8	69.7	67.4	80.3	75.8	78.7	-	-	-	77.0	80.3	80.1	53.5	59.1	63.0	75.8	78.1	78.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	85.2	94.8	96.5	96.2	93.2	84.0	-	-	-	98.0	96.1	94.2	83.9	87.3	89.1	94.4	96.3	88.9
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	66.3	82.3	77.0	72.6	-	-	-	74.4	73.1	78.5	-	-	58.4	67.4	75.3	79.4
LEP	84.6	100.0	88.3	100.0	-	73.4	-	-	-	-	-	74.5	47.2	76.8	52.1	84.6	-	61.1
Students with Disabilities	31.1	40.7	39.1	45.2	45.9	45.3	-	-	-	36.1	37.3	52.5	25.1	24.5	19.1	37.1	39.2	41.9
Economically Disadvantaged	52.6	61.9	60.7	72.7	69.7	70.1	-	-	-	67.3	71.9	74.9	46.6	46.8	52.1	64.8	70.6	72.6
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	63.7	67.4	69.0	-	-	-	59.4	62.7	65.7	35.8	35.3	35.6	66.6	66.7	63.5
White	-	-	-	77.8	78.9	79.2	-	-	-	74.7	74.6	77.7	47.6	48.6	51.3	78.1	79.5	76.6
Black	-	-	-	43.1	47.0	54.0	-	-	-	38.8	48.2	43.8	15.7	16.2	14.5	47.9	48.1	45.9
Hispanic	-	-	-	66.6	72.3	68.4	-	-	-	60.8	59.8	72.7	34.9	26.7	30.6	66.8	69.0	64.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	88.0	95.9	86.8	-	-	-	79.3	87.0	89.2	64.8	67.2	64.3	86.0	83.0	74.2
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	58.8	69.6	72.0	-	-	-	65.7	63.2	65.6	-	-	12.5	81.5	87.9	66.0
LEP	-	-	-	48.6	64.8	50.0	-	-	-	41.2	35.2	48.9	2.4	11.1	10.0	58.6	48.5	38.5

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	18.8	25.6	26.1	-	-	-	16.7	20.0	27.5	8.9	6.5	11.4	30.7	30.0	22.4
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	56.4	62.1	63.0	-	-	-	50.9	56.5	59.2	23.4	23.2	24.8	59.3	59.6	56.7
PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grade 11																		
Groups	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008												
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5												
All	35.8	35.3	35.6	66.6	66.7	63.5												
White	47.6	48.6	51.3	78.1	79.5	76.6												
Black	15.7	16.2	14.5	47.9	48.1	45.9												
Hispanic	34.9	26.7	30.6	66.8	69.0	64.1												
Asian/Pacific Islander	64.8	67.2	64.3	86.0	83.0	74.2												
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-												
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	12.5	81.5	87.9	66.0												
LEP	2.4	11.1	10.0	58.6	48.5	38.5												
Students with Disabilities	8.9	6.5	11.4	30.7	30.0	22.4												
Economically Disadvantaged	23.4	23.2	24.8	59.3	59.6	56.7												

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Data - What do the District Report Card data tell you about student performance in your district? What areas of weakness ,if any, are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are indicated?

The data suggests that several District-led initiatives during the past several years are having a positive impact on elementary and middle school student achievement levels. Our high school achievement levels indicate a need for major reform as most all groups have declined in composite scores during the past five (5) years. The impact of switching LEP students from the IMAGE to ISAT regimen is evident in the 2008 scores, showing a noticeable decline year-to-year.

3rd-8th grade Reading has been supported by focused tutoring, after school programming, and universal screening tools with achievement scores rising to a level of 68.9% students meeting/exceeding (M/E) on the 2008 ISAT Reading exam. 3rd-8th grade Mathematics has been supported through full implementation of Everyday Math and Connected Math; the All group in 8th grade showed a 63.5% M/E level in 2008. Other major efforts have focused on differentiated instruction and co-teaching methods.

Our high school achievement levels show major weakness. No subgroup met the Reading or Mathematics AYP target. Furthermore, only the Hispanic subgroup increased its achievement level in Mathematics in 2008. The number of students who met the AYP target in 2008 (from 2007 scores) in Reading

increased in the Hispanic, Native American, and Students with Disabilities, but none met the benchmark.

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

3rd-8th Grade Scores have been impacted by these Internal Factors:

I. Curricular changes

A. Balanced Literacy was implemented District-wide in 2004

B. The second edition of Everyday Math was implemented in 2005, which has been updated by the Third Edition in 2009

C. Connected Math implemented at the middle school level, District-wide, in 2006

D. Adoption of literacy-based Social Studies series in 2008

E. Data teams have been initiated, implementation integrity must increase

3rd-8th Grade Scores have been impacted by these External Factors:

I. The higher truancy rate experienced by the District negatively affected scores

II. RPS205 has a significantly higher mobility rate than the State average

III. The District's Economically Disadvantaged population has increased by 14% during the past 4 years

High School Scores have been impacted by these Internal Factors:

I. Numerous changes in the administrative teams at each high school have caused a lack of focus

II. A lack of focused, limited, and non-utilized professional development opportunities for teachers

III. Instructional pedagogy has not adapted to current "best practice" idealogy

IV. Inadequate counseling system has hampered transitions from middle to high school and high school to post-secondary (college, career, trade school, etc.), and high school matriculation

V. Anecdotal evidence points to improved school climate

High School Scores have been impacted by these External Factors:

I. The higher truancy rate experienced by the District negatively affected scores

II. RPS205 has a significantly higher mobility rate than the State average

III. The District's Economically Disadvantaged population has increased by 14% during the past four (4) years

IV. Perceived employment opportunities dampen higher career or educational aspirations among students

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

Our curricular and instructional changes at the 3rd-8th grade level have demonstrated efficacy, but further monitoring must occur. We must also improve the integrity of data team implementation, allowing the results of our numerous assessments to truly impact instruction.

Perceptions of school climate at the high school level have been improving as evidenced by frequent anecdotal reports from various stakeholders. These positive changes have yet to lead to higher achievement, but we believe the foundation is now present for systematic improvements. Internal factors expressed above can now be addressed through District and school-based improvement efforts.

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data

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 indicated?

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

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
Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges**

Data - Briefly describe attributes and challenges of the district 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
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
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 district'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?

We believe Rockford Public Schools are able to positively affect several factors that will, in turn, improve student achievement rates. Those key factors within our zone of influence include:

1. We can affect the chronic truancy rate, which has been too high for decades.
2. We can affect the professional development that we offer to ensure there is adequate focus, breadth, and motivation.
3. We can affect the pedagogical framework that is used to guide instructional practices in our classrooms.
4. We can affect the counseling practices used in our secondary schools.

We address each of the above Key Factors in our Action Plan. The Key Factors must be addressed in short- and long-term ways so that increased achievement levels are obtained and then maintained. Our Action Plan provides for systemic change to positively affect each student in each school.

Section II-Action Plan

Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed(AYP)	Deficiencies Addressed(AMAO)
1	The District will achieve 70%(M/E) in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 in Reading	1,3,5,6,7,9,	1,2,
2	While our IEPs do not currently include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services, 100% of the IEP's that will be written during the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 school years will include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services.		
3	The District's students will achieve a 78% Graduation Rate in 2009 and 80% in 2010	2,	
4	All students' achievement level in Mathematics will be 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010	4,8,	
5	LEP Students Make AYP		1,2,

The following areas of deficiency have been identified from the most recent AYP report for your district.

1	District is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2	District is deficient in Graduation Rate
3	Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
4	Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
5	Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
6	LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
7	Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
8	Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
9	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

The following areas of deficiency have been identified from the most recent AMAO report for your district.

1	District is not meeting AYP for LEP
2	District is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1 Title :

The District will achieve 70%(M/E) in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 in Reading

Objective 1 Description :

The District will work to ensure full implementation of balanced literacy (K-5), need-specific, targeted Reading instruction (6-8), and will migrate leveled interventions into the high school level. Students' specific needs will be monitored through District-wide common assessments, e.g. Discovery Education

assessments. This monitoring will enable frequent movement between intervention groups (Rtl) for students who do not meet grade-level Illinois Learning Standards. Professional development will be provided to ensure affected faculty know intervention strategies and are able to implement them effectively. Parents/guardians will be offered numerous reading workshops to understand ILS and provide targeted support to their child(ren). Parents/guardians will be offered training in the District-wide common assessments to understand the data concerning their child's achievement and needs.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency.

1	District is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
3	Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
5	Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
6	LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
7	Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
9	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

This objective addresses the following areas of AMAO deficiency.

1	District is not meeting AYP for LEP
2	District is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 1 Title : The District will achieve 70%(M/E) in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 in Reading

Strategies/Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Implement Discovery Education periodic assessments in reading and math, grades K-11, to properly place students in appropriate reading and/or intervention groups.	9/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	508000
Implement additional reading intervention programs, including Early Success, Direct Instruction, and Language !, in K-8 sites.	8/25/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	900000
Implement reading intervention groups into the high schools, including SOAR to Success, Language !, and other programs.	8/24/2009	6/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	300000
Implement Data Teams at all tier levels to frequently reform students' instructional groups based on their individual responses to interventions.	8/23/2008	6/30/2010	Before School	Local Funds	50000
Incorporate reading strategies and instruction in all content areas.	8/25/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	1500000

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

Objective 1 Title : The District will achieve 70%(M/E) in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 in Reading

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Provide training in Discovery Education assessments to administrators, coordinators, implementers, and other key personnel.	8/6/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Other	50000
Provide training in Fountas and Pinnell reading assessment to elementary principals and reading coaches.	8/6/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	50000
Provide training for all teachers to incorporate reading strategies in content areas.	1/5/2009	6/30/2010	During School	Other	600000
Provide training to relevant faculty to effectively lead specific reading intervention groups and strategies.	8/23/2008	6/30/2010	After School	Local Funds	100000

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

Objective 1 Title : The District will achieve 70%(M/E) in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 in Reading

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Schools will work with their PTO and other parent groups/forums to provide information concerning reading achievement and strategies for parents to support their child's reading achievement.	8/23/2008	6/30/2010	After School	Title I	100000
The District will communicate age and grade-level appropriate materials and activities through the District's website.	7/1/2008	6/30/2010	After School	Local Funds	2500

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title : The District will achieve 70%(M/E) in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 in Reading

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

The District will monitor all actions through a multi-facted approach. Curriculum Coordinators(one at elementary and one at secondary) will collaborate with Principals, Reading Coaches, Reading Intervention Specialists, and English Department Chairs to ensure training is provided for all relevant teachers. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction and Director of Curriculum and Instruction will collaborate with Curriculum Coordinators to assess the

efficacy and implementation integrity of the specific reading intervention programs and strategies. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction (secondary), the Assistant Superintendent of Student Support (elementary and Special Education), and the Assistant Superintendent of Community Outreach and Procedures (elementary and alternative) will collaborate with the appropriate Principals to ensure adequate staffing, scheduling, materials, etc. are provided to fully implement necessary reading and intervention programs. Building principals will monitor all aspects of parental involvement components.

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
Ms. Colleen Cyrus	Assistant Superintendent, Student Support
Dr. Thomas Schmitt	Assistant Superintendent, Community Outreach and Procedures
Ms. Marcia Strothoff	Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2 Title :

While our IEPs do not currently include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services, 100% of the IEP's that will be written during the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 school years will include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services.

Objective 2 Description :

Transition is a large portion of the staff development for secondary teachers in the School District during the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 school years.

This objective does not address any AYP deficiency.

This objective does not address any AMAO deficiency.

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 2 Title : While our IEPs do not currently include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services, 100% of the IEP's that will be written during the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 school years will include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services.

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Goals and Objects for transition were added to the districts data base in the computerized IEP system	9/22/2008	9/23/2008	During School	Local Funds	0
RKFD 205 computerized IEP system will not allow IEP's to be finalized with out compliance with the transition requirements.	8/22/2008	6/5/2009	During School	Other	1000

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

Objective 2 Title : While our IEPs do not currently include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services, 100% of the IEP's that will be written during the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 school years will include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services.

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Sue Walter provided an inservice training for secondary teachers and administrators on transition requirements.	7/17/2008	7/17/2008	Summer School	Other	5000
Administrative Staff will attend the statewide conference in Peoria, IL	10/27/2008	10/28/2008	After School	Other	2000
Special education administrators will train casemanagers who will support students who require transition plans.	8/21/2008	6/5/2010	During School	Other	5000

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

Objective 2 Title : While our IEPs do not currently include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services, 100% of the IEP's that will be written during the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 school years will include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services.

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
All families are expected to be active participant in their student's IEP.	8/21/2008	6/6/2010	During School	Other	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title : While our IEPs do not currently include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services, 100% of the IEP's that will be written during the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 school years will include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services.

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

Middle School and High School Special Education Administrators will attend IEP meetings and monitor IEP completion for these requirements.

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
Colleen Cyrus	Assistant Superintendent for Student Support
Theresa Montalbano	Director of Special Education

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3 Title :

The District's students will achieve a 78% Graduation Rate in 2009 and 80% in 2010

Objective 3 Description :

The District will improve the implementation integrity of our Freshman Foundations initiative, add a Director of Attendance and Truancy, redesign our counseling system, improve perceived relevancy through specialized programs (e.g., Academic Career Education High School), and partner with a variety of community agencies to improve students' aspirations. We also believe pedagogical improvements throughout the system will increase students' self-efficacy and lead to higher graduation rates. Additional opportunities for students to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Credit Recovery) will be developed and implemented. Communication with parents/guardians will be improved through the redesign of our counseling service system (attendance, assignment completion, grades, matriculation,etc.), thereby empowering parents to better support their children through the high school years.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency.

2	District is deficient in Graduation Rate
---	--

This objective does not address any AMAO deficiency.

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 3 Title : The District's students will achieve a 78% Graduation Rate in 2009 and 80% in 2010

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Implement an exit plan for seniors	7/1/2009	6/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	1000
Revise the exit plan for seniors	5/1/2010	6/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
Fully implement the components(after school programs, separate facilities, student academic teams, individualized academic program placement,orientation and transition activities for parents and students) of the Freshman Foundation Initiative	12/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	80000
Each high school will develop a leadership team to include all stakeholders	10/1/2008	6/30/2009	During School	State Funds	6000
Secure consultant to collaborate with high school leadership teams to formulate a model that addresses the needs of all students	3/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	State Funds	50000

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

Objective 3 Title : The District's students will achieve a 78% Graduation Rate in 2009 and 80% in 2010

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Research practices, procedures, and articulation of services offered by high achieving school districts relative to counseling services.	12/1/2008	6/30/2009	During School	Local Funds	1000
Meet and review with building counselors and building administrators to determine the most effective and efficient current practices.	12/1/2008	6/30/2009	Before School	Local Funds	1000
Develop a multi-faceted counseling model that meets the needs of all students.	7/1/2009	6/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	1000
Staff development for counselors to ensure high rates of implementation of new model.	6/1/2010	6/30/2010	Summer School	Other	6000
The high school consultant will facilitate leadership teams to identify assets and barriers to success of each high school	10/1/2008	3/31/2009	During School	State Funds	50000

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

Objective 3 Title : The District's students will achieve a 78% Graduation Rate in 2009 and 80% in 2010

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Parents will be updated quarterly on graduation requirements met and remediation plans when necessary.	9/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	5000

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
District-wide assessment data will be communicated with parents, at minimum, tri-annually	9/1/2008	6/30/2010	After School	Local Funds	5000

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 3 Title : The District's students will achieve a 78% Graduation Rate in 2009 and 80% in 2010

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

The Director of Curriculum and Instruction and the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction will oversee the work of counselors, Curriculum Coordinators and Supervisor, and building administrators relative to designing and implementing system-wide plans and procedures. High school principals are supervised by the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction and will be accountable for building-specific plans and procedures. High school principals will oversee the implementation of exit and counseling plans in each high school.

The ultimate measure, of course, is the Graduation Rate for each high school and for the District as a whole. The promotion rate, e.g. 9th to 10th grade, will also be monitored to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of the strategies designed for this objective.

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
Ms. Marcia Strothoff	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction
Ms. Tracy Stevenson-Olson	Director of Curriculum and Instruction
Building Principals	

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 4 Title :

All students' achievement level in Mathematics will be 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010

Objective 4 Description :

Full implementation of Everyday Math and Connected Math will be monitored to ensure the integrity of the programs. Additional instructional opportunities will be provided to students (tutoring, intervention groups (Rtl), etc.) who do not meet grade-level proficiency targets. Resources have been developed and are

being implemented for parents/guardians (website, parent nights, etc.). New-to-the-program (curriculum and/or grade) and Special Education teachers will receive professional development to ensure implementation integrity of each program. Professional development will be delivered to faculty at the high school level to improve instructional pedagogy and student achievement in each subgroup.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency.

4	Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
8	Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

This objective does not address any AMAO deficiency.

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 4 Title : All students' achievement level in Mathematics will be 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010

Strategies/Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Fully implement all components of Everyday Math, 3rd Edition, in all elementary classrooms	9/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Other	50000
Fully implement all components of Connected Math in all middle school math classrooms	9/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Other	25000
All algebra teachers will implement manipulatives-based instruction	9/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	25000
Before and after school tutoring is provided for all students	9/1/2008	6/30/2010	Before School	Other	66000
Pilot Academic Achievement Specialists at two elementary schools and evaluate efficacy for expansion	1/10/2009	6/30/2010	During School	State Funds	600000
Assess students to continually refine interventions	10/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Other	600000

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

Objective 4 Title : All students' achievement level in Mathematics will be 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010

Strategies/Activities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Professional development in Everyday Math and Connected Math for teachers new to the programs and for teachers in need of assistance with implementation	7/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Other	75000
Professional development in manipulatives-based algebra course work	9/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	25000
Professional development in data analysis for intervention identification	8/6/2008	6/30/2010	Before School	Other	25000

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

Objective 4 Title : All students' achievement level in Mathematics will be 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Launch websites to support parental involvement in their child's academic success	10/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Local Funds	500
Parent meetings to familiarize stakeholders in the use of standards-based report cards	10/1/2008	6/30/2010	After School	Local Funds	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 4 Title : All students' achievement level in Mathematics will be 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010

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

The tier-level coordinators will monitor implementation of all components described in the Action Plan Objective 4. The Director of Curriculum and Instruction will monitor tier-level coordinators' efforts.

District coordinators, in cooperation with site leadership teams, will continually analyze data, horizontally and vertically, to identify gaps and success. They will then develop intervention groups, professional development opportunities, and communication with parents to ensure students meet the achievement levels described.

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
Sue Mainville	Elementary Math Coordinator
Diane Fischer	Middle School Math Coordinator
Cathy Morrow	High School Math Coordinator

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 5 Title :

LEP Students Make AYP

Objective 5 Description :

Our LEP subgroup had 38.1% in the meets/exceeds categories on 2008 State Reading tests, whereas the AYP target was 62.5%. We will implement our Action Plan to ensure at least 70% of test-takers in 2009 and 77.5% of test-takers in 2010 meet the proficiency targets. The percentage fo LEP stduents who demonstrated progress on the 2008 ACCESS was 28.1%. Our goal is to improve this percentage and meet our AMAO goals.

This objective does not address any AYP deficiency.

This objective addresses the following areas of AMAO deficiency.

1	District is not meeting AYP for LEP
2	District is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 5 Title : LEP Students Make AYP

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
ACCESS results for students will be analyzed for instructional focus and planning.	7/1/2008	6/30/2010	Before School	State Funds	2500
Lesson plans in bilingual classrooms will include and address Illinois English Language Proficiency Standards.	7/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	State Funds	2500
% of Minimum Daily English instruction will follow district plans: 1st year (including KDG)- 10%; 2nd yr.-20%; 3rd yr.-30%; 4th yr.-40%; 5th yr.-50%; 6th yr.-English Instruction with native language support as needed.	7/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	State Funds	2800
ESL instruction daily in content areas.	7/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	State Funds	450

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

Objective 5 Title : LEP Students Make AYP

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Ensure all bilingual teachers achieve full teacher certification.	7/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Title III	4000
Train all bilingual teachers to become certified administrators of ACCESS test.	7/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Title III	500
Continue training and use of Illinois English Language Proficiency Standards within lessons.	7/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Title III	500
Continue training all bilingual teachers in components of a comprehensive balanced literacy program.	7/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Title III	4000
Workshops on lessons to incorporate ESL components in content areas.	7/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Title III	1800
Workshops on implementation of Response to Intervention strategies for ELL students.	11/1/2008	6/30/2010	During School	Title III	3000

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

Objective 5 Title : LEP Students Make AYP

StrategiesActivities	StartDate	EndDate	TimeLine	FundSource	Amount
Parent Advisory Council meetings will include presentations of objectives and participate in evaluating implementation.	8/1/2008	6/30/2010	After School	State Funds	1000
PTO building meetings and awareness of Illinois English Language Proficiency Standards.	8/23/2008	8/30/2010	During School	State Funds	100

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 5 Title : LEP Students Make AYP

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

Student Strategies:

- Bilingual and Reading Curriculum Coordinators classroom visits
- Quarterly reports to Bilingual Director and Building Principals

Professional Development:

- The Learning Support Services and Bilingual Departments will continue professional development offerings on standards-based learning environments
- Reading Coaches, Reading Intervention Specialists, and Bilingual Curriculum

Coordinators will develop a framework for common evaluation of student work

- Kim Asher, Language Arts Supervisor, will continue to coordinate a cohort of teachers in developing common summative assessments in English
- Human Resources will monitor all bilingual teachers' progress toward complete certification

Parent Involvement:

- Director of Bilingual Services, Paul Yankee, will schedule Parent Advisory Council presentations
- All building principals will distribute Power Standards in Spanish and English to students on the first day of school

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
Ed Portillo	Executive Director of Research, Grants, and Federal Programs
Paul Yankee	Director of Bilingual Program

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation

A. 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 district improvement team or plan developers are identified here.

Ms. Linda Hernandez - Superintendent

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 and Instruction

Ms. Theresa Montalbano Owen – Director of Special Education

Ms. Tracy Stevenson-Olsen – Director of Curriculum and Instruction

Mr. Kerry Burd – Coordinator, School Psychology and Educational Diagnosticians Department

Mr. Ed Portillo – Executive Director of Research, Grants, and Federal Programs

Mr. Jon Malone – Director of Attendance and Truancy Initiatives

Ms. Cherice Fuller - Special Education Teacher

Ms. Rocheena Wright - Parent

Mr. Todd Schmidt - Parent

Consultants from the Center for Performance Assessment

Dr. Lori Fanello, Assistant Superintendent, ROE

Ms. Terry Parker, RESPRO Coordinator

Our team met during August-November 2008 to finalize this document, which consolidates input from the various stakeholders. Consultants from the Center for Performance Assessment provided technical assistance via telephone and e-mail exchanges. District personnel gathered, analyzed, and summarized data relative to their departments. District personnel reported their findings to the District Improvement Plan (DIP) team. The DIP team reviewed and synthesized the findings, drew conclusions, and developed the 2008-2010 District Improvement Plan. Insight and guidance from our ROE and RESPRO personnel were utilized to refine this District Improvement Plan.

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation

B. 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 responsibilities include providing schools technical assistance that must include data analysis, identification of the district's challenges in implementing professional development requirements, the resulting need-related technical assistance and professional development to effect changes in instruction. Districts are also responsible for revising the district's budget to ensure that funds provided under Title I and Title III supplement, not supplant, non federal funds, and that services provided with these funds are comparable with the services in schools that are not receiving funds under Title I (NCLB, Section 1116 and 1120A).

The Learning Support Services Team trains all of the Reading Coaches, Literacy Leaders, and Math Intervention Specialists. There is a Reading Coach in each elementary school, a Reading and Math support person in each middle school, and an English and Math Department Chair in each high school. All coaches attend staff development sessions on comprehensive school reading programs, extended responses, and assessments. When the training is completed, the coaches return to their schools and train their staffs on how to implement the strategies.

Consultants from around the State of Illinois and the country were contracted to facilitate this training. Training and follow up sessions are scheduled during the summer and will continue throughout the next two years.

Title I, Bilingual, Research and Evaluation, Information Technology, and Special Education are resources used to support all subgroups in meeting the AYP targets.

The Fresh Start Alternative School, Fresh View program (nee Skyview), Freshman Foundation, Roosevelt Opportunities Program, and Roosevelt Young Adult Program have been assessed and improved to support the initiatives of this plan. All faculty members will assist students in making more appropriate behavior, curricular, and programmatic choices. The faculties will be trained in all district curriculum areas as well as in specific intervention strategies.

Four of our schools have increased the length of their school day. The district has provided support for the Corrective Action schools. Each school has submitted a plan to the Learning Support Services team outlining how the additional time will be used. Two of the schools are piloting "Academic Achievement Specialists" who provide additional intervention services to Level II students.

Grants, Community Agencies, the Regional Office of Education, Rockford College, and Northern Illinois University are some of the resources that will assist us in the implementation of the strategies in this plan. The Regional Office of Education, the Leadership and Learning Center, Learning Support Services, and the Colleges will provide various training as needed.

Community agencies such as Booker Washington Center and Northwest Community Center serve as places where meetings with families can take place to support the strategies of the plan.

The 21st Century Grant after school programs are supported by business and community members using the same strategies that are taught during the school day with the students in the after school program, maximizing instructional time to achieve the AYP targets.

The department of Research, Federal Programs, and Grants will assist appropriate stakeholders with data collection and analysis. The Learning Support Services department will coordinate community resources to support the initiatives contained within the DIP.

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation

C. State Responsibilities

State Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that ISBE, RESPROS, and other service providers have provided the district during the development and review of this plan and other services that will be provided during the implementation of the plan. This may include ISBE technical assistance projects such as Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS), Children Have Opportunities to Inclusive Community Environments and Schools (CHOICES), Illinois Autism Training and Technical Assistance Project (IATTAP), Parent Educator Partnership (PEP), Illinois Service Resource Center (ISRC), and Transition Outreach Training for Adult Living (TOTAL). ISBE shall provide technical assistance to the district, if requested, to develop and implement the district plan and work with schools needing improvement. Such technical assistance shall be supported by effective methods and instructional strategies based on scientifically based research. Such technical assistance shall address problems, if any, implementing the parental involvement activities described in NCLB, Section 1118, and the professional development activities described in NCLB, Section 1119. [NCLB, Section 1116(c)(9)(B)].

The Illinois State Board of Education has provided several resources to Rockford Public Schools and this school to assist in the district 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 District 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 District administrators and the DIP team in data analysis, previous DIP review, and development of this DIP. The RESPRO has also provided staff development opportunities.

Our Regional Office of Education has provided data and DIP team coaching, technical assistance, and offers numerous staff development opportunities. The ROE offers materials for teachers and administrators to utilize for professional development activities as well. Lori Fanello, Assistant Superintendent, has provided consistent support and assistance to District leadership.

The RESPRO and ROE staffs have historically provided assistance to District personnel to implement the DIP. We expect the same will continue during the implementation of this plan.

Section IV-A Local Board Action

Date Approved by Local Board: 12/19/2008

A. Assurances

1. 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).
2. Technical assistance provided by the district serving its school is founded on scientifically based research (NCLB, Section 1116(b)(4)(C)) as defined in NCLB, Section 9101(37).
3. The plan includes strategies and activities that support the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards and ensures alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with the Illinois Learning Standards.
4. The district will spend at least 10 percent of the funds made available under Title I, Part A, subpart 2 of NCLB, for the purpose of providing high-quality professional development. (Title I districts only.)

B. Superintendent's Certification

By submitting the plan on behalf of the district, 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 plan completion from the **Submit Your Plan** page the plan shall be deemed to be executed by the superintendent on behalf of the district.

ISBE Monitoring - Part I

ANALYSIS OF DATA

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

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

	Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?
	Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

OTHER DATA

	Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?
	Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS

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

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

	Has the DIP team stated measurable objectives that promote continuous and substantial progress to ensure that students in each subgroup meet the State's target (e.g., in delivering tiered services or differentiated instruction)?
	Has the DIP team stated <u>measurable objectives</u> that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan?
	Do the objectives address all areas of AYP and AMAO deficiency?
	Do the objectives address the areas of special education compliance?

ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

	Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?
	Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement?
	Are the strategies and activities measurable?
	Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified?
	Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear?
	Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students?

	Do the professional development strategies and activities directly address the factors that caused the school to be identified in status or special education non-compliance?
	Do the parent involvement strategies and activities clearly align with the strategies and activities for students?
	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?
	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?
	Will the collection of strategies and activities along with the monitoring process provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?

MONITORING

	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?
	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?

Part I Comments

ISBE Monitoring - Part II

**METHODS OF PLAN DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, AND IMPLEMENTATION
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?
	Does the DIP team include a cross section of teachers, experts, parents, and other stakeholders to develop a plan on behalf of students that best effect necessary changes?

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?
	If applicable, is it clear what corrective action the district is taking with this school?

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

	Does the plan indicate what support outside providers have given in developing the plan and what support, if any, is expected for its implementation?
--	---

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD

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

Part II Comments