

2002-2003 No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon Schools Program Cover Sheet

Name of Principal Mr. Ivan D. Neal (Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Phillip C. Showell Elementary School (As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address Rt. 2, Box 5 (If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Selbyville DE 19975-9684 City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. ( 302 ) 436-1040 Fax ( 302 ) 436-1053

Website/URL www.k12.de.us/showe Email ineal@irsd.k12.de.us

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

(Principal's Signature) Date 3/28/03

Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.

Name of Superintendent Mrs. Lois Hobbs (Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Indian River School District Tel. ( 302 ) 436-1000

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

(Superintendent's Signature) Date 3/28/03

Name of School Board President/Chairperson Mr. Charles Bireley (Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this package, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature) Date 3/28/03

## **PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA**

### **DISTRICT** (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district:     \_\_8\_\_ Elementary schools  
   \_\_2\_\_ Middle schools  
   \_\_0\_\_ Junior high schools  
   \_\_2\_\_ High schools  
  
   \_\_12\_\_ TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure:       \_\_\$8,012\_\_\_\_ (as of 2001)  
     Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \_\_\$8,809\_\_\_\_ (as of 2001)

### **SCHOOL** (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
- Urban or large central city  
 Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area  
 Suburban  
 Small city or town in a rural area  
 Rural
4.   2   Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.  
  (5)   If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?
5. Number of students enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
<b>K</b>	22	24	<b>46</b>	<b>7</b>			
<b>1</b>	18	23	<b>41</b>	<b>8</b>			
<b>2</b>	29	28	<b>57</b>	<b>9</b>			
<b>3</b>	26	28	<b>54</b>	<b>10</b>			
<b>4</b>	33	23	<b>56</b>	<b>11</b>			
<b>5</b>	25	29	<b>54</b>	<b>12</b>			
<b>6</b>				Other			
<b>TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL</b>							<b>308</b>

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- |       |                                  |
|-------|----------------------------------|
| 62.39 | % White                          |
| 21.94 | % Black or African American      |
| 13.79 | % Hispanic or Latino             |
| 1.25  | % Asian/Pacific Islander         |
| 0.63  | % American Indian/Alaskan Native |

**100% Total**

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year:   13  %

(This rate includes the total number of students who transferred to or from different schools between October 1 and the end of the school year, divided by the total number of students in the school as of October 1, multiplied by 100.)

<b>(1)</b>	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	15
<b>(2)</b>	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	28
<b>(3)</b>	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	43
<b>(4)</b>	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	329
<b>(5)</b>	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.13
<b>(6)</b>	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	13

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school:   .04  %  
  13  Total Number Limited English Proficient  
 Number of languages represented:   2    
 Specify languages: Chinese  
                           Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals:   46.65  %  
  149  Total Number Students Who Qualify

If this method is not a reasonably accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families or the school does not participate in the federally-supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services:   19  %  
  62  Total Number of Students Served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

- |                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <u>    </u> Autism                | <u>    </u> Orthopedic Impairment                 |
| <u>    </u> Deafness              | <u>  5  </u> Other Health Impaired                |
| <u>    </u> Deaf-Blindness        | <u> 45 </u> Specific Learning Disability          |
| <u>    </u> Hearing Impairment    | <u> 12 </u> Speech or Language Impairment         |
| <u>  1 </u> Mental Retardation    | <u>    </u> Traumatic Brain Injury                |
| <u>    </u> Multiple Disabilities | <u>    </u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

**Number of Staff**

	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>  1  </u>	<u>    </u>
Classroom teachers	<u> 17 </u>	<u>  9 </u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>  4 </u>	<u>    </u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>  2 </u>	<u>  2 </u>
Support staff	<u> 14 </u>	<u>    </u>
Total number	<u> 38 </u>	<u>    </u>

12. Student-“classroom teacher” ratio:  18 to 1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout and drop-off rates.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Daily student attendance	94.2%	94.7%	95.8%	95.3%	95.3%
Daily teacher attendance	83%	88%	79%	83%	86%
Teacher turnover rate	29%	19%	5%	11%	---
Student dropout rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Student drop-off rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## **PART III – SUMMARY**

**Provide a brief, coherent narrative snapshot of the school in one page (approximately 475 words). Include at least a summary of the school’s mission or vision in the statement and begin the first sentence with the school’s name, city, and state.**

Phillip C. Showell Elementary School is located in the small rural town of Selbyville, Delaware. It is one of eight elementary schools in the Indian River School District.

The school has a total student population of 319 students in grades PK – 5. The racial composition of our diverse student body includes 62.39% Caucasian, 21.94% African American, 13.79% Hispanic, 1.25% Asian, and 0.6% American Indian.

Showell, “the little school that’s BIG on learning,” is a community school where parents, teachers, support staff and community members collaborate for the benefit of all students. The staff consists of one administrator, two secretaries, three custodians, six cafeteria workers, four paraprofessionals, one nurse, one counselor, one intervention specialist, and 22 teachers. Our active Parent Teacher Organization provides a vehicle for parents to support the school’s programs in a number of ways. Parents and community members can further partner with the school via the Helping Hands Mentoring Program, student tutoring, and classroom volunteer opportunities. Students are challenged academically, and are encouraged to demonstrate model behavior. Good citizenship is reinforced via our Character Educational Program. Our active Student Council provides a vehicle for the development of leadership skills.

The Showell staff is committed to providing students with the behavioral and academic skills required to reason, communicate, and live with dignity in a literate society. Our staff seeks to provide instruction that allows all students to reach their fullest potential. We will assist students in gaining the academic competence and the responsibility to find success through their school years and into the world of work.

Our school goals include increasing the percentage of students who meet or exceed the state standards in all academic areas, providing professional development for instructional staff, improving student writing skills by providing best practice instructional strategies and implementing quarterly writing assessments, increasing the availability of technology to enhance learning and instruction, and finally, increasing parental and community involvement opportunities.

Phillip C. Showell Elementary School is unique in many ways. Our small size has resulted in the creation of a nurturing learning environment for students. This has also led to the development of a professional learning community where teachers work closely together both within and across grade levels to promote student learning. Instructional staff members participate in numerous professional development activities, which enable them to provide our students with instructional strategies that are sound and research-based. Our active School Improvement Committee, which consists of staff and community members, identifies and allocates resources necessary to enhance achievement for all students. Almost half our student population is low income, which qualifies us as a Title I school. The staff’s efforts and students’ achievements have been recognized significantly. Phillip Showell was named a National Distinguished Title I School in 2000 and again in 2002. Within the past two weeks, prior to the nomination for the Blue Ribbon Schools Program Award we were notified by the Delaware Department of Education that we were named once again a National Distinguished Title I School for 2003.

## **PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS**

1. The staff of Phillip C Showell (PCS) use multiple indicators to track student growth and the gains of various student populations, as well as to gauge overall academic success of the school. Student progress toward the Delaware content standards is monitored using a variety of measures, including performance assessment, portfolio and norm-referenced testing. These measures allow PCS's students to demonstrate learning in varied forms. The degree of student learning in relation to our academic standards is the foundation for instruction.

Although we use multiple measures, the Delaware Student Program (DSTP) serves as our primary indicator of student progress toward the standards. This test is administered annually and has been expanded to include grades 2 through 10. The data presented for our school will focus on grades 3 and 5, as the more recently adopted assessments at the other grade levels are not yet supported by 3 years of data.

The DSTP assesses reading using literary, informative, and technical texts. Students are required to demonstrate understanding of the text by completing short answer, multiple choice, and extended response questions. The percentage of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students at PCS who have met or exceeded the reading standard (reflected at performance levels 3, 4, and 5) has increased from 46.7% to 94.3% between 1998 to 2002. Likewise, significant improvement is evident in the range of 5<sup>th</sup> graders meeting and exceeding the standard from 66% in 1998 to 91% in 2002. Nationally-normed data also reflect reading gains for the five year period. On the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT-9) Reading Comprehension subtest from 1998 to 2002 the mean NCE score has risen from 46 to 59 in grade 3 and from 47 to 65 in grade 5.

The DSTP is a yardstick of students' abilities to use written English for the purposes of self-expression, informing, and persuading while considering a variety of audiences. Written expression is assessed through student responses to a writing prompt. PCS student gains are evidenced by an increase at the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade level from 29% meeting or exceeding the standard in 1998 to a high of 57% in 2002. As the data tables shows, grade 3 students throughout the state have been challenged by the rigorous standards as only 46% of the students in the state met or exceeded the standard. In grade 5, 51% were meeting or exceeding the standard in 1998, as compared to 83% in 2002.

In the mathematics portion of the DSTP, the students are required to demonstrate key concepts by solving "real-life" problems. Our emphasis on problem solving is evidenced in increased proficiency for both 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> graders. In 1998, only 27% of the school's 3<sup>rd</sup> graders met or exceeded the standard in mathematics. In 2002, that percentage had increased to 94%. In 1998, only 54% of the 5<sup>th</sup> graders were meeting or exceeding the standard, as compared to 95% in 2002. On the Stanford Achievement Test Math Problem-solving subtest the mean NCE score has risen from 40.0 to 79.8 in grade 3 and from 49.3 to 71.2 in grade 5.

The challenge of closing achievement gaps is facilitated by our school's small size. Our shared responsibility for student growth tailored to individual needs is reflected in our students' achievement evidence. However, the data in a small school is impeded by the concern for statistical significance. Our student population in a grade level ranges from 41-57. Our school-wide Title I status negates the potential for a Title I disaggregated analysis. Looking at our data, one realizes that there are fluctuations in population numbers that make it more difficult to track every group over the 5-yr span. However, looking at the disaggregated data that is significant, a pattern is easy to discern. Our "at-promise" populations are blooming! In reading, our 3<sup>rd</sup> grade low-income students steadily came from 78% being below the standard to our current level of only 8.7% below. Their corresponding scaled score increased 58 points, while their counterpart, non-low income, only increased 25 scaled score points.

All disaggregated populations of math students made stellar gains. In third grade our low-income students grew from a low of 5.3% meeting the math standard in 1998 to 92.3% meeting it in 2002. The Hispanic population reached the point where there were no students below the standard in 2002. Our third grade African Americans steadily rose from only 9.1% meeting or exceeding the standard in 1998 to 83% meeting or exceeding in 2002. Our African American 5<sup>th</sup> grade students have moved progress moving from 26% meeting the standard to higher percentages of 70% and 75%. Our goal is to move this population from the meets to the exceeds category.

A look at our data makes one realize PCS's school culture embraces all children. Our results demonstrate high expectations and a standards-based philosophy. Our staff takes great pride in our students' achievement. This focus on success was recognized by the State of Delaware when PCS Elementary receive a Superior School Award based on Delaware School Accountability Ratings in 2001.

## **2. Show how the school uses assessment data to understand and improve student and school performance.**

Assessment data is the catalyst for deliberation, discussion, problem-solving, and decision-making at PCS. "Digging Into Data" is a school-wide in-service event which compels PCS staff to formally "dig-into" the evidence of student progress. The following is a snapshot of some ramifications of this process. In June, the staff spent an entire day analyzing the 2002 DSTP data that was released the end of May. The day-long professional reflection focused on the following: Where are our students? What are their strengths?, What are their weaknesses?, What are individual and group instructional needs? How does disaggregating the data influence the school picture? Are we meeting the instructional needs of all students and student populations? The outcome of this June "Digging into Data" day was a school-wide goal of writing for this school year. The staff continued the focus of working together to improve student writing during an in-service day in August. A collective sense of responsibility characterized the staff interactions as they worked together to develop plans for better instruction and intervention, and to consider professional development needs related to writing. Grade levels articulated expectations about writing in relation to the state standards. Evaluating writing and the need for consistency and training became agreed upon necessities. The need to get a better handle on the instructional picture in writing developed into plans for curriculum mapping by each staff member with the goal of analyzing methodology and content. This was just one of the outgrowths of this data discovery! Professional development needs surfaced for assistance in text-based writing instruction and the development of appropriate prompts. An in-service was designed for the third week of September where plans were developed to expand grade level and school-wide writing opportunities. Additionally, plans for portfolio pieces and collegial scoring were developed. Additional instructional time was allocated to writing with better integration plans into content areas. Digging into data is continued more informally at weekly grade level meetings as teachers continue to examine students' daily progress in writing. Even students use the assessment data to assess their own learning and set goals for themselves. In relation to the writing goal, students are using theme test results and rubrics to assess and plan for improvements and to set related goals.

Other more formal measures of student progress are used to look for trends and to determine the degree to which students are achieving the standards. They include: The Star Reading Test, Grade A+ by AGS for K and 1, The Language Acquisition Survey for ESL students, and the Work Sampling Portfolio for PK, K and 1. Data is disaggregated and analyzed with consideration of needs for student support, curriculum, instructional strategies, colleague support, and instructional time.

## **3. Describe how the school communicates student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students, and the community.**

PCS Elementary communicates student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students, and the community in a variety of ways. One of the school's goals reads, "All students will meet or exceed the state standards." Subsequently, progress toward that goal is measured and shared with the public through the school's monthly newsletter, school website, and the local newspaper. The latter not only publishes results and features news articles about growth between the current year and the previous year, but also compares PCS to schools throughout the state. Moreover, student performance data is presented during public session to the local Board of Education in late summer or early fall. Delaware Student Testing Program results are shared with both parents and students. Parents are urged to contact their child's teacher with questions. Additionally, the school annually presents achievement data to parents at "open house" in late August, at a fall PTA meeting, and during parent conferences. School staff shares results at community meetings. The PCS school profile is annually distributed to parents and is available to the community. The school's monthly newsletter provides student performance details; and bulletin boards exhibit student achievement data. PCS's School Improvement Committee, which is

comprised of parents, community members, and staff, scrutinizes data as it designs its plan and allocates funds for the succeeding year to reflect student performance results. Classroom teachers have a variety of methods of keeping parents informed of progress. They include the following: tests signed, nightly homework and communication folders, Friday packets reflecting weekly progress, student assignment books with teacher comments, and conferences. Formal communications involve progress reports and report cards. Teachers communicate with students in many ways using individual student conferences and explaining progress using rubrics that detail strengths and weaknesses.

**4. Describe how the school will share its successes with other schools.**

First, PCS will share its successes with other Indian River schools through the networking system that currently exists within the district. Principals, assistant principals, and reading specialists meet with their peers on a regular basis. Frequent agenda topics include “best practice” instruction, student performance results, and achievement gap data. In essence, student performance and strategies for its enhancement are featured since the primary IRSD goal is “All students will meet or exceed the state standards.” Secondly, since the local and state newspapers publish student performance results and compare schools throughout the state, PCS has received calls and subsequently has welcomed teachers and administrators who request to visit classrooms in order to discern what PCS’s teachers are doing to effect such dramatic academic growth. Additionally, staff members are willing to conduct professional development sessions in nearby schools, throughout the state, and at national conferences. A Title I National Distinguished School in 2000, 2002, and 2003, PCS with its 46.65% free/reduced lunch rate and its 37.6% minority population has gained renown for its students’ accomplishments.

## **PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION**

**1. Describe in one page the school’s curriculum, including foreign languages (foreign language instruction is an eligibility requirement for middle, junior high, and high schools), and show how all students are engaged with significant content, based on high standards.**

Phillip Showell Elementary’s curriculum has been designed to reflect Delaware’s rigorous core content area standards. At its core is a balanced literacy program published by Houghton Mifflin. Students vicariously experience worldwide adventures via the authentic literary selections while strengthening their comprehension skills, practicing decoding and textural analysis strategies, expanding vocabulary, and increasing fluency. As a supplement for those who warrant additional phonics instruction, PCS has selected to use Open Court to more effectively meet students’ needs. Since reading and writing are naturally integrated, students hone their text-based writing skills in relation to the narratives, informational texts, or technical readings included in their anthologies. Additionally, the pupils respond to “stand alone” prompts relating to numerous topics and concepts. In order to enrich their students’ learning experiences, PCS’s staff members have improved their instructional skills through participation in the Delaware Writing Project and the Delaware Reading Project.

Furthermore, the NSF-researched Math Trailblazers program (Kendall Hunt) has been implemented in all kindergarten through fifth grade classrooms. Emphasizing the conceptual-learning rather than the memorization of algorithms or the mastery of computational skills, the Math Trailblazers curriculum has dramatically changed math instruction at PCS. To better meet students’ math needs, as well as, to transition to more interactive, experiential methods of teaching, the staff has participated in Math Club professional development sessions, where grade level peers prepare for upcoming units, discuss strategies for student success, and explore effective assessment of what students know and are able to do mathematically.

Indian River partners with other districts in the state’s Science Coalition. All of the district teachers have been trained to use Smithsonian Project science kits, which enable students to experience hands-on science so that they can meet the state’s science standards. Included in their science curriculum is the opportunity to explore nature in the district’s Outdoor Education Center at Ingram Pond. Again, since Delaware’s science standards stress conceptual knowledge rather than isolated fact memorization, Phillip PCS’s students learn science by doing, discussing, drawing conclusions, and writing about their observations, experiences, and analyses.

Social studies is the fourth standards-based core content area to which a portion of the educational time is devoted. Officially, district staff use Houghton Mifflin’s *We the People* curriculum, which they supplement with various materials and activities. Moreover, since Delaware’s high stakes accountability focuses on students’ reading achievement, teachers seize the opportunity to address interconnected geography, civics, history, and economics standards through their reading materials. The district has heavily invested in social studies-linked “tradebooks” for students’ instructional and recreational reading. A PCS team is currently working with district peers and University of Delaware personnel to design thematic units and standards-based performance assessments as a part of the Delaware Social Studies Project. A common feature of all curricular activities and materials is the emphasis on conceptual understanding, problem-solving, justification of answers, evaluative thinking, multiple perspectives, and generalization to new situations.

In addition to the regular classroom instruction in the standards-linked core content areas, PCS’s students weekly engage in physical education, art, vocal and instrumental music, computer-assisted instruction, library, and health education classes. Students who need additional learning opportunities are served by Title I reading assistants, a reading specialist, a writing teacher, and a special education department.

**2. (Elementary Schools) Describe the school’s reading curriculum, including a description of why the school chose this particular approach to reading.**

The Delaware ELA content standards are our curriculum. A challenge was locating rich curricular-linked resources that not only aligned with the content skills but reflected features of a well-designed reading program. A district committee with representative lead teachers from each elementary school delved into the current reading research and narrowed the potential materials through a year-long pilot. Houghton Mifflin’s “Invitations to Literacy” was endorsed and chosen. Our language arts committee recognized it’s strength in cultivating home-school literacy connections. We value Invitations to Literacy’s systematic and spiraling skills/ strategies and the full integration of LA standards components of reading, writing, viewing, speaking, and listening. However, what PCS has come to recognize as the most powerful element of Invitations is the fact these curricular materials allow the flexibility for our staff to tailor to the needs of our diverse student population. It allows us to provide the enriching, challenging thematic extensions that our gifted / talented students need. Of greater value, the core literature encourages a classroom community of diverse learners and doesn’t relegate weaker readers to isolated groups.

Although the Houghton Mifflin’s materials are a foundation, they are not exclusively our reading program. Through analysis of reading assessments that include fluency checks, sight word recognition surveys, comprehension measures and the process of striving for improved achievement, we have expanded and enhanced our reading program to incorporate stronger phonemic awareness and phonetic components. The school chose to pursue a more systematic program with a plan of instruction that offers a more organized logical sequence. The staff determined that many students needed more opportunities for phonetic reinforcement. Along with phonics in-servicing, Open Court Phonics was adapted into our reading program in grades PS to grade 3. Additionally, our HM theme tests needed major revision to align them more directly with Delaware Standards. Committees of teachers have worked at increasing the degree of interpretive and extended meaning questions and to enhance the writing assessment to a more challenging degree. Rubrics have been rewritten to reflect Delaware’s expectations.

Since our goal states that all students will read varied literary, informative, and technical genre with understanding by the end of third grade, the PCS staff has been forced to become more resourceful with time and instructional strategies. The need to integrate reading across content areas is facilitated by utilizing HM’s Social Studies materials which correlate to the ELA standards and by expanding reading skills through informative trade books called Paperback Pluses

**3. Describe one other curriculum area of the school’s choice and show how it relates to essential skills and knowledge based on the school’s mission.**

Our mission is to provide students with the behavioral and academic skills required to reason, communicate, and live with dignity in a literate society. Our staff seeks to provide instruction that allows all students to reach their fullest potential; ultimately realizing success through their school years and into the world of work. This is an added challenge in our area characterized by poultry industries and blue collar trade-an area where 46.65% of the population is identified as low income. Consequently, we have made a commitment to the multicultural community we serve by creating a partnership where students are “**our priority**”. One curricular facet devised to fulfill this expectation is entitled, “Success Strategies”. Daily, each grade level has a designated block of 35-40 minutes which focuses on the needs of individual learners. In this block of time each staff member has a critical role to play in ensuring that each student’s instructional and personal/social growth needs are addressed. This pool of teachers and support staff reduces group sizes to address and maximize each child’s growth. We use instructional needs reports, assessment indicators, progress reports, and a school staff support process to initiate the steps to successfully move students forward. The format and content vary by child. Some students grow academically and socially through interactions with 49 community mentors. Others receive reading intervention using the SOAR or Early Success Programs or instruction with teachers certified to teach students with special needs. Technology is fused into the “Success Strategies” strand with academic software that includes Earobics and an integrated individually paced learning system in math or reading from the Computer Curriculum Corporation. During “Success Strategies” we utilize a writing teacher, a

Title I para, a reading specialist, a basic skill intervention para, and have created a small-group language support for ESL primary students. The emphasis is on instruction that builds on prior experiences and places the learning within meaningful contexts. This needs-focused learning equips our students with the skills and strategies to move forward. Our improved scores attest to the accomplishments of “Success Strategies”.

Additionally, our goals for “Success Strategies” have expanded beyond the confines of this time period. We have extended our instructional day to encompass a spectrum of support opportunities. There is a before school enrichment program that is designed to provide the impetus to move students who have met the Delaware State Standards (in grades 3-5) toward the Exceeds and Distinguished levels of performance. Additionally, we host an after school intervention program during the winter and spring. “Bridges”, our extended year program, is designed to provide “at-promise” students an additional 20 days of instruction in the summer. This is the boost many students need! Our “at-promise” kindergarten students are invited to attend full-day K with the additional half-day strengthening their foundations for literacy and the English language. This has accelerated a “closing of the gap” for our “at-promise” students.

#### **4. Describe the different instructional methods the school uses to improve student learning.**

PCS teachers infuse the principles of Dimensions of Learning and Marzano’s Classroom Instruction that Works in their daily interactions with students. These are the basis of a model and philosophy for effective schools which our staff has been emulating. Knowing how children learn best guides them in their daily instructional plans. Their instruction in the classroom utilizes and encourages the key thinking strategies. Comparing, contrasting, summarizing, and classifying are processes at the heart of instruction in all content areas. Teachers promote strategies for learning through a progressive approach from modeling and direct instruction toward independence. This year, one of the teacher determined instructional focuses is for students to use more effective strategies for extracting and organizing informative text. School-wide exposure to and adoptions of “gist”, one- sentence summary, and story summary formats helps reinforce strategies for learning while developing the students’ understanding of text structures. Likewise, a school-wide emphasis concentrates on the level of thinking elicited by teacher’s questions.

Students learn best in instructional environments that address individual learning styles and differences. The cultural diversity in our school requires teachers to orchestrate opportunities to extend and enrich background knowledge while providing an atmosphere where students can feel comfortable taking risks to try new language and skills. Our heterogeneous organization facilitates the use of reciprocal teaching with students actively involved in the peer modeling and teaching. Discovery through hands-on learning using cooperative groups is the embodiment of the instructional format associated with our math and science curriculums. Reinforcing student efforts and providing recognition and positive feedback are instructional strategies that are also reflected in a myriad of ways including class applause, notes to students, star student and the sharing of writing or projects with other groups.

#### **5. Describe the school’s professional development program and its impact on improving student achievement.**

Professional development activities were determined by school and district goals. Our staff developed a three-tiered approach that addressed school, grade level and personal goals. The School Improvement Committee considered the school’s needs and ensured that they addressed the mission and made sure that the necessary resources were allocated to achieve them. Then, professional development activities were planned that helped teachers engage in a variety of professional development activities during 2002-2003. Our main goal this year was to close the achievement gaps between populations in the school. We accomplished this by providing a variety of strands of professional development. These strands were designed to improve instructional practices, strengthen curriculum and content knowledge, and meet individual student needs in diverse classroom settings.

One of our major curricular goals was improving student writing. To achieve this, a workshop was provided by the Delaware Writing Project in the area of text-based writing. An in-building inservice was held on October 11, 2002, that focused on analyzing student writing. Each student had completed a

writing prompt, which staff members scored. After the analyses were completed, grade level teachers looked for areas where they could provide needed instruction. Best practice research linked to writing was also shared during faculty and grade-level meetings by building staff. Additionally, our staff members requested further writing support by utilizing a lead teacher to provide classroom instruction. Staff members have continued pursuit of these goals by attending off-site professional development workshops on an individual or grade-level basis.

The Dimensions of Learning model is an on-going goal from previous years. This year we have concentrated professional development on improving teachers' use of questioning to enhance learning. Teacher observations this year have encompassed increasing student comprehension through improved questioning techniques.

Additional on-going professional development activities were provided by the district administration. Curriculum mapping training sessions have been held. Lead teachers learned the components and provided additional training for our staff. Our teachers were highly involved in monthly Math Club sessions where teachers collaborated as they addressed improving instructional practices and assessments. Smithsonian Science training, that promoted discovery based learning, was also available. A district-wide inservice was held on November 11, 2022, that addressed closing the achievement gap. This dovetailed nicely with our building's efforts in this area.

**Delaware State Testing Program**  
**A Criterion-Referenced Assessment**

This overview applies to:	Table 1a	Reading Grade 3	page 16
	Table 1b	Reading Grade 5	page 17
	Table 1c	Math Grade 3	page 18
	Table 1d	Math Grade 5	page 19
	Table 1e	Writing Grade 3	page 20
	Table 1f	Writing Grade 5	page 21

Grade 3, 5 (end of standards cluster years)      Test      Delaware State Testing Program

Edition/publication year 1996      Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement Systems

What groups were excluded from testing? 0      Why, and how were they assessed? All student populations are assessed at PCS. Every effort is made to ensure all students take the assessment. Absent students must make up the assessment the following week. Schools automatically receive scores of 0 for students who do not participate in the assessment.

The DSTP Student Performance levels and cut scores were established by Delaware educators and community members from around the state. These cut-scores were approved by the State Board of Education in September 1999.

There are five performance levels in reading, writing, and mathematics. The following describe each level:

<b>DSTP Student Performance Levels</b>		
<b>Level</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Description</b>
5	Distinguished	Excellent Performance
4	Exceeds the Standard	Very Good Performance
3	Meets the Standard	Good Performance
2	Below the Standard	Needs Improvement
1	Well Below the Standard	Needs Significant Improvement

The cut score for DSTP appear in the tables at the bottom of each content area and grade level chart. The indicated number represents the lowest possible score a student can earn and still be within the indicated performance levels.

The DSTP involves five separate days of assessment. Two days are for reading, two days for math, and one day for writing. The test takes in excess of 2 hours daily.

**Phillip Showell Elementary Table 1a**  
**Delaware State Testing Program- Reading -Grade 3**  
**Criterion-Referenced** Testing developed by state with Harcourt Education Measurement Systems

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing Month	March	March	April	April	May
<b>READING SCORES SHOWELL GR 3</b>					
Total					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	26.4%	26.5%	34.9%	17.1%	13.3%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	67.9%	53.1%	53.5%	60.9%	33.3%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	5.7%	20.4%	11.6%	22%	53.3%
Number of Students Tested	62	54	49	48	45
Percent of total students tested	100%	98%	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	1 (hospitalized)	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0	2%	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.Low income # in population	26	24	18	23	19
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	26.1%	12.5%	33.33%	8.7%	0%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	65.2%	50%	50%	56.52%	21.1%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	8.7%	37.5%	16.67%	34.78%	78.9%
Low income mean scaled score # in popul.	444.22	429.08	439.28	421 .35	385.79
2. Not Low income mean scaled score	37	25	25	18	26
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	26.7%	30%	36%	27.8%	23.1%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	70%	56%	56%	66.67%	42.3%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	3.33%	4%	8.%	5.56%	34.6%
Not Low Income mean	451.67	454.6	456.76	450.28	426.12
3.African American # in population	12	10	13	19	11
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	8.3%	30%	30.6%	0%	0%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	67%	40%	46.1%	53.6%	18.2%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	16.7%	30%	23.3%	47.4%	81.8%
African American Mean Scaled Score	426	440.9	444	418	381.5
4 .Hispanic # in population	8	8	2	5	3
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	25%	25%	Not	Not	Not
Meets (Performance Level 3)	75%	50%	Statistically	Statistically	Statistically
Below Standard (1 & 2)	0%	25%	Significant	Significant	Significant
Hispanic Mean Scaled Score	448	418.4			
5 White # in population	42	35	31	24	30
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	30.9%	31%	35.6%	29.1%	20%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	61.9%	57%	48.4%	50%	43.3%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	7.2%	12%	16%	20.9%	36.7%
White Mean Scaled Score	495.11	449.3	455.48	446.27	422
<b>STATE SCORES</b>					
Total					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	28.8%	23.4%	24.2%	20.9%	15.9%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	50.5%	50.8%	52.6%	47.7%	45.6%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	20.7%	25.9%	23.2%	31.4%	38.5%
State Mean Scaled Score	440.75	435.17	437.19	428.13	420.88
School Mean Scaled Score	448.43	442.10	449.44	434.05	409.09

<b>Cut Scores- DSTP Reading Grade 3</b> (lowest scaled score a student can earn and still be within the indicated performance level)				
Grade	Below	Meets	Exceeds	Distinguished
3	387	411	465	482

**Phillip Showell Elementary Table 1b**

Delaware State Testing Program- **Reading -Grade 5**

Criterion-Referenced Testing developed by state with Harcourt Education Measurement Systems

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing Month	March	March	April	April	May
<b>READING SCORES -SHOWELL</b>					
Total					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	29.4%	21.4%	29.4%	26.7%	22.1%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	61.8%	50.%	58.8%	55.6%	44.1%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	8.8%	28.6%	11.8%	17.8%	33.8%
Number of Students Tested	41	54	43	51	68
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	98.5%
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	1 vacation
Percentage of students excluded	0	0	0	0	98.5%
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.Low income		19		20	37
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	Not	5.3%	Not	15%	13.5%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	Statistically	68.4%	Statistically	60%	29.7%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	Significant	26.32%	Significant	25%	56.8%
Low income mean scaled score		468.89		472.55	448.46
2.Not low income	24	23	22	25	31
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	33.3%	34.8%	45.5%	36%	32.3%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	62.5%	34.8%	40.9%	52%	61.3%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	4.2%	30.4	13.6%	12%	6.4%
Not Low income mean scaled score	499.38	484.7	494.95	496.16	485.9
3.African American	7	14	12	11	19
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	Not	0%	8.3%	0%	21.0%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	Statistically	50%	58.3%	45.5%	21.0
Below Standard (1 & 2)	Significant	50%	43.9%	55.5%	58%
African American mean scaled score		455.9	463	446.5	452.2
3.Hispanic	1	9	3	7	9
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	Not	11%	Not	Not	0%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	Statistically	56%	Statistically	Statistically	33.3%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	Significant	33%	Significant	Significant	66.6%
Hispanic mean scaled score		463.3			428.22
3White	31	31	27	33	40
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	29.8%	26%	39.2%	33%	27.5%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	61.2	47.8%	47.8%	54.5%	57.5%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	9.%	16.2%	13%	12.5%	15%
White mean scaled score	485.1	490.25	492.7	493.8	480
<b>STATE SCORES</b>					
Total					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	21.97%	16.23%	18.3%	14.29%	15.81%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	56%	48.72%	50.97%	48.51%	43.22%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	22.02%	33.04%	30.72%	37.19%	40.96%
State Mean	478.13	468.88	470.16	462.54	459.98
School Mean	492.41	477.57	486.97	485.67	465.53

<b>Cut Scores- DSTP Reading Grade 5</b> (lowest scaled score a student can earn and still be within the indicated performance level)				
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Below</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
5	427	451	508	529

**Phillip Showell Elementary Table 1c**

Delaware State Testing Program- **Math Grade 3**

Criterion-Referenced Testing developed by state with Harcourt Education Measurement Systems

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing Month	March	March	April	April	May
<b>MATH SCORES –gr 3 SHOWELL</b>					
Total					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	47.6%	38.5%	37.2%	14.6%	0%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	46%	46.2%	53.5%	63.4%	26.7%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	6.4%	15.4%	9.3%	22%	73.3%
Number of Students Tested	62	54	49	48	45
Percent of total students tested	100	98%	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	1 (hospitalized)	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0	2%	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1. Low income					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	56.2%	24%	22.2%	4.4%	00%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	46.15	52%	61.1%	60.9%	5.3%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	7.7%	24%	16.7%	34.8%	94.7%
Low income mean scaled score	459.88	432.72	442.33	417.8	378.32
2. Not Low Income					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	48.6%	51.9%	48%	27.8%	00%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	46%	40.7%	48%	66.7%	42.3%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	5.4%	7.4%	4%	5.5%	57.7%
Not Low Income mean Scaled Score	465.19	458.85	458.2	445.2	404.31
3. African American	12	10	13	19	11
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	8%	30%	15.3%	0%	0%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	75%	40%	61.5%	47.4%	9.1%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	17%	30%	23.2%	52.6%	90.9%
African American Mean Scaled Score	435.6	438.3	436.4	411.7	378.8
4. Hispanic	8	8	2	5	3
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	12.5%	12.5%	Not	Not	Not
Meets (Performance Level 3)	87.5%	75%	Statistically	Statistically	Statistically
Below Standard (1 & 2)	0%	12.5%	Significant	Significant	Significant
Hispanic Mean Scaled Score	476	484			
5. White	42	35	31	24	30
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	52.8%	46%	45.1%	25%	0%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	42.3%	43%	51.6%	58.3%	36.6%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	4.7%	11%	3.2%	16.7%	63.4%
White Mean Scaled Score	467.79	453.76	459.8	443.6	400.5
<b>STATE SCORES</b>					
Total					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	26.2%	21.9%	20.8%	14.5%	8.9%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	45.8%	49.4%	51.9%	49.0%	45.8%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	27.9%	28.7%	27.3%	36.5%	45.2%
State Mean	434.08	430.03	431.08	421.23	411.04
School Mean	463	446.29	451.58	429.83	393.33

<b>Cut Scores- DSTP Math Grade 3</b> (lowest scaled score a student can earn and still be within the indicated performance level)				
Grade	Below	Meets	Exceeds	Distinguished
3	382	407	464	499

**Phillip Showell Elementary Table 1d**  
**Delaware State Testing Program- -Math-Grade 5**  
**Criterion-Referenced Testing developed by state with Harcourt Education Measurement Systems**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing Month	March	March	April	April	May
<b>MATH SCORES- SHOWELL Elementary</b>					
Total					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	50%	16.7%	20.6%	20%	15.9%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	45%	61.1%	70.6%	57.8%	37.7%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	5%	22.2%	8.8%	22.2%	46.4%
Number of Students Tested	41	54	43	51	69
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Low income</b>					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	Not	00%	Not	10%	10.8%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	Statistically	72.4%	Statistically	55%	29.7%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	Significant	27.6%	Significant	35%	59.5%
Low income mean scaled score		459.45		461	440.97
<b>2. Not Low Income</b>					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	33.3%	36%	31.8	28%	21.9%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	62.5%	48%	63.6%	60%	46.9%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	4.2%	16%	4.6%	12%	31.25%
Not Low Income mean scaled score	499.4	488.88	490.7	483.3	472.6
<b>3. African American</b>					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	Not	0%	0%	0%	0%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	Statistically	70%	75%	45.5%	26.3%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	Significant	30%	25%	54.5%	63.1%
African American mean scaled score		455.9	460.5	435.5	437
<b>4. Hispanic</b>					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	Not	0%	Not	Not	0%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	Statistically	78%	Statistically	Statistically	44.4%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	Significant	22%	Significant	Significant	66.6%
Hispanic mean scaled score		464.3			436.4
<b>5 White</b>					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	45.1%	29%	30.4	27.3%	24.3%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	48.3%	61.3%	65.2	57.6%	39.0%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	6.6%	9.7%	4.4	15.1%	36.7%
White mean scaled score	503	485.84	488	479.7	468.4
<b>STATE SCORES</b>					
Total					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	17.5%	14.5%	13.4%	11.28%	10.1%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	49.6%	47.7%	48.6%	44.1%	42.21%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	32.8%	37.8%	37.9%	44.6%	47.72%
State Mean	465.99	459.98	460.25	453.71	449.84
School Mean	503.2	473.07	480.06	473.4	455.65

<b>Cut Scores- DSTP Math Grade 5</b> (lowest scaled score a student can earn and still be within the indicated performance level)				
Grade	Below	Meets	Exceeds	Distinguished
5	424	449	503	525

**Phillip Showell Elementary Table 1e**  
**Delaware State Testing Program- Writing-Grade 3**  
**Criterion-Referenced Testing developed by state with Harcourt Education Measurement Systems**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing Month	March	March	April	April	May
<b>WRITING SCORES -SHOWELL Elementary</b>					
Total					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	4.8%	0%	0%	0%	2.3%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	52.4%	41.5%	27.9%	64.1%	27.3%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	42.3%	58.5%	72.1%	35.9%	70.45%
Number of Students Tested	62	54	49	48	45
Percent of total students tested	100%	98%	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	1 (hospitalized)	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0	2%	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Low income</b>					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	3.85%	00%	00%	00%	5.26%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	42.3%	40%	16.7%	63.6%	21.1%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	53.8%	60%	83.3%	36.4%	73.7%
Low income mean	6.31	6.44	5.89	6.95	5.84
<b>2. Not Low Income</b>					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	5.4%	00%	00%	00%	00%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	59.5%	42.9%	36%	64.7%	32%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	35.1%	57.1%	64%	35.3%	68%
Not Low Income mean scaled score	7.14	6.54	6.16	6.84	6.04
<b>STATE SCORES</b>					
Total					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	1.8%	.4%	.64%	1.86%	2.94%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	44.8%	32.4%	36.2%	46.9%	52.6%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	54.4%	67.2%	63.1%	51.3%	44.4%
State Mean	6.36	5.89	6.06	6.44	6.85
School Mean	6.79	6.49	6.05	6.90	5.95

<b>DSTP Student Performance Levels</b>		
<b>Level</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Description</b>
5	Distinguished	Excellent Performance
4	Exceeds the Standard	Very Good Performance
3	Meets the Standard	Good Performance
2	Below the Standard	Needs Improvement
1	Well Below the Standard	Needs Significant Improvement

<b>Cut Scores- DSTP Writing Grade 3</b> (lowest scaled score a student can earn and still be within the indicated performance level)				
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Below</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
3	5	7	11	13

**Phillip Showell Elementary Table 1f**  
**Delaware State Testing Program-Writing -Grade 5**  
**Criterion-Referenced Testing developed by state with Harcourt Education Measurement Systems**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing Month	March	March	April	April	May
<b>WRITING SCORES- SHOWELL</b>					
Total					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	5%	5.6%	0%	6.7%	1.5%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	77.5%	59.3%	55.9%	71.1%	50%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	17.5%	35.2%	44.1%	22.2%	48.5%
Number of Students Tested	41	54	43	51	68
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	98.5%
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	1 vacation
Percentage of students excluded	0	0	0	0	98.5%
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1. Low income					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	Not	6.9%	Not	00%	2.8%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	Statistically	44.8%	Statistically	70%	33.3%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	Significant	48.3%	Significant	30%	63.9%
Low income mean		7.54		8.	6.86
2. Not Low Income					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	7.7%	4%	00%	12%	00%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	73.1%	76%	68.2%	72%	68.8%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	19.2%	20%	31.8%	16%	31.2%
Not Low Income mean scaled score	8.23	8.48	7.77	8.64	7.94
<b>STATE SCORES</b>					
Total					
Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)	7.87%	4.12%	1.68%	5.29%	6.08%
Meets (Performance Level 3)	41.4%	46.6%	33.5%	45.7%	39.94%
Below Standard (1 & 2)	50.7%	49.25%	64.8%	48.98%	53.98%
State Mean	7.34	7.34	6.78	7.52	7.42
School Mean	8.18	7.96	7.38	8.36	7.37

<b>DSTP Student Performance Levels</b>		
<b>Level</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Description</b>
5	Distinguished	Excellent Performance
4	Exceeds the Standard	Very Good Performance
3	Meets the Standard	Good Performance
2	Below the Standard	Needs Improvement
1	Well Below the Standard	Needs Significant Improvement

<b>Cut Scores- DSTP Writing Grade 5</b> (lowest scaled score a student can earn and still be within the indicated performance level)				
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Below</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
5	6	8	11	13

Grade 2 - 5

Test \_\_\_Stanford Achievement Test -

Edition/publication year\_1996 Publisher \_\_\_Harcourt Education Measurement\_\_

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? \_\_\_All student populations are tested at Showell

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs\_√\_\_\_ Scaled scores \_\_\_ Percentiles\_\_\_\_\_

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

The reports on the SAT-9 do not.

The SAT-9 in grades 2, and 4 were district assessments prior to 2002. The state of Delaware expanded the Delaware State Testing Program to these “off-grades” in the 2001-2002 testing year. The reading comprehension subtest and the math problem solving subtest are a portion of our current DSTP testing program. For its first year (2001-02), there was no summary or disaggregated data prepared by the state.

This overview applies to:	Table 2a	Reading Grade 3	page 23
	Table 2b	Reading Grade 4	page 24
	Table 2c	Reading Grade 5	page 25
	Table 2d	Reading Grade 2	page 25
	Table 2e	Math Grade 3	page 26
	Table 2f	Math Grade 4	page 26
	Table 2g	Math Grade 5	page 27
	Table 2h	Math Grade 2	page 27

**Phillip Showell Elementary 2a**  
**Nationally Normed Measure**  
**Reading Comprehension**

Grade 3

Stanford Achievement Test- SAT-9

Edition/publication year \_\_\_\_\_

Publisher \_\_\_\_\_

What groups were excluded from testing? None

Scores are reported as: NCEs  Scaled Scores Percentiles

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing Month	March	March	April	April	May
<b>Reading Comprehension</b> PHILLIP SHOWELL Elementary					
Mean NCE Score	59.23	58.65	62.19	55.36	45.51
Number of Students Tested	62	54	49	48	45
Percent of total students tested	100%	98%	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	1 (hospitalized)	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0	2%	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1. low income	57.47	51.55	58.56	49.8	35.6
2. non low income	60.52	65.53	64.8	62.46	52.76
3.					
<b>STATE SCORES</b>					
State Mean NCE Score	58.64	57.49	56.57	53.99	51.17

**Phillip Showell Elementary 2b**  
**Nationally-normed Measure**

Grade 4  
 Edition/publication year 1966

Stanford Achievement Test- SAT-9  
 Publisher Harcourt Educational  
 Measurement

What groups were excluded from testing? None

Scores are reported as: NCEs  Scaled Scores Percentiles

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month	March	March	April	April
<b>Reading Comprehension</b> PHILLIP SHOWELL Elementary				
Mean NCE Score	52	61	53	53
Number of Students Tested	52	43	49	42
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA
1.				
2.				
3.				
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
State Mean NCE Score	NA*	NA*	NA*	NA*

\*State does not publish DSTP2 data

**Phillip Showell Elementary 2c**  
**Nationally-Normed Measure**  
**Reading Comprehension**

Grade 5 Stanford Achievement Test- SAT-9  
 Edition/publication year 1996 Publisher \_\_\_\_\_  
 What groups were excluded from testing? None

Scores are reported as: NCEs  Scaled Scores Percentiles

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
	March	March	April	April	May
<b>Reading Comprehension</b>					
PHILLIP SHOWELL Elementary					
Mean NCE Score	65.06	58.25	57.56	56.26	47.25
Number of Students Tested	41	54	43	51	68
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	98.5%
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	1 vacation
Percentage of students excluded	0	0	0	0	98.5%
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1. low income	N/A	55.11	N/A	48.91	36.75
2. non low income	68.15	60.84	61.84	62.19	59.77
<b>STATE SCORES</b>					
State Mean NCE Score	54.99	53.85	53.2	51.4	50.26

**Phillip Showell Elementary 2d**  
**Nationally=Normed Measure**

Grade 2 Stanford Achievement Test- SAT-9  
 Edition/publication year 1996 Publisher \_\_\_\_\_  
 What groups were excluded from testing? None

Scores are reported as: NCEs  Scaled Scores Percentiles

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
	March	March	April	April
<b>Reading Comprehension</b>				
PHILLIP SHOWELL Elementary				
Mean NCE Score	62	57	77	52
Number of Students Tested	57	62	54	52
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
1. low income				
2. non low income				
3.				
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
State Mean NCE Score	NA*	NA*	NA*	NA*

\*State does not publish DSTP2 summary data

**Phillip Showell Elementary 2e  
Nationally-Normed Measure**

Math Problem Solving

Grade 3

Stanford Achievement Test- SAT-9

Edition/publication year 1996

Publisher \_\_\_\_\_

What groups were excluded from testing? None

Scores are reported as: NCEs  Scaled Scores Percentiles

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
	March	March	April	April	May
<b>Math Problem Solving</b> PHILLIP SHOWELL Elementary					
Mean NCE Score	79.76	67.74	67.12	58.88	40.03
Number of Students Tested	62	54	49	48	45
Percent of total students tested	100%	98%	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	1 (hospitalized)	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0	2%	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1. low income	78.77	61.33	63.58	52.79	33.06
2. non low income	80.49	74.16	69.66	66.67	45.13
3.					
<b>STATE SCORES</b>					
State Mean NCE Score	63.02	61.12	59.7	55.04	51.4

**Phillip Showell Elementary 2f  
Nationally-Normed Measure**

Grade 4

Stanford Achievement Test- SAT-9

Edition/publication year 1996

Publisher \_\_\_\_\_

What groups were excluded from testing? None

Scores are reported as: NCEs  Scaled Scores Percentiles

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
March	March	March	April	April
Math Problem Solving PHILLIP SHOWELL Elementary				
Mean NCE Score	59	65	53	45
Number of Students Tested	52	43	49	42
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
1. low income				
2. non low income				
3.				
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
State Mean NCE Score	NA*	NA*	NA*	NA*

\*State does not publish DSTP2 summary dat

**Phillip Showell Elementary 2g**  
**Nationally- Normed Measure**  
**Math Problem Solving**

Grade 5 Stanford Achievement Test- SAT-9  
 Edition/publication year 1996 Publisher \_\_\_\_\_  
 What groups were excluded from testing? None

Scores are reported as: NCEs  Scaled Scores Percentiles

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
March					
Math Problem Solving PHILLIP SHOWELL Elementary					
Mean NCE Score	71.23	65.34	63.89	56.48	49.3
Number of Students Tested	41	54	43	51	68
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	98.5%
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	1 vacation
Percentage of students excluded	0	0	0	0	98.5%
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1. low income	N/A	60.42	N/A	48.28	40.22
2. non low income	72.98	69.41	70.33	63.04	59.79
3.					
<b>STATE SCORES</b>					
State Mean NCE Score	60.03	57.72	56.28	53.05	51.52

**Phillip Showell Elementary 2h**  
**Nationally-Normed Measure**

Grade 2 Stanford Achievement Test- SAT-9  
 Edition/publication year 1996 Publisher \_\_\_\_\_  
 What groups were excluded from testing? None

Scores are reported as: NCEs  Scaled Scores Percentiles

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
March	March	March	April	April
Math Problem Solving PHILLIP SHOWELL Elementary				
Mean NCE Score	59	61	74	71
Number of Students Tested	57	62	54	52
Percent of total students tested	0	0	0	0
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded				
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
1. low income				
2. non low income				
3.				
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
State Mean NCE Score	NA*	NA*	NA*	NA*

\*State does not publish DSTP2 summary data

**Grade K-1 Assessments:** (state-wide as part of DSTP)

K-1 Work Sampling Assessment

Pearson Early Learning Company in conjunction with the Delaware Department of Education

Edition- 3/01

Replaced Metropolitan Achievement Test This is year 2.

Also,

Grade A+ Group Diagnostic Reading Assessment (school level)

K pre and post form

By AGS

This is the second year. This test replaces K Metropolitan.