FAIRFIELD
PUBLIC SCHOOLS

# District Improvement Plan 2015-2020

DRAFT May 19, 2015

Approved by the Board of Education on_____

## Board of Education

Philip Dwyer, Chairman
John Convertito, Vice-Chairman
Jessica Gerber, Secretary
Paul Fattibene
Donna Karnal
Eileen Liu-McCormack
John Llewellyn
Jennifer Maxon-Kennelly
Marc Patten

## Administration

David Title, Superintendent
Karen Parks, Assistant Superintendent
Margaret Boice, Director of Secondary Education
Thomas Cullen, Director of Operations
Ann Leffert, Director of Human Resources
Andrea Leonardi, Director of Special Education and Special Programs
Doreen Munsell, Director of Finance and Business Services
Michael Rafferty, Interim Director of Elementary Education

# District Improvement Plan

## Section 1

# Introduction

# Introduction

At the conclusion of the Fairfield Public Schools previous Strategic Plan on June 30, 2013, the Fairfield Board of Education began the process of developing a new Long-Range Plan. On January 15, 2013, the Board appointed the Advisory Committee on Mission and Goals to revise the school system's Mission and Goals[1]. This sub-committee met from February 2013 to January 2014, and submitted its recommendations to the full Board of Education. On March 11, 2014, the Board of Education adopted a revised Mission and Goals, which describe the Board's long-term vision for the Fairfield Public Schools.

The Board's Mission and Goals are aspirational. They are not a description of the current status of the school system; rather, they articulate the school system's loftiest aspiration - - a stretch, a challenge, to push itself to achieve what it had not previously achieved. The District Improvement Plan is designed to define the indicators that would represent the attainment of the Mission and Goals, as well as the actions necessary to achieve them over the next five years. The Mission and Goals are on the next page.

[1] *Policies 0100, 0110, and 0200*

# Mission

The mission of the Fairfield Public Schools, in partnership with families and community, is to ensure that every student acquires the knowledge and skills needed to be a lifelong learner, responsible citizen, and successful participant in an ever-changing global society through a comprehensive educational program.

# Long-Term Goal

Fairfield Public Schools will ensure that every student is engaged in a rigorous learning experience that recognizes and values the individual and challenges each student to achieve academic progress including expressive, personal, physical, civic, and social development. Students will be respectful, ethical, and responsible citizens with an appreciation and understanding of global issues. Student achievement and performance shall rank among the best in the state and the nation.

# Educational Goals

Fairfield Public School students will:

- develop into responsible citizens who exhibit ethical behavior;
- acknowledge, explore, and value the importance of diversity;
- develop a healthy personal identity and self-reliance;
- demonstrate strong motivational persistence to learn;
- exhibit an inquisitive attitude, open mind, and curiosity;
- acquire an understanding and appreciation of other cultures;
- understand international issues and demonstrate the skills needed to participate in a global society; and
- acquire knowledge of the following areas of study: science; technology; mathematics; language arts; social studies; literary, visual, and performing arts; world language; unified arts; health and physical education.

# Development Process

After the Board's adoption of its Mission and Goals on March 11, 2014, a process and timeline were developed to craft the District Improvement Plan to: 1) measure how to judge the school system's progress toward its Mission and Goals; and 2) identify the Core Strategies and Specific Actions the school system should undertake over the next five years to make substantial progress toward attaining its Mission and Goals.

The school system has been working on a number of improvement initiatives for several years. The intent of this Plan is to build on these efforts, not start over. Continuity is an important feature of any serious attempt to have a long-lasting impact on student learning.

At the same time, new ideas must be generated to move the school system along an improvement path that will lead to the attainment of the lofty aspiration articulated in the school system's Mission and Goals. This Plan, therefore, merges the benefits of sustained improvement efforts with new ideas into a single Plan.

The process of school system improvement over time can be represented by Figure 1. The vertical axis represents the school system quality and the horizontal axis represents time:

**Figure 1**

Point A represents the current state of the school system. Point B indicates that, if no improvement efforts are undertaken, at the end of five years, school system quality will be largely unchanged. Some would argue that, with no improvement efforts, Point B would actually be lower than Point A because of changes in the expectations of student learning that will occur over the next five years. Point C represents where the school system desires to be in terms of quality, as articulated by its Mission and Goals. The purpose of the Plan, therefore, is to design improvement efforts that will move the school system from Point B to Point C and measure the progress of these efforts in terms of student learning.

Long-range improvement consists of three distinct phases, represented in Figure 2:

**Phase I** focuses on the ENDS, translating the lofty aspirations for our students into reliable and valid Student Performance Indicators.

**Phase II** focuses on MEANS – how we intend to improve student achievement.

**Phase III** focuses on REVIEW, which occurs after the first full year of implementation and data reporting.

**Figure 2**
District Improvement Plan
Stages of Development

*Part 1* -- ***Ends***

The first step in the process was determining the Student Performance Indicators that would accurately represent the current status (Point A) and the desired status (Point C) of the school system. This was done in two phases:

1. Agreement on the Student Performance Indicators as outlined in the "Criteria for Quality Student Performance Indicators." These indicators are stated in terms of student achievement, learning or outcomes.

2. Agreement on the five-year target for each Student Performance Indicator. Baseline data and targets are included in Section 2. Some SPI's are new and therefore baseline data may not be available at this time and, as a result, no targets are listed. Because of the number and complexity of our SPI's, this step was moved to the end of the process.

*Part 2* – ***Means***

The next step in the process was determining the Core Strategies to be employed to achieve the ends in Part 1. These Core Strategies, taken together, are referred to as a Theory of Action. These adult actions will lead to improvement in student learning, achievement or other important student outcomes embodied in the Mission and Goals. After the Core Strategies were identified, the next step was to determine the Specific Actions that, if enacted, would implement each of the Core Strategies over the next five years. The scheduling of Specific Actions for a given year is done on an annual basis, not up front for all five years of the Plan.

*Part 3* – ***Review Progress***

Because of a rapidly changing educational landscape, any Plan of this duration will need regular updating and review. Annually, the administration will prepare a public update on the progress of the Student Performance Indicators and the Specific Actions completed during the previous year. In addition, we will set out the Specific Actions to be undertaken during the next school year. During the third year of implementation, a formal review of the Plan should be undertaken to determine if Specific Actions need to be modified, subtracted or added to the Plan.

# Model of Continuous Improvement

The school system has been working with a model of continuous improvement as represented in Figure 3. The base of the model represents a coherent set of Improvement Plans at the school system, school, department, grade, and individual level. The school system's Theory of Action is adapted at the department and school level to establish a through-line of consistency from the school system to the classroom levels. These Plans inform and are informed by the cycle of data analysis as represented in the diagram. Professional Learning, to improve the Instructional Core, is critical to the success of this model.

Figure 3

# Fairfield Public Schools
# Model For Using Data For Continuous Improvement

# Theory of Action

The purpose of a Theory of Action is to outline our Core Strategies to achieve the Mission and Goals of the school system.

There are four Core Strategies in our Theory of Action: Instructional Program, Teams/School Improvement Plans, Leadership Capacity, and Resources. Under each Core Strategy, we list a more specific description of the actions the school system proposes to undertake to support this strategy. These actions are school system priorities, some of which are already in some stage of implementation.

Underlying this Theory of Action is the expectation that all staff members, teams, departments and schools engage regularly in reflective practice – examining data, taking action, reviewing the results of our actions, adjusting our practice to improve results and evaluating our effectiveness in a cycle of continuous improvement as shown in Figure 3.

## Instructional Program

If we ensure that a rigorous, comprehensive instructional program is consistently delivered across all schools and grade levels, with alignment between the written, taught and assessed curriculum, then instruction will be of consistently high quality and student learning will improve.

- Align and implement curriculum to state and national standards on a systematic schedule and ensure proper articulation
- Develop and implement common assessments aligned to the curriculum in all content areas
- Develop implementation guides in all content areas as curriculum is revised
- Hold staff accountable for consistent implementation of all approved curriculum
- Implement and evaluate the effectiveness of evidence-based instructional strategies in all content areas
- Ensure a positive school climate

## Teams/School Improvement Plans

If we work effectively in teams across all levels of the organization to examine system, school and individual student progress, create a culture where individuals regularly research and engage in developing and sharing effective practices, and regularly support and supervise teachers in implementing effective classroom practices, then teachers will improve instruction and student learning will improve.

- Implement School system and School Improvement Plans based on data and research-based practices that will improve achievement (includes academic and school climate indicators)
- Implement department-level improvement plans for vertical consistency, aligned to the school system and school improvement plans
- Implement school-wide data teams in each school to review progress on the SIP, share effective practices, and adjust SIP as warranted
- Implement grade level and/or department data teams
- Implement a school system level data team
- Implement Instructional Rounds

## Leadership Capacity

If we strengthen the instructional leadership capacity of teachers and administrators, then we will be better able to identify and implement effective instructional practices, and help teachers improve their practices through support and accountability. This improved instructional practice will lead to improved student learning.

- Focus All PK-12 Leadership Meetings throughout the year on improvement of instruction
- Establish a common understanding of what effective teaching practice (Marzano) looks like in classrooms
- Ensure consistent, quality feedback to teachers, principals and central office leaders on implementation of school system and school priorities
- Implement Professional Growth and Evaluation Plans
- Demonstrate how education mandates/reforms can be used to leverage school system improvement efforts

## Resources

If we provide our staff and students with appropriate levels of educational resources (human, time and material) and if they use these resources effectively, then student learning will improve.

- For each improvement initiative, provide effective professional learning for all staff members on a continuous basis
- Recruit and retain highly qualified personnel for all vacant positions
- Align financial resources to enact school system priorities
- Partner with parents to achieve system priorities and goals
- Improve intervention efforts for struggling students and high-achieving students
- Ensure a safe, clean learning environment in all schools

District Improvement Plan

Section 2

# Student Performance Indicators

Taken together, the entire set of Student Performance Indicators provides an accurate, comprehensive reflection of the school system's Mission and Goals, given assessment tools readily available at this time.

## Criteria for Quality Student Performance Indicators:

- **Valid** – accurately reflects accomplishment of the Mission and Goals; worth dedicating scarce resources; reflects district priorities; creates appropriate incentives.
- **Reliable** – consistent, accurate measurement from one rater to another and over time.
- **Aligned to our curriculum** – so that staff receive consistent messages about the goals of instruction.
- **Publicly defensible and understood (or easily explained)** – may benchmark to other districts; publicly-reported student performance data is almost always included if curriculum alignment is present.
- **Good baseline data** exists or is easily gathered with existing resources.
- **Summative or highly predictive/critical point** (based on student data).
- **Not overly narrow in scope.**
- **Best available measures may be "proxies" in difficult-to-measure areas.**
- **Does not result in "over-testing" solely for the purposes of this Plan.**

Performance indicators and data collection tools can be found on pages 16-19.

*See pages 20 and 21 for explanations.*

| Assessment | Grade or Course Level | Subjects | Data Measures |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Post High School Student Survey** | | Success Post-High School | To Be Determined |
| **2. Graduation Rates** | | | 2.1 Percent of students graduating in 4years<br>2.2 Percent of students graduating in 4 years **and** qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch<br>2.3 Percent of students graduating in 6 years<br>2.4 Percent of students graduating in 6 years **and** qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch |
| **3. AP Scores** | Grades 10-12 | Multiple | 3.1 Percent of students scoring 3 and above<br>3.2 Percent of students scoring 3 and above **and** qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch<br>3.3 Percent of students scoring 4 and above<br>3.4 Percent of students scoring 4 and above **and** qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch |
| **4. AP Participation by Graduation** | Grades 10-12 | Multiple | 4.1 Percent of all students that successfully complete 1 AP course by graduation<br>4.2 Percent of all students that successfully complete 1 AP course by graduation **and** qualify for Free or Reduced Lunch |
| **5. Career and Technical Education (CTE)** | High School | • Technology Education<br>• Family and Consumer Science<br>• Business | 5.1 Percent of students enrolled<br>5.2 Percent of Non-Traditional* students enrolled<br>*(*Non-traditional includes current and emerging high-skill occupations where one gender comprises less than 25% of those employed in such occupation.)* |
| **6. Academic Expectations Rubrics** | Grade 11<br>Grade 12 | • Creative and Critical Thinking<br>• Communication and Collaboration | 6.1 Percent of students scoring at or above a 3 on a 1-4 scale<br>6.2 Percent of students scoring at or above a 3 on a 1-4 scale **and** qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch<br>6.3 Percent of students scoring a 4 on a 1-4 scale<br>6.4 Percent of students scoring a 4 on 1-4 scale **and** qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch |
| **7. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Assessment** | Level 20 | • French<br>• Spanish<br>• Chinese | 7.1 Percent of students scoring at or above Proficient Level<br>7.2 Percent of students scoring at the Advanced Level |

*See pages 20 and 21 for explanations.*

| Assessment | Grade or Course Level | Subjects | Data Measures |
|---|---|---|---|
| **8. ACTFL Latin Interpretive Reading Assessment (ALIRA)** | Level 20 | Latin | 8.1 Percent of students scoring at or above Proficient Level<br>8.2 Percent of students scoring at Advanced Level |
| **9. World Language Credits Earned by Graduation** | Grade 12 | World Language | 9.1 Percent of students earning 4+ credits by graduation<br>9.2 Percent of students earning 8+ credits by graduation |
| **10. AP Calculus and Multivariable Participation** | Grade 12 | Mathematics | 10.1 Percent of graduating students that successfully completed at least one AP Calculus, or Multivariable Calculus course by graduation |
| **11. Extra-Curricular Participation** | Grades 6-12 | • Clubs<br>• Sports<br>• Arts | 11.1 Percent of students enrolled in at least one extra-curricular activity each year over-all<br>11.2 Percent of students enrolled in at least one club activity each year<br>11.3 Percent of students enrolled in at least one sports activity each year<br>11.4 Percent of students enrolled in at least one arts activity each year |
| **12. CMT/CAPT** | Grades 5,8, and 10 | Science | 12.1 Percent of students scoring at or above Goal<br>12.2 Percent of students scoring at or above Goal **and** qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch<br>12.3 Percent of students scoring at Advanced Level<br>12.4 Percent of students scoring at Advanced Level **and** qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch |
| **13. CT Physical Fitness Test** | 4,8, and 10 | Fitness | 13.1 Percent of students passing all 4 tests in grade 4<br>13.2 Percent of students passing all 4 tests in grade 8<br>13.3 Percent of students passing all 4 tests in grade 10 |

*See pages 20 and 21 for explanations.*

| Assessment | Grade or Course Level | Subjects | Data Measures |
|---|---|---|---|
| **14. District Common Assessments** | Grades K-11 | Writing | 14.1 Percent of students scoring at or above Grade Level<br>14.2 Percent of students scoring at or above Grade Level **and** qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch<br>14.3 Percent of students scoring at Advanced Level<br>14.4 Percent of students scoring at Advanced Level **and** qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch |
| **15. School Climate Survey** | Grades 3-12 | Climate | 15.1 Average student responses on a scale of 1-4 (1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Strongly Agree) to all student responses about safety, social-emotional well-being and citizenship (community service) |
| **16. STAR Reading** | Grades K-8 | Reading | 16.1 Percent of students scoring at or above Grade Level<br>16.2 Percent of students scoring at or above Grade Level **and** qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch.<br>16.3 Percent of students scoring above Grade Level<br>16.4 Percent of students scoring above Grade Level **and** qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch. |
| **17. iReady Math** | Grades K-8 | Math | 17.1 Percent of students scoring at or above Grade Level<br>17.2 Percent of students scoring at or above Grade Level **and** qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch.<br>17.3 Percent of students scoring above Grade Level<br>17.4 Percent of students scoring above Grade Level **and** qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch. |
| **18. Attendance** | Grades K-12 | | 18.1 Average Daily Attendance Rate K-5<br>18.2 Average Daily Attendance Rate K-5 **and** qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch<br>18.3 Average Daily Attendance Rate, Grades 6-8<br>18.4 Average Daily Attendance Rate, Grades 6-8 **and** qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch<br>18.5 Average Daily Attendance Rate, Grades 9-12<br>18.6 Average Daily Attendance Rate, Grades 9-12 **and** qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch |

*See pages 20 and 21 for explanations.*

| Assessment | Grade or Course Level | Subjects | Data Measures |
|---|---|---|---|
| **19. Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals (CELF)** | PK | • Vocabulary<br>• Language | 19.1 Percent of students approaching benchmark<br>19.2 Percent of students exceeding benchmark |

# Student Performance Indicator Descriptions

**Post High School Student Survey**

We will contract with an outside vendor to conduct an independent, reliable and valid assessment of our graduates, one year after high school graduation.

**Academic Expectations Rubrics**

The Academic Expectations Rubrics are internally designed and scored tools that measure our students' achievement of 21st Century Skills in the areas of Communicating and Collaborating as well as Critical and Creative Thinking. The rubrics will be used in grades 9 – 12 to assess students on performance-based assessments in a range of content areas. The use of these rubrics supports a NEASC expectation that school-wide rubrics will measure students' progress in these skills across all academic areas during the four years of high school.

**American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Assessment of Performance Towards Proficiency in Languages (AAPPL)**

The ACTFL Assessment of Performance Towards Proficiency in Languages (AAPPL) addresses the World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages. The AAPPL Measure assesses the following modes of communication: Interpersonal Listening/Speaking; Presentational Writing; Interpretive Reading and Listening.

**ACTFL – Latin Interpretive Reading Assessment**

The ACTFL Latin Interpretive Reading Assessment (ALIRA) is a computer-adaptive assessment of Latin students' ability to read for comprehension a variety of Latin-language texts that typify those used in an instructional setting. One or two multiple-choice questions accompany each text and gather evidence of understanding of main ideas, supporting details, point-of-view, inferences, or text purpose. Criterion-referenced standards are used.

**AP Calculus and Multivariable Calculus**

One indicator of the rate at which students are successfully accelerated in mathematics is the percentage of students in each graduating class who successfully complete AP Calculus and/or Multivariable Calculus, the highest levels of mathematics available in our program.

**CT Physical Fitness Test**

The Connecticut Physical Fitness Assessment Program includes a variety of physical fitness tests designed to measure muscle strength, muscular endurance, flexibility and cardiovascular fitness. There are 4 sub-tests in this assessment.

**District Common Assessments**

In grades K-8, students produce on-demand, long-form writing three times per year. Students write in three different forms: informational, opinion/argumentative, and narrative. Writing is assessed using district writing rubrics that are aligned to the Connecticut Core Standards. Grade level expectations increase from year to year.

**STAR – Reading**

STAR Reading assessments are computer-adaptive. STAR Early Literacy measures skills in key domains of early literacy: Print Concepts, Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Word Recognition, Fluency, Vocabulary Acquisition and Use. STAR Reading measures skills within key domains: Phonics and Word Recognition, Fluency, Key Ideas and Details, Craft and Structure, Integration of Knowledge and Ideas, Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity, and Vocabulary Acquisition and Use. Student results are reported as being below, on, or above level.

**iReady - Math**

iReady is a valid and reliable growth measure for Mathematics aligned to the Common Core Standards. This adaptive math screening tool covers the main domains of mathematics: Number and Operations, Algebra and Algebraic thinking, Measurement and Data, and Geometry. Student results are reported as being on, above or below level.

**Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals (CELF)**

CELF is a rating scale for student progress in the following areas: (1) non-verbal communication, (2) conversational routines and skills and (3) asking for, giving and responding to information. Student progress is measured against age criterion scores.

# Other Definitions:

**Capstone Experience**:

A capstone experience is a multifaceted, senior year assignment that serves as a culminating academic and intellectual project, presentation, or performance in which students demonstrate their acquisition of 21st Century Skills. In grades 9 through 11, students will be provided with short-term performance-based tasks that prepare them for the demands and rigor of the Capstone. Capstone experiences require students to be innovative and purposeful; to think broadly and deeply; and to use critical and creative thinking to solve complex problems. Attainment of these skills will be measured using the Academic Expectations Rubrics throughout a student's high school program.

# District Improvement Plan

# Section 3

# Specific Actions

One of the most difficult parts of planning is translating the lofty aspiration of the school system, as represented in its Mission and Goals, into actions that will make the Plan "come alive" and significantly impact student achievement. Most long-range plans fail not because the aspirations are not bold, but because of a school system's inability to imbed the improvement efforts of the district into the "real world" of running a school system.

Figure 4 represents this dilemma as a continuum, with the lofty "Dreams" of the Mission and Goals on one side, and the reality of "Doing" on the other. To "bridge" this gap, and keep the improvement efforts from falling into the abyss between Dreaming and Doing, we create Specific Actions to implement over the five-year period. It is the enactment of these Specific Actions that will enable the school system to move toward achieving its Mission and Goals and reach its five-year targets on the Student Performance Indicators.

Figure 4

To be effective, Specific Actions must meet a set of criteria. These are listed on the next page. The inclusion of a Specific Action in this Plan commits the school system to undertaking this Action sometime during the life of the Plan. The list may appear daunting in the aggregate; however, there are two important points to keep in mind. First, this represents, in some cases, a continuation and deepening of existing work. These are not all new initiatives. Second, this is five years' worth of work, not one.

For the past four years, at the start of each year, the administration has presented a list of improvement initiatives to be accomplished during that fiscal year. This list will continue to be published and used as the basis for our improvement efforts, as many of the items on the annual initiatives list will come directly from the District Improvement Plan. For each initiative, and for each Specific Action in a given year, a central office administrator will be given primary responsibility for ensuring its implementation, often with assistance from other staff in the central office and the schools. Assignments of responsibility are made on the basis of current position responsibilities, and that staff member is held accountable for implementation through the evaluation process. In that way, we have merged the operational work of the district leaders with the improvement work of this Plan, thereby minimizing the chances of improvement efforts falling into the abyss.

## Criteria for Specific Actions in the District Improvement Plan

### The Action:

- Will advance the District toward achieving its Mission and will improve one or more Student Performance Indicators
- Is aligned to the District Theory of Action
- Shows that the benefits of enacting this Action outweigh the costs (quantifiable and non-quantifiable)
- States a desired outcome that is either observable, demonstrable or measurable
- Is clear and understandable
- Requires a significant effort over at least a one-year period of time (may need to be several years) for full implementation
- Impacts the entire system or at least one complete level (elementary, middle, high school)

# Specific Actions

*Collectively, this set of Specific Actions is designed to help the school system achieve its Mission and Goals. Some of the Actions represent a continuation and deepening of existing change initiatives. Some represent new ideas worthy of implementation sometime over the next five years.*

*Specific Actions would be scheduled at some point in the five years of the Plan, with the goal of fully implementing all the Actions by the end of the Plan. Not all Specific Actions will commence in year 1 (2015-2016). Actions will be scheduled to balance the work over the five-year period. For those Actions that are anticipated to take more than one year to complete, the estimated number of years from initiation to full implementation is noted in parentheses.*

## 1. Instructional Program

If we ensure that a rigorous, comprehensive instructional program is consistently delivered across all schools and grade levels, with alignment between the written, taught and assessed curriculum, then instruction will be of consistently high quality and student learning will improve.

*Curriculum Development and Implementation*

1-1 Develop and implement a World Language program at the elementary school level that reflects the best research-based practices in the field. (2 years)

1-2 Implement a K-12 sequence of experiences supporting the development of skills leading to a successful capstone experience at the high school level. (3 years)

1-3 Develop a scope and sequence of technology skills PK-12 and embed in all subject areas. (2 years)

1-4 Implement the published curriculum renewal schedule, including status updates, as designed, each year. (5 years)

1-5 Develop and implement culturally competent curriculum PK-12 for social emotional learning and self-regulation that reflects the best research-based practices in the field and imbed in existing district structures (e.g., advisory, developmental guidance, health). (2 years)

1-6 For each curriculum revision, provide up-to-date instructional materials, including culturally relevant materials, to improve outcomes for our increasingly diverse population (including English Language Learners). (5 years)

1-7 Establish and implement a PK-12 scope and sequence for embedding executive functioning, study skills and independence into all curriculum areas. (2 years)

1-8 Improve the districtwide English Language Learners program and increase all teachers' capacity to serve this population of students.

1-9 Develop a comprehensive transition program from grade 5 to grade 6, and from grade 8 to grade 9 to increase student success at grades 6 and 9.

*Assessment Development and Implementation*

1-10 Expand and standardize the use of academic rubrics, K-12. (3 years)
1-11 Develop and implement high school performance tasks in grades 9 and 10, linked to a capstone experience, and assess student performance using the academic expectations rubrics. (3 years)
1-12 Develop and implement performance tasks at the middle and elementary schools in Language Arts, Math, Social Studies and Science in grades 6-12. (4 years)
1-13 Analyze, align and revise the assessment calendar PK-12 and calibrate the scoring of common assessments.

*Professional Learning*

1-14 Implement Professional Learning that will assist staff to analyze and use student performance data from district assessments.
1-15 Develop an annual Professional Learning calendar for all certified and non-certified staff based on improvement initiatives and state mandates.
1-16 Implement Professional Learning for all staff to improve our ability to address a diverse population of students and families.
1-17 Provide Professional Learning on how to implement academic rubrics. (2 years)
1-18 Implement Professional Learning on "Teaching in the Block" to all high school teachers. (3 years)
1-19 Implement a web-based curriculum platform to enhance consistent teacher communication and sharing of effective curriculum resources. (2 years)

*Program Improvement*

1-20 Implement the improved gifted model as designed in 2011-2012 in the elementary and middle schools.
1-21 Revise high school graduation requirements.
1-22 Review high school learning expectations regarding technology to implement a mastery-based requirement rather than a credit requirement.
1-23 Review/revise district guidelines regarding homework to reflect the latest research.
1-24 Implement a revised middle school schedule.
1-25 Revise Unified Arts offerings at the middle school level to strengthen the link to high school courses.
1-26 Develop and implement a middle school advisory program.

## 2. Teams/Improvement Plans

If we work effectively in teams across all levels of the organization to examine system, school and individual student progress, create a culture where individuals regularly research and engage in developing and sharing effective practices, and regularly support and supervise teachers in implementing effective classroom practices, then teachers will improve instruction and student learning will improve.

2-1 Align all school improvement plans with the District Improvement Plan.

2-2 Use vertical teams to develop curriculum, Department Improvement Plans, department-based Problems of Practice and Instructional Rounds in each content area.

2-3 Implement mixed-level observations of professional practice and peer conferences to improve vertical alignment.

2-4 Use data team meetings to analyze student performance and make instructional adjustments to improve learning of all students in all content areas.

2-5 Use technology to facilitate the effective use of student performance data into district, school, department and grade-level data teams.

2-6 Use best-practice models to create a top-notch alternative high school program. (2 years)

2-7 Use the District Data Team to analyze district performance data and model effective Data Team practices. (2 years)

2-8 All schools will engage in Instructional Rounds at least twice per year as part of the School Improvement Plan implementation.

## 3. Leadership Capacity

If we strengthen the instructional leadership capacity of teachers and administrators, then we will be better able to identify and implement effective instructional practices, and help teachers improve their practices through support and accountability. This improved instructional practice will lead to improved student learning.

3-1 Use the Marzano teacher evaluation protocols and rubrics to improve and calibrate instructional practices. (2 years)

3-2 Develop and implement a peer coaching model for teachers and administrators. (3 years)

3-3 Identify and train at least one teacher in each school to serve as a "Teacher Leader" for each district/school initiative (Rounds, Data Teams, etc.).

3-4 Align teacher goals in the Teacher Professional Growth Plan to goals in the School Improvement Plan and/or Department Improvement Plan. (2 years)

3-5 Implement an Administrators Academy to continually update the professional knowledge and skills for all school and district leaders.

## 4. Resources

If we provide our staff and students with appropriate levels of educational resources (human, time and material) and if they use these resources effectively, then student learning will improve.

*Talent Development*

4-1 Implement a plan to recruit more broadly to deepen the pool of highly qualified applicants for vacant positions.

4-2 Implement a research-based common protocol to select the most qualified applicant for vacant positions.

4-3 Develop and implement a New Teacher Academy to build capacity of all non-tenured teachers. (2 years)

4-4 Implement an elementary schedule which provides teachers more common planning time.

4-5 Implement common planning time for high school teachers.

4-6 Implement a research-based common protocol for the use of common planning time across all levels.

*Technology*

4-7 Implement the 3-year Technology Plan as designed each year. (3 years)

4-8 Implement a consistent "Bring Your Own Device" program throughout the school system that makes most effective use of the technology.

4-9 Expand the use of on-line learning throughout the system for enrichment, remediation, and low-enrollment courses. (3 years)

4-10 Develop and implement consistent practices in the proper use of technology by teachers and students outside of the school day.

4-11 Use technology to enhance professional learning for all staff members. (3 years)

*Enhanced Services to Students*

4-12 Develop a plan to minimize the impact of teacher absences on student learning.

4-13 Identify profiles of non-graduating high school students and develop a preventative intervention plan to increase the graduation rate.

4-14 Increase student access to assistance for emotional and mental health needs. (2 years)

4-15 Expand the continuum of services, using evidence-based practices, for academic and behavioral interventions with consistent processes and communication strategies. (2 years)

4-16 Increase instructional support beyond the school day for all struggling students to improve student achievement. (3 years)

4-17 Expand academic and non-academic enrichment opportunities to more K- 8 students. (2 years)

*Parents*

4-18 Research and develop an enhanced school-family partnership at each school as part of its School Improvement Plan.

4-19 Expand Family Resource Center resources to all Pre-K to 5 families.

4-20 Enhance communication efforts with parents through Infinite Campus, district and school websites and other technology, at each school and district-wide.

*Communication*

4-21 Communicate changes in the instructional program to all stakeholders in the community.

4-22 In partnership with the Fairfield Police Department, strengthen communication with all stakeholders on matters of school safety and security.

District Improvement Plan | Section 4

# Baseline Data and Targets

Student Performance Indicators with Baseline Data and Targets

| # | Assessment | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Post HS Student Survey | Post HS | Success Post-HS | TBD | Summer 2016 | |
| 2 | Graduation Rates | | | 4-Year Graduation Rate | 93.8% | 96% |
| 2 | Graduation Rates | | | 4-Year Graduation Rate and FR | 82.7% | 90% |
| 2 | Graduation Rates | | | 6-Year Graduation Rate | Summer 2015 | |
| 2 | Graduation Rates | | | 6-Year Graduation Rate and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 3 | AP Scores | Grades 9-12 | Various | Pct at 3 and above | 89.3% | 93% |
| 3 | AP Scores | Grades 9-12 | Various | Pct at 3 and above and FR | 90.5% | 93% |
| 3 | AP Scores | Grades 9-12 | Various | Pct at 4 and above | 61.8% | 70% |
| 3 | AP Scores | Grades 9-12 | Various | Pct at 4 and above and FR | 63.6% | 70% |
| 4 | AP Participation by Graduation | Grades 9-12 | Various | Pct successfully complete 1 course by graduation | 93.4% | 96% |
| 4 | AP Participation by Graduation | Grades 9-12 | Various | Pct successfully complete 1 course by graduation and FR | 84.0% | 90% |
| 5 | Career/Tech Ed | Grades 9-12 | Various | Pct enrolled | 61.9% | 75% |
| 5 | Career/Tech Ed | Grades 9-12 | Various | Pct of non-traditional enrolled | 9.4% | 15% |
| 6 | Academic Expectations Rubrics | 11 | Creative and Critical Thinking | Pct at 3 and above | Summer 2016 | |
| 6 | Academic Expectations Rubrics | 11 | Creative and Critical Thinking | Pct at 3 and above and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 6 | Academic Expectations Rubrics | 11 | Creative and Critical Thinking | Pct at 4 | Summer 2016 | |
| 6 | Academic Expectations Rubrics | 11 | Creative and Critical Thinking | Pct at 4 and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 6 | Academic Expectations Rubrics | 12 | Creative and Critical Thinking | Pct at 3 and above | Summer 2016 | |
| 6 | Academic Expectations Rubrics | 12 | Creative and Critical Thinking | Pct at 3 and above and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 6 | Academic Expectations Rubrics | 12 | Creative and Critical Thinking | Pct at 4 | Summer 2016 | |

Student Performance Indicators with Baseline Data and Targets

| # | Assessment | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | Academic Expectations Rubrics | 12 | Creative and Critical Thinking | Pct at 4 and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 6 | Academic Expectations Rubrics | 11 | Communication and Collaboration | Pct at 3 and above | Summer 2016 | |
| 6 | Academic Expectations Rubrics | 11 | Communication and Collaboration | Pct at 3 and above and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 6 | Academic Expectations Rubrics | 11 | Communication and Collaboration | Pct at 4 | Summer 2016 | |
| 6 | Academic Expectations Rubrics | 11 | Communication and Collaboration | Pct at 4 and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 6 | Academic Expectations Rubrics | 12 | Communication and Collaboration | Pct at 3 and above | Summer 2016 | |
| 6 | Academic Expectations Rubrics | 12 | Communication and Collaboration | Pct at 3 and above and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 6 | Academic Expectations Rubrics | 12 | Communication and Collaboration | Pct at 4 | Summer 2016 | |
| 6 | Academic Expectations Rubrics | 12 | Communication and Collaboration | Pct at 4 and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 7 | ACTFL | Level 20 | French | Pct at/above Proficient | Summer 2016 | |
| 7 | ACTFL | Level 20 | French | Pct at Advanced | Summer 2016 | |
| 7 | ACTFL | Level 20 | Spanish | Pct at /above Proficient | Summer 2016 | |
| 7 | ACTFL | Level 20 | Spanish | Pct at Advanced | Summer 2016 | |
| 7 | ACTFL | Level 20 | Chinese | Pct at/above Proficient | Summer 2016 | |
| 7 | ACTFL | Level 20 | Chinese | Pct at Advanced | Summer 2016 | |
| 8 | ALIRA | Level 20 | Latin | Pct at/above Proficient | Summer 2016 | |
| 8 | ALIRA | Level 20 | Latin | Pct at Advanced | Summer 2016 | |
| 9 | WL Credits by Graduation | 12 | World Languages | Pct of graduates with 4+ credits, 2 years | 88.6% | 93% |
| 9 | WL Credits by Graduation | 12 | World Languages | Pct of graduates with 8+ credits, 4 years | 43.1% | 50% |
| 10 | AP Calculus and Multivariable Participation | 12 | Mathematics | Pct Successfully Completed Course | 13.26% | 20% |

Student Performance Indicators with Baseline Data and Targets

| # | Assessment | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | Extra Curricular Participation | 6-8 | Extra Curricular | Pct in at least one activity overall | Summer 2015 | |
| 11 | Extra Curricular Participation | 6-8 | Clubs | Pct in at least one Club activity | Summer 2015 | |
| 11 | Extra Curricular Participation | 6-8 | Sports | Pct in at least one Sports activity | Summer 2015 | |
| 11 | Extra Curricular Participation | 6-8 | Arts | Pct in at least one Arts activity | Summer 2015 | |
| 11 | Extra Curricular Participation | 9-12 | Extra Curricular | Pct in at least one activity overall | Summer 2015 | |
| 11 | Extra Curricular Participation | 9-12 | Clubs | Pct in at least one Club activity | Summer 2015 | |
| 11 | Extra Curricular Participation | 9-12 | Sports | Pct in at least one Sports activity | Summer 2015 | |
| 11 | Extra Curricular Participation | 9-12 | Arts | Pct in at least one Arts activity | Summer 2015 | |
| 12 | CMT | 5 | Science | Pct at/above Goal | 80.1% | 90% |
| 12 | CMT | 5 | Science | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 46.6% | 70% |
| 12 | CMT | 5 | Science | Pct at Advanced | 33.4% | 45% |
| 12 | CMT | 5 | Science | Pct at Advanced and FR | 6.9% | 20% |
| 12 | CMT | 8 | Science | Pct at/above Goal | 81.4% | 90% |
| 12 | CMT | 8 | Science | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 57.6% | 75% |
| 12 | CMT | 8 | Science | Pct at Advanced | 28.6% | 50% |
| 12 | CMT | 8 | Science | Pct at Advanced and FR | 15.3% | 40% |
| 12 | CAPT | 10 | Science | Pct at/above Goal | 73.5% | 90% |
| 12 | CAPT | 10 | Science | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 50.7% | 75% |
| 12 | CAPT | 10 | Science | Pct at Advanced | 47.7% | 55% |
| 12 | CAPT | 10 | Science | Pct at Advanced and FR | 25.4% | 40% |
| 13 | CT Physical Fitness Test | 4 | Fitness | Pct Passing 4 Tests | 67.0% | 70% |

Student Performance Indicators with Baseline Data and Targets

| # | Assessment | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | CT Physical Fitness Test | 8 | Fitness | Pct Passing 4 Tests | 69.0% | 70% |
| 13 | CT Physical Fitness Test | 10 | Fitness | Pct Passing 4 Tests | 57.0% | 70% |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | K | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | K | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | K | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | K | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 1 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 1 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 1 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 1 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 2 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 2 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 2 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 2 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 3 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 3 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 3 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 3 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 4 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 4 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 4 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level | Summer 2015 | |

Student Performance Indicators with Baseline Data and Targets

| # | Assessment | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 4 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 5 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 5 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 5 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 5 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 6 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 6 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 6 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 6 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 7 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 7 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 7 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 7 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 8 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 8 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 8 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 8 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 9 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 9 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 9 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 9 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |

Student Performance Indicators with Baseline Data and Targets

| # | Assessment | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 10 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 10 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 10 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 10 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 11 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 11 | Writing | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 11 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level | Summer 2015 | |
| 14 | District Common Assessments | 11 | Writing | Pct at Advanced Level and FR | Summer 2015 | |
| 15 | School Climate Survey | 3-5 | Climate | Avg Student Responses on Scale of 1-4 | 3.2 | 3.5 |
| 15 | School Climate Survey | 6-12 | Climate | Avg Student Responses on Scale of 1-4 | 2.8 | 3.2 |
| 16 | STAR | K | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | K | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | K | Reading | Pct above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | K | Reading | Pct above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 1 | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 1 | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 1 | Reading | Pct above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 1 | Reading | Pct above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 2 | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 2 | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 2 | Reading | Pct above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |

Student Performance Indicators with Baseline Data and Targets

| # | Assessment | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | STAR | 2 | Reading | Pct above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 3 | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 3 | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 3 | Reading | Pct above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 3 | Reading | Pct above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 4 | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 4 | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 4 | Reading | Pct above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 4 | Reading | Pct above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 5 | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 5 | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 5 | Reading | Pct above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 5 | Reading | Pct above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 6 | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 6 | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 6 | Reading | Pct above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 6 | Reading | Pct above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 7 | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 7 | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 7 | Reading | Pct above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 7 | Reading | Pct above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |

Student Performance Indicators with Baseline Data and Targets

| # | Assessment | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | STAR | 8 | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 8 | Reading | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 8 | Reading | Pct above Grade Level | Summer 2016 | |
| 16 | STAR | 8 | Reading | Pct above Grade Level and FR | Summer 2016 | |
| 17 | iReady | K | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level | 79.7% | 83% |
| 17 | iReady | K | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | 51.9% | 58% |
| 17 | iReady | K | Math | Pct above Grade Level | 47.8% | 50% |
| 17 | iReady | K | Math | Pct above Grade Level and FR | 35.2% | 40% |
| 17 | iReady | 1 | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level | 83.4% | 88% |
| 17 | iReady | 1 | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | 65.6% | 72% |
| 17 | iReady | 1 | Math | Pct above Grade Level | 47.6% | 54% |
| 17 | iReady | 1 | Math | Pct above Grade Level and FR | 26.2% | 40% |
| 17 | iReady | 2 | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level | 85.4% | 90% |
| 17 | iReady | 2 | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | 68.8% | 75% |
| 17 | iReady | 2 | Math | Pct above Grade Level | 45.7% | 54% |
| 17 | iReady | 2 | Math | Pct above Grade Level and FR | 20.3% | 40% |
| 17 | iReady | 3 | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level | 83.7% | 90% |
| 17 | iReady | 3 | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | 51.1% | 75% |
| 17 | iReady | 3 | Math | Pct above Grade Level | 43.4% | 54% |
| 17 | iReady | 3 | Math | Pct above Grade Level and FR | 11.4% | 40% |
| 17 | iReady | 4 | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level | 86.1% | 90% |

Student Performance Indicators with Baseline Data and Targets

| # | Assessment | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | iReady | 4 | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | 56.9% | 80% |
| 17 | iReady | 4 | Math | Pct above Grade Level | 55.0% | 60% |
| 17 | iReady | 4 | Math | Pct above Grade Level and FR | 20.8% | 45% |
| 17 | iReady | 5 | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level | 86.3% | 90% |
| 17 | iReady | 5 | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | 60.8% | 80% |
| 17 | iReady | 5 | Math | Pct above Grade Level | 41.8% | 60% |
| 17 | iReady | 5 | Math | Pct above Grade Level and FR | 21.5% | 45% |
| 17 | iReady | 6 | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level | 83.5% | 90% |
| 17 | iReady | 6 | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | 44.3% | 80% |
| 17 | iReady | 6 | Math | Pct above Grade Level | 47.3% | 60% |
| 17 | iReady | 6 | Math | Pct above Grade Level and FR | 15.7% | 45% |
| 17 | iReady | 7 | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level | 86.5% | 90% |
| 17 | iReady | 7 | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | 68.4% | 80% |
| 17 | iReady | 7 | Math | Pct above Grade Level | 55.0% | 60% |
| 17 | iReady | 7 | Math | Pct above Grade Level and FR | 25.3% | 45% |
| 17 | iReady | 8 | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level | 86.1% | 90% |
| 17 | iReady | 8 | Math | Pct at/above Grade Level and FR | 63.6% | 80% |
| 17 | iReady | 8 | Math | Pct above Grade Level | 59.0% | 70% |
| 17 | iReady | 8 | Math | Pct above Grade Level and FR | 27.3% | 45% |
| 18 | Attendance | K-5 | | Attendance Rate | 96.2% | 98% |
| 18 | Attendance | K-5 | | Attendance Rate and FR | 95.6% | 98% |

Student Performance Indicators with Baseline Data and Targets

| # | Assessment | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | Attendance | 6-8 | | Attendance Rate | 96.1% | 98% |
| 18 | Attendance | 6-8 | | Attendance Rate and FR | 94.9% | 98% |
| 18 | Attendance | 9-12 | | Attendance Rate | 96.6% | 98% |
| 18 | Attendance | 9-12 | | Attendance Rate and FR | 95% | 98% |
| 19 | CELF | PK | Vocabulary and Language | Pct Approaching Benchmark | Summer 2015 | |
| 19 | CELF | PK | Vocabulary and Language | Pct Exceeding Benchmark | Summer 2015 | |