

Eisenhower Middle School

Restructuring Plan 2008

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

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number	041012050251006		
District Name	ROCKFORD SD 205	School Name	EISENHOWER MIDDLE SCHOOL
Superintendent	LINDA HERNANDEZ	Principal	JILL DAVIS
District Address	201 S MADISON ST	School Address	3525 SPRING CREEK RD
City/State/Zip	ROCKFORD,IL 61104 2092	City/State/Zip	ROCKFORD,IL,61107 1199
District Telephone#	8159663000 Extn:3101	School Telephone#	8152292450 Extn:0
District Email	hernandl@rps205.com	School Email	davisj@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?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No
2007-08 Federal Improvement Status		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	99.8	Yes	99.8	Yes	74.0		Yes	73.7		Yes	94.5	Yes		
White	99.7	Yes	99.7	Yes	88.5		Yes	86.4		Yes				
Black	99.5	Yes	99.5	Yes	63.2		Yes	57.0		Yes				
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	57.4		Yes	65.0		Yes				
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	27.3		No	52.3		No				
Students with Disabilities	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	24.5	32.5	No	30.6	35.3	No	91.8			
Economically Disadvantaged	99.8	Yes	99.8	Yes	65.3		Yes	66.3		Yes				

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 (%)	92.1	92.9	93.6	94.5	94.2	94.7	94.3	94.5
Truancy Rate (%)	19.8	15.1	2.2	2.9	3.3	2.6	1.1	1.4
Mobility Rate (%)	10.4	10.1	9.5	17.6	13.5	11.4	9.8	12.0
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	914	917	934	930	919	917	914	916
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	46.2	47.0	44.6	36.7	40.3	50.3	56.5	59.5
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	8.0	8.1	0.9	9.9	9.8	8.5	7.7	16.0
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	52.2	53.0	55.4	57.2	54.8	51.1	48.1	41.6
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	30.0	30.1	28.5	24.8	24.5	24.2	25.6	24.0
Hispanic (%)	13.6	13.5	13.4	15.4	17.4	20.3	19.9	26.9
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	4.0	3.2	2.7	2.3	2.8	2.9	3.4	3.1
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.3	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	3.0	4.5

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	60.3	30.4	7.0	2.2	0.1	-
	2000	55.6	30.8	10.4	3.1	0.2	-
	2001	52.2	30.0	13.6	4.0	0.2	-
	2002	53.0	30.1	13.5	3.2	0.2	-
	2003	55.4	28.5	13.4	2.7	0.1	-
	2004	57.2	24.8	15.4	2.3	0.3	-
	2005	54.8	24.5	17.4	2.8	0.3	0.1
	2006	51.1	24.2	20.3	2.9	0.3	1.1
	2007	48.1	25.6	19.9	3.4	-	3.0
	2008	41.6	24.0	26.9	3.1	-	4.5
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

Eisenhower Middle School

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	4.1	36.3	100.0	87.1	9.3	226	25.1	-	-
	2000	6.1	43.8	100.0	89.3	12.9	148	14.5	-	-
	2001	8.0	46.2	100.0	92.1	10.4	181	19.8	-	-
	2002	8.1	47.0	100.0	92.9	10.1	150	15.1	-	-
	2003	0.9	44.6	100.0	93.6	9.5	22	2.2	-	-
	2004	9.9	36.7	100.0	94.5	17.6	28	2.9	-	-
	2005	9.8	40.3	100.0	94.2	13.5	30	3.3	-	-
	2006	8.5	50.3	100.0	94.7	11.4	25	2.6	-	-
	2007	7.7	56.5	100.0	94.3	9.8	11	1.1	-	-
	2008	16.0	59.5	100.0	94.5	12.0	13	1.4	-	-
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	

	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	902	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	1024	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	914	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	917	-	-	-	308	305	-
	2003	934	-	-	-	315	318	-
	2004	930	-	-	-	304	316	-
	2005	919	-	-	-	320	295	-
	2006	917	-	-	-	299	317	-
	2007	914	-	-	-	311	308	-
2008	916	-	-	-	300	302	-	
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	

	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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	-	-	-	71.9	75.9	67.6	-	-	-	74.0	74.8	76.2	49.4	61.7	72.6	78.2	84.1	79.0
White	-	-	-	85.0	85.6	90.2	-	-	-	84.6	83.9	86.0	61.7	72.1	82.9	87.7	90.6	90.7
Black	-	-	-	42.8	61.3	70.0	-	-	-	51.9	52.5	66.7	30.0	43.6	43.1	59.7	70.3	57.8
Hispanic	-	-	-	75.0	67.3	39.3	-	-	-	74.0	80.7	62.2	34.9	53.5	74.3	70.5	82.8	82.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	77.0	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	90.9	100.0	-	-	-	81.8	-	91.7
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	75.1	91.7	-	-	-	-	-	70.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	28.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Eisenhower Middle School

Restructuring Plan 2008

2/11/2009 9:12:24 AM

Page 15 of 28

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	29.7	21.9	12.9	-	-	-	38.5	24.2	20.6	17.4	17.0	25.8	36.6	30.4	32.4
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	60.0	72.0	57.2	-	-	-	66.1	68.6	71.4	32.0	43.3	61.3	67.4	80.1	69.8

**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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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	-	-	-	76.7	78.0	74.3	-	-	-	78.4	76.0	74.8	50.9	50.0	47.5	73.1	82.2	72.7
White	-	-	-	88.9	85.7	90.2	-	-	-	86.6	87.5	87.4	62.1	59.6	62.0	85.4	89.5	83.8
Black	-	-	-	47.1	62.7	71.7	-	-	-	58.2	55.7	49.3	23.2	34.5	16.5	45.2	66.3	54.7
Hispanic	-	-	-	80.0	70.9	55.8	-	-	-	84.0	75.4	73.6	58.1	38.1	35.9	67.2	82.8	72.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	84.6	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	90.9	100.0	-	-	-	72.7	-	83.4
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	93.8	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	76.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	51.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Eisenhower Middle School

Restructuring Plan 2008

2/11/2009 9:12:24 AM

Page 17 of 28

Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	34.3	21.2	32.2	-	-	-	30.8	25.8	29.4	16.7	8.0	12.5	42.9	28.0	22.9
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	67.0	71.9	66.7	-	-	-	73.1	67.8	65.2	31.3	30.4	29.1	59.5	79.6	66.8

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 Eisenhower Middle School is crafted to meet District goals within the culture, climate, and specific needs of the school.

Eisenhower Middle School failed to meet the 2008 AYP target or Safe Harbor for Reading in the following subgroups: LEP and Students with Disabilities. Students with Disabilities also failed to meet the AYP target in Mathematics in 2008. 2008 was the first year Eisenhower had the LEP subgroup; therefore there is no trend data and no Safe Harbor target. All racial/ethnic subgroups tracked under NCLB have demonstrated consistent success until this year's LEP/Hispanic subgroup. It is significant to note that Eisenhower has continued to meet the AYP targets with its Economically Disadvantaged group, even as the percentage of students in the group has increased 23.2% this decade, to its highest level, 59.5%, in 2008.

Eisenhower's achievement level in Mathematics for Students with Disabilities has not demonstrated a consistent trend. The subgroup's M/E rate is currently at 30.6%, failing to meet the 35.3% Safe Harbor Target. The LEP subgroup, which scored 52.3% as proficient, was not present in longitudinal data as this is the first year for Eisenhower to have sufficient students for a subgroup. It is believed that the change to the Connected Math curriculum and related changes in instructional practices has caused the remarkable increases for other groups and will aid in improving student achievement in the future for these two

subgroups.

We observe like scores and trends in Reading scores. Students with Disabilities scores showed 24.5% proficient, with no discernable trend, while LEP students' proficiency level was 27.3%, with no trend due to the same reasons as in Mathematics. The positive achievement increases seen in other groupings are attributed to the multiple levels of English Language Arts instruction that were introduced in 2005, and expanded upon each year since. As teachers become more adept at implementation, we expect further increases. Eisenhower's administration and Data Teams continue to closely monitor ELA offerings and classroom implementation.

Eisenhower's student body has been greatly changed by District restructuring strategies. The move to zoned attendance centers impacts one-third of the student population annually from FY07 to FY10. We moved the entire Transitional Bilingual Education program from Lincoln to Eisenhower in 2008. This move greatly increased Eisenhower's LEP group, while similarly decreasing its monolingual population. The LEP percentage more than doubled, to 16%, from the previous year. The only grade level which has the LEP subgroup data disaggregated is sixth. The school's Free and Reduced lunch rate has increased from 46.2% at the start of the decade to 59.5% in 2007, the highest rate this decade. The truancy rate stands at 1.4%, while the Attendance Rate has remained consistently solid, coming in at 94.5% on 2008.

All Eisenhower faculty members are now considered Highly Qualified under NCLB parameters. Ms. Jill Davis, Principal, has provided stable leadership and direction. All other administrators in Eisenhower were replaced for strategic reasons with the advent of the 2008-2009 school year.

We believe the dedicated principal and faculty will be able to continue the effective implementation of the broad-ranging reforms contained within this plan and the District's Three Year Strategic Plan at Eisenhower. While the school's achievement levels have increased significantly and some subgroups met current targets, the ever-increasing AYP targets suggest that general, widespread improvement efforts continue to be warranted. Continuous monitoring of achievement levels and program revision is also warranted due to the addition of the TBE/TPI program and the decrease in the monolingual portion of the student body.

Eisenhower Middle School is not a Title I school and has not been subject to NCLB-mandated corrective actions. The school staff members have been working diligently to improve the school's achievement levels for all students. They have been utilizing their Data Teams and have also created 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%. Our middle schools are in the fourth 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 second year of the reforms intended to alter their composition, practices, and culture. We are making substantial progress across the District, with most schools making double digit gains in student achievement. We believe these gains will continue as better prepared students matriculate through the entire system and our reforms take deep root in the culture and climate of each school, the District, and our community.

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

The District 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. Davis and her Assistant Principals become better versed in the curricular areas, they will be better able to assist and evaluate teachers in their instructional efficacy, which in turn should lead to higher student achievement. The new professional development plan will also afford Eisenhower's administrators greater collaboration time with their colleagues in schools that have made achievement gains, particularly with Students with Disabilities and LEP students.

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. Davis and her Assistant Principals are being trained in all of these areas by RPS205 staff and ROE/RESPRO trainers.

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 2008, is in the fourth year of a five-year plan to restructure all middle schools. These district-wide, tier-specific changes address Response to Intervention, English Language Arts, Social Studies, Mathematics, Science, 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 the fall of 2006, a group of community members studied current student assignment practices (parent/guardian choice) and developed a student assignment process based on zones. The Board of Education adopted the proposal in early 2007 and implementation began with 6th grade students for the FY2008. The proposal closed one middle school (Wilson) and those students were sent to the remaining six middle schools, with the majority of students going to West Middle School (altering about 25% of the general and special education populations, gifted program enrollment excluded), and a sizable contingent going to Kennedy Middle School (altering about 13% of the general and special education populations). The other four middle schools had their populations change less than 5% from Wilson's student transfers. Eisenhower gained the middle school level of bilingual services (from Lincoln) to meet the Board of Education's mandated SES percentage.

The move to zoned attendance centers is in the middle of a three-year process to fully implement as the Board of Education adopted the proposal to zone students in the entry grade and roll the zones up. All middle schools will be fully zoned by FY2010. Early anecdotal evidence indicates that the beliefs listed below will come to fruition as the schools become fully zoned.

It is believed that zoned attendance centers for middle 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
- Support 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 middle school students are: Barbour (Spanish Language Immersion program), Ellis Arts Academy (CAPA), and Washington (Gifted program).

Our middle school students have bucked national trends on standardized tests; they have made substantial gains over the past four years. Our district-wide average meets/exceeds percentage in Reading has increased from 49% to 63% in the past three years. Gains in mathematics scores have been even greater, increasing from 37% M/E to 65% over the same time period.

To better assist students in Reading, we have restructured our English Language Arts curriculum, adopted different assessment tools, and are teaching Reading strategies in Social Studies classes (started in August 2007). 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.

For FY2006, we adopted *Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI)* as our common assessment tool in reading for middle school students. Teachers utilized the assessment to obtain greater insight into each student's specific need(s), better communicate to parents as to how they could assist their child learn more, and re-group students into the most appropriate instructional level on a semester-by-semester basis. For FY2008, we adopted the Enterprise Edition of the SRI to allow greater transferability of data between District schools for each student. This adoption has increased the speed with which timely data is distributed to all

relevant end users.

In FY2006, we restructured our Language Arts/Reading curriculum to provide 15 levels of instruction at the middle school level versus the previous utilized three levels. Prior to 2006 we offered a language arts course, Anthology, at each grade level. We now offer Language Exclamation! A, B, and C, Soar to Success 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, Bridges I, II, and III, Anthology 6, 7, and 8, and Communications. Students are assessed each semester using the SRI and enrolled in the course for the next semester that best meets their deficiencies or builds upon strengths.

We also mandated that students enrolled in a Language Arts course, whereas it was optional previously. These instructional level offerings, with varied intervention curricula, have started affecting student achievement levels as evidenced by SRI and ISAT scores (composite), fueling the rise from 49% M/E to 63%.

Eisenhower 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 design 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 the fall of 2007, a team of educators began to research literacy strategy-based Social Studies textbooks for sixth grade students, under the leadership of Kathy Cassioppi, Social Studies Curriculum Coordinator, with assistance from Reading Coordinators. A new series from Houghton Mifflin was selected and purchased in winter of 2008. Staff development activities were conducted in summer 2008, and the new series was introduced in August 2008. We believe using common literacy strategies across another curricular area will assist all students in mastering the strategies and improving 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 middle schools. We expect our reading scores to continue to increase across all grade levels and subgroups due to this substantive restructuring of content, sequence, and delivery.

We adopted a new Mathematics text series, *Connected Math*, in 2006. The series was implemented on a "roll-up" basis. Sixth grade students were taught using *Connected Math* in 2006, seventh grade switched in 2007, and eighth grade in 2008. We have seen scores increase dramatically. Our composite scores have increased 28% over the past four years to 63%. To facilitate in the continuation of our gains, the District is creating a website for parents to use with their students at home. The site became fully operation in the 2008-2009 school year. Only Students with Disabilities failed to meet the AYP target in 2008 at Eisenhower for Mathematics.

We believe the increase in composite math scores will continue unabated due to our professional development, implementation of the strategies and activities becoming better as teachers gain experience with the new series, and the consistent involvement of parents/guardians. These district-wide reforms are augmented by building-specific activities and strategies.

The Science curriculum was restructured in 2006. Sixth and seventh grade received Holt's new series and Physics was introduced in eighth grade, utilizing

Physics First as the text. Introducing Physics in eighth grade enabled teachers to lead students through hands-on discovery of the physical world around them and the relevancy of higher-level math skills. While Science scores are not calculated into AYP computations, we believe increasing students' background knowledge and demonstrating the relevance of lessons learned will support increased achievement in English Language Arts and Mathematics.

Our middle schools have been greatly restructured and are showing positive effects. Math scores are up 28% and Reading scores are up nearly 15%. We believe achievement levels will continue to climb as better prepared students matriculate through our system, staff efficacy improves with experience using the new series, students and families are more connected to their schools through zoning, and Special Education service delivery models are revamped. Each middle school has also implemented various improvement strategies and activities.

Eisenhower Middle 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

2/11/2009 9:12:24 AM

- 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 Eisenhower 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.

Eisenhower Middle School Action Plan

Time Period:	Activity:	Person(s) Responsible:	Costs/Source:
August 2007-June 2010	Continue Reading Intervention program with two periods of English Language Arts	Building Principals and Reading Intervention Specialists	Fund 10
August-October 2008	Implement new Scholastic Reading Inventory software with system-wide management component	Pat Bushard, MS Language Arts Coordinator, Tim McFadden, Technology Coordinator and Reading Intervention Specialists	\$12,000, Fund 10.
August 2008-August 2009	Define and develop <i>Response to Intervention</i> . Expand second tier offerings, e.g. additional levels of Language !	Colleen Cyrus, Asst. Supt., and Marcia Strothoff, Asst. Supt.	No costs associated with planning and development. Costs will be incurred for implementation.
December 2007-	Develop revised Social	Kathy Cassioppi, Social	\$ 540,000 for textbooks,

March 2008	Studies curriculum for grades 5-8. Utilize a literacy-based series for new curriculum	Sciences Coordinator	covered by Illinois Textbook Loan Program and Fund 10.
August 2008 – October 2008	Develop a plan to better connect students with their school through various intervention programs. Administrators will lead <i>Behavior and Development Committees</i> for grade level intervention plans.	Jill Davis, Principal, and Grade Level Data Teams	\$5,000, Fund 10
June-August 2009 and June-August 2010	Multiple development opportunities for staff in Reading, Writing, Special Education, Social Science, and Freshman Foundation principles	Colleen Cyrus and Marcia Strothoff	Various grants cover the cost of stipends and presenters' fees
January 2009-June 2009	Initial implementation activities for <i>Response to Intervention</i> program	Colleen Cyrus and Special Education Administrators	All costs to be borne by IDEA grant
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
August 2009	Full Implementation of zoned attendance center plan reached	Colleen Cyrus	None
August 2009	Full implementation of Physics First curriculum for 8 th grade reached	Building Principals	None

August 2009	Implement "Cluster Meetings" for zoned schools to articulate curriculum, pedagogy, and student life issues.	Assistant Superintendents and Building Principals	None
August 2009	Full implementation of Language I, at all levels, is reached	Building Principals	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