

Local Board Approved	01/24/2011
Submitted	01/25/2011
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	



Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 1 - 2010 AYP Report

Is this School making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this School been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	No
Is this School making AYP in Reading?	No	2010-11 Federal Improvement Status	
Is this School making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2010-11 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status Year 5

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading		Mathematics				Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		77.5			77.5			91		80	
All	99.7	Yes	99.7	Yes	63.3		No	64.9		No			96.7	Yes
White	99.6	Yes	99.6	Yes	68.2	75.6	No	70.9	74.4	No			97.7	
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	36.0	43.8	No	30.0	41.9	No			93.9	
Hispanic	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	45.0	52.8	No	48.6	48.6	Yes			95.6	
Asian/Pacific Islander														

Native American													
Multiracial/Ethnic													
LEP													
Students with Disabilities	99.1	Yes	99.1	Yes	22.9	29.5	No	19.8	28.7	No		79.0	
Economically Disadvantaged	97.9	Yes	97.9	Yes									

**Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress(AYP)**

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. \*\*\*
3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 77.5% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 91% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 80% graduation rate for high schools.

\* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2009.

\*\* Safe Harbor Targets of 77.5% or above are not printed.

\*\*\* Subgroups with fewer than 45 students are not reported. Safe Harbor only applies to subgroups of 45 or more. In order for Safe Harbor to apply, a subgroup must decrease by 10% the percentage of scores that did not meet state standards from the previous year plus meet the other indicators (attendance rate for non-high schools and graduation rate for high schools) for the subgroup. For subgroups that do not meet their Safe Harbor Targets, a 75% confidence interval is applied. Safe Harbor allows schools an alternate method to meet subgroup minimum targets on achievement.

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data  
Item 2 - 2010 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	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Attendance Rate (%)	94.0	94.0	93.6	94.1	93.5	93.7	94.0	94.2
Truancy Rate (%)	1.7	1.0	1.5	1.5	2.1	2.6	1.7	1.3
Mobility Rate (%)	7.7	7.8	15.1	9.1	6.3	8.0	4.7	7.9
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	84.7	97.8	89.5	92.2	85.7	92.2	91.6	96.7
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	3.2	2.4	2.3	1.9	2.2	2.4	2.2	2.8
School Population (#)	3,180	3,297	3,502	3,728	3,801	3,879	3,900	3,848
Low Income (%)	6.9	7.0	5.4	4.6	5.9	6.3	8.6	7.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.7	0.8
Students with Disabilities (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.6
White, non-Hispanic (%)	87.3	85.9	83.5	81.5	80.2	78.6	77.0	76.3
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	5.0	5.1	5.6	6.0	6.1	6.1	6.7	6.4
Hispanic (%)	6.1	7.2	8.7	9.4	9.8	10.8	10.9	11.7
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.8
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.7
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	0.3	1.2	1.9	2.3	3.1	3.1

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

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
S C H O O L	2000	88.8	4.8	4.6	1.6	0.2	-
	2001	88.5	5.0	4.8	1.5	0.2	-
	2002	87.6	5.2	5.5	1.5	0.3	-
	2003	87.3	5.0	6.1	1.2	0.4	-
	2004	85.9	5.1	7.2	1.2	0.6	-
	2005	83.5	5.6	8.7	1.1	0.8	0.3
	2006	81.5	6.0	9.4	1.1	0.8	1.2
	2007	80.2	6.1	9.8	1.3	0.7	1.9
	2008	78.6	6.1	10.8	1.4	0.8	2.3
	2009	77.0	6.7	10.9	1.6	0.7	3.1
	2010	76.3	6.4	11.7	1.8	0.7	3.1
D I S T R I C T	2000	88.8	4.8	4.6	1.6	0.2	-
	2001	88.5	5.0	4.8	1.5	0.2	-
	2002	87.6	5.2	5.5	1.5	0.3	-
	2003	87.3	5.0	6.1	1.2	0.4	-
	2004	85.9	5.1	7.2	1.2	0.6	-
	2005	83.5	5.6	8.7	1.1	0.8	0.3
	2006	81.5	6.0	9.4	1.1	0.8	1.2
	2007	80.2	6.1	9.8	1.3	0.7	1.9
	2008	78.6	6.1	10.8	1.4	0.8	2.3
	2009	77.0	6.7	10.9	1.6	0.7	3.1
	2010	76.3	6.4	11.7	1.8	0.7	3.1
	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-

<b>S T A T E</b>	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
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5
	2010	52.8	18.8	21.1	4.2	0.2	2.9

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 Truants (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
S C H O O L	2000	-	5.5	95.4	92.8	5.8	21	0.8	2.3	85.2
	2001	0.1	4.7	94.0	92.2	7.2	38	1.3	4.2	83.0
	2002	0.1	5.2	94.0	92.2	5.9	43	1.5	3.0	78.4
	2003	0.2	6.9	94.0	94.0	7.7	51	1.7	3.2	84.7
	2004	0.1	7.0	94.0	94.0	7.8	33	1.0	2.4	97.8
	2005	0.4	5.4	94.0	93.6	15.1	53	1.5	2.3	89.5
	2006	0.4	4.6	94.0	94.1	9.1	58	1.5	1.9	92.2
	2007	0.4	5.9	94.0	93.5	6.3	84	2.1	2.2	85.7
	2008	0.7	6.3	94.0	93.7	8.0	98	2.6	2.4	92.2
	2009	0.7	8.6	94.0	94.0	4.7	65	1.7	2.2	91.6
2010	0.8	7.4	94.0	94.2	7.9	51	1.3	2.8	96.7	
D I S T R I C T	2000	-	5.5	95.4	92.8	5.8	21	0.8	2.3	85.2
	2001	0.1	4.7	94.0	92.2	7.2	38	1.3	4.2	83.0
	2002	0.1	5.2	94.0	92.2	5.9	43	1.5	3.0	78.4
	2003	0.2	6.9	94.0	94.0	7.7	51	1.7	3.2	84.7
	2004	0.1	7.0	94.0	94.0	7.8	33	1.0	2.4	97.8
	2005	0.4	5.4	94.0	93.6	15.1	53	1.5	2.3	89.5
	2006	0.4	4.6	94.0	94.1	9.1	58	1.5	1.9	92.2
	2007	0.4	5.9	94.0	93.5	6.3	84	2.1	2.2	85.7
	2008	0.7	6.3	94.0	93.7	8.0	98	2.6	2.4	92.2
	2009	0.7	8.6	94.0	94.0	4.7	65	1.7	2.2	91.6
2010	0.8	7.4	94.0	94.2	7.9	51	1.3	2.8	96.7	
	2000	6.1	36.7	97.2	93.9	17.5	45,109	2.4	5.8	82.6
	2001	6.3	36.9	94.5	93.7	17.2	42,813	2.2	5.7	83.2

S T A T E	2002	6.7	37.5	95.0	94.0	16.5	39,225	2.0	5.1	85.2
	2003	6.3	37.9	95.7	94.0	16.4	37,525	1.9	4.9	86.0
	2004	6.7	39.0	96.3	94.2	16.8	40,764	2.1	4.6	86.6
	2005	6.6	40.0	95.7	93.9	16.1	43,152	2.2	4.0	87.4
	2006	6.6	40.0	96.6	94.0	16.0	44,836	2.2	3.5	87.8
	2007	7.2	40.9	96.1	93.7	15.2	49,056	2.5	3.5	85.9
	2008	7.5	41.1	96.8	93.3	14.9	49,858	2.5	4.1	86.5
	2009	8.0	42.9	96.7	93.7	13.5	73,245	3.7	3.5	87.1
	2010	7.6	45.4	96.2	93.9	13.0	72,383	3.6	3.8	87.8

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	2000	2,792	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,945	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	3,007	-	-	-	-	-	744
	2003	3,180	-	-	-	-	-	792
	2004	3,297	-	-	-	-	-	779
	2005	3,502	-	-	-	-	-	902
	2006	3,728	-	-	-	-	-	886
	2007	3,801	-	-	-	-	-	940
	2008	3,879	-	-	-	-	-	998
	2009	3,900	-	-	-	-	-	959
	2010	3,848	-	-	-	-	-	966
D I S T R I C T	2000	2,792	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,945	-	-	-	-	-	683
	2002	3,007	-	-	-	-	-	744
	2003	3,180	-	-	-	-	-	792
	2004	3,297	-	-	-	-	-	779
	2005	3,502	-	-	-	-	-	902
	2006	3,728	-	-	-	-	-	886
	2007	3,801	-	-	-	-	-	940
	2008	3,879	-	-	-	-	-	998
	2009	3,900	-	-	-	-	-	959
	2010	3,848	-	-	-	-	-	966
	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	2,007,170	164,791	161,546	162,001	151,270	148,194	123,816
	2002	2,029,821	-	-	-	-	-	-

<b>S T A T E</b>	2003	2,044,539	164,413	157,570	159,499	160,924	156,451	138,559
	2004	2,060,048	161,329	160,246	158,367	162,933	160,271	139,504
	2005	2,062,912	156,370	158,622	160,365	162,047	162,192	142,828
	2006	2,075,277	155,155	154,372	158,822	160,362	160,911	147,500
	2007	2,077,856	155,356	153,480	154,719	162,594	159,038	150,475
	2008	2,074,167	155,578	152,895	153,347	160,039	161,310	149,710
	2009	2,070,125	156,512	152,736	152,820	155,433	158,700	144,822
	2010	2,064,312	155,468	154,389	152,681	154,465	154,982	146,919

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

\*\*Educator Data is available only for district level\*\*

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Av. Teacher Experience (Years)	Av. Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Tchrs w/ Emgncy or Prvsnl. Creds (%)	Cls not taught by Hi Qual Tchrs (%)
<b>D I S T R I C T</b>	2000	145	16	56,481	30	70	-	21	-	-
	2001	149	16	60,387	30	70	-	22	-	-
	2002	154	16	61,225	30	70	-	22	-	-
	2003	164	15	66,082	30	70	-	22	1	-
	2004	172	13	64,506	28	72	-	22	1	-
	2005	176	12	62,876	27	73	-	23	1	-
	2006	193	12	64,886	26	74	-	22	2	-
	2007	197	12	65,720	26	74	-	23	1	-
	2008	204	12	66,105	29	71	-	22	-	-
	2009	202	12	70,823	27	73	-	22	-	-
2010	205	13	75,113	26	74	-	22	-	-	
<b>S T A T E</b>	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	15	47,929	54	46	19	18	-	-
	2002	126,544	14	49,702	54	46	19	18	2	2
	2003	129,068	14	51,672	54	46	18	18	3	2
	2004	125,702	14	54,446	51	49	19	19	2	2
	2005	128,079	14	55,558	50	49	19	18	2	2
	2006	127,010	13	56,685	49	51	19	19	2	1
	2007	127,010	13	58,275	48	52	19	19	2	3
	2008	131,488	12	60,871	47	53	18	18	1	1
2009	133,017	13	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1	

---

	2010	132,502	13	63,296	42	57	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)

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Reading for Grade 11						
Groups	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds</b>	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	64.9	63.2	58.7	61.3	66.8	62.2
White	67.1	68.1	62.5	65.9	73.0	67.6
Black	38.7	20.0	29.6	26.4	27.2	32.6
Hispanic	57.9	50.8	44.2	44.1	46.3	42.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	64.3	36.4	81.8	75.0	66.6
Native American	-	-	70.0	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	54.9	50.0	45.9
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	19.2	16.9	16.0	21.6	11.3	11.3
Low Income	50.0	45.9	45.7	33.3	46.9	36.9

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

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

PSAE - % Meets + Exceeds for Mathematics for Grade 11						
Groups	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5	70.0	77.5
All	67.2	62.4	64.6	64.3	64.8	63.2
White	71.7	68.3	69.1	70.2	71.1	69.7
Black	23.9	10.9	25.0	26.4	27.3	25.0
Hispanic	50.6	47.0	50.0	44.1	40.9	45.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	64.2	54.6	81.8	66.7	66.6
Native American	-	-	60.0	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	41.9	58.4	37.5
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	23.1	7.0	10.3	10.8	11.3	7.8
Low Income	43.5	32.4	50.0	44.4	45.4	34.8

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

## Section I-A Data &amp; 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?

A review of the 2010 school report card data evidences that approximately one-third of all grade 11 students tested on the 2010 PSAE exam did not meet academic standards or AYP in the areas of both reading and mathematics. In reading, 63.3 % of all students met the established standards while 37.7% of the students did not. Students in the subgroups of white, black, hispanic, and students with disabilities (IEP) failed to meet the AYP target benchmark of 77.5% or safe harbor. Of these groups, only the students with disabilities (IEP) student subgroup increased their percentage towards meeting standards in 2010 as compared to the 2009 PSAE test. In mathematics, 64.9 % of the total population of students met the benchmark of 77.5%. All of the following subgroups failed to meet the benchmark score or safe harbor; all, white, black, and IEP students. The Hispanic subgroup reached safe harbor and increased their percentage of meeting the standards from 42.9% in 2009 to 48.6% in 2010. 93% of the students taking the IAA assessment (N=14) met or exceeded the state standards in all 4 subject areas; reading, math, science, and writing.

The overall school graduation rate improved 5.1% in 2010 increasing from 91.6% in 2009 to 96.7% in 2010. The graduation rate for both black and hispanic students significantly increased in 2010. The black student graduation rate increased 10.3% in 2010 from 83.6% in 2009 to 93.9% in 2010. The hispanic student graduation rate increased 28.9% to 95.6% in 2010 from 66.7% in 2009. The 2010 AYP Report indicates that LTHS met the graduation benchmark of 80% for the qualifying subgroups of all (96.7%), white (97.6%), black (93.9%), and hispanic (95.6%). The students with disabilities (IEP) subgroup was at a 79% graduation rate.

2010 Report Card data also indicates improvement in many other areas. The attendance rate improved 0.2% from 94.0 % in 2009 to 94.2% in 2010. The truancy rate decreased 0.4% from 2009-2010, from 1.7% to 1.3%. The high school graduation rate saw a significant increase in 2010 with more students finishing and graduating from LTHS. The graduation rate increased 5.1% from 2009 to 2010, increasing to 96.7%. Since 2005, the LTHS graduation rate has increased 7.2%, from 89.5% in 2005 to the current rate of 96.7%. Increasing the graduation rate has been an area of focus within the district per a goal adopted by the Lockport Township High School District 205 School Board.

The number of students who are Limited English Proficient was at the highest in 2010 since 2003. In 2010, 0.8% of our student population was Limited English Proficient, rising from 0.2% in 2003. The number of students attending LTHS who are reported as low income actually saw a decrease from 2009 to 2010. In 2009, low income students made up 8.6% of the student population where in 2010 low income students was 7.4%, a decrease of 1.2%. Despite the decrease last year, the number of low income students has grown since 2006 when the rate was only 4.6%.

The mobility rate of LTHS students increased in 2010 from 4.7% to 7.9%.

Students with disabilities and an Individual Education Plan (IEP) made up 13.6% of the total school student population in 2010.

---

One area of concern identified in the School Report Card was the drop out rate. In 2010, the drop out rate was reported at 2.8%, highest since 2004 (2.4%). This was an increase of 0.6% since 2009. Report Card data indicates that the drop out rate has fluctuated at LTHS from a low of 1.9% in 2006 to a high of 4.2% in 2001.

The student demographic makeup has changed at LTHS since the inception of the PSAE exam in 2002. The percentage of white students in the district has steadily decreased from 87.3% in 2003 to 76.3% in 2010. The hispanic population has demonstrated the most growth and increased from 4.6 in 2000 to 11.7% in 2010. The percentage of black students enrolled in the district has remained fairly steady, increasing slightly from 4.8% in 2000, 5.1% in 2005, and 6.7% in 2009. In 2010 the percentage of black students enrolled was 6.4%. The Asian student population has remained between 1-2% since 2003. In 2003 this population was 1.2% and in 2010 it was 1.8%. The Native American/Alaskan Native population has remained below 1% since 2003 and was at 0.7% in 2010. The Multiracial/Ethnic population was 3.1% for both the 2009 and 2010 school years. This population of students has increased 2.8% since 2005.

A review the School Report Card data within a historical context also reveals some changes which are ongoing within the school community. Most proximate has been the increase in student population since 2002. This increase in student enrollment has led to overcrowded facilities which has resulted in the evolution of an alternative schedule implemented during the 2009-2010 school year. As a result of this alternative schedule, many upper classmen were unable to receive academic interventions and counseling during the regular school day. In 2010, LTHS experienced a student enrollment decline for the first time in many years. The student population trend at LTHS had shown a steady increase in students each year from 2000 to 2009. During these years enrollment grew from 2792 students in 2000 to 3900 students in 2009. In 2010, LTHS saw a slight reversal in enrollment, decreasing 52 students from 3900 in 2009 to 3848 in 2010. Report Card data also indicates that since the inception of the PSAE exam, LTHS enrollment in grade 11 has increased from 744 students to 966 in 2010. LTHS tested 99.7% of all students enrolled in grade 11 on the 2010 PSAE exam.

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

A number of factors have contributed to the failure of our students to meet Adequate Yearly Progress in mathematics and reading. A historical review of EXPLORE data indicates that a large percentage of students entering LTHS have significant deficiencies in the areas of reading and mathematics. For the class of 2011, EXPLORE score results from the test administered in grade 9 indicate that many students entered LTHS with scores below the ACT College Readiness Benchmark scores for both reading and mathematics. In reading, the black, hispanic, and multiracial student subgroups failed to meet the EXPLORE College Readiness Benchmark score of 15.0. On average, Black students scored 13.4, hispanic students scored 14.0, and multiracial students scored 14.0. In mathematics, the subgroups of Asian, black, hispanic, and multiracial failed to meet the benchmark score of

17.0 on the EXPLORE. Asian students scored 16.3, black students 14.7, hispanic 15.1, and multiracial 14.9. The composite average on the EXPLORE exam for the entire class of 2011 was 16.6. As an example, EXPLORE results from the current freshman class, the class of 2014, on an exam administered in November 2009, indicate that 47.6% (448/943) of the students earned a reading score of 1- 14 , below the benchmark of 15, and 54.3% (512/943) of all of the students scored a 16 or less in mathematics, below the mathematics benchmark of 17. Most recent local assessment data reveals that of the class of 2015, entering LTHS in the fall of 2011, 49.5% of the students failed to meet the EXPLORE benchmark score of 15 in reading (444 students of 897 tested received a reading score of 14 or below) while 60% of the students tested (541/905) did not meet the mathematics benchmark score of 17.

Additionally, transcript analysis has led to the conclusion that students who transfer into Lockport Township High School District 205 are at significant risk for not meeting standards and failing to graduate. Previous research identified that over 1/3 of students who do not graduate from LTHS are new students to the district. Lockport Township High School's mobility rate during the 2010 school year was 7.9%.

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

These factors reveal that next steps have to be focused on the following: continuing to building capacity for teachers to work with an increasingly diverse student body, improving the quality and effectiveness of classroom instruction differentiating for all students and implementing effective grading practices and procedures, develop focused and targeted interventions to promote student success in core academic subject areas such as mathematics and reading, increase the use of student performance data (EPAS) to monitor and assess student progress and achievement, maintain support programs for new students to the district, and creating mechanisms for identifying and promoting the academic success of individual students using RtI strategies. Next Steps should also include promoting articulation efforts, focusing on curriculum and instructional improvement, between LTHS and the 7 public and 2 parochial "feeder" school districts which are within the boundaries of District 205.

#### 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?

Data utilized include EXPLORE, PLAN, Practice ACT and ACT assessments, results of common quarter and semester exam data used in all core academic subject areas, transcript analysis of students failing to meet College Readiness Benchmark scores, quarter and semester grade distribution reports, and transcript analysis of non-graduating students. Incoming grade 9 students are individually reviewed and placed into classes based on prior student work, academic achievement, test history, and grade 8 teacher

level recommendations. Lockport Township High School also uses the EXPLORE from the EPAS assessment system to assess all incoming students in November of their eighth grade year. This early academic assessment allows for appropriate program placement of students upon entering District 205 and the monitoring of individual student progress as part of Response to Intervention (RtI). LTHS staff, including department chairs and counselors, review this local data and determine final course placement for each individual student.

Local assessment data indicates that a large percentage of our students will need additional academic supports and interventions to meet state and college readiness standards.

In addition, the school has developed common assessments within courses that are aligned with the current Illinois State Learning Standards. These standards are reflected in the core curricular maps which identify essential learning which will occur in each course. Core curriculum maps and local classroom assessments are directly linked to the current Illinois Learning Standards and ACT's College Readiness Standards. Work is also being done in core academic areas to align our current curriculum with the new Common Core Standards being adopted by the Illinois State Board of Education.

LTHS is currently reviewing our classroom grading policies and grading practices to determine if the current system provides a reliable and valid assessment of student achievement and a linkage to student achievement on standardized common assessments. Lockport Township High School uses the EXPLORE from the EPAS assessment system to assess all incoming students in November of their eighth grade year. This early academic assessment allows for appropriate program placement of students upon entering District 205 and the monitoring of individual student progress as part of Response to Intervention (RtI). Classroom, course, and departmental data needs to be further reviewed to determine if students are progressing towards meeting the state and college readiness standards and identify any gaps or misalignment in the curriculum with these standards..

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

The lack of a consistent grading policy and inconsistent use of local classroom formative assessment data may be a factor in student achievement on standardized assessments. Use of valid and reliable classroom assessment data and the implementation of consistent classroom grading policies and practices may provide a more reliable indication of student academic progress and achievement on standardized exams.

EPAS data , a review of incoming grade 9 students performance, and new transfer students to the District evidences that many students who enter Lockport Township High School enter with significant deficits in the core academic areas, including reading and mathematics. Moreover, analysis has led to the conclusion that students who transfer into Lockport Township High School District 205 are at significant risk for not meeting standards and failing to graduate.

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

These factors reveal that next steps have to be focused on the following: continuing to build capacity for teachers to work with an increasingly diverse student body, improving the quality and effectiveness of classroom instruction differentiating for all students, develop focused and targeted interventions to promote student success in core academic subject areas such as mathematics and reading, increase the use of student performance data (EPAS) to monitor and assess student progress and achievement, maintain support programs for new students to the district, and creating mechanisms for identifying and promoting the academic success of individual students using Response to Intervention (RtI) strategies. The district is currently implementing a strategic plan, developed in partnership with the Consortium for Educational Change, and has established various committees of stakeholders and staff charged to: review student progress and achievement outcomes, investigate, evaluate, and recommend new procedures for classroom grading, and review all current student academic and behavioral supports and interventions.

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?

As noted previously, Lockport Township High School District 205 has surpassed student enrollment capacity. Much focus and energy of both the administration and the Board of Education has been directed towards providing students with a safe and secure physical school environment and appropriate learning and working conditions. The issue of overcrowding and a lack of classroom space has affected the daily class schedule and the general environment within the school buildings.

Seven public elementary school districts and two parochial schools are within the boundaries of Lockport Township High School. Each "feeder" district is independent and governs their own curricular and instructional programming. Articulating a common schedule, and the curricular and instructional efforts are challenging. The advent of a Planning Council and a common institute for six of our feeder districts have enhanced articulation efforts already in place. Efforts have also been made to articulate student progress and achievement data with each of the feeder school districts. Continued articulation and sharing of student data is necessitated.

Transfer student performance and success has been identified as a challenge during the past year at Lockport Township High School as data has demonstrated that these students are failing at a disproportionate rate. A Transfer Student Committee had been convened and recommendations as to new practices have been implemented to support the success of this group. Data indicates that new and transfer students to LTHS need further support and mentoring.

The rapid increase in the ELL student population is a new challenge to our school district. A bilingual teacher and bilingul course programming has recently been added to the

core curriculum. The 2010 Fall Housing Report indicates 31 different home languages within our school district. Teachers are faced with students with who speak a variety of languages and who have varying degree of English proficiency.

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

Each of these factors has influenced and impacted the ability of the district to provide research driven interventions to students at risk of failure.

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

These factors are accounted for within the structure of this School Improvement Plan. Despite the conditions as a result of overcrowding, measures need to be undertaken to provide students at risk with opportunities during the school day for additional academic support and interventions. Continued efforts to provide students with a safe and secure learning environment need to be implemented. Students new to District 205 need to be mentored and provided additional guidance and support to ensure both academic and social success while at LTHS. The District needs to continue to foster articulation and data sharing with all "feeder" school districts via the revised Planning Council. Students with Limited English skills need to be immediately recognized and placed into appropriate courses which will maximize their academic success. Teachers and staff need to be continuously in-serviced in meeting the needs of a diverse student population.

#### 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 and information tell you?

Lockport Township High School is currently working in partnership with the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) to provide our entire teaching staff with professional development in the area of Differentiated Instruction (DI). ASCD staff has collaborated with teams of teachers representing all academic departments to equip them with instructional strategies and teaching tools to meet the needs of all of the students at LTHS. All LTHS teaching staff will be trained in DI by ASCD by the end of the 2010-2011 school year. Professional development for staff in DI will continue throughout the 2011-12 school year. Meeting the needs of all learners through the incorporation of DI classroom instructional strategies will be an expectation of all faculty of LTHS.

To promote continuous teacher learning and instructional improvement, Lockport Township High School encourages members of the teaching staff to attend local, regional, and national conferences and workshops. Staff members regularly attend conferences held through the local Professional Development Alliance and local/state/national professional organizations. LTHS also provides opportunities for onsite professional development to staff. Reading specialists employed by LTHS provide all staff with opportunities to learn and implement "Mosaic of Thought" strategies into their lessons. A Differentiated Instruction team of teachers meets regularly to share DI strategies and techniques and to advance the incorporation of DI into all subject areas. Math teachers receive training in using Kagan teaching strategies and using the TI calculators in class. All PE teachers attend a regional PE/health/drivers ed workshop annually. Teachers in all academic departments are encouraged to enhance their skills by attending conferences/workshops. Many teachers in District 205 also belong to their respective professional organization and subscribe and read professional journals and publications. Teachers and staff have been encouraged to focus their professional development activities towards a district initiative, improvement of instruction in their specific subject area, or focus on one of the strategic plan goal areas.

All teachers at LTHS hold a valid Illinois State Teaching Certificate and are "highly qualified" in their teaching subject areas. As reported on the 2010 School Report Card, 72.2% of LTHS teachers hold a Master's Degree or above.

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

Research indicates that the presence of a highly qualified staff which engages in a research driven program of professional development is a key to promoting student achievement. Lockport Township High School encourages and promotes ongoing professional development for all staff members in their specific subject areas. It has also entered a partnership with ASCD to promote ongoing professional learning in the areas of Differentiated Instruction. This commitment to staff professional development will lead to the enhancement of classroom instruction and to the improvement of student academic performance.

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

The district will continue in its efforts to promote faculty capacity through current district initiatives such as Differentiated Instruction and "Mosaic of Thought" strategies. Focused professional development will also continue to be in place to meet the needs of each individual academic department. By the end of the 2010-11 school year, all currently employed teachers will be in-serviced in the use of differentiated instruction. As part of the District Strategic Plan, a committee has begun work to investigate and adopt a common framework of effective instruction and to revise our current staff evaluation tool. This committee is reviewing the work on effective instruction and teacher evaluation by Charlotte Danielson, Robert Marzano, James Stronge, Jon Saphier, and the University of Washington. Once a framework of instruction and evaluation has been agreed upon and accepted by the district, extensive professional development and training will be provided to all administration and staff for full implementation of the accepted model.

A return to a regular school day for all students will allow the District to develop a daily school schedule which will include time for administration and staff to collaborate. With

the beginning of the 2011-12 school year, all staff will be provided with additional time each day to work on course, department, building, and district activities. This additional collaboration time will provide daily opportunities and professional dialogue amongst the staff.

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?

The district utilizes an online parent portal program allowing parents/guardians access to student academic progress, grades, attendance, and teacher contacts. Approximately 50% of our current families use this resource as a tool to keep involved in their son/daughters progress at LTHS.

Parent participation remains high in the district's orientation and transition system for eighth grade students. In addition, parents annually participate in a Curriculum Night to learn about expectations associated with the courses in which their students are enrolled. Through implementation of the ASCA model, the LTHS Guidance Services Department has begun developing evening parent education programs focusing on a variety of topics, including orientation to high school, student financial aid-college fairs, drug and alcohol seminars, and understanding standardized testing results. Parents remain highly active in a variety of booster organizations which support specific curricular and extra-curricular programs in which students participate. The District has undertaken measures, such as implementing a new phone message and email system and using social media outlets, to inform and actively engage parents in the activities of the school district. Parents are often informed of resources and programs available to their students, such as tutoring opportunities, ACT test prep programs, or counseling services, to help their child's academic performance.

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

Research indicates that linkages with the family are essential to promoting student success. As a result of our strategic planning process undertaken in 2009-2010, parents were involved in focus groups and committees which provided input and recommendations on improving the academic and instructional programs of the district.

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

Among the goals which have been established by the Board of Education is the development of a standing Citizens Advisory Council. This organization will serve as a forum for parent and community input into the school.

The strategic planning committees will continue to serve as a means to school improvement and improving student academic performance. Seeking parental input and involving parents in the activities of the school and their son/daughters education is an ongoing goal of District 205.

#### Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

From the factor pages (I-A, I-B, and I-C), 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?

An analysis of local data reveals that students enter Lockport Township High School with deficits in the areas of reading and mathematics. EPAS data reveals that 60.3 % of the students from the incoming class of 2015 did not meet the mathematics benchmark score of 17 and nearly one-half (49.50%) of all students entering LTHS with the incoming class of 2015 did not meet the benchmark score of 15 on the EXPLORE reading assessment. Lockport Township High School uses the EXPLORE from the EPAS assessment system to assess all incoming students in November of their eighth grade year. This early academic assessment allows for appropriate program placement of students upon entering District 205 and the monitoring of individual student progress as part of Response to Intervention (RtI). In addition, the school has developed common assessments within courses that are aligned with the current Illinois State Learning Standards. These standards are reflected in the core curricular maps which identify essential learning which will occur in each course. Work has also begun on examining existing curriculum maps to account for the newly adopted Common Core Standards in the areas of English Language Arts and mathematics.

Among the challenges faced by Lockport Township High School District 205 which have impacted the educational climate are consistently increasing enrollment coupled by an inability to secure voter support for the construction of new facilities. Among the consequence of the accompanying overcrowding has been the implementation of a schedule for juniors and seniors which impacted opportunities to provide additional resources and interventions to struggling students and severely limited opportunities for staff collaboration and articulation. During the 2011-12 school year, a return to a regular school schedule for all students will be implemented. This schedule will include common collaboration time provided to all staff members. This time will be used to work on common assessments, curriculum and standards alignment and implementation of ongoing district initiatives. A return to a regular schedule and having all students on campus for a full day will also facilitate in providing academic resource rooms in the areas of mathematics and English, a Junior Study Skills credited program for at-risk students, additional access to a mandatory tutoring program in the areas of mathematics and English, and opportunities for the incorporation of a developmental guidance model into the school's curriculum. This new schedule will also allow teachers and staff to have greater access to students during the day and to offer additional help and support before and after the regular school day.



Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies

Objective Number	Title (click the link to edit any objective)	Deficiencies Addressed
1	<a href="#">Develop support and intervention strategies to improve the academic performance of students who are at risk of not meeting or exceeding state standards in reading.</a>	1,3,5,7,8,
2	<a href="#">Develop support and intervention strategies to improve the academic performance of students who are at risk of not meeting or exceeding state standards in mathematics.</a>	2,4,6,9,

The following deficiencies have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for your school.

- 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 2. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 3. White students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 4. White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 5. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 6. Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- 7. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 8. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- 9. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

## Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

## Objective 1

Develop support and intervention strategies to improve the academic performance of students who are at risk of not meeting or exceeding state standards in reading.

## Objective 1 Description

While our current achievement in reading for the white student subgroup is 68.2%, black students is 36.0%, hispanic students is 45.0%, and students with disabilities is 22.9% meeting/exceeding state standards, these subgroups will make AYP or Safe Harbor in each of the succeeding two school years.

**This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:**

- ⓑ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 2. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 3. White students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 4. White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 5. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 6. Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 7. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- ⓑ 8. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 9. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

## Section II-B Action Plan - Strategies and Activities for Students

**Objective 1 Title :**

Develop support and intervention strategies to improve the academic performance of students who are at risk of not meeting or exceeding state standards in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Maintain academic support and MIS resource rooms at East and Central Campus during all study hall periods for English/Reading assistance. Teachers will require students failing English class to attend these assistance sessions.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Increase enrollment of students in High School Reading utilizing student EPAS score data. Any student not meeting a score of 15 on the EXPLORE will be placed into a High School reading course.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	Maintain implementation of mandatory Junior Study Skills course for at-risk junior level students who do not meet the benchmark score in reading on a practice ACT exam administered in April of grade 10. This Intervention provides English and study skills assistance.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Local Funds	
4	Maintain the New Student transitional program for transfer students. This includes a study hall with a defined developmental guidance curriculum including academic, social-emotional, and college-career planning supports, and mentoring opportunities. All students in grades 9-12 who enroll as a new student to LTHS will be placed into this program.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Title I	3,000
5	Provide tuition-free summer school during the summer of 2011 for students failing English classes during their freshman and/or sophomore year.	06/06/2011	08/06/2012	Summer School	Title I	7,500
6	Investigate, develop, and Implement a reading support program to aid low level readers in grades 9-10. Students will be placed upon individual EPAS score reports.	08/17/2011	05/24/2012	During School	Title I	15,000

7	Maintain mandatory tutoring assistance during the school day in study hall for grade 9-11 students failing English classes.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Title I	105,411
8	Utilize READ NATURALLY reading program during the current school year for students with disabilities and evidence of significant reading deficiencies.	08/17/2010	05/25/2011	During School	Other	5,000

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Develop support and intervention strategies to improve the academic performance of students who are at risk of not meeting or exceeding state standards in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Partnership with Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) for the development of instructional capacity in differentiation of instruction (DI). All teachers will be trained by the conclusion of the 2010-11 school year.	03/15/2011	05/24/2012	Before School	Title I	17,500
2	Development of diversity committee resulting from Diversity Audit conducted by Kaleidoscope Group for the purpose of conducting focus group discussions on items listed as problematic by the survey results and facilitating discussion from reading "Courageous Conversations About Race in Education".	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	In partnership with the Council for Educational Change (CEC), develop and implement a strategic plan addressing student outcomes, grading policies, support systems, effective instruction and staff evaluation, finances, and community involvement.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Title I	10,007
4	Continue the Literacy Council as a forum to promote development of literacy programs and professional learning opportunities for teachers.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Title I	900
5	Professional development and program support for the development and implementation of guidance curriculum utilizing the American School Counselor Association model	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Local Funds	

6	Participation in Professional Development Alliance/local/state/national workshops and learning opportunities for staff.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Title II	15,486
7	Provide extensive professional training to administration and staff for the implementation of an effective instruction and teacher evaluation framework as recommended by the strategic plan committee. Teachers will receive training in either the Danielson, Marzano, Stronge, Saphier, or University of Washington frameworks.	01/06/2011	07/01/2012	During School	Title II	40,000
8	In-service teachers during departmental meetings and faculty meetings on "Mosaic of Thought" and increasing literacy through the use of effective reading comprehension and thinking strategies.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

**Objective 1 Title :**

Develop support and intervention strategies to improve the academic performance of students who are at risk of not meeting or exceeding state standards in reading.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Continue the development of the Transfer Student Parent Program during the 2011 and 2012 school years	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	After School	Title I	2,000
2	Maintain the LTHS District 205 Citizens Advisory Council.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	After School	Local Funds	
3	Increase participation in English Language Learner parent forums to 50% participation by the end of the 2011-2012 school year.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	After School	Title I	3,000
4	Development of focused parent outreach sessions as part of movement toward ASCA developmental guidance model.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	After School	Local Funds	
5	Provide character education/safe schools educational programs for both students and parents. Invite parents to Rachels Challenge evening programming.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	After School	Local Funds	
6	Upgrade and enhance online parent communication informational systems, including email, facebook, and twitter networking.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	Before School	Local Funds	

7	Solicit parent and community input regarding the implementation of the LTHS strategic plan.	08/17/2010	07/01/2011	After School	Title I	10,007
---	---	------------	------------	--------------	---------	--------

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 1 Title :**

Develop support and intervention strategies to improve the academic performance of students who are at risk of not meeting or exceeding state standards in reading.

**Monitoring** - Include the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities for the objective and identify the person(s) responsible for overseeing the work. Describe the process and measures of success of this objective. (How will school personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

Progress will be monitored utilizing the three tiers associated with Response to Intervention (RtI). For Tier I students, progress shall be monitored utilizing: EPAS testing data, grade distribution reports, progress toward graduation under a revised student classification system, local progress reports, and performance on locally developed common examinations. In addition, analysis will take place as to school climate issues utilizing appropriate surveying tools and analysis as to discipline and attendance data. For Tier II students, progress shall be monitored utilizing student performance data in focused intervention programs including High School Reading, Strategic Reading, mandatory tutoring programs, and Junior Study Skills by examining local assessment data, grade distribution reports. Students in Tier II will be monitored by local teams including the Central Campus Building Leadership Team, the Building Review and Intervention Team (BRAIT) and the Student Review and Intervention Teams (STRAIT). Individual plans for student progress will be developed. During the 2010-11 school year, Individual Student Profiles will be developed on each grade 9 student by the Central Campus House Teams. More intensive individualized interventions will be developed for students as the need arises. Classroom walkthroughs will be utilized to monitor the degree to which district literacy strategies and DI are being integrated across the curriculum.

As part of the strategic plan, a student outcomes and an interventions committee has been created. The student outcomes committee has been charged with reviewing measures of student academic and social/emotional development and progress.

The interventions committee will review all current student support programs and interventions and make recommendations for eliminating, changing, or development of new interventions to improve student achievement.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	Name	Title
1	Mr. Dennis Hicks	Principal-East Campus
2	Paige Dague, Ed.D.	Principal-Central Campus
3	Brett Gould, Ph.D.	Assistant Superintendent

## Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

## Objective 2

Develop support and intervention strategies to improve the academic performance of students who are at risk of not meeting or exceeding state standards in mathematics.

## Objective 2 Description

While our current achievement in mathematics for the white student subgroup is 69.7%, black student subgroup is 25.0%, and students with disabilities is 7.8% meeting/exceeding state standards, these subgroups will make AYP or Safe Harbor in each of the succeeding two school years.

**This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:**

- Ⓔ 1. School is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓒ 2. School is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 3. White students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓒ 4. White students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 5. Black students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓒ 6. Black students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 7. Hispanic students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓔ 8. Students with disabilities are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
- Ⓒ 9. Students with disabilities are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

Section II-B Action Plan - Strategies and Activities for Students

**Objective 2 Title :**

Develop support and intervention strategies to improve the academic performance of students who are at risk of not meeting or exceeding state standards in mathematics.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Provide academic support and MIS resource rooms at East and Central Campus for all students experiencing difficulty in mathematics. This assistance will be available to all students during all study hall periods.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Local Funds	
2	Maintain implementation of mandatory Junior Study Skills course for at-risk junior level students. This Intervention provides mandatory mathematics and study skills assistance to students who did not meet the benchmark mathematics score on a practice ACT test administered in April of sophomore year.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	Before School	Title I	
3	Maintain the New Student transitional program for all grade 9-12 students who transfer into LTHS during the 2010-11 or 2011-12 school year. This program includes enrollment in a study hall with a defined developmental guidance curriculum and mentoring opportunities.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Title I	3,000
4	Provide tuition-free summer school during the summer of 2011 for freshman and sophomore students who failed a mathematics class during the 2010-2011 school year.	06/06/2011	08/05/2011	Summer School	Title I	7,500
5	Maintain mandatory tutoring during study hall for students failing mathematics classes. This is a mandated program for any student in grade 9-11 failing either algebra or gemoetry.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Local Funds	
6	Provide extended time learning classes in algebra for all grade 9 students who do not reach a benchmark score of 15 on the EXPLORE exam.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Local Funds	

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

Develop support and intervention strategies to improve the academic performance of students who are at risk of not meeting or exceeding state standards in mathematics.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Partnership with Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) for the development of instructional capacity in differentiation of instruction (DI). All teachers will be trained in differentiated instruction by the conclusion of the 2010-2011 school year.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Title I	17,750
2	Development of diversity committee resulting from Diversity Audit conducted by Kaleidoscope Group for the purpose of conducting focus group discussions on items listed as problematic by the survey results and facilitating discussion from reading "Courageous Conversations About Race in Education".	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Local Funds	
3	Participation in Professional Development Alliance/local/state/national workshops and learning opportunities for staff. In partnership with the Council for Educational Change (CEC), develop and implement a strategic plan addressing student outcomes, grading policies, support systems, effective instruction and staff evaluation, finances, and community involvement.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	Before School	Title I	10,007
4	Professional development and program support for the development and implementation of guidance curriculum utilizing the American School Counselor Association model.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Local Funds	
5	Participation in Professional Development Alliance/local/state/national workshops and learning opportunities for staff.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Title II	15,487
6	Provide extensive professional training to administration and staff for the implementation of an effective instruction and teacher evaluation framework as recommended by the strategic plan committee. Teachers	01/06/2011	07/01/2012	During School	Title II	40,000

will receive training in either the Danielson, Marzano, Stronge, Saphier, or University of Washington frameworks.				
---	--	--	--	--

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

**Objective 2 Title :**

Develop support and intervention strategies to improve the academic performance of students who are at risk of not meeting or exceeding state standards in mathematics.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	Continue the development of the Transfer Student Parent Program during the 2010-11 and 2012 school years.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Title I	2,000
2	Maintain the LTHS District 205 Citizens Advisory Council.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	After School	Local Funds	
3	Increase participation in English Language Learner parent forums to 50% participation by the end of the 2011-2012 school year.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	After School	Title I	3,000
4	Development of focused parent outreach sessions as part of movement toward ASCA developmental guidance model.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	After School	Local Funds	
5	Provide parent character education/safe schools educational programs for parents, such as Rachel's Challenge.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	After School	Local Funds	
6	Upgrade and enhance online parent communication informational systems, including email, facebook, and twitter networking.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	During School	Local Funds	
7	Solicit parent and community input regarding the implementation of the LTHS strategic plan.	08/17/2010	05/24/2012	After School	Title I	10,007

## Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

**Objective 2 Title :**

Develop support and intervention strategies to improve the academic performance of students who are at risk of not meeting or exceeding state standards in mathematics.

**Monitoring** - Include the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies and activities for the objective and identify the person(s) responsible for overseeing the work. Describe the process and measures of success of this objective. (How will school personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

Progress will be monitored utilizing the three tiers associated with Response to Intervention. For Tier I students, progress shall be monitored utilizing: EPAS testing data, grade distribution reports, progress toward graduation under a revised student classification system, local progress reports, and performance on locally developed common examinations. In addition, analysis will take place as to school climate issues utilizing appropriate surveying tools and analysis as to discipline and attendance data. For Tier II students, progress shall be monitored utilizing student performance data in focused intervention programs including High School Reading, Strategic Reading, mandatory tutoring programs, and Junior Study Skills by examining local assessment data, grade distribution reports. Students in Tier II will be monitored by local teams including the Central Campus Building Leadership Team, the Building Review and Intervention Team (BRAIT) and the Student Review and Intervention Team (STRAIT). Individual plans for student progress will be developed. More intensive individualized interventions will be developed for students as the need arises. Classroom walkthroughs will be utilized to monitor the degree to which district literacy strategies and DI are being integrated across the curriculum.

As part of the strategic plan, a student outcomes and an interventions committee has been created. The student outcomes committee has been charged with reviewing measures of student academic and social/emotional development and progress.

The interventions committee will review all current student support programs and interventions and make recommendations for eliminating, changing, or development of new interventions to improve student achievement.

Designate the name and role of the person(s) (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

	Name	Title
1	Dennis Hicks	Principal- East Campus
2	Dr. Paige Dague	Principal-Central Campus
3	Dr. Brett Gould, Ph.D.	Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction

Section III - 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.*)

Lockport Township High School will address the elements of this plan at a public Board of Education meeting to be held on January 24, 2011. This plan will also be made available to the public on our school website at [www.lths.org](http://www.lths.org).

All parents of current students will be informed via the school-wide phone messaging system that this plan is available on the school website and also available to review at either of our two school campuses.

Section III - 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.

This plan is a product of the work of various groups of individuals and committees reviewing issues of pertinence to Lockport Township High School District 205. This plan is a continuation of work begun in previous district improvement efforts. This current document was facilitated by Dr. K. Brett Gould, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, Central Campus Principal Dr. Paige Dague, and East Campus Principal Mr. Dennis Hicks.

During the 2009-2010 academic school year, District 205 entered into a partnership with the Consortium for Educational Change (CEC) to conduct a comprehensive systems analysis of the district. This included conducting a data review and numerous focus group sessions with all stakeholders of the district. As a result of this analysis, the district has maintained its partnership with the CEC organization and began developing a strategic plan process for the 2010-11 school year and beyond. This strategic plan focuses on five major component areas of the district; student learning, support systems, stakeholder engagement, employee development, and finances. The improvement strategies included within this school improvement plan contain many of the recommendations and considerations uncovered during the strategic planning process. Other groups contributing to the development of the goals and strategies outlined in this plan include the LTHS ASCA Model Steering Committee composed of members of the Guidance Services Department and facilitated by Chairperson Bruce Lane, Ph.D. The Department Chair Council, comprised of the 11 academic department chairpersons, meets regularly to provide input on a range of curricular and environmental issues impacting the school. The Literacy Council consists of representatives from each academic department within the school as well as literacy

specialists and building and district administrators. The Mathematics Department under the direction of Chair Julia Hudson has researched and developed programs related to improving mathematics instruction and student performance while the English Department under the leadership of Chairperson Tom O'Brien does the same for the areas of English and Reading. Literacy Specialists Deborah Summers and Pat Stanley are vital leaders within their domain. Assistant Superintendent Todd Wernet has facilitated a Diversity Audit conducted by Kaleidoscope, LLC. and continues to work in concert with other service providers within the school community as to next steps. Dr. Gould is the liason to the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and also facilitates feeder school articulation in the areas of mathematics, reading, Response to Intervention, and the new Common Core Standards. Finally, the goals established by the Lockport Township High School District 205 Board of Education have been foundational in providing focus to this plan.

	Name	Title
1	Paige Dague, Ed.D.	Principal, Central Campus
2	Dennis Hicks	Principal, East Campus
3	Brett Gould, Ph.D.	Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction

### Section III - 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. The peer review should precede the local board approval and 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>.

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

This plan was reviewed in consultation with RESPRO staff from the Will-Kendall-Grundy professional Development Alliance.

Mr. Peter Sullivan, Principal, Lisle Senior High School, reviewed this plan on January 18, 2011.

Mr. James Mitchem, Principal, Bolingbrook High School, Valley View District 265-U, reviewed this plan on January 19, 2011.

Dr. Von Mansfield, Superintendent, Homewood-Flosmoor School District, reviewed this plan on January 19, 2011.

Dr. Kathleen Doyle, Intermediate Service Center Region 4, Cook County, Illinois, reviewed this plan on January 19, 2011.

Section III - 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.

Lockport Township High School has a comprehensive two-year mentoring program which is conducted jointly by the district and building administration and the local teachers' union. New teachers are teamed with a veteran teachers of the district who serve as peer mentors. Prior to the beginning of the school year, all new teachers to the district engage in two days of induction and professional learning opportunities based upon the work, "The first days of School" written by Harry and Rosemary Wong. New teachers are also required to attend monthly informational and update sessions during the school year with the building administration. As part of the mentoring process, new teachers also spend time observing in vital areas throughout the district including the Dean's Office, Media Center and Guidance Services Office. In addition, they are required to observe classes of veteran staff and are encouraged to invite colleagues to observe their lessons and provide feedback. Second year staff attends reading instruction meetings where they receive professional development to improve and enhance student reading and comprehension skills. Teachers receive instruction on how to incorporate reading and comprehension activities into their daily lessons using the Ellin Keene "Mosaic of Thought" strategies.

The LTHS Teacher Mentoring program is a district required process with specific projects that must be completed. All teachers who are new to the district must participate in this program, regardless of how many years of teaching experience they may have when hired.

The LTHS Teacher Mentoring Process is an ISBE recognized and approved mentoring program.

Section III - 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.

As part of the strategic plan, standing committees have been formed to review student performance outcomes, determine the effectiveness of academic and social/emotional

interventions and supports, investigate and recommend a model of effective instruction and teacher evaluation, enhance parent and community input, and monitor district finances.

A team consisting of representatives of the various committees of the strategic plan and from the groups which contributed to this improvement plan will evolve as a standing committee which will regularly meet to analyze progress of both the strategic plan and the implementation of this school improvement plan.

This monitoring team, under the supervision of the two building principals, will be responsible for analyzing student performance data, monitoring the implementation of plan strategies and activities, and identifying resources and services needed for the district to implement the elements of both the District Strategic Plan and this District Improvement Plan.

**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). (Check all that apply.)

- Require implementation of a new research-based curriculum of instructional program;
- Extension of the school year or school day;
- Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance;
- Significant decrease in management authority at the school level;
- Replacement of the principal;
- Restructuring the internal organization of the school;
- Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school.

**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. (Please check all that apply.)

- Reopening the school as a public charter school, consistent with Article 27A of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/Art. 27A.);
- Replacing all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school's inability to make AYP;
- Entering into a contract with a private entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the school as a public

school;

é Implementing any other major restructuring of the school’s governance that makes fundamental reform in:

- é governance and management, and/or
- é financing and material resources, and/or
- é staffing.

Section III - 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.

This plan was developed by members of the LTHS administration under the advisement of representatives from the local Will-Grundy-Kendall Professional Development Alliance and RESPRO staffs. RESPRO provides funding for LTHS staff to attend in-service programs and professional development activities particularly in the areas of mathematics and reading instruction.

	Name	Title
1	Alex Hildebrand	RESPRO Consultant
2	Robert Wennberg	RESPRO Consultant
3	Allan Alson	Consortium for Educational Change-consultant
4	Peter Sullivan	Principal-Lisle Senior High School
5	Bruce Lane	Guidance Services Department Chair

## Section IV-A Local Board Action

**DATE APPROVED** by Local Board: 01/24/2011

**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

Yes  No

Have the areas of low achievement been clearly identified? [C]

Yes  No

Does the SIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness? [C]

Yes  No

Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students? [C]

Yes  No

Does the analysis, along with other optional data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities? [C]

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes  No  N/A

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

Yes  No  N/A

Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?

Yes  No  N/A

Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

OTHER DATA (OPTIONAL)

Yes  No  N/A

If included, has the SIP team analyzed other available data to clarify the areas of weakness in order to target improvement strategies and activities?

Yes  No  N/A

Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?

Yes  No  N/A

Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

**IDENTIFICATION OF KEY FACTORS**

Yes  No Have data or research been used to determine the key factors believed to cause low performance? [C]

Yes  No Are the key factors within the district’s capacity to change or control? [C]

**CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES**

Yes  No Has the SIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan? [C]

Yes  No  N/A Do the objectives address all areas of AYP deficiency? [C]

**ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES**

Yes  No Is there a clear relationship between the key factors believed to have caused low achievement and the strategies and activities selected?

Yes  No Will the selected strategies and activities likely improve student learning and achievement? [C]

Yes  No Are the strategies and activities measurable? [C]

Yes  No Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified? [C]

Yes  No Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear? [C]

Yes  No  N/A Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students? [C]

Yes  No  N/A 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?

Yes  No  N/A Do the parent involvement strategies clearly align with the strategies and activities for students? [C]

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Do these parent activities relate to the factors contributing to low achievement and will they engage parents in sharing responsibility for student learning?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives? [C]
<b>MONITORING</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers? [C]

PART I - COMMENTS

PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN

PARENT NOTIFICATION

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	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) [C]
---	---

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted? [C]
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	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? [C]

PEER REVIEW

Yes  No

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? [C]

**TEACHER MENTORING PROCESS**

Yes  No

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? [C]

**DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES**

Yes  No

Is it clear what support the district will provide to ensure the success of the plan? [C]

Yes  No  N/A

If applicable, is it clear what corrective actions or restructuring options the district is taking with this school? [C]

**STATE RESPONSIBILITIES**

Yes  No

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

**SCHOOL SUPPORT TEAM**

Yes  No  N/A

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? [C]

**APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD**

Yes  No

The plan indicates the approval date of this plan. [C]

**PART II - COMMENTS**