

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL

Restructuring Plan 2007

Board Approval Date:	4/22/2008
Plan Submission Date & Ref No:	4/23/2008 - RES07 - 002056
ISBE Monitoring Date:	ISBE Monitoring Not Started.

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

School & District Information

RCDTS Code Number : 041012050250004

District Name: ROCKFORD SD 205

School Name : JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL

Superintendent: Linda Hernandez

Principal :Dr. Kenneth Jackson

District Address: 201 S MADISON ST

School Address : 4145 SAMUELSON RD

City/State/Zip : ROCKFORD, IL 61104 2092

City/State/Zip : ROCKFORD, IL 61109 3299

District Phone : (815) 966-3101

School Phone : (815) 874-9536

District Email : RPS205.com

School Email :

Is this for a Title I School? No

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 1 - Adequate Yearly Progress Report for 2007

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?		No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2007-08 Federal Improvement Status		
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2007-08 State Improvement Status		Academic Watch Status

	Percent Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
Student Groups	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		55.0			55.0			90.0		72.0	
All	98.5	Yes	98.5	Yes	30.9		No	34.3		No			70.4	No
White	97.8	Yes	97.8	Yes	43.2	53.0	No	43.7	50.4	No			72.7	
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	12.1	40.0	No	13.6	29.5	No			67.6	
Hispanic	98.6	Yes	98.6	Yes	14.8		No	23.0		No				
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities	95.9	Yes	95.9	Yes										
Economically Disadvantaged	99.1	Yes	99.1	Yes	22.2	43.6	No	25.6	34.8	No			72.2	

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 2 - Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives Report for 2007

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

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 3 - School Information

Basic Information	2001 - 2002	2002 - 2003	2003 - 2004	2004 - 2005	2005 - 2006	2006 - 2007
Attendance Rate (%)	90.8	88.8	88.4	85.8	88.2	88.9
Truancy rate (%)	10.1	15.7	15.7	22.2	23.1	20.0
Mobility rate (%)	26.8	26.0	29.6	32.8	29.1	20.1
Expulsion rate (%)						
Retention rate, if applicable (%)						
HS graduation rate, if applicable (%)	82.4	85.2	63.8	69.4	69.1	70.4
HS dropout rate, if applicable (%)	7.3	10.4	8.9	10.7	3.0	5.6
Teachers working out-of-field (#)						
Paraprofessionals in Title I funded programs and/or schools designated as school-wide with less than 2 years of training and/or education degree (#)						
School Population (#)	1,787	1,766	1,807	1,924	1,964	2,010
Economically disadvantaged (%)	39.8	41.8	41.0	50.3	51.7	57.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) (%)	3.0	0.1	5.1	6.1	7.8	9.0
Students with disabilities (%)						
White, non-Hispanic (%)	56.2	55.5	54.8	53.8	49.3	47.4
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	28.9	29.0	29.4	27.7	28.7	28.0
Hispanic (%)	10.9	11.5	12.2	14.9	17.6	19.7
Native American or Alaskan Native (%)	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 4 - Race/Ethnicity

	Year	White(%)	Black(%)	Hispanic(%)	Asian(%)	Native American(%)	Multiracial/Ethnic(%)
S C H O O L	2001	59.1	26.6	10.4	3.7	0.1	-
	2002	56.2	28.9	10.9	3.9	0.1	-
	2003	55.5	29.0	11.5	3.7	0.2	-
	2004	54.8	29.4	12.2	3.5	0.1	-
	2005	53.8	27.7	14.9	3.5	0.1	-
	2006	49.3	28.7	17.6	3.8	0.2	0.4
	2007	47.4	28.0	19.7	3.8	0.1	0.9
D I S T R I C T	2001	51.0	31.1	14.5	3.1	0.2	-
	2002	49.1	31.5	16.1	3.1	0.2	-
	2003	47.7	31.8	17.2	3.1	0.2	-
	2004	46.0	32.3	18.3	3.2	0.2	-
	2005	44.3	31.0	19.2	3.1	0.1	2.3
	2006	42.5	30.5	20.6	3.1	0.2	3.2
	2007	40.7	30.8	21.5	3.0	0.1	4.0
S T A T E	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 5 - Educational Environment

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income(%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truancy (%)	HS Dropout Rate(%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2001	2.2	32.5	95.0	87.6	26.6	274.0	16.5	9.3	71.4
	2002	3.0	39.8	73.6	90.8	26.8	189.0	10.1	7.3	82.4
	2003	0.1	41.8	74.5	88.8	26.0	287.0	15.7	10.4	85.2
	2004	5.1	41.0	100.0	88.4	29.6	296.0	15.7	8.9	63.8
	2005	6.1	50.3	100.0	85.8	32.8	388.0	22.2	10.7	69.4
	2006	7.8	51.7	100.0	88.2	29.1	461.0	23.1	3.0	69.1
	2007	9.0	57.6	60.0	88.9	20.1	418.0	20.0	5.6	70.4
D I S T R I C T	2001	9.0	53.3	99.5	91.8	16.6	2,562.0	10.3	6.7	73.9
	2002	10.3	56.9	95.7	93.1	16.8	2,248.0	8.3	6.0	74.9
	2003	6.5	56.9	96.3	92.8	16.8	1,717.0	6.2	7.8	81.3
	2004	12.2	55.1	99.8	92.7	19.0	2,306.0	8.3	6.6	69.4
	2005	12.0	57.6	98.2	91.5	20.9	2,436.0	9.6	8.9	73.1
	2006	12.0	65.7	99.0	92.3	18.1	2,626.0	9.4	3.0	71.0
	2007	12.3	68.4	91.9	92.6	15.0	1,868.0	6.6	3.2	75.0
S T A T E	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813.0	2.2	5.7	83.2
	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225.0	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.9	94.0	16.4	37,525.0	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764.0	2.1	4.6	86.5
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152.0	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836.0	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056.0	2.5	3.5	85.9

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 6 - Enrollment Trends

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
S C H O O L	2001	1,714	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	1,787	-	-	-	-	-	348
	2003	1,766	-	-	-	-	-	334
	2004	1,807	-	-	-	-	-	359
	2005	1,924	-	-	-	-	-	309
	2006	1,964	-	-	-	-	-	296
	2007	2,010	-	-	-	-	-	337
D I S T R I C T	2001	26,502	2,094	2,177	2,242	1,966	2,002	1,170
	2002	26,674	2,158	2,121	2,118	2,165	1,929	1,506
	2003	27,330	2,109	2,200	2,149	2,221	2,124	1,531
	2004	27,576	2,083	2,120	2,172	2,227	2,164	1,552
	2005	27,464	2,061	2,107	2,102	2,105	2,141	1,483
	2006	27,456	2,097	2,055	2,053	2,094	2,044	1,443
	2007	27,787	2,197	2,100	2,092	2,072	2,137	1,541
S T A T E	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2003	2,044,539	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2004	2,060,048	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2005	2,062,912	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006	2,075,277	136,123	139,619	146,935	153,566	154,856	-
	2007	2,077,856	-	-	-	-	-	-

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 7 - Educator Data

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

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

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 8a - Assessment Data (Reading)

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading - Grades 11					
Groups	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
All	40.7	50.3	48.1	40.1	30.7
White	47.2	58.2	60.6	46.4	43.0
Black	22.7	30.4	17.1	27.8	12.2
Hispanic	46.9	30.7	40.5	34.1	13.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	50.1	60.0	63.7	35.7
Native American	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	3.8	6.7	18.4	11.9	5.6
Economically Disadvantaged	27.2	34.9	38.0	33.8	22.0

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

Item 8b - Assessment Data (Mathematics)

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics - Grades 11					
Groups	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
All	36.9	50.0	40.8	35.5	32.0
White	44.5	58.3	51.5	45.7	41.3
Black	13.6	17.9	13.2	16.7	12.2
Hispanic	34.4	42.3	32.4	25.0	20.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	68.8	60.0	63.6	64.2
Native American	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	-	3.3	10.5	9.5	13.5
Economically Disadvantaged	23.3	35.8	30.7	26.9	22.9

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section II-A Plan Activities - Restructuring Options

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

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

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

i. governance and management, and/or

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section II-B Plan Activities - Plan Description

A. Restructuring Plan Description

Describe the plan for restructuring the school.

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

Jefferson High School failed to meet 2007 AYP target for Mathematics in all subgroups, as well as the composite. The Mathematics scores in 2007 will also fail to meet AYP targets in 2008 for all subgroups, as well as the composite. Reading scores also failed to meet the 2007 AYP target in all subgroups as well as the All group. The same fail-to-meet would be observed in 2008. The trend data is negative for Jefferson. The percentage of students who met/exceeded the AYP target, as measured by the PSAE, has declined over the past three years.

Jefferson's PSAE Reading meet/exceeds percentages have declined as follows: All from 48.1% to 30.7%, 2005 to 2007; White, from 60.6% to 43.0%; Black, from 17.1% to 12.2%; Hispanic, from 40.5% to 13.2%; Asian Pacific Islander, from 60.0% to 35.7%; Students with Disabilities, from 18.4% to 5.6%; and Economically Disadvantaged, from 38.0% to 22.0%. Mathematics scores have generally declined as well. Jefferson's PSAE Mathematics meet/exceeds percentages have declined as follows: All from 40.8% to 32.0%, 2005 to 2007; White, from 51.5% to 41.3%; Black, from 13.2% to 12.2%; Hispanic, from 32.4% to 20.6%; and Economically Disadvantaged, from 30.7% to 22.9%. Two subgroups showed small improvements: Asian Pacific Islander, from 60.0% to 64.2%, and Students with Disabilities, from 10.5% to 13.5%, 2005 to 2007.

Jefferson's demographic data has not changed significantly during the past three years. The school's Free and Reduced lunch count has increased from 50.3% to 57.6% during the past three years. The mobility (32.8% to 20.1%) and truancy (22.2% to 20.0%) rates have decreased over the past three years, while the Attendance Rate has been statistically steady. Parental Involvement has declined 40% over the past three years.

Jefferson's Principal was replaced in 2006. The Board of Education placed a new principal at Jefferson for the 2008-2009 school year. Mr. Don Rundall will become the principal on July 1, 2008. It is expected that other administrative changes will be made as well. Over half

(56.7%) of the teaching positions have had personnel changes during the past three years. Faculty members are now Highly Qualified under NCLB parameters.

Jefferson High School's restructuring started in August 2007 with the partial implementation of the Freshman Foundations (FF) program. Some scheduling changes were made to support teaming of first-time 9th grade students. Some classroom locations were altered to group freshmen in a geographic area of the building. A Freshman Foundations Coordinator was hired to oversee program implementation. The FF program guidelines will be fully implemented at Jefferson in August 2008. The changes relative to zoned attendance center, Behavior and Development task force work, and Career Academy proposals should quicken the pace of improvement at Jefferson.

In order to hasten the full implementation of Freshman Foundations at Jefferson, we are reorganizing our administrative team's duties. An Assistant Principal will be named as the "Freshman Administrator" this summer. The Freshman Administrator will be wholly responsible for supervising the schedule (to support teaming), Extended Learning Opportunities, teacher evaluations for those who teach ninth grade students, instructional strategies, and other facets of student life. We believe having a certificated administrator, in addition to the Freshman Foundations Coordinator, will ensure the breadth and depth of program implementation that we want and believe to be efficacious.

The case for making our Freshman Foundations program the cornerstone of Jefferson's restructuring is easily made based on researched models. Roderick in 2006 (Closing the Aspirations-Attainment Gap) wrote, "Research shows that compared to students with on-time promotion to the 10th grade, students who are not performing well enough to be promoted by the end of their first year of high school are three-and-a-half times less likely to stay in school and graduate within five years." We must connect each incoming class at Jefferson High School with their school, their teachers, and rigorous content to make substantial gains in achievement, graduation rate, and most other measures.

We believe the implementation of the broad-ranging reforms contained within this plan and the District's Three Year Education Plan will show positive effects at Jefferson. Broader and deeper implementation will come with time, professional development, and a committed-to-improvement administration. Due to the fact that no subgroup met the AYP target in 2007, and due to the ever-increasing AYP targets, our general, widespread reformation efforts are warranted.

Jefferson High School is not a Title I school and therefore not subject to NCLB-mandated sanctions. The school staff members have been working to improve the school's achievement levels for all students. They have started to utilize Data Teams and a RESPRO-provided Improvement Coach to monitor specific course data and revise instruction accordingly. They 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 57% and from 60% meet/exceeds in Mathematics to 75%. Our middle schools are in the third year and have seen District-wide averages on the ISAT increase in Reading from 49% meet/exceeds to 63% and from 37% meet/exceeds in Mathematics to 65%. Our high schools are in the first year of the reforms intended to alter their composition, practices, and culture. We are making substantial progress across the District, with most schools making double digit gains in student achievement. We believe these gains will continue as better prepared students matriculate through the entire system and our reforms take deep root in the culture and climate of each school, the District, and our community.

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

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

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

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

Rockford Public Schools and our RESPRO are working to utilize the Surveys of Enacted Curriculum to see if what is being taught is what is being tested and taught at the depth it is tested. The RESPRO would support this effort. It is \$12.50/survey/teacher. As we are working on

vertical and horizontal articulation of our curriculum, it would be beneficial to each high school to match their words with their actions.

Rockford Public Schools, in 2008, is in the first year of a three-year plan to restructure all high schools. These District-wide, tier-specific changes address Response to Intervention, Student Assignment, student life, course delivery, more rigorous Graduation Requirements, multiple opportunities for success, and student choices for programming. 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 9th grade students for the FY2008 year. The proposal closed one middle school (Wilson) and converted the building to a first-time freshman-only campus. Specific program and enrollment changes are considered later in this plan.

The move to zoned attendance centers will take four years to fully implement as the Board of Education adopted the proposal to zone students in the entry grade and roll the zones up. All high schools will be fully zoned by FY2011. Early anecdotal evidence, extracurricular participation rates, and disciplinary referral rates indicate that the beliefs listed below will come to fruition as the schools become fully zoned.

It is believed that zoned attendance centers for high school 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 is possible 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 or programs of choice, which are sometimes referred to as Magnet Schools. The citywide schools or programs of choice for high school students are: Auburn High School (CAPA, Gifted, and ROTC) and East High School (Construction Program). The Board of Education adopted a proposal in late 2007 to form the Academic Career Education High School (ACEHS), which will begin operations in August 2008. Students and parents are afforded additional choices at Roosevelt High School, an alternative high school.

Our high schools clearly need to be restructured. Our students’ achievement levels, as measured by the 11th grade PSAE, have generally decreased from 2005 to 2007, sometimes by precipitous amounts. Auburn’s M/E rate in Reading was 62% in 2005, but fell to 45% in 2007; their Mathematics rate dropped from 47% to 36%. East’s M/E rate in Reading was 30% in 2005, but fell to 29% in 2007; their Mathematics rate increased from 20% to 23%. Guilford’s M/E rate in Reading was 58% in 2005, but fell to 50% in 2007; their Mathematics rate dropped from 48% to 46%. Jefferson’s M/E rate in Reading was 49% in 2005, but fell to 31% in 2007; their Mathematics rate dropped from 41% to 32%. The declines over the past two years serve as a clear call to act.

In 2009, we will adopt the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) as our common assessment tool in reading for ninth grade students. Teachers will utilize the assessment to obtain greater insight into each student’s specific need(s) and better communicate to parents as to how they could assist their young adult learn more. During FY2008, we adopted the Enterprise Edition of the SRI to allow greater transferability of data between District schools for each student, which provides three years of data to high school counselors to help them most appropriately schedule incoming freshmen.

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

In the first year of our high school reformation plan, we hired three part-time staff at each high school to coordinate various improvement activities. We added a Department Chair for English and Math, and we added a Freshman Foundation Coordinator. Each of these staff members is to ensure that adequate resources are available to teachers in their respective areas, lead relevant teachers in data-driven decision-making relative to instruction and program development, coordinate opportunities for students to demonstrate success, serve as a liaison between department or grade level and administration, and other activities designed to improve student achievement and life.

The Freshman Foundation Coordinator also has tasks related to implementing the Foundations program at his/her high school. These tasks include leading teachers into a more Standards-based grading system, coordinating after school activities and Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO), and working with administration to provide a separate building location and schedules that support teaming to the

greatest degree possible.

The Freshman Foundation initiative seeks to create ninth grade learning communities that provide improvements for students and schools that last through each student's four-year high school experience, which ends upon graduation. The objective for Freshman Foundation is: To create freshman learning communities that facilitate the transition from the middle grades to high school by maximizing every student's potential for academic success.

Program Structure and Overview:

All Rockford High Schools are adhering to the same basic philosophy, spirit, and structure to implement the Freshman Foundation Program. Our ninth grade learning communities will focus on student engagement and foster academic success by employing the following strategies:

- Separating first year freshman in a separate wing or hall and carefully orchestrating the transition to high school.
- Ensuring that every freshman is enrolled in courses that optimize his or her chance for success. Eighth grade teachers and counselors will recommend classes on the basis of individual student strengths.
- Designing instruction around the Power Standards and providing multiple opportunities for student success.
- Providing after school extended learning opportunities for selected students during a two week period immediately following each quarter. (Maximum of two courses per semester).
- Creating a grading policy that focuses on academics rather than behaviors and encourages students to work toward mastery of standards.
- Creating a homework policy that clearly states the intent and the grading weight of homework.
- Strongly encouraging every freshman to participate in some school activity, sport, club, or service organization.
- Providing assemblies, programs and trips designed specifically for freshmen.
- Strongly recommending either Career Awareness (freshman year) or Speech by grade eleven.

We also implemented Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) in October 2007. ELO program elements are:

- Designed for students who have mastered some of the standards, but not enough to earn a grade of "C". Students who master between 41% and 69% of the power standards during any given quarter will be invited to attend after school extended learning opportunities in up to two courses during the two weeks immediately following the last day of each quarter. During the two weeks of ELO, these students will receive additional help and opportunities to display mastery of some or all of the remaining standards. Students who master enough additional power standards to attain a mastery rate of 60% will have their course grade changed to a C and receive the appropriate credit on their transcript.
- Students who master between 60 and 69% of the power standards may opt to take the grade of D and decline the extended learning opportunity and the chance to raise their grade to a "C". A grade of D does provide credit toward a diploma.

- Students who master between 41% and 59% of the standards and who choose not to attend ELO sessions will receive a grade of “F” after two weeks. Students who choose not to attend ELO will only be allowed to make up the failed class through Credit Recovery or Summer School.
- Students who make grade of 0- 39% and need credit for the course for graduation must retake the course through Credit Recovery, Night School or Summer School.

The students who participate in 2007-2008’s initial implementation of the Freshman Foundation program will not be assessed via the PSAE until 2010. We are developing common summative assessments in the 2007-2008 school year to gain greater insight and transferability of data in English, Algebra, and Geometry. These assessment data points will be used to refine Foundation programming, enroll tested students in the most appropriate courses, and revise or improve instructional methodologies.

We will expand the development of common summative assessments in 2008-2010 to all core subjects. We believe that common summative assessments will enable us to monitor teacher efficacy, program design, and provide a basis for multiple opportunities for success for all students.

We are piloting the ELO concept with seniors at Auburn High School in the second semester of the 2007-2008 school year. Lessons learned in this pilot will be used to guide the expansion of the ELO concept to grades 10-12 in FY2009 and FY2010. The expected cultural shift, from “failure happens” to “success is possible,” should increase expectations for student success across stakeholder groups, enable the District to devote additional resources to first-time courses rather than “repeater” courses, and increase matriculation and graduation rates as students gain credits rather than frustration.

The District has supported the implementation of the Freshman Foundation element of our restructuring with:

- The creation of a new position- Freshman Foundation Coordinator
- The Reduction in class size to 1 to 25 as possible with a maximum of 28 in all core academic courses
- The development of student record sheets and quarterly assessments for power standards
- The development of more appropriate freshman core and elective classes
- The provision of \$ 10,000 in financial support to fund field trips, clubs and service learning opportunities.

We are in the process of increasing options available to students in the program of study as well. We hired our first full-time Director of Career Education on July 1, 2007. Responsibilities for this administrator include:

- Development of joint programs with Rock Valley College
- Creation of community partnerships
- Creation of internship programs
- Management of CEANCI funding, programming, and reporting
- Management of dual credit class opportunities

- Management of Virtual classes, especially the pilot usage of widespread usage of IVHS classes at Auburn High School during the 2007-2008 school year
- Develop curriculum and implementation program for Career High School

Michael Cermak, Director of Career Education, has worked with community leaders, union officials, parents and students, and developed the curriculum and program for Rockford's Academic Career Education High School. The first class of ACEHS students will start in August 2008, utilizing space at Rock Valley College's Stenstrom Center.

Dr. Thomas Schmitt and Michael Cermak will research a Career Academy concept to be used at each traditional high school in FY2009, with possible implementation in 2010. Each high school's Career Academy would build upon the limited career courses in place at each site, but expand offerings to increase rigor and relevancy in the courses and to build relationships with community businesses and institutions through job shadowing and internships. Madison West (Madison, WI) and Nathan Hale High School (West Allis, WI) will provide insights and assistance in planning for our Career Academies. Both of these schools are situated in locales that approximate Rockford's, have needed to reform their schools, and have demonstrated success in using a career focus to improve student achievement with sizeable segments of their populations. Madison West has participated in the "High School Survey of Student Engagement" and seen increases in students' reported perceptions of academic, social, and personal engagement. Nathan Hale is recognized as offering the best Career Academy in Wisconsin and is rated fourth nationally.

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

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

1. Why form Behavior and Development Task Forces?

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

2. What will the Task Forces do?

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

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

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

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

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

Rockford’s 3 Rs Restructuring Plan

Action Plan

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

6. Track relevant data for first semester FY2009
7. Report to Board of Education in January 2009
8. Track relevant data for second semester FY2009
9. Report to Board of Education in June 2009

Rockford's 3 Rs Restructuring Plan

READY for School

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

RESPECT

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

REACHING Higher

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

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

Auburn High School Action Plan

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

Summer 2007 Training for all incoming 9th grade teachers, Freshman Foundations Coordinators, and relevant administrators Martha Hayes, CIO Per diem for teachers, Title II, IDEA, and balance by Fund 10

August 2007, ongoing Place English, Math, and Freshman Department Chairs or Coordinators Building Principals Fund 10

August 2007 Institute Training of all staff on Extended Learning Opportunities, grading and homework policies, and connecting students to the school through activities and clubs Building Principals and Freshman Foundation Coordinators None

August 2007 Hire Director of Career Education. Martha Hayes, CIO Fund 10

August 2007-December 2007 Plan for career high school Dr. Thomas Schmitt, Asst. Supt. and Michael Cermak, Director of Career Education None

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

January 2008 Assess Freshman Foundations initial impacts and revise second semester plan as necessary Linda Hernandez, Supt., Marcia Strothoff, Asst. Supt., Building Principals, and Freshman Foundation Coordinators none

December 2007- March 2008 Develop revised Social Studies curriculum for grades 5-8 and study related changes for high school students Kathy Cassioppi, Social Sciences Coordinator None

April-May 2008 Present Social Science changes to Board of Education, including a new requirement for new coursework in World Geography in high school. Also, a change in the sequencing of Government class will be presented Marcia Strothoff and Kathy Cassioppi None

June-July 2008 Work with Information Systems Department to ensure accurate Graduation Rate calculation and revise Transcript form to better communicate with parents Marcia Strothoff, Dr. Thomas Schmitt, Frank Schepley, and Terry Wight None

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

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

August 2008 Review, refine and adjust Freshman Foundation principles and practices Linda Hernandez, Colleen Cyrus, Thomas Schmitt, Marcia Strothoff, Building Principals, and Freshman Foundation Coordinators None

August-September 2008 Implement revisions in FF principles and move concepts into 10th grade Building Principals and Freshman

Foundation Coordinators Fund 10 to cover costs for ELO implementation at 10th grade level
August-December 2008 Career Academy concepts and models researched Dr. Thomas Schmitt and Michael Cermak \$3,000 for travel and supplies, covered by Career Education funds
August 2008 Academic Career Education High School opens for inaugural class Michael Cermak \$ 92,000 plus per capita costs, Fund 10.
August 2008-June 2009 Develop and test common assessments in all core subject areas Marcia Strothoff and Curriculum Coordinators or Supervisors Stipends for cooperating teachers to be covered by Fund 10 and/or Title II
August 2008-2009 Develop new courses in Environmental Science, Math, and World Geography Marcia Strothoff and Curriculum Coordinators or Supervisors Supplies, Fund 10.
August 2008-June 2009 Initial implementation activities for Response to Intervention program Colleen Cyrus and Special Education Administrators All costs to be borne by IDEA grant
August 2009-June 2010 Implement refined Response to Intervention plan Colleen Cyrus, Special Education Administrators, and Building Principals IDEA grant and Fund 10
August 2009 Consider adding Department Chairs for Social Science, Science, and Fine Arts Linda Hernandez and Tom Hoffman, COO .2 allocation for each position at each high school

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by School Board : 4/22/2008

SUPERINTENDENT'S CERTIFICATION

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

Signature of LEA Superintendent

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL - ROCKFORD SD 205

ISBE Monitoring - Part I