

Board of Education Questions
Re: The District Improvement Plan Update Presentation on 10/4/2016

DIP Questions from Mrs. Gerber

1. page 3, #5 — I was hoping to get more clarification regarding what you mean by “the issue of expectations for student performance.” I was also curious about the reference to “focused discussions around grading,” and would love to get some insights regarding who Alison Zmuda is, and why she is someone the district might hire. (also wondering about costs, but perhaps that is more for our next BoE meeting where we are discussing the 17-18 budget?)
The secondary leadership teams have been discussing the issue of traditional grading and whether it is a true reflection of a student’s learning or rather incorporates behavioral data. This is part of a discussion on formative versus summative grading and is aligned to standards-based grading. We have only started the discussion, but in that discussion, we have uncovered many concerns about our traditional grading system and whether is best supports students’ and their learning. Allison Zmuda’s book entitled *Learning Personalized* is currently being studied by the high school leadership team because it incorporates many of the topics related to student learning and feedback that we have been discussing. Should everyone endorse her beliefs and strategies, we may seek her support in sharing her views with staff at both high school later this year.
2. page 3, #6 — who is on, or going to be on the Capstone committee? And when you mention that a recommendation will be presented to district leadership “later this year” I assume that means school year?
A committee made up of high school teachers, counselors and administrators met last year to start this conversation. Their thoughts and possible structures for the Capstone has been shared with high school Joint Leadership. The next report will be at the end of this school year.
3. page 5, #14 — wondering if there has been any interest from other districts regarding students coming to WFC. I also recall that there was discussion regarding a status update/report on WFC that would be given to the Board sometime this Fall — when should we expect that?
We are in the process of creating our materials for other districts (contracts, service agreements, etc.). We plan to open the dialogue with other districts beginning in the second quarter.
4. page 7, #20 — now that there is a new protocol for hiring new teachers, will there be follow up to see if the protocol is successful and/or if there should be any adjustments made?
The new hiring protocol was reviewed with administrators during the August Advance days. Administrators have provided feedback regarding the protocol. The committee will be reconvened sometime in the winter to review the suggestions and make any revisions.
5. page 9, #28 — how have the changes regarding paperless report cards, etc. been conveyed to parents?
The parents were notified by the building principals.

6. page 9, #31 — you may be planning on discussing this more fully at our next meeting, but just wondering how quickly the district will need to implement any new racial imbalance plan that is developed — as soon as 17-18? And are there any financial ramifications?

Yes, the new plan will be recommended by Dr. Tracy at the October 18 Board meeting and the Board will take action on the plan at the next meeting on November 15. The plan requires actions and has budget impact for the 2017-18 school year.

7. page 10, #32 — I recall Dr. Title mentioning exact numbers regarding residency cases — do you have those available? It might be helpful to share again, as this is a topic that has come up a few times, from both teachers and parents.

During the 2014 – 15 school year, our residency officer conducted 86 investigations which resulted in 42 students being withdrawn from the FPS due to non-residence in Fairfield.

During the 2015-16 school year, there were 45 residency investigations resulting in 25 students being withdrawn from FPS.

We believe that changes made to improve the registration process are leading to fewer non-residents enrolled in FPS, which is a preventative approach to reducing the cost of investigations and reducing the disruptive impact on student lives.

8. page 12, #1 — can we see the post-graduate survey? How long after graduation to alumni get them? What percentage of graduates have taken the survey each year?

Please see the attached survey. The surveys are conducted one year after graduation. For the Class of 2014 survey, the response rate at Ludlowe was 20.2% and at Warde 16.0% and for the Class of 2015, the response rate at Ludlowe was 18.2% and at Warde 18.3%.

9. page 15, #7 — I looked at the ACTFL website and it appeared to me that their levels were “Novice”, “Intermediate”, “Advanced”, “Superior” and “Distinguished”, and that both Advanced and Novice had three sub-levels (Low, Medium & High). So when the word “Proficient” is used as a measure here, what does that mean? And when “Advanced” is used, does that mean Low, Medium or High? Did all students taking level 20 take these exams? And is there any comparative data that gives some indication as to what our baseline data means?

PROFICIENT at the level 20 is **INTERMEDIATE LOW**. **ADVANCED** on the district report refers to students scoring **beyond PROFICIENT**, in other words, scoring beyond **INTERMEDIATE LOW**. (It does not mirror the ACTFL terminology and the ACTFL use of the word advanced.)

The baseline data can be defined by the proficiency descriptors and ‘can do’ statements - what a student can do at a particular target. The data is based on national standards and this is the first time we have used it. But our curriculum revision included a greater focus on speaking skills and we are interested in seeing if that emphasis will be reflected in the assessment results each year.

10. pages 16, 17, 2, #s 12 and 14 — I was curious as to what insights you had about the considerably lower math scores versus LA scores — is this a result of when the test is given, which occurs before students have had a chance to learn some of the math topics covered in the PSAT and SAT?

Please see the attached chart: PSAT and SAT Analysis.

11. page 22-23, #16 — while the CMT Science scores have all improved, the CAPT advanced #s have declined — do you have any insights regarding this? Will the new science curriculum help address this? The 2016 CAPT test incorporated some NGSS type questions for the first time. This is the state's way of assessing district readiness for the recommended three-year implementation timeline. While the at-or-above goal numbers are consistent, analysis shows that the decline in students at the advanced category is partially due to normal fluctuation of cohorts and partially due to the higher expectation of NGSS.
- Our new curriculum will be completely aligned with the new standards but the state will still be testing the majority of the older standards until at least 2020.

DIP Questions from Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly

12. p. 2 As we continue to modify implementation guides to reflect WL being added in K-2, how does this NOT impact the actual curriculum, to have more time devoted to the subject? And is this additional work primarily in language acquisition, or cultural acquisition?
- With the addition of grade 3 this year we are deepening the instructional focus of cultural and language acquisition. When grades K-2 are added we will need to examine the curriculum to determine what other skill areas can be added and at what time. We are in the process of reviewing other elementary World Languages programs and expect to have a more complete response on what is needed, including costs, at the Board's November meeting.
13. p. 2 The decision regarding requiring Earth Science....will this be based on the CAPT exam and our performance, or on what is considered the best program approach to science? (or something else?)
- Any recommendations regarding the new science curriculum will be based on a combination of what we believe to be best for students and what is being driven by the Next Generation Science Standards. The new standards include significantly more rigorous Earth Science content, which may no longer be considered appropriate for grade 9. Earth Science at this level requires science skills and prior knowledge that may not be something students have acquired until after grade 9.
14. p. 3 #5 Could you be ready to explain "the issue of expectations for student performance as a need" and the nature of the "focused discussion around grading"?
- To the first question – this is the need to calibrate teachers and implementation guides across grade levels so that there is an increased expectation in what students will know and be able to do (content and skills) as they enter the ensuing grades.
15. p. 3 #6 Would these performance-based assessments be taking the place of midterms or finals, or are they imbedded within the course?
- These performance-based assessments may eventually take the place of midterms, but currently we are expecting them to be formative in nature. These assessments will be common within a given course and will measure the same academic skills regardless of the discipline in which they are administered. The intent is to give students practice in demonstrating the skills that we deem essential for graduation from FPS in the areas of critical and creative thinking and communicating and collaborating.
16. p. 5 #14 I thought we had been told that we would be receiving a more "substantial" report on the progress that has been made in improving the educational environment and opportunities at WFC. I appreciate the paragraph here, but it really is lacking in specific details regarding progress and what the

target areas are for improvement. #25 on p. 8 seems to reference relevant data, but I'm not sure if WFC can be disaggregated in those areas.

We expanded clinical support options for students with mental health needs in all three high schools by contracting the services of Effective School Solutions. In all schools, Effective School Solutions Social Workers worked with students identified by school teams as in need of more intensive clinical support. At the Walter Fitzgerald Campus Effective School Solutions program, three students returned to the district, one in 2015-2016 and two in 2016-2017.

17. p. 8 #24....What will be the focus for the remaining three years of this Action?

For elementary there is a need to ensure all classroom staff are able to instruct in the readers' workshop model to a high skill level. This requires us to provide professional development in the structures and forms of workshop, the expectations for skill development, how to assess to those skill expectations, and how to remediate instruction as a result of student progress. We also need to refine our early intervention process to ensure students in need are being caught in time and that effective interventions are provided.

18. p. 10 #32 Didn't we discuss allocating money for staff to improve this? Was that discussion only?

There was no funding necessary to strengthen the registration process. We simply require more proof of residence at a registration and have trained registrars to ask better questions, require more original documents, and have a supervisor review the materials if there are questions.

19. p. 12 I am very keen for more information regarding the ***Post Graduate Survey***, as what I saw here was incredibly disappointing. Honestly, if this question is all we asked, then we need to stop spending money on this, as I view the data provided here as quite useless. I REALLY hope there was more to it. The Post Graduate Survey is quite lengthy, and there is a wealth of information from students that is provided to the schools. We simply chose this indicator as one factor in measuring students' preparedness for college. A copy of the survey is attached.

20. p. 13 #3 Comment on the final sentence: if this is the position of the Central Office and staff (which I certainly understand), aren't you essentially saying that there is no point to the 2020 Target?

- this comment about "cohort" is made again on p. 16, #11.....and on p. 29 #22

No, the comment does not mean that there is no point to the 2020 target. The point is that each year the data is taken from a different cohort of students, which may impact the results. One year of data does not show a trend. Several years of data does show a trend, comparing a variety of cohorts, which would certainly give us valuable feedback regarding our program. Trends taken from several years of data can certainly provide us with valuable information regarding our program and strategies, but one year of data is not a trend and the difference may be simply a difference in the make-up of the cohort. We know from experience that some cohorts (classes) are stronger in performance than others.

21. p. 14 #5....again this same final sentence, seeking to negate the point of the 2020 target. So again, I ask, are you looking to measure this a different way? Isn't it also possible that the decline in non-traditional enrolled is due to the increase in percent enrolled, which might have been all "traditional" students, thus pitting one statistic against another?

Similar answer as the above question. No, we are not looking for a different way to measure but looking for a trend before we draw any conclusions about whether our strategies are working or not. Regarding one statistic competing against the other, yes, that is possible. But, we want to not only measure our success in attracting students to current and emerging high-skill occupations, but also to attract

students to occupations where one gender is under-represented. As the CTE enrollments go up, yes, it may cause the non-traditional enrollments to go down, but we are challenging ourselves to make both measures increase.

22. p. 22 #15....Why no 2016 high school data?

Because the high schools were unable to collect the data and continue to struggle to find a way to collect and measure student participation in extra-curricular activities. There are extensively more activities offered at the high school level. It is very difficult to determine how many students from a graduating class DID NOT participate in any club, sport, or arts activity during the 4 years in high school. We hope to have a method in place by the end of this school year, particularly if the sub categories are not required.

23. p. 23 #18....What do these numbers represent, since this entails three formative assessments? Is it the final measurement? The average?

It is the final measurement for the year.

DIP Questions from Mrs. Liu-McCormack

24. What towns are included in regions 5 and 15?

Region 5 includes Bethany, Orange and Woodbridge. Region 15 includes Middlebury and Southbury.

25. What are the average per pupil expenditures in the other DRG B towns?

Please see the attached page.

26. Why are past i-Ready scores not included here?

We decided last year to no longer use IReady, since we have transitioned to STAR.

27. Why no STAR reading data?

We were unable to include STAR Reading data because we will not have enough assessment data to determine the Student Growth Profile until the spring of 2017. We decided to use the Student Growth Profile because it considers the growth of reading ability for each student as compared to their peers on a national level. Initially, we intended to use students' achievement levels in STAR, but after better understanding the reporting functions in STAR, we felt it better to use Student Growth Profile because it shows growth over the year, not simply a reading level. To produce Student Growth Profiles, STAR requires that each student take 3 assessments over the course of the year, so that data will be available in the spring of 2017.

28. How are we doing in Science? What efforts are we making to improve – especially in Physics?

We are in the process of re-writing the curriculum aligned to the new Next Generation Science Standards for implementation next year.

29. What are we doing to help students with the transition from 5th grade to 6th grade – in terms of the increased testing that they will experience in middle school?

We are doing Instructional Rounds focused on instructional strategies and teacher expectations to help understand what is needed to have a smoother transition.

30. What are we doing to promote better handwriting and notetaking? Concerned that in too many cases, teachers are giving notes on “handouts” so student miss the experience of taking their own notes, understanding what is most important, etc.
As mentioned at the Board meeting, notetaking is one of the research based strategies included in Marzano’s suggested strategies for effective learning. We are currently using Marzano’s Teaching Framework in our Educator Evaluation Plan and will ask that supervisors pay closer attention to students’ notetaking practice and teacher notetaking expectations.
31. What is the value of reporting results of Common Assessments? Aren’t they really internal, district-made assessments? If we change them each year, data won’t be comparable.
We agree that these assessments are better used for internal feedback to students and teachers, but we continue to use them because it is currently our only way to monitor student learning in writing. The writing components to SBAC and SAT were removed by the state. At some future time, if there is another standardized assessment for writing, we may request that they be removed from the Performance Indicator list on the DIP.
32. What are we doing in terms of early identification of Dyslexia, ADD, ADHD, Auditory learning disabilities? The district’s responsibility for “Child Find”, identifying and providing services for children under all thirteen of the disability categories begins as early as age 3. At the preschool level, children are identified through transition from Birth to Three services, developmental screenings and direct referral. At the elementary and upper levels, teams identify children at risk for disabilities through review of screening data, monitoring progress with interventions through general education, and direct referrals.
In the 2015-2016 school year training was provided for all staff, PK – 5, in the identification of early signs of Dyslexia. Last summer a work group convened to review how evaluations are developed related to specific areas of suspected disability. The group reviewed current practices in the screening, intervention, and identification process specifically for concerns related to; speech and language development, behavior, and learning. This work is ongoing.
33. Do we assume that students who require ELL services should be assigned to the “lower level” courses? Who decides what levels to place these kids in?
All students are placed in classes based on their achievement and evidence of in-class performance. The ELL teachers work closely with these students and their classroom their teachers at all levels.
34. Do we plan to look at performance data in terms of “cohorts” and “sub-groups” (such as boys/girls, free/reduced lunch)?
We have looked at data for different subgroups and have determined that the largest discrepancy in academic achievement is across socio-economic levels, which is why we are using Free and/or Reduced Lunch as the subcategory of focus. It reflects the largest achievement gap across the district.
35. In the Leadership area, what are we doing to encourage and groom teachers to assume school leadership positions?
Teachers in Fairfield have many opportunities to participate in Leadership opportunities such as serving as an Instructional Improvement Teacher, Language Arts Specialist, Math Science Teacher, Technology

Integration Specialist, and as Dean in one of the middle or high schools. In addition, classroom teachers can remain in the classroom and participate in Instructional Rounds and lead workshop for our new teachers as part of the New Teacher Academy.

36. Why did the percentage of post-grads indicating that they are “well prepared” decline from 2015 to 2016?

The survey results are extremely positive over both years and there may be no way to discern “why” the percentage of “well prepared” responses took a slight decline between the classes of 2014 and 2015. It may be due to the difference in the experiences of a few students who took the survey.

37. Why did percentage of AP scores of 4 or above decline? Should students who enroll in AP courses be required to take the AP examinations?

We are trying to encourage as many students as possible to take AP courses and do not believe that requiring all students to take the AP exam will support that effort. The decline in the percentage of AP scores of 4 or above may be due to the increase in numbers of students challenging themselves in AP courses, but not yet completely comfortable with the rigors of AP. Certainly, we realize we need to provide more support to these students.

38. Why no ACTFL data prior to 2016?

We were not giving these tests prior to last year.

39. Broad district averages on Climate Survey don’t tell us anything about needs for improvement in particular schools.

The Board specifically requested these measures as response averages and we agree that they are very broad. Schools use specific data from the surveys related to specific questions to develop strategies and goals for teachers and administrators. It is these goals and strategies that help our schools to improve their individual school climates, which ultimately improve the overall climate across the district, and increase the average response scores.

8. During your first year of college or technical school, do you believe you were adequately prepared for:

Reading Level	___ Yes ___ No	Lab Experimentation	___ Yes ___ No
Study Load	___ Yes ___ No	Oral Presentations	___ Yes ___ No
Written Assignments	___ Yes ___ No	Group Work	___ Yes ___ No
World Language Level	___ Yes ___ No	Test Taking Skills	___ Yes ___ No
Mathematics Level	___ Yes ___ No	College Social Life	___ Yes ___ No
Science Level	___ Yes ___ No		

9. During your first year of college/technical school, were you:

Required to take remedial coursework in English? ___ Yes ___ No

Required to take remedial coursework in mathematics? ___ Yes ___ No

Placed at a higher level or exempted out of coursework? ___ Yes ___ No

If yes, which of the following is the ONE major reason?

___ AP Test Scores

___ College Placement Test

___ SAT I/II Test Scores

___ UCONN ECE Courses

___ Other Specify _____

10. Have you transferred or are in the process of transferring from the original college you attended?

___ Yes ___ No

Which of the following reasons is the ONE major reason that you transferred?

___ Changed majors

___ Didn't enjoy chosen college

___ Dropped out of college

___ Financial reasons

___ Family or friends

___ More convenient location

___ Original college is only a two-year college

___ Other Specify _____

11. What is your current major? _____

PREPARATION FOR THE FUTURE AND LEARNING SKILLS

12. Using the scale at the right, rate how well FLHS prepared you in the following areas.

SCALE

___ To participate in citizenship responsibilities

___ To make informed career choices

___ To make informed educational choices

___ To make informed healthy life style choices

___ To make informed money management decisions

___ To treat others with respect

___ To accept responsibility for your choices

___ To handle academic pressure effectively

___ To handle social pressure effectively

___ To think creatively

___ To respect diversity

5-Excellent

4-Good

3-Average

2-Poor

1-Unsatisfactory

13. Using the same scale, rate how well you were prepared in each of the following areas for your future experiences.

___ Appreciation of Arts/Music

___ Computer/Technology Skills

___ Group Work Skills

___ Listening Skills

___ Mathematics Skills

___ Oral Presentation Skills

___ Problem Solving/Thinking Skills

___ Reading Skills

___ Research Skills

___ Science Skills

___ Study Skills

___ World Language Skills

___ Writing Skills

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

14. For each academic subject area listed below, please check the subject areas in which you took courses at FLHS. Then rate the overall quality of instruction in each of these areas using the scale below. If you had no courses in a subject area, simply leave the response blank.

SCALE: 5-Excellent, 4-Good, 3-Average, 2-Poor, 1-Unsatisfactory

Took Courses	Rating	Subject Area	Took Courses	Rating	Subject Area
		Art			Music
		Business Education			Physical Education
		Drama			Resource Room/Learning Center
		English			Science
		Family and Consumer Science			Social Studies
		Health Education			Technology Education
		Mathematics			World Languages

15. In general, please rate your FLHS teachers in the following areas using the same scale.

- _____ Availability to provide extra help when needed
- _____ Used a variety of teaching techniques
- _____ Fairness in grading students
- _____ Held high expectations for students
- _____ Clearly communicated expectations to students
- _____ Fostered an environment which helped students to learn

16. List any suggestions you have concerning how we might improve any of our academic programs.

SCHOOL COUNSELING AND SUPPORT SERVICES

17. Of the following school counseling and support services, please check those which you used at FLHS and rate each using the scale below.

SCALE: 5-Excellent, 4-Good, 3-Average, 2-Poor, 1-Unsatisfactory

Used Service	Rating	School Counseling Service
		Course Planning
		Schedule Adjustments
		Help with Academic Problems
		Help with Personal Problems
		Career Exploration and Planning
		College Planning
		College Application Process
		Availability of Counselors

18. Of the following aspects of the college and career center, please check those which you used at FLHS and rate each using the same scale.

Used Service	Rating	College and Career Center
		Computer Searches
		Job Board
		College Representative Visits
		College Planning Resources
		Financial Aid Information
		FLHS Senior Internship/FWHS Job Shadowing

19. List any suggestions you have on how we can improve the school counseling and support services.

LIBRARY/MEDIA SERVICES

20. Using the same scale, please rate the following aspects of the library/media center.

Rating	Library/Media Center
	Quality/Quantity of Print Materials (books, magazines)
	Quality/Quantity of Electronic Materials (database, internet, E-Books, etc.)
	Availability of Hardware (computers, cameras, etc.)
	Helpfulness of Staff
	Study Climate

21. Do you feel that FLHS adequately prepared you to manage information and technology?

_____ Yes _____ No

22. List any suggestions you have on how we can improve the library/media center.

OTHER KEY AREAS

23. Of the following activities, please check those that you participated in at FLHS and rate each of those using the scale below.

SCALE: 5-Excellent, 4-Good, 3-Average, 2-Poor, 1-Unsatisfactory

Participated	Rating	Extracurricular Activity
		Athletics
		Clubs
		Drama
		Music
		Publications
		Student Government

24. In general, while a student at FLHS, do you believe you were treated with respect:

By the FLHS Administration? _____ Yes _____ No

By the FLHS Faculty? _____ Yes _____ No

By the Other FLHS Students? _____ Yes _____ No

25. Briefly describe the greatest strength(s) of Fairfield Ludlowe High School.

26. Briefly describe the most important area(s) for improvement at Fairfield Ludlowe High School.

27. Rate your present feelings about your years at FLHS according to the following scale. _____

SCALE: 5-Strongly Positive, 4-Generally Positive, 3-Neutral, 2-Generally Negative, 1-Strongly Negative

PSAT & SAT Analysis

I was recently asked, “Why did math do so much worse than ELA on the PSAT and SAT?” By comparing just the percent of students reaching PSAT and SAT benchmarks, yes math was lower (see tables 1 and 2 below). As one could see, the difference between the Mathematics and ELA scores illustrates an approximate difference of students reaching performance to be around 20-30 percentage points.

Table 1: Percent of Students at Benchmark for PSAT

	<i>Math</i>	<i>ELA</i>
<i>10th Grade</i>	62%	95%
<i>11th Grade</i>	57%	95%

Table 2: Percent of Students at Benchmark for SAT

	<i>Math</i>	<i>ELA</i>
<i>11th Grade</i>	63%	85%

However, a closer inspection when compared to the state and national average can tell a different story (see tables 2 through 6). In general, students performed better on the PSAT and SAT on the ELA section when compared to the mathematics section, both nationally and in the State of Connecticut. This is similar to the results from the Smarter Balanced Assessment in that percent of students meeting benchmark in ELA was 20-30 percentage points higher than mathematics in the spring of 2015.

Table 3: Percent of Students at Benchmark in Connecticut for PSAT

	<i>Math</i>	<i>ELA</i>
<i>10th Grade</i>	45%	88%
<i>11th Grade</i>	40%	85%

Table 4: Percent of Students at Benchmark Nationally for PSAT

	<i>Math</i>	<i>ELA</i>
<i>10th Grade</i>	48%	87%
<i>11th Grade</i>	48%	86%

Table 5: Percent of Students at Benchmark in Connecticut for SAT

	<i>Math</i>	<i>ELA</i>
<i>11th Grade</i>	39%	65%

Table 6: Percent of Students at Benchmark Nationally for School Day SAT

	<i>Math</i>	<i>ELA</i>
<i>11th Grade</i>	31%	53%

Looking at the PSAT differences to the State and National benchmark rates from the Fairfield rate, the difference was higher in the math than ELA. On average, the PSAT difference of students between Fairfield and National/Connecticut students at benchmark was 16.8 percentage points in mathematics, while the difference for ELA was 9.5 percentage points (see table 7 on the next page). Based on this information, one could possibly conclude that the mathematics outperformed ELA. However, the ELA could have a *Ceiling Effect* in that it is not possible to go over 100%, thus limiting the difference between Fairfield with the State of Connecticut and National benchmark ELA rates.

Table 7: Difference between Fairfield Ludlowe High School and National/Connecticut PSAT & SAT Benchmark Percentages

			<i>Math</i>	<i>ELA</i>
<i>Connecticut Difference</i>	<i>PSAT</i>	<i>10th Grade</i>	+18 percentage points	+8 percentage points
	<i>PSAT</i>	<i>11th Grade</i>	+21 percentage points	+12 percentage points
	<i>SAT</i>	<i>11th Grade</i>	+24 percentage points	+20 percentage points
<i>National Difference</i>	<i>PSAT</i>	<i>10th Grade</i>	+15 percentage points	+7 percentage points
	<i>PSAT</i>	<i>11th Grade</i>	+13 percentage points	+11 percentage points
	<i>SAT</i>	<i>11th Grade</i>	+31 percentage points	+32 percentage points

The question raised from this data could be, “*Why the difference?*” A possible answer could be the different cut scores for each of these assessments. For example, the cut score for PSAT mathematics for grades 10 and 11 was 470 and 500 respectively. Conversely, the cut score for PSAT ELA for grades 10 and 11 was 360 and 390 respectively. ***If the same PSAT ELA cut scores were applied to mathematics for grades 10 and 11, the percent of students meeting benchmark would be 97% for grade 10 and 95% for grade 11.*** Thus, it is hard to make a one-to-one correspondence of the performance of student groups on the PSAT and SAT as these assessments have different cut scores out of 800. The best way to compare the results of the PSAT and SAT assessments is to make sure and compare the results within assessments, not between assessments (i.e., math assessments to math assessments to national & state rates, not between math assessments to ELA assessments).

Consequently, the percent of students achieving benchmark between the Smarter Balanced Assessment and the PSAT and SAT assessments were strikingly similar. Last spring, the rate of students meeting benchmark, 64% of the students at Fairfield Ludlowe High School were in the “Meeting” and “Exceeding” ranges. This is similar to both the 10th and 11th grade benchmark rates as illustrated on the PSAT and SAT. Thus in general, the PSAT and SAT achievement level helps validate the achievement of the Fairfield Ludlowe scores from last spring on the Smarter Balanced Assessment, which was the 8th highest rate in the State of Connecticut.

Per Pupil Expenditures and Enrollments
for DRG B School Districts

<u>District</u>	2014-15 Net Current <u>Expenditures Per Pupil</u>	2014-15 <u>Enrollment</u>
Avon	\$ 15,389	3,326
Brookfield	\$ 13,943	2,756
Cheshire	\$ 14,346	4,527
Fairfield	\$ 15,920	10,255
Farmington	\$ 15,831	4,028
Glastonbury	\$ 15,132	6,313
Granby	\$ 14,332	1,948
Greenwich	\$ 21,687	8,674
Guilford	\$ 16,458	3,454
Madison	\$ 15,917	3,166
Monroe	\$ 15,629	3,368
New Fairfield	\$ 14,441	2,549
Newtown	\$ 15,428	4,857
Region 05	\$ 16,349	2,359
Region 15	\$ 15,659	3,913
Simsbury	\$ 15,423	4,358
South Windsor	\$ 16,051	4,401
Trumbull	\$ 15,078	6,586
West Hartford	\$ 14,579	10,252