

**2003-2004 No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon Schools Program
Cover Sheet**

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

Official School Name Frankford Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address RR 3 Box 86 Frankford School Road
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Frankford Delaware 19945-9518
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (302) 732-3808 Fax (302) 732-3811

Website/URL www.k12.de.us/frankford E-mail sbrittingham@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.

Sharon Brittingham Date February 10, 2004
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent* Ms. 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.

Lois M Hobbs Date February 10, 2004
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson Mr. Harvey Walls
(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.

Harvey Walls Date February 10, 2004
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

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

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

[Include this page in the school's application as page 2.]

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2003-2004 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 1998.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

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

1. Number of schools in the district: 7 Elementary schools
2 Middle schools
0 Junior high schools
2 High schools
3 Other (Briefly explain) :
 One Magnet School, One Alternative School, and One
 Special Needs School
- 14 TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: \$8012.00
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \$9494.00

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. 6 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
 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
K	45	41	86	7			
1	42	38	80	8			
2	28	38	66	9			
3	37	24	61	10			
4	41	33	74	11			
5	33	35	68	12			
6				Other	39	22	61 *
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →							496

* These 61 students are preschool, Howard T. Ennis School students (a special needs school) Satellite Program, and Project Village East (a preschool program for ESOL and low socio economic students).

Racial/ethnic composition of _____ 34 % White
the students in the school: _____ 30 % Black or African America
_____ 34 % Hispanic or Latino
_____ 2 % Asian/Pacific Islander
_____ % American Indian/Alaskan Native
100% Total

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 17 %

(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.)

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	38
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	36
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	74
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	435
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.17
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	17%

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 27 %
138 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Proficient

Number of languages represented: 5

Specify languages: Spanish, Laotian, Mestizo, Korean, and Chinese

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 76 %
396 Total Number Students Who Qualify

If this method does not produce 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: 17 %
87 Total Number of Students Served

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

_____ Autism	_____ Orthopedic Impairment
<u> 3 </u> Deafness	<u> 13 </u> Other Health Impaired
_____ Deaf-Blindness	<u> 60 </u> Specific Learning Disability
_____ Hearing Impairment	_____ Speech or Language Impairment
<u> 7 </u> Mental Retardation	_____ Traumatic Brain Injury
<u> 3 </u> Multiple Disabilities	_____ 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> 2 </u>	_____
Classroom teachers	<u> 22 </u>	_____
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u> 22 </u>	_____
Paraprofessionals	<u> 12 </u>	_____
Support staff	<u> 5 </u>	_____
Total number	<u> 63 </u>	_____

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 1 to 22

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. 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 rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.)

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Daily student attendance	94%	95%	93%	94%	95%
Daily teacher attendance	92%	92%	93%	92%	93%
Teacher turnover rate	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%
Student dropout rate	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Student drop-off rate	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

PART III - SUMMARY

Frankford Elementary School (FES) is located in the rural town of Frankford, Delaware. It is one of eight elementary schools in the Indian River School District. The school has a total student population of 496 students in grades PK – 5. The racial composition of the diverse student body includes 34% Caucasian, 30% African American, 34% Hispanic, and 2 % Asian. FES houses the largest portion of low socio economic students in the district, an Intensive Learning Center, a satellite program for Ennis (a special needs school), all elementary aged HHPD (Hard of Hearing/ Profoundly Deaf) students for the district, all ESOL students for the southern part of the district, and Project Village, a pre school program for ESOL and low socio economic students.

Frankford Elementary, “a school for everyone,” is a community school where parents, teachers, support staff and community members collaborate for the benefit of all students. The staff consists of 2 administrators, 2 secretaries, 5 custodians, 9 cafeteria workers, 8 paraprofessionals, 1 signer translator, 1 nurse, 1 counselor, 1 family intervention therapist, 1 reading specialist, 2 reading teachers, 3 ESL teachers, 8 specialists, 5 foster grandparents, 1 HHPD teacher and 29 teachers. Our active Parent Teacher Organization provides a vehicle for parents to support the school’s programs. Parents and community members partner with the school via the H.O.S.T.S. Mentoring Program, and classroom volunteer opportunities. Through partnerships with the Indian River High School, high school students mentor and support school programs and our after school homework assistance program. The school wide discipline program, “Stop and Think,” promotes making positive choices and good citizenship. Our Character Education program promotes making good choices and becoming a productive member of society. In the past our active Student Council provides a vehicle for the development of leadership skills.

The Frankford staff is committed to providing students with the skills required to reason, communicate, and live in a literate society. The staff seeks to provide instruction that allows all students to reach their fullest potential. They assist students in gaining academic competence and the responsibility to find success through their school years and into the world of work. This is done through before school and after school programs, differentiated instruction, and extra support programs. Staff members have written and received grants amounting to well over half a million dollars over the past six years to purchase materials and fund special programs to meet students’ needs. Through a partnership with the local community college the school has increased its number and use of computers, from fewer than 50 to over 250. Over 59% of the teaching staff have master’s degrees and another 10% are working on post-graduate degrees.

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, increasing the availability of technology to enhance learning and instruction, and finally, increasing parental and community involvement opportunities.

Frankford Elementary School is unique. 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 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 School Improvement Committee, which consists of staff, parents, and community members, identifies and allocates resources to enhance achievement for all students. Almost 76% of our student population is low income, which qualifies us as a Title I school. The staff’s efforts and students’ achievements have been recognized as closing the achievement gap. The Washington State Apple Growers recognized the school in 2001 for its efforts in closing the achievement gap. The school also received a Superior rating by the state of Delaware for 2002-2003. The principal was named a National Distinguished Principal in 2003.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

Frankford Elementary School's Assessment Results in Reading and Mathematics

The staff of Frankford Elementary School use multiple indicators to track student growth and the gains of various student populations and to gauge overall academic success of the school. Student progress toward the state standards is monitored using a variety of measures, including performance assessment, portfolio and norm-referenced testing.

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 3rd grade students at FES who have met or exceeded the reading standard (reflected at performance levels 3, 4, and 5) has increased from 61.43% to 92.45% between 1998 to 2003. Likewise, significant improvement is evident in the range of 5th graders meeting and exceeding the standard from 52.63% in 1998 to 90% in 2003. Nationally normed data also reflect reading gains for the five-year period. On the Stanford Achievement Test Reading Comprehension subtest from 1998 to 2003 the mean NCE score has risen from 51 to 75 in grade 3 and from 54 to 72 in grade 5.

In the mathematics portion of the DSTP, the students are required to demonstrate key concepts by solving “real-life” problems. In 1999, only 61.77% of the school’s 3rd graders met or exceeded the standard in mathematics. In 2003, that percentage had increased to 80.95%. In 1998, only 52.63% of the 5th graders were meeting or exceeding the standard, as compared to 80.35% in 2003. On the Stanford Achievement Test Math Problem-solving subtest the mean NCE score has risen from 71 to 76 in grade 3 and from 61 to 74 in grade 5 from 1998 to 2003.

The data in a small school is impeded by the concern for statistical significance. Our student population in a grade level ranges from 91 students in kindergarten to 63 students in fifth grade. 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. FES’s at risk populations are making gains. In reading, our 3rd grade low-income students steadily came from 62.51% in 1998 being below the standard to only 5.56% below in 2003. In reading our fifth grade low income students went from 66% in 1998 not meeting to 19.05% not meeting in 2003.

All disaggregated populations of math students made gains. In third grade our low-income students grew from a 40.64% meeting the math standard in 1998 to 79.07% meeting it in 2003. Our third grade African Americans steadily rose from only 45.8% meeting or exceeding the standard in 1998 to 73.3% meeting or exceeding in 2003. Our African American 5th grade students have made progress moving from 37.2% meeting the standard in 1998 to 65.2% meeting the standard and 4.3% distinguished in 2003. Our goal is to move all students in this population to meeting or exceeding the standards.

A look at our data makes one realize FES’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 Frankford Elementary received a Superior School Award based on Delaware School Accountability Ratings in 2003.

FES's ability to use assessment data to understand and improve student and school performance

Assessment data is the catalyst for problem solving and decision-making at FES. "Data Day" is a school-wide in-service event, which compels FES staff to examine the evidence of student progress. In June, the staff spent a day analyzing the 2003 DSTP data that was released in May. These results were compared to in house assessments and report card grades. 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? What does the disaggregated data imply? Are we meeting the instructional needs of all student populations? Are our in-house assessments and report card grades aligned with the state standards? The outcome of this day were school-wide goals focusing on reading and math instruction as well as better alignment of assessments and grading practices with the content standards. Grade levels articulated expectations about reading and math in relation to the state standards. Enhancing reading and math skills, and the need for additional training in these areas, became goals for staff development. Professional development needs surfaced for assistance in text-based writing, answering extended responses in math, and guided reading. An in-service was held in August to present guided reading strategies. Plans were developed to expand grade level and school-wide reading opportunities. Accelerated Reader and before school and after school reading programs, focusing on identified weaknesses, were established. Additional instructional time was allocated to reading and math with better integration into content areas. Data collection and analysis is continued more informally at weekly grade level meetings as teachers examine students' daily progress. Theme tests, math unit assessments, and writing assessments are benchmarks to determine the direction of instruction. This data is shared at grade level meetings and quarterly Promotion and Review meetings. 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, Computer Curriculum Corporation (CCC), and the Work Sampling Portfolio for PK, K and 1. Data is disaggregated and analyzed with consideration of needs for students, curriculum, instructional strategies, teacher support, and instructional time.

Frankford Elementary School's Communication of Student Performance

FES 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 FES to schools throughout the state. Moreover, student performance data is presented during public session to the Board of Education in late summer. 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 PTO meeting, family literacy night, and during parent conferences. School staff shares results at community meetings. The FES school profile is annually distributed to parents and is available to the community. The school's monthly newsletter provides student performance details. The school's website also contains information about testing results. FES's School Improvement Committee, which is comprised of parents, community members, and staff, uses data as it plans and allocates funds for the succeeding year to reflect student performance results. Classroom teachers keep parents informed of progress through having 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. The principal and assistant principal also conference with each student in grade 3 and 5 individually and share information from their cumulative folder and the results of the DSTP.

Sharing our Successes with Others

First, FES 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, FES has received calls and subsequently has welcomed teachers and administrators who request to visit classrooms in order to discern what FES’s teachers are doing to effect such dramatic academic growth, especially with such a diverse population, and over 76% free and reduced lunch status. Additionally, staff members are willing to conduct professional development sessions in nearby schools, throughout the state, and at national conference. This is already a current practice as teachers present on such topics as ESOL instructional strategies, implementing an NCTM standards based math program, early intervention programs such as Boost Up and Project Village, Dimensions of Learning, and strategies for closing the achievement gap. We will continue our practice of providing inservice training to local day care centers to share the strategies that we have found to be successful with our students. The principal is on the Board of the Delaware Principals’ Academy and has presented, and will continue to share, the schools’ successes. She has also shared the schools’ strategies throughout the state at events sponsored by the University of Delaware and Delaware State University on closing the achievement gap. The school’s progress is currently being used for at least two dissertation proposals and will thus be shared with a vast community of learners. FES with its 76% free/reduced lunch rate and its 64% minority population, has gained renown for its students’ accomplishments.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Frankford Elementary School’s Curriculum

Frankford Elementary’s curriculum has been designed to reflect Delaware’s rigorous content area standards. At its core is a balanced literacy program published by Houghton Mifflin. Students 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, FES 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 related to numerous topics and concepts. In order to enrich their students’ learning experiences, FES’s staff members have improved their instructional skills through participation in the Delaware Writing Project and the Delaware Reading Project. To ensure that all students are meeting the standards in reading, supplemental reading programs are available, such as Soar to Success, Early Success, Corrective Reading, Earobics, and Horizons.

Furthermore, the NSF-researched Math Trailblazers program (Kendall Hunt) has been implemented in all pre-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 FES. 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. Math lead teachers also provide demonstration lessons for their peers. Assessments are closely aligned with the state content standards. The math curriculum requires students to reflect and analyze data and explain their answers, much like the state assessment.

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, FES’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. District staff use Houghton Mifflin’s *We the People* curriculum, which they supplement with various materials and activities. Since Delaware’s high stakes accountability focuses on students’ reading achievement, teachers use the opportunity to integrate geography, civics, history, and economics standards through their reading materials. The district has invested in social studies-linked “tradebooks” for students’ instructional and recreational reading. A FES 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. Common features 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, FES’s students weekly engage in physical education, art, vocal and instrumental music, computer-assisted instruction, library, and guidance. Students who need additional learning opportunities are served by Title I reading assistants, ESOL teachers, two reading teachers, a computer teacher for individualized CCC math and reading instruction, and a special education department.

Frankford Elementary School's Reading Curriculum

The Delaware ELA content standards are our curriculum. A district committee with representative teachers from each elementary school examined the current reading research and narrowed the materials through a yearlong pilot. Houghton Mifflin's "Invitations to Literacy" was chosen. Invitations to Literacy uses a systematic and spiraling skills approach which integrates the LA standards of reading, writing, viewing, speaking, and listening. These materials allow the flexibility for the staff to tailor them to the needs of our diverse student population. It allows us to provide enriching, challenging thematic units. The core literature encourages a classroom community of diverse learners and doesn't relegate weaker readers to isolated groups. Houghton Mifflin becomes the focus of shared reading opportunities. Houghton Mifflin is the foundation, but is not exclusively our reading program. Through analysis of reading assessments that include fluency checks, sight word recognition surveys, comprehension measures and 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 and adopted Open Court Phonics into our prekindergarten to grade 3 reading program. Preschool and kindergarten also adopted Breakthrough to Literacy to give our students the visual, oral and kinesthetic approach needed for "at risk" students. Additional support programs are used to assist students who need a more structured approach to reading instruction. Supplemental programs include Horizons, Corrective, Early Success, and Soar to Success. HM theme tests were revised to align them more directly with Delaware Standards. Committees of teachers worked at increasing the number of interpretive and extended meaning questions and to enhance the writing assessments. Rubrics have been rewritten to reflect Delaware's expectations. Since students must read varied literary, informative, and technical genre with understanding by the end of third grade, FES staff has become more resourceful with time and instructional strategies. The need to integrate reading across content areas is facilitated by utilizing informative trade books, which correlate to the ELA standards. Through grants, teachers have expanded their in class libraries with leveled readers to provide a rich, varied assortment of books. Students at all grade levels, from kindergarten to grade five, participate in Accelerated Reader to promote their enjoyment of reading.

Accelerated Learning

Our staff seeks to provide instruction that allows all students to reach their fullest potential. This is a challenge in our area where 76% of the population is identified as low income and 27% LEP. One curricular facet devised to ensure student success is support programs monitored by a master schedule. Each teacher develops his/her schedule allocating 90 minutes for ELA and 60 minutes for mathematics instruction. Students who need additional assistance are pulled during part of the day for thirty minutes of small group instruction, outside of this core area of instruction. This serves two purposes. First, the teacher and the resource staff can then work with small groups of students on specific areas of weaknesses with differentiated strategies and materials. The composition of the groups can change depending on students' needs. Second, students are not missing instruction and students do not feel they are different from their peers. The staff uses instructional needs reports; assessment indicators, progress reports, and a school staff support process to initiate the steps to assist the student. The format and content vary by child. Some students receive support through interactions with one of 150 community mentors. Others receive reading intervention using SOAR, Early Success, Horizons, Corrective, Earobics, or instruction with special education teachers. The master schedule allows us to chart where students are, what services they are being given, which ones work and which don't. This enables us to better match the child with the curricular piece that best meets his/her needs. Technology has enhanced our ability to provide individualized instruction with academic software that includes Earobics and an integrated individually paced learning system in math and reading. Teachers, paras, a reading specialist, ESOL teachers, and reading teachers, create small-group support for students before school, during school and after school. The emphasis is on instruction which accelerates skill building in identified areas. This needs-focused learning equips our students with the skills and strategies to move forward. Our improved scores attest to the accomplishments of our ability to match the child to the curriculum piece needed to accelerate their learning. We host an after school intervention program during the winter and spring to assist with reading instruction, another after school program to assist with homework for ESOL students, and an after school program to provide low socio economic students with additional instrumental lesson time. The impact of music on student achievement has been well documented. "Bridges", our extended year program, provides students an additional 20 days of instruction in the summer. We provide full-day Kindergarten for all students, focusing on literacy and fine and gross motor skill development. These support curriculum pieces have helped "close the gap" for our students.

Instructional Methods to Improve Student Learning

FES 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 instructional plans. Instruction in the classroom utilizes and encourages 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 goals was for students to use more effective strategies when responding to questions. School-wide exposure to and adoption of R.A.R.E responses to answering questions (Restate the question, answer the question, give reasons, and explain the answer) and graphic organizers help reinforce strategies for learning while developing the students' understanding of text structures. Students learn best when individual learning styles and differences are addressed. 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. The use of direct teaching strategies to ensure understanding of various text structures and what good readers do is taught and reinforced in all content areas. Our organization facilitates the use of reciprocal teaching with students actively involved in peer modeling and teaching. Discovery through hands-on learning using cooperative groups is the instructional format associated with our math and science curriculums. Reinforcing student efforts, providing recognition and positive feedback are instructional strategies that are also reflected in many ways including class applause, notes to students, star student, kiss your brain, quarterly student recognition assemblies, Writers' Tea, "I Saw It," and the sharing of writing or projects with other groups.

Our Professional Development Plan and its Impact on Student Achievement

Professional development activities were determined by school and district goals. Our staff development plan addressed school, grade level and personal goals. The School Improvement Committee considered the school's needs and made sure that the necessary resources were allocated to achieve them. Professional development activities were planned that helped teachers engage in professional activities during 2002-2003. Our main goal this year was to close the achievement gaps between populations in the school. We accomplished this by aligning professional development with our needs. Our plan was designed to improve instructional practices, strengthen curriculum and content knowledge, and meet individual student needs in diverse classroom settings. A major curricular goal was improving student reading. To achieve this, a workshop was provided by a national speaker in the area of guided reading. An inservice was held in October that focused on infusing guided reading strategies into the language arts block and utilizing available resources. Each student completed a STAR reading assessment, fluency checks, and a reading comprehension test which required extended responses 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 reading was also shared during faculty and grade-level meetings by building staff. Inservice training was provided for text based reading and writing responses, how to benchmark and how to use leveled materials. Staff members participated in book club. Our staff members received further support by utilizing a lead teacher to provide classroom instruction. Staff members continued their pursuit of these goals by attending off-site workshops on an individual or grade-level basis. The Dimensions of Learning model has been a focus for six years. This year we have concentrated professional development on improving teachers' use of questioning to enhance learning and DOL # 2, declarative and procedural knowledge. Teacher observations focused on DOL strategies and monitoring of improved questioning techniques. Curriculum mapping training sessions have been held with lead teachers providing additional training for the staff. Teachers were involved in monthly Math Club sessions where they collaborated on mathematics instruction. Smithsonian Science training, that promoted discovery based learning, was also available. A district-wide inservice was held that addressed closing the achievement gap.

Delaware State Testing Program
A Criterion-Referenced Assessment

This overview applies to:	Table 1a	Reading Grade 3	page 15
	Table 1b	Reading Grade 5	page 16
	Table 2a	Math Grade 3	page 17
	Table 2b	Math Grade 5	page 18
	Table 3a	Cut Scores Reading	page 19
	Table 3b	Cut Scores Math	page 20

*On the following tables the subgroup data with less than 15 students tested were marked with an asterisk.

*In all of the tables, the data is shown in the percentages of students who achieved at or above that level.

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

Edition/publication year: 1996 Publisher: Harcourt Educational Measurement Systems

*Please note: In 1997- 1999 Limited English Speaking Students were given a one-time exemption from the state assessment if they had not been in the country for at least 3 years. In 2001 this changed to a one-year exemption. With No Child Left Behind no groups were allowed to be exempted from the Delaware State Assessment program. Since Frankford Elementary School houses the LEP students for the southern end of our school district this data reflects these guidelines. These students were given the LAS test instead of the State Assessment.

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

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

DSTP Student Performance Levels		
Level	Category	Description
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 scores for DSTP appear in the tables on pages 19-20. The indicated numbers represent 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.

Frankford Elementary School - Table 1a
Delaware State Testing Program- Reading -Grade 3

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

Year Administered	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing Month	March	March	March	April	April	May
READING SCORES Grade 3						
Total						
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	98.11	97.5	94.88	81.55	70.58	71.43
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	92.45	97.5	84.62	72.32	60.29	61.43
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	39.62	35	35.9	18.47	17.64	21.43
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	16.98	17.5	23.08	4.62	5.88	10
Number of Students Tested	53	42	39	65	68	70
Percent of total students tested	92	88	95	97	94	97
Number of students excluded *	4	5	2	2	4	2
Percentage of students excluded	8	12	5	39	6	3
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. Low income (Number in population)	36	26	15	41	44	32
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	97.23	96.14	93.33	73.18	59.09	53.3
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	94.45	96.14	73.33	63.42	47.73	37.5
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	38.89	30.76	33.33	7.32	9.09	0
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	13.89	15.38	20	2.44	2.27	0
Low Income Percentile Rank	74	73	75	41	32	28
2. Not Low income (Num. in Population)	17	14	24	24	24	38
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	*	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	100	*	95.84	95.83	91.66	86.84
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	88.24	*	91.67	87.5	83.33	81.58
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	41.18	*	37.5	37.5	33.33	39.47
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	23.53	*	25	8.33	12.5	18.42
Not Low Income Percentile Rank	78	*	87	74	59	70
3. African American (Num. in Population)	26	20	13	26	30	35
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	*	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	100	100	*	84.5	66.7	57.2
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	88.4	90	*	65.3	53.4	40.1
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	38.4	15	*	3.8	13.4	5.8
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	11.5	5	*	0	6.7	2.9
African American Percentile Rank	73	27.13	*	42.4	41.5	36
4. White (Number in Population)	22	18	20	31	32	33
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	100	94.4	100	90.3	78.2	84.8
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	100	94.4	90	87.1	68.8	81.8
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	45.4	55.5	45	35.5	25	39.4
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	22.7	33.3	25	9.7	6.2	18.2
White Percentile Rank	81	82	89	62.9	49.52	65.5
STATE SCORES						
Total						
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	91.84	91.05	88.29	89.64	83.97	78.04
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	79.31	79.3	74.11	76.80	68.62	61.54
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	29.63	28.77	23.36	24.23	20.88	15.89
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	14.28	13.64	10.36	12.37	9.19	6.77
State Percentile Rank	67	66	64	62	57	52
School Percentile Rank	75	74	83	54	41	51

* There were not enough Hispanic students enrolled to have any significant data.

Frankford Elementary School - Table 1b
Delaware State Testing Program- Reading -Grade 5

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

Year Administered	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing Month	March	March	March	April	April	May
READING SCORES Grade 5						
Total						
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	97.5	95.56	97.43	74.54	86.31	69.74
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	90	86.67	94.87	58.18	68.5	52.63
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	35	31.11	43.59	20	20.55	13.16
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	5	13.33	20.51	9.09	15.07	2.63
Number of Students Tested	40	45	39	55	73	76
Percent of total students tested	98	93	97	96	96	97
Number of students excluded *	1	3	1	2	3	2
Percentage of students excluded	2	7	3	4	4	3
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. Low income (Number in population)						
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	21	25	16	30	43	50
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	95.24	92	93.75	53.33	83.73	58
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	80.95	84	87.5	33.33	60.47	34
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	9.52	12	25	3.33	6.98	2
Low Income National Percentage	4.76	8	12.5	0	2.33	0
2. Not Low income (Num. in Population)						
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	19	20	23	25	30	26
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	100	100	100	100	90	92.31
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	100	100	100	100	80	88.46
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	99.99	90	100	88	40	34.61
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	63.15	55	56.52	40	33.33	7.69
Not Low Income National Percentage	5.26	20	26.09	20	70	67
3. African American (Num. in Population)						
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	18	20	15	23	34	35
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	94.6	90	93.3	65.1	85.3	57.2
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	77.9	75	93.3	43.4	64.7	34.3
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	22.3	10	40	8.6	17.6	5.7
African American National Percentage	5.6	5	20	4.3	8.8	0
4. White (Number in Population)						
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	21	24	20	27	36	35
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	100	95.9	100	85.1	91.7	80
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	95.3	91.7	100	81.4	75	71.4
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	47.7	50	50	33.3	22.2	20
White National Percentage	4.8	20.8	25	14.8	19.4	5.7
STATE SCORES						
Total						
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	92.89	90.98	84.05	85.75	79.56	75.34
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	78.5	77.97	66.95	69.27	62.81	59.04
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	23.44	21.97	18.23	18.3	14.3	15.82
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	8.66	9.41	8.08	6.84	6.02	5.98
State National Percentage	59	59	57	56	53	50
School National Percentage	72	62	70	47	54	47

* There were not enough Hispanic students enrolled to have any significant data.

Frankford Elementary School - Table 2a
Delaware State Testing Program- Math -Grade 3

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

Year Administered	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing Month	March	March	March	April	April	May
MATH SCORES Grade 3						
Total						
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	95.24	95.75	88.88	86.5	80.89	72.86
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	80.95	76.6	77.77	76.92	61.77	65.72
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	22.22	25.54	37.77	20	29.42	31.43
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	0	4.26	13.33	3.08	14.71	7.14
Number of Students Tested	63	47	45	65	68	70
Percent of total students tested	100	100	93	94	94	97
Number of students excluded *	0	0	3	4	4	2
Percentage of students excluded	0	0	7	6	6	3
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. Low income (Number in population)	43	30	19	41	44	32
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	92.48	93.33	84.22	80.49	72.73	50.02
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	78.53	76.66	73.69	68.29	50	40.64
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	18.6	23.33	31.58	14.63	18.18	12.51
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	0	3.33	15.79	0	6.82	3.13
Low Income Percentile Rank	76	84	88	61	56	40
2. Not Low income (Num. in Population)	20	17	26	24	24	38
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	100	100	92.31	95.83	95.83	92.1
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	85	76.47	80.77	91.66	83.33	86.84
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	30	29.41	42.31	29.16	50	47.37
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	0	5.88	11.54	8.33	29.17	10.53
Not Low Income Percentile Rank	77	85	92	83	80	89
3. African American (Num. in Population)	30	23	16	26	30	35
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	93.3	95.7	93.8	73.1	80	57.2
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	73.3	78.3	68.8	65.4	53.3	45.8
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	13.3	17.4	25	7.7	23.3	11.5
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	0	0	6.2	0	13.3	2.9
African American Percentile Rank	71	78	67.4	49	57.1	45.3
4. White (Number in Population)	24	21	22	31	32	33
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	95.8	90.5	86.4	96.8	81.3	87.8
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	91.6	76.2	86.4	93.6	71.9	84.8
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	33.3	38.1	50	32.3	34.4	54.5
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	0	9.5	18.2	6.5	15.6	12.1
White Percentile Rank	81	23.8	89	72	61.3	81.1
STATE SCORES						
Total						
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	89.86	88.86	86.96	89.55	82.5	75.33
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	73.6	72.03	71.32	72.73	63.54	54.76
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	24.96	26.17	21.89	20.79	14.53	8.9
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	6.78	6.75	6.03	5.42	3.66	1.84
State Percentile Rank	74	73	70	68	59	53
School Percentile Rank	76	84	91	68	65	71

* There were not enough Hispanic students enrolled to have any significant data.

Frankford Elementary School - Table 2b
Delaware State Testing Program- Math -Grade 5

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

Year Administered	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing Month	March	March	March	April	April	May
MATH SCORES Grade 5						
Total						
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	91.06	86.43	77.78	76.37	80.83	64.47
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	80.35	74.57	66.67	61.82	57.54	52.63
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	17.85	18.64	31.48	18.18	16.44	10.52
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	7.14	11.86	14.81	9.09	8.22	2.63
Number of Students Tested	56	69	54	55	73	76
Percent of total students tested	100	96	98	96	96	97
Number of students excluded *	0	3	1	2	3	2
Percentage of students excluded	0	4	2	4	4	3
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. Low income (Number in population)	33	37	27	30	43	50
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	87.88	83.79	62.97	56.66	74.42	44
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	69.7	67.57	51.85	43.33	41.86	36
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	3.03	5.41	18.52	3.33	0	8
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	3.03	5.41	7.41	3.33	0	2
Low Income Percentile Rank	56	71	86	37	42	30
2. Not Low income (Num. in Population)	23	22	27	25	30	26
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	95.65	90.91	92.59	100	90	84.62
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	95.65	86.36	81.48	84	80	84.62
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	39.13	40.91	44.44	36	40	15.39
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	13.04	22.73	22.22	16	20	3.85
Not Low Income Percentile Rank	91	88	92	88	83	77
3. African American (Num. in Population)	23	26	21	23	34	35
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	91.2	80.7	71.4	60.8	76.4	51.5
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	69.5	57.6	57.1	43.4	55.8	37.2
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	4.3	3.8	28.5	4.3	5.8	2.9
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	4.3	0	9.5	4.3	2.9	0
African American Percentile Rank	58	58	89	37.4	48.9	37.5
4. White (Number in Population)	25	30	27	27	36	35
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	96	89.9	85.1	85.1	88.9	74.2
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	92	86.6	74	74	61.1	68.5
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	36	33.3	37	33.3	25	17.1
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	12	23.3	18.5	14.8	13.9	5.7
White Percentile Rank	78.8	88	91	67.8	61.3	61.2
STATE SCORES						
Total						
<i>At or above</i> Well Below the Standard (1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>At or above</i> Below the Standard (2)	88.66	84.88	80.59	83.01	77.76	73.48
<i>At or above</i> Meets the Standard (3)	70.99	67.17	62.2	62.07	55.4	52.28
<i>At or above</i> Exceeds the Standard (4)	17.81	17.57	14.53	13.43	11.28	10.07
<i>At or above</i> Distinguished (5)	6.64	7.39	4.89	5.85	3.99	3.36
State Percentile Rank	70	68	64	62	56	53
School Percentile Rank	74	79	90	64	61	47

* There were not enough Hispanic students enrolled to have any significant data.

Cut Scores DSTP Table 3a
Grade 3 Reading

The scores in the Cut Scores tables refer to the cut points set forth by a committee under the guidance of Harcourt Educational Measurement. The specific grade level tables show how Frankford Elementary School's scores compared to the State of Delaware. The levels in which the students performed can then be measured by using the Cut Scores tables.

Cut Scores- DSTP Reading Grade 3 (lowest scaled score a student can earn and still be within the indicated performance level)				
Well Below the Standard	Below	Meets	Exceeds	Distinguished
<386	387	411	465	482

Grade 3	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Frankford Elementary	457.70	452.65	448.15	425.86	415.15	420.61
State	442.49	440.74	435.17	437.19	428.13	420.88

Grade 5 Reading

Cut Scores- DSTP Reading Grade 5 (lowest scaled score a student can earn and still be within the indicated performance level)				
Well Below the Standard	Below	Meets	Exceeds	Distinguished
<426	427	451	508	529

Grade 5	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Frankford Elementary	490.78	485.56	496.62	463.60	470.93	450.71
State	479.73	478.13	468.88	470.16	462.54	459.98

Cut Scores DSTP Table 3b
Grade 3 Math

The scores in the Cut Scores tables refer to the cut points set forth by a committee under the guidance of Harcourt Educational Measurement. The specific grade level tables show how Frankford Elementary School's scores compared to the State of Delaware. The levels in which the students performed can then be measured by using the Cut Scores tables.

Cut Scores- DSTP Math Grade 3 (lowest scaled score a student can earn and still be within the indicated performance level)				
Well Below the Standard	Below	Meets	Exceeds	Distinguished
<381	382	407	464	499

Grade 3	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Frankford Elementary	433.38	438.23	443.73	429.20	432.50	429.53
State	434.79	434.08	430.03	431.08	421.23	411.04

Grade 5 Math

Cut Scores- DSTP Math Grade 5 (lowest scaled score a student can earn and still be within the indicated performance level)				
Well Below the Standard	Below	Meets	Exceeds	Distinguished
<423	424	449	503	525

Grade 5	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Frankford Elementary	473.38	471.10	469.57	460.67	459.47	440.91
State	468.43	465.99	459.98	460.25	453.71	449.84

Delaware State Assessment Program
Off- Grade Testing

This overview applies to:	Table 4a	Reading- Grades 2 and 4	page 22
	Table 4b	Math- Grades 2 and 4	page 23

Grade: 2 and 4 (off-grade testing years) Test: Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year: 1996 Publisher: Harcourt Educational Measurement Systems

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. Both the district and the state used the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT-9) for off-grade testing. The reading comprehension subtest and the math problem solving subtest are a portion of our current DSTP testing program. For its first year (2001-2002), there was no summary or disaggregated data prepared by the state.

Frankford Elementary School- Table 4a
SAT-9 Reading Comprehension Grades 2 and 4

Grade 2	2002-2003	1999-2000
Testing Month	March	April
Reading Comprehension		
Mean NCE Score	62.4	53.2
Number of Students Tested	61	56
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%

Grade 4	2002-2003	1999-2000
Testing Month	March	April
Reading Comprehension		
Mean NCE Score	55.5	47.9
Number of Students Tested	49	58
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%

Frankford Elementary School- Table 4a
SAT-9 Math Grades 2 and 4

Grade 2	2002-2003	1999-2000
Testing Month	March	April
Math		
Mean NCE Score	61.6	58.8
Number of Students Tested	61	56
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%

Grade 4	2002-2003	1999-2000
Testing Month	March	April
Math		
Mean NCE Score	61	54.3
Number of Students Tested	49	58
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%