

Local Board Approved	12/16/2008
District Plan Submitted	12/17/2008
Plan Resubmitted	
ISBE Monitoring Completed	

District Information

RCDT Number:	480723100160000		
District Name:	LIMESTONE CHSD 310	Superintendent:	KELLY J. FUNKE
District Address:	4201 S AIRPORT RD	Telephone:	3096976271
City/State/Zip:	BARTONVILLE,IL,61607 2199	Extn:	412
Email:	kfunke@limestone.k12.il.us		
Is this for a Title I district ?		<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Is this for a Title III district that did not meet AMAO?		<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No

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

Is this District making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this district been identified for District Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this District making AYP in Reading?	No	2007-08 Federal Improvement Status	District Improvement Year 1
Is this District making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2007-08 State Improvement Status	Academic Early Warning Year 1

Student Groups	Percentage Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Safe** Harbor Target	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		62.5			62.5			90.0		75.0	
All	99.6	Yes	99.6	Yes	56.3		No	53.1		No			93.3	Yes
White	99.6	Yes	99.6	Yes	58.1		Yes	56.5	53.5	Yes			93.6	
Black														
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														

Multiracial /Ethnic														
LEP														
Students with Disabilities														
Low Income	98.4	Yes	98.4	Yes	43.6	43.8	Yes	33.3	51.2	No			100.0	

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging. 2. At least 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. *** 3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision. 4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 75% graduation rate for high schools.
<p>* Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2007. ** Safe Harbor Targets of 62.5% or above are not printed. *** Subgroups with fewer than 45 students are not reported. Safe Harbor only applies to subgroups of 45 or more. In order for Safe Harbor to apply, a subgroup must decrease by 10% the percentage of scores that did not meet state standards from the previous year plus meet the other indicators (attendance rate for non-high schools and graduation rate for high schools) for the subgroup. For subgroups that do not meet their Safe Harbor Targets, a 75% confidence interval is applied. Safe Harbor allows schools an alternate method to meet subgroup minimum targets on achievement.</p>

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

This district is not accountable for AMAO data for 2008

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

District Information								
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Attendance Rate (%)	93.3	93.8	93.2	92.9	92.6	92.8	92.5	92.1
Truancy Rate (%)	2.4	2.7	1.8	2.4	1.9	4.1	5.1	3.7
Mobility Rate (%)	17.7	24.1	13.6	17.3	21.9	21.1	22.1	15.3
HS Graduation Rate, if applicable (%)	93.4	92.1	96.2	93.4	90.9	92.8	94.0	93.3
HS Dropout Rate, if applicable (%)	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.2	0.1	0.1	2.1	1.7
District Population (#)	1,069	1,055	1,053	1,077	1,074	1,112	1,142	1,133
Low Income (%)	12.6	12.9	14.6	15.5	25.9	23.4	24.7	22.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP) (%)	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities (%)								
White, non-Hispanic (%)	92.1	91.6	90.0	91.6	91.0	89.5	88.4	88.3
Black, non-Hispanic (%)	4.3	4.8	5.8	4.9	5.8	7.2	6.6	5.7
Hispanic (%)	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.2	2.1	2.3	2.3	1.9
Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.7	0.7	0.9	1.1
Native American or Alaskan Native(%)	0.3	0.3	0.8	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.4
Multiracial/Ethnic (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.6	2.6

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

	Year	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (%)	Native American (%)	Multi racial /Ethnic (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	92.7	3.7	2.6	0.8	0.2	-
	2001	92.1	4.3	2.4	0.8	0.3	-
	2002	91.6	4.8	2.3	1.0	0.3	-
	2003	90.0	5.8	2.4	1.0	0.8	-
	2004	91.6	4.9	2.2	1.0	0.3	-
	2005	91.0	5.8	2.1	0.7	0.4	-
	2006	89.5	7.2	2.3	0.7	0.3	-
	2007	88.4	6.6	2.3	0.9	0.3	1.6
	2008	88.3	5.7	1.9	1.1	0.4	2.6
	2009	85.0	7.5	1.6	1.0	0.3	4.5
S T A T E	2000	61.1	20.9	14.6	3.3	0.2	-
	2001	60.1	20.9	15.4	3.4	0.2	-
	2002	59.3	20.8	16.2	3.5	0.2	-
	2003	58.6	20.7	17.0	3.6	0.2	-
	2004	57.7	20.8	17.7	3.6	0.2	-
	2005	56.7	20.3	18.3	3.7	0.2	0.7
	2006	55.7	19.9	18.7	3.8	0.2	1.8
	2007	54.9	19.6	19.3	3.8	0.2	2.2
	2008	54.0	19.2	19.9	3.9	0.2	2.7
	2009	53.3	19.1	20.8	4.1	0.2	2.5

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 5 - Educational Environment

	Year	LEP (%)	Low Income (%)	Parental Involvement (%)	Attendance (%)	Mobility (%)	Chronic Truants (N)	Chronic Truancy (%)	HS Dropout Rate (%)	HS Graduation Rate (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	0.3	15.0	98.4	92.8	12.3	22	2.1	0.4	88.8
	2001	0.7	12.6	98.1	93.3	17.7	24	2.4	0.8	93.4
	2002	-	12.9	97.5	93.8	24.1	27	2.7	0.9	92.1
	2003	-	14.6	96.5	93.2	13.6	18	1.8	0.8	96.2
	2004	-	15.5	95.4	92.9	17.3	25	2.4	0.2	93.4
	2005	-	25.9	92.8	92.6	21.9	19	1.9	0.1	90.9
	2006	-	23.4	94.6	92.8	21.1	43	4.1	0.1	92.8
	2007	-	24.7	94.2	92.5	22.1	55	5.1	2.1	94.0
	2008	-	22.4	92.4	92.1	15.3	39	3.7	1.7	93.3
	2009	0	27.8	93.7	92.7	18.7	2	0.2	2.2	94.7
S T A T E	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
	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	-

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 6 - Enrollment Trends

	Year	School (N)	Grade 3 (N)	Grade 4 (N)	Grade 5 (N)	Grade 7 (N)	Grade 8 (N)	Grade 11 (N)
D I S T R I C T	2000	1,077	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	1,069	-	-	-	-	-	246
	2002	1,055	-	-	-	-	-	259
	2003	1,053	-	-	-	-	-	269
	2004	1,077	-	-	-	-	-	239
	2005	1,074	-	-	-	-	-	248
	2006	1,112	-	-	-	-	-	265
	2007	1,142	-	-	-	-	-	276
	2008	1,133	-	-	-	-	-	269
	2009	1,146	-	-	-	-	-	273
S T A T E	2000	1,983,991	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 7 - Educator Data

	Year	Total Teacher FTE (N)	Average Teacher Experience (Years)	Average Teacher Salary (\$)	Teachers with Bachelor's Degree (%)	Teachers with Master's Degree (%)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (HighSchool)	Teachers w/ Emergency/ Provisional Credentials (%)	Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (%)
D I S T R I C T	2000	60	16	42,626	42	58	-	18	-	-
	2001	61	16	44,672	36	60	-	18	-	-
	2002	62	15	45,779	44	54	-	17	-	-
	2003	61	12	46,032	53	44	0	17	2	-
	2004	57	13	48,184	53	44	0	19	-	-
	2005	56	13	50,217	46	50	0	19	-	-
	2006	56	12	49,482	57	41	0	20	-	-
	2007	59	12	50,232	56	42	0	19	-	-
	2008	62	12	52,615	59	39	-	18	-	-
	2009	65	12	54,104	52	46	-	18	0	0
S T A T E	2000	122,671	15	45,766	53	47	19	18	-	-
	2001	125,735	14	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	2	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	12	61,402	44	56	18	18	1	1

**Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data
Item 8a - Assessment Data (Reading)**

[Note: for High Schools, High School Districts, or Unit Districts Only]

PSAE - % Meets & Exceeds Reading grade 11

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	57.2	59.7	58.6	54.5	53.8	55.3
White	57.5	61.4	60.7	57.7	56.2	56.9
Black	-	-	38.5	22.2	7.7	38.1
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	15.4	5.6	16.7	14.8	9.4	18.8
Low Income	58.8	44.0	45.9	45.6	35.6	44.8

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

[Note: for High Schools, High School Districts, or Unit Districts Only]

PSAE - % Meets & Exceeds Mathematics grade 11

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
AYP Benchmark % Meets + Exceeds	40.0	40.0	47.5	47.5	55.0	62.5
All	50.8	56.2	37.6	47.1	45.8	52.2
White	52.7	58.0	40.1	51.4	46.9	56.0
Black	-	-	0.0	11.1	15.4	14.3
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiracial/Ethnic	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	7.7	5.3	3.2	3.7	0.0	6.3
Low Income	47.1	32.0	24.5	23.9	42.4	29.3

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

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

An examination of the data reveals the following:

- The percentage of low income population from 1999 to 2004 was consistently between 12% to 15%
- Between the years 2004 to 2005 the low income population jumped from 15% to 25%; since 2005 to the present the low income population stabilized between 25% to 22% (282 to 260 students)
- Parental involvement was stable at about 94%
- Student attendance has been stable between 92% and 93%

- With the exception of 2002, which was 24%, between 1999 and 2004 the mobility rate varied from 12% to 17%
- In 2005 the mobility rate jumped to 21% and has remained constant
- The truancy rate was steady at 2% until 2006; since then it has increased to about 4-5% each year
- The dropout rate was less than 1% with a slight increase in 2007 to just less than 2%
- The percentage of white students has decreased; conversely the minority population has increased by 4%
- The percentage of black students has increased by 1.5%
- The percentage of Hispanic students has remained steady at 1%
- The percentage of Asian and native American students has been stable
- The percentage of multi-racial students has increased from less than 1% to over 2.6%
- The average class size is 16.6 students, which is lower than the state average of 19.6 students
- The overall school performance on the PSAE of the number of students meeting and exceeding on the test increased about 6% from 2007 to 2008
- The overall state performance on the PSAE of the number of students meeting and exceeding on the test has remained steady at about 52%
- Our school's overall performance on the PSAE is relatively the same as the state average of the number of students meeting and exceeding on the test
- In the area of Reading, the school's percent of meets or exceeds has remained steady at about 55%
- In the area of Reading, the state's percent of meets or exceeds has remained steady at about 54%
- In the area of Reading, the school's percent of meets or exceeds is relatively the same as the state average
- From 2002 to 2008, in the area of Reading, the school's percentage of meets or exceeds has consistently been in the 54% to 59% range
- In the area of Mathematics, the school's percent of meets or exceeds has increased by 6% from 2007 to 2008 and is currently about 52%
- In the area of Mathematics, the state's percent of meets or exceeds has remained steady at about 53%
- In the area of Mathematics, the school's percent of meets or exceeds is relatively the same as the state average
- From 2002 to 2008, in the area of Mathematics, the school's percentage of meets or exceeds has fluctuated, rising as high at 56% in 2004, falling to 37% in 2005, and then currently increasing to 52%
- In the area of Science, the school's percent of meets or exceeds has increased about 4% from 2007 to 2008 and is currently about 50%
- In the area of Science, the state's percent of meets or exceeds has remained steady at about 51%
- In the area of Science, the school's percent of meets or exceeds is relatively the same as the state average
- From 2002 to 2008, in the area of Science, the school's percentage of meets or exceeds has fluctuated rising as high at 58% in 2004, falling to 46% in 2007, and then currently increasing to 50%
- Comparing 2007 Prairie State Achievement Test (PSAE) Reading scores to 2008 Reading scores, the following observations are made:

1. There were increases of 1.8% for the "All" category, 0.7% for the "White" subgroup, and 9.2% for the Economically Disadvantaged" subgroup

2. On the PSAE in 2008, the percent of students ("All" category) Meeting or Exceeding in Reading was 56.3%, which was below the state target of 62.5%, indicating Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) was not made as a district

3. Of the two subgroups identified, both made AYP through Safe Harbor: "Whites" at 58.1% and "Economically Disadvantaged" at 43.6%

Comparing 2007 Prairie State Achievement Test (PSAE) Mathematics scores to 2008 Mathematics scores, the following observations are made:

1. There were increases of 6.6% for the "All" category and 9.1% for the "White" subgroup; the "Economically Disadvantaged" subgroup score decreased by 13.1%
2. On the PSAE in 2008, the percent of students ("All" category) Meeting or Exceeding in Math was 53.1%, which is below the state target of 62.5% indicating AYP was not made

3. The "Economically Disadvantaged" subgroup did not meet in the Math category with only 33.3% Meeting or Exceeding
4. The "White" subgroup did make AYP through Safe Harbor (53.5%)
5. "All" of our students have been identified as needing more support and interventions in the area of math

Attendance on testing days is excellent at 99.6%

Graduation rate is good at 93.3%

(The District acknowledges a need for deeper analysis both of the school's report card data and of that from its eight feeder schools. This will provide more clarity for making decisions. REV 3/31/09)

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

Factors that may have contributed to these results are the following:

- Strategies are not implemented with integrity (reading in the content areas, sustained silent reading, writing across the curriculum)
- Strategies are not sustained
- If teachers do not change their strategies, the student achievement results will also not change
- Teachers are hesitant and/or need more support to try new strategies
- Teachers and administrators are not held accountable to follow-through on strategies
- Math is a 3-year requirement, but not all junior level students are enrolled in a junior level math class (geometry or Advanced Algebra/Trigonometry)
- Incoming freshmen students are not always properly placed in math classes
- Students are not required to pass the core content courses to advance to the next grade level as long as the total number of credits is adequate; therefore some juniors have not had sufficient junior-level course work prior to taking the PSAE
- Student attendance rate is consistent from year to year

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

Conclusions that may be drawn for school improvement are as follows:

- Implement more follow through with regards to best practices, teaching strategies, & use of technology
- Investigate & research universal screening instruments
- Compile more data on junior level math placements
- Increase communication on and clearly define formal professional development procedures

- Provide additional support and interventions for students who did not meet/exceed in reading and/or math on the PSAE
- Collect more accurate data to determine which parents are actively involved
- Research motivation techniques to improve student efforts
- Expand articulation between LCHS & feeder grade schools
- Place freshmen students more appropriately in math classes

Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data

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

Examining the data on local assessments reveals the following:

Limestone Community High School began administering the EXPLORE, PLAN, ACT EXAMS (EPAS) in fall 2007; therefore, there is only data from the 2007 and 2008 school years to compare. However, the results will be used to compare the PSAE scores in Spring 2008 to the Fall 2007 EPAS scores for the current junior class. The results of the Fall 2008 EPAS will be compared to the Spring 2009 PSAE scores. Collection of longitudinal data will begin to determine areas of strength and areas for improvement in our curriculum.

Reading (% of students scoring in each quartile)

Quartile	2007 EXPLORE	2008 PLAN
75-100%	21	24
50-74%	31	28
25-49%	34	23
1-24%	14	24

There was a decrease in the percentage of students in the 2nd quartile (34 to 23%), which corresponded with an increase in the percentage of students in the 1st quartile (14 to 24%).

Math (% of students scoring in each quartile)

Quartile	2007 EXPLORE	2008 PLAN
75-100%	14	13
50-74%	37	30
25-49%	26	45
1-24%	23	12

There was an increase in the percentage of students in the 2nd quartile (26 to 45%), which corresponded with a decrease in the percentage of students in the 1st quartile (23 to 12%).

There was a decrease in the percentage of students in the 3rd quartile (37 to 30%).

Composite (% of students scoring in each quartile)

Quartile	2007 EXPLORE	2008 PLAN
75-100%	17	19
50-74%	33	33
25-49%	34	23
1-24%	16	25

There was a decrease in the percentage of students in the 2nd quartile (34 to 23%), which corresponded with an increase in the percentage of students in the 1st quartile (16 to 25%).

Additionally, LCHS junior English and math classes have utilized a web-based program, KeyTrain, to help acclimate students to the WorkKeys curriculum. Data collected comparing the KeyTrain pretest for the Reading for Information compared to the Spring 2008 PSAE Reading for Information tests show an increase in score of 0.27. Data collected comparing the KeyTrain pretest for the Applied Mathematics to the Spring 2008 PSAE Applied Mathematics tests show an increase in score of 1.01.

There is currently no data gathered from a universal screening instrument to identify students in need of interventions in math and reading to begin meeting the requirements of Response to Intervention (RtI).

There is currently no common assessment data to monitor the progress of the students requiring RtI.

There is no plan in place for an RtI team to problem solve students' areas of deficiencies based on data and to plan appropriate interventions to those identified areas of deficiencies.

(The district recognizes an deficiency in the amount and type of data collected in the past. Common assessments will be developed and used along with a universal screening tool. REV 3/31/09)

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

Factors contributing to the results are listed below.

- Now that EPAS has been implemented in our district, we anticipate seeing a correlation between EPAS and PSAE scores, along with an examination as to how to address areas of weakness
- Early testing dates (9/11/08) may contribute to lower student performance on the PLAN test as students have had little exposure to curriculum material
- Students taking the PLAN test have not received instruction on nearly the entire geometry curriculum, which is a more prevalent component of the math test (last year's test was administered 10/31/07)
- Student motivation to do well on local assessments is lacking
- No correlation exists between being academically successful and meeting/exceeding on PSAE tests
- There is a need for more data to make classroom or departmental decisions
- Curriculum and assessments are not aligned to Illinois Assessment Framework or College Readiness Standards
- Students come from 8 separate grade school districts with a minimal amount of articulation and coordination between the grade school districts and between LCHS
- No universal screening process is in place to identify students who need interventions (Rtl)
- Not all junior students have participated in training and review for PSAE
- Key Train has been in place for less than one year

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

Conclusions that may be drawn are as follows:

- LCHS has several students who scored below the average levels in math and reading. Moving to EPAS and giving the teachers access to the scores as soon as possible will address specific weaknesses for individual students. The areas can then be addressed through curriculum and instruction by individual classroom teachers.
- Hands-on experiences with the KeyTrain program seem to have a positive impact on student performance; this should be continued.
- LCHS should collect data on the number of freshmen students who fail freshmen English or Algebra to determine those in need of interventions as they would be behind in curricular requirements.
- As part of Response to Intervention (Rtl), the district must examine universal screening instruments to administer at least three (3) times per year to identify students in need of interventions in math and reading. Additionally, a process needs to be developed to more frequently monitor the progress for students needing interventions.
- A plan will be developed using Rtl's team training to problem solve students' areas of deficiencies and to plan appropriate interventions to those identified areas of deficiencies.
- Common assessments need to be developed.
- An examination as to why there appears to be no correlation between academically successful and meeting/exceeding on PSAE would be helpful.

Section I–C. Data & Analysis – Other Data
Item 1 - Attributes and Challenges

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

Discipline data indicates that from 2006-2008, there is a consistent pattern:

- The top four discipline infractions (tardy, truancy, failure to serve, and classroom misconduct) have remained the same
- Tardy violations are 21% of all discipline school-wide
- Classroom misconduct is 20% of all discipline violations school-wide
- Minority students are disproportionately disciplined at a higher rate than non-minorities
- Discipline infractions decrease as students progress toward graduation
- Students who are out of school because of suspensions are missing out on instructional time

To address these issues a committee meets yearly including administrators, faculty members, students, and parents to discuss issues related to discipline policies and procedures. Our minority population receives discipline consequences at a rate twice that of non-minority students. In 2006 minority students were 10.5% of the school population and 13.5% of the overall discipline; 11.7% and 25.8% in 2007; so far in 2008, the minority student population (14.17%) have accounted for 35% of the discipline. These students live the farthest from the school location, with the earliest pick-up times, earliest school arrival times, are at school the longest amount of time, and are greatest number of daily bus riders.

Other relevant data includes the following:

- Computer labs were used during 1128 different class periods for the 2007-08 school year
- 47 teachers accounted for the computer lab usage; 26 teachers did not sign up for computer lab use
- 4 additional computer labs were dedicated every day solely for computer classes
- 27 teachers used the computers in the library for 396 class periods

As part of the data concerning Rtl planning and impacting student performance, the following are relevant:

- a team of 4 administrators, 3 regular division teachers and 1 special education teacher, the school social worker, a school counselor, and a SEAPCO school psychologist attended three (3) training workshops on Rtl in the Fall 2008 and will attend two (2) additional workshops Spring 2009
- an administrator, a Language Arts teacher, and the SEAPCO school psychologist attended an Rtl workshop in October 2008, which was designed specifically for secondary education needs to address interventions in curriculum and instruction.

Identified challenges are as follows:

- An increasing Economically Disadvantaged subgroup (22.4%)
- Constraints of the school-provided transportation which does not provide transportation home for students who stay to receive additional support

- Financial constraints that limit the resources/interventions that are in place
- A segment of the student population who are not involved in school activities, resulting in less connectivity to the school

(Other data such as perceptions of students, student evaluation of teacher performance and parent contacts will be added in the future to provide further clarity. REV 3/31/09)

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

Factors that contributed are as follows:

- A growing economically disadvantaged/minority group without re-evaluation of discipline procedures
- Freshmen orientation to rules and regulations does not contain any follow-up
- Tardy policy is ineffective in preventing students from being late to class
- Technology use has increased with the installation of LCD projectors and use of "Playaways"
- Teachers are required to use technology in one lesson plan per grading period which is documented in curriculum maps and in lesson plan books
- A younger teaching staff is using technology more often due to current trends in teacher preparation
- Transportation concerns of early pick-ups and only one night provided for students who want to stay for extra assistance
- Staff members have not yet been trained in RtI
- Training staff members in RtI will enhance teachers' abilities to evaluate curriculum and instruction to determine what changes are needed to address areas of students' deficiencies
- Staff does not take into consideration the effectiveness of instructional methods used in the classroom; RtI is not currently implemented
- Common assessments have not been developed

The challenges have contributed to student performance in the following ways:

- Economically Disadvantaged students typically have fewer resources in the home to support the education process, i.e., books, computers, Internet access
- Many of our students have no means of transportation if they wish to stay after to receive extra help with their course work
- Programs that could address some of the students' concerns are not in place due to financial constraints, i.e., Credit Recovery during the regular school year, remediation, tutor labs for reading and math
- The mobility rate results in some students receiving an inconsistent education, along with transitioning concerns
- Students cannot learn if they are frequently absent from school
- Students who show a disconnect present challenges in the classroom

Credit Recovery was implemented in the Summer of 2008 for students to earn credit for failed classes. Thirty-two students took advantage of this opportunity. Expanding this opportunity throughout the school year would help more students to stay on track to graduate within 4 years.

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

Conclusions that can be drawn for school improvement are as follows:

- Consider new discipline philosophy such as "Discipline with Dignity"
- Provide conflict resolution opportunities to give students skills in solving problems to prevent verbal and physical confrontations that result in school discipline
- Survey our student population to consider their needs for additional services
- Consider positive reinforcement programs that promote positive behaviors and attitudes of students
- Research programs on bullying and cyber-bullying and the effects of such on the school climate
- Examine ways to provide more/additional support and resources to Economically Disadvantaged, Special Education, and bubble students
- Examine the Credit Recovery program to expand this throughout the school year for students who fail required courses
- Incorporate RtI training throughout the district to address interventions within the curriculum and instruction for students who are deficient in reading or math
- Examine the discipline consequences in consideration of transportation concerns of students residing on the outskirts of the school district and those that cannot secure a ride outside normal school hours
- Survey parents to examine their concerns with current transportation needs of students
- Investigate more technology use in the classrooms

Section I-C. Data & Analysis – Other Data
Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

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

An examination of the data reveals the following:

- The number of teachers with Master's degrees has dropped from 63% in 2001 to 39% in 2008
- Conversely, the number of Bachelor's degrees as a terminal degree has increased from 37% to 59%
- Average years of experience has declined from 17 years experience in 1999 to 12 years experience in 2008, which also results in a much younger average age for our teachers than in 1999
- There are only two minority teachers on staff (up from only one for the 2007 school year), even though our minority population is increasing (11.7%)
- Gender of our staff has changed from 58.8% males and 41.5% females in 1999 to 49.2% males and 50.8% females in 2007. For the 2008 school year the percentages are evenly split with 50% Males and 50% Females
- 78 teachers were given 4 hours each of training focused on reading/strategies in content areas
- 10 teachers were given 20 hours of training focused on aligning the Illinois Learning Standards within the curriculum
- 78 teachers were given 3 1/2 hours each of training focused on exposing all teachers to the PSAE/ACT format – (2006-07-all teachers took a practice ACT/PSAE test to expose them to the format; Lang. Arts teachers (11) and Math teachers (7) were given 2 hours of training to expose them to the PSAE/ACT format)
- From 2003-04 to 2008-09, 41 student teachers were placed in our district with 24 different cooperating teachers

- Student teachers taught in the following disciplines from 2003-04 to 2008-09: 2 Business; 5 Family & Consumer Science; 2 Foreign Language; 4 Fine Arts; 1 Industrial Technology; 3 Language Arts; 3 Math; 4 Physical Development/Health; 2 Science; 7 Social Science; 8 Special Education
- In the 2007-2008 school year, 3 teachers attended a workshop on "Leaders for Hire"; 3 teachers attended a workshop about Reading Instruction Targeting Students from Poverty; 6 Language Arts teachers attended an outside conference or workshop
- In the 2008-2009 school year, 4 teachers attended a workshop entitled A Framework for Understanding Poverty; 9 teachers and staff members attended a workshop on "Team Building Roles and Leadership"; 10 teachers and staff members attended a workshop on Module 1: RTI Concepts; 11 teachers and staff members attended a workshop on "Universal Screenings & Benchmarks"; 4 Language Arts teachers attended an outside conference or workshop
- Teachers and administrators attend many workshops and conferences each year to remain current in their content areas (2007-2008 – 42 staff attended 76 workshops/conferences)
- A team of 3 regular division teachers, a special education teacher, a school social worker, a school counselor, 4 administrators, and a SEAPCO school psychologist attended three (3) one day workshops in Rtl, Fall 2008. They will attend two additional workshops in the Spring 2009
- An administrator, a Language Arts teacher, and the SEAPCO psychologist attended an Rtl workshop in October 2008 designed specifically for secondary education
- Since 2001, 69 regular division teachers have been hired and assigned mentors; 46 are still in the district
- Since 2001, SEAPCO (a special ed. co-op) has hired and placed with mentors 16 special education teachers in our district; 8 are still in the district
- The current mentor program matches most new teachers with an experienced staff in a different content area
- Professional development time has focused on reading/strategies in content areas, aligning the Illinois Learning Standards within the curriculum and instruction, and exposing all teachers to the PSAE/ACT format

Degrees Earned	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
BS/BA	30	32	32	26
BS/BA + 15 hours	3	3	9	7
MS/MA	14	16	15	18
MS/MA + 15 hours	7	6	6	6
MS/MA + 30 hours	4	4	7	3
MS/MA + 45 hours	4	6	6	9

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

Factors contributing to the results are the following:

- Only a few teachers take advantage of professional development; out of state conferences are typically not approved
- Department and division meetings are informational and are rarely about curriculum or instruction
- Teachers do not have any formal follow-up after attending workshops or conferences
- Staff members do not understand the implications of Rtl and how to implement in their classrooms
- Some teachers are not aware of the Illinois Assessment Frameworks or the College Readiness Standards

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

The following conclusions may be drawn:

- Encourage graduate course work for our less experienced teachers
- Encourage professional development for all staff members
- Hire more minority teachers to serve as role models
- Continue providing support for staff in reading strategies and curriculum/instruction alignment
- Standards Aligned Classroom (SAC) training could assist teachers in curriculum/instruction alignment
- Target the Illinois Framework Assessments and College Readiness Standards in professional development
- Educate teachers about Response to Intervention (RtI) strategies

**Section I-C. Data & Analysis – Other Data
Item 3 - Parent Involvement**

Data - Briefly describe data on parent involvement. What do these data tell you?

Examination of the data reveals the following:

- Parent contact was 94.2 % in 2007 and 92.4% in 2008
- Parent Teacher Conferences trend is that fewer parents attend in spring than in the fall (the percentage of parents attending the spring conferences decreased by the following: (2003-04 - 10.9%; 2004-05 - 10.0%; 2005-06 - 10.2%; 2006-07 - 17.7%; 2007-08 - 6.8%)
- The attendance at Parent/Teacher conferences had been decreasing every year until this Fall 2008 when it increased by 9% from last year
- School Counselors report that approximately 45%-50% of freshmen parents have attended the freshmen parent orientation for the last 3 years
- Of the 526 parents who attended Parent/Teacher conferences Fall 2008, only 12 returned surveys
- FamilyAccess "hits" has increased each year (877 hits in 2002-03; 45,289 in 2006-2007; 334,323 hits in 2007-08; so far in 2008-09, 140,964)
- 646 different parents have accessed FamilyAccess so far in 2008-09; this represents 58% of the parents, which is an increase from 43% in 2007-08
- 20 parents are active in the Athletic Boosters Club, which meets monthly & volunteers to work the concessions at games
- 30 parents are active in the Band Boosters Club, which meets monthly & helps with set-ups for band competitions and football game performances
- Strong support from parents of students in Student Council and the Student Prevention Team
- The Alert Now automated notification system was used to notify all parents of Parent-Teacher Conferences in the Fall of 2008

- "Rocket Reviews" (district 12-page newsletters) are sent quarterly to all parents
- A special edition of the "Rocket Review" is mailed to the parents of all junior students informing them of the importance of PSAE
- Monthly newsletters are mailed to all Title I parents to keep them informed of the students' areas of study
- A parent attended some of the District Improvement Plan meetings, which is fewer than desired for Rtl
- Each spring all junior parents are contacted by teachers via phone to remind parents of the upcoming PSAE

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

Factors that may have contributed are as follows:

- Parents may lack the skills to support their child's education (can't help them with homework)
Parents may only hear from school or teachers when child is having difficulties
- Parents may have had negative educational experiences or only have contact with the school for negative situations involving their child
- Parents may attend the fall P/T conferences to meet teachers; if the teachers have not changed in the spring, parents may not feel that they need to attend
- More parents attending the Parent/ Teacher conferences this fall may be due to the automated phone calls (Alert Now) that were made to remind parents
- Parents may not have transportation to attend Parent/Teacher conferences
- Some parents may lack confidence when speaking with teachers so they avoid that interaction
- Some parents have given up on their child's education
- Parents may not see parent surveys at the conferences or are not encouraged to complete them
- Families with computers and Internet access have an advantage over families without in keeping abreast of students' performances
- Parents may not know how to get involved at Limestone Community High School
- Parents find it difficult to attend School Improvement Team meetings during regular school hours
- Parent contact data only measures contact - not necessarily involvement

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

Conclusions that may be drawn for the district are as follows:

- Encourage teachers to initiate more positive parental contact with a goal of 2 contacts per week throughout the year
- Find other ways to collect data to determine parental involvement, i.e., IEP attendance, P/T conferences, contact with teachers throughout the year for individual parents so that we can compare the percentages for the Economically Disadvantage Parents to the overall percentages
- Encourage parents to complete a parental involvement questionnaire to find out what types of involvement opportunities they would like to have in the school
- Investigate PTOs at the High School level
- Investigate information about student led conferences at the secondary level
- Place parent surveys in every room or outside each classroom during Parent-Teacher conferences

- Involve more parents in the school improvement process by contacting more parents
- Increase the frequency of parent involvement in the problem-solving component of Rtl so they have a better understanding of curriculum and instruction intervention strategies to assist their student

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors

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

Key factors that have contributed to low achievement and that our district has capacity to change or control are listed below.

- A. Focus staff development efforts on professional learning communities to examine "Discipline with Dignity" to address student discipline
- B. Examine making adjustments to the transportation schedule
- C. Blend the freshmen students from 8 different feeder grade schools by offering more co-curricular activities to encourage more loyalty to LCHS along with increased student motivation
- D. Promote student motivation to do well on local and state assessments
- E. Provide more training and review for students for PSAE
- F. Incorporate the Work Keys format into all classrooms when administering student assessments
- G. Offer summer school and/or CreditRecovery for students who have failed courses
- H. Provide more opportunities for professional development to address deficiencies in the areas of reading and math
- I. Collect more data to examine if a correlation exists between being academically successful and meeting/exceeding on PSAE tests
- J. Collect more data and use to make classroom or departmental decisions (universal screenings & more frequent monitoring)
- K. Align the curriculum and assessments to the Illinois Assessment Framework or College Readiness Standards
- L. Develop common assessments in content areas
- M. Increase use of technology for instruction
- N. Identify individual students (especially economically disadvantaged, special education, and bubble) who are not meeting standards, provide appropriate interventions, and track their progress through more frequent assessments
- O. Enhance training for teachers to provide more opportunities for all students with special emphasis on struggling students (economically disadvantaged, bubble students, students with IEPs)
- P. To address Rtl, develop a form of universal screenings to identify students who need additional interventions in curriculum and instruction
- Q. Provide educators additional support/training in more diverse instructional strategies and interventions once students are identified as deficient
- R. Increase parental participation in school activities, i.e., Discipline Committee, School Improvement Team Meetings, Rtl Team Meetings, Athletic Boosters Meetings, Band Boosters Meetings, and students' academics

Section II-Action Plan

Action Plan Objectives and Deficiencies			
Objective Number	Title	Deficiencies Addressed	
		AYP	AMAO
1	Increase Reading Achievement	1,	
2	Increase Math Achievement	2,3,	
3	Indicator 13		
4	To increase the number of special education students receiving educational services in the general education setting.	1,2,	

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

1 District is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2 District is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
3 Low Income students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

No deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO Report.
This district is not accountable for AMAO for this year

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 1 Title :

Increase Reading Achievement

Objective 1 Description :

While only 56.3% of students in the "All" category, 58.1% of our "White" subgroup, and 43.6% of our Economically Disadvantaged subgroup Met/Exceeded in Reading, all groups will obtain Safe Harbor in 2009 & will make AYP in 2010.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

1 District is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

**No Deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO report.
This district is not accountable for AMAO this year**

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

Objective 1 Title :

Increase Reading Achievement

	Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. All 270 junior-level students will receive ACT and Work Keys test preparation through Key Train and will participate on a regular basis (at least 7 English class periods during the 2008-09 school year).	09/08/2008	05/23/2010	During School	Local Funds	2000
2	2. All students will receive practice in reading strategies in the content areas.	09/08/2008	05/23/2010	During School	Other	0
3	3. All students will participate daily for 15 minutes in a school-wide reading program. Teachers will be supported by working with the school library media specialist to provide appropriate and up-to-date reading material. Teachers will be encouraged to assist reluctant readers by directing them to appropriate reading materials.	09/02/2008	05/23/2010	During School	Other	15400
4	4. Students will have access to "Playaways" (a visual book and audio recording used simultaneously) to increase student reading fluency.	09/08/2008	05/23/2010	During School	Other	12000
5	5. Students will have access to a new reading area in the library.	08/18/2008	05/23/2010	During School	Other	2500
6	6. Students will be universally screened 3 times per year to identify students who need Rtl interventions.	09/01/2009	05/05/2010	During School	Local Funds	19000
7	7. More frequent assessments will be incorporated to ensure student interventions are effective (Rtl).	09/15/2009	05/05/2010	During School	Local Funds	1000
8	8. Students will receive incentives for increasing achievement 2 points on EXPLORE, PLAN, or practice ACT from 1 year to the next (Tier 2).	09/10/2009	09/10/2010	During School	Local Funds	500
9	9. Students will complete a course evaluation each semester.	05/20/2009	05/26/2010	During School	Local Funds	50
10	10. Students will have the opportunity to volunteer to serve on the					

	Discipline Committee to make suggestions for positive reinforcements for achieving honor roll and acquiring no discipline.	12/09/2008	03/30/2010	During School	Other	0
11	11. Students will have access to Credit Recovery during the summer to make up failed course work.	06/05/2009	06/30/2009	Summer School	Local Funds	2000
12	12. Students will have access to Credit Recovery throughout the school year to make up failed coursework.	08/18/2009	06/30/2010	After School	Local Funds	7500
13	13. Students will be encouraged to attend reading lab to receive additional instruction	09/18/2009	05/23/2010	During School	Title V	40000

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

Objective 1 Title :

Increase Reading Achievement

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. A team of high school teachers will attend "Rigors and Relevance High School Challenge" conference in Bloomington. Information learned at the conference will be shared with the rest of the staff. The anticipated result is more critical examination of the curriculum to ensure our curriculum is indeed relevant and rigorous for our students.	06/17/2009	06/18/2010	Summer School	Local Funds	1000
2	2. Teachers will receive Response to Intervention (RtI) training to identify and monitor student achievement.	09/05/2009	05/16/2010	After School	State Funds	7000
3	3. All Language Arts teachers will utilize EPAS test assessment scores as 1 form of universal screening for their students to guide their instructional strategies.	11/05/2008	05/16/2010	After School	Other	0
4	4. A reading specialist will be consulted/employed to train classroom teachers to monitor student performance and to assist in the development of interventions for individual students.	02/26/2009	05/16/2010	During School	Title I	1000
5	5. Teachers will work in departments to align courses, curriculum, and assessments to the Illinois Assessment Framework during released school time and/or SIP days.	02/26/2009	05/23/2010	After School	Title I	10000
6	6. Teachers will develop common departmental assessments.	02/26/2009	05/23/2010	During School	Local Funds	5000
7	7. Teachers will share information with the rest of the staff after attending outside workshops and conferences (all teachers will be required to attend training every three years).	01/05/2009	05/23/2010	During School	Other	0

8	8. Teachers will use technology to access online library resources, United Streaming, and other on-line resources.	09/08/2008	05/23/2010	During School	Other	0
9	9. All teachers will be required to implement 2 reading strategies each semester. Examples of student work will be submitted to division heads.	01/05/2009	05/23/2010	During School	Other	0
10	10. Teachers will report positive reinforcement information about their students to parents (suggested goal of 2 student contacts per week).	01/05/2009	05/23/2010	After School	Other	0
11	11. Teachers will be trained in "Discipline with Dignity"	08/15/2008	05/23/2010	After School	State Funds	1000
12	12. All freshmen Language Arts teachers will use 8th grade Explore results as a form of universal screening to guide instructional strategies.	08/18/2009	05/23/2010	Before School	Local Funds	1000
13	13. Teachers will identify better ways to track parental involvement, i.e. attendance at Parent/Teacher Conferences, IEPs, freshmen orientation, volunteering.	01/05/2009	05/23/2010	During School	Other	0
14	14. A data specialist will be employed to collect, analyze, distribute, and communicate appropriate data to school personnel.	08/15/2009	05/23/2010	During School	Local Funds	25000

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

Objective 1 Title :

Increase Reading Achievement

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. Parents will receive monthly newsletters from Title I teachers to communicate the importance of reading and to offer parents suggestions to provide support/assistance for their student.	09/08/2008	05/28/2010	After School	Title I	400
2	2. All LCHS parents will have access to Skyward which allows them to access their students' grades daily.	08/20/2008	05/28/2010	During School	Title II	0
3	3. Parents will participate in School Improvement meetings to regularly monitor and assess the progress.	10/31/2008	05/28/2010	After School	Other	0
4	4. Key Train progress reports will be mailed to parents/guardians of all junior students prior to administering the PSAE.	03/23/2009	03/24/2010	During School	Local Funds	500
5	5. A plan will be developed to include parents in the Rtl team meetings to better understand their child's individual needs and the intervention strategies identified to address them.	09/14/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	50

6	6. A plan will be developed to communicate intervention progress to parents (Rtl).	09/14/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Local Funds	50
7	7. Parents will be given the opportunity to complete parent surveys.	02/12/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Other	0
8	8. Parents will be given a list of opportunities of ways to become involved at LCHS.	08/17/2009	05/28/2010	During School	Other	0
9	9. Parents will complete a survey to investigate if providing transportation to Parent/Teacher conferences would increase attendance.	02/12/2009	05/28/2009	During School	Local Funds	50
10	10. All parents will be contacted by LCHS staff members for positive reinforcement information about their student at least 2 times per year.	01/05/2009	05/23/2010	During School	Other	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 1 Title :

Increase Reading Achievement

Limestone Community High School moved from the STS local assessment to the EPAS in the Fall of 2007. The purpose was to obtain more alignment with the Illinois Learning Standards and to assess the student strengths and weaknesses in reading. With this information teachers will be better equipped to address the reading deficiencies within the regular classroom setting and through individual student interventions. Teachers will develop common assessments to be administered periodically to determine if there have been student gains in reading achievement.

The ultimate indicators of the effectiveness of the strategies will be student performance on the PSAE assessment in reading and successful results of interventions implemented as a result of the Rtl team meetings. The Language Arts specialist will monitor the progress of students who have been identified as needing interventions in reading.

Ensuring that adequate resources are provided to administer universal screenings and appropriate interventions is critical. Collecting current and accurate data and providing time/resources for personnel to analyze and distribute data is required to help teachers use data to drive decisions in the classrooms.

	Name	Title
1	Dr. Kelly Funke	Superintendent
2	Dr. Betty Gibson	Curriculum Director
3	Dr. Suzanne Minor	Pupil Personnel Services Director

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 2 Title :

Increase Math Achievement

Objective 2 Description :

While the "All" group (53.1%) and the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup (33.3%) did not make AYP in Mathematics, all groups will make AYP in 2009 and 2010 through Safe Harbor.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

2 District is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

3 Low Income students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

No Deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO report.

This district is not accountable for AMAO this year

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

Objective 2 Title :

Increase Math Achievement

	Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. All 270 junior level mathematics students will receive Work Keys test preparation through Key Train and will practice on a regular basis (10 class periods per year).	09/08/2008	05/16/2010	During School	Local Funds	2000
2	2. Identified students will receive daily support and instruction in addition to their regular math class in math skills by a certified math teacher.	08/20/2009	05/16/2010	During School	Other	0
3	3. To incorporate RtI, universal screening will be planned to identify students who need intervention strategies.	09/01/2009	05/23/2010	During School	Local Funds	500
4	4. More frequent assessments will be implemented to ensure student intervention strategies are effective (RtI).	08/15/2009	05/23/2010	During School	Local Funds	1000

5	5. Students will be encouraged to attend math lab to receive additional instruction	09/08/2009	05/23/2010	During School	Local Funds	40000
6	6. Students will participate in "Math across the Curriculum"	02/26/2009	05/23/2010	During School	Other	0
7	7. Students will receive incentives for increasing achievement 2 points on EXPLORE, PLAN, or practice ACT from 1 year to the next	09/11/2008	05/23/2010	During School	Local Funds	500
8	8. Students will have access to Credit Recovery during the summer to make up failed course work	06/05/2010	06/30/2010	Summer School	Local Funds	2000
9	9. Students will have access to Credit Recovery throughout the school year to make up failed coursework	08/18/2009	06/30/2010	After School	Local Funds	7500

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

Objective 2 Title :

Increase Math Achievement

	Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. Teachers will develop common assessments within each math course, designed to assess each student's understanding and mastery of the targeted learning areas.	01/04/2010	05/23/2010	After School	Local Funds	5000
2	2. Math teachers will receive Response to Intervention training to identify and monitor student achievement.	09/05/2008	05/16/2010	During School	State Funds	1000
3	3. All Math teachers will utilize EPAS test assessment scores for all students to guide their instructional strategies.	11/05/2008	05/16/2010	During School	Other	0
4	4. A math specialist will be consulted/employed to educate classroom teachers in intervention strategies to improve identified students' performance.	02/26/2009	05/23/2010	During School	Title I	1000
5	5. Math teachers will align course curriculum and instruction with the Illinois Assessment Framework	01/05/2009	05/23/2010	After School	Local Funds	10000
6	6. All teachers, regardless of content area, will receive training on implementing math strategies in their content area	08/15/2009	05/23/2010	After School	Local Funds	500
7	7. Math teachers will train all teachers in ways to incorporate "Math across the Curriculum"	02/26/2009	05/23/2010	After School	Local Funds	350
8	8. A math specialist will be consulted/employed to help train classroom teachers, to monitor students' performance, and to assist in the	02/26/2009	05/23/2010	During School	Title I	1000

	development of interventions for individual students.					
9	9. Teachers will share information with the rest of the staff after attending outside workshops and conferences (all teachers will be required to attend training every 3 years)	01/05/2009	05/23/2010	During School	Other	0
10	10. A data specialist will be employed to collect, analyze, distribute, and communicate appropriate data to school personnel	08/15/2009	05/23/2010	During School	Local Funds	0
11	11. A team of high school teachers will attend "Rigors and Relevance High School Challenge" conference in Bloomington. Information learned at the conference will be shared with the rest of the staff. The anticipated result is more critical examination of the curriculum to ensure our curriculum is indeed relevant and rigorous for our students.	06/17/2009	06/18/2010	Summer School	Local Funds	1000

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

Objective 2 Title :

Increase Math Achievement

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. LCHS parents will be offered training on Skyward Family Access at LCHS location and at feeder grade school locations	09/23/2009	05/16/2010	After School	Local Funds	500
2	2. Parents will participate in School Improvement meetings to regularly monitor and assess the progress.	10/31/2008	05/16/2010	After School	Other	0
3	3. Key Train progress reports will be mailed to parents/guardians of all junior students prior to administering the PSAT/ACT.	03/23/2009	03/24/2010	During School	Local Funds	500
4	4. Parents will receive monthly newsletters from Title I teachers to communicate the importance of math and to offer parents suggestions to provide support/assistance for their student.	08/20/2008	05/16/2010	After School	Title I	400
5	5. Parents will be included in the RtI team meetings to better understand their child's individual needs and the intervention strategies identified to address them.	01/04/2010	05/23/2010	During School	Other	0
6	6. Intervention progress will be communicated to parents via e-mail/phone contacts.	03/10/2010	05/23/2010	During School	Other	0
7	7. Parents of at-risk students, as identified by the Explore/Plan tests, will be contacted to attend Parent/Teacher conferences	09/25/2009	09/25/2010	After School	Other	0

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 2 Title :

Increase Math Achievement

Limestone Community High School switched from the STS local assessments to EPAS in the Fall of 2007. The purpose was to obtain more alignment with the Illinois Learning Standards and to assess the student strengths and weaknesses in mathematics. With this information, teachers will be better equipped to address the math deficiencies within the regular classroom setting and through individual student interventions. Teachers will develop common assessments to be administered periodically to determine if there have been student gains in mathematics achievement.

The ultimate indicators of the effectiveness of the strategies will be student performance on the PSAE assessment in mathematics and as well as successful results of interventions implemented as a result of Rtl team meetings. The mathematics specialist will monitor the progress of students who have been identified as needing interventions in the area of mathematics.

Ensuring that adequate resources are provided to administer universal screenings and appropriate interventions is critical. Collecting current and accurate data and providing time/resources for personnel to analyze and distribute data is required to help teachers use data to drive decisions in the classrooms.

	Name	Title
1	Dr. Kelly Funke	Superintendent
2	Dr. Betty Gibson	Curriculum Director
3	Dr. Suzanne Minor	Pupil Personnel Services Director
4	Mrs. Denise Ryder	Administrative Assistant/Dean of Students
5	Mr. Kris Adams	Math Teacher
6	Mr. Jim Ryder	Math Teacher

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives

Objective 3 Title :

Indicator 13

Objective 3 Description :

Limestone CHSD 310 shall achieve 100% compliance with Indicator 13 requirements. All students 16 years and older shall have coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

Significant progress has been achieved over the past two years. For the 2006-07 year, **reported** data suggested that only 17% of students with IEPs requiring transition goals met Indicator 13 requirements. For 2007-08, 93% of IEPs contained the necessary goals and services. In fact, 100% of the 2008-09 IEPs meet Indicator 13 requirements.

The district will maintain its current 100% compliance with Indicator 13 requirements of the State Performance Plan and to specifically address the district's designation of "Needs Assistance for Two or More Years (NA2) for Indicator 13" by using technical assistance resources.

1). The district/cooperative has/will utilize the following technical assistance resources:

From ISBE LEA Determinations Indicator 13 Tools and Resources Website:

NSTTAC Web-based Examples and Non-Examples for SPP/APR Indicator 13 - Copies of this technical resource will be provided to staff involved with transition planning and discussed at a staff meeting.

NSTTAC Evidence Based Secondary Transition Practices - Copies of "Self-Directed IEPs (Allen et al., 2001; Snyder, 2002; Snyder & Shapiro, 1997) would be provided to staff involved with transition planning and discussed at a staff meeting. Selected students would be encouraged to lead their own IEP meetings, particularly in the area of transition planning.

FACTS Manual Instructions for Entry of Indicator 13 Data - The district and cooperative have made a concerted effort to submit accurate Indicator 13 data. In so doing, significant progress has been made as evidenced by the increase in percentage of compliance over the past three years.

Harrisburg Project: iePoint Student: Transition - This presentation will be made at a staff meeting for those involved with transition planning and shared with selected students in order to generate interest in "student directed" IEP meetings.

This Objective does not address any AYP deficiency.

**No Deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO report.
This district is not accountable for AMAO this year**

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

Objective 3 Title :

Indicator 13

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1				Before School	Title I	

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

Objective 3 Title :

Indicator 13

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1				Before School	Title I	

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

Objective 3 Title :

Indicator 13

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1				Before School	Title I	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring
Objective 3 Title :

Indicator 13

The SEAPCO Special Education Administrator shall take the lead in ensuring that Limestone Community High School 310 complies with Indicator 13 requirements. She shall advise appropriate staff of the various websites to utilize as technical assistance resources and provide materials as indicated in Objective 3.

	Name	Title
1	Dr. Suzanne Minor	Pupil Personnel Services Director
2	Ms. Lora Haas	SEAPCO Administrator
3	Dr. Betty Gibson	Curriculum Director

Section II-A Action Plan - Objectives
Objective 4 Title :

To increase the number of special education students receiving educational services in the general education setting.

Objective 4 Description :

When comparing district data with the cooperative and all high school districts in Illinois, only 12% of the students with disabilities at Limestone High School #310 receive their instruction in the general education setting for 80% or more of the school day compared to 41.9% in the area co-op, and 38.1% in all Illinois high school districts.

This objective addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

1 District is deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
--

2 District is deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
--

No Deficiencies have been identified from your most recent AMAO report.

This district is not accountable for AMAO this year

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

Objective 4 Title :

To increase the number of special education students receiving educational services in the general education setting.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. General and special education teachers will meet quarterly to collaborate on student achievement, focusing on educational environment and access to the general education curriculum.	08/17/2009	03/29/2010		Title I	15000
2	2. The district will implement Response to Interventions (Rtl) and utilize the problem-solving process to provide interventions for all students.	01/11/2010	03/29/2010		Title I	8000
3	3. The district will utilize a data-based decision-making process to determine the placement of students with disabilities.	08/17/2009	03/29/2010		Title I	8000

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

Objective 4 Title :

To increase the number of special education students receiving educational services in the general education setting.

		TimeLine			Budget	
	Strategies and Activities	Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. Regular division & special education teachers will have common collaboration time to coordinate accommodations	08/17/2009	03/29/2010	During School	Title II	15000
2	2. Special education teachers will collaborate with regular division to inform them of accommodations & modifications	08/17/2009	03/29/2010	During School	Title II	15000
3	3. Teachers involved in inclusion for the FY10 school year will have common prep time	08/17/2009	03/29/2010	During School	Other	0
4	4. All general education teachers will be provided with training to better serve students with IEPs, including how to meet accommodations and modifications for students with disabilities	09/01/2009	03/29/2010	After School	Title II	8000
5	5. All general education teachers and special education teachers will be provided with additional training on how to provide additional supplementary aids and services for students with IEPs	08/17/2009	03/29/2010	After School	Title II	8000

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

Objective 4 Title :

To increase the number of special education students receiving educational services in the general education setting.

	Strategies and Activities	TimeLine			Budget	
		Start Date	End Date		Fund Source	Amount(\$)
1	1. Parents will be provided education about accomodations from the IEP team members on how they can minimize the impact of the students' disability.	08/17/2009	03/29/2010	During School	Other	0
2				Before School	Title I	

Section II-E Action Plan - Monitoring

Objective 4 Title :

To increase the number of special education students receiving educational services in the general education setting.

The district must improve in the area of students receiving 80% or more of their education in the general educational setting by 12%.

	Name	Title
1	Mrs. Lora Haas	SEAPCO Area Administrator
2	Dr. Suzanne Minor	LCHS Special Education Administrator
3		

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation A. Stakeholder Involvement

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

A School Improvement Team was established to develop the District Improvement Plan. The intent was to incorporate more consensus building and collaboration of all of the stakeholders in the plan. This team consisted of administrators, teachers, parent, 7 RtI team members, and an outside consultant. They met several times throughout the 2008-2009 school year to analyze data from the School Report Card and local assessments, as well as to brainstorm ways that our district could address the needs of our students.

Members of the team are listed below:

Mr. Cory Brown, Science Teacher & SIP Team Member

Mrs. Sara Callear, Parent & SIP Team Member
Mrs. Donna Dahmm, Special Education Teacher & SIP Team Member
Mrs. Stephanie Decker, LCHS Counselor, SIP & Rtl Team Member
Mr. Tim Farquer, Physical Development/Health Teacher & SIP Team Member
Mr. Rob Fitch, Language Arts Teacher & SIP Team Member
Dr. Betty Gibson, Curriculum Director, SIP, & Rtl Team Member
Mrs. Linda Gordon, Special Education Social Worker & SIP Team Member
Mr. George McKenna, Administrative Assistant/Dean of Students, SIP, & Rtl Team Member
Dr. Suzanne Minor, Pupil Personnel Services Director & Rtl Team Member
Mrs. Lynn Montgomery, LCHS School Social Worker, SIP, & Rtl Team Member
Mr. Steve Pille, Industrial Technology Teacher & SIP Team Member
Mrs. Julie Powers, Technology Coordinator & SIP Team Member
Mrs. Marsha Pratt, Special Education Teacher and Rtl Team Member
Ms. Lauren Price, Language Arts Teacher & SIP Team Member
Mr. Greg Robinson, Social Science Teacher & Rtl Team Member
Mrs. Denise Ryder, Administrative Assistant/Dean of Students, SIP, & Rtl Team Member
Mr. Jim Ryder, Mathematics Teacher, SIP, & Rtl Team Member
Mrs. Mary Smith, Library Media Specialist & SIP Team Member
Miss Kris Tinnon, Language Arts Teacher & Rtl Team Member
Ms. Valerie Kessler, Special Education School Psychologist & Rtl Team Member
Mrs. Lora Haas, SEAPCO Area Administrator

The LCHS Board of Education members (listed below) were instrumental in supporting the School Improvement Plan

Mr. Michael Vollmer, President
Mr. Larry Winkler, Vice President
Mr. Jim Bainter, Secretary
Mr. Richard Ingram
Mr. Donald Look
Mr. Robert Neal
Mr. David Rebmann

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation
B. District Responsibilities

District Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that the district has provided to revise the plan and other services that the district will provide toward implementation of strategies and activities. District responsibilities include providing technical assistance to the schools including data analysis, identification of the district's challenges in implementing professional development requirements, the resulting need-related technical assistance and professional development to effect changes in instruction, and analysis and revision of the district's budget to ensure that funds provided under Title I and Title III supplement, not supplant, non federal funds, and that services provided with these funds are comparable with the services in schools that are not receiving funds under Title I (NCLB, Section 1116 and 1120A).

STAFFING: A reading specialist and a mathematics specialist will be consulted/employed to assist classroom teachers in intervention strategies to improve student performance.

A data specialist will be employed to assist teachers in maintaining and interpreting data to improve student performance.

A teacher will be placed to provide tutoring in math and reading throughout the school day.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: The district has included several School Improvement Days in the school calendar to allow the staff to participate in sessions related to reading in the content area and Ruby Paynes' *Understanding the Framework of Poverty*. Additionally a group of Language Arts teachers have formed a pilot professional learning community (PLC). They are developing common assessments and lesson plans to ensure students will have a uniform curriculum and instruction. Substitute coverage will be provided so members of the PLC may observe and critique each other to monitor strategies that are successful. All certified staff will review and update curriculum maps throughout the year to ensure the Illinois Learning Standards are being addressed. Additional time will be provided for teachers to align curriculum and instruction to the Illinois Assessment Framework and the College Readiness Standards. Consultants will provide training and guidance in this process. The district plans to send a team of teachers/administrators to the "Rigor and Relevance High School Challenge" conference for professional development. Teachers will have time set aside to collaborate to ensure the needs of special education students are being met in the general education setting.

RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION (RtI): The district will send four (4) administrators, one (1) guidance counselor, one (1) school social worker, one (1) Language Arts teacher, one (1) social science teacher, one (1) math teacher, and one (1) special education teacher to five (5) training sessions throughout the 2008-2009 school year to better understand the process for planning and implementing RtI. These individuals form the RtI team that will train district personnel on the RtI components and how to implement it at LCHS. This RtI team will remain in place when RtI is implemented Fall 2010. Additionally 1 administrator, 1 Language Arts teacher, and 1 SEAPCO school psychologist will attend RtI training focusing on middle and secondary schools.

OTHER DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS: The School Improvement Team recommends developing a plan to provide a math and a reading lab throughout the school day to assist students who are deficient in one or both of these areas. Continuation of the Credit Recovery program and extending it throughout the school year to help keep our students on track to graduate within four (4) years is also recommended. Supplementary aids and services will be provided as needed to allow for participation in the general education setting and the curriculum. District #310 will revise the board policy on staff development to address the provision of services to students with disabilities in the general education setting. Inclusion teachers will be provided a common plan time to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

Section III - Development, Review and Implementation
C. State Responsibilities

State Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that ISBE, RESPROS, and other service providers have provided the district during the development and review of this plan and other services that will be provided during the implementation of the plan. ISBE shall provide technical assistance to the district, if requested, to develop and implement the district plan and work with schools needing improvement. Such technical assistance shall be supported by effective methods and instructional strategies based on scientifically based research. The technical assistance shall address problems, if any, implementing the parental involvement activities described in NCLB, Section 1118, and the professional development activities described in NCLB, Section 1119. [NCLB, Section 1116(c)(9)(B)].

Dr. Barbara Wilmot – RESPRO Coach, Math Consultant

Carole Diedrichsen - ISBE training in School Improvement Plans and Rtl components

Martha (Marti) Woelfle - ISBE training in School Improvement Plans and Rtl components

Dr. Sally Weber - Two Rivers Professional Development Center - SIP & DIP training with Rtl components

Jodi Bouris - Two Rivers Professional Development Center - SIP & DIP training with Rtl components

ISBE website - Information on school improvement plans, PowerPoints to disseminate to School Improvement & Rtl teams

Illinois Interactive Report Card (iirc) Website - Data to use in analysis of School Report Card information

Susie Morrison - Advanced Ed/Quality Assurance Review training

Two Rivers Professional Development Center - Technical Support

Section IV-A Local Board Action

DATE APPROVED by Local Board: 12/16/2008

A.Assurances

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

B.Superintendent's Certification

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

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?
- Yes No Does the DIP include analysis of report card data that sufficiently clarify the areas of weakness?
- Yes No Is it clear that the areas of weakness are broad or narrow and whether they affect many or few students?
- Yes No Does the analysis, along with other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

LOCAL ASSESSMENT DATA

- Yes No Do these local assessment results add clarity to the state assessment data?
- Yes No Does the analysis, along with the other data, provide clear direction for the selection of the objectives, strategies, and activities?

OTHER DATA

- Yes No Do the other data add clarity to the state assessment data?
- Yes No 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?
- Yes No Are the key factors within the district's capacity to change or control?

CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES

Yes No

Has the DIP team stated measurable objectives that promote continuous and substantial progress to ensure that students in each subgroup meet the State's target (e.g., in delivering tiered services or differentiated instruction)?

Yes No

Has the DIP team stated measurable objectives that clarify the present areas needed for improvement for the two years of the plan?

Yes No N/A

Do the objectives address all areas of AYP and AMAO deficiency?

Yes No N/A

Do the objectives address the areas of special education compliance?

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?

Yes No

Are the strategies and activities measurable?

Yes No

Are the measures of progress for the strategies and activities clearly identified?

Yes No

Are expectations for classroom behavior and practice related to the objectives clear?

Yes No N/A

Is professional development aligned with the strategies and activities for students?

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 special education non-compliance?

Yes No N/A

Do the parent involvement strategies and activities clearly align with the strategies and activities for students?

Yes No 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?

Yes No

Are timelines reasonable and resources coordinated to achieve the objectives?

Yes No

Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?

Yes No

Will the collection of strategies and activities along with the monitoring process provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?

MONITORING Yes No

Is it clear who will oversee progress of the objectives and take responsibility for ensuring implementation of the plan?

 Yes No

Will the collection of strategies and activities, along with the monitoring process, provide sufficient direction for plan implementers?

PART I - COMMENTS**PART II - SECTIONS III and IV OF THE PLAN****METHODS OF PLAN DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, AND IMPLEMENTATION****STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT** Yes No

Does the plan describe how stakeholders have been consulted?

 Yes No

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

DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES Yes No

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

 Yes No

If applicable, is it clear what corrective action the district is taking with this school?

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?

APPROVAL DATE OF LOCAL BOARD Yes No

The plan indicates the approval date of this plan.

PART II - COMMENTS

