

Progress Update

District: Christina School District

School \ Building: Christina Administrative Office

School Year: 2010

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 1: Provide effective academic supports for the full range of students

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(ies):

- 1 Implement new and improve existing support programs for both reading and mathematics across all grades
- 2 Use assessment data consistently to target students for sustained reading or mathematics instruction
- 3 Enhance teacher abilities to provide reading instruction at secondary levels across all content areas
- 4 Establish teacher collaboration framework to ensure efforts are aligned to meet student needs
- 5 Improve lesson designs and instructional practices to make instruction more meaningful and interesting
- 6 Refine School-wide enrichment model to better support academic growth of high achieving students
- 7 Maintain Compliance with Federal and State Law and Regulation for Funding
- 8 Support on-going School Needs tied to School Success Plans - Not aligned directly to Strategic Plan goals
- 9 When filling open positions, give first consideration to Highly Qualified teachers. When there are no Highly Qualified teachers, provide support to assist in teachers becoming Highly Qualified. Assign special education teachers to classes in which they are Highly Qualified.
- 10 Improve lesson design and instructional practice that align with technical skills needed for industry
- 11 Streamline pathways to ensure completion and graduation rate.

Measure(s):

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	65.0

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	68.3

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
6/30/2008	82	6/30/2008	69.1
6/30/2009	84	6/30/2009	72.9
6/30/2010	86	(none)	

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
6/15/2010	100	6/15/2010	98.2

Measure: % Proficient in Writing on the DSTP (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	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	75	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	80	6/15/2010	Jun 15 2010 12:00AM

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (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
6/30/2008	67	6/30/2008	28.8
6/30/2009	74	6/30/2009	32.9
6/30/2010	81	6/30/2010	32.5

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (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
6/30/2008	75	6/30/2008	42.4
6/30/2009	78	6/30/2009	43.2
6/30/2010	81	6/30/2010	40.5

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	45.1

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	51.6

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
6/15/2010	95	6/15/2010	Jun 15 2010 12:00AM
6/15/2009	94	6/15/2009	90

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

Start Year: 2007

Baseline: 28

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2009	<16	6/1/2010	24
6/15/2008	<19	6/1/2009	29
6/15/2010	<13	6/15/2010	Jun 15 2010 12:00AM

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

Start Year: 2007

Baseline: 72

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	<67	6/1/2008	70
6/15/2009	<62	6/1/2009	74
6/15/2010	<57	6/15/2010	70

Measure: Percent of students meeting/exceeding their norm-based growth target in MATH

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 49

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	52	6/10/2008	49
6/15/2009	55	6/10/2009	57.6
6/15/2010	60	6/15/2010	59

Measure: Percent of students meeting/exceeding their norm-based growth target in READING

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 49

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	52	6/10/2008	49
6/15/2009	55	6/10/2009	56.5
6/15/2010	60	6/15/2010	52

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
6/30/2008	10	6/30/2008	10.6
6/30/2009	9	6/30/2009	10.3
6/30/2010	8	(none)	

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (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	2/28/2009	89.2
2/28/2010	95	6/15/2010	89.9

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (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	2/28/2009	68.9
2/28/2010	80	6/15/2010	69.4

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Science on the DSTP (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
6/30/2008	35	6/30/2008	37.0
6/30/2009	40	6/30/2009	41.2
6/30/2010	45	6/30/2010	39.3

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (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	2/28/2009	58.9
2/28/2010	69	6/15/2010	60.0

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (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	2/28/2009	51.8
2/28/2010	59	6/15/2010	52.2

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Social Studies on the DSTP (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
6/30/2008	35	6/30/2008	35.5
6/30/2009	40	6/30/2009	37.5
6/30/2010	45	6/30/2010	38.2

Measure: Meet or Exceed AMAO targets

Start Year: 2009 **Baseline:** >85

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
9/30/2009	85	9/30/2009	Sep 30 2009 12:00AM
9/30/2010	86	9/30/2010	Sep 30 2010 12:00AM
9/30/2008	84	9/30/2008	Sep 30 2008 12:00AM

Measure: Percent of students in Kindergarten who have are Benchmark at the EOY on the DIBELS assessment

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 68

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	70	6/30/2008	74
6/15/2009	75	6/30/2009	79
6/15/2010	80	6/15/2010	82

Measure: Percent of students in 1st grade who have are Benchmark at the EOY on the DIBELS assessment

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 67

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/30/2008	65
6/15/2009	70	6/30/2009	67
6/15/2010	72	6/15/2010	65

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP
(American Indian/Alaska Native - All Grades)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 70.4

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP
(American Indian/Alaska Native - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	50	6/15/2008	70.4
6/15/2009	58	6/15/2009	84.0
6/15/2010	67	6/15/2010	72.7

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP
(American Indian/Alaska Native - All Grades)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 77.8

DOE Indicator: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP
(American Indian/Alaska Native - All Grades)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	77.8
6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	92.0
6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	81.8

Measure: [CM] 1S1 - % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP
(CTE Concentrators - 12th Graders testing in Grade 10)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 64.3

DOE Indicator: [CM] 1S1 - % Proficient in Reading on the
DSTP (CTE Concentrators - 12th Graders testing in Grade 10)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	62	6/15/2008	64.3
6/15/2009	68	6/15/2009	62.8
6/15/2010	74	(none)	

Measure: [CM] 1S2 - % Proficient in Math on the DSTP
(CTE Concentrators - 12th Graders testing in
Grade 10)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 48.1

DOE Indicator: [CM] 1S2 - % Proficient in Math on the DSTP
(CTE Concentrators - 12th Graders testing in
Grade 10)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	41	6/15/2008	48.1
6/15/2009	50	6/15/2009	44.2
6/15/2010	59	(none)	

Measure: [CM] 2S1 - % of CTE Concentrators Passing
Technical Skills Assessment

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 66.4

DOE Indicator: [CM] 2S1 - % of CTE Concentrators Passing
Technical Skills Assessment

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	69	6/15/2008	66.4
6/15/2009	71	6/15/2009	91.9
6/15/2010	73	(none)	

Measure: [CM] 3S1 - % of CTE Concentrators Completing
CTE Pathway and Graduating

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 64.2

DOE Indicator: [CM] 3S1 - % of CTE Concentrators
Completing CTE Pathway and Graduating

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	66	6/15/2008	64.2
6/15/2009	70	6/15/2009	82.5
6/15/2010	74	(none)	

Measure: [CM] 4S1 - NCLB Graduation Rate (CTE
Concentrators)

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 82.1

DOE Indicator: [CM] 4S1 - NCLB Graduation Rate (CTE
Concentrators)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	81	6/15/2008	82.1
6/15/2009	82.5	6/15/2009	89.4
6/15/2010	84	(none)	

Measure: [CM] 5S1 - % of CTE Concentrator Graduates in Secondary Placement

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 90.3

DOE Indicator: [CM] 5S1 - % of CTE Concentrator Graduates in Secondary Placement

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	95	6/15/2008	90.3
6/15/2009	96	6/15/2009	49.3
6/15/2010	97	(none)	

Measure: [CM] 6S1 - % of CTE Participants in Programs in Non-Traditional Fields

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 45.2

DOE Indicator: [CM] 6S1 - % of CTE Participants in Programs in Non-Traditional Fields

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	38	6/15/2008	45.2
6/15/2009	38.5	6/15/2009	46.2
6/15/2010	39	(none)	

Measure: [CM] 6S2 - % of CTE Concentrators Completing CTE Pathways in Non-Traditional Fields

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 41.2

DOE Indicator: [CM] 6S2 - % of CTE Concentrators Completing CTE Pathways in Non-Traditional Fields

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	20	6/15/2008	41.2
6/15/2009	21	6/15/2009	38.0
6/15/2010	22	(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

During the 2009-10 school year, the Christina School District continued to work on a consistent and cohesive plan for both the intervention block and 90-minute small group instruction, with a focus on effective strategies that address differentiation. The District continued to investigate intervention math programs. The schools/grades that piloted the Math Connect/Triumphs program (McMillan McGraw) saw an upward trend in scores in DSTP last spring. The District's City of Wilmington schools will be using this series starting in fall 2010.

READ 180 was implemented with greater fidelity and consistency in 2009-10, and included additional professional development for teachers. Secondary school teachers received one-on-one coaching support during the winter and spring 2010 to facilitate implementation of the Read 180 program. Each teacher received a support plan and recommendations to improve their implementation of the program. There were additional trainings given to administrators and teachers through the summer 2010. READ 180 has also been selected as a Tier III intervention for RtI. The Department of Secondary Curriculum and Instruction and Professional Development is currently exploring various intervention programs that align with Read 180 and System 44.

The District's City of Wilmington elementary schools used the Reading First model and received ongoing professional development to support implementation of the program. Reading First Coaches in each school led the professional development. Although the Reading First model was discontinued after the 2009-10 school year, many of the instructional intervention strategies will continue in SY 2010-11.

In 2010-11, all schools set aside time for collaboration through professional learning communities (PLCs). However, implementation of PLC's varied by school in terms of consistency and content. Protocols were used by some schools, but these protocols varied greatly across the District. In schools in which PLC protocols were utilized, they typically specified the schedule and focus of the meetings, including when and how student data were to be reviewed. Teachers continued to use PLC's as the main venue to review student data and plan strategies for improvement. Most schools set aside time for at least two collaborative meetings per month, although many PLCs met weekly.

A team from each school continued training in Learning Focused Strategies. LFS strategies were used to support and focus the work of the collaborative teams. The three-year plan for LFS implementation was revised to focus more directly on the identified needs in District schools, including both targeted training and support materials. The implementation plan, differentiated at the elementary and secondary level, included a monitoring plan. At the mid-year mark, it was determined that in order to accelerate effective LFS implementation in schools, the model needed to be changed from one in which a small team received training to one in which all content teachers received the training. LFS training and implementation will continue in SY 2010-11.

Enrichment service teachers continued to receive professional development on materials designed to strengthen and enhance problem solving and thinking skills in mathematics and language arts. Materials were purchased and teachers were in the process of implementing the material towards the end of the school year. These teachers additionally received professional development in the area of technology integration.

In 2009-10, the Office of Accountability and Assessment continued to provide detailed summary and individual-level reports to schools to help them

interpret and use their data in order to target students for instructional interventions. All principals received individual-level data files which were color-coded and sorted to easily indicate students' performance levels on the MAP (Measures of Academic Performance) assessment and specify the relative distance between each student's MAP performance and DSTP-determined proficiency (based on MAP-to-DSTP alignment) in both Math and Reading. Schools under improvement received additional support in the interpretation and application of these data through monthly or more frequent meetings with District support teams.

One major challenge which affected the District's progress in this area in 2009-10 included the loss of professional development days related to the State of Delaware's budgetary difficulties. Additionally, the District experienced significant turnover in its central administrative leadership just prior to and during the 2009-10 school year, including but not limited to its superintendent and directors of elementary and secondary curriculum.

Outcomes and Trends

Across the past four academic years, the District has seen inconsistent growth in student achievement, as well as inconclusive progress towards closing achievement gaps between key subgroups of students. The extent of progress has varied by data source and measure. The following trends have been experienced across the period:

- The percentage of Kindergarten students performing at the Benchmark level (Support Recommendation) on the Spring DIBELS assessments of Reading fluency has steadily and significantly increased from a baseline of 65% in spring 2006 to 82% in spring 2010. Students in 1st grade witnessed a less consistent pattern of growth across the period, fluctuating between 63% and 67% at Benchmark performance levels across the period. In spring 2010, 65% of 1st graders exhibited Benchmark performance in reading fluency. This was slightly up from the 2006 baseline (63%) but down from spring 2009 levels (67%).

- Trends in academic proficiency, as measured by the annual State of Delaware DSTP assessment, have varied across the past four years. Combined across all tested grades, the District showed inconsistent patterns across subjects:

- o Reading proficiency rates decreased across the period, from a baseline of 76% in spring 2006 to 69% in spring 2010. Most of the decrease across the period was the result of declines in students scoring within Performance Level 3 (the lowest PL required to be considered proficient). The percentage of students scoring in the highest two Performance Levels (PL 4-5; Exceeds the Standard and Distinguished, respectively) decreased to a smaller extent across the period, from 23% in spring 2006 to 20% in spring 2010. Correspondingly, the percentage of students (grades 3-10) scoring in the lowest performance level (PL 1 – Well Below the Standard) increased across the period, from 9% in spring 2006 to 13% in spring 2010.

- o Writing proficiency rates increased slightly from 2006 to 2010, starting at from a baseline of 60% in spring 2006 to 70% in spring 2009 (the Writing assessment was discontinued after the 2008-09 school year). However, this trend is confounded by significant changes 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 slightly, from 6% in 2006 to 5% in 2009.

- o Math proficiency rates remained relatively stable from 2006 to 2010, increasing slightly from a baseline of 63% in spring 2006 to 65% in spring of 2009 and 2010. The percentage of students scoring in the PL 4-5 in Math increased as well across the period, moving from 21% in 2006 to 26% in 2010, after having dipped down to 20% in 2008. The percentage of students (grades 3-10) in the lowest performance category (PL 1) fluctuated across the period, but were down slightly overall, moving from 23% in 2006 to 21% in 2010.

- o Science proficiency rates decreased from a baseline of 69% in 2005-06 to 65% in 2009-10. However, the 65% proficiency rate in 2010 represents an increase over the previous two years in which science proficiency rates had dropped. The percentage of students scoring in PLs 4-5 increased slightly across the entire period (17% in 2006 vs. 20% in 2010), though it fluctuated up and down in years in between. The percentage of students scoring in PL 1 also fluctuated across the period (14% in 2006 to 15% in 2010).

o Social Studies proficiency rates also declined slightly, from 53% in 2005-06 to 49% in 2009-10. Similarly, the percentage scoring in PLs 4-5 decreased from 11% to 6% across the period, while the percentage scoring in PL 1 increased from 14% to 20%.

- Proficiency rates in Reading and Math increased substantially among students of English Language Learner (ELL) backgrounds in all DSTP-tested subjects through 2009. However, in 2010, proficiency in both subjects decreased substantially. In Reading, the proficiency rate for ELL students (combined across grades) increased from 52% in 2006 to 68% in 2009, then declined to 45%; in Writing, the proficiency rate increased from 48% (2006) to 59% in 2009 (after which the Writing test was discontinued by DOE); in Math, the rate increased from 45% to 65% in 2009, then decreased to 48%. A cleansing of DOE's ELL student enrollment across the State at least partially explains the sudden declines in proficiency. Many students who were inappropriately tagged as ELL in prior years were cleaned from DOE's roles in DELSIS in 2009-10 because they should have been exited from ELL status in the system (based on ACCESS test performance/English proficiency levels). This more than likely removed the most English-proficient ELL students from the roles and resulted in a sudden drop in DSTP performance in Math and Reading. That said, declining Math and Reading proficiency trends were contradicted by trends in Science and Social Studies (which are given in only a select four grades). In Science, the proficiency rate for ELL students steadily increased across the five year period, from just 38% in 2005-06 to 63% in 2010. Similarly, in Social Studies, ELL students' proficiency rates increased from 20% to 43% across the period. Finally, the percentage of ELL students increasing their English skills by at least one level (at least 3 composite scale points) from the previous school year, as measured by the ACCESS exam, increased steadily across the period, from 70% in 2006 to 93% in 2010.

- The percentage of students (combined grades 2-10) meeting/exceeding their individualized, norm-based growth targets on the MAP assessment in Reading increased slightly across the period from 49% in 2007 to 52% in 2010. However, this was down from the previous year (52% in 2009). In Math, the percentage rose steadily with each year from a 2007 baseline of 49% in both subjects in 2007 to 59% in 2010.

- The percentage of middle and high school students that were reading below the 5th grade level (Lexile < 700) fluctuated across the last four years. While this percentage increased from 25% in 2007 to 29% in 2009 (indicating declining reading levels at the secondary level), it then decreased in 2010 back down to 24%.

- 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 less than 235) declined slightly across the overall period, though this trend was less than steady. However, in fall 2009 this percentage remained unacceptably high, with 70% of 9th graders scoring below a Rit score (MAP) of 235.

- The four-year (on-time) high school graduation rate declined from 2006 to 2008, from 74.0% in 2006 to 69.1% in 2008. However, the four-year graduation rate was up again in 2009 to 72.9% [The official DOE NCLB graduation rate for the 2010 school year had not yet been released at the time this reported was completed.]

- The percentage of highly qualified teachers (HQT) declined from 97% in 2006 to 91% in 2007. However, thereafter, the HQT percentage increased steadily, ending at 98% in 2010.

Objective 2: Cultivate Leaders to create a culture of high performance

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(ies):

- 1 Provide training and support for leaders and staff in leadership skills
- Implement a succession planning process to identify and grow leaders
- 2 Establish a district accountability system that aligns with the Administrator Performance Reviews
- 3 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
- 4 Maintain Compliance with Federal and State Law and Regulation for Funding
- 5 Support on-going School Needs tied to School Success Plans - Not aligned directly to Strategic Plan goals

Measure(s):

Measure: Percent of teachers at a level 3 or higher as measured on the Lo-Ti survey

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 19

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2009	20	6/15/2009	17
6/15/2010	22	6/15/2010	26

Measure: Disparity between socioeconomic groups in Reading

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 19.8

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	18.0	6/15/2008	17.1
6/15/2009	16.0	6/15/2009	17.2
6/15/2010	14.0	6/15/2010	13.1

Measure: Disparity between socioeconomic groups in Mathematics

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 20.3

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	18.0	6/15/2008	20.7
6/15/2009	16.0	6/15/2009	20.2
6/15/2010	14.0	6/15/2010	13.9

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

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 49.5

DOE Indicator: [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	6/15/2010	53.4

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

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 83.1

DOE Indicator: [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	6/15/2010	83.7

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

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 59.9

DOE Indicator: [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	6/15/2010	64.0
6/15/2008	60	6/15/2008	59.9
6/15/2009	64	6/15/2009	63.5

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	77.5

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	58.1

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	59.7

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	82.5
6/15/2009	84	6/15/2009	82.4
6/15/2008	82	6/15/2008	82.2

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	65.2

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	78.5

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	61.4

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
Across the 2009-10 school year, the Christina School District continued to invest significantly in the development of leadership staff at all levels,

including both teachers and administrators. Collaborative teams (professional learning communities) were evident in every school, focusing on curriculum standards and instruction. Additional professional development and focus on instructional needs are a part of the professional development plan for the upcoming 2010-11 school year as the District refines skills in this area. This work, along with the work in curriculum as the state pursued adoption of the national standards, strengthened the content and pedagogy of the District's teachers, and as a result, additional teachers were afforded opportunities to demonstrate their talents as teacher leaders.

The use and application of data continued to be an area of emphasis across the District. Building administrators received both summary and individual student-level reports designed to facilitate timely and appropriate adjustments to instruction based on student performance/need. This, in conjunction with the professional development with Learning Focused Solutions (LFS), assisted collaborative teams to hone in on their students' instructional needs. It is expected that this change in focus to district-wide training should increase knowledge and skills in instructional strategies at a faster rate than initially planned. The District changed the focus from training a team from each school to doing more across the entire District. This will give teachers some additional as they work to align and differentiate the curriculum.

The District additionally continued its professional development plan to increase the integration of technology in classrooms (measured via LoTi survey scores) in 2009-10. The plan included training for beginners in "how to use" technology, intermediate/advanced use of the software/hardware, and integration of technology with the curriculum. Multiple sessions will continue to be offered going forward.

The four city schools continued to be involved in the Reading First initiative. Some teachers at these four schools were introduced to LFS in 2008-09, as they continued their professional development with specialists from the field. Additional elementary schools also joined the various professional development offerings to strengthen their skills. Each school had an instructional leadership team that proved to be instrumental in analyzing/applying school data and focusing their work on the needs of the students.

Across the 2009-10 school year, the Christina School District continued to invest significantly in the professional development of its teachers and administrators. The Distributive Leadership Program and Vision 2015 continued to actively operate in all of the District's secondary schools. Participation in Distributed Leadership and Vision 2015 sessions continued to develop the skills of secondary school leaders and key teaching staff. As a result of these two initiatives, substantial progress was made in the development of key leadership skills, including use of data to drive decision-making, empowerment of teachers as leaders, and strategic planning for school-wide effectiveness. Secondary principals and their respective school teams additionally attended a Focus on Instruction Conference in February 2010. Finally, Focus on Results teams (part of the Vision 2015 initiative) visited secondary schools repeatedly across the year. This work at the secondary level supported the work of the collaborative teams at the secondary schools, strengthening their work on instruction and student achievement.

The new cohort of Aspiring Leaders Program (ALP) included 13 teachers in 2009-10. A series of ALP professional development sessions was carried out across the year. Four teachers additionally attended the Aspiring Leader program offered by the State of DE. ALP members participated in administrative shadowing experiences in May 2010. The Assistant to the Principal program was fully implemented with four teachers placed in schools as assistants to principals during the 2009-10 year. Assistants worked in schools that did not earn an Assistant but had a need for the position. Experience in this position allowed them to grow in knowledge and develop their leadership skills. Two of the assistants were eventually selected as Assistant Principals, and the District was able to offer the position to others qualified.

On-going DPAS II training for all new teachers/specialists was offered in SY 2009-10 to develop understanding and knowledge of DPAS frameworks and process. There was additional assistance was offered via mentoring sessions and one-on-one meetings with teachers. The District's New Mentoring Program focused (and continues to focus in SY 2010-11) on the requirements and the needs of the new teachers. Additional professional development was provided, as the District's New Teacher Mentor Coordinator worked to support incoming teachers. Finally, existing school leaders attended DPAS II certification training in June 2010, with another session scheduled this fall for any unable to attend the previous session.

For administrators, the Superintendent held New Principal Meetings on a monthly basis to review policy, procedure, and provide professional

development. She worked directly with new principals that were new or with one year experience in the position. For the entire administrative team, there were monthly Leadership Team meetings in which the superintendent discussed district-wide items, such as the Strategic Plan, upcoming DCAS, School Improvement Grant opportunities, Race to the Top, as well as other items of priority for the District.

Finally, key District administrative leaders were actively engaged in their own professional development. Trainings attended included DASL Balanced Leadership training through the University of Delaware (to develop awareness of the skills needed to be an effective educational leader); coaching leaders to attain student achievement; and training in national Learning Focused Solutions to assist in the development of an appropriate professional development program.

Outcomes and Trends

Through the various initiatives targeting leadership development among school staff, the District expected to continue in its development of a professional culture of high performance, which would, by logical extension, result in improved academic outcomes for students. Success in leadership development was, thus, measured in terms of changes over time in students' access to and participation in higher level academic courses and reductions in achievement gaps between historically disadvantaged student subgroups and their non-disadvantage peers. Across the past four school years, the District experienced inconsistent progress towards meeting this objective. The following trends have been observed across the period:

Teacher and School Performance

- The use of technology by teachers in the classroom increased in 2009-10 compared to the three previous school years (as indicated by the percentage of CSD teachers at Level 3 on the annual Lo-Ti Survey). In 2009-10, 26% of teachers were at Level 3 use of technology compared to between 17% and 19% during the three prior years.
- Unfortunately, the number of schools making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) declined steadily across the period, from 19 schools in 2006 to 13 schools in 2010. This decline is in large part related to the annual increase in NCLB proficiency targets in Reading and Math.

Student, Staff, and Parent Perceptions

- The percentage of staff reporting principal engagement (comprised of 5 items on the My Perspective Survey) steadily increased across the past four years, from 80.3% (baseline year, spring 2007) to 87.4% in spring 2010.
- The percentage of students reporting principal involvement (comprised of 4 items on the My Perspective Survey) increased from 74.6% (baseline year, 2007) to 84.0% in 2009, but then decreased in 2010 to 80.8%. However, the number of grades surveyed in 2010 was reduced to from grades 3-12 in previous years to just grades 5, 7, and 9 in 2010. Therefore, the 2010 decline should be interpreted with caution.
- The percentage of parents reporting principal access (comprised of 2 items on the My Perspective Survey) increased from 81.0% (baseline year, 2007) to 90.7% in 2010. It is important to note that parent survey return rates were inconsistent across the period, fluctuating significantly from year to year. Inconsistent survey returns makes the interpretation of trends in parents' responses problematic. In spring 2010, a concerted effort was made by the District administration to increase the return rate to at least 50%. This resulted in a much higher return rate than in prior years.
- Mean standard scores measuring satisfaction with school climate (School Climate Survey) decreased from 2006 to 2010 for teachers (by 1.5 points), though nearly all of this decline occurred prior to the 2009-10 school year. Staff satisfaction with school climate actually increased slightly between 2009 and 2010, from 99.1 to 100.3, putting them right at the State-wide average for school staff. For students, standard scores measuring satisfaction with school climate decreased across the period from 100.0 in winter 2006 to and 97.9 in winter 2010. Parents' satisfaction with school climate also declined across the period, from 103.6 in winter 2006 to 98.6 in winter 2010. [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 achievement gap decreased from 20.5 percentage points in spring 2006 (baseline) to 18.5 percentage points in 2010. In Writing, the gap decreased from 17.6 points in 2006 to 14.9 points in 2009 (the Writing test was discontinued by the State after 2009). In Math, the gap decreased from 28.8 points in 2006 to 24.0 points in 2010. In Science, the White-African American performance gap decreased from 2009 to 2010, but had fluctuated slightly, both up and down, across the three previous years. In Social Studies, the White-African American performance gap increased across the period, from 27.0 points in 2006 to 30.4 points in 2010. Unfortunately, decreases in the White-African American achievement gaps were not always the result of increasing proficiency among African American students, but in some grade groups and subjects, corresponded to relative decreases in performance across time for White students.
- The achievement gaps (DSTP) between White and Hispanic students showed consistent reductions across all tested subjects. In Reading, the gap decreased from 17.7 percentage points in 2006 (baseline) to 11.1 percentage points in 2010; in Writing, the gap decreased from 14.7 to 8.0 points (in 2009), in Math, the gap decreased from 20.4 to 13.4 points (2010); in Science, the gap decreased from 26.6 to 14.8 points (2010); and in Social Studies, the White-Hispanic performance gap decreased from 25.7 points in 2006 to 20.2 points in 2010.
- Five-year trends (2006-2010) in the combined-grade achievement gap between low income and non-low-income students showed consistent reductions across all tested subjects. The gap decreased slightly in Writing (by 1.0 point, 2006-2009), but more substantially in Reading (by 3.5 points, 2006-2010), Math (by 5.9 points), Social Studies (by 8.5 points), and Science (by 13.3 points). All of the substantive reductions in income-based achievement gaps in Reading, Math, and Social Studies occurred between 2009 and 2010 after having either shown flat or inconsistent trends in previous years. Additional analyses by school level indicated that in all but high school reading, low income students increased their proficiency rates in Math and Reading across the five year period while higher income students either saw declining or inconsistent proficiency trends.
- Trends in achievement gaps across the four-year period between Special Education and Regular Education students varied by content area. Between spring 2006 and spring 2010, the combined-grade gap in Reading increased substantially (by 12.1 percentage points), in Writing (between 2006 and 2009), the gap increased by 5.5 points, and in Math, the gap increased by 5.9 points. Achievement gaps were reduced in Social Studies by 8.3 points and in Science by 8.4 points.
- Achievement gaps between ELL students and English-proficient students decreased across all subjects from 2006 to 2009. However, the gaps increased significantly between 2009 and 2010. In Reading, the gap had decreased from 24.6 percentage points in 2006 to just 6.0 points in 2009 (a reduction of 18.6 points in total), but then increased again in 2010 to 25.7 points. Reductions in gaps between 2006 and 2009 were also seen across all other DSTP-tested subjects: Writing (by 3.7 points), Science (by 5.4 points), Social Studies (by 0.5 point), and in Math, the gap was completely disappeared. However, similar to the Reading gap trend, the Math gap rose to 18.2 points in 2010. However, in Science and Social Studies, the gaps continued to decrease across the period, and in 2010, were just 2.6 points and 5.7 points, respectively. It is possible that the increasing Reading and Math gaps in 2010 were related to a DOE clean-up of the ELL data in DELSIS. However, it is not clear why this data clean-up would not have impacted Science and Social Studies in similar ways.

SAT Participation and Performance

- SAT participation decreased steadily across the period, declining 32% across the period, from 666 students in 2006 to 454 students in 2010.
- SAT performance (mean scale scores) also decreased across the period. In Reading, mean scores dropped from 475 in 2006 to 464 in 2010. In Math, mean scores decreased from 478 in 2006 to 457 in 2010). In Writing, scores dropped from 464 in 2006 to 452 in 2009.

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 23.2% in 2010.
- The percentage of high school seniors who successfully completed at least one Advanced Placement (AP) course across their high school career remained fairly stable across the period, with 35.8% completing one or more AP courses in 2006, and then declined slightly between 2007 and 2010. In 2010, 32.9% of high school seniors completed at least one AP course.
- The percentage of high schools students in AP classes that passed with a score of '3' or higher increased from 31% in 2006 to 45% in 2010 (though this was down slightly from 2009 in which 53% of AP exams were passed. [This measure is based on only those students that took the AP final course exams.]

Objective 3: Support the success fo student who need special education services

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(ies):

- 1 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
- 2 Realign the current special education process to improve services for all students
- 3 Establish system to monitor and adapt implementation based on results
- 4 Maintain Compliance with Federal and State Law and Regulation for Funding
- 5 Support on-going School Needs tied to School Success Plans - Not aligned directly to Strategic Plan goals
- 6 When filling open positions, give first consideration to Highly Qualified teachers. When there are no Highly Qualified teachers, provide support to assist in teachers becoming Highly Qualified. Assign special education teachers to classes in which they are Highly Qualified.

Measure(s):

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (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	50	6/15/2010	32.6

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP
(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	6/15/2010	31.6

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
6/15/2010	100	6/15/2010	98.2

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
12/15/2008	478	12/12/2008	470
6/15/2009	480	12/1/2009	464
6/15/2010	483	9/30/2010	464

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	12/1/2009	465
6/15/2010	482	9/30/2010	457

Measure: Mean SAT Writing score

Start Year: 2007

Baseline: 464

DOE (none)

Indicator:

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	12/1/2009	450
6/15/2010	471	9/30/2010	452

Measure: Number of students taking the SAT Reasoning test

Start Year: 2007

Baseline: 587

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
12/15/2008	600	12/12/2008	554
6/15/2009	625	12/1/2009	530
6/15/2010	650	9/30/2010	454

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

Start Year: 2007

Baseline: 33

DOE (none)

Indicator:

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	32
6/15/2010	46	6/15/2010	33

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

Start Year: 2007

Baseline: 52

DOE (none)

Indicator:

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	12/1/2009	53
6/15/2010	60	6/15/2010	45

Measure: Disparity between socioeconomic groups in Reading

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 19.8

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	18.0	6/15/2008	17.1
6/15/2009	16.0	6/15/2009	17.2
6/15/2010	14.0	6/15/2010	13.1

Measure: Disparity between socioeconomic groups in Mathematics

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 20.3

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	18.0	6/15/2008	20.7
6/15/2009	16.0	6/15/2009	20.2
6/15/2010	14.0	6/15/2010	13.9

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

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 48.8

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

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2008	50	6/30/2008	43.1
6/30/2009	52	6/30/2009	49.2
6/30/2010	54	(none)	

Measure: [CM] Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside regular class 80%+ of day

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 53

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	60	3/30/2008	56.2
3/30/2009	65	3/30/2009	56.3
3/30/2010	70	3/30/2010	53.7

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
6/30/2008	6.8	6/30/2008	3.2
6/30/2009	6.2	6/30/2009	2.9
6/30/2010	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

In the 2009-10 School Year, the Christina School District entered the Delaware Department of Education's Needs Based Funding Pilot, which provides funding based on individual student needs rather than based on a student's disability category. The Needs Based Funding Structure allows flexibility in who delivers services to students. The implementation provided greater latitude for students to receive services in the least restrictive environment. However, the 2009-10 school year brought additional challenges related to the lack of professional development days. Fewer PD days hindered the District's ability to continue professional development on Inclusive Educational Practices. While the District employed two inclusion coaches to assist teachers with modeling and building level professional development, teachers continued to request professional development to fully support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. The 2010-2011 Professional Development Plan will focus on inclusive educational practices, accommodations, modifications and support.

Christina completed full implementation of IEP Plus, the web based IEP system. IEP Plus has brought greater collaboration and communication between regular and special education teachers. The collaborative process has been strengthened through the use of the projection system. IEP plus has allowed direct access to students' program, supports, and modifications.

The implementation of the Internal and External Audit Reviews provided the District an opportunity to monitor both compliance and effectiveness of the Individual Education Plans developed for students with disabilities. The Christina School District September 30th Audit Report was an indication that the Christina Audit Reviews had a positive, significant impact on IDEA compliance activities throughout the District. The Special Services Department completed External Audit Reviews in all schools. The development of supports, services, goals, and benchmarks continues to be an area that requires intense professional development. Secondary Schools are currently participating in Professional Development in the area of writing IEPs that are standards based aligned.

The Special Services Department continues to provide support to building leadership through individual technical assistance visits and leadership professional development. In addition the Department is represented in the District Support Team and Vision 2015. The District Support Team Visits have provided an opportunity to view special education service delivery models in each of the schools and have highlighted the need for support at various levels.

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 to 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 in high school have remained around 11% in Reading and in the single digits in Math.

Combined across grades, however, proficiency rates for Special Education students increased in two of the five content areas tested on the DSTP (Writing and Science) across the five year period (Writing was discontinued after 2009). Decreases were seen in Reading and Math, while proficiency in Social Studies remained stable across the period. Combined-grade, cross-year proficiency rate trends for Special Education students are summarized below:

- Proficiency rates for Special Education students decreased from 2006 (baseline year) to 2010 in Reading from 47% to 32% and in Math from 35% to 32%. In Science, the combined-grade proficiency rate increased in 2010 to 42% after having remained relatively stable across the previous four years (between 35% and 37%). In Social Studies, the proficiency rate was 22% in 2010, where it had been for most of the five-year period. Finally, the Writing proficiency rate had increased from 28% in 2006 to 32% 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 2010 in Reading (by 12 percentage points), Writing (by just under 6 percentage points), and Math (by 6 percentage points). The proficiency gap decreased by a little more than 8 points in both Science and Social Studies across the five-year period.
- 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% in 2006 to 57% in 2009 (2010 data will not be made available by DOE until Spring 2011).

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

Objective 1: Develop strong school and family partnerships to support positive environments

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(ies):

- 1 Establish clear district ownership of school and family partnerships
- 2 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
- 3 Improve communication vehicles to allow timely dialog about student, school, district, and community issues
- 4 Provide Christina staff training in cultural and socioeconomic diversity
- 5 Maintain Compliance with Federal and State Law and Regulation for Funding
- 6 Support on-going School Needs tied to School Success Plans - Not aligned directly to Strategic Plan goals

Measure(s):

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

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2010	500,000	6/15/2010	1,969

Start Year: 2009 **Baseline:** 483,631

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Measure: Average % of parents responding positively agree on My Perspective Parent Survey Communication

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	80	6/15/2008	80.5
6/15/2009	85	6/15/2009	89.3
6/15/2010	90	6/15/2010	87.3

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 77.5

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Measure: Average % of parents responding positively agree on My Perspective Survey Support for Learning

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2009	92.0	6/15/2009	92.1
6/15/2010	94.0	6/15/2010	91.0

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 90.3

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

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 has sought to transform the District and community into one where all stakeholders (the District, parents, community and faith-based organizations, businesses, and other stakeholders) work in an aligned fashion to make meaningful engagement a cultural norm in order to positively impact student and community outcomes. While some schools have historically displayed exemplary levels of parental involvement, many continued to struggle to engage parents actively. Christina SD has made efforts to implement a model of involvement that can serve as the framework for a comprehensive program for school-family-community partnerships. The model recognizes various types of involvement, namely: Parenting, Communicating, Volunteering, Learning at Home, Decision Making, and Collaborating with the Community. By ensuring that District and community partners have a portfolio of programs targeted at these various types of involvement, and by aligning resources from District departments such as Special Services, Title I, Elementary and Secondary Curriculum and Instruction, School Climate, and Student Services, the District has made continuous efforts to support its children and families.

In 2009-10, the Christina School District continued to hold membership status in the National Network of Partnership Schools (NNPS) (Johns Hopkins University) in 2009-10 and continued to strive to adopt its model of involvement, with six additional schools obtaining school level memberships across the past three years. One middle school established a fully functioning Action Team for Partnership. Under the model of involvement from the National Network of Partnership Schools, the role of an Action Team for Partnership includes planning, implementing, evaluating, and continually looking for ways to improve family and community involvement activities to create welcoming schools, positive school climates, and helping all students to succeed. The action team usually consists of 6 to 12 members, and includes district-level staff, school staff, parents, and community partners.

The Assistant Superintendent, the Supervisor for Parent and Community Partnerships, and a Board of Education member additionally completed 16 hours of professional development through the NNPS District Leadership Institute, March 18 – 19, 2010 in Baltimore, MD. Upon completing the institute, CSD leaders now plan to write the District's action plan to strengthen collegial support for partnerships; make presentations on school, family, and community partnerships to administrators and teachers; evaluate schools' one-year action plans for partnerships, help schools to write quality action plans, and identify resources to assist in leading and facilitating schools' Action Team for Partnerships on program development. Within this model of involvement, one-year action plans include a set of selected objectives, desired results, measures to assess results, and specific involvement activities that will be implemented.

ParentLink school-to-home communication system continued to be utilized at higher levels across the past three years, both at the district and school levels, for emergency alerts, notifications, invitations to District and school events, and attendance announcements at the secondary level.

The planning and development of a District level Parent Advisory Council was completed in SY 2009-10. In SY 2010-11, parents from all schools and programs will be represented on the Parent Advisory Council and meetings will be held monthly in both Wilmington and Newark areas.

In SY 2009-10, five additional Parent Resource Centers were established in two elementary schools, two middle schools, and one high school. By the end of the school year, four of the Parent Resource Centers were furnished and operational with computers and resources for parents and with

supports from the Delaware Parent Information Resource Center. As of the beginning of the 2010-11 school year, there are seven Parent Resource Centers, with plans to add an additional five centers this coming school year.

A parent/community involvement monthly tracking system is currently under development, which should enable the District to better track schools' efforts and successes in engaging parents and community. In addition, a rubric has been proposed to be used by schools to measure their levels of partnership and community involvement. The Office of Family and Community Engagement (OFCE) trained administrators on the tracking system in August-September 2010, with plans to begin implementation in October 2010. However, this plan had been delayed as of the date of this report. Plans to meet with principals for Title I Compliance and support are being planned and proposed to be held in November. Other methods of effectively tracking parent participation are being researched and plans to pilot selected methods will be considered.

The Office of Family and Community Engagement (OFCE) staff participated in monthly District Support Team Visits to schools under improvement in SY 2009-10. These support team visits were designed to assess progress, with OFCE's presence designed to help support strategies related to parent/community engagement goals specified in each of the schools' success plans, as well as to provide oversight of school-level compliance with associated federal regulations.

In SY 2009-10, OFCE sponsored and coordinated a number of meetings in and for the community to share information and facilitate involvement in CSD schools. OFCE held two public forums at Bancroft and Keene elementary schools on Strengthening Partnerships as a part of the development of the District's new strategic plan. Over 75 parents and community partners were in attendance. Across the school year, OFCE sponsored three parent meetings with the Superintendent in/for three of the District's City of Wilmington elementary schools in preparation for proposed school transformations and seven workshops at each of the District's secondary schools during the months of April and May. In July 2010, OFCE additionally held two parent information meetings to share information about School wide Title I and about the Consolidated Grant. More than 50 parents and community representatives attended these meetings.

OFCE has partnered with The Learning Link of Delaware to provide technical assistance to schools for training to staff in effective engagement of parents in the academic success of students. Additional support was acquired in the form of a consultant to help facilitate the engagement of community partners in aligning the District's efforts to support student success.

Finally, OFCE identified the supports needed for each school in SY 2009-10 and developed a plan of implementation for the model of involvement from the National Network of Partnership Schools. Departmental staff, including a contracted partner, The Learning Link of Delaware, and parent involvement coaches from this organization, were trained in establishing an Action Team for Partnership one day training in August 2010. Direct services in assisting schools to assess their current levels of parent and community involvement and strategies to strengthen partnerships will begin during the 2010-11 school year, with plans to serve 15 schools (Bayard, Kirk, Gauger-Cobbs, Glasgow, Newark, McVey, Leasure, Brookside, Bancroft, Palmer, Pulaski, Stubbs, Christiana, Shue-Medill, and Sarah Pyle Academy).

OFCE faced a number of challenges in SY 2009-10 in its efforts to meet its parent/community engagement objectives. The department was down one full-time employee for much of the 2009-10 school year. Additionally, an increase in the number of Title I schools in the District resulted in an increased need for support among these schools related to federal compliance with family involvement regulations, both at the elementary and secondary levels. With the current contractual support now in place, the department expects to provide greater on-site technical assistance to more schools in SY 2010-2011, with resulting increases in active engagement among parents and community members, including but not limited to attendance at school events, parent conferences, and other related activities.

Outcomes and Trends

The identification and utilization of measures with which to evaluate District progress towards increasing levels of parent and community involvement and input continue to be developed as part of the District's overall efforts to increase levels of parent/community engagement. Much of the baseline data for this objective was first collected and examined during and after the 2008-09 school year. As such, the use of "hard" data to

evaluate progress towards this objective has been somewhat limited. Nevertheless, across the 2009-10 school year, there was some evidence of improvement in this area. 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 increased across the overall plan period. Additionally, the number of homes connected with the District's communication systems (ParentLink and Home Access continued to increase in 2009-10.

The following summary provides only a partial picture of progress realized by the end of the 3-year strategic plan period:

- Parent Link was 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. In its introductory (baseline) 2008-09 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. In 2009-10, the number of messages sent to students' homes increased by 24% to 1,969 messages in total.
- Home Access was also first instituted in the District 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, to date, only limited utilization data continue to be available from this system. During the 2008-09 (baseline) school year, there were a total of 9,160 Home Access accounts activated, 53.1% of which registered at least one use/point of access. In 2009-10, the number of registered Home Access accounts increased by 20% to 11,006 accounts in total. However, utilization continued to be low in 2009-10. Of the 11,006 registered account holders, only 52% actually accessed the system one or more times during the school year.
- 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 remained relatively stable, though high, across the three years of survey data available. IN 2007-08 (baseline), 90.3% of parents, on average, responded positively to this series of survey items. This percentage increased slightly in 2008-09 to 92.9% (though the response rate for parents of high school students was extremely low in spring 2009), but then decreased slightly to 91.0% in 2009-10 (spring).
- 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 2006-07 (spring baseline for this set of survey items) to 89.3% in spring 2009 (though the response rate for parents of high school students was extremely low in 2009) and remained relatively high in 2009-10, at 87.3% (Spring).

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

Objective 1: Improve school climates and student/staff relationships

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(ies):

- 1 Improve communication and implementation of the student code of conduct
- 2 Develop an intensive support system for students who exhibit severe behavioral issues
- 3 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
- 4 Maintain Compliance with Federal and State Law and Regulation for Funding
- 5 Support on-going School Needs tied to School Success Plans - Not aligned directly to Strategic Plan goals

Measure(s):

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

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 19.7

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

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

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	9/30/2010	19.0

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

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 1.7

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	1.0	6/15/2008	0.7
6/15/2009	0.5	6/15/2009	1.7
6/15/2010	0.5	6/15/2010	1.6

Measure: Percent of students using drugs (marijuana) reported by the ATOD annual survey

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 3.0

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2009	2.0	6/15/2009	2.0
6/15/2010	1.0	6/15/2010	2.0

Measure: Average % of parents responding positively agree on My Perspective Survey Support for Learning

Start Year: 2008 **Baseline:** 90.3

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Monthly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2009	92.0	6/15/2009	92.1
6/15/2010	94.0	6/15/2010	91.0

Measure: [CM] Dropout Rate (All Students)

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 10.8

DOE [CM] Dropout Rate (All Students)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/30/2008	10	6/30/2008	10.6
6/30/2009	9	6/30/2009	10.3
6/30/2010	8	(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 District made significant progress across the past year in the area of discipline and school climate. In an effort to enhance communication about procedures, all documentation and forms pertaining to discipline and school climate were posted on the intranet (August 2009). In order to promote consistency across the District concerning the implementation of the Student Code of Conduct, a discipline referral legend was developed and distributed to principals and assistant principals at training in August 2009. The document contains all violations of the Student Code of conduct, examples of student behavior that fit into the category, and appropriate e-school coding for each violation. This was also made available on the intranet.

In SY 2009-10, the Office of School Climate and Discipline reviewed summative discipline data across the District and by individual school on a regular basis. As a result, the Office of School Climate and Discipline worked with the three high schools to review and devise plans of action concerning the disproportionate number of African American students receiving disciplinary actions. Particular emphasis was placed on identifying the "behavior" that was considered inappropriate among African American male students. Two of the three high schools additionally implemented Saturday School for low-level "suspendable" offenses. This program was put into place in an effort to keep students in school and ultimately lower suspension rates.

In an effort to maintain accurate data on discipline, the Office of School Climate and Discipline continued to receive and review disciplinary data errors in e-school from DOE, and communicated these errors to school building principals each week. By year's end, all errors communicated to the District by DOE had been changed in e-school.

The Office of School Climate and Discipline, in collaboration with a variety of stakeholders from the Christina School District, worked on revising the Student Code of Conduct. The revisions (implemented in SY 2010-11) provide principals with more discretion in assigning consequences to students. The revised code also terminates what has been perceived to be a zero tolerance policy. The Office of School Climate and Discipline continues to review and refine the expulsion process.

The District in collaboration with administration and staff continued to reframe the Douglass Alternative School. In 2009-10, clinical counseling services were expanded and there were four counselors providing services to students and their families at Douglass. In the past, there was one school-based counselor and one part-time supplemental counselor. Another modification to counseling services in the District affected the elementary counseling program in our schools, which moved to a clinical counseling model.

The District continued to provide staff development in the area of classroom management in SY 2009-10, and for the first time offered direct support in the schools, working with individual teachers as requested by building principals. The District would like to provide more of this level of direct support to teachers, but to date, limits on time and personnel prevent an expansion of these services.

In SY 2009-10, the District additionally provided anti-bullying training to staff, as requested by individual schools. A District protocol was developed and put into place for dealing with students involved in blatant or alleged bullying situations. In addition, all elementary schools were given the opportunity to schedule an anti-bullying assembly sponsored by the District. Five elementary schools took advantage of this option.

The Office of School Climate and Discipline continues to monitor compliance with regulations around funding with the assistance of the business

office and has offered workshops at individual schools based upon their individual needs and per their requests. However, limited time and staff resources continue to constrain the expansion and/or intensification of these services at this time.

Outcomes and Trends

The majority of indicators used by the District to measure progress in the area of school climate and student-staff relationships indicate incremental improvements across the past three years. Data on suspensions, absences, perceptions (survey-based) of school climate and student engagement, and reports of substance use among students all tended to show mild positive trends:

Instruction Missed Due to Disciplinary Actions

- The percentage of students across the District that were suspended one or more times, after having increased from 19.7% in 2006-07 (baseline) to 22.6% in 2008-09, again decreased in 2009-10 to 19.0%, slightly below that evidenced in the strategic plan's baseline year (percentages based on CSD rolling enrollment across the school year, approximately 21,000 students in 2009-10). The percentage of students suspended for a total of 15 days or more remained relatively stable across the period from 2006-07 (1.7%) to 2008-09 (1.7%), but decreased in 2009-10 to 1.2% of the rolling student enrollment.
- The percentage of students with 10 or more absences decreased in each of the past four years, from 49.8% in 2006-07 (baseline) to 43.5% in 2009-10.

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 varying trends, according to school level (elementary, middle, and high) and survey target group (parents, teachers, and students). Generally, each surveyed group exhibited more positive perceptions of school climate at the elementary level than at either secondary level. Christina SD students and parents at the middle and high school levels continue to perceive school climate slightly less positively than their respective counterparts across the State of Delaware:

- o At the elementary school level, school climate total standard scores increased slightly between 2006-07 and 2008-09 for all three groups of respondents (students—98.5 to 99.9; teachers—98.5 to 99.2; parents—99.1 to 99.9). Trends for students and teachers between 2008-09 and 2009-10, however, were generally flat (99.5 for elementary students and 99.9 for teachers in 2009-10), while the overall perceptions of parents of elementary school children showed a meaningful improvement (from 99.9 in 2008-09 to 102.6 in 2009-10). Mean standard scores for all three groups remained at or very near Statewide averages for elementary level responders.

- o At the middle school level, school climate total standard scores exhibited varying trends, depending on surveyed group. Parents and students both saw decreases in their perceptions of school climate: parents from 98.3 in 2007-08 to 90.0 in 2009-10 and students from 97.5 to 94.8 across the same period. Interestingly, teachers showed the opposite trend across the period, increasing their mean standard score from 95.6 to 103.1. However, all of this increase occurred between 2008-09 and 2009-10. Parent and student means remained below Statewide averages for these two groups. [Survey results from 2006-07 are excluded from this trend report because middle and high school results were combined in that year.]

- o At the high school level, school climate total standard scores across the period from 2007-08 to 2009-10 increased for teachers and students, but parent scores showed a decreasing trend. Students' mean standard score increased in each year, from 95.3 in 2007-08 to 97.4 in 2009-10. Teachers' mean score increased from 96.8 to 100.5 across the same period. However, parents saw their means score decrease from 92.3 2007-08 to 86.1 in 2009-10. Parent and student means remained below Statewide averages for these two groups. [Survey results from 2006-07 are excluded from this trend report because middle and high school results were combined in that year.]

• 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 in each year from 2007-08 (baseline for this subscale) to 2009-10:

o At the elementary school level, the mean percentage of students indicating engagement in school increased from 82.4% to 84.8%, and at the secondary level (middle and high school students combined), from 54.3% to 57.2%. [The My Perspective Survey was administered to students in grades 5, 7, and 9 in spring 2010. In prior years, the survey was taken by students in grades 3-12. This change may have impacted three-year trends].

o The mean percentage of school staff (all school levels combined) indicating that their students were engaged in school increased slightly from 75.9% to 79.1% from 2007-08 to 2009-10.

Substance Use/Abuse

• The percentage of students reporting cigarette, alcohol, or marijuana use (across the lifespan) on the annual Alcohol, Tobacco, and Drug Abuse Survey (ATOD) steadily declined in grades 5 and 8 from Fall 2005 (baseline, SY 2005-06) to Fall 2009 (SY 2009-10). However, students in grade 11 did not fare as well, with increases in both alcohol and marijuana consumption:

o Among 5th graders, the percentage reporting cigarette use dropped from 10% in 2005-06 (baseline) to 6% in 2009-10; alcohol use declined from 20% to 18%, and marijuana use decreased from 3% to 2% across the same period.

o Among 8th grade students, the percentage reporting cigarette use dropped by half, from 32% in 2005-06 to 16% in 2009-10; alcohol use declined from 58% to 54%, and marijuana use decreased from 34% to 24%.

o Among 11th grade students, the percentage reporting cigarette use decreased slightly, from 31% in 2005-06 to 28% in 2009-10. However, the percentages of students reporting alcohol and marijuana use increased from 71% to 77% (alcohol) and from 47% to 50% (marijuana) across the same period.

Objective 2: Utilize facilities efficiently to improve academics and access

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(ies):

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

Measure(s):

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	65.0

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	68.3

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
9/30/2008	21	9/30/2008	20
9/30/2009	24	9/30/2009	24
9/30/2010	25	9/30/2010	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	16	8/28/2008	8
8/28/2009	17	8/30/2009	8
8/28/2010	18	8/30/2010	12

Measure: % Proficient in Writing on the DSTP (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	6/15/2008	Jun 15 2008 12:00AM
6/15/2009	75	6/15/2009	Jun 15 2009 12:00AM
6/15/2010	80	6/15/2010	Jun 15 2010 12:00AM

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	70	6/30/2009	56
6/15/2010	75	6/30/2010	60

Questions:

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

R	Fully met
*	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
Nearly all the initiatives set forth in Goal 3, Objective 2 of Christina's Strategic Plan for 2007-2010 were accomplished. In 2008, the Christina

School District's Neighborhood Schools Plan was approved by the Delaware State Board of Education and was 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. In 2009, 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 their homes as possible. The District completed this plan in August 2009 with the opening of the new Porter Road Elementary School.

Across this three-year plan period, the District additionally completed all of the renovations projects funded by the 2002 referendum, providing each school building in the District with air-conditioning. In order to increase the efficient use of facilities, the District sold one building, which had been unoccupied, to the University of Delaware (83 East Main Street, Newark) in 2009. In addition, during the 2009-10 school year, the District's 300 Executive Drive property (also unoccupied) was declared an excess property and is currently in the process of being marketed for sale. The District has developed a Memorandum of Understanding with Delaware Economic Development Office allowing the State to market this property. The Memorandum will remain in place through the end of the calendar year 2010. At that time, the agreement will be reviewed and either continued or the property will head out to the open market for sale.

A Request for Proposals has been sent out to consulting professionals to update the District's Facilities Assessment that was completed in 2005. The Assessment schedule for surveying all buildings, as well as the development of the plan, will continue through the spring of 2011. Once the plan has been presented to the Board of Education, the Facilities Department will develop a capital plan with a schedule for a bond referendum later in 2011.

Finally, CSD was successful in a vote held in the Spring of 2010 to increase local taxes for operating revenues. The additional funds will begin to become available early in November 2010 and will support a number of important District initiatives going forward.

The successful completion of these initiatives will provide continuity of attendance patterns for students across the District. They have additionally created space for important District-initiated and State-mandated programs, fulfilled long-promised changes, and demonstrated the fiscal responsibility of the District.

Outcomes and Trends

The Christina School District made tangible progress in maximizing the efficiency of space utilization and improving building conditions across the last three years. Considerable accomplishments were realized in 2009-10 with the passage of a tax referendum in spring 2010 and the planning and implementation of full-day kindergarten in all District schools (implemented in fall 2010). A detailed account of the findings under this objective is provided below:

- The number of schools in the Christina School District that were at or above 75% capacity (space for students) increased from 14 in 2005-06 (baseline) to 24 in 2009-10. Under-utilization varied across the period, with the number of schools below 65% capacity initially decreasing from three schools in 2005-06 to one school in 2007-08, but then increasing back to three schools in 2009-10.
- The number of elementary schools with space for Full Day Kindergarten programs increased from just one school in 2005-06 to all 18 of CSD's elementary schools in 2009-10. As noted above, full-day kindergarten was implemented district-wide in fall 2010-11.
- The number of schools not qualifying for a principal unit (due to low enrollment) decreased from two schools in 2005-06 to no school in 2009-10.
- The percentage of schools receiving a rating of "good" or better on the Formal Facilities Assessment showed steady, positive increases across the period, from 50% in 2005-06 to 60% in 2009-10.

- Finally, the percentage of parents reporting that they felt 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 2005-06 (SY 2005-06, baseline) to 95.3% in 2008-09, though the percentage dropped slightly in SY 2009-10 (93.4%).

- o At the middle grade level, the percentage increased from 72.0% to 84.8% across the entire period, though the highest percentage of parents reporting feeling welcome in schools was found in 2007-8 (92.1%).

- o At the high school level, the percentage of parents feeling welcome in schools increased from 64.0% to 82.0% across the entire period, though the highest percentage of parents at this school level feeling welcome in schools was found in 2008-09 (93.0%). [The response rate for parents of high school students was extremely low in spring 2009, and thus the 2008-09 results are less likely to be representative of the entire body of CSD parents of high school students than in other years.]

Goal 4: Support Title I schools under improvement efforts to meet all AYP targets (this applies specifically to Bancroft and Pulaski Elementary Schools for FY10)

Objective 1: Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development designed to build the capacity of the LEA and school staff to improve schools and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome related measures

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(ies):

- 1 Improve lesson designs and instructional practices to make instruction more meaningful and interesting
- 2 Establish teacher collaboration framework to ensure efforts are aligned to meet student needs

Measure(s):

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	65.0

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	68.3

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	45.1

Measure: Percent of students meeting/exceeding their norm-based growth target in MATH

Start Year: 2007

Baseline: 49

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	52	6/10/2008	49
6/15/2009	55	6/10/2009	57.6
6/15/2010	60	6/15/2010	59

Measure: Percent of students meeting/exceeding their norm-based growth target in READING

Start Year: 2007

Baseline: 49

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	52	6/10/2008	49
6/15/2009	55	6/10/2009	56.5
6/15/2010	60	6/15/2010	52

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

Start Year: 2008

Baseline: 49.5

DOE Indicator: [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	6/15/2010	53.4

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	58.1

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	59.7

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	65.2

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	61.4

Measure: Percent of students in Kindergarten who have are Benchmark at the EOY on the DIBELS assessment

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 68

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	70	6/30/2008	74
6/15/2009	75	6/30/2009	79
6/15/2010	80	6/15/2010	82

Measure: Percent of students in 1st grade who have are Benchmark at the EOY on the DIBELS assessment

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 67

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/30/2008	65
6/15/2009	70	6/30/2009	67
6/15/2010	72	6/15/2010	65

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

Prior to the 2009-10 school year, the Christina School District (CSD) developed a tiered support and oversight structure for Schools in Restructuring, Under Improvement, and Schools of Concern (those that failed to make AYP in 2008-09). This tiered plan increased the frequency of monitoring and the types and intensity of support activities based on the status of the school. District Support Teams, comprising central office staff with varying areas of expertise, engage these schools monthly in meetings, observation visits, data review, strategic planning, and budgetary oversight. Specific to the needs of our two elementary schools in Restructuring (Pulaski and Bancroft), the District's support plan significantly increased the District's role in providing oversight, controls, and a variety of supports. The District Support Team, in collaboration with these schools, set times and dates, and conducted support team meetings and observational walkthrough visits on a monthly basis. The CSD Office of Accountability and Assessment produced and reviewed data in order to assist these schools in monitoring student performance and progress towards meeting the school's improvement goals and objectives. Principals and leadership staff received continual data reports, including comprehensive data files for all incoming students (test data, disciplinary data, attendance data, demographics, etc.), as well as individual student-level reports showing MAP performance relative to DSTP-proficiency across the school year. Monthly meetings were used to review these data, show staff how to best use these reports, and make recommendations on instructional adjustments and interventions using these data, and align professional development accordingly. CSD support teams additionally oversaw the submission of the following items to DOE: Budgets and proposals for ARRA and SI Grants, School Success Plans, Project Management Plans, and Progress Formative and Summative updates.

The Offices of Elementary and Secondary Curriculum and Professional Development additionally provided access and opportunities for professional growth focused on extending conversation around the instructional core. During District support team visits, school leaders were asked to present best practices used to advance student achievement. Secondary schools received resources and support to develop extended day and summer bridge programs. Secondary school leaders focused on strategies to improve instructional coherence across the District. The seven secondary school administrators, along with their math teachers, selected one common extended instructional program to implement in extended intervention time.

In March 2010, District support team visits were replaced with an independent quality school review process conducted by Cambridge Education, LLC (CLEAR Review). Cambridge Education was contracted by the Christina School District to conduct in-depth examinations of school functions in each of the District's 30 schools and programs, including Pulaski ES and Bancroft ES, which are both in restructuring this year. These reviews were designed to provide actionable feedback to each CSD school, and the recommendations that result from the review process will be incorporated into schools' success plans. Many of the District's school support team members were active participants in the CLEAR review process with Cambridge staff. Cambridge provided each school with a written report with feedback and helped schools develop action plans charting next steps. While the CLEAR review process temporarily halted monthly support meetings at the two CSD schools in restructuring (Pulaski and Bancroft), the District's Office of Accountability and Assessment (OAA) continued to provide timely data summaries, analyses, and individual student level performance data to each school. OAA staff continued to review data and discuss implications with school leadership across the period. OAA also continued to monitor and review the updating of school success plans, project maps, and formative progress updates across the school year.

At Bancroft and Pulaski Elementary Schools, continuous professional development was provided in the following areas: Reading First, Learning Focused Solutions, Parent-Community Involvement, Response-to-Intervention, core content-specific training, and interpretation of performance data. Monthly walk-through observations were used to generate strategies for improved instruction, classroom management, and general school organization, and were discussed collaboratively with school leadership teams. Subsequent implementation of these strategies was monitored in follow-up support team meetings. Most of these supports were made available to all other CSD schools in various phases of improvement. The Office of Elementary Curriculum and Professional Development continued to offer professional development to these schools during the CLEAR review process.

At the secondary school level, during the months of March and April, the Director of Secondary Curriculum and Instruction collaborated with Vision 2015 staff to conduct walk-through observations using the Vision 2015 observation rubric. Secondary school teams participated in inter-school observations through the Vision network and the District support team process. The school teams provided feedback to each other and developed

action plans charting their next steps. All secondary schools were involved in identifying teachers to present at the district-wide professional development conference on April 30th. The conference was a direct outgrowth of the District Support Team Visits.

The District experienced a number of significant challenges in 2009-10 to effective implementation of the support team process. One major challenge to the School Support process was the late communication of State and federal regulations and expectations surrounding District support processes (in fall 2009). Short deadlines and lack of clarity caused the District to reassess plans and implementation of parts of the support process on a short timeline. As such, the process evolved across the school year. Support for the District's schools under improvement was further complicated by the loss of the District's Director of Elementary Curriculum in July 2009. The District was without a Director of Elementary Curriculum and Professional Development until December 2009.

Establishing a manageable set of areas in which to focus in the success planning process with schools under improvement represented another significant challenge. Most of the District's schools under improvement and in restructuring missed Adequate Yearly Progress in multiple subjects and sub-groups. The many areas of academic, social, behavior, and community-based challenges that these schools faced made it difficult to establish key areas of focus for these schools, and this was exacerbated by the State Department of Education's decision early in the school year to require schools under improvement to add a new goal based on 2008-09 accountability results. Adding an additional goal further detracted from schools' capacity to effectively focus their efforts in fewer areas of need based upon their own internal assessments.

The Cambridge (CLEAR) review process created challenges for the District support process because Support Team personnel were pulled out of Support Team meetings and into the CLEAR review walk-through process. This disrupted the schedule of monthly support meetings and decreased the level and variety of supports (due to a reduction in the variety of staff expertise on the teams) that could be made available to schools during that period. The monthly support team meeting schedule was further disrupted by the intense schedule of DCAS field testing that occurred in late Spring 2010.

Finally, in Spring 2009-10, the State of Delaware Department of Education designated Bancroft ES, Pulaski ES, and Stubbs ES as Tier I partnership zone schools. This required a change in leadership at two of the schools (Bancroft and Stubbs) and resulted in the loss of many teaching staff. While this high level of staff turnover has created some new challenges in 2010-11 for Bancroft and Stubbs Elementary Schools, it has also opened up new possibilities for reform and improvement in these two schools.

Outcomes and Trends

Progress in the academic and non-academic realms within schools in restructuring and under improvement was assessed through a variety of measures. Academic measures included the MAP assessment in Math and Reading, which was administered to all students in the Christina School District in grades 2-10 at four different periods in SY 2009-10; the DSTP, administered in March 2010 to grades 2-10 in Math and Reading; and the DIBELS assessment of reading fluency, which was administered to students in grades K-5 three times (fall, winter, spring).

All schools, including those under improvement and in restructuring, were provided with detailed individual level MAP performance status and growth files following each of the test instances across the school year. These files were color-coded and sorted in such a way as to better enable school leaders to target students that were struggling to make academic progress in Math and Reading. In addition to providing schools with late Winter performance and growth estimates, these MAP files included both projections and estimates of DSTP-proficiency (predicting March DSTP proficiency as well as estimating point-in-time proficiency on the DSTP), and provided the distance in RIT scale points between each student's current score and the minimum score associated with DSTP proficiency at PL 3). All schools additionally received multiple summary data reports, which provided status and growth estimates broken out by grade, race, income status, ELL status, and Special Education status. DIBELS benchmark / strategic / intensive data summaries were provided to all elementary schools, both through the M-Class website and through additional summary reports from the Office of Accountability and Assessment. More detailed reports of growth, based on individual skill component tests, were provided to schools upon request. DSTP proficiency results were graphically summarized for schools in summer 2010 once "dis-embargoed," and were disaggregated by all identified subgroups. The District implemented the disciplinary dashboard in SY 2009-10, which was posted to the

District's website each month graphically depicting each school's attendance rates, discipline referrals, and suspension counts. These data were also reviewed at monthly District support meetings with leadership staff in all schools in restructuring and under improvement. Finally, School Climate Survey (University of Delaware) results and My Perspective Survey results were summarized in spring and summer 2010, respectively, for each school so that schools could assess perceptions of climate and a variety of instructional and environmental conditions within their schools.

Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)

MAP results presented a generally positive picture of Math growth across the year in the District's elementary schools, and to a lesser extent, in high schools that were under improvement and in restructuring (growth target data are presented by school below). Sterck (Delaware School for the Deaf) saw substantial increases in growth rates in both Math and Reading. It is important to note that these growth rates do not reflect end-of-year proficiency, but rather the degree to which students made academic progress across the year that met or exceeded nationally-normed growth thresholds given students' individual starting positions/scores (at the beginning of the school year). In Reading, Bancroft ES and Sterck DSD saw significant increases in the percentages of students making or exceeding normative average growth for the year in 2009-10 compared to 2008-09. No other schools saw such increases. However, still only four schools had 50% or more of their students making normative average growth in Reading (Gauger-Cobbs MS, Shue-Medill MS, Christiana HS, and Sterck DSD). In Math, growth rates increased significantly at Bancroft ES, Glasgow HS, and Sterck DSD, and to lesser extent at Pulaski ES, Christiana HS and Newark HS. Seven of the 10 schools in restructuring or under improvement saw 50% or more of their students making normative average growth in Math (Bancroft ES, Pulaski ES, Gauger-Cobbs MS, Christiana HS, Glasgow HS, Newark HS, and Sterck DSD).

MAP Growth (Percent Meeting/Exceeding Normative Average Growth)

Reading 2008-09 2009-10

Bancroft ES 34% 43%
 Pulaski ES 47% 43%
 Stubbs ES 39% 35%

Gauger-Cobbs MS 50% 50%
 Kirk MS 54% 39%
 Shue-Medill MS 54% 50%
 Christiana HS 51% 53%

Glasgow HS 50% 40%
 Newark HS 44% 43%

Sterck (DSD) 31% 55%

Math 2008-09 2009-10

Bancroft ES 36% 54%
 Pulaski ES 46% 50%
 Stubbs ES 39% 35%

Gauger-Cobbs MS 56% 56%

Kirk MS 57% 49%
Shue-Medill MS 51% 48%

Christiana HS 50% 56%
Glasgow HS 45% 56%
Newark HS 49% 51%

Sterck DSD 32% 63%

DSTP Results (Reading and Math Proficiency Summary)

Proficiency rates on the spring 2010 DSTP in Reading and Math indicated that a number of Christina's schools under improvement and in restructuring saw meaningful improvement in student academic performance between SY 2008-09 and SY 2009-10 (proficiency rates are listed below by school). Improvement was greatest in the District's two elementary schools, which both exhibited gains in both subjects. Bancroft ES saw its proficiency rates in Reading increase by 17% in Reading and by 54% in Math; Pulaski ES saw proficiency rates increase 4% in Reading and 29% in Math; and Stubbs ES saw increases of 7% in Reading and 27% in Math. The District's middle schools exhibited minimal to no increases in their Reading and Math proficiency rates. Gauger-Cobbs MS was the only middle school to see its Math achievement rise across the period (a 7% increase). Two of the District's three high schools showed meaningful proficiency rate increases in Math: Christiana HS saw its Math proficiency rates increase by 27% from 2008-09 to 2009-10 and Newark HS saw a 10% increase across the same period. Glasgow HS exhibited no change in Math proficiency. Unfortunately, two of the District's three high schools showed declines in Reading proficiency: Glasgow HS declined by 16% and Newark HS declined by 3%. Christiana HS showed not change across the two-year period.

Reading 2008-09 2009-10

Bancroft ES 38% 45%
Pulaski ES 54% 56%
Stubbs ES 43% 46%

Gauger-Cobbs MS 76% 75%
Kirk MS 73% 71%
Shue-Medill MS 73% 72%

Christiana HS 50% 50%
Glasgow HS 52% 44%
Newark HS 59% 57%

Sterck DSD 17% 23%

Math 2008-09 2009-10

Bancroft ES 34% 53%
Pulaski ES 53% 69%
Stubbs ES 41% 52%

Gauger-Cobbs MS 66% 71%
Kirk MS 66% 63%
Shue-Medill MS 66% 66%

Christiana HS 29% 36%
Glasgow HS 32% 33%
Newark HS 46% 51%

Sterck DSD 10% 6%

DIBELS Results (Reading Fluency Summary)

The DIBELS assessment of reading fluency was taken by students at Bancroft, Pulaski and Stubbs elementary schools in September, January, and May of SY 2009-10. End-of-year combined-grade results indicate that each of three schools saw moderate increases from fall 2009 to spring 2010 in the percentage of students performing at Benchmark levels, with slightly smaller decreases in the percentage of students performing at the Intensive level (those most at risk of academic failure). Bancroft ES exhibited Benchmark percentage increases from 33% in fall 2009 to 38% in spring 2010, with corresponding decreases in the percentage of Intensive students from 38% to 36% (i.e., the majority of progress was exhibited by students initially performing in the Strategic range). Pulaski ES saw an increase in the percentage of students performing at the Benchmark level from 41% to 46% from fall to spring, with a corresponding decrease in the percentage performing in the Intensive range from 31% to 27% across the period. Finally, Stubbs ES exhibited an increase in the percentage of Benchmark students from 43% in the fall to 46% in the spring. However, the percentage of Stubbs ES students scoring in the Intensive range also increased across the period, from 27% to 31% (an indication that some Strategic students saw improvement while others saw declines in reading fluency across the year).

A comparison to end-of-year performance in spring of the previous school year (2009) indicated that students (all grades combined) in two of the three elementary schools under improvement (or in restructuring) demonstrated slightly lower levels of reading fluency at the end of SY 2009-10 than at the end of the previous school year. This finding contradicts the DSTP reading performance trend across the period. However, it is important to remember that the DSTP measures comprehension while the DIBELS measures reading fluency only. On the DIBELS end-of-year Benchmark assessment, Bancroft ES was the only elementary school of the three to see its end-of-year reading fluency Benchmark rate increase across the period, though the increase was fairly small, from 36% in spring 2009 to 38% in spring 2010. Pulaski and Stubbs both witnessed declines in end-of-year fluency: Pulaski's rate declined slightly from 48% in spring 2009 to 46% in spring 2010, while Stubbs' rate declined from 49% to 46% across the period.

Objective 2: Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(ies):

- 1 Develop an intensive support system for students who exhibit severe behavioral issues
- 2 Implement new and improve existing support programs for both reading and mathematics across all grades

Measure(s):

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	65.0

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	68.3

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

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 1.7

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	1.0	6/15/2008	0.7
6/15/2009	0.5	6/15/2009	1.7
6/15/2010	0.5	6/15/2010	1.6

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	45.1

Measure: Percent of students meeting/exceeding their norm-based growth target in MATH

Start Year: 2007

Baseline: 49

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	52	6/10/2008	49
6/15/2009	55	6/10/2009	57.6
6/15/2010	60	6/15/2010	59

Measure: Percent of students meeting/exceeding their norm-based growth target in READING

Start Year: 2007

Baseline: 49

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	52	6/10/2008	49
6/15/2009	55	6/10/2009	56.5
6/15/2010	60	6/15/2010	52

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

Start Year: 2008

Baseline: 49.5

DOE Indicator: [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	6/15/2010	53.4

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Math on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	58.1

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	59.7

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	65.2

Measure: [CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (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	6/15/2010	61.4

Measure: Percent of students in Kindergarten who have are Benchmark at the EOY on the DIBELS assessment

Start Year: 2007 **Baseline:** 68

DOE Indicator: (none)

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	70	6/30/2008	74
6/15/2009	75	6/30/2009	79
6/15/2010	80	6/15/2010	82

Measure: Percent of students in 1st grade who have are Benchmark at the EOY on the DIBELS assessment

Start Year: 2007

Baseline: 67

DOE (none)

Indicator:

Perspective: Student Achievement/Student Performance

Period: Yearly

Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
6/15/2008	68	6/30/2008	65
6/15/2009	70	6/30/2009	67
6/15/2010	72	6/15/2010	65

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

During the current school year, the District supported a wide array of programs and strategies with research foundations to support the improvement process at Bancroft and Pulaski Elementary Schools. This includes the following:

1. Provided additional staff (coaches and interventionists) to support existing Reading First program in both schools.
2. Provided ongoing training to school staff teams in Learning Focused Strategies with the expectation that teachers would begin to incorporate some of these strategies in their instruction in Year 1.
3. Standardized RtI forms and processes across schools.
4. Provided ongoing training for teachers in the implementation of Targeted Instruction to support the RtI process based on skill level tiers in reading.
5. Assigned instructional coaches to support productive PLC practices, including review of data to drive instruction.
6. Continuously reviewed performance data to target areas for improvement.
7. Provided professional development for parents to work with their children at home in order to improve student achievement. The Joyce Epstein model for parent involvement is being monitored district-wide.
8. Coordinated the development of the East Side Community Schools Initiative (Bancroft ES and Stubbs ES) to support the community school model. As part of this partnership, schools worked with community agencies and stakeholders to provide a comprehensive set of services to students and families.

There have been challenges associated with staffing changes, both at Central Office and at Bancroft and Pulaski Elementary Schools. For the first three months of the school year, the District was without a Director of Elementary Curriculum. Bancroft ES, in particular, underwent a 50% turnover in teaching staff between the 2008-09 academic year and the current (2009-10) school year. Teacher turnover resulted in the need to re-train much of each school's teaching staff. This has limited the continuity and fidelity of curriculum and program implementation. In addition, professional development days were greatly curtailed at the beginning of the school year unexpectedly due to State budget cuts and associated furlough days. As such, mandatory professional development in Reading First took precedence over training in all other areas. In addition, it was difficult to attract highly qualified instructional coaches and interventionists, who are tasked with supporting PLCs, modeling instruction, providing training, RtI small group instruction, etc., to work in these two schools. These challenges, along with those detailed under Goal 4, Objective 1 (above), frequently created less-than-optimal conditions for the implementation of reforms at Bancroft and Pulaski, as well as in the District's eight other schools that were under improvement in 2009-10.

Outcomes and Trends

*Refer to interim outcomes reviewed under Goal 4, Objective 1.

Appendix A: Project Maps