

Progress Update

District: Christina School District

School \ Building: Christina Administrative Office

School Year: 2009

Progress Update Type: End of Grant

Number: 1

Goal 1: Accelerate achievement for all students and minimize the disparities among all groups of students

Objective 0: Provide effective academic supports for the full range of students

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(ies):

- 0 Implement new and improve existing support programs for both reading and mathematics across all grades
- 0 Use assessment data consistently to target students for sustained reading or mathematics instruction
- 0 Enhance teacher abilities to provide reading instruction at secondary levels across all content areas
- 0 Establish teacher collaboration framework to ensure efforts are aligned to meet student needs
- 0 Improve lesson designs and instructional practices to make instruction more meaningful and interesting
- 0 Maintain Compliance with Federal and State Law and Regulation for Funding
- 0 Refine School-wide enrichment model to better support academic growth of high achieving students
- 0 Support on-going District Needs - Not tied directly to Strategic Plan goals

Measure(s):

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math (All Students - All Grades)

Start Year: 2008

Baseline: 62.7

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	73	6/15/2008	62.4
6/15/2009	78	6/15/2009	64.2
6/15/2010	83	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading (All Students - All Grades)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 71.8

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	82	6/15/2008	69.9
6/15/2009	86	6/15/2009	70.1
6/15/2010	90	(none)	

Measure: [CM] NCLB Graduation Rate (All Students)

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 75

DOE Indicator: [CM] NCLB Graduation Rate (All Students)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
1/30/2007	80	1/30/2007	Jan 30 2007 12:00AM
1/30/2008	82	1/30/2008	Jan 30 2008 12:00AM
1/30/2009	84	6/30/2008	69.1

Measure: [CM] Percent of classes taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 91

DOE Indicator: [CM] Percent of classes taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	100	6/15/2008	94.0
6/15/2009	100	6/15/2009	94.8
6/15/2007	98	(none)	

Measure: % Proficient in Writing (All Students - All Grades)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 64.0

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	70	6/30/2008	63
6/15/2009	75	6/30/2009	70
6/15/2010	80	(none)	n/a

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies (All Students - Grade 11)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 50

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 11)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
8/30/2008	67	6/30/2008	28.8
8/30/2009	74	8/30/2009	33.2
8/30/2010	81	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Science (All Students - Grade 11)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 65

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 11)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
8/30/2008	75	6/30/2008	42.4
8/30/2009	78	8/30/2009	43.5
8/30/2010	81	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading (ELL - All Grades)

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 66

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (ELL - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	56.7
6/15/2009	74	6/15/2009	61.9
6/15/2010	80	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math (ELL - All Grades)

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 53

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (ELL - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	59	6/15/2008	59.1
6/15/2009	66	6/15/2009	62.5
6/15/2010	73	(none)	

Measure: Percent of ELL students moving at least one level as measured by the ACCESS test

Start Year: 2007

Baseline: 92

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	93	6/30/2008	92.0
6/15/2010	95	(none)	n/a
6/15/2009	94	6/15/2009	65

Measure: Percent of middle and high school students beginning the school year Reading below the 5th grade lev

Start Year: 2007

Baseline: 42

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2009	<35	(none)	
6/15/2008	<40	6/1/2009	29
6/15/2010	<30	(none)	

Measure: Percent of high school students beginning the school year unprepared to do high school math

Start Year: 2007

Baseline: 61

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	<55	6/1/2008	70
6/15/2009	<50	6/1/2009	74
6/15/2010	<45	(none)	

Measure: Number of Math classrooms having at least 50% of the students meeting/exceeding their growth target

Start Year: 2007

Baseline: 35

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	40	6/10/2008	49
6/15/2009	45	6/10/2009	57.6
6/15/2010	50	(none)	

Measure: Number of ELA classrooms having at least 50% of the students meeting/exceeding their growth target

Start Year: 2009 **Baseline:** 35

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	40	6/10/2008	49
6/15/2009	45	6/10/2009	56.5
6/15/2010	50	(none)	

Measure: [CM] Dropout Rate (All Students)

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 10.8

DOE Indicator: [CM] Dropout Rate (All Students)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
11/30/2008	10	6/30/2008	10.6
11/30/2009	9	(none)	
11/30/2010	8	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Science (All Students - Grade 4)

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 90.0

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 4)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/28/2008	91	2/28/2008	86.8
2/28/2009	93	1/30/2009	87.5
2/28/2010	95	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Science (All Students - Grade 6)

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 69.4

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 6)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/28/2008	70	2/28/2008	65.5
2/28/2009	75	1/30/2009	66.0
2/28/2010	80	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Science (All Students - Grade 8)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 37.0

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 8)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
8/30/2008	35	6/30/2008	37.0
8/30/2009	40	8/30/2009	41.6
8/30/2010	45	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies (All Students - Grade 4)

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 62.5

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 4)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/28/2008	65	2/28/2008	65.0
2/28/2009	67	1/30/2009	65.8
2/28/2010	69	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies (All Students - Grade 6)

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 53.1

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 6)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
2/28/2008	55	2/28/2008	51.7
2/28/2009	57	1/30/2009	52.1
2/28/2010	59	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies (All Students - Grade 8)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 35.5

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (All Students - Grade 8)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
8/30/2008	35	6/30/2008	35.5
8/30/2009	40	8/30/2009	37.9
8/30/2010	45	(none)	

Measure: Meet or Exceed AMAO targets

Start Year: 2009

Baseline: >85

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
9/30/2009	85	(none)	n/a
9/30/2010	86	(none)	n/a

Questions:

Question 1 : What progress have you made in meeting this objective?

- * Fully met
- * Significant progress made
- R Partial progress made
- * Little or no progress made
- * Not started or attempted

Question 2 : Briefly describe and explain your level of progress. Include data or other supporting evidence.

What factors contributed to your success in meeting this objective?

What factors were barriers in meeting this objective?

If you are considering changing this objective or strategies, measures, or targets related to this objective next year, please describe the change(s) and provide a brief rationale.

Implementation and Challenges

Christina School District's three-year Strategic Plan, developed in 2007, introduced a number of new interventions and programs to the District, including READ 180 (at the secondary level) and Triumphs Math Program (at the elementary level). Committees researched available materials, reviewed the data, and made decisions on what would best fit the needs of the students in the Christina School District. Over the course of the plan, necessary materials were purchased and professional development provided. Implementation varied across schools. This variability was due to inconsistent staffing (teachers) and challenges associated with computer hardware. Professional development continues to be provided for the various intervention strategies that have been employed. Elementary schools in the City of Wilmington continue to be part of the Reading First Program. Professional development has been provided to improve teachers' instruction skills in Reading and better support Reading First implementation. Implementation of the Reading First model has been fairly consistent over time. However, the continual outflow of teachers from the District's city schools to its suburban schools has caused disruptions and required re-training for many new teachers each year. Finally, two of the District's city elementary schools also worked with the Turnaround School Program of the University of Virginia.

The professional learning communities (PLC) model was introduced, and teams from all schools in the district were provided multiple professional development opportunities. Schools reworked their schedules to allow for collaboration time for teachers organized by either grade level or subject

area. Protocols were used for reviewing assessment data, student work, and lesson tuning. In addition to the PLC framework, training has been initiated in Learning Focused Strategies, which is designed to support and focus the work of PLCs. Every school holds at least two PLCs a month, with many of the schools meeting either weekly or twice weekly. In Reading First schools, there are three PLC meeting each month, one of which focuses exclusively on Reading.

The Career and Technical Education courses were revamped and are now aligned to the core curriculum standards. The courses and pathways are more defined and more rigorous, giving students definite criteria and expectations for each course. Additionally, materials have been updated to be more reflective of 21st century skill requirements. This is the first year that all CTE classes will be using the new syllabi.

Finally, at the elementary level, enrichment service teachers now work with students scoring at the 85 percentile and above in reading and mathematics, moving from a school wide enrichment program to a program that targets the enhancement of problem solving and thinking skills.

The Christina School District encountered a number of challenges across the past few years, which created barriers to successful implementation of planned strategies targeted to address Goal 1, Objective 1 of its Strategic Plan. Continuing budgetary limitations resulting from the District's financial crisis of 2006, has limited the staff and resources available to support high-quality implementation of new and existing initiatives. In addition, the District's return to Neighborhood Schools-based student enrollment pattern resulted in the movement of many students in the district (all students in grades K-8 now attend their neighborhood schools). The District also changed the grade configuration of schools to conform to a K-5, 6-8, 9-12 pattern. These changes also resulted in significant shifts in teachers across schools. Resulting assignment shifts placed some teachers in grades, positions, or in schools in which they were not as well-prepared, or equipped, to teach. For example, some teachers with training in Reading First found themselves in schools using different Reading instructional programs, while Reading First schools were left with fewer instructors with Reading First training. This resulted in the need for additional professional development at the beginning of the current school year (2009-10). Finally, the addition of a new elementary school to the District at the beginning of the current school year (2009-10) resulted in the additional movement of students and staff across the district.

Outcomes and Trends

Across the past three academic years, the District has seen inconsistent growth in student achievement and inconsistent progress towards closing achievement gaps between disaggregated groups of students. The extent of progress (or decline) has varied according to the specific indicators utilized to track student outcomes. The following trends have been experienced across the period:

- The percentage of Kindergarten students performing at Benchmark levels on the Spring DIBELS assessments of Reading fluency has steadily increased from a baseline of 65% in 2006 to 79% in 2009. Our 1st grade population has seen smaller and less consistent growth across the period, increasing from a baseline of 63% reading at the Benchmark level in 2006 to 67% by 2009, though reading fluency for 1st grade students tended to fluctuate across the period.
- Changes in academic proficiency, as measured by the annual DSTP assessment, were variable across the four-year period. The district showed small gains in Math and Writing proficiency but overall declines in Reading, Science, and Social Studies. Combined across all tested grades (2-10),
 - o Reading proficiency rates decreased slightly across the period, from a baseline of 76% in Spring 2006 to 74% in Spring 2009. The percentage of students scoring in Performance Levels 4-5 (Exceeds the Standard and Distinguished, respectively) decreased slightly as well, from 23% in 2006 to 22% in 2009. The percentage of students (grades 3-10) scoring in the lowest performance level (PL 1 – Well Below the Standard) did not change across the period (9%).
 - o Writing proficiency rates increased slightly, from a baseline of 60% in Spring 2006 to 70% in Spring 2009. However, this trend was confounded by reductions in the grades that were tested in Writing across the period. The percentage of students scoring in Performance Levels 4-5 increased

from 8% in 2006 to 11% in 2009, while the percentage of students (grades 3-10) performing at PL 1 decreased only slightly, from 6% in 2006 to 5% in 2009.

o Math proficiency rates remained fairly stable from 2006 to 2008 at 63%, increasing to 65% in 2009. The percentage of students scoring in the PL 4-5 range fluctuated across the period, but were higher in 2009 (24%) than in 2006 (21%). The percentage of students (grades 3-10) in the lowest performance category (PL 1) fluctuated across the period, but were down in 2009 (19%) compared to the 2006 baseline (23%).

o Science proficiency rates decreased from a baseline of 69% in Fall 2005 to 61% in Fall 2008. The percentage of students scoring in PLs 4-5 decreased only slightly across the period (17% in 2006 vs. 16% in 2007), while the percentage of students scoring in PL 1 increased from 14% to 17%.

o Social Studies proficiency rates also declined slightly, from 53% in Fall 2006 to 49% in Fall 2009. Similarly, the percentage scoring in PLs 4-5 decreased from 11% to 7% across the period, and the percentage scoring in PL 1 increased from 14% to 20%.

- Proficiency rates increased substantially among students of English Language Learner (ELL) backgrounds in all DSTP-tested subjects. In Reading, the proficiency rate for ELL students (combined across grades) increased from 52% in 2006 to 68% in 2009; in Writing, from 48% to 59%; in Math, from 45% to 65%; in Science, from 38% to 53%, and in Social Studies, from 20% to 42%. Additionally, the percentage of ELL students increasing their English skills by at least one level from the previous school year, as measured by the ACCESS exam, increased from 70% in 2006 to 90% in 2009.

- The percentage of students (combined grades 2-10) meeting/exceeding their individualized, norm-based growth targets on the MAP assessment increased in both Math and Reading. The percentage rose from a 2007 baseline of 49% in both subjects in 2007 to 56% in Reading and 57% in Math in 2009.

- The percentage of middle and high school students that were reading below the 5th grade level (Lexile = 700) did not decrease. Unfortunately, this percentage increased from 25% in 2007 to 29% in 2009, indicating declining reading levels at the secondary level.

- The percentage of students entering 9th grade students that were unprepared for high school mathematics (as indicated by a Math RIT score on the MAP assessment under 235) fluctuated across the period. It declined slightly from its baseline of 72% in 2007 to 70% in 2008, and then rose to 74% in 2009.

- The four-year (on-time) high school graduation rate declined across the period from 74.0% in 2006 to 69.1% in 2008. [The graduation rate for the 2009 school year has not yet been released by DOE.]

- The percentage of highly qualified teachers (HQT) fluctuated across the period, with a 97% HQT baseline. After dipping to 91% in 2007, the HQT percentage increased to 93% in 2008 and to 95% in 2009.

Objective 0: Cultivate leaders to create a culture of high performance

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(ies):

- 0 Provide training and support for leaders and staff in leadership skills
 - Implement a succession planning process to identify and grow leaders
- 0 Establish a district accountability system that aligns with the Administrator Performance Reviews
- 0 Establish a system of performance measures which includes:
 - Alignment with the strategic plan, and routine operational issues
 - Periodic Board and Superintendent review
 - Communication with constituents
- 0 Maintain Compliance with Federal and State Law and Regulation for Funding
- 0 Support on-going District Needs - Not tied directly to Strategic Plan goals

Measure(s):

Measure: Percent of teachers at a level 2 or higher as measured on the Lo-Ti survey

Start Year: 2009 **Baseline:** 10

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	18	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	20	6/15/2009	17
6/15/2010	22	(none)	n/a

Measure: Disparity between ethnic, special education, and socioeconomic groups in Reading

Start Year: 2009 **Baseline:** 20.0

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	17.0	6/15/2008	17.1
6/15/2009	15.0	6/15/2009	17.2
6/15/2010	13.0	(none)	

Measure: Disparity between ethnic, special ed, and socioeconomic groups in Mathematics

Start Year: 2009 **Baseline:** 25.0

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	23.0	6/15/2008	20.7
6/15/2009	20.0	6/15/2009	20.2
6/15/2010	17.0	(none)	

Measure: Average subscore of Principal effectiveness on the My Perspective Survey

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 2.0

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	2.4	4/28/2008	89.3
6/15/2009	2.7	6/15/2009	91.3
6/15/2010	3.0	(none)	n/a

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math (Afr. American - All Grades)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 49.5

DOE [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Afr. American - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	49.5
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	51.0
6/15/2010	67	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math (Asian/Pacific Islander - All Grades)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 83.1

DOE [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Asian/Pacific Islander - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	84	6/15/2008	83.1
6/15/2009	86	6/15/2009	83.9
6/15/2010	88	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math (Hispanic - All Grades)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 59.9

DOE [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Hispanic - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2010	67	(none)	
6/15/2008	60	6/15/2008	59.9
6/15/2009	64	6/15/2009	63.5

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math (White - All Grades)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 76.2

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (White - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	75	6/15/2008	76.2
6/15/2009	79	6/15/2009	78.2
6/15/2010	83	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math (Low Income - All Grades)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 53.0

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Low Income - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	53.0
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	55.3
6/15/2010	67	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading (Afr. American - All Grades)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 60.7

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Afr. American - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	60.7
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	60.5
6/15/2010	79	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading (Asian/Pacific Islander - All Grades)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 82.2

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Asian/Pacific Islander - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2010	86	(none)	
6/15/2009	84	6/15/2009	82.4
6/15/2008	82	6/15/2008	82.2

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading (Hispanic - All Grades)
Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 63.3
DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Hispanic - All Grades)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	63.3
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	67.4
6/15/2010	79	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading (White - All Grades)
Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 81.7
DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (White - All Grades)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	82	6/15/2008	81.7
6/15/2009	84	6/15/2009	81.3
6/15/2010	86	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading (Low Income - All Grades)
Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 60.7
DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Low Income - All Grades)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	60.7
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	61.5
6/15/2010	79	(none)	

Questions:

Question 1 : What progress have you made in meeting this objective?

- * Fully met
- * Significant progress made
- R Partial progress made
- * Little or no progress made
- * Not started or attempted

Question 2 : Briefly describe and explain your level of progress. Include data or other supporting evidence.

What factors contributed to your success in meeting this objective?

What factors were barriers in meeting this objective?

If you are considering changing this objective or strategies, measures, or targets related to this objective next year, please describe the change(s) and provide a brief rationale.

Implementation and Challenges

Over the last three years, the Christina School District has initiated participation in a broad array of initiatives designed to build capacity and grow leaders. These efforts include, but are not limited to the following:

- Distributive Leadership Program (secondary schools). All secondary schools participated in the Distributive Leadership (SAELP) Program and Vision 2015. The programs were attended by school teams and had a leadership training module that enhanced the capacity of teacher leaders. Retreats throughout the year allowed teams time to plan and distribute the leadership further.
- VISION 2015 Leadership program (secondary schools)
- Professional Learning Community training for both school teams and principals (with Jay Westover). This training, which was attended by administrators and school teams, trained staff in skills that would facilitate the implementation of PLCs and help staff focus on common objectives for continuous school improvement.
- Aspiring Leader Program: Cohort I (12 participants) completed an 18-month program, and Cohort II (2009-10) is beginning with 13 participants.
- Professional development for implementation of DPAS II for teachers, specialists and administrators. Additional sessions were held to ensure knowledge base for implementation.
- Implementation of the Assistant to the Principal program
- The Balanced Scorecard was implemented at the district level with plans to implement at the building level.

The challenges cited under Goal 1 Objective 1 also inhibited the District's capacity to implement reforms targeting Objective 2. Limited resources, multiple transitions (including the return to Neighborhood Schools, changes to grade configuration patterns, and resulting teacher shifts), along with significant principal turnover in a number of schools, impeded our capacity to implement planned strategies with high fidelity.

Outcomes and Trends

Through the enhancement of leadership capacity, the District hoped to develop a professional culture of high performance, thereby leading to higher-level class participation (and pass) rates and improved academic outcomes for students. In particular, the district sought to increase student access to and participation in higher level academic opportunities and reduce achievement gaps between historically disadvantaged student subgroups. Across the past three academic years, we have experienced inconsistent progress towards meeting this objective. The following trends have been observed across the period:

Teacher and School Performance

- There was no measurable increase in teachers' use of technology in the classroom (Lo-Ti Survey results). Reported use decreased slightly from 19.0% in 2007 to 18% in 2009.
- The number of schools making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) declined across the period, from 19 schools in 2006 to 14 schools in 2009.

Student, Staff, and Parent Perceptions

- The percentage of staff reporting principal engagement (My Perspective Survey Q#22-26) increased slightly from 80.3% (baseline year 2007) to 83.9% in 2009.
- The percentage of students reporting principal involvement (My Perspective Survey -- Elem. Q#13-16 and Secondary Q#20-23) increased from 74.6% (baseline year 2007) to 84.0% in 2009.
- The percentage of parents reporting principal access (My Perspective Survey Q#14-15) increased from 81.0% (baseline year 2007) to 91.3% in 2009 (the response rate for parents of high school students was extremely low in 2009, which reduces confidence in this finding).
- Mean standard scores measuring satisfaction with school climate (School Climate Survey) decreased from 2006 to 2009 for teachers (by 2.8 standard points), students (1.6 standard points), and parents (4.2 standard points). [Mean standard score set to 100 across the State of DE.]

Achievement Gaps

- Achievement (DSTP proficiency) gaps between White and African American students in Reading, Writing, and Math (grades 2-10 combined) narrowed only slightly across the period. The Reading the gap decreased from 20.5 percentage points in 2006 (baseline) to 19.4 percentage points in 2009. In Writing and Math, the gaps decreased from 17.6 points and 28.8 points, respectively, in 2006 to 14.9 points and 27.3 points, respectively, in 2009. In Science and Social Studies, the White-African American performance gap increased slightly across the period— in Science, from 28.2 to 29.8 points and in Social Studies from 27.0 to 30.8 percentage points.
- In contrast, the achievement gaps (DSTP) between White and Hispanic students decreased across the period in all DSTP-tested subjects: in Reading, the gap decreased from 17.7 percentage points in 2006 (baseline) to 11.2 percentage points in 2009; in Writing, the gap decreased from 14.7 to 8.0 points, in Math, from 20.4 to 13.8 points; in Science, from 26.6 to 23.2 points; and in Social Studies, the White-Hispanic performance gap decreased from 27.0 points in 2006 to 21.8 points in 2009.
- Four-year trends (2006-2009) in the combined-grade achievement gap between low income and non-low-income students were inconsistent across different tested content areas. The gap decreased slightly in Writing (by 1.0 point) and in Science (by 3.1 points), and increased slightly in Reading (by 0.6 percentage point), Math (by 0.4 point), and Social Studies (by 3.1 points).
- Trends in achievement gaps across the four-year period between Special Education and Regular Education students varied by content area. The gaps increased in Reading (by 4.9 percentage points), in Writing (by 5.5 points), and in Math (by 6.5 points), while achievement gaps were reduced in Social Studies (by 6.2 points) and in Science (by 1.1 points).
- Achievement gaps between ELL students and English-proficient students have been reduced across all subjects. In Reading, this gap decreased from 24.6 percentage points in 2006 to just 6.0 points in 2009 (a reduction of 18.6 points in total). Reductions were also seen across all other DSTP-tested subjects: Writing (by 3.7 points), Science (by 5.4 points), and Social Studies (by 0.5 point). In Math, the gap was completely erased: while non-ELL students out-performed ELL students by 17.0 percentage points in 2006, the Math proficiency rate for ELL students was actually greater than that for non-ELL students in 2009.

SAT Participation and Performance

- SAT participation decreased across the period, declining from 666 in 2006 to 554 in 2008 SAT data for the 2009 school year are pending.
- SAT performance decreased slightly in Reading (from 475 in 2006 to 470 in 2008), in Math (from 478 in 2006 to 465 in 2008), and in Writing (from 464 in 2006 to 456 in 2008). SAT data for the 2009 school year are pending.

Course-Taking in High School

- The percentage of 10th grade students who successfully completed Integrated Algebra/Geometry/Statistics 3 increased from 3.0% in 2006 to 17.3% in 2008, declining slightly in 2009 to 15.1%.
- The percentage of high school seniors who successfully completed at least one Advanced Placement (AP) course across their high school careers decreased from 35.8% in 2006 to 32.3% in 2009.
- The percentage of high schools students in AP classes that passed with a score of '3' or higher increased from 31% in 2006 to 46% in 2008 (2009 data are pending).

Objective 0: Support the success of students who need special education services

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(ies):

- 0 Integrate inclusive practices into the overall process for meeting state standards for all students
 - Use student needs to drive student and staff assignments and student supports
- 0 Realign the current special education process to improve services for all students
- 0 Establish system to monitor and adapt implementation based on results
- 0 Maintain Compliance with Federal and State Law and Regulation for Funding
- 0 Support on-going District Needs - Not tied directly to Strategic Plan goals

Measure(s):

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math (Special Ed - All Grades)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 30.6

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Special Ed - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	40	6/15/2008	30.6
6/15/2009	45	6/15/2009	31.1
6/15/2010	55	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading (Special Ed - All Grades)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 39.9

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (Special Ed - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	37.2
6/15/2009	55	6/15/2009	35.6
6/15/2010	60	(none)	

Measure: Mean SAT Critical Reading (Verbal) score

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 475

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	478	12/12/2008	470
6/15/2009	480	(none)	n/a
6/15/2010	483	(none)	n/a

Measure: Mean SAT Mathematics score

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 476

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	478	12/12/2008	465
6/15/2009	480	(none)	n/a
6/15/2010	482	(none)	n/a

Measure: Mean SAT Writing score

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 464

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	465	12/12/2008	456
6/15/2009	468	(none)	n/a
6/15/2010	471	(none)	n/a

Measure: Number of students taking the SAT Reasoning test

Start Year: 2007

Baseline: 586

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	675	12/12/2008	554
6/15/2009	700	(none)	
6/15/2010	725	(none)	

Measure: Percent of high school seniors who have successfully completed one or more AP courses

Start Year: 2009

Baseline: 41

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	42	6/15/2008	31
6/15/2009	44	6/15/2009	33
6/15/2010	46	(none)	n/a

Measure: Percent of students with grades of 3, 4, or 5 on an AP exam

Start Year: 2007

Baseline: 52

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	55	12/12/2008	46
6/15/2009	58	(none)	n/a
6/15/2010	60	(none)	n/a

Measure: [CM] NCLB Graduation Rate (Special Ed)

Start Year: 2008

Baseline: 48.8

DOE Indicator: [CM] NCLB Graduation Rate (Special Ed)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
1/30/2008	48	1/30/2008	Jan 30 2008 12:00AM
1/30/2009	50	6/30/2008	43.1
1/30/2010	52	(none)	

Measure: [CM] Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside regular class 80%+ of day
Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 75
DOE Indicator: [CM] Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside regular class 80%+ of day
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
3/30/2008	76	3/30/2008	56.2
3/30/2009	77	3/30/2009	56.3
3/30/2010	78	(none)	

Measure: [CM] Dropout Rate (Special Ed)
Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 7.1
DOE Indicator: [CM] Dropout Rate (Special Ed)
Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance
Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
11/30/2008	6.8	6/30/2008	4.9
11/30/2009	6.2	(none)	
11/30/2010	5.6	(none)	

Questions:

Question 1 : What progress have you made in meeting this objective?

*	Fully met
*	Significant progress made
R	Partial progress made
*	Little or no progress made
*	Not started or attempted

Question 2 : Briefly describe and explain your level of progress. Include data or other supporting evidence.

What factors contributed to your success in meeting this objective?

What factors were barriers in meeting this objective?

If you are considering changing this objective or strategies, measures, or targets related to this objective next year, please describe the change(s) and provide a brief rationale.

Implementation and Challenges

The Christina School District has achieved substantial improvement in the area of Compliance Monitoring around Federal, State and Local Regulations, which positively impacted the processes and procedures around the development and implementation of Individual Educational Plans (IEP). The Internal Review completed by building administrators provided the building administrators a view of the processes and procedures utilized within their building and a snapshot of the services and supports delivered to students with disabilities. The External Review completed by the Special Services Department provided a more comprehensive look at the enforcement of Part B and the quality of services provided to students with disabilities. The result of the September 30th State Audit indicates significant improvement in the process and procedures utilized in the implementation of Part B.

The District provided training in the State of DE web-based IEP system, IEP Plus. Students, parents, teachers and related services staff can fully participate in the IEP process via the IEP projection system. The web based system promotes more collaboration, discussion and group decision making which has improved the process resulting in a more comprehensive IEP.

In 2007-2008, the District provided training in the Implementation of Inclusive Educational Practices resulting in more opportunities for students to be educated in the least restrictive environment. The district employed Inclusion Coaches to assist teachers and administrators in providing quality instruction to students with disabilities. Ongoing technical assistance and support was provided to schools in the area of academics and school climate via School Wide Positive Behavior support training (CSD is a school-wide PBS District). One major barrier to implementation of Inclusive Educational Practices was the delay in the State of Delaware's expansion of needs-based funding to the District. Lack of funding delayed the full implementation of Inclusive Educational Practices across the District.

Outcomes and Trends

The Christina School District continues to struggle to reduce the substantial achievement gaps that exist between our Special Education and Regular education students. DSTP-based academic proficiency rates for Special Education students tend decrease with age/grade and school level, with gaps between Special Education and Regular Education students in each content area increasing significantly at the secondary level. Proficiency rates for Special Education students decreased in three of the five content areas tested on the DSTP (Reading, Math, and Science) between 2006 and 2009. Proficiency increased slightly in Writing across the period. The proficiency rate gap between Special Education students and their Regular Education peers also increased across the period in Reading, Writing, and Math. Cross-year proficiency trends for Special Education students are summarized below:

- Proficiency rates for Special Education students decreased from 2006 (baseline year) to 2009 in Reading (from 47.4% to 40.6%), in Math (from 35.0% to 31.1%), and in Science (from 37.4% to 34.8%). Proficiency rates in Social Studies did not grow or decline across the period, remaining between 21% and 22% across the period. Writing proficiency rates increased from 27.5% in 2006 to 31.9% in 2009.
- As noted in the evidence reported under Goal 1, Objective 2, the Special Education proficiency gap (combined across grades 2-10) increased from 2006 to 2009 in Reading (by 4.8 percentage points), Writing (by 5.5 percentage points), and Math (by 6.5 percentage points), while decreasing slightly in Science (by 1.1 points) and to a greater extent in Social Studies (by 6.2 points).
- The percentage of Special Education students that were included in regular education classrooms for instruction (with supports) for at least 80% of the instructional day increased from 50.0% in 2006 to 65.0% in 2009.

Goal 2: Establish and leverage community partnerships to promote accelerated achievement in welcoming school environments

Objective 0: Develop strong school and family partnerships to support positive school environments

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(ies):

- 0 Establish clear district ownership of school and family partnerships
- 0 Adopt model of involvement and implement associated activities focusing first on positive school environments
 - Parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision making, collaborating with the community
- 0 Improve communication vehicles to allow timely dialog about student, school, district, and community issues
- 0 Provide Christina staff training in cultural and socioeconomic diversity
- 0 Maintain Compliance with Federal and State Law and Regulation for Funding
- 0 Support on-going District Needs - Not tied directly to Strategic Plan goals

Measure(s):

Measure: Number of parent/family contacts through the Parent Link telephone messaging system

Start Year: 2009

Baseline: 5

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Community

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	5	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	10	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	15	(none)	

Measure: Mean subscore - Communications with Parents

Start Year: 2009

Baseline: 100

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	100	6/15/2008	80.5
6/15/2009	100	6/15/2009	89.3
6/15/2010	100	(none)	

Measure: Mean subscore - Teacher relations with home

Start Year: 2009

Baseline: 100

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	100	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	100	6/15/2009	92.1
6/15/2010	100	(none)	

Questions:

Question 1 : What progress have you made in meeting this objective?

*

Fully met

*

Significant progress made

R

Partial progress made

*

Little or no progress made

*

Not started or attempted

Question 2 : Briefly describe and explain your level of progress. Include data or other supporting evidence.

What factors contributed to your success in meeting this objective?

What factors were barriers in meeting this objective?

If you are considering changing this objective or strategies, measures, or targets related to this objective next year, please describe the change(s) and provide a brief rationale.

Implementation and Challenges

The Christina School District has established clear ownership of school and family partnerships through an identified Department of Family and Community Engagement (DFCE), with a Supervisor and Title I parent liaison, as well as oversight from the Assistant Superintendent. The District adopted Epstein's Six Types of Involvement from the National Network of Partnership Schools for promoting and increasing parental involvement initiatives and provided professional development to all school leaders on the model and on best practices for engaging parents and community members. In addition to district's membership in the network, six elementary schools and one middle school initiated school-level partnerships. This included all five of the District's schools located in the City of Wilmington where poverty rates tend to be high and parental involvement historically low. One elementary school's parent involvement activity was featured in the network's publication for best practices.

Communication vehicles were improved through implementation of the Parent Link school-to-home communication system, Home Access Center, and the development and distribution of up 10,000 copies of a district-wide Parent Handbook in both English and Spanish. Two district-wide parent information meetings were held to share the District's strategic plan and update parents on progress. A Title I parent conference was held in October 2008 and attended by more than 100 parents. This conference was planned in collaboration with Region III PTA and several community partners (including the DEPIRC), and was hosted Dr. Karen Mapp. Last year, Region III PTA membership reached 3,173 members from 27 PTA established units. Confident parenting workshops were extended to Title I parents by the Center for the Improvement of Child Caring, and were supported with Title I funds. Significant challenges were encountered in getting significant numbers of parents to attend these workshops related to transportation and communication. Plans are currently in place to provide direct support for all schools in leveraging community support and utilizing multiple means of communication to inform parents of such opportunities in the future.

Initial training in cultural competency occurred in 2007, where all district and school leaders were introduced to a cultural competency program. Two elementary schools within the city, piloted the program to increase community collaborations and partnerships for the schools and their students. However, the program was discontinued—a decision made by the participating school communities and District administration—after the District's implementation of the Neighborhood Schools policy warranted a re-assessment of the needs of our school communities. A project planning team researched additional options during 2008 and discovered a more cost-effective Anti-Bias program offered through Positive Behavior Support (PBS). Two district staff persons were trained in this program in June 2009, with additional staff trained in September 2009.

Outcomes and Trends

The identification and utilization of measures with which to evaluate district progress towards increasing levels of parent and community involvement are still in the developmental stage. Much of the baseline data for this objective was first collected and examined during and after the 2009 school year. As such, the use of "hard" data to evaluate progress towards this objective is necessarily limited. Nevertheless, there is some evidence of improvements in parental perceptions of access to and communication with schools, as well as the degree to which educational discussions/support between parent and child are taking place within the home. The following summary provides only a partial picture of progress realized to date:

- Parent Link was a new service instituted in the Christina School District in the 2009 school year. The service is designed to facilitate communication between schools and parents via automated phone calls to students' homes. During the 2009 school year, there were a total of

1,594 messages sent to parents from either the central district office or by individual schools via Parent Link.

- Home Access was also instituted during the 2009 school year. This on-line service provides a web-based platform for parents to monitor their children's assignments and progress in school. Unfortunately, only limited utilization data are available from this system at present. During the 2008-09 school year, there were a total of 9,160 Home Access accounts activated, 53.1% of which registered at least on use/point of access.
- The mean percentage of parents responding positively (agree or strongly agree) on Support for Learning (parent-child educational discussions) subscale items on the annual My Perspective Survey increased from 90.3% in 2008 (baseline for this set of survey items) to 92.1% in 2009 (the response rate for parents of high school students was extremely low in 2009, which reduces confidence in this finding).
- The mean percentage of parents responding positively (agree or strongly agree) on Communication (school-to-home) subscale items on the annual My Perspective Survey increased from 77.5% in 2007 (baseline for this set of survey items) to 89.3% in 2009 (the response rate for parents of high school students was extremely low in 2009, which reduces confidence in this finding).

Goal 3: Create and maintain safe learning environments that promote excellent academic achievement

Objective 0: Improve school climates and student/staff relationships

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(ies):

- 0 Improve communication and implementation of the student code of conduct
- 0 Develop an intensive support system for students who exhibit severe behavioral issues
- 0 Provide time and training for staff to understand and develop strong connections with students
 - Continued implementation Positive Behavior Support system
 - Continued focus on adult behaviors to de-escalate issues
- 0 Maintain Compliance with Federal and State Law and Regulation for Funding
- 0 Support on-going District Needs - Not tied directly to Strategic Plan goals

Measure(s):

Measure: [CM] Out-of-School Suspension Rate (All Students)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 18.5

DOE Indicator: [CM] Out-of-School Suspension Rate (All Students)

Perspective: District/School Processes

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/30/2008	16.8	12/30/2008	23.5
12/30/2009	14.8	10/20/2009	22.6
12/30/2010	12.8	(none)	

Measure: Percent of students who are suspended for more than 15 days in a school year

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 25

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: District/School Processes

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	20	6/15/2008	0.7
6/15/2009	15	6/15/2009	1.7
6/15/2010	10	(none)	

Measure: Percent of students using cigarettes, alcohol or other drugs as reported by the ATOD annual survey

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 50

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	47.5	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	45	6/15/2009	2.0
6/15/2010	42.5	(none)	

Questions:

Question 1 : What progress have you made in meeting this objective?

*

Fully met

*

Significant progress made

R

Partial progress made

*

Little or no progress made

*

Not started or attempted

Question 2 : Briefly describe and explain your level of progress. Include data or other supporting evidence.

What factors contributed to your success in meeting this objective?

What factors were barriers in meeting this objective?

If you are considering changing this objective or strategies, measures, or targets related to this objective next year, please describe the change(s) and provide a brief rationale.

Implementation and Challenges

The Christina School District initiated a number of initiatives across the past few years to improve safety and climate conditions within the District's schools. The District implemented a district-wide system of accountability for reviewing discipline data entry at the school building level (and ultimately by the District). School staff was required to print out, review and submit to the Office of School Climate and Discipline (OSCD) specific Cognos reports reflecting in/out of school suspensions, data entry errors, and attendance reports (this requirement was terminated at the beginning of the 2009-10 school year). OSCD additionally receives daily notices from the DE Department of Education (DOE) reporting data entry errors, which are then shared with schools on a weekly basis to facilitate corrections.

In order to improve communication and implementation around the Student Code of Conduct, the Office of School Climate and Discipline updated and established consistent procedures for the entry of discipline data into e-school. The District provided training opportunities across the past three years for all staff with discipline data entry responsibilities in order to support the use of these procedures. However, attendance at these training sessions has been poor, with only 12 staff attending during the 2008-09 school year (to date in 2009-10, four additional staff persons have attended). OSCD has established consistent procedures for the implementation of the Student Code of Conduct. Each year, school-level administrators and Deans of students participate in a training to review the updated Code of Conduct and the procedures/practices for implementing the Code, including alternative placement and expulsion policies (the State of DE also offered a mandatory training for school administrators on reporting school crime). Finally, OSCD implemented the Student Code of Conduct interactive website which provides an interactive overview of important parts of the code that students need to understand.

The District developed an intensive support system for students exhibiting severe behavioral problems. This included re-framing the focus of the Douglass Alternative School from a more punitive framework to one focused on providing needed services and designed to help students modify their behavior. Areas of focus of the school now include teacher character education, replacement behaviors, social skills, and self-discipline. In addition, counseling services have been enhanced at the school and students are no longer suspended for low-level offenses.

During the 2008-09 school year, Christina implemented a school-based intervention (in-school alternative), as per DOE regulation, during the 2008-09 school year after an extensive evaluation was performed. The program targets students who display chronic disruptive behaviors, and is also used as a consequence for those students who violate the Student Code of Conduct.

The District has additionally provided professional development for staff that specifically addresses how to connect with students—Proactively Addressing Behavior and Discipline professional development and coaching series. This professional development series was designed by the Supervisor of School Climate and Discipline and primarily focuses on assisting staff to understand the dynamics of connecting with students, as well as the elements of effective classroom management. The professional development series consists of three half day theory sessions (maximum number of participants 25) and follow-up coaching with individual teachers in their classrooms. To date, OSCD has trained three cohorts with a total of approximately 50 participants.

In addition, over the past two years (2007-2008, 2008-2009), OSCD has worked with the District's PBS coordinator and the schools to ensure that

all schools have had two levels of training and have a PBS team in place. OSCD has also made itself available, upon request from the schools, to participate in the development of behavior plans for students who display chronic disruptive behaviors. Finally, professional development which focuses on modifying adult behaviors has been offered to District staff, including training in de-escalation and on other topics covered in the Proactive Behavior Support System training series.

Outcomes and Trends

The majority of measures of school climate and student-staff relationships indicate incremental improvements across the past few years. While the percentage of Christina SD students that were suspended one or more times increased slightly across the period, most other measures, including data on absences, perceptions (survey-based) of school climate and student engagement, and reports of substance use among students, showed mild positive trends:

Instruction Missed Due to Disciplinary Actions

- The percentage of students across the district that were suspended one or more times increased from 19.7% in 2007 (baseline) to 22.6% in 2009. The percentage of students suspended for a total of 15 days or more remained relatively stable across the period (1.7% in both 2007 and 2009). However, suspensions in the first two months of the 2010 school year are down 49.3% from the 2009 school year.
- The percentage of students with 10 or more absences decreased from 49.8% in 2007 to 45.1% in 2009.

Perceptions of School Climate and Student Engagement

- Perceptions of overall school climate, as measured by mean total standard scores on the annually administered School Climate Survey (U. of Del.), showed small positive trends at the elementary and high school levels, but negative trends at the middle school level. Christina SD students, teachers, and parents at the middle and high school levels continue to perceive school climate less positively than their respective counterparts across the State of Delaware:

- o At the elementary school level, total standard scores increased slightly from 2007 to 2009 for all three groups of respondents (students—98.5 to 99.9; teachers—98.5 to 99.2; parents—99.1 to 99.9).

- o At the middle school level, total standard scores decreased slightly from 2008 (2007 data combined middle and high school together) to 2009 for all three groups of respondents (students—97.5 to 96.5; teachers—95.6 to 95.2; parents—98.3 to 97.8).

- o At the high school level, total standard scores increased slightly from 2008 to 2009 for all three groups of respondents (students—95.3 to 96.9; teachers—96.8 to 99.1; parents—92.3 to 96.9).

- The mean percentages of teachers and students indicating that students are engaged in school/classroom instruction, as measured on the annual My Perspective Survey--Student Engagement subscale/set of questions—indicate that, on average, perceptions of student engagement increased from 2008 (baseline for this subscale) to 2009:

- o At the elementary school level, the mean percentage citing student engagement increased from 82.4% to 86.1%, and at the secondary level (middle and high school students combined), from 54.3% to 57.5%.

- o The mean percentage of school staff (all school levels combined) citing student engagement increased slightly from 75.9% to 76.9%.

Substance Use/Abuse

- The percentage of students reporting cigarette, alcohol, or marijuana use (across the lifespan) on the annual Alcohol, Tobacco, and Drug Abuse (ATOD) Survey decreased in grades 5 and 8, with more variable trends observed in grade 11:
 - o Among 5th graders, the percentage reporting cigarette use dropped from 10% in 2006 (baseline) to 4% in 2009; alcohol use declined from 20% to 10%, and marijuana use decreased from 3% to 2%.
 - o Among 8th grade students, the percentage reporting cigarette use dropped by more than half, from 32% in 2006 to 15% in 2009; alcohol use declined from 58% to 49%, and marijuana use decreased from 34% to 26%.
 - o Among 11th grade students, the percentage reporting cigarette use decreased slightly, from 31% in 2006 to 28% in 2009. However, the percentage of students reporting alcohol use increased from 71% to 75%, and the percentage reporting marijuana use remained about the same across the period (from 47% to 48%).

Objective 0: Utilize facilities efficiently to improve academics and access

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(ies):

- 0 Educate students close to home in grades K-5
- 0 Establish space in Elementary schools for Full Day Kindergarten
- 0 Create space in middle schools to allow grade configuration and feeder pattern changes
- K-5, 6-8, 9-12
- 0 Complete school renovations in progress
- 0 Consider options for underutilized buildings

Measure(s):

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math (All Students - All Grades)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 62.7

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	73	6/15/2008	62.4
6/15/2009	78	6/15/2009	64.2
6/15/2010	83	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading (All Students - All Grades)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 71.8

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	82	6/15/2008	69.9
6/15/2009	86	6/15/2009	70.1
6/15/2010	90	(none)	

Measure: Number of Schools operating at or above 85% capacity

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 14

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
9/30/2007	18	9/30/2007	Sep 30 2007 12:00AM
9/30/2008	21	9/30/2008	20
9/30/2009	24	9/30/2009	24

Measure: Number of Elementary Schools with space for Full Day Kindergarten

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 1

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
8/28/2008	8	8/28/2008	8
8/28/2009	17	8/30/2009	8
8/28/2010	18	(none)	n/a

Measure: % Proficient in Writing (All Students - All Grades)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 64.0

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	70	6/30/2008	63
6/15/2009	75	6/30/2009	70
6/15/2010	80	(none)	n/a

Measure: Number of schools that received a rating of "good" on a formal facilities assessment

Start Year: 2008

Baseline: 57

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	65	6/30/2008	52
6/15/2009	75	(none)	
6/15/2010	85	(none)	

Questions:

Question 1 : What progress have you made in meeting this objective?

*	Fully met
R	Significant progress made
*	Partial progress made
*	Little or no progress made
*	Not started or attempted

Question 2 : Briefly describe and explain your level of progress. Include data or other supporting evidence.

What factors contributed to your success in meeting this objective?

What factors were barriers in meeting this objective?

If you are considering changing this objective or strategies, measures, or targets related to this objective next year, please describe the change(s) and provide a brief rationale.

Implementation and Challenges

The Christina School District's Neighborhood Schools Plan was approved by the Delaware State Board of Education in February of 2008 and implemented prior to the 2008-09 school year. This plan reorganized school feeder areas to minimize travel distance between students' homes and their schools, and created consistent K – 5, 6 – 8, 9 – 12 grade configurations across the district's schools. Christina's constituency approved the plan and supported it with a successful referendum, funding the completion of two schools: an Elementary school along Route 40 and a middle school in the City of Wilmington. Reconfiguration of school feeder patterns to accommodate these two projects created the space necessary for Full Day Kindergarten district-wide (starting in 2009-10) and for a grade 6–8 configuration in all middle schools, while also educating students in grades K-8 as close to home as possible. The District completed this plan in August 2009 with the opening of the new Porter Road Elementary School. Across this period, the District also completed all of the renovations projects funded in the 2002 referendum, providing each school building in the district with air-conditioning.

The District additionally reviewed all of its buildings to assess efficiency of use. Recommendations were made to the Board of Education to sell one facility to the University of Delaware (83 East Main Street, Newark). That recommendation was accepted and the transaction was completed in 2009. Another facility—300 Executive Drive—was declared as excess property and is in process of being marketed for sale in 2010.

Outcomes and Trends

The Christina School District has made tangible progress in maximizing the efficiency of space utilization and improving building conditions across the last few years. In addition, more parents reported feeling welcome in CSD schools in 2008-09 than in previous years. A more detailed account of these findings follows:

- The number of schools in the Christina School District that are at or above 75% capacity (space for students) increased from 14 in 2006 (baseline) to 24 in 2009. Under-utilization decreased across the period, with the number of schools below 65% capacity decreasing from three to two across the period.
- The number of elementary schools with space for Full Day Kindergarten programs increased from just one school in 2005-06 to 8 schools in 2008-09. All elementary schools in the Christina School District have space for Full Day Kindergarten as of the current school year (2009-10).
- The number of schools not qualifying for a principal unit decreased from two schools in 2006 to just one school in 2009. At the beginning of the current school year (2009-10), all CSD schools qualified for principal units.
- The percentage of schools receiving a rating on the Formal Facilities Assessment of "good" or better increased from 50% in 2006 to 56% in 2009.
- The percentage of parents reporting that they feel welcome in Christina SD schools (My Perspective Survey) increased across all school levels:
 - o At the elementary grade level, the percentage indicating that they felt welcome in their children's schools increased from 91.0% in 2006 to 95.3% in 2009.
 - o At the middle grade level, the percentage increased from 72.0% to 87.7%.
 - o At the high school level, the percentage increased from 64.0% to 93.0% (the response rate for parents of high school students was extremely low in 2009, which reduces confidence in this finding).

Appendix A: Project Maps