

Julia Lathrop Elem School

School Improvement Plan 2008

Local Board Approved	
Submitted	
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

RCDT Number	041012050252041		
District Name	ROCKFORD SD 205	School Name	JULIA LATHROP ELEM SCHOOL
Superintendent	LINDA HERNANDEZ	Principal	Prudence Court
District Address	201 S MADISON ST	School Address	2603 CLOVER AVE
City/State/Zip	ROCKFORD,IL 61104 2092	City/State/Zip	ROCKFORD,IL,61102
District Telephone#	8159663000 Extn:3101	School Telephone#	8159663285 Extn:0
District Email	hernandl@rps205.com	School Email	courtp@rps205.com

Is this plan for a Title I School? True

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

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2007-08 Federal Improvement Status	restructuring implementation
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	Yes	2007-08 State Improvement Status	academic watch status year 5

	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		62.5			62.5			90.0		75.0	
All	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	32.3		No	62.8		Yes	94.2	Yes		
White														
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	44.8	37.0	Yes	55.7		Yes	93.9			
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	20.3	55.6	No	70.0		Yes	94.8			
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	19.4		No	72.6		Yes				
Students with Disabilities														
Economically	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	29.9	46.1	No	61.4		Yes	93.8			

	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
Disadvantaged														

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress
<p>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.</p> <p>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. ***</p> <p>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.</p> <p>4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 75% graduation rate for high schools.</p> <p>* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2007.</p> <p>** Safe Harbor Targets of 62.5% or above are not printed.</p> <p>*** 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.</p>

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

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

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

School Information								
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Attendance Rate (%)	92.8	94.3	94.0	93.3	93.4	93.3	94.0	94.2
Truancy Rate (%)	3.6	4.5	4.4	11.3	5.9	8.1	2.3	2.1
Mobility Rate (%)	20.0	14.3	26.3	25.8	31.7	17.6	13.3	25.3
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Population (#)	334	359	366	394	358	400	425	412
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	80.5	86.6	91.8	76.1	86.9	92.0	92.7	94.2
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	29.6	35.7	29.0	33.5	36.0	40.8	43.5	51.0
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	38.3	30.4	24.6	22.3	18.2	14.0	12.0	10.2
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	26.9	28.7	33.9	33.5	34.6	32.5	31.3	27.4
Hispanic (%)	33.5	40.1	41.0	43.9	46.9	53.3	55.1	59.5
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	1.2	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.3	-	-	0.2
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	1.6	2.4

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 O L	1999	39.7	37.9	20.8	0.5	1.0	-
	2000	32.3	34.7	32.0	0.3	0.8	-
	2001	38.3	26.9	33.5	-	1.2	-
	2002	30.4	28.7	40.1	-	0.8	-
	2003	24.6	33.9	41.0	-	0.5	-
	2004	22.3	33.5	43.9	-	0.3	-
	2005	18.2	34.6	46.9	-	0.3	-
	2006	14.0	32.5	53.3	-	-	0.3
	2007	12.0	31.3	55.1	-	-	1.6
	2008	10.2	27.4	59.5	0.2	0.2	2.4
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

	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	7.0	76.1	100.0	92.9	14.7	10	3.2	-	-
	2000	21.2	74.3	100.0	93.6	18.3	53	17.1	-	-
	2001	29.6	80.5	100.0	92.8	20.0	12	3.6	-	-
	2002	35.7	86.6	100.0	94.3	14.3	17	4.5	-	-
	2003	29.0	91.8	100.0	94.0	26.3	17	4.4	-	-
	2004	33.5	76.1	100.0	93.3	25.8	47	11.3	-	-
	2005	36.0	86.9	100.0	93.4	31.7	21	5.9	-	-
	2006	40.8	92.0	100.0	93.3	17.6	34	8.1	-	-
	2007	43.5	92.7	100.0	94.0	13.3	10	2.3	-	-
2008	51.0	94.2	100.0	94.2	25.3	9	2.1	-	-	
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	385	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2000	346	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	334	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	359	73	42	55	-	-	-
	2003	366	60	66	43	-	-	-
	2004	394	59	61	65	-	-	-
	2005	358	73	47	54	-	-	-
	2006	400	70	69	43	-	-	-
	2007	425	65	70	71	-	-	-
	2008	412	68	58	71	-	-	-
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	56.1	20.0	46.9	38.0	25.0	24.6	-	-	-	43.6	43.9	43.1	28.5	38.5	50.0	27.8	37.3	31.0
White	-	36.4	63.2	46.6	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	41.7	-	41.7	46.6	-	-	47.1	30.8
Black	50.0	6.7	33.4	39.1	18.2	43.4	-	-	-	34.8	52.0	45.0	28.6	41.7	50.0	20.0	21.7	48.0
Hispanic	-	-	-	27.3	-	6.7	-	-	-	41.2	41.2	44.4	-	23.1	53.3	31.3	47.3	10.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	8.3	-	-	-	-	-	17.6	-	-	-	-	-	7.7
Students with Disabilities	-	10.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.1	-
Economically Disadvantaged	53.0	21.9	42.2	39.6	25.0	22.8	-	-	-	40.4	42.6	40.3	23.5	36.2	40.0	31.3	35.2	29.4
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 8b - Assessment Data (Mathematics)**

ISAT - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grades 3-8, 2003-2008																		
	Grade 3						Grade 4						Grade 5					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	70.7	45.7	53.0	60.8	32.5	57.6	-	-	-	61.8	56.2	70.7	46.3	55.7	61.9	55.6	44.1	60.5
White	-	72.7	57.9	62.6	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	58.3	-	66.6	66.7	-	-	58.8	53.8
Black	63.7	33.3	50.0	60.9	27.3	46.2	-	-	-	52.1	52.0	70.0	42.9	50.0	61.2	53.3	26.1	56.0
Hispanic	-	-	-	63.6	-	71.0	-	-	-	76.5	64.7	77.8	-	53.9	66.6	56.3	52.7	62.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	70.9	-	-	-	-	-	70.6	-	-	-	-	-	53.8
Students with Disabilities	-	40.0	-	-	-	7.7	-	-	-	20.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	18.2	-
Economically Disadvantaged	64.7	43.8	53.4	63.2	33.3	55.7	-	-	-	59.6	55.6	69.2	48.5	53.2	57.1	59.4	42.6	60.3
	Grade 6						Grade 7						Grade 8					
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	-	-	-	47.5	55.0	62.5	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

Students at Lathrop School did not make AYP in Reading, scoring 32.3% in 2008. These students will score 70.0% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 or make Safe Harbor.

Black students at Lathrop did make Safe Harbor in 2008, scoring 44.8 % in Reading and 55.7% in Math. Those students will score 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 or make Safe Harbor in both areas.

Additionally, economically disadvantaged students did not make AYP in 2008, scoring 29.9% in Reading and 61.4% in Math. These students will score 70.0% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010 or make Safe Harbor in both areas.

While Hispanic students did not make AYP in Reading scoring 20% in 2008 , they did make AYP in math, scoring 70.0%. LEP students scored 72.6% in Math in 2008. Both of these groups will make AYP in Reading and Math scoring 70% in 2009 and 77.5% in 2010

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

A variety of significant factors have contributed to student performance at Lathrop. Among those factors are the composition of the student population, parental involvement, staff turnover, student to teacher ratio, level of staff experience, and building discipline. A fluctuation in the mobility of the student population over the last three years has impacted achievement. Lathrop's student population went from a mobility rate of 17.6% in 2006 to 13.3% in 2007 with a jump to 25.3% in 2008.

The population of Lathrop School is largely an economically disadvantaged group. Between the years of 2004 and 2008, the percent of low income families has risen from 76.1% to 94.2%.

Additionally, a classroom of bilingual students has been added and a classroom of monolingual students has been dropped, starting with Kindergarten, every year since 2001. In 2008, Lathrop's Hispanic population was 59.5%. This is a mixed blessing as the bilingual students have done well in state testing, in 2007 making AYP. Beginning in 2008 and thereafter, bilingual students must take the state test in English which impacts AYP.

Parental involvement, as demonstrated by poor attendance at Open House, Lighted Libraries, and parent/teacher conferences, is minimal.

Parents who are economically disadvantaged are at work or don't have a current telephone number when the classroom teacher attempts to make contact. Contact numbers are frequently changed or non-existent.

In the last three years, Lathrop has experienced an 85% turnover in staff. This factor has made consistency of instruction difficult. The average teaching experience of the staff at Lathrop is 5 to 7 years in contrast with the district average level of experience which is 15.4 years and the state average which is 12.9 years. While teachers with less experience may have enthusiasm and fresh ideas, they are often challenged in the areas of classroom management and understanding of the curriculum.

Student to teacher ratio has often been used as an indicator of academic success. Lathrop has a ratio of 22:1 whereas the district ratio is 19:1 and the state's ratio of students to teacher is 18:1.

Other factors influencing Lathrop School student achievement are student mobility and the rate of truancy. Lathrop's mobility rate has increased from 13.3% in 2007 to 25.3% in 2008. Due to community, district and school initiatives, Lathrop's truancy rate has decreased from a high of 11.3% four years ago to 2.1% in 2008. School attendance has shown steady improvement from 93.3% four years ago to 94.2% in 2008.

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

The implications of all these factors for school improvement at Lathrop are extensive. There are factors we can influence and factors beyond our control.

Reading and math interventions must be first and foremost in our plan for improvement. More adults working with smaller groups of children are vital. While Lathrop made AYP in math for 2008, the bar is raised even higher in 2009 to 70.0% and 77.5% in 2010. Staff needs to use supplemental materials to provide hands-on activities and real world experiences to the students.

Staff development in the form of reading and math strategies, assessment construction, and behavior interventions will support our efforts. The staff will be trained in Response to Intervention strategies and evaluation. The Thinklink assessment program will be the universal tool to help ascertain student performance levels.

Reading and math experiences that can be shared by parents and students to enhance student learning will be vital.

We can't change the fact that the majority of our students are economically disadvantaged. We can however use that awareness to enhance opportunities and instruction for all children, keeping in mind the particular needs of the various groups that make up our school population.

We must encourage parental involvement in a more meaningful way, thinking outside of the traditional activities to attract parents. The design of those activities must include meaningful, helpful information for parents and students. The time of day needs to be a consideration because of our many working parents. Finally, we need to provide food for the families so that they don't have to choose between supertime at home and coming to school. Serving food also facilitates community building among parents, students, and staff.

While we can't affect student to teacher ratio, we can insure that those interactions are positive and productive. Staff development addressing classroom management and effective discipline will be offered to benefit inexperienced as well as veteran teachers. The development of schoolwide discipline and climate

strategies will make Lathrop a welcoming productive place for staff and students. The more positive the climate and effective the discipline, the more attractive place Lathrop will be to teach, addressing the issue of staff turnover.

An effective building discipline system will provide the atmosphere needed for students to focus on learning and achieving. Reduced behavior referrals and suspensions will result in more time on task for students and teachers.

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data (Optional)

Data - Briefly describe the relevant local assessment data used in this plan. What do these data tell you? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are apparent?

Think Link is a universal screening tool aligned with state standards which will be used to establish baseline reading and math data for all grade levels. It will also predict areas of weakness which need to be addressed in both subject areas.

Local reading assessment data also comes from analyzing the results of Fontas and Pinnell balanced literacy testing done in all classrooms on a trimester basis.

The assessment includes running records, word study, extended response, phonological awareness, and sight words. The test is administered three times a year to first through fifth grade.

Everyday Math data indicates that f third, fourth, and fifth graders have some areas of weakness. Think Link data will also be analyzed beginning in January of 2009. Third grade students performed below benchmark goals in end of the year testing. For example, the writing benchmark was 27% meeting or exceeding standards and third graders as a group scored 0%. The reading level benchmark for end of the year was level P and third graders scored three levels lower at M. Fourth grade students scored 20.5% meeting and exceeding when the end of year benchmark was 24%. Their average reading level was R when the grade level benchmark was T. Fifth grade students had an end of year average for writing of 15.1% meeting or exceeding standards when the benchmark was 27%. That same group read at level T when the end of year benchmark for fifth grade was level W.

Local math assessment data come from analyzing the results of Thinklink which will be administered three times a year. The assessment is aligned with the Everyday Math series and state standards.

Data collected about math for third, fourth, and fifth grade students at Lathrop school indicate some areas of weakness. After first grade, the percentage of students meeting the end of year benchmark score declines each year. This indicates that student math proficiency is below grade level from second through fifth grade. Specific skills in which students are deficient include telling time, place value recognition, money recognition, word problems, number patterns, identifying fractions with models, probability vocabulary, identifying images from flip, slides and turns, reading and interpreting graphs, calculating perimeter and area, metric conversions, identifying 2D and 3D dimensional shapes.

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

A variety of factors have contributed to the results achieved by Lathrop students in taking the district reading assessment, Fontas and Pinnell and Thinklink,

Inexperienced staff lack facility in implementing complex curriculum such as guided reading. Consistent implementation of guided reading among all grade levels and classes has been lacking. Low income students with limited background experiences and opportunities are hindered from developing necessary reading skills. Parents who are struggling to make a living and support their families have limited time to spend reading to and with their children and helping with homework.

A variety of factors have contributed to the results achieved by Lathrop students in taking the district math assessment. These factors include: Ineffective math instruction from second to fifth grade. Basic math skills are not learned at each grade level.

The high (85%) staff turnover since 2005 contributed to an inconsistent implementation of math curriculum. Lathrop has a high percentage of inexperienced staff.

Low levels of parent involvement, low reading comprehension skills, and low problem solving strategies are also contributing factors.

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

From examining our local assessment data, we can draw some conclusions for school improvement at Lathrop. These conclusions are common to both the areas of reading and math.

Teachers, both inexperienced and veteran, must be supported in curriculum implementation through professional development and modeling of strategies by those proficient in reading and math instruction.

Tutors, who are retired teachers and funded by Title 1, will participate in Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. Supplemental materials to enhance the curriculum in reading and math need to be made available to teachers and students. Emphasis needs to be placed on hands-on, experiential learning to support students who do not have the necessary background to succeed.

Outreach to parents needs to be carefully planned to encourage their efforts to support their childrens' school experience.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)
Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

Data - Briefly describe attributes and challenges of the school and community that have affected student performance. What do these data and/or information tell you?

There are several attributes and challenges in the district and community that have effected student performance. Lathrop has experienced an 85% turnover rate among staff members since 2005. We face an additional challenge in providing the support for students from economically disadvantaged families. All of the above, coupled with average classroom sizes larger than those across the district and the state, lead to an adverse effect on student performance.

Because 94.2% of the students attending Lathrop are economically disadvantaged, many parents struggle to provide adequate and appropriate clothing for their children.

In the effort to address progressive levels of intervention addressing student needs, Lathrop will employ a variety of approaches. The Reading Coach and Title 1 teachers will meet with small groups of children identified by local and universal assessment tools to their reading skills. Two retired teachers will meet with other groups of students who need further support, which in some cases involves one-on-one tutoring. Special Education Resource teachers engage in co-teaching with regular classroom teachers. Classroom teachers use Science and Social Studies to teach reading skills across the curriculum. This is particularly facilitated by the new district Social Studies curriculum which is literacy based.

Factors - In what ways, if any, have these attributes and challenges contributed to student performance results?

Eleven out of twenty-four teachers at Lathrop School are non-tenured. That means they are new to the district and therefore are learning all of the district's teaching requirements. Having three principals since 2004 has complicated matters by sending mixed messages with regard to leadership expectations concerning classroom management and building climate.

The number of discipline referrals has increased sharply over the last three years. In the 2004-2005 school year, 27 referrals were given to students. In the 2005-2006 school year that number increased to 137 with new administration and the figure jumped to 1,030 in the 2006-2007 school year as the school was overseen by yet another new administrator. In the second year of the current administration, 2007-2008, with the beginnings of implementation of a conscious discipline initiative, discipline referrals for the school year fell to 773.

When students at Lathrop don't have adequate or appropriate clothing, they stay home from school. Frequently children come to school inappropriately dressed for the weather. When the students' basic needs, i.e. proper clothing, are not met, it makes it difficult for them to concentrate on achieving to their highest

potential. While schools uniforms are not the answer to school achievement and behavior problems in themselves, a uniform policy has been shown to be effective when used in combination with other interventions. The Principals' Partnership research asserts that "there is evidence that supports that there are fewer discipline referrals and violence as well as higher attendance rates since the implementation of a uniform policy."(2007)

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

In Bulletin 875-99 "Fostering Resilience in Children"(Ohio State University) the authors stress the importance of teacher support and state, "Children from impoverished and stressful homes need high standards, not low standards." We offer free and/or reduced breakfast and lunch to provide all students the opportunity to a "healthy" education. We have implemented the Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS) to afford staff and students a school-wide discipline program which gives consistency for all stakeholders. "Unless you have order and civility, not much learning can go on."(Shanker, May/June 1999)

The staff has designed the Lathrop "PRIDE" program which blends with PBIS in teaching social skills and behavior expectations. Each letter of the word stands for an expectation. Lessons are being designed to teach the children how to demonstrate Lathrop PRIDE.

School uniforms have been proven to promote a positive school climate and improve behavior. A staff committee will develop a uniform proposal to be presented to the school board for approval by January, 2009.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)

Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

Data - *Briefly describe data on educator qualifications and data and/or information about staff capacity and professional development opportunities related to areas of weakness and strength. What do these data tell you?*

Lathrop School has experienced an 85% staff turnover since 2005. In a teaching staff of twenty-three individuals, eleven of those have less than four years teaching experience. However, sixty percent of the staff hold an MA degree. First year teachers have had the benefit of a district mentor.

Professional development has been made available through the school district, during regular monthly meetings, and in the form of modeling and co-teaching with individual classes.

Factors - *In what ways, if any, have educator qualifications, staff capacity, and professional development contributed to student performance results?*

Several factors in this category have had an impact on student achievement. The first factor is staff inexperience, both in years of teaching and facility in presenting curriculum. Poor classroom management by novice teachers has impacted learning and added to discipline concerns in the school. The high rate of staff turnover has led to a lack of consistency in instruction and leadership.

Continuing professional development at the district and school level has consistently been available in an effort to address staff deficiencies.

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

Continuing staff development, especially that tailored to the needs of the educators at Lathrop School, is vital. A survey of staff regarding their perceived areas of need and the results of professional evaluation will drive the selection of training to be offered.

The use of Title 1 funds can make out-of-district workshops and conferences available to staff members.

Training by building administration and modeling by colleagues will help solve classroom management issues for novice teachers.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)
Item 3 - Parent Involvement**Data** - *Briefly describe data on parent involvement. What do these data tell you?*

Parent involvement at Lathrop School varies by activity. Parent attendance at Open House is marginal with an average of 12% attendance across the grades. Family Reading Night brought participation of 80 families out of a school population of 425 students. Books and Bingo, an evening activity arranged by Title 1,

drew 200 people which included parents and children. Greatest parent involvement was on Community Day. Agencies from the community came to share information and offer resources to help families in their daily life. Community Day was held during the dinner hour, so we had meat and cheese trays available for participating families to enjoy while there. Attendance at that event numbered 250 people.

Parent/teacher conferences average 95% attendance across the grades. That includes telephone and written contacts as well as the face-to-face meetings.

The Lathrop Parent/Teacher Organization consists of one person who runs an annual fundraising activity and use that money to plan assemblies and events for the school children.

Factors - *In what ways, if any, has parent involvement contributed to student performance results?*

Non-attendance at school functions does not necessarily indicate that the parents don't care. Many parents struggle to hold down more than one job to support their families. Lack of access to transportation or a telephone are also common factors which prevent parent involvement, or even communication, at Lathrop. Parents' ability to participate in school activities affects student attitudes about the importance of school to themselves and to their parents. When parents don't show consistent support and interest in students' progress in school, the students don't value high achievement.

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

Parent involvement at Lathrop School is vital to the success of the students. We are studying methods to increase parent involvement and participation. There are certain elements that seem to be common to the success of events at Lathrop. Whatever is planned must be early in the evening and no longer than 45 minutes in length.

We need to provide the parents and their students with experiences that enhance learning but are enjoyable for all involved. The experience needs to include food for the people attending and material things the families can take away with them i.e. books, math games, or information to help families.

Events need to be carefully scheduled and spread out over the course of the year. Publicity for any event needs to be plentiful, timely, and in Spanish as well as English.

Communication with parents will include monthly newsletters from the principal and weekly/monthly newsletters from the classroom teachers. Teachers communicate with home on a daily basis by means of a special Lathrop take-home folder in the primary grades and a student planner in grades 3-5.

The Lathrop website is constantly being updated with news about important events and class activities.

Formal parent/teacher conferences are held in November and April as well as informal meetings on an as needed basis.

The parent community has been surveyed about attitudes toward school uniforms and school climate. Parents are members of the School Improvement Planning team.

For further parent activities, please refer to Section II, Part of this document.

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

Section I-D - Key Factors – From the preceding screens (I-A, I-B, I-C-1, 2, 3) identify key factors that are within the school's capacity to change or control and which have contributed to low achievement. What conclusions about next steps have you reached from reviewing available data and information and about all the factors affecting student achievement?

While we can't change the fact that 94.2% of our students are economically disadvantaged, we can design instruction that provides a rich environment and experiences that promote the development of prior knowledge.

Parental involvement at Lathrop is minimal. We will design activities and events in such a way that parents will be motivated to participate.

The experiences will include usable, meaningful information and be held at a time when the parents are most likely to come.

Climate is more positive and discipline at Lathrop School is improving. We will continue to study research-based strategies which will facilitate a more orderly environment.

Although we can't directly impact the number of years of teaching experiences our teachers have, we can provide relevant professional development and mentoring to ensure that our teachers are well prepared to deliver instruction.

We must improve all of our students' abilities in reading and math. We will implement strategies and activities that reflect educational best practice so that the students can meet the state's meets and exceeds goals.

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed
1	All students, economically disadvantaged students, Hispanic, black, and LEP as a result of tiered interventions will make AYP in Reading in 2009 and 2010.	1,2,3,4,
2	All students at Lathrop will continue to make AYP in math in 2009 and 2010, scoring 70% and 77.5% respectively.	
3	All Lathrop School students will make AYP in Reading and Math in 2009 and 2010 facilitated by the creation of an orderly school environment	1,2,3,4,

The following deficiencies [not objectives] have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for your school.	
1	School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2	Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
3	LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
4	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective: 1

All students, economically disadvantaged students, Hispanic, black, and LEP as a result of tiered interventions will make AYP in Reading in 2009 and 2010.

Objective 1 Description:

1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2. Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
3. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
4. Hispanic and LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency	
1	School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2	Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
3	LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

4	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
---	--

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 1 Title : All students, economically disadvantaged students, Hispanic, black, and LEP as a result of tiered interventions will make AYP in Reading in 2009 and 2010.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	The reading coach and Title 1 teachers will identify student needs in bilingual and monolingual classes by means of a universal screening tool and district assessment. They will meet with these students in small groups and individually to reinforce reading skills throughout the school year	8/25/2008	6/2/2010	During School	Title I	
2	Two retired teachers will be hired as tutors to work with groups of children in Tier 2 and Tier 3 on identified skill deficits.	9/15/2008	5/26/2010	During School	Title I	
3	Full implementation of district curriculum in balanced literacy is reinforced by modeling and observation by the reading coach and the principal	9/3/2008	6/1/2010	During School	Local Funds	
4	Continuous assessment and regrouping based on specific student needs using Fontas and Pinnell and Thinklink.	9/15/2008	5/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	
5	Title 1 teachers are providing a lending library of leveled books for students to read at school and at home. Bilingual materials and learning activities will be included.	9/2/2008	5/26/2010	During School	Title I	
6	21st Century After School Program will use SRA programmed reading series to support classroom instruction.	9/15/2008	5/14/2010	After School	State Funds	
7	Bilingual reading tutor will work with small groups of students from bilingual classes grades 2-5 to support English language acquisition	9/10/2008	5/25/2010	During School	Local Funds	
8	All classes, especially bilingual classes, will implement the use of Marie Carbo reading tapes to support reading fluency and comprehension.	10/27/2008	6/25/2010	During School	Local Funds	
9	21st Century After School Program will provide reading comprehension tutoring to bilingual students in grades 3 - 5.	9/15/2008	5/14/2010	After School	State Funds	
10	Classroom teachers will develop lessons and strategies to specifically address making connections in reading comprehension.	9/3/2008	5/26/2010	After School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title : All students, economically disadvantaged students, Hispanic, black, and LEP as a result of tiered interventions will make AYP in Reading in 2009 and 2010.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	District reading curriculum coordinator will model guided reading lessons in classrooms.	9/3/2008	5/25/2010	During School	Local Funds	
2	Staff will attend district sponsored workshops on strategies to improve balanced literacy.	8/25/2008	5/10/2010	During School	Title I	
3	During monthly staff meetings, the reading coach will train staff in guided reading strategies and 6-trait writing.	8/25/2008	5/25/2010	After School	Title I	
4	Beginning in January, 2009, staff will participate in a book study group using the book Guided Comprehension as text.	1/5/2009	6/3/2009	After School	Title I	
5	Bilingual staff will consistently implement the ESL curriculum, reviewing its effectiveness on a yearly basis.	8/25/2008	5/25/2010	During School	Local Funds	
6	All staff will increase best ESL reading/language strategies in classroom instruction.	8/25/2008	5/25/2010	During School	Local Funds	
7	In response to district training, staff will increase integration of effective reading strategies in all content areas with a focus on newly adopted Social Studies curriculum.	8/25/2008	5/25/2010	During School	Local Funds	
8	Professional development in Response to Intervention strategies and techniques will be provided for all staff.	8/21/2008	5/26/2010	After School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 1 Title : All students, economically disadvantaged students, Hispanic, black, and LEP as a result of tiered interventions will make AYP in Reading in 2009 and 2010.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Title 1 will sponsor Books and Bingo night for students and their families. The attendees will play bingo and win books for the children. Pizza will be served for dinner.	12/3/2008	12/3/2008	After School	Title I	
2	The Lathrop Library will sponsor a family reading night during which families will read together at home for at least thirty minutes. When the children return the reading log to school, they will receive a certificate and a free book.	11/20/2008	11/20/2008	After School	Title I	
3	Children will read at home, keep a reading log to be signed by their parents/guardians. The log will be returned to school and the students who have read will be entered in a drawing for prizes provided by Magic Waters Water Park.	1/5/2009	5/25/2009	After School	Other	

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
4	Dive into Reading program - staff designed reading initiative. Parents and children come to school one night a month to read in a particular genre, have dinner, and earn books. A passport recording each evenings' reading experience will be kept over the course of the year.	2/2/2009	5/25/2010	After School	Other	
5	Students will participate in the Book-It reading program sponsored by Pizza Hut. Students will read at home, document the reading at school, and receive pizza rewards at the end of each month.	1/5/2009	5/25/2009	After School	Local Funds	
6	Teachers will develop an instructional DVD to be sent home with all students demonstrating correct techniques for parent/child read alouds.	1/16/2009	6/3/2009	During School	Local Funds	
7	Children will read at home, keep a reading log to be signed by their parents/guardians. The log will be returned to school and the students who have read will be entered in a drawing for prizes provided by Magic Waters Water Park	1/5/2009	5/28/2009	After School	Other	
8	After a motivational assembly by the Rockford River Hawks, students will read at home and maintain a reading log to be signed by parents/guardians. The logs will be returned to school to earn tickets to a River Hawks Semi- Professional baseball game	1/5/2009	5/27/2009	After School	Other	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title : All students, economically disadvantaged students, Hispanic, black, and LEP as a result of tiered interventions will make AYP in Reading in 2009 and 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?)

Classroom teachers will administer district reading assessment, Fontas and Pinnell, three times over the course of the school year, analyzing the results for reading levels and skills development of their students. Changes in reading materials and skill emphasis will be made according to data analysis done in the context of grade level data teams.

The reading coach will record Fontas and Pinnell data on the assessment grid available to all teachers on the district public drive. During staff and grade level meetings, the reading coach will help the teachers interpret their data.

Think Link information will be analyzed and discussed in grade level meetings. Adjustments to improve student learning will be implemented and monitored.

The rading coach and classroom teachers will publicize and monitor particiaption in the Magic Waters and River Hawks reading programs.

The reading coach, the Title 1 teachers and the Title 1 tutors will analyze the reading data and adjust their instruction and groupings accordingly.

Title 1 teachers will schedule, publicize, and oversee the Books and Bingo activity. Attendance will be taken to assess the success of the event.

The school librarian, Yvonne Jaycox, will organize and publicize Family Reading Night.

The district curriculum coordinator, Anita Hughes, and the reading coach will present professional development experiences during the school day and after school. The impact of the experience will be monitored by teacher attendance figures and reflective feedback.

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
Rita Hall	Reading Coach
Christine Nania	Title 1 teacher
Mavash Moallem	Title 1 teacher

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective: 2

All students at Lathrop will continue to make AYP in math in 2009 and 2010, scoring 70% and 77.5% respectively.

Objective 2 Description:

Lathrop students made AYP in math in 2008. All students scored 62.8% while black students scored 55.7%. Hispanic and LEP students scored 70.0% and 72.6% respectively. Educationally disadvantaged students scored 61.4%. However, the students at Lathrop will be expected to score 70.0% and 77.5% in 2009 and 2010 to make AYP so math instruction and interventions must continue to be rigorous.

This objective does not address AYP deficiency(if any).

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 2 Title : All students at Lathrop will continue to make AYP in math in 2009 and 2010, scoring 70% and 77.5% respectively.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Title 1 teachers, using Thinklink data, will identify areas of weakness in math. They will work with small groups and individuals to reinforce those areas.	9/3/2008	6/3/2010	During School	Title I	
2	Two retired teachers will work with students as identified by Thinklink assessment and classroom teachers as needed extra support in math. The tutors will work with individuals and small groups.	9/15/2008	5/19/2010	During School	Title I	
3	Title 1 teacher will teach whole class math games which support Everyday Math concepts to every class on a weekly basis.	8/27/2008	5/28/2010	During School	Title I	
4	On a weekly basis classroom teachers will incorporate supplementary math manipulatives designed to enhance Everyday Math instruction.	8/27/2008	5/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
5	Math skills will be targeted for practice 30 minutes daily in 21st Century After School program	9/15/2008	5/14/2010	After School	Other	
6	In classroom setting, practice math extended response on a weekly basis.	8/27/2008	5/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title : All students at Lathrop will continue to make AYP in math in 2009 and 2010, scoring 70% and 77.5% respectively.

	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Classroom teachers attend district sponsored Everyday Math curriculum workshops	8/20/2008	5/25/2010	After School	Title I	
2	Math curriculum coordinator consult with teachers and model classroom lessons to help in full implementation of Everyday Math curriculum.	9/3/2008	5/28/2010	During School	Title I	
3	Math curriculum coordinator will share and demonstrate use of supplementary manipulatives at a staff meeting.	9/11/2008	9/11/2008	After School	Local Funds	
4	District Math Coordinator will orient the teaching staff to third edition of Everyday Math and provide suggestions for implementation.	8/22/2008	8/22/2008	Before School	Local Funds	
5	On a monthly basis, classroom teachers will share successful strategies for implementing the math curriculum. They will demonstrate at the monthly staff meeting and provide written instructions to the staff for the activity.	9/11/2008	5/13/2010	After School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 2 Title : All students at Lathrop will continue to make AYP in math in 2009 and 2010, scoring 70% and 77.5% respectively.						
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Nickle Facts - Students will practice math facts appropriate to their grade level at home with their parents. When the parents sign a note that their child is ready to take a math facts test, that child can take the test at school, earning a free pass to Nickle World game center for a passing score	11/26/2008	5/29/2009	After School	Title I	
2	Grades 3rd, 4th and 5th send Home Links component of Everyday Math to parents weekly.	9/17/2008	5/26/2010	After School	Other	
3	All grades implement use of Home Links component of Everday Math program, sending home math information to parents.	9/17/2008	5/26/2010	After School	Other	
4	Grades K-1 send home math games and instructions which are part of Everyday Math curriculum weekly. Students and parents play game and return short teacher created evaluation of the game and the experience to school	9/17/2008	5/26/2010	After School	Other	
5	All grades send home math games that accompany the Everyday Math curriculum on a weekly basis. Students and families play games and return short teacher-created evaluation of the experience to school the next day.	9/17/2008	5/26/2010	After School	Other	
6	Family Math Night - Parents and students will come to school to make and play math games and have a pizza supper	1/22/2009	1/22/2009	After School	Title I	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title : All students at Lathrop will continue to make AYP in math in 2009 and 2010, scoring 70% and 77.5% respectively.
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 Thniklink assessment will be used to monitor the progress of individuals in math groups three times a year to determine the movement of students through Tier 2 and Tier 3 levels of interventions.

Classroom teachers will keep records tracking the subject matter and return rate of Home Links and Everyday Math games. They will compare this information with results of the Thinklink and Everyday Math assessments and adjust math practice sent home accordingly.

Classroom teachers will monitor student assessments in Nickle Facts activity. Title 1 teacher will track student success and award Nickle World passes to students who earn them.

Classroom teachers will monitor expenses and the creation of crafts for Craft Night during the spring Fun Fair. Teachers will assess the activity with students following Craft Night using a personal reflection and a rubric. Title 1 will coordinate evening activity with parent, monitor attendance, and oversee food

for families.

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
Christine Nania	Title 1
Deanna Shere	3rd Grade
Ellen Olson	1st Grade

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective: 3

All Lathrop School students will make AYP in Reading and Math in 2009 and 2010 facilitated by the creation of an orderly school environment

Objective 3 Description:

Over the last three years, discipline referrals at Lathrop have risen dramatically to a high of 1030 during the 2006-2007 school year. In order to promote a positive, safe learning environment so that Lathrop will make 70.0% in reading and math in 2009 and 77.5% in reading and math in 2010 or Safe Harbor three specific interventions will be initiated.

Positive Behavior Intervention Support will be adopted as a building-wide system of behavior support. The implementation of PBIS will reduce behavior referrals by 75% in 2009 and by 95% in 2010.

As a feature of PBIS, the Lathrop PRIDE social skills instruction strategy will be taught at every grade level.

Although research does not support the notion that school uniforms by themselves will solve academic and behavioral problems, it has been shown that uniforms enhance the climate of orderliness and safety in a school. With that in mind, the process of the adoption of school uniforms at Lathrop will be started during the 2008-2009 school year and fully implemented in the fall of the 2009-2010 school year.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency

1	School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2	Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
3	LEP students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
4	Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities

Objective 3 Title : All Lathrop School students will make AYP in Reading and Math in 2009 and 2010 facilitated by the creation of an orderly school environment						
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Students will be oriented about the staff designed strategy, Lathrop PRIDE, representing the concept that the students are problem solvers, responsible, independent, determined, and encouraging. The students will learn the expectations and behaviors related to Lathrop PRIDE in class and all areas of the building. The students will learn the Lathrop PRIDE motto and recite it together each morning in the school morning meeting.	9/3/2008	5/28/2010	During School	Other	
2	Using one component of PRIDE each week for the first five weeks of the school year, the students will write about, discuss, and illustrate the principles of PRIDE.	9/3/2008	10/10/2008	During School	Other	
3	Students demonstrating Lathrop PRIDE will be highlighted by displaying their picture on a bulletin board in the main school hall.	9/3/2008	5/28/2010	During School	Other	
4	As part of the implementation of PBIS, specific classroom lessons will be designed to teach students how to demonstrate PRIDE characteristics in all areas of the school and at all times of day.	9/3/2008	5/28/2010	During School	Other	
5	Paw Print shaped forms will be awarded to students "caught" following PRIDE principles in the school. These paw prints will be placed in a weekly classroom drawing and a monthly schoolwide drawing to earn books and school supplies.	9/3/2008	5/28/2010	During School	Title I	
6	Posters displaying PRIDE components and expected behaviors will be prominently displayed in classrooms, hallways, and all other areas to which students have access.	8/25/2008	5/28/2010	During School	Other	
7	An all-school assembly focusing on positive attitudes and behavior using music and song will be scheduled.	4/23/2009	4/23/2009	During School	Title I	
8	Components of PRIDE will be reviewed and behavior instruction will continue until the students have had lesson in how to display the five components in each area of the building and each time of the day.	9/3/2008	5/28/2009	During School	Other	
9	Lathrop School will implement school uniform program completing district requirements for the proposal by January, 2009, piloting uniforms from January 2009 - June, 2009, and full implementation in fall, 2009	9/3/2008	8/25/2009	During School	Other	

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

Objective 3 Title : All Lathrop School students will make AYP in Reading and Math in 2009 and 2010 facilitated by the creation of an orderly school environment						
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Teachers will receive second tier training in Positive Behavior Intervention Support during December, January, February of the 2008-2009 school year.	12/4/2008	2/27/2009	After School	Local Funds	
2	Identified PBIS building core team will receive training in second tier strategies	12/4/2008	12/4/2008	After School	Local Funds	
3	PBIS core team will provide updates during monthly staff meetings about PBIS strategies and progress.	12/11/2008	5/13/2010	After School	Other	
4	Staff designers of PRIDE intervention will orient the staff and provide materials for the staff to create posters for classrooms.	8/22/2008	8/22/2008	Before School	Other	
5	Staff and core team will continue training in Stage 2 implementation of PBIS	1/8/2009	1/8/2009	After School	Local Funds	
6	Principal and staff will examine district policies and strategies with regard to uniforms at monthly staff meetings.	9/11/2008	1/15/2009	After School	Other	
7	Parent support specialist will be trained in operation of SWISS behavior tracking and reporting system.	1/15/2009	1/15/2009	During School	Local Funds	

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

Objective 3 Title : All Lathrop School students will make AYP in Reading and Math in 2009 and 2010 facilitated by the creation of an orderly school environment						
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date	Time Line	Fund Source	Amount (\$)
1	Parents will be informed about the adoption of Positive Behavior Intervention Support at Lathrop at registration in the student handbook	8/12/2008	8/13/2008	Before School	Local Funds	
2	Parents will be updated as to the progress of PBIS in the school in the principal's monthly newsletter and in teacher class newsletters	9/5/2008	5/28/2010	After School	Local Funds	
3	Parents will be informed about Lathrop PRIDE strategies in the school handbook, in principal's monthly newsletters, and classroom newsletters	8/13/2008	5/28/2010	Before School	Local Funds	
4	Posters explaining components of PRIDE and PBIS will be prominently displayed throughout the public areas of the school so that any parents visiting the building will be able to become familiar with Lathrop's behavior supports	8/25/2008	5/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	
5	With a survey result of 80%, Lathrop staff will implement the District 205 policy for the adoption of uniforms. By spring 2009, the policy will be formulated and distributed to the parents.	8/13/2008	8/12/2009	Before School	Local Funds	
6	7. At registration, information about prices and sources for school uniforms.	8/12/2009	8/12/2009	Before School	Local Funds	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 3 Title : All Lathrop School students will make AYP in Reading and Math in 2009 and 2010 facilitated by the creation of an orderly school environment

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

Uniform committee will monitor and maintain data on parent surveys, research on uniform policies, write the Lathrop uniform policy, and find sources for the uniforms.

PBIS core team will develop and monitor implementation of PBIS strategies and intervention. Parent Support Specialist will make entries in and monitor the data from the SWISS system of tracking schoolwide behavior.

The PBIS core team and the staff will analyze data on behavior provided by the SWISS computer system and make decisions about which behavior interventions on which to focus Lathrop Lessons.

The staff Lathrop PRIDE committee will provide continuing support for the PRIDE strategy during the 2008-2009 and the 2009-2010 school year. Data will be collected by classroom teachers about the frequency of positive behaviors resulting from the students' awareness of expected behaviors. The students will be surveyed about their attitudes with relation to school climate and behavior in the spring of 2008, in the fall of 2008, and in the spring of 2009.

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
Prudence Court	Principal
Dan Bogdonas	Fifth Grade Teacher
Dinah Hyslop	First Grade Teacher

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation Part A. Parent Notification*

This section describes how the plan has been developed and reviewed and identifies the support in place to ensure implementation.

Parent Notification - Describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand. (**Requirement for Title I Schools only.*)

Parents of Lathrop School students were notified about the school's academic status in writing through a letter distributed at school registration in August, 2008.

Parents were sent letters through the mail notifying them of the status of Lathrop School and informing them of their right to transfer to another school or receive free tutoring for their children by private sources.

Information about Lathrop's status was posted on the Rockford District 205 website.

Information about schools in status was released by the District and printed in the local newspaper.

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation Part B. Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder Involvement - Describe specifically how stakeholders (including parents, school staff, and outside experts) have been consulted in the development of the plan. The names and titles of the school improvement team or plan developers must be identified here.

Beginning in September, school staff were formed into data teams and asked to study ISAT and local assessment data to review and revise a plan for the improvement of instruction, and thereby ISAT scores, for the students at Lathrop School.

In January during School Improvement Planning Day, the groups will be reconfigured to include other stakeholders. These participants will include the school librarian, the parent support specialist, the art, music, and gym teacher, and the PTO president who is a parent at Lathrop. Our school secretary supplied and analyzed significant discipline data.

RESPRO has provided us with a SIP coach who has given advice and participated in the SIP planning sessions.

Names and titles of school improvement team or plan developers:

	Name	Title
1	Carmen Ramirez	Kdg. teacher
2	Suzanne Freeman	Kdg teacher
3	Jennie Johnson	Kdg teacher
4	Demetrice Hairston	Kdg teacher
5	Ellen Olson	First Grade teacher
6	Lori Fitzgerald	First Grade teacher
7	Dinah Hyslop	First Grade teacher
8	Jesus Medrano	Second Grade teacher
9	Maria Castello	Second Grade teacher
10	Nancy Spahr	Second Grade teacher
11	Fidel Fernandez	Third Grade teacher
12	Eva Valle-Bravo	Third Grade teacher
13	Cheryl Buczkowski	Fourth Grade teacher
14	Paula Randall	Fourth Grade teacher
15	Deanna Shere	Third Grade teacher
16	Maria Mendia	Fourth Grade teacher
17	Gregorio Arellano-Rodriguez	Fifth Grade teacher
18	Daniel Bogdonas	Fifth Grade teacher
19	Martina Smith	Fifth Grade teacher
20	Prudence J. Court	Principal
21	Edith Zipse	School Secretary
22	Sarah Carlson, Laura Hibbs	Art
23	Deb Ketzell	Music
24	Anna Legge, Gonzalo Diaz	Special Education
25	Marilyn Feimster	P.E.
26	Rita Hall	Reading Coach

27	Christine Nania, Mahvash Moallem	Title 1
28	Yvonne Jaycox	Librarian
29	Leslie Mitkusevitch	PTO President
30	Merri-lynn Seaburg	Respro SIP Coach
31		
32		

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation Part C. Peer Review Process

Peer Review - Describe the district's peer review and approval process. Peer review teams should include teachers and administrators from schools and districts similar to the one in improvement, but significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students. As appropriate, peer reviewers may be teachers from other schools, personnel from other districts, Regional Office of Education staff, Intermediate Service Center staff, RESPRO staff, university faculty, consultants, et al., or combinations thereof. RESPRO staff serving on a School Support Team should not serve on a peer review team in the same district. Peer review and subsequent local board approval must be completed within 45 days of receiving the school improvement plan.

For further description of the peer review process see LEA and School Improvement: Non-Regulatory Guidance, July 21, 2006, at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

Describe the peer review process including participants and date(s) of peer review.

The Regional Office of Education (ROE) will provide training in the SIP process in September and October 2008. SIP Monitoring/Scoring training will be provided to reviewers in October and November 2008. Ongoing support from the ROE will support the correct and effective evaluation of School Improvement Plans. SIP teams will pair with other schools in their tier level during November 2008 to review and refine their plans. Representatives of SIP Teams will submit their peer-reviewed SIP to the District Review Team prior to November 24, 2008. Schools then will submit their final plans to Dr. Thomas Schmitt for processing to the Board of Education on or before December 1, 2008.

The District Review Committee shall consist of Ms. Marcia Strothoff, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, Ms. Colleen Cyrus, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services, and Dr. Thomas Schmitt, Assistant Superintendent for Community Outreach and Procedures. All members of the District Review Committee will be trained in the SIP process by ROE a staff. School Improvement Plans based on 2008 Data will be submitted to the Board of Education for final approval on December 18, 2008. Approved School Improvement Plans will be submitted to the Illinois State Board of Education following approval by the Rockford Public Schools' Board of Education, prior to December 23, 2008.

All schools in Rockford Public Schools have produced a School Improvement Plan based on 2008 data to include incorporation of Response to Intervention

(Rtl) Plans and the Ten Components of a Schoolwide Title I Program (where applicable).

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation Part D. Teacher Mentoring Process

Teacher Mentoring Process - Describe the teacher mentoring program. Mentoring programs pair novice teachers with more experienced professionals who serve as role models and provide practical support and encouragement. Schools have complete discretion in deciding what else the teacher mentoring program should provide.

The major focus of the RPS new teacher induction program is the work of mentors trained in the Frameworks for Professional Teaching available through the NewTeacherCenter in Santa Cruz, California. Our Illinois partner for training and implementation is The Consortium For Educational Change (CEC). The program is based on the acquisition of Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS) taught through the use of Danielson's Frameworks Induction Program. This program incorporates Danielson's Four Domains of Professional Practice: 1) Planning and Preparation, 2) The Classroom Environment, 3) Instruction, and 4) Professional Responsibilities. These domains include methods of inquiry for content knowledge, an understanding of human development, approaches to learning that address diverse learner needs, planning for instruction, the creation of engaging and stimulating learning environments, a range of models for instructional delivery, the development of a range of communication skills, the use of formal and informal assessment strategies to support student academic development, the nurturing of collaborative relationships, and an emphasis on high standards of professional conduct.

In line with the above research and standards, this project values: (1) teaching as a career-long developmental process; (2) teaching as a continuous cycle of teaching, assessment, reflection, and re-teaching; (3) professional standards and a focus on student achievement as central to the improvement of practice; (4) teacher development as occurring best in a collegial environment where the sharing of expertise is valued; and (5) a teacher's professional growth as central to the improvement of student achievement.

All mentors are retired teachers who complete a 12 day training program provided by CEC in the Frameworks program. In addition, mentors attend monthly support sessions to improve their practice. Each mentor is assigned 3-5 new teachers to guide during the year. Mentors schedule an average of 1.5 hours of work with new teachers each week. Professional development is offered to teachers in specific grade level and subject areas during the year. Professional development is provided by the RPS curriculum department, school-based coaching, the Regional Office of Education, Golden Apple Foundation as well as the RPS induction program.

A final evaluation of the mentoring project is submitted the Illinois State Board of Education each summer. Mentors maintain time logs that document the time spent each week with each of their protégés and the topic of their sessions. The time logs are submitted to the grant manger for tabulation and review and do not contain confidential information. Time logs will be used for formative assessment during year two of the project. An annual survey of participants is completed to inform the

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation
Part E. District Responsibilities

District Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that the district has provided to revise the plan and other services that the district will provide toward implementation of strategies and activities. District technical assistance should include data analysis, identification of the school's challenges in implementing professional development requirements, the resulting need-related technical assistance and professional development to effect changes in instruction, and analysis and revision of the school's budget (NCLB, Section 1116). If applicable, identify corrective actions or restructuring options taken by the district.

The School Improvement Plan for each district building was developed with support and services provided by the RockfordSchool District. District assistance and participation in the plan included provision of data, data analysis, technical assistance, assessment coordination, intervention design, funding support, professional development opportunities, collaboration with community and curricular support. The following representatives from Rockford District 205 provided resources for the development and implementation of the plan:

The Rockford Board of Education

Mrs. Linda Hernandez, Superintendent of Schools

Mr. Thomas Hoffman, Chief Operations Officer

Ms. Colleen Cyrus, Assistant Superintendent of Student Support

Ms. Pamela Laughlin, Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources

Dr. Thomas Schmitt, Assistant Superintendent of Community Outreach and Procedures

Ms. Marcia Strothoff, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum & Instruction

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

Dr. Vinest Steele, Director of Title I

Mr. Paul Yankee, Director of Bilingual Education

Mr. Bob Corder, Director of Human Resources

Mr. Frank Schepley, Assessment Specialist

Ms. Shirley Chrestman, Special Education Assistant Director

Mrs. Linda Oshita, Title I Curriculum Coordinator

Mrs. Anita Hughes, Reading Coordinator

Mrs. Sue Mainville, Math coordinator

Mr. Ed Hayden, Coordinator of Social Work

Ms. Maggie Kempel, Project Coordinator

Ms. Sherrie Bias, NCLB Officer

The primary support intervention for all schools throughout the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 school years will be a systematic, continuous monitoring of school implementation by the District Leadership Team. Reading and Mathematics progress is summarized on a trimester basis for elementary schools and a quarterly basis for secondary schools and then presented to the District Leadership Team.

Implementation progress and goal achievement of each plan shall be reviewed, evaluated, and modified on an ongoing basis. The timeline for these reviews is as follows:

Elementary Schools – first Tuesday of each month, September – May;

Middle Schools – first Wednesday of each month, September – May; and

High Schools – first Friday of each month, September – May.

School teams are required to present implementation progress on the various components and goals of the SIP. The progress will be reported to the entire SIP Team, parent organization(s), community stakeholders, and faculty members on a quarterly basis via formal meetings. Input received via the meetings will be reviewed for possible inclusion in the SIP as an amendment. Stakeholder groups must agree upon the proposed revision(s) to the SIP document prior to its/their inclusion in the SIP document.

Corrective Actions taken by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress for a fourth annual calculation (Corrective Action Status) should be aligned with the strategies and activities of this plan. The district must take one or more of the following actions in such a school per NCLB, Section 1116(b)(7)(C)(iv).

Restructuring Options (allowed in Illinois) selected by a district for a Title I school that failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress for a fifth annual calculation (Restructuring Status) should be aligned with the strategies and activities of this plan. The district must take one or more of the following options in such a school.

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation Part F. State Responsibilities

State Responsibilities - *Specify the services and resources that ISBE, RESPROS, and other service providers have provided the school during the development and review of this plan and other services that will be provided during the implementation of the plan. ISBE shall provide technical assistance to the school if district fails to do so.*

The Illinois State Board of Education has provided several resources to Rockford Public Schools and this school to assist in the school improvement process. ISBE has provided timely student achievement data in 2008. Results from standardized tests proctored in spring 2008 were provided, preliminarily, in June 2008 and were made public in October 2008. ISBE and its partner, Northern Illinois University, have provided the Interactive Illinois Report Card, the School Improvement Plan template, and supporting documents. Individuals from ISBE and NIU have provided technical assistance in using the aforementioned documents.

Our RESPRO staff, led by Terry Parker, has collaborated with school faculty and the SIP team in data analysis, previous SIP review, and development of this SIP. The RESPRO has also provided financial resources to produce our SIP (stipends for SIP team members, if applicable), provide staff development opportunities, and purchase requisite supplies and materials.

Our Regional Office of Education has provided data and SIP 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, which in turn, provided the information to SIP writers.

The RESPRO and ROE staffs have historically provided assistance to school personnel to implement the SIP. We expect the same will continue during the

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation
Part G. School Support Team

State Responsibilities – List the names and identify the roles (e.g., distinguished educator, district curriculum coordinator, university partner, or RESPRO consultant) of the School Support Team. If applicable, School Support Teams are assigned to schools in corrective action to provide sustained and intensive support for those schools to make adequate yearly progress. Note: School Support Teams are not the same as school improvement teams or the school planning team. Schools in academic watch, restructuring, or restructuring implementation status should have School Support Teams. Some schools in Choice, SES, or academic early warning status also have School Support Teams.

	Name	Title
1	Marcia Strothoff	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction
2	Dr. Vinest Steele	Director of Title 1
3	Mr. Paul Yankee	Director of Bilingual Education
4	Mrs. Anita Hughes	Reading Coordinator
5	Mrs. Sue Mainville	Math Coordinator
6	Ms Maggie Kempel	21st Century After School Program
7	Mrs. Merri-Lynne Seaburg	Respro SIP coach

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board:

A. ASSURANCES

1. The district has provided written notice in a timely manner about the improvement identification to parents of each student enrolled in the school, in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand (NCLB, Section 1116(c)(6)).
2. Strategies and activities have been founded in scientifically based research as required by NCLB, Section 1116(b)(3)(A)(i) and as defined in NCLB, Section 9101(37).
3. Technical assistance provided by the district serving the school is founded on scientifically based research (NCLB, Section 1116(b)(4)(C)) as defined in NCLB, Section 9101(37).
4. The plan includes strategies and activities that support the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards and ensures alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessments with the Illinois Learning Standards.
5. The school will spend at least 10 percent of the funds made available under Section 1113 of NCLB for the purpose of providing teachers and the principal high-quality professional development. (Title I schools only.)

B.SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

By submitting the plan on behalf of the school the district superintendent certifies to ISBE that all the assurances and information provided in the plan are true and correct and that the improvement plan has been duly approved by the local school board. By sending e-mail notification of the plan completion from the **Submit Your Plan** page (Section IV-C) the plan shall be deemed to be executed by the superintendent on behalf of the school.

Section IV-B ISBE Monitoring

PART I - SECTIONS I and II OF THE PLAN

ANALYSIS OF DATA

- Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified?
- Does the SIP 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 optional data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

- If included, is there evidence that the SIP team analyzed optional data to clarify the areas of weakness?
- 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 (OPTIONAL)

- If included, has the SIP team analyzed other available data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities?
- 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 SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan?
- Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency?

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 in special education non-compliance?
	Do the parent involvement strategies 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?
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

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

	Does this plan describe how the school has provided written notice about the school's academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? (Title I Schools Only)
--	--

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

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

PEER REVIEW

	Is the peer review process described and is there evidence that this plan has been subjected to rigorous review to ensure that it will have "the greatest likelihood" of ensuring that all groups will achieve AYP?
--	---

TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS

	Is it clear how the school is ensuring that teachers are receiving the support needed for their professional growth and to retain them in the profession?
--	---

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

	Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan?
	If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options 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?
SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM	
	Have the names and titles of School Support Team members been listed in the plan? Does the team appear to have the expertise to support this school in regards to the school improvement plan?
APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD	
	The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.

PART II - COMMENTS