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ABSTRACT

Positive Outcomes Charter School (POCS) welcomed its first students 17 years ago. The charter school was founded by a group of educators and physicians who recognized that students struggling with mental health issues were an underserved population in desperate need of a small school setting that was not tied to district rules or geographic boundaries. Positive Outcomes, which serves students in the seventh through the twelfth grades, has evolved from its first days; however, our core mission of providing individualized attention for students at risk of academic failure has never wavered.

The charter that governs POCS under the Delaware Department of Education authorizer has been renewed three times. At each renewal, the school received commendations for its work with a challenging population. As a charter school, POCS was able to apply for and receive a waiver for charter school student achievement standards because of its service commitment to students at risk of academic failure. The school began with a small population, and remains the smallest charter school in the state. Currently, our charter allows for 120 students.

Throughout the history of POCS, we have worked tirelessly to serve as a magnet for students demonstrating dramatic academic deficits in addition to identified special needs in education. School districts throughout Kent County regularly recommend POCS to families as another setting for public education. Currently, POCS draws students from all three counties, with some students commuting more than an hour and a half daily to attend the school.

What brings families to the school is its attention to the individual needs of students. Small class sizes, assistive technology for all, a focus on collaboration and teamwork of all members of the school community, and a highly qualified staff with special education experience are the primary reasons that families choose POCS. What also draws families are the dramatic gains in both academic confidence and capacity of students as demonstrated by gains on standardized assessments and other indicators. Today, nearly 100% of the students attending the school have identified needs ranging from federally mandated 504 or individualized education plans to mental health issues and challenges. Almost all new students arrive with academic deficits.

MISSION
Our mission is to provide an opportunity for children to learn in a safe, caring, respectful environment, where their individuality is valued and their individual needs are addressed.

VISION
POCS strives to provide an individualized educational opportunity that provides each student with core knowledge skills needed to excel in the world.

This year-end report covers the 2012-2013 school year. It is intended to be used by the Board of Directors to formally evaluate the school’s performance. It will also serve as the document to report our progress to the Department of Education. Whenever possible, statistical data has been included and compared to State data, or to data from the previous school year.

Copies of this report are distributed to the Board of Directors of POCS, the faculty and staff of the school, the Secretary of Education and other Department of Education leaders, and others upon request. A copy of this report will be posted on the school’s website at www.positiveoutcomescs.org and will be available to all of our parents.
Academic performance:

What are the school’s academic performance outcomes that will demonstrate student growth, proficiency, and college and career readiness levels as measured by the Performance Framework? Provide an analysis of strengths, challenges, and opportunities for growth in these areas.

An Alternative Academic Performance Framework that directly correlates with the unique mission of our school measures our academic performance. This Alternative Academic Performance Framework was developed by the Delaware Department of Education with assistance from Public Impact.

Based on the 2012-2013 Delaware Alternative Academic Performance Framework, POCS has been rated as Does Not Meet Standard. This is the same rating that the school received during the 2011-2012 school year. This report highlights areas that the school is making progress to receive a rating of “Meets Standard” during our next charter renewal term.

Over the past year, POCS has shown areas of significant growth that illustrates the hard work and dedication of our faculty, staff and students. It is our expectation that student growth and achievement will continue to be an area in which our school excels. It is important to note that our target population includes students who are experiencing academic difficulties in a traditional school setting.

A majority of Students who enroll in our school are coming with greater and greater levels of academic deficiency in basic skills. This is characteristic of our target population. Academically, our students start their journey with us, performing significantly lower than students in traditional public schools. Given the academic deficiency of incoming students, it is an ongoing challenge to improve achievement.

Our entire school program is focused on stopping the rate of decline and erasing deficits for all of our students. Every program, policy and practice is focused on this goal. Our processes are individualized for each individual student. When viewing this information it is best to remember the student population that we serve is at risk.

**Measure 1 - Student Progress Over Time (Growth)**

For our school, growth is one of the most important indicators of our success and achievement. While most of our students arrive with different levels of proficiency, our number one goal is moving them closer to standard or if they are already meeting standards to continue growing. This requires a strong focus on growth and remediation of skills. The data from 2011-2013 demonstrates the areas that we are showing improvement. It is our belief that our data points will continue to show increases each year until we meet the standard for all sections of growth.

**Measure 1a. Are students meeting their fall to spring instructional scale growth targets?**

Percentage of Students Meeting Growth Targets.
When looking at the percentage of students meeting their fall to spring scale score growth targets, it is clear that this is an area that our school continues to show improvement. The data from Measure 1a shows that the percentage of students meeting growth targets increased 13.8% in Mathematics and 13.3% in ELA. The growth for ELA meets the standard and Mathematics missed the standard by 1.8%.

**Measure 1b. Are lowest-performing students in the school meeting their fall to spring instructional scale score growth targets?**

*Percentage of Students in the Lowest Quartile Meeting Growth Targets.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure 1b looks at the growth of the lowest-performing students in our school. The data from this measure shows the diverse challenges that our school faces. The performance of the lowest-performing students does not correlate to results of Measure 1a. The Mathematics growth of our lowest quartile of students increased 18.3% over the last two years, exceeding the standard. ELA growth of our lowest quartile of students does not match this performance. ELA data for Measure 1b shows that this group does not meet the standard and also has not changed over the past two years. Although, we are showing significant overall improvement in ELA; we must refine our intervention programs to work with the lowest quartile of students.

**Measure 1c. Are students making enough annual growth to maintain or achieve proficiency status within 3 years or by 10th grade?**

*Alternative framework targets applied.*

*Percentage of Students Making Sufficient Growth.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure 1c looks at the sufficient growth to maintain or achieve proficiency within 3 years or by 10th grade. This data point shows improvement in ELA but not in Mathematics. ELA performance for this area showed a 17% improvement and is now meeting the standard. Mathematics performance showed a 2.7% decrease and is below the standard.

**Measure 2 – Student Achievement (Status)**
Measure 2a. Are students achieving proficiency on state examinations in math and reading?

Alternative framework methodology applied.¹

School Proficiency Scores, State Comparison Averages and Percentiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject and Year</th>
<th>School Prof %</th>
<th>Special Population School Average</th>
<th>Special Population 90th Percentile</th>
<th>Special Population 20th Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math, 2011-12</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math, 2012-13</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA, 2011-12</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA, 2012-13</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2013 State Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) were 70.0% for Reading and 70.2% for Mathematics.

POCS has always strived to show improvement in our school’s academic performance compared to similar schools with similar student compositions. This indicator compares our school to several comparison schools. The data presented illustrates that our school is meeting the standard in both Mathematics and ELA. ELA proficiency percentages showed significant increases (+18.7). This matches overall reading performance over the last two years.

While we are meeting the standard in mathematics, we have seen a decrease in the percentage of students meeting proficiency (-8.4%). Our mathematics program struggled during the 2012-2013 school year. One of our two mathematics teachers was replaced in February due to poor performance. At the same time that we hired a new mathematics teacher, we also added a Math Specialist to our team. It is our

¹ Comparison schools included in the 2a. alternative analysis:

| Brennan School† | John G. Leach† | Positive Change (Parkway Academy) |
| Camelot Non-Secure Detention † | Kent County Community School† | Providence Corporation† |
| Carver Center | Kent County Alternative School | Richardson Park Learning Center† |
| Central School | Kent County Secondary ILC Program† | Sarah Pyle Academy |
| Charlton School | Lake Forest ILC | School for the Deaf |
| Chris Sturmfels Youth Center† | Laurel Secondary ILC † | Seaford House Treatment |
| Cleveland White School† | Lewes Day Treatment Center | Silver Lake Treatment |
| Delaware Day Treatment Center† | Meadowood Program† | Smyrna Intensive Learning Center† |
| Douglass School | New Castle County Detention Center | Stevenson House |
| DSCYF | New Castle School | Sussex Consortium |
| Ferris School | Northeast Treatment | Terry Psychiatric |
| First State School | People’s Place II – Townsend NSD† | The Wallin School† |
| Grace and Snowden School | People’s Place Non-Secure Detention† | Western Sussex Academy*** |
| Howard T. Ennis† | | |

*Delaware Day Treatment Center was not included in the 2010-11 2a analysis, because there was no available 2010-11 data for this school.

**There was only available Math data for Lewes Day Treatment Center in 2010-11; it is not included in the Reading analysis for 2010-11.

***Western Sussex Academy was not included in the 2011-12 2a analysis, because there was no available 2011-12 data for this school.

†Comparison school added for 2012-13 analysis.
expectation that this new mathematics team will show growth and increased proficiency during the 2013-2014 school year.

**Measure 2b. Are students in demographic subgroups achieving proficiency on state examinations in math and reading?**

*Alternative framework methodology applied.*

### Low Socio-Economic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject and Year</th>
<th>School Proficiency Rate</th>
<th>State Average Proficiency Rate</th>
<th>State Proficiency Rate at 90th Percentile</th>
<th>State Proficiency Rate at 20th Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math, 2011-12</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math, 2012-13</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA, 2011-12</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA, 2012-13</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2013 State Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) were 59.2% for Reading and 60.0% for Mathematics.

The performance of our students classified as Low Socio-Economic status matches similar performance in other measures. In ELA there was an increase in proficiency rates (+21%) and in mathematics there was a decrease in proficiency rates (-12.5%). In addition both groups are not meeting the standard, with mathematics being far below the standard.

It is expected that overall system improvements will yield results in this measure in the future. The school does not identify specific subgroups in need of assistance. Instead, our school focuses on every student making progress.

### Students with Disabilities (Weighted by Disability Level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject and Year</th>
<th>School Proficiency Rate</th>
<th>State Average Proficiency Rate</th>
<th>State Proficiency Rate at 90th Percentile</th>
<th>State Proficiency Rate at 20th Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math, 2011-12</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math, 2012-13</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA, 2011-12</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA, 2012-13</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2013 State Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) were 41.4% for Reading and 41.8% for Mathematics.

The performance of our students classified as Students with Disabilities (SWD) in both ELA and Mathematics does not meet standard. ELA performance is the closest to meeting standards. ELA proficiency percentages of SWD increased 16% over the last two years. In addition, the ELA measure is 1.8% from meeting the standard.

---

2 The alternative framework only evaluates Low Socio-Economic Status, Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners. Results for Students with Disabilities are weighted by disability level.
Mathematics performance lags behind ELA. The proficiency percentages of SWD decreased 0.2% over the last two years. This decrease is small; however, the State average proficiency rate increased 3.2% over the same time frame.

**Measure 2c. Are students performing well on state examinations in math and reading in comparison to selected schools?**

*Alternative framework methodology applied.*

School Proficiency Compared to Selected School Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject and Year</th>
<th>School Prof %</th>
<th>District Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math, 2011-12</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math, 2012-13</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA, 2011-12</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA, 2012-13</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure 2c demonstrates the performance of our school compared to schools that serve similar demographics of students. This is an area that highlights the success of our school and our students. Both ELA and Mathematics are exceeding the standard for this measure. Mathematics (+20.1%) and ELA (+41%) are exceeding the comparison school proficiency rates.

**Measure 2d. Are students performing well on state examinations in math and reading in comparison to similar schools in the state?**

*Alternative framework methodology applied.*

School Proficiency Compared to Similar Schools Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject and Year</th>
<th>School Prof %</th>
<th>Similar Schools Prof%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math, 2011-12</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math, 2012-13</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA, 2011-12</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA, 2012-13</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Schools included in the 2011-12 2c. analysis: Charlton School, Delaware Day Treatment Center, Kent County Alternative School, Lake Forest ILC, Stevenson House.

4 Schools included in the 2012-13 2c. analysis: Charlton School, Delaware Day Treatment Center, Kent County Alternative School, Kent County Community School, Kent County Secondary ILC Program, Lake Forest ILC, Milford ILC, People’s Place Non-Secure Detention, Providence Corporation, Smyrna Intensive Learning Center, Stevenson House.

*Alternative framework methodology considers disability level in addition to Low Socio-Economic Status, English Language Learners, and Race when constructing the similar schools comparison.*
Performance on Measure 2d matches performance in other areas presented above. Mathematics and ELA performance on this measure does not meet the standard with Mathematics being far below the standard. Reading proficiency percentages increased while mathematics proficiency percentages decreased. It is expected that performance in this area will increase over the next year to show gains.

**Measure 3 – State and Federal Accountability**

**Measure 3a. Did the school make AYP?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AYP Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POCS did not make AYP for the 2012-2013 school year. Several factors impacted our performance when reviewing AYP calculations. One of the largest impacts on our school making AYP is the number of cells now applicable to our school. This was due to a change in the N size requirements that were changed with the ESEA flexibility waiver. Our school now was rated using 6 cells compared to 2 the previous school year.

As has been previously stated, our Mathematics performance did not match our gains in ELA. Using the original model, POCS met targets for 3 of 6 cells (50%). POCS ELA met targets for All Students, White or Caucasian and Students with Disabilities. Mathematics missed targets for All Students, White or Caucasian and Students with Disabilities.

Using the growth model, POCS met targets for 4 of 6 cells (66%). POCS ELA met targets for All Students, White or Caucasian and Students with Disabilities. Mathematics met the cell target for Students with Disabilities and missed targets for All Students, and White or Caucasian. This is an improvement over the previous year. During the 2011-2012 school year our school missed all targets using the growth model.

POCS did meet the expectations for other academic indicators. Our school met expectations for school attendance. POCS also met all expectations for participation in 6 of 6 cells.

It is our hope that as we continue to improve, the school will meet AYP expectations over the next few school years.

**Measure 4 – Post- Secondary Readiness**

**Measure 4a. Does students’ performance on the SAT reflect college readiness?**

Percentage of Students receiving a 1550 or better on the SAT
When POCS was founded 17 years ago, college enrollment was not a target that the school envisioned for our graduates. The prime goal for the students enrolled in our school was to obtain a high school diploma. This was our first mission, help them to finish school. This has changed. Post-secondary education is now our number one goal for all of our graduates. This presents some challenges. Many students who enroll in our school today do not see college as a possibility. Most report that they simply want to graduate. Our job is to change this perception.

SATs are new to our school. Previously, very few students wanted to take the test. The school day administration of the SAT is helping us change this behavior. As we increase our academic rigor, it is expected that the percentage of students scoring at 1550 or higher will increase.

Measure 4b. Are students graduating from high school?

As a school that serves a high-need at-risk population, meeting graduation rate expectations has proved problematic. This is due to many factors. The population that our school serves has historically had low graduation rates. This trend holds true in our school. Our school has also seen the increase in dropout rates over the last three years. We believe that this change matches an increase in our academic expectations for students. Many students who have dropped out reported that they dropped out because our school is now too hard or that we are asking them to do too much.

We have also seen an increase in students that require more than four years to graduate. Over the last three years an average of 4 students do not graduate by June of their senior year but do graduate by December of the following year.

It is our goal to increase our graduation rate. This rate is the slowest of all indicators to change.
DCAS Performance
During the 2012-2013 school year our students showed areas of growth throughout the year. Each grade level in both ELA and Mathematics showed improvement in the percentage of students who met proficiency expectations. The following chart outlines this growth.

ELA showed the greatest gains in our program. From the fall administration to the final spring administration the percentage of students meeting proficiency increased (7th grade +45%, 8th grade +27%, 9th grade +24% and 10th grade +34%). Mathematics did not match ELA performance but did show increases (7th grade +8%, 8th grade +15%, 9th grade +14% and 10th grade +13%).

In addition to increasing the percentage of students meeting proficiency expectations, our school seeks to decrease the percentage of students who are listed as being Well Below the Standard. Our goal is to have this percentage below last year’s results. For 2012-2013 we met this goal in 7 of our 8 areas. Each grade in ELA and Math decreased this percentage with the exception of 10th grade ELA which showed a 2% increase. The charts below illustrate this performance.
**Strengths, Challenges and Opportunities for Growth**

**Strengths**

POCS has demonstrated considerable growth over the past three years. Since being named a Partnership Zone School in 2010, our school has been dynamically revised to become a model school for providing services and supports to an at-risk population. Our school has developed programs that support the entire student. This starts with a holistic approach to servicing each student where his or her needs dictate. Each student in our school is educated one student at a time. Our school focuses on students in all we do. Everything is designed for them. We have never changed a program because it was too hard for staff to execute.

Another significant strength is our faculty and staff who work tirelessly to support our students. Each staff member in our school is hired to provide a caring and supportive environment for our students. Faculty and staff who do not meet expectations are replaced.

Our school utilizes Learning Focused Strategies (LFS) as our instructional model. Each faculty member receives regular professional development in implementing our model. The faculty receives frequent walk-through evaluations from our administration and also our Partnership Zone partners to ensure LFS is implemented with fidelity.

**Challenges and Opportunities for Growth**

The largest challenge that our school faces is continuing to demonstrate growth for our students. This is especially true in the area of reading. Over the last two years our school has experienced historic growth; however, at some point this trend will be difficult to maintain. We must accept that matching the same magnitude of improvement year over year will become harder and harder.

The next challenge will be to sustain the momentum around improvement. At a time when we are being successful, we must also continue to develop and grow and not become complacent. While we strive to reach 100% academic proficiency, we recognize that for our identified population this may be difficult.

Additionally, over the next school year our school will be working to implement Common Core State Standards and preparing to adapt to a new assessment. Unfortunately, changes in assessment tools have not been kind to our students. They begin to understand the nuances of each test and then it is changed. We are seeking to develop and utilize practice tests to help with this transition. Until full scale use of the new assessments begin, we will not know the full impact on our students.

Finally, we must improve our student performance in Mathematics. The 2013-2014 school year will see many changes to our Mathematics program. We have taken lessons learned from Reading and have applied them to Mathematics. We have hired a Mathematics Specialist to work with our Alpha (7-9) and Omega (10-12) mathematics teachers. We have purchased Math180 which is a sister program to Read180. This area must show growth over the next year.
Financial performance:

What are the school’s financial performance expectations that will demonstrate viability and sustainability as measured by the Performance Framework? Provide an analysis of strengths, challenges, and opportunities for growth in these areas.

Based on the 2011-2012 Delaware Financial Performance Framework, POCS has been rated as Meets Standard. This is the same rating that the school received during the 2010-2011 school year. Data for the 2012-2013 school year was not available for inclusion in this report; however, initial drafts indicate that we expect to be rated as Meets Standard again. Data will be updated as soon as possible following completion of the current framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1.a.</th>
<th>1.b.</th>
<th>1.c.</th>
<th>1.d.</th>
<th>2.a.</th>
<th>2.b.</th>
<th>2.c.</th>
<th>2.d.</th>
<th>OVERALL RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External auditors have audited our school finances annually and have found neither findings nor acts of impropriety. It is anticipated that this performance will continue into the future.

The school’s budget is reviewed and approved by the POCS Board of Directors. A monthly financial report is reviewed by the POCS Citizen’s Budget Oversight Committee (CBOC) and the POCS Board of Directors. This report is posted on our website as required. The school operates with a financial surplus to ensure fiscal viability and security.

**Strengths, Challenges, and Opportunities for Growth**

**Strengths**

The school’s financial future is secure. Our school has met or exceeded enrollment expectations for each of the last three years. A waiting list is maintained in the event of any unexpected openings. Every financial decision the school makes is based on sound and planned reasoning. Both the Board of Directors and the CBOC are involved in every decision.

**Challenges and Opportunities for Growth**

Funding for our school is a function of enrollment. As a small school (120 Students) our funding levels can vary from year to year. Additionally, our school is dependent on consistent local funding numbers. Shifts in the number of students from one school district or another can cause funding to increase or decrease. Occasionally, the local funding received from one school district can shift by $50,000 to $100,000. For a school of our size and mission, these fluctuations can seriously impact our budgets and planning. These shifts can also create challenges in maintaining a stable faculty and
support personnel. Our school has had to trim budgets as late as September 26th due to these shifts.

Organizational Performance:

What are the school’s performance expectations in meeting its organizational responsibilities including, but not limited to, administrative operations, reporting, and legal responsibilities as measured by the Performance Framework? Provide an analysis of strengths, challenges, and opportunities for growth in these areas.

Based on the 2011-2012 Delaware Organizational Performance Framework, POCS has been rated as Meets Standard. Data for the 2012-2013 school year was not available for inclusion in this report; however, we expect to be rated as Meets Standard again. Data will be updated as soon as possible following completion of the current framework.

The purpose of the Organizational Performance Framework is to communicate to the charter school and public the existing compliance-related expectations that the charter school is held to. The Organizational Performance Framework lists expectations the charter school is required to meet through state and federal law and the charter Performance Agreement. For each measure a school receives one of two ratings: “Meets Standard” or “Does Not Meet Standard.”

POCS has received a rating of Meets Standard in each of the assessed framework elements.

Strengths, Challenges, and Opportunities for Growth

Strengths

POCS has always strived to be in compliance with all requirements. We plan to continue this practice. We have strong internal capacity to continue to meet all organization expectations. Our leadership team, school board and staff strive to ensure that we are considered an exceptional organization.

Challenges and Opportunities for Growth

The greatest challenge that we face is the continuously changing charter landscape in Delaware. Each year brings new regulations, requirements and expectations. Outside pressures continue to utilize resources that should be solely focused on students and our school.

We have overcome many challenges during our existence, and will continue to do so.
Status of Conditions Placed Upon the Charter:

Include:

- A status update of any conditions imposed upon the school’s charter,
- Your plan to meet any conditions that are currently “not met”.

During the 2012-2013 school year the school did not have any conditions placed upon the Charter.
Student retention goals and targets:

The percentage of students who have re-enrolled from the prior year according to ESEA demographic categories.

93.3% (98 out of 105) of the non-graduating students enrolled at the end of the 2012-2013 school year reenrolled in our program for 2013-2014. The schools' demographics for reenrollment were as follows:

- Caucasian 68.69%
- African American 28.28%
- Native American 2.02%
- Pacific Islander 1.01%

A total of seven students did not reenroll in our program. Two students moved out of state, one student is placed out of state for treatment, one student dropped out, one student transferred to a homeschool, once student transferred to James H. Groves and one transferred back to the students home district.

The number of students who have left your school before the year is over or before the end of the charter school’s grade configuration per ESEA demographic category and provide a summary of why they left.

A total of six students left our school before the school year was over. Three students dropped out of school, two transferred to James H. Groves and one transferred to a homeschool.

The six withdrawals represent the following demographics:

- 83.3% (5 Students) Caucasian
- 16.6% (1 Student) African American

Percentage of students who did not pass from one grade to the next.

2% of students were not promoted to the next grade; however, most are completing make up credit programs to get back on track during the 2013-2014 school year.

Your plan to improve student retention and average daily attendance if less than your stated targets.

We do not see student retention as a major problem for our program. In general, once a student attends our school they typically remain with us.

Our goal is to always have our students reenroll in our program; however, some students who attend our school feel that they have made progress and desire to return.
to a tradition school environment. As a result, we do have students leave before our grades complete. We also have several students who attend school with us for grades 7 and 8 then transition to a traditional high school environment. We do not view these as students leaving our program, but students who we have helped to feel that they will be successful.

Innovation:

Positive Outcomes Charter School (POCS), was founded by a group of educators and physicians who recognized that students struggling with mental health issues were an underserved population in desperate need of a small school setting that was not tied to district rules or geographic boundaries.

What brings families to the school is its attention to the individual needs of students. Small class sizes, assistive technology for all, a focus on collaboration and teamwork of all members of the school community, and a highly qualified staff with special education experience are the primary reasons that families choose Positive Outcomes.

It is our belief that our entire program could be considered innovative. Our instructional supports, school climate and overall student support programs could and should be emulated in other school districts throughout our state. Additional features of our school that are considered innovative, unique or integral to fulfilling the school’s mission and philosophy include the following:

**Big Picture Learning Model School Integration**

With the integration of the Big Picture model into the POCS curriculum, our staff is committed to igniting the passions of the students through discovery and development of each student’s unique interests. Our students feel empowered and have the self-confidence to create their own success through a personalized learning environment and purposeful internships of their choice. With the support of advisors and community partners, our students graduate as confident and capable young adults, prepared to make their mark on the world.

Each student is part of an advisory, which serves almost as a family unit. For many of our students, the advisory is the most stable and welcoming environment in their lives. Advisors build strong relationships with their advisees and in many cases, the advisor as an advocate for the student is often the one adult that the students trust in his/her life. The advisor stays with the advisory for three grades to provide a consistent, positive adult mentor in the lives of our students. The advisor guides and helps the students to manage their Personalized Learning Plans, mapping the skills, requirements, and goals necessary for graduation. The student’s advisor also manages and assesses internships and projects, and helps students develop critical life skills.
In order to best serve each individual, advisors will work with each student to develop a Personalized Learning Plan that maps academic content to be learned to personal goals and interests, outlines specific plans to accomplish these goals, and serves as the driver for student assessment. Learning plans are developed with a strong partnership with parents and student, guided by the advisor to ensure that the student fulfills academic and credit requirements. The Personalized Learning Plan also identifies any necessary support services, including remediation and counseling needed by the student. Advisors and peers hold students accountable for making progress toward their identified goals through one-on-one conferences with students. Each student’s Personalized Learning Plan is reviewed with parents four times a year. The process also ensures that each student graduates from POCS with a solid post-high school plan.

Among other unique features of the BPL school design is that students are taught in the ‘real’ world through interest-based (called Learning Through Interest – LTI) internships. POCS students discover and explore their personal passions through research and real world experiences during these interest-based internships. Advisors and content-area specialists tie these passions into the academic content through integrated LTI projects.

In addition, we help students identify their passions through exposure to opportunities in the community via advisory-based field-trips, community service, and guest speakers. Learning is not confined to the school building or school day. We work with students to identify other avenues and opportunities to develop their skills.

**School Wide Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (SWPBIS)**

POCS first began developing their SWPBIS system during the Spring of 2004. Initial development and implementation involved: (a) an overview presentation of SWPBIS to all staff members, (b) school-wide vote to determine interest in implementation of SWPBIS (100% of staff said yes), (c) team training on SWPBIS features, (d) creation of a list of school-wide expectations (Be There, Be Ready, Be Responsible, Be Respectful, Be Your Best), (e) posting the school-wide expectations in hallways and parking lot, (f) modification of the school-wide acknowledgment system (student of the month and paw prints), and (g) modification of the discipline system (all discipline referrals handled by administrator). Despite initial momentum, POCS’ first attempt to implement SWPBIS lacked fidelity (e.g., missing several key features of SWPBIS, such as teaching, corrective consequence flowchart, data-based decision making, supplemental supports) and sustainability (e.g., SWPBIS procedures were not systematized in staff and student handbooks). Consequently, POCS did not achieve as much success with the SWPBIS as hoped, so focus shifted away from this approach.

Staff recognized that a change in the school’s approach and philosophy was needed in order to provide a more effective educational environment and positive culture. In the Winter of 2011, POCS partnered with the Devereux Center for Effective Schools (CES) in order to revamp POCS’ SWPBIS system. The goals of the partnership were to develop and implement a three tiered model of SWPBIS with high fidelity and in doing so reduce the number of office discipline referrals (ODRs) and suspensions.
Revamping of POCS’ SWPBIS system occurred in four distinct phases. During Phase I, evaluators from Devereux CES administered the school-wide evaluation tool (SET) to identify what elements of SWPBIS were currently in place, in need of improvement, and/or in need of development. In November of 2011, POCS received an overall SET mean score of 46% and the following subscale scores: 50% behavioral expectations defined, 30% behavioral expectations taught, 17% recognition system, 38% behavioral violations, 75% data-based decision making, 13% management, and 100% district support. This meant that POCS was partially implementing SWPBIS at this time. Data from the SET was used for targeted action planning.

During Phase II, a SWPBIS leadership team was formed. The team was and continues to be representative of the staff at the school. The administrators have been active participants on the team. The SWPBIS leadership team met and continues to meet twice a month to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate POCS’ SWPBIS system. Consultants from Devereux CES provided the team with training and technical assistance to assist the team with product development. Staff feedback was systematically sought and used in the development of these products. The team has developed and implemented many of the elements necessary for effective SWPBIS implementation, including: (a) defined behavioral expectations and rules that are posted throughout the school building, (b) system for teaching behavioral expectations (i.e., recorded presentations), (c) acknowledgment system for encouraging expected behaviors (i.e., pack bucks), (d) consistent of hierarchy of corrective consequences organized in a flowchart, (e) data-based decision making to identify students who may need higher levels of behavioral support (e.g., check-in/check-out for students with 2-5 ODRs).

During Phase III, the SWPBIS team organized the elements of SWPBIS in a staff manual. The manual was used to train staff on POCS’ SWPBIS system and encourage consistent implementation across staff. Details from the manual were also included in the staff handbook, student handbook, and school website. Staff were formally trained to implement the SWPBIS procedures in the Fall of 2012 and received a refresher training in the Fall of 2013.

In addition to focusing on the broader school implementation of SWPBIS, consultants from Devereux CES have assisted administration with implementation of SWPBIS in the classroom setting. In the Fall of 2012, staff received a training on the use of praise to increase task engagement. Observations were conducted to examine staff’s use of effective classroom management techniques. Data from these observations informed staff trainings and identified teachers in need of classroom consultation.

Finally, during Phase IV, evaluators from Devereux CES re-administered the SET to assess growth and fidelity of implementation. In February of 2013, POCS received an overall SET mean score of 96% and the following subscale scores: 100% behavioral expectations defined, 90% behavioral expectations taught, 100% recognition system, 88% behavioral violations, 100% data-based decision making, 94% management, and
100% district support. This meant that POCS was fully implementing SWPBIS with high fidelity. Data from the SET continues to be used for targeted action planning. Based on data and feedback from stakeholders, the team continues to develop and refine aspects of the SWPBIS system. Recent focus has been placed on the completion of lesson plans and teaching schedule.

Overall, the increase in proactive behavior management, as well as the improvement in implementation fidelity of SWPBIS, has had dramatic results. From the 2011-2012 school year to the 2012-2013 school year, (a) the average number of ODRs per day decreased by 43%, (b) the average number of in-school suspensions referrals per month decreased by 67%, (c) the average number of in-school suspension days per month decreased by 63%, (d) the average number of out-of-school suspensions referrals per month decreased by 67%, (e) the average number of out-of-school suspension days per month decreased by 77%. These outcomes far exceeded the goals that were initially set for SWPBIS implementation. For the 2013-2014 school year, the team hopes to further decrease ODRs and maintain low rates of in-school and out-of-school suspensions.

**Parent Support**

At POCS our parents are a significant piece of our school community. We believe in working closely with them to support the academic, behavior and social growth of their students. As part of our team, we create and foster a collaborative community designed to support relationships. Parents are invited to every meeting and function that we have. They are a critical part of our school governance and decision making process.

Our parent programs are also exemplary. We provide numerous avenues to foster and develop our parents as school leaders who are involved in the continued development of our program. Parents have the ability to sit on our school board, participate during our Parent Action Committee meetings, and to be a part of our school improvement efforts. From our opening week parent/student barbeque to our final Parent Action Committee of the year, our parents are an ever present component of our success and development.

We have also created a parent support group for our parents. This group, led by our school LCSW, meets the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Tuesday of each month and with the focus to complete support around our parent's needs. Our goal is to expand this program to include support for any Kent County parent. To compliment this, we have created a Parent Tool Box of Skill training designed to help parents support their students at home. This program is available online for any of our parents.

**Reading and Math Intervention**

In 2010, POCS made a decision to make reading a priority in our school. A systemic program was developed to respond to students who had significant deficits as well as creating a culture that put reading at the forefront of all students' learning plans.
A screening protocol was established to identify students who require Tier 2 or Tier 3 intervention. This protocol includes multiple data points such as previous DCAS, STAR Assessment (SRI was phased in this year) and teacher records. Tier 3 intervention consists of Read 180 labs administered and monitored by a certified Reading Specialist. Read 180 is a comprehensive system of curriculum, instruction, and assessment based on scientifically researched strategies proven to improve student achievement in reading. Tier 2 students participate in a dedicated period of 45 minutes of reading a day in the form of Sustained Silent Reading (SSR). The administration has dedicated monies each year to build a SSR library of books that are engaging, current, and varied in genre and readability so that all students have access to literature of their choice. Content area teachers administer tier 1 intervention during academic classes through differentiation and scaffolding to meet the diverse needs of all learners.

In working with our data coach, staff identified areas of literacy and mathematics deficiency based on DCAS data and developed strategies and processes to address those areas. These strategies were implemented school wide, in every content area. The reading specialist provided model lessons and coaching to content teachers to help with implementation and continuity among classes. The Reading Specialist also “pushes in” to classes to assist students with literacy strategies.

This model for reading intervention and remediation is duplicated this year in our math program. A Math Specialist will administer and monitor a Math 180 intervention program for Tier 3 students and develop a Tier 2 program for an additional 30 minutes of math time for students not in Math 180.

All advisors have test talks in which students and teachers jointly review assessment data and goals are set for subsequent tests. Strategies are developed with students to reach assessment goals. This allows students to take ownership of the assessment process.