Fairfield Public Schools

# First Annual Update on the District Improvement Plan

2015-2020

September 29, 2016

## Introduction

On July 9, 2015, the Board of Education approved a District Improvement Plan for the Fairfield Public Schools for the period 2015 to 2020. The Plan provides that, "no later than the first BOE meeting in October of each year, the Superintendent shall present the implementation status of the District Improvement Plan together with any recommended modifications for consideration and affirmance of the Board of Education. The administration will prepare a public update each fall on the progress of the Student Performance Indicators and the Specific Actions completed during the previous year" (page 9). This document has been prepared in response to those requirements, in three parts:

- Part I summarizes the steps that have been taken since July of 2015 to implement the actions set forth in the Plan.

- Part II presents data related to each of the Student Performance Indicators specified in the Plan, including:

    - baseline data;
    - the 2020 target toward which the district is working;
    - the data that was gathered during the 2015-16 school year; and
    - an interpretation of the data, where appropriate.

- Part III sets forth modifications of the Plan that the administration proposes for the consideration of the Board of Education.

# Part I: Progress to Date

The following is a summary of the steps that the district has taken over the past year to implement the changes described in Section 3 of the District Improvement Plan: Specific Actions.

## Instructional Program

1. **Develop a World Language Program at the elementary school level that reflects the best research-based practices in the field.** ***(Year 1 of 2)***

   In 2015-2016, we developed implementation guides and common assessments and put them in place this year for grades 4 and 5. The approved 2016-2017 budget enables us to begin Spanish in Grade 3, with the plan to add grades K-2 in 2017-2018. In June 2016, implementation guides were modified to address the addition of Spanish instruction in grade 3 and to include lessons learned from the full implementation of the grade 6 program in 15-16.

   Status: Year 1 Complete

2. **Develop and approve curriculum in Social Studies K-12 and Computer Literacy Grades 6-8. *** ***(Year 1 of 5)***

   The Board of Education approved the revised PK-12 Social Studies curriculum, along with new textbooks in grades 6-12. The curriculum will be implemented in grades 6-12 in 2016-17 and in grades PK-5 in 2017-18. The Board of Education approved the revised Computer Literacy curriculum for implementation during the 2016-2017 school year.

   Status: Year 1 Complete

3. **Research and review the K-12 Science Program sequence of courses to align with the new generation science standards.** ***(Year 1 of 5)***
   This process was completed during the summer of 2016. A recommended course sequence for the high schools will be made before the Program of Studies goes to print in January 2017. The curriculum will be presented to the Board in May 2017.

   The CT State Department of Education has just recently suggested an order of sequencing of science content for the Next Generation Science Standards in time for the summer curriculum writing. The largest issue for us is whether Earth Science will be a required grade 9 course for all students.

   Status: In Progress

4. **Implement newly adopted curriculum in World Language and Library/Media K-12.** ***(Year 1 of 5)***
   Implementation guides and common assessments were developed and used in elementary World Languages in 2015-2016. The elementary Library/Media curriculum was partially implemented due to the challenges



*Board Approval Required

of connecting that curriculum to classroom practices. The primary issue was a lack of time for co-planning. This was addressed through co-development of curriculum among English Language Arts, Social Studies, and Library Media in June, 2016.

We implemented the revised World Language and Library Media curriculum in all schools and classrooms in grades 6 through 12. The Library Media curriculum continues to be included as we work on Social Studies implementation, and as we develop the Capstone project.

Additionally, in conjunction with the Technology Department, the Library Media Specialists are working to transition sections of the Library Media Center to Makers' Spaces. Some elementary libraries have activities in place for students to explore STEM concepts.

Status: In Progress

5. **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.**
During the 2015-16 school year, we focused on Instructional Rounds in academic content areas (English, Math and World Language) across levels. Through this process we identified the issue of expectations for student performance as a need to be addressed. This year we will expand Instructional Rounds to include Social Studies as we implement a new curriculum.

   We also established specific guidelines for special education transitions -- the annual and transition PPT process. We developed a transition process for all student/families transitioning from 5-6, 8-9, and 12 to the Community Partnership Program (CPP). The planning process engaged students, families, school staff and administration in planning for positive transitions and ensuring programmatic implementation on day one. During the fall semester of 2016-2017, we will assess outcomes and reflect on feedback to adjust for transitions in the 2016-17 school year. We will also address the Early Childhood Center (ECC) transition process and the graduation transition process in the 2016-17 school year.

   We will also involve the middle and high schools in focused discussions around grading, which started this year. We will include the middle schools in a discussion about preparation for the Capstone. The summer reading for teachers and administrators will include *Personal Learning*, by Alison Zmuda, whom we hope to hire next year to work with our administrative teams.

   Status: In Progress

6. **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.** ***(Year 1 of 3)***
The goal of the secondary curriculum departments is to implement performance-based assessments in the required courses for the four major academic areas in grades 9, 10 and 11. We completed an initial field test of the Academic Expectations rubric. Performance tasks for grades 9, 10 and 11 using a common template will be finalized for all content areas except science. Due to the revised science curriculum, we need an additional year to align those tasks to the proposed curriculum.

   A Capstone committee is working on defining the elements of a Capstone project and developing an implementation plan that supports Capstone preparation for younger students. A recommendation will be presented to district leadership later this year.

   Status: In Progress

7. **Revise and implement additional common assessments aligned to the curriculum in grades K through 12, including performance-based assessments.** ***(Year 1 of 3 and Year 1 of 4)***
   We have identified expectations for the common elements of strong performance assessments and a schedule of initial performance assessment placement. We will align performance assessments to the Fairfield Public Schools' Academic Expectations. The PK-12 curriculum leaders are working on a standard template with common elements for grades PK-12.

   Status: In Progress

8. **Implement Professional Learning to strengthen instructional practices for students with disabilities and ELL students.**
   Professional development activities in the special education department included: Cadre #1 of our research-based reading intervention began its work. This work will result in 35 teachers earning certification in structured literacy teaching by the end of the 2016-17 school year. Cadre #2 will begin later this semester with an additional 35 teachers who will earn certification by June 2017. School psychologists and social workers focused on improving our comprehensive evaluations and increasing district capacity to work with and provide interventions to students with anxiety in our schools. We continue to provide these professional learning opportunities in 2016-17.

   ELL teachers were provided more professional learning opportunities. Their training and outcomes are being aligned to the English Language Arts curriculum during 2016-17.

   Status: Ongoing

9. **Implement Professional Learning on "Teaching in the Block" to all high school teachers.** ***(Year 1 of 3)***
   Both high schools have used their faculty meetings and building-based professional development days to focus on instructional strategies in the block schedule. The workshops have been facilitated by teachers who have experienced success in using a particular strategy or practice in the new schedule. Our Technology Integration Specialist has been extremely helpful in sharing the use of Google docs and other technologies, such as the flipped classroom, to advance this work.

   Status: Complete

10. **Develop a middle school advisory program.**
    A middle school advisory program is now in place, with a modified schedule on advisory days. The middle school administrators will use the program that is available through Naviance until the district's social-emotional framework is completed and a new curriculum is developed.

    Status: Complete

## Teams/Improvement Plans

11. **All School and Department Improvement Plans will align with the District Improvement Plan.**
    This has been completed at all levels. Schools have compared their year-end data to one-year targets so that targets could be re-set for this year. In the most recent PK-12 District Leadership Team meeting, schools shared leadership strategies that were effective in advancing the school improvement work. This work will continue on an annual basis.

    Status: Complete

12. **Use vertical teams to conduct Instructional Rounds in Math, Language Arts, Social Studies, Science, and World Language.**
We successfully conducted Instructional Rounds in Math, Language Arts, and World Languages that involved observation of instruction at elementary, middle and high school classrooms. The Instructional Rounds process is continuing in 2016-17

    Status: Ongoing

13. **Continue to improve the effectiveness of Data Teams at the School, Grade, Department and District levels to enhance student learning.** ***(Year 1 of 2)***
The District Data Team met on a monthly basis last year to review district-wide results in SBAC Mathematics and English/Language Arts. It also reviewed results related to several other student performance indicators in the District Improvement Plan.

    Data teams are in place at all schools. We plan to establish a small group of staff from each school this year to work with the Information Technology Department to learn about the use of the data visualization tab on Infinite Campus to support Data Team work.

    The high schools, including Walter Fitzgerald Campus (WFC), are starting to use the Tableau reports created by the Tech Department. This allows review of student data, enabling School Improvement Team discussion regarding the meaning of the data in terms of progress and the work still required.

    Status: Year 1 Complete

14. **Use best-practice models to improve the alternative high school program to engage every student in a challenging and rigorous program.** ***(Year 1 of 2)***
WFC is using project-based learning to help develop student interest and engagement in learning. Student presentations have resulted in a new enthusiasm around learning. The behaviors have improved and students are more involved in the school. There is still a great deal of work to be done, but the work at WFC will certainly benefit from the investigation of personalized learning and the work of Alison Zmuda.

    Following Board of Education approval, we are now soliciting other school districts about the possibility of enrolling students this program on a tuition basis.

    Status: Year 1 Complete

15. **All schools will engage in Instructional Rounds at least twice per year as part of the School Improvement Plan implementation.**
Elementary schools, including ECC, conducted Instructional Rounds in their schools in 2015-2016. Some elementary Rounds involved only staff at one school; in other cases, it involved staff members from multiple schools. At the secondary level, some schools did not conduct their own Rounds but participated in the department-led Rounds. The high schools had several Rounds occurring in their departments, some led by curriculum leaders and coordinators, and others conducted entirely by teachers. They also participated in vertical Rounds across the middle and high schools in World Language, Language Arts, Math and Special Education.

    Status: Complete

## Leadership Capacity

16. **Strengthen teacher leadership capacity related to the School Improvement Process (Instructional Rounds, Data Teams, Marzano learning strategies).** ***(Year 1 of 2)***

Teachers have been an integral part of the leadership through their work in existing district processes and protocols. They have been provided professional learning to support their role as facilitators of Instructional Rounds and they serve on and lead school-based data teams.

Dr. Title trained an additional 25 teachers as Instructional Rounds facilitators in 2015-2016. In May 2016, these teacher leaders also met with Dr. Title as a group to review their successes and areas for growth in Instructional Rounds facilitation.

Teacher leadership also continues to grow with participation in influential committees such as the Capstone. As noted, teachers are leading most of the professional development for other teachers in teaching in the block schedule. The teacher leader for psychologists led his fellow psychologists and social workers in improving our crisis intervention teams and other responsibilities of their positions. Teachers are also taking on leadership roles as the first cadre of individuals trained in the new dyslexia mandate work.

Our Technology Integration Specialist for the high schools is an excellent example of teacher leadership. She excels in her position and has expanded the effective use of technology across the high schools, including WFC. She has been instrumental in supporting teachers as they explore new techniques/strategies and the use of technology to more effectively use the time in the block schedule.

In addition to teacher leadership development, all administrators went through a calibration process regarding the Marzano learning strategies, as required by the Fairfield Educator Professional Growth Plan, in August 2015. Administrators participated in professional learning regarding the Marzano strategies at a District Leadership Team meeting in the fall of 2015.

Status: Year 1 Complete

17. **Align teacher goals in the Teacher Professional Growth Plan to goals in the School Improvement Plan and/or Department Improvement Plan.** ***(Year 1 of 2)***

All teacher goals are aligned to the School Improvement Plans. School Improvement Plans are aligned to the Department and District Improvement Plans.

Status: Complete

18. **Ensure that all 6 new administrators have a successful first year in Fairfield.**

All new administrators have been supported, both by request of the administrator and through reaching out by the Director of Human Resources and other members of the central office leadership team. All of our new leaders proved to be effective and successful in their roles during the 2015-16 school year.

Status: Complete

19. **Implement Leadership Academy Module #1: Leadership Capacity Special Education Processes and Practices.**

We completed Module #1 of our Leadership Academy. The focus of Module #1 was Special Education. The Director of Special Education and Special Programs conducted four sessions with secondary administrators and four sessions with elementary administrators that explored leadership in the

following areas: setting up a culture of collaboration, addressing individual needs, working with families and outside providers, using conflict resolution, and ensuring staff accountability.

Status: Complete

## Resources

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

A committee comprising central office, district-wide and building administrators convened in February and March of 2016 to develop the Educator Hiring Protocol. The protocol was presented to the district administrators at a District Leadership Team meeting in April 2016. All resources have been developed and distributed to administrators. The new protocol was employed in the hiring all teachers for the 2016-17 school year.

Status: Complete

**21. Develop and implement a New Teacher Academy to build capacity of all non-tenured teachers.** ***(Year 1 of 2)***

A survey of administrators and first-year and second-year teachers was conducted in October 2015 to assess successes of current teacher induction and needs going forward. A team of district administrators and teachers convened in May to develop the structure of the New Teacher Academy. Implementation began in August 2016 and will continue throughout the 2016-17 school year.

Status: Year 1 Complete

**22. Implement common planning time for high school teachers.**

Most departments have been able to take advantage of common planning time at both high schools. Although the entire department may not have the same scheduled planning time, most teachers have common planning time with their colleagues.

Status: Complete

**23. Implement specific components of the technology plan regarding classroom technology equipment and instructional software and applications which support student learning PK – 12.** ***(Year 1 of 3)***

All classrooms across the district are now supplied with either a SMART Board or a projection system. With the support of our high school Technology Integration Specialist, an online application for software and computer applications has been developed. This application tracks all software and apps for teachers so they can explore what we already have before asking for something else. It has also made teachers much more aware of licensing practices associated with software and applications. The progress in the use of effective digital applications at the high school level has been astounding and continues to move the district toward a one-to-one computing district.

Status: Year 1 Complete

**24. Develop and implement on-line training modules to support the professional growth and needs of staff.** ***(Year 1 of 3)***

Currently, we have a consultant from Pfizer that is developing four different on-line modules for our science teachers free of cost.

Status: Year 1 Complete

**25. Expand options for mental health support for students in grades 9-12.** ***(Year 1 of 2)***

We have expanded the options for supporting students with mental health needs at the high schools and the WFC. As a result, we were able to return four students to district in 2015-16 and an additional seven for the 2016-17 school year. Additionally, we have seen a significant reduction in the number of students leaving the district for out-of-district placements. We remain optimistic about our results as student attendance is improving, grades and data regarding achievement are improving and students and families report positive growth and support of the program. Next steps include discussion of elementary and middle school level improvements and the enhancement of prevention efforts through teaching models like DBT (dialectical behavioral therapy). We are currently preparing proposals for consideration and inclusion for the 2017-2018 school year.

Status: Year 1 Complete

**26. Train teachers and implement evidence-based reading program for struggling readers (dyslexia) for students in grades K-5. Implement evidence-based reading program for students in grades 6-12.** ***(Year 1 of 2)***

In regular education a phonemic awareness screen was put in place. This identified a need for teacher professional learning for classroom teachers to improve instruction in word work. Additionally, materials were purchased to support instruction in all classrooms. This work will continue in 2016-17. Also, see the work done on #8 related to dyslexia.

The reading program *Language! Live* is currently in year two of implementation in the high school Reading Strategies classes. This program focuses on word training and reading comprehension. Teachers participated in an 8-hour professional development session led by *Language! Live* trainers. In the Reading classes in grades 6-8, teachers continue to use the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System to assess student reading ability and to design evidenced-based reading support. Professional learning resources were identified and purchased for grades 6-8 and plans for coaching using these materials are in place. This work will continue in 2016-17.

Status: Year 1 Complete

**27. Expand the use of Infinite Campus across all schools to improve communication and efficiency, including the use of Grade Book at the elementary schools.**

We are in the midst of training the elementary Instructional Improvement Teachers in leading the use of Infinite Campus in their schools. This training has included using Messenger and Tableau to increase communication. In addition, we are working to develop an implementation model linking district assessments and unit plans to Progress Report standards. We are refining those standards to reduce their number and make them more understandable to parents.

Status: In Progress

28. **Implement electronic applications to increase efficiency (HR functions, field trip approval, Preventative Maintenance, increased electronic communication, bus disciplinary referrals).**
The Human Resources Department opened up Employee Self Service (ESS) to all employees in March 2016. "Pay stub" information is now available in the ESS application and is no longer distributed in paper copy.

    In the Maintenance Department, we have implemented the module in our existing "School Dude" system that encompasses preventative maintenance for HVAC, Controls Integration, and Roofs. Low Voltage, Emergency Generators, and Boilers are planned for 2016-2017 and will complete the electronic conversion of our preventative maintenance programs.

    Student records are now mostly maintained in IC. Minimal paper reports are retained in the 50-year retention paper files. Many routing teacher forms have been converted to digital documents and completed online. The use of the website to communicate has eliminated the need for a host of documents to be sent to parents, including health requirements, report cards, registration documents, etc. The revised BOE Policies are now be housed on the website as a result of the CABE audit, and there will no longer be paper binders, alleviating not only paper, but hours of staff time in sending out the paper updates.

    Status: In Progress

29. **Implement and communicate a School Safety and Security Improvement Plan that complies with all state requirements in conjunction with the Fairfield Police Department and the community.**
We completed a new Safety and Security Plan in cooperation with the Fairfield Police and Fire Departments for submission to the Connecticut State Department of Education. The Lockdown Drill Manual has been completed and distributed to all staff. This manual resulted from the dialog among the Fairfield Police Department, Fairfield Fire Department, building administrators and key BOE central office personnel. Lt. Eddie Weihe ensured that the manual contained input from all four of these groups.

    Status: Complete

30. **Explore redistricting options that could mitigate the costs of the Holland Hill and Mill Hill capital projects.**
The Board approved its subcommittee's recommendation on the principles to be followed in a redistricting scenario. The Superintendent hired Milone and MacBroom to explore all options for redistricting and the consultants used the Board's principles as the basis for its study. A full presentation was conducted in public on this issue in February, 2016 and the results are posted on the school system's website. The firm identified some conceptual redistricting options. In addition, as a result of this work, the Board received new 10-year enrollment forecasts for the entire district and by school.

    Status: Complete

31. **Design a Racial Imbalance Plan that satisfies the state requirements. ***
The Milone and MacBroom study focused specifically on the options for redistricting to achieve racial balance. No short-term redistricting solution is available; we presented to the State Board of Education on May 4, 2016. An amendment to the district's Plan is under development and will be presented to the Board of Education in October. The amended Plan is due back to the State Board of Education in December, 2016.

    Status: In Progress



*Board Approval Required

**32. Research strengthening the enforcement of residency requirements.**

We developed and implemented registration policies to strengthen the residency investigation process and streamline the flow of requirements. This action identified non-resident families with students in the Fairfield Public Schools, prompting residency investigations.

The registration staff should be commended for its work in the development of policies/practices to better enforce BOE policies on enrollment in districted schools and also on residency checks. We believe that our current staff cannot continue to effectively conduct the investigative work in-house and that an outside firm should be considered to supplement the in-house staff in the 2017-2018 budget.

Status: Complete

**33. Develop and clearly communicate an operating and capital budget, including safety and security infrastructure (Phase II) for 2016-2017 that fully funds state and federal mandates and the District Improvement Plan. ***

The capital non-recurring budget, which included Phase II of the Security Infrastructure, was approved by the town bodies with the exception of the central office server room HVAC project. The operating budget, as approved by the Town, fully funds the District Improvement Plan initiatives for 2016-2017, as well as all state and federal mandates. Approximately $3.5 million was saved by switching health insurance plans to the Connecticut Partnership 2.0. The town's revenue from the State was reduced by approximately $2.3 million and the BOE has agreed to do its part throughout 2016-2017 to help mitigate this loss.

Status: Complete

**34. Accept as completed the Stratfield renovation and addition, Dwight roof, FWHS roof, FWMS renovation and addition projects. ***

The Board accepted the completed Stratfield renovation and addition, Dwight roof, and the Fairfield Woods Middle School renovation and addition during the 2015-2016 school year. The Fairfield Warde High School roof project was completed during the summer of 2016.

Status: Complete

**35. Finalize Paraprofessionals and SPED Trainers Contracts. ***

The Paraprofessional contract was finalized in December 2015. The SPED Trainers contract was finalized in July of 2016. As a side note, the Technology Department voted to de-certify and is no longer part of a bargaining unit.

Status: In Progress

# Part II: Student Performance Indicators

The following table presents the most recent available data on the various Student Performance Indicators that were set forth in the District Improvement Plan when it was adopted in July of 2015, along with corresponding baseline data and 2020 targets. The index numbers along the left hand margin refer to the assessment categories that were included in Section 2 of the Plan. Following the Index number is a description of the assessment and what component of student achievement it is expected to measure. Where applicable, there is a second paragraph interpreting the student performance after one year of implementation.

Below the description and interpretation for each assessment category is a chart which lists the data measures that are used to monitor student performance within each assessment category. For example, there are two data measures within the assessment category for Career and Technical Education (CTE), one to measure the percentage of students enrolled in CTE courses, and the other to measure the percentage of non-traditional students enrolled in CTE courses. Both of these measures are used to monitor our success in attracting students to current and emerging high-skill occupations, particularly where one gender is under-represented. The chart also lists the grade in which the assessment is administered, the descriptor for each measure within the assessment category, the year in which the Baseline Data was collected or will be collected, the Baseline Data, Data collected in 2016 if available, and the 2020 Target. It is important to note several things in the chart. The column labeled Baseline Year indicates the year in which the Baseline Data was or will be collected. Some of the Baseline Data will not be available until 2017 and much of the Baseline Data only became available in 2016, in which case you will see that the Baseline Data and the 2016 Data are the same. For those assessments, there will be no interpretation of the data because there is no one-year comparative data. For those assessment categories where there is no Baseline Data available until 2017, there will be no Targets. Finally, for those assessments in which Baseline Data was established in 2015 and 2016 Data is also available, there will be a one-year interpretation of data included in the text above the chart. However, it is important to remember that for each assessment, the comparative data measures the achievement of different cohorts of students, making it is difficult to determine if the change is due to the difference in the two cohorts of students or the beginning of a trend. Additional data must be collected to establish a trend in performance.

Occasionally, data in the table is designated as ‘FR’, which stands for ‘Free or Reduced’ price lunch program. Data so labeled pertains to low-income students.

1. The **Post Graduate Survey Indicator** measures the extent to which Fairfield students are prepared for college or technical school compared to other students at the same college or technical school. The baseline data was collected in 2015 for the graduating class of 2014 by Futuristic Research of Reading, Pennsylvania. This same company collected the 2016 data for the graduating class of 2015. The students were asked to comment on their "preparation level versus other students at your college or technical school." Answer options included, "Better Prepared," "Prepared About the Same," or "Not as Well Prepared." The data used for this indicator is the percentage of students who answered "Better Prepared" or "Prepared About the Same."

   From 2015 to 2016, there is a slight dip in the percentage, but in both years the percentage of students indicating that they are well prepared for college or technical school is very high.

| *Assessment Number* | *Assessment Name* | *Grade Level or Course* | *Subjects* | *Measure* | *Baseline Year* | *Baseline Data* | *2016 Data* | *2020 Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Post HS Student Survey | Post HS | Success Post-HS | Survey | 2015 | 96.7% | 93.9% | 98% |

2. The district **4-year Graduation Rate** measures the percentage of students who graduate in the year of their cohort. The cohort year of graduation is determined by kindergarten entrance year. The district percentage includes all Fairfield students who graduate from Fairfield Public High Schools, as well as students with disabilities placed by Fairfield Public Schools in alternative settings.

| *Assessment Number* | *Assessment Name* | *Grade Level or Course* | *Subjects* | *Measure* | *Baseline Year* | *Baseline Data* | *2016 Data* | *2020 Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Graduation Rates | | | 4-Year Graduation Rate | 2016 | 93.8% | 93.8% | 96% |
| | | | | 4-Year Graduation Rate and FR | 2016 | 82.7% | 82.7% | 90% |

The district **6-year Graduation Rate** is determined by the state and measures the percentage of students who graduate within two years after their cohort graduation date. The district percentage includes all Fairfield students who graduate from Fairfield Public High Schools, as well as students with disabilities placed by Fairfield Public Schools in alternative settings. The 6-year graduation rate is a new measure by the State Department of Education intended to capture students who persist to graduation including students with disabilities in our 18-21 program. This data will not be available until spring of 2017.

| *Assessment Number* | *Assessment Name* | *Grade Level or Course* | *Subjects* | *Measure* | *Baseline Year* | *Baseline Data* | *2016 Data* | *2020 Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Graduation Rates | | | 6-Year Graduation Rate | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | 6-Year Graduation Rate and FR | 2017 | | | |

3. **AP** exams are scored on a scale of 1 to 5. A score of 5 means the student is extremely well qualified to receive college credit for that course; a score of 4 means the student is well qualified; a score of 3 means that the student is qualified to receive credit for the course; a score of 2 means the student may be qualified, and a score of 1 offers no recommendation for college credit. Scoring of the exams varies widely, as each exam is focused on different content and skills. In general, colleges will give a student credit for a score of 3 or higher, although more competitive colleges may only give credit for a score of 4 or higher, depending upon the exam.

   One year of comparative data shows that the overall participation rate is growing, but the percentage of students scoring at 3 and above is declining. The data also continues to show that more support must be provided to economically challenged students. It should be noted that the data shown is from two different graduating classes and may be more reflective of the differences in the cohorts rather than a trend in performance.

| *Assessment Number* | *Assessment Name* | *Grade Level or Course* | *Subjects* | *Measure* | *Baseline Year* | *Baseline Data* | *2016 Data* | *2020 Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | AP Scores | Grades 9-12 | Various | Pct at 3 and above | 2015 | 88.9% | 85.3% | 93% |
| | | | | Pct at 3 and above and FR | 2015 | 91.5% | 82.5% | 93% |
| | | | | Pct at 4 and above | 2015 | 58.1% | 56.4% | 70% |
| | | | | Pct at 4 and above and FR | 2015 | 68.4% | 46.0% | 70% |

4. **AP Participation by Graduation** measures the percentage of students in a graduating class who successfully completed at least one Advanced Placement course (with a 75% or above) during the high school experience.

   Overall, the percentage of students increased, but more support and encouragement may be needed for FR students.

| *Assessment Number* | *Assessment Name* | *Grade Level or Course* | *Subjects* | *Measure* | *Baseline Year* | *Baseline Data* | *2016 Data* | *2020 Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | AP Participation by Graduation | Grades 9-12 | Various | Pct successfully complete 1 course by graduation | 2015 | 58.5% | 63.4% | 80% |
| | | | | Pct successfully complete 1 course by graduation and FR | 2015 | 15.9% | 32.8% | 50% |

5. The **Career/Tech Ed** indicator measures the percentage of graduating students who enrolled in at least one career/tech-education course (i.e., business, family consumer science, technology education) during the high school experience.

From the baseline data of 2015, to the current data of 2016, 7.3% more graduating students took at least one CTE course. The one-year comparison also shows a slight decline in the percentage of non-traditional students enrolled, which may illustrate a comparison between the two different cohorts rather than a trend in student performance.

| *Assessment Number* | *Assessment Name* | *Grade Level or Course* | *Subjects* | *Measure* | *Baseline Year* | *Baseline Data* | *2016 Data* | *2020 Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Career/Tech Ed | Grades 9-12 | Various | Pct enrolled | 2015 | 61.9% | 69.2% | 75% |
| | | | | Pct of non-traditional enrolled | 2015 | 9.4% | 8.9% | 15% |

6. The **Academic Expectations Rubrics** are used to measure our students' achievement of 21st Century Skills in the areas of Communicating and Collaborating as well as Critical and Creative Thinking. The 2015-2016 school year was used to field test the rubrics and performance-based assessments and led to revisions and refinements. During the 2016-2017 school year, the rubrics will be used to collect baseline data.

| *Assessment Number* | *Assessment Name* | *Grade Level or Course* | *Subjects* | *Measure* | *Baseline Year* | *Baseline Data* | *2016 Data* | *2020 Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | Academic Expectations Rubrics | 11 | Creative and Critical Thinking | Pct at 3 and above | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at 3 and above and FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at 4 | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at 4 and FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | 12 | Creative and Critical Thinking | Pct at 3 and above | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at 3 and above and FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at 4 | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at 4 and FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | 11 | Communication and Collaboration | Pct at 3 and above | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at 3 and above and FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at 4 | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at 4 and FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | 12 | Communication and Collaboration | Pct at 3 and above | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at 3 and above and FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at 4 | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at 4 and FR | 2017 | | | |

7. The **ACTFL** performance assessment measures the learner's functional competency to engage in linguistic tasks on topics of personal, social, and academic relevance. It is aligned to The World Readiness standards created by the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Language (ACTFL) and is measured by the proficiency guidelines created by ACTFL.

| *Assessment Number* | *Assessment Name* | *Grade Level or Course* | *Subjects* | *Measure* | *Baseline Year* | *Baseline Data* | *2016 Data* | *2020 Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | ACTFL | Level 20 | French | Pct at/above Proficient | 2016 | 25.0% | 25.0% | 50% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2016 | 7.0% | 7.0% | 12% |
| | | | Spanish | Pct at /above Proficient | 2016 | 56.0% | 56.0% | 75% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2016 | 11.0% | 11.0% | 16% |
| | | | Chinese | Pct at/above Proficient | 2016 | 3.0% | 3.0% | 30% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2016 | 3.0% | 3.0% | 8% |

8. 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.

| *Assessment Number* | *Assessment Name* | *Grade Level or Course* | *Subjects* | *Measure* | *Baseline Year* | *Baseline Data* | *2016 Data* | *2020 Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | ALIRA | Level 20 | Latin | Pct at/above Proficient | 2016 | 88.0% | 88.0% | 94% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2016 | 81.0% | 81.0% | 96% |

9. The **STAMP** performance assessment measures the learner's functional competency to engage in linguistic tasks on topics of personal, social, and academic relevance. It is aligned to The World Readiness standards created by the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Language (ACTFL) and is measured by the proficiency guidelines created by ACTFL.

| *Assessment Number* | *Assessment Name* | *Grade Level or Course* | *Subjects* | *Measure* | *Baseline Year* | *Baseline Data* | *2016 Data* | *2020 Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | STAMP | Level 20 | Italian | Pct at/above Proficient | 2016 | 6.0% | 6.0% | 40% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2016 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 10% |

10. The **WL Credits by Graduation/4+ Credits/2 Years** indicator measures the percentage of high school students who graduate with a total accumulation of 4 or more high school World Language credits (2 or more years).

One year of comparative data shows a slight increase in the percentage of students completing two years (4 credits) of World Language by graduation.

| *Assessment Number* | *Assessment Name* | *Grade Level or Course* | *Subjects* | *Measure* | *Baseline Year* | *Baseline Data* | *2016 Data* | *2020 Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | WL Credits by Graduation | 12 | World Languages | Pct of graduates with 4+ credits, 2 years | 2015 | 88.5% | 88.9% | 93% |

The **WL Credits by Graduation/8+ Credits/4 Years** indicator measures the percentage of high school students who graduate with a total accumulation of 8 or more high school World Language credits (4 or more years).

One year of comparative data shows a slight increase in the percentage of students completing four years (8 credits) of World Language by graduation.

| *Assessment Number* | *Assessment Name* | *Grade Level or Course* | *Subjects* | *Measure* | *Baseline Year* | *Baseline Data* | *2016 Data* | *2020 Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | WL Credits by Graduation | 12 | World Languages | Pct of graduates with 8+ credits, 4 years | 2015 | 44.4% | 45.3% | 50% |

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

One year of comparative data shows at 3.2 percentage point increase in the percentage of students successfully completing the highest levels of mathematics available in our program. Again, it should be noted that one year of comparative data may be more reflective of the differences in the cohorts rather than a trend in performance, although the number of students accelerated in middle school math continues to grow.

| *Assessment Number* | *Assessment Name* | *Grade Level or Course* | *Subjects* | *Measure* | *Baseline Year* | *Baseline Data* | *2016 Data* | *2020 Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | Calculus and Multivariable Participation | 12 | Mathematics | Pct Successfully Completed Course | 2015 | 13.3% | 16.5% | 20% |

12. The **PSAT** has been redesigned by the College Board to measure progress toward college and career readiness and is aligned to the Connecticut Core Standards. The PSAT is a good predictor for student performance on the SAT for student achievement in both mathematics and evidence-based reading and writing. For the purpose of the DIP, it is our recommendation to use the 10th grade PSAT data to monitor student performance and identify student needs prior to the 11th grade SAT (eliminating the need to include 11th grade PSAT as an indicator).

| *Assessment Number* | *Assessment Name* | *Grade Level or Course* | *Subjects* | *Measure* | *Baseline Year* | *Baseline Data* | *2016 Data* | *2020 Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | PSAT | 10 | Language Arts | Pct at/above College and Career Benchmark | 2016 | 95.6% | 95.6% | 98% |
| | | | | Pct at/above College and Career Benchmark and FR | 2016 | 84.9% | 84.9% | 88% |
| | | | Math | Pct at/above College and Career Benchmark | 2016 | 60.3% | 60.3% | 75% |
| | | | | Pct at/above College and Career Benchmark and FR | 2016 | 34.2% | 34.2% | 50% |

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | PSAT | 11 | Language Arts | Pct at/above College and Career Benchmark | 2016 | 95.0% | 95.0% | 98% |
| | | | | Pct at/above College and Career Benchmark and FR | 2016 | 84.3% | 84.3% | 88% |
| | | | Math | Pct at/above College and Career Benchmark | 2016 | 52.7% | 52.7% | 70% |
| | | | | Pct at/above College and Career Benchmark and FR | 2016 | 30.0% | 30.0% | 50% |

13. The **Smarter Balanced Assessments** are aligned to the Connecticut Core Standards to measure literacy in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. The assessment measures progress of students in grades three through eight toward college and career readiness. SBA data provides feedback to the strengths and needs of curriculum and instruction in the Fairfield Public Schools. From the data we can identify what instructional strategies and resources work best for our students and apply that learning to areas of need.

Results continue to exceed the state of Connecticut average. The difference between the percent of students meeting or exceeding district and state performance on the ELA assessment ranges from 14 to 21 percentage points with an average difference of 18%. On the mathematics assessment, district averages exceeded state averages by a range of 18 to 23 percentage points with an average difference of 21%.

• Across grades 3-8 ELA performance on the SBA remained consistent.

• The strongest district performance in math in 2016 occurred in grades 5 and 6. This year that performance remained steady while instructional and curricular efforts to improve performance in other grades resulted in a 7% increase in grade 3, 4% increase in grade 4, 3% increase in grade 7, and an 8% increase in grade 8.

Although one year of comparative data shows some increase in scores for economically challenged students, these scores in general indicate more support is needed to significantly improve performance.

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | SBAC | 3 | Language Arts | Pct at/above Achievement Level | 2015 | 67.0% | 68.0% | 80% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 23.0% | 40.0% | 40% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level | 2015 | 37.0% | 43.0% | 47% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 7.0% | 21.0% | 15% |

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | SBAC | 3 | Math | Pct at/above Achievement Level | 2015 | 64.0% | 71.0% | 75% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 15.0% | 46.0% | 25% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level | 2015 | 21.0% | 31.0% | 50% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 3.0% | 10.0% | 30% |

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | SBAC | 4 | Language Arts | Pct at/above Achievement Level | 2015 | 72.0% | 75.0% | 85% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 28.0% | 38.0% | 40% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level | 2015 | 40.0% | 47.0% | 55% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 10.0% | 15.0% | 25% |
| | | | Math | Pct at/above Achievement Level | 2015 | 64.0% | 68.0% | 80% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 14.0% | 27.0% | 40% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level | 2015 | 22.0% | 29.0% | 28% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 4.0% | 10.0% | 10% |

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | SBAC | 5 | Language Arts | Pct at/above Achievement Level | 2015 | 80.0% | 76.0% | 85% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 48.0% | 49.0% | 55% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level | 2015 | 43.0% | 45.0% | 60% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 14.0% | 19.0% | 25% |
| | | | Math | Pct at/above Achievement Level | 2015 | 63.0% | 64.0% | 80% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 29.0% | 23.0% | 45% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level | 2015 | 31.0% | 34.0% | 40% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 9.0% | 7% | 15% |

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | SBAC | 6 | Language Arts | Pct at/above Achievement Level | 2015 | 78.0% | 76.0% | 88% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 33.3% | 56.0% | 53% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level | 2015 | 34.9% | 36.0% | 40% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 18.2% | 13.0% | 8% |

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | SBAC | 6 | Math | Pct at/above Achievement Level | 2015 | 64.2% | 63.0% | 87% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 33.3% | 28.0% | 67% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level | 2015 | 34.9% | 36.0% | 32% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 9.3% | 15.0% | 18% |

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | SBAC | 7 | Language Arts | Pct at/above Achievement Level | 2015 | 77.6% | 74.0% | 80% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 47.5% | 37% | 51% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level | 2015 | 26.9% | 31.0% | 30% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 3.3% | 4% | 17% |
| | | | Math | Pct at/above Achievement Level | 2015 | 58.2% | 61.0% | 84% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 31.2% | 18.0% | 45% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level | 2015 | 28.8% | 30.0% | 39% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 11.7% | 3% | 14% |

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | SBAC | 8 | Language Arts | Pct at/above Achievement Level | 2015 | 71.0% | 75.0% | 78% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 31.0% | 48.0% | 51% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level | 2015 | 24.6% | 29.0% | 34% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 11.8% | 12.0% | 15% |
| | | | Math | Pct at/above Achievement Level | 2015 | 54.8% | 63.0% | 74% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 28.4% | 33.0% | 55% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level | 2015 | 30.7% | 36.0% | 36% |
| | | | | Pct Exceeding Achievement Level and FR | 2015 | 6.0% | 11.0% | 16% |

14. The **SAT** has been redesigned by the College Board to measure progress toward college and career readiness and is aligned to the Connecticut Core Standards. The SAT is now designated as the state assessments for all students in grade eleven to measure achievement in mathematics and evidence-based reading and writing.

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | SAT | 11 | Language Arts | Pct at/above College and Career Benchmark | 2016 | 84.8% | 84.8% | 90 |
| | | | | Pct at/above College and Career Benchmark and FR | 2016 | 57.1% | 57.1% | 75 |
| | | | Math | Pct at/above College and Career Benchmark | 2016 | 62.8% | 62.8% | 75 |
| | | | | Pct at/above College and Career Benchmark and FR | 2016 | 37.7% | 37.7% | 55 |

15. **Extra-Curricular Participation** is an important measure of a student's connectedness to school. This indicator illustrates the percentage of students who participate in at least one middle or high school club, sport, and/or fine arts activity during the calendar year. It is our recommendation to eliminate the subcategories of clubs, sports, and fine arts activities because the measure is focused on a student's connectedness to school and the subcategories do not provide additional helpful information and are extremely difficult to track.

| *Assessment Number* | *Assessment Name* | *Grade Level or Course* | *Subjects* | *Measure* | *Baseline Year* | *Baseline Data* | *2016 Data* | *2020 Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | Extra Curricular Participation | 6-8 | Extra Curricular | Pct in at least one activity overall | 2016 | 58.0% | 58.0% | 75% |
| | | 9-12 | | Pct in at least one activity overall | 2017 | | | |

16. The **Science CMT (grades 5 and 8 only)** assesses students' understanding of important scientific concepts from life, earth and physical science strands, as well as the ability to apply those concepts to real-world issues. In addition, there is a major focus on scientific inquiry and using scientific reasoning to solve problems. The Science test includes a combination of multiple-choice and open-ended questions.

Student performance on the top two bands of the science assessments increased 4% in grade 5, 3% in grade 8 and remained constant at 70% in grade 10.

The **Science CAPT (grade 10 only)** assesses students' understanding of important scientific concepts from five different content strands, as well as their abilities to apply those concepts to real-world issues. In addition, there is a major focus on scientific inquiry and using scientific reasoning to solve problems. The test includes a combination of multiple choice and open-ended questions, which may require students to create graphs.

The student performance on the grade 10 Science CAPT shows little or no change from 2015 to 2016, and the data supports the need for continued support for economically challenged students.

| *Assessment Number* | *Assessment Name* | *Grade Level or Course* | *Subjects* | *Measure* | *Baseline Year* | *Baseline Data* | *2016 Data* | *2020 Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | CMT | 5 | Science | Pct at/above Goal | 2015 | 76.30% | 81% | 90% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 2015 | 40.30% | 41% | 70% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2015 | 22.90% | 37% | 45% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced and FR | 2015 | 1.4% | 8% | 20% |
| | | 8 | | Pct at/above Goal | 2015 | 79.1% | 83% | 90% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 2015 | 52.2% | 56% | 75% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2015 | 26.5% | 29% | 50% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced and FR | 2015 | 11.1% | 18% | 40% |

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | CAPT | 10 | | Pct at/above Goal | 2015 | 69.8% | 70% | 90% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 2015 | 45.5% | 46% | 75% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2015 | 45.1% | 40% | 55% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced and FR | 2015 | 25.0% | 18% | 40% |

17. 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.

One year of comparative data shows similar performance in grade 4 and 8 while grade 10 students show some improvement. This may be the result of growth in the fitness of students with more time in physical education and sports, however, one year of comparative data may reflect the difference in the cohorts rather than a trend in performance.

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | CT Physical Fitness Test | 4 | Fitness | Pct Passing 4 Tests | 2015 | 67.0% | 66.0% | 70% |
| | | 8 | | Pct Passing 4 Tests | 2015 | 69.0% | 69.0% | 70% |
| | | 10 | | Pct Passing 4 Tests | 2015 | 57.0% | 60.0% | 70% |

18. **The K-5 District Common Assessment** is a formative assessment. In grades K-5, students produce on-demand, long-form writing three times per year. Writing is assessed using district writing rubrics that are aligned to the Connecticut Core Standards. Grade level expectations increase from year to year.

This writing assessment provides feedback to teachers on students' ability to respond to a prompt. Teachers use student responses to plan instruction.

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | District Common Assessments | K | Writing | Pct at/above Goal | 2016 | 90% | 90.0% | 95% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 2016 | 73% | 73.0% | 82% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2016 | 43% | 43.0% | 50% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced and FR | 2016 | 15% | 15.0% | 25% |
| | | 1 | | Pct at/above Goal | 2016 | 72% | 72.0% | 85% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 2016 | 57% | 57.0% | 67% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2016 | 27% | 27.0% | 35% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced and FR | 2016 | 19% | 19.0% | 25% |

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | District Common Assessments | 2 | Writing | Pct at/above Goal | 2016 | 70% | 70.0% | 85% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 2016 | 55% | 55.0% | 65% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2016 | 22% | 22.0% | 35% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced and FR | 2016 | 12% | 12.0% | 25% |
| | | 3 | | Pct at/above Goal | 2016 | 70% | 70.0% | 85% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 2016 | 46% | 46.0% | 56% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2016 | 26% | 26.0% | 35% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced and FR | 2016 | 5% | 5.0% | 25% |
| | | 4 | | Pct at/above Goal | 2016 | 67% | 67.0% | 85% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 2016 | 33% | 33.0% | 43% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2016 | 16% | 16.0% | 30% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced and FR | 2016 | 3% | 3.0% | 10% |
| | | 5 | | Pct at/above Goal | 2016 | 74% | 74.0% | 85% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 2016 | 42% | 42.0% | 52% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2016 | 31% | 31.0% | 38% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced and FR | 2016 | 6% | 6.0% | 15% |

**The District Common Assessment in grades 6-8** is on-demand informational/literary argument writing in response to reading. This is scored using ELA district-writing rubrics aligned to Connecticut Core Standards.

This writing assessment provides feedback to teachers on students' ability to respond to a prompt. Teachers use student responses to plan instruction.

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | District Common Assessments | 6 | Writing | Pct at/above Goal | 2016 | 79.0% | 79.0% | 85% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 2016 | 58.0% | 58.0% | 68% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2016 | 13.0% | 13.0% | 17% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced and FR | 2016 | 3.0% | 3.0% | 10% |

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | District Common Assessments | 7 | Writing | Pct at/above Goal | 2016 | 67.0% | 67.0% | 85% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 2016 | 39.0% | 39.0% | 65% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2016 | 4.0% | 4.0% | 8% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced and FR | 2016 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 5% |
| | | 8 | | Pct at/above Goal | 2016 | 84.0% | 84.0% | 90% |
| | | | | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 2016 | 57.0% | 57.0% | 67% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2016 | 21.2% | 21.2% | 25% |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced and FR | 2016 | 8.4% | 8.4% | 15% |

**The District Common Assessment in grades 9-11** is on-demand argument, document-based writing. This is scored using the district-social studies writing rubric aligned to Connecticut Core Standards and the Connecticut Social Studies Frameworks. Writing baseline data will be collected this year as the new Social Studies curriculum is implemented.

This writing assessment provides feedback to teachers on students' ability to respond to a prompt. Teachers use student responses to plan instruction.

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | District Common Assessments | 9 | Writing | Pct at/above Goal | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced and FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | 10 | | Pct at/above Goal | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced and FR | 2017 | | | |

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | District Common Assessments | 11 | Writing | Pct at/above Goal | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at/above Goal and FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct at Advanced and FR | 2017 | | | |

19. The School Climate Survey is an anonymous online survey, developed by a subcommittee of parents, teachers and administrators. The domains and questions were developed to align with the National School Climate Standards. This data represents 2014 baseline data. The next survey will be conducted in fall/winter 2016. The scale used was: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Strongly Agree. The questions aligned with each domain can be found in the 'School Climate' section of the district and school websites.

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | School Climate Survey | 3-5 | Climate, Domain: **Institutional Environment** | Avg Responses by Domain (Scale of 1-4) | 2014 | 3.25 | | 3.7 |
| | | | Climate, Domain: **Teaching and Learning** | | 2014 | 3.27 | | 3.7 |
| | | | Climate, Domain**: Safety** | | 2014 | 2.99 | | 3.5 |
| | | | Climate, Domain: **Interpersonal Relationships** | | 2014 | 3.17 | | 3.5 |
| | | | Climate, Domain: **Communication** | | 2014 | 3.26 | | 3.7 |
| | | 6-12 | Climate, Domain: **Institutional Environment** | | 2014 | 3.13 | | 3.5 |
| | | | Climate, Domain: **Teaching and Learning** | | 2014 | 3.01 | | 3.5 |
| | | | Climate, Domain: **Safety** | | 2014 | 2.82 | | 3.3 |

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | School Climate Survey | 6-12 | Climate, Domain: **Interpersonal Relationships** | Avg Responses by Domain (Scale of 1-4) | 2014 | 3.06 | | 3.5 |
| | | | Climate, Domain: **Communication** | | 2014 | 3.09 | | 3.7 |

20. **STAR** is a formative assessment. A Student Growth Percentile, or SGP, compares a student's growth to that of his or her academic peers nationwide. Academic peers are students in the same grade with a similar scaled score on a STAR assessment at the beginning of the time period being examined. SGP is reported on a 1–99 scale, with lower numbers indicating lower relative growth and higher numbers indicating higher relative growth. For example, if a student has an SGP of 90, it means the student has shown more growth than 90 percent of academic peers. SGPs add significantly to our understanding of how well a student is doing in school. While knowing a student's level of achievement tells you whether the student is performing below, above, or on grade level, an SGP indicates what kind of progress the student is making. For example, a student may be performing at a low level, yet experiencing high rates of growth. This tells us that instruction is effective. Conversely, a high-performing student could be stagnating. Specifically, SGPs tell us whether a student's growth is more or less than can be expected. For example, without an SGP, a teacher would not know whether an increase of 100 scaled scores represented average, above-average, or below-average growth. This is because students of differing achievement levels in different grades grow at different rates. For example, a high-achieving second grader grows at a different rate than a high-achieving eighth grader.

After three iterations of the test, STAR determines a growth rate for each individual child. We will use the rate each fall as a target and report out each year the number of children who achieve that target by the end of the school year.

**STAR Reading**

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | STAR | K | Reading | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | 1 | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | 2 | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | 3 | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2016 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2016 | | | |
| | | 4 | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2016 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2016 | | | |

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | STAR | 5 | Reading | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2016 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2016 | | | |
| | | 6 | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2016 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2016 | | | |
| | | 7 | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2016 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2016 | | | |
| | | 8 | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2016 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2016 | | | |

**21. STAR Math**

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21 | STAR | K | Math | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | 1 | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | 2 | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | 3 | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | 4 | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | 5 | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2017 | | | |

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21 | STAR | 6 | Math | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | 7 | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2017 | | | |
| | | 8 | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target | 2017 | | | |
| | | | | Pct of Students Achieving Their Projected Growth Target – FR | 2017 | | | |

22. **Attendance** rate is calculated by the State Department of Education using June PSIS data. It is calculated by determining the number of days in attendance divided by the number of days enrolled in the school. Outplaced students are including in this data.

Overall, attendance rates across all levels are extremely high. In grades K-5 the attendance rate has remained constant with a 0.4% increase in attendance for students receiving free and reduced lunch. At the middle level, the attendance rate has remained fairly constant with a 0.4% decrease for students receiving free and reduced lunch. At the high school level, attendance has shown a slight decline from 2015 to 2016 with a 1.4% drop for all students and a 0.6% decline for students receiving free and reduced lunch. Outplaced students are included in these figures. It must be emphasized that one year of comparative data may reflect the difference in cohorts rather than a trend in performance.

| Assessment Number | Assessment Name | Grade Level or Course | Subjects | Measure | Baseline Year | Baseline Data | 2016 Data | 2020 Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22 | Attendance | K-5 | | Attendance Rate | 2015 | 96.2% | 96.2% | 98% |
| | | | | Attendance Rate and FR | 2015 | 95.6% | 95.9% | 98% |
| | | 6-8 | | Attendance Rate | 2015 | 96.1% | 96.0% | 98% |
| | | | | Attendance Rate and FR | 2015 | 94.9% | 94.1% | 98% |
| | | 9-12 | | Attendance Rate | 2015 | 96.6% | 95.2% | 98% |
| | | | | Attendance Rate and FR | 2015 | 95.0% | 94.4% | 98% |

23. **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.

Results on the CELF indicate the progress we are making to strengthen curriculum and instruction in our PK settings.

| *Assessment Number* | *Assessment Name* | *Grade Level or Course* | *Subjects* | *Measure* | *Baseline Year* | *Baseline Data* | *2016 Data* | *2020 Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 23 | CELF | PK | Vocabulary and Language | Pct Meeting Benchmark | 2015 | 89.5% | 92.0% | 97.0% |

# Part III: Recommended Changes

The administration recommends the following changes in the District Improvement Plan:

1) Remove the PSAT for grade 11 students as a Performance Indicator. The Plan was developed in the year when the SBAC Field Test was administered to grade 11 students as the state assessment for high school students in the areas of Math and Language Arts. Since that time, the SAT has been designated as the state assessment to monitor student achievement in Math and Language Arts for high school students. The SAT is administered to grade 11 students and provides extensive information about student performances, which is similar to the feedback from the PSAT. The PSAT administered in grade 10 provides excellent data to monitor achievement in Math and Language Arts and provides staff important information about instructional needs for students. With the administration of both the PSAT in grade 10 and the SAT in grade 11, the PSAT data is not necessary to monitor student performance.

2) A second recommendation is to remove the sub-categories of Clubs, Sports, and Arts within the Performance Indicator of Extra-Curricular Participation. The intent of this Performance Indicator is to measure students' connectedness to school. The inclusion of the sub-categories has made the collection of the data extremely difficult to collect and does not enhance the meaning of the data. Regardless of the type of activity in which a student participates, that participation reflects the student's connectedness to school, making the sub-categories irrelevant.