Fairfield Public Schools

Update on the District Improvement Plan, 2015-2020

Preparing Learners for a Changing World

October 10, 2017

Fairfield Public Schools Priorities for Excellence

2017-2018

Mission

The mission of 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.

Fairfield Public Schools Priorities

Instructional Program

Each staff member will support well-rounded academic success including expressive, personal, physical, civic, and social development for all students. Each staff member will support all students in developing an appreciation and understanding of global issues.

School and Team Improvement

Student achievement and performance shall rank among the best in the state and the nation.

Leadership Capacity

Leadership will support, design, and implement a comprehensive educational program for PK-21+.

Resources

Improve resources through human staffing, time, and materials.

Facilities

Staff will provide facilities that are clean and well maintained. All planned projects will be on time and within budget.

Safety and Security

Staff will work directly with the Fairfield Police Department to implement a comprehensive safety plan for daily management as well as crisis planning.

Fairfield Staff Work Plan 2017-2018

Instructional Program

Each staff member will support well-rounded academic success including expressive, personal, physical, civic, and social development for all students. Each staff member will support all students in developing an appreciation and understanding of global issues.

1. Prepare for 2018-2019 Science Curriculum New Course Implementation Grades 9-12: NGSS (June 2018)
   *1-4

2. Refine and review for PK-12+ technology integration and global preparedness (June 2018)
   *1-3, 1-23

3. Refine and review K-5 Mathematics implementation (June 2018)
   *1-4

4. Begin study and review of new high school graduation requirements (June 2018)
    *1-2, 1-22

Expressive
1. Music Curriculum Review PK-12 (June 2018)
   *1-4

Personal, Physical, and Social Development
1. Middle School and High School will implement DBT (June 2018)
   *1-5, 4-14

Civic
1. 3-5 Social Studies Implementation (June 2018)
   *1-4

Social Development
1. PK Implementation at Stratfield (June 2018)

2. Study and plan for a K-5 Behavioral Services Program (June 2018)

School and Team Improvement

Student achievement and performance shall rank among the best in the state and the nation.

1. Refine SRBI Process PK-12+ to include a stronger intervention model (June 2018)
   *1-8, 2-4, 2-6, 4-9, 4-13, 4-15, 4-16

2. Design and implement a data warehouse system for analytics (June 2018)
   *2-5

3. All school leadership will engage in PK-12 feeder pattern walkthroughs.
   *2-8

Leadership Capacity

Leadership will support, design, and implement a comprehensive educational program for PK-12+.

1. Update and Refine a District Success Plan for 2018-2021 engaging leadership and staff PK-12+ *New*

2. Enhance peer coaching model in K-5 Language Arts
   *3-2

3. Use technology to enhance professional learning through the Google suite of apps (applications).
   *4-11

Resources

1. Continue New Teacher Academy and continue to mentor Year 1 and Year 2 teachers through the TEAM program.
   *4-3

2. Implement 6-Day Rotation to increase elementary planning time
   *4-4

3. Enhance district communication through IC, Facebook, Twitter, and other social media platforms
   *4-21

Facilities

Staff will provide facilities that are clean and well maintained. All FPS planned projects will be on time and on budget.

1. Update the 2017-2018 Waterfall Schedule (October 2017)

2. Study and determine best use of all facilities through engaging community input on *'structural change'* with the assistance of engaging an outside consultant (June 2018)

Safety and Security

Staff will work directly with the Fairfield Police Department to implement a comprehensive safety plan for daily management as well as crisis planning.

1. Work closely with the Fairfield Police Department on relocation planning
   *4-2

Specific Actions – Reference Numbers

Instructional Program

Curriculum Development and Implementation

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 embed in existing district structures (e.g., advisory, developmental guidance, health). (2 years)

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

Program Improvement

1-22 Revise high school graduation requirements.

1-23 Review high school learning expectations regarding technology to implement a mastery-based requirement rather than a credit requirement.

Teams/Improvement Plans

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 improve the alternative high school program to engage every student in a challenging and rigorous program. (2 years)

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

Leadership Capacity

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

Resources

Talent Development

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.

Technology

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

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

Enhanced Services to Students

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)

Communication

4-21 Enhance communication efforts using district and school websites and other technology, at each school and
district-wide.

4-23 In partnership with the Fairfield Police Department, strengthen communication with all stakeholders on
matters of school safety and security.

Report Contents

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 annual informational update to the Board of Education is provided each October. The following report has been prepared with three key sections:

Part I: Progress to Date

Part II: Student Performance

Part III: Recommended Adjustments for 2017-2018

Part I: Progress to Date

The following is a summary of the steps that the district took during the 2016-2017 school 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.**

   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 2015-2016.

   Status: Year 2

   Due to budget constraints, K-2 Spanish will not begin in 2017-2018. Staff will begin exploring other opportunities to enhance World Language in elementary with no additional staffing.

2. **Develop and approve curriculum in Social Studies K-12 and Computer Literacy Grades 6-8. ***

   The Board of Education approved the revised PK-12 Social Studies curriculum, along with new textbooks in grades 6-12. The curriculum was implemented in grades 6-12 in 2016-2017.

   The Board of Education approved the revised Computer Literacy curriculum for implementation during the 2016-2017 school year.

   Status: Year 2

   A great deal of work was involved in developing the Social Studies units in grades 3-5 that are currently being implemented in 2017-2018. Staff have worked to tie the Social Studies and Science curricula to Language Arts. The new units are interactive, hands-on and utilize an inquiry-based approach to enhance student engagement. Non-fiction books have been purchased to supplement all elementary classroom libraries to support the non-fiction content.

In grades 6-12, the implementation went well. Tremendous work is being done in terms of equity, diversity, and performance-based assessments. FLHS and FWHS held a joint "Identity Conference" for the first time in the spring of 2017.

The two high schools have a joint committee that met on May 16, 2017 to discuss the Academic Expectations Rubrics and review the implementation of performance-based assessments, to make them meaningful. They met again on September 14, 2017 as follow-up preparation for the 2017-2018 year.

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.

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

Status: Year 2

CT had not clearly defined the alignment of courses in time for FPS to move forward with purchasing materials and preparing for full implementation in 2017-2018. The curriculum is strong and staff have been preparing for the new rollout. MS and HS staff have met to work on the implementation guides and planning. The rollout may be multi-year for grades 6-12, depending on financial constraints.

In 2017-2018, a new AP Computer Science course has been added at FWHS, further expanding computer science offerings to encourage more students to enroll and find success. The course was also offered at FLHS but did not generate enough interest to run the class.

The K-12 Science curriculum will be presented to the Board of Education in the spring of 2018. The presentation will include an updated implementation plan.

4. **Implement newly adopted curriculum in World Language and Library/Media K-12.**

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 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.

FPS 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. Most recently, the legislation has changed in regards to graduation requirements and the Capstone project will be under more review in light of the new opportunities.

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

Status: Year 2

FPS growth occurred in this area during the 2016-2017 year. Several Library Media Commons have some type of Makerspace for students, and some elementary schools are hosting STEAM nights for families. This will be refined for consistency in PK-12 going forward into 2017-2018.

During 2016-2017, the FLHS and FWHS Academic Expectations Committee discussed Capstone. Staff focused on how Capstone could/would fit with the Academic Expectations Rubric. Staff feedback was gathered and small groups worked to provide input on the rubric. Staff are watching closely as new graduation standards could affect the idea of a Capstone and the direction that FPS will take moving forward.

K-8 implemented the 2nd year of the Library/Media K-12 curriculum, which introduced more non-fiction texts and focused on cross-curricular writing. The implementation of the revised Social Studies and Science curricula in grades K-5 will require support from the Library/Media Specialist and the resources of the Library Media Center. The LMS curriculum supports and enhances both of these implementations; each is designed using an inquiry focus.

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.**

Status: Year 2

The transition process has been enhanced; students are better prepared with updated goals and services before arriving at the transitional site. During 2016-2017, the process continued to be refined from elementary through high school.

Several opportunities exist for 8th grade students to become familiar with high schools, including:
1. An Electives/Course Selection night for all 8th graders and their parents;
2. A scheduled visit from high school counselors and student representatives to further explain high school life;
3. Tours for students and families before school starts in August;
4. 9th grade orientation day; and
5. A developmental guidance program that focuses on the transition to high school for all 9th graders.

The ECC transition process improved with ECC working very closely with the elementary school leadership on transitions for incoming students. Due to increased enrollment for 2017-2018, one CLC classroom was added at Burr and one CLC classroom was added at OHS. Several CLC students were moved from current sites to new sites, to best meet student needs. Extensive transitional planning with families helped them feel comfortable about the change.

Transitions across levels will continue to improve this year with the new leadership structure in central office, the implementation of cross-level walkthroughs, and the development of PK-12 expectations and assessments. The expectations and assessments will be aligned to the Academic Expectations and will also align instructional practices and expectations.

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.**

   Status: Year Two

   Performance based assessments were put in place in grades 9-11 during the 2016-2017 year. The Academic Expectations Committee reviewed the implementation and provided feedback on the rubric and process. In 2017-2018, the staff will continue to make changes to the process so that performance-based assessments will be meaningful and authentic. The assessments will be spread out over time so that students are not working simultaneously on disconnected performance based assessments.

   Staff are watching the development of the Capstone concept (mastery-based assessment) as part of the new graduation requirements.

   Depending on the outcome of the new requirements, the Capstone may need to be incorporated into the schedule. Performance tasks are being linked in K-6 Social Studies curriculum and should provide an opportunity for an exhibition or "mini" Capstone development.

7. **Revise and implement additional common assessments aligned to the curriculum in grades K through 12, including performance-based assessments.**

   Status: Year 2

   Staff do not support the measurement of common assessments for use in the District Improvement Plan (DIP). After much discussion and study, the District Leadership Team (DLT) believe that formative assessments are not intended to measure student to student, but rather in contrast, to help the teacher understand what the individual student has and has not mastered.

   There will be expansion of PK-12 formative assessments aligned to the Academic Expectations. This work will begin in 2017-2018 and continue over the next two years.

8. **Implement Professional Learning to strengthen instructional practices for students with disabilities and ELL students.**

   Status: Year 2

   We have trained 30 special education staff during the 2016-2017 year on consistent specialized instruction. Every elementary and middle school has at least one staff member trained in Wilson Reading. Cadre #2 will start in the fall of 2017 and will expand to Language Arts Specialists. Cadre #3 will begin in the fall of 2018.

   The Executive Leadership Team studied the ELL data from all 11 elementary schools during 2016-2017 to better understand the placement of specific languages across the schools and future programming implications.

   Under the leadership of the K-5 and 6-12 Directors of Literacy and Learning, there will be greater integration of the ELL staff with the Language Arts Specialists. The focus will be on developing

intervention skill sets and aligning expectations for student learning to enhance classroom strategies for daily instruction.

9. **Implement Professional Learning on "Teaching in the Block" to all high school teachers.**

   Status: Year 2

   High Schools are providing professional learning opportunities for staff around instructional strategies. For example, last year, staff volunteered to offer workshops for their colleagues on instructional strategies and teachers had a choice to sign up for a series of workshops.   Similar plans are in the works for this year.   In addition, some of the PLTs offered to share their learning with colleagues in their departments.

   While the block implementation is complete, the staff are continuing to evaluate the high school master schedule and instruction. There was discussion this year to remove the "minis" except in critical AP courses that require the extended lab. The mini sessions are not joined to the actual 90-minute block, so some staff are questioning their value since they now have such a long block. The mini has big impacts on the master scheduling process, and the staff will continue to evaluate this during the 2017-2018 year.

10. **Develop a middle school advisory program.**

   Status: Year 2

   The advisory program is working well and staff are able to utilize Naviance.

Teams/Improvement Plans

11. **All School and Department Improvement Plans will align with the District Improvement Plan (DIP).**

   Status: Year 2

   In the spring of 2016-2017, the DLT provided input on the DIP and the SIP (School Improvement Plan). In terms of format, overwhelmingly the teams want to simplify the SIP and condense the document so that it is clearer. DLT also analyzed the DIP and worked through a collaborative process to discuss each section and provide collective feedback on what is working, and what needs to be a focus going forward. The DLT has discussed eliminating some of the data points to be more targeted in their approach, especially to close achievement gaps.

12. **Use vertical teams to conduct Instructional Rounds in Math, Language Arts, Social Studies, Science, and World Language.**

   Status: Year 2

   Many of the teams continued Instructional Rounds in 2016-2017. However, due to the challenge in getting substitutes and paying for them, other processes were utilized later in the spring. Staff feel that collaboration is highly valuable and that learning from one another enhances instruction. Staff will

continue a PK-12 vertical focus during the 2017-2018 year to provide consistency across the district. The use of walkthroughs will support administrator learning of the PK-12 system and lead to improved alignment and collaboration.

13. **Continue to improve the effectiveness of Data Teams at the School, Grade, Department and District levels to enhance student learning.**

Status: Year 2

The Data Teams at each school are working well. The goal for 2017-2018 will be to move the focus down to the individual student to increase targeted instruction. IC is not working as a data warehouse the way that staff would like to see it function for easily collecting and analyzing data. This will need to be a focus for next year to continue and refine the tool that FPS will utilize from the lens of the teacher. The Data Team process will be integral to and blended with, the SRBI process changes occurring at all levels.

14. **Use best-practice models to improve the alternative high school program to engage every student in a challenging and rigorous program.**

Status: Year 2

Project Based Learning (PBL) has grown to be at the core of instructional practice at WFC. There were no outside tuition students this year, but the possibility does exist for the future. The infusion of Chromebooks this year was instrumental in beginning to look at options for personalizing learning.

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

Status: Year 2

During 2016-2017, Instructional Rounds continued but they became more difficult in the late spring due to a shortage of substitutes and substitute funding. In 2017-2018, the administrative staff will visit and observe school staff in a coordinated PK-12 feeder pattern walk-through, as a replacement to the Instructional Rounds format. Staff are reevaluating this practice for 2017-2018 to see how best to move forward with limited resources.

Leadership Capacity

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

Status: Year 2

In 2016-2017, the DLT continued Instructional Rounds and worked to develop the capacity of teachers. The technology committee met regularly to provide input on instructional practice. The staff have taken the lead on providing workshops for parents on "13 Reasons Why" in an effort to be proactive about the series and

mental health issues. In terms of teacher evaluation, the calibration process for all leaders occurred in August 2017 during Professional Development.

Professional learning was focused on mathematics and language arts in elementary and social studies in secondary. Most of the elementary schools will move to a 5th grade model for mathematics; a departmentalized method to support the need for more advanced mathematics leading into middle school.

17. **Align teacher goals in the Educator Evaluation Plan to goals in the School Improvement Plan and/or Department Improvement Plan.**

Status: Year 2

The process has worked well to keep staff and the DLT focused during the 2016-2017 school year. After review, the SIP will be simplified in format to narrow the focus on priority goals in 2017-2018.

We will research means of further improving this alignment in 17-18.

18. **Ensure that all six <u>new</u> administrators have a successful first year in Fairfield.**

Status: Year 2

The Executive Leadership Team will continue to support all administrators new to the district in 2017-2018. The DLT meets monthly and Professional Development has ranged from reviewing student data, goal writing, and addressing specific content work.

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

Status: Year 2

In March 2017, our Special Education attorney presented a workshop on Expulsions and Safe School Climate, indicating what to do in terms of an investigation from the lens of a school leader.

Resources

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

Status: Year 2

Successfully utilized in the 2016-2017 hiring process.

21. **Develop and implement a New Teacher Academy to build capacity of all non-tenured teachers.**

Status: Year 2

A detailed calendar was utilized to provide ongoing support throughout the 2016-2017 year. There were 52 teachers in the program last year.

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

Status: Year 2

This was accomplished for most teachers since the implementation of the block schedule. All high school teachers are members of small group Professional Learning Teams (PLTs) within their departments.   This is a formal structure embedded in the school day. Collaborative teams have common planning time during their preparation time each week. Specialty positions (such as special education teachers) are a growth area.

23. **Implement specific components of the technology plan regarding classroom technology equipment and instructional software and applications, supporting student-learning PK – 12.**

Status: Year 2

A focus in 2016-2017 was to support the implementation of Google Classroom to provide more variety for student and teacher collaboration. In addition, STAR Reading, Early Literacy, and STAR Math were implemented in PK-12. These provide easily accessible data that is used as a screening tool to identify students needing additional supports. Renaissance Learning provided Professional Development for all LAS and principal teams to enhance proficiency. Professional Development in 2017-2018 will focus on available technology that is easily accessible by staff and students.

24. **Develop and implement on-line training modules to support the professional growth and needs of staff.**

Status: Year 2

FPS implemented teacher and student access to Lynda.com as on online learning platform in 2016-2017. It has been well-received/used by teachers in the arts, graphics, programming and business departments. This proposal will require further study in 17-18. Our task is to increase the differentiation of professional learning opportunities for all staff in order to better meet identified needs and interests.

25. **Expand options for mental health support for students in grades 9-12.**

Status: Year 2

Effective School Solutions data is being monitored carefully to determine the program's effectiveness. Meetings with company representatives and collections of data are essential in the analysis of outplacements.   Social workers and psychologists participated in Dialectical Behavioral Therapy (DBT) training in the summer of 2017, and it will continue during the school year for specific staff members. All high school staff received a full introductory training at the start of the school year.

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.**

Status: Year 2

Reading programs are in place and training in *Language! Live* as well as *Wilson Reading* are more consistent across the district. In addition, we have a UCONN Reading Certification Cohort being taught in FPS. The focus in 2017-2018 will be a continuation of training to enhance teaching practices. Improvement of the Scientific Research Based Interventions (SRBI) process will help determine staff professional learning needs and identify high quality supports for teacher learning.

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.**

Status: Year 2

Infinite Campus is now the required method of communication at the elementary level. Progress Reports were revised and implemented in 2016-2017. Parents and staff were surveyed prior to the changes and their input contributed to the revisions.

Elementary teachers do not keep grades in the same manner as middle and high school teachers. Because the K-5 progress report card is standards-based, students receive marks indicating progress towards mastery, rather than traditional letter grades.   We will continue to embed district assessments into the gradebook but it will not serve the same purpose as the secondary level.

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 Preventative Maintenance (PM) module in our existing "School Dude" system 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 housed on the website because of the CABE audit. There will no longer be paper binders, alleviating not only paper, but also hours of staff time in sending out the paper updates.

Status: Year 2   Continued focus on paperless.

We are working towards implementing paperless workflows for professional learning forms and field trips.

29. **Design a Racial Imbalance Plan that satisfies the state requirements.**

   Status: The State Board of Education approved the Racial Imbalance Plan and Timeline on September 6, 2017.

30. **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.

   Status: Complete

31. **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.**

   Status: Year 2

   The 2017-2018 budget was challenging. As of September 2017, the Legislature had not determined the Connecticut Budget. As a result, funds have been frozen to assist with any unforeseen budget reductions.

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

   Status: Year 2

   A major focus during the 2016-2017 year was to work with the Holland Hill Building Committee to reduce the cost and tighten up the Ed Spec to meet the approval expectations of the BoF, BoS, and RTM. The project was reduced by approximately $3M by working together as a collective team and carefully reviewing the Ed Spec.

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

    Status: Year 2   In Progress

   The bargaining for this group is not settled as of September 2017.

Part II: Student Performance Indicators

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 2017, students indicate that they are well prepared for college or technical school.

Assessment Number	Assessment Name	Grade Level or Course	Subjects	Measure	Baseline Year	2015 Data	2016 Data	2017 Data	2020 Target
1	Post HS Student Survey	Post HS	Success Post-HS	Survey	2015	96.7%	93.9%	*94.4%	98%

Only FWHS

2.   4-year Graduation Rate

Measures the percentage of students who graduate in the year of their cohort. 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	2017 Data	2020 Target
				4-Year Graduation Rate	2015	93.8%	94.6%	*	96%
				4-Year Graduation Rate and FR	2015		82.7%	*	90%

Not yet available from the state.

3.   Advanced Placement Exams

Exams are scored on a scale of 1 to 5. Nationally, a passing score is a three, four, or five.

AP Exams are not universally accepted for college credit, regardless of the score. Each university sets the acceptance passing score. If a student has passed an AP Exam that will fall in his or her major line of study at college, it is unlikely that the university will utilize the score and/or exam to waive a course or fee.

AP PARTICIPATION RATE	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	Target
By Graduation What is the % of students who have successfully completed an AP course?	58.5%	63%		80%
Economically Disadvantaged	15.9%	32%		
AP PASS RATE				
Percent passing at least one exam	88.9%	85.3%		
Economically Disadvantaged	91.5%	82.5%		

***See Attachment 1 for National Pass Rate Information

4.   Career and Technical Education

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

Enrolled in at least One CTE Course in High School	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	TARGET
Percent Enrolled	62.1%	69.2%	70.9%	75%

5.   The Academic Expectations Rubrics

Rubrics are developed to measure our achievement of 21st Century Skills in the areas of Communicating and Collaborating as well as Critical and Creative Thinking. The rubrics are formative in nature and do not reflect data which will be utilized as scientifically-based norm-referenced data.

***See Attachment 2

6. American Council of Teachers of Foreign Language (ACTFL)

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 and is measured by the proficiency guidelines created by ACTFL.

FRENCH 20	2015-2016	2016-2017	Target
At or Above Proficient	25%		50%
Advanced	7%		12%
SPANISH 20	2015-2016	2016-2017	Target
At or Above Proficient	56%		75%
Advanced	11%		16%
CHINESE 20	2015-2016	2016-2017	Target
At or Above Proficient	3%		30%
Advanced	3%		8%

7. The ACTFL Latin Interpretive Reading Assessment (ALIRA)

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.

LATIN 20	2015-2016	2016-2017	Target
At or Above Proficient	88%		94%
Advanced	81%		96%

8. STAMP Test

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.

ITALIAN 20	2015-2016	2016-2017	Target
At or Above Proficient	6%		40%
Advanced	0		10%

9. World Language Credits by Graduation

Indicator measures the percentage of high school students who graduate with two or four years of World Language.

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	Target
Two Years	88.5%	88.9%		93%
Four Years	44.4%	45.3%		50%

10. Advanced Mathematics

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.

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	Target
Calculus and Multivariable Participation	13.3%	16.5%	15.95%	20%

11. Smarter Balanced Assessments (SBA)

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 the instructional strategies and resources that work best for our students and apply that to areas of need.

***See Attachment 3 for Fairfield Results

12. Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)

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 assessment for all students in grade eleven to measure achievement in mathematics and evidence-based reading and writing.

Language Arts	2015-2016	2016-2017	Target
At or Above College and Career Benchmark	84.8%	85.5%	90%
At or Above College and Career Benchmark and FR	57.1%	58.8%	75%

Math	2015-2016	2016-2017	Target
At or Above College and Career Benchmark	62.8%	62.5%	75%
At or Above College and Career Benchmark and FR	37.7%	33.8%	55%

13.   Extra-Curricular Participation

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.

***While valuable information, the data warehouse system is not able to supply accurate information at this time.

14.   Science CMT (grades 5 and 8 only)

Assesses 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.

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.

***Information not available as of today, 10/5/17.

15.   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.

GRADE LEVEL	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	Target
4th Grade	67%	66%	68%	70%
8th Grade	69%	69%	73%	70%
10th Grade	57%	60%	54%	70%

16.   School Climate Survey

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: http://fairfieldschools.org/district-information/school-climate/school-climate-survey/

17.   STAR

Norm-referenced reading and mathematics assessments. After three iterations of the test, STAR determines a growth rate for each individual child.

***Information to be presented with student assessment data in November.

18.   Attendance

The State Department of Education uses June PSIS data to calculate attendance rate. 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.

Grade Level Attendance Rate	2015-2016	2016-2017	Target
K-5	96.2%		98%
6-8	96.1%		98%
9-12	96.6%		98%

19.   CELF

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.

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

Preschool	2015-2016	2016-2017	Target
Vocabulary and Language Meeting Benchmark	89.5%		97%

Part III: Recommended Changes

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

1) Simplify the School Improvement Plan format.

2) Do not utilize formative assessments as part of the District Improvement Plan reporting. The focus should be on norm referenced and scientifically valid data.

3) Refine the focus for PK-12+ to enhance targeted instruction.

4) Reduce data points to allow for more focused targeting of instruction.

Five Year AP Performance: FPS/STATE/ALL TESTS TAKEN

Biology	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5	53%	8%	16%	13%	5%	7%	30%	9%	11%	11%	10%	10%	20%	5%	7%	6%	7%	6%
4	24%	42%	40%	43%	32%	43%	22%	31%	34%	32%	31%	32%	17%	22%	22%	22%	21%	21%
3	11%	45%	41%	37%	50%	43%	16%	39%	37%	37%	35%	37%	14%	36%	35%	36%	34%	37%
2	5%	5%	3%	7%	12%	7%	12%	19%	15%	17%	19%	17%	15%	29%	27%	27%	29%	28%
1	8%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	19%	3%	3%	3%	5%	4%	34%	7%	9%	8%	10%	9%
Total Exams	38	74	63	75	133	138	3,334	3,706	3,596	3,842	3,973	3,927	191,949	203,902	214,264	224,928	238,947	249,339
Mean Score	4.08	3.53	3.68	3.63	3.29	3.89	3.32	3.25	3.37	3.31	3.24	3.28	2.73	2.88	2.91	2.91	2.85	2.88

	Biology 2016	Biology 2017
Number Tested	133	138
Enrolled FPS	158	182
Percentage Tested FPS	84.2%	75.8%

Chemistry	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5	30%	27%	12%	10%	19%	26%	22%	27%	15%	13%	13%	16%	16%	19%	10%	9%	11%	9%
4	32%	38%	28%	40%	38%	31%	25%	24%	23%	22%	22%	23%	19%	21%	17%	16%	16%	16%
3	24%	25%	43%	40%	33%	29%	22%	20%	30%	32%	32%	29%	20%	19%	26%	28%	27%	26%
2	10%	10%	16%	10%	10%	14%	13%	14%	22%	21%	21%	21%	15%	15%	26%	25%	25%	27%
1	4%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	17%	14%	11%	12%	10%	12%	29%	26%	21%	22%	22%	22%
Total Exams	71	63	95	30	42	42	2,556	2,576	2,686	2,576	2,561	2,554	132,783	140,178	149,040	153,275	153,986	150,491
Mean Score	3.73	3.83	3.34	3.50	3.67	3.69	3.22	3.36	3.09	3.04	3.07	3.10	2.79	2.93	2.68	2.66	2.69	2.63

	Chemistry 2016	Chemistry 2017
Number Tested	42	42
Enrolled FPS	48	42
Percentage Tested FPS	87.5%	100%

Physics 1	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5				3%	2%	10%				8%	8%	7%				5%	5%	5%
4				19%	17%	27%				19%	19%	21%				14%	14%	16%
3				33%	34%	35%				25%	27%	22%				21%	21%	20%
2				34%	37%	19%				28%	28%	31%				30%	30%	29%
1				12%	10%	9%				20%	19%	19%				31%	30%	30%
Total Exams				172	100	98				2,774	2,854	2,946				172,518	170,353	163,535
Mean Score				2.66	2.64	3.09				2.66	2.70	2.64				2.32	2.33	2.36

	Physics 1 2016	Physics 1 2017
Number Tested	100	98
Enrolled FPS	167	154
Percentage Tested FPS	59.9%	63.6%

Physics 2	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5				4%	9%	11%				6%	10%	14%				9%	9%	11%
4				31%	47%	16%				17%	21%	20%				14%	17%	16%
3				46%	25%	58%				38%	34%	38%				33%	35%	35%
2				19%	19%	16%				31%	30%	23%				35%	31%	29%
1				0%	0%	0%				8%	5%	5%				10%	8%	10%
Total Exams				26	32	19				372	482	450				20,717	26,501	22,335
Mean Score				3.19	3.47	3.21				2.84	3.00	3.15				2.77	2.89	2.89

	Physics 2 2016	Physics 2 2017
Number Tested	32	19
Enrolled FPS	49	30
Percentage Tested FPS	65.3%	63.3%

Environmental Science	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5	13%	8%	21%	6%	19%	18%	14%	11%	12%	10%	9%	13%	9%	8%	8%	8%	8%	9%
4	53%	47%	48%	56%	47%	43%	36%	30%	31%	32%	31%	30%	25%	23%	24%	24%	23%	24%
3	13%	23%	16%	19%	17%	18%	18%	20%	16%	17%	16%	18%	17%	17%	15%	15%	15%	15%
2	19%	16%	12%	19%	15%	20%	20%	24%	24%	24%	25%	22%	24%	25%	26%	25%	26%	25%
1	1%	6%	3%	0%	2%	2%	12%	16%	17%	17%	19%	17%	25%	26%	27%	28%	29%	26%
Total Exams	83	77	58	32	53	56	1,850	1,957	2,147	2,121	2,056	2,325	108,954	118,483	130,830	139,446	149,635	158,381
Mean Score	3.58	3.34	3.71	3.50	3.66	3.55	3.19	2.96	2.97	2.93	2.86	3.01	2.68	2.61	2.60	2.59	2.55	2.66

	Environmental Science 2016	Environmental Science 2017
Number Tested	53	56
Enrolled FPS	63	69
Percentage Tested FPS	84.1%	81.2%

Calculus AB	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5	72%	38%	61%	38%	26%	5%	34%	31%	33%	29%	29%	24%	25%	24%	25%	22%	25%	18%
4	17%	44%	21%	34%	20%	18%	20%	22%	20%	20%	20%	22%	17%	18%	17%	17%	17%	18%
3	11%	11%	14%	21%	26%	29%	17%	19%	17%	19%	19%	21%	17%	17%	18%	19%	17%	21%
2	0%	4%	4%	5%	14%	32%	8%	9%	10%	9%	9%	18%	10%	11%	11%	10%	10%	22%
1	0%	2%	0%	2%	14%	16%	21%	19%	20%	22%	23%	14%	30%	29%	30%	32%	31%	21%
Total Exams	47	45	56	58	65	38	4,233	4,300	4,586	4,537	4,523	4,361	268,086	283,418	294,706	304,318	309,536	303,471
Mean Score	4.62	4.11	4.39	4.02	3.31	2.66	3.39	3.36	3.34	3.25	3.25	3.23	2.97	2.96	2.94	2.86	2.96	2.91

	Calculus AB 2016	Calculus AB 2017
Number Tested	65	38
Enrolled FPS	79	67
Percentage Tested FPS	82.3%	56.7%

Calculus BC	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5	89%	63%	41%	40%	34%	27%	62%	55%	53%	50%	55%	49%	50%	46%	48%	45%	49%	42%
4	5%	25%	20%	15%	13%	17%	14%	16%	15%	16%	16%	19%	16%	16%	16%	16%	15%	43%
3	3%	9%	29%	38%	38%	35%	12%	15%	16%	17%	15%	18%	16%	18%	16%	18%	17%	20%
2	0%	0%	10%	0%	6%	19%	4%	5%	4%	5%	5%	11%	5%	6%	5%	5%	6%	14%
1	3%	3%	0%	6%	9%	2%	8%	9%	12%	12%	9%	3%	12%	14%	14%	15%	13%	5%
Total Exams	37	32	41	47	47	52	1,274	1,483	1,600	1,757	1,851	1,934	94,649	104,598	112,285	119,411	125,322	120,211
Mean Score	4.78	4.44	3.93	3.83	3.57	3.48	4.20	4.02	3.92	3.89	4.04	3.98	3.87	3.73	3.81	3.72	3.81	3.78

	Calculus BC 2016	Calculus BC 2017
Number Tested	47	52
Enrolled FPS	56	56
Percentage Tested FPS	83.9%	92.9%

Statistics	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5	37%	37%	32%	41%	32%	34%	18%	18%	19%	16%	18%	17%	13%	13%	14%	13%	14%	13%
4	51%	32%	40%	36%	44%	29%	25%	23%	26%	23%	26%	20%	21%	20%	21%	19%	22%	16%
3	10%	24%	21%	23%	20%	29%	24%	26%	26%	25%	24%	25%	26%	25%	24%	25%	25%	25%
2	2%	5%	8%	0%	4%	6%	15%	17%	14%	18%	13%	18%	18%	19%	18%	19%	16%	20%
1	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	1%	18%	16%	16%	18%	20%	20%	23%	23%	23%	24%	24%	26%
Total Exams	49	62	53	44	50	85	3,166	3,349	3,353	3,566	3,789	3,913	154,152	170,035	184,623	196,365	207,179	208,214
Mean Score	4.22	3.98	3.96	4.18	4.04	3.89	3.09	3.10	3.19	3.03	3.08	2.96	2.83	2.80	2.86	2.80	2.88	2.69

	Statistics 2016	Statistics 2017
Number Tested	50	85
Enrolled FPS	54	96
Percentage Tested FPS	92.6%	88.5%

English Language and Composition	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5	48%	29%	20%	27%	30%	32%	23%	20%	18%	19%	20%	19%	11%	10%	10%	10%	11%	9%
4	34%	38%	42%	32%	39%	40%	30%	24%	28%	27%	26%	27%	20%	16%	18%	18%	18%	18%
3	17%	29%	26%	31%	24%	23%	27%	30%	30%	29%	29%	29%	29%	29%	28%	27%	27%	28%
2	1%	4%	11%	10%	6%	4%	16%	20%	20%	19%	21%	19%	28%	30%	30%	30%	32%	31%
1	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	4%	6%	5%	6%	4%	5%	12%	15%	14%	15%	13%	14%
Total Exams	103	152	149	183	142	176	5,887	6,447	6,744	7,061	7,328	7,509	445,172	477,735	507,124	530,375	550,141	574,865
Mean Score	4.28	3.90	3.71	3.74	3.91	4.01	3.52	3.30	3.34	3.34	3.36	3.34	2.90	2.77	2.79	2.79	2.82	2.77

	English Language and Composition 2016	English Language and Composition 2017
Number Tested	142	176
Enrolled FPS	148	181
Percentage Tested FPS	95.9%	97.2%

English Literature and Composition	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5	34%	41%	29%	39%	33%	35%	15%	14%	14%	13%	13%	12%	8%	8%	8%	8%	7%	7%
4	41%	41%	35%	33%	33%	42%	25%	27%	25%	27%	25%	23%	18%	19%	18%	18%	18%	16%
3	22%	18%	27%	25%	23%	23%	31%	33%	32%	31%	32%	33%	30%	31%	30%	30%	29%	30%
2	3%	0%	10%	3%	10%	0%	24%	22%	23%	24%	24%	26%	32%	32%	33%	33%	33%	34%
1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	4%	5%	6%	6%	7%	11%	10%	12%	11%	12%	14%
Total Exams	73	49	49	36	30	31	5,650	5,400	5,445	5,458	5,277	5,523	381,073	386,531	398,731	402,754	407,037	399,440
Mean Score	4.07	4.22	3.82	4.08	3.90	4.13	3.19	3.25	3.21	3.19	3.14	3.07	2.80	2.81	2.76	2.78	2.75	2.68

	English Literature and Composition 2016	English Literature and Composition 2017
Number Tested	30	31
Enrolled FPS	70	63
Percentage Tested FPS	42.9%	49.2%

	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
United States History	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5	25%	23%	37%	27%	22%	37%	22%	19%	19%	17%	20%	19%	12%	11%	11%	9%	12%	11%
4	36%	44%	46%	36%	46%	32%	27%	29%	29%	26%	27%	24%	21%	22%	21%	18%	18%	18%
3	23%	16%	14%	26%	24%	17%	23%	23%	22%	25%	25%	25%	22%	22%	20%	24%	23%	22%
2	15%	14%	3%	9%	7%	12%	19%	21%	22%	20%	18%	19%	27%	27%	28%	25%	23%	24%
1	1%	3%	0%	2%	1%	2%	9%	8%	8%	12%	11%	14%	19%	19%	20%	24%	24%	26%
Total Exams	124	136	115	128	136	139	6,563	6,419	6,394	6,388	6,696	6,645	428,717	444,628	464,978	476,526	494,545	505,187
Mean Score	3.69	3.70	4.16	3.75	3.81	3.90	3.35	3.31	3.29	3.18	3.28	3.15	2.80	2.77	2.76	2.64	2.70	2.64

	United States History 2016	United States History 2017
Number Tested	136	139
Enrolled FPS	138	148
Percentage Tested FPS	98.6%	93.9%

Psychology	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5	22%	17%	10%	45%	17%	24%	25%	25%	23%	22%	20%	23%	21%	21%	19%	20%	19%	19%
4	28%	17%	25%	22%	44%	39%	26%	30%	29%	27%	27%	27%	26%	27%	27%	26%	26%	25%
3	17%	28%	25%	22%	20%	27%	20%	20%	20%	19%	19%	19%	19%	20%	20%	20%	19%	20%
2	22%	28%	20%	6%	10%	7%	13%	11%	12%	13%	14%	15%	14%	13%	14%	13%	14%	15%
1	11%	11%	20%	4%	9%	3%	16%	14%	17%	19%	20%	16%	20%	20%	21%	21%	22%	21%
Total Exams	18	18	20	49	90	71	4,356	4,820	5,466	5,621	5,834	6,100	220,880	239,520	260,470	278,360	294,729	295,005
Mean Score	3.28	3.00	2.85	3.98	3.50	3.75	3.29	3.41	3.28	3.21	3.15	3.25	3.13	3.17	3.09	3.12	3.07	3.05

	Psychology 2016	Psychology 2017
Number Tested	90	71
Enrolled FPS	145	107
Percentage Tested FPS	62.1%	66.4%

European History	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5	18%	18%	15%	24%	21%	18%	16%	16%	14%	17%	13%	18%	11%	10%	9%	10%	7%	9%
4	35%	28%	39%	27%	42%	38%	25%	24%	21%	21%	24%	28%	19%	19%	17%	17%	16%	19%
3	39%	46%	32%	38%	27%	24%	37%	33%	35%	35%	33%	28%	36%	35%	34%	36%	29%	28%
2	6%	5%	5%	6%	10%	20%	9%	9%	10%	9%	24%	21%	11%	11%	12%	11%	35%	32%
1	2%	4%	9%	5%	0%	0%	14%	18%	20%	18%	6%	5%	23%	25%	29%	26%	12%	12%
Total Exams	129	83	102	63	86	50	1,683	1,650	1,690	1,572	1,260	1,167	108,983	110,104	110,708	108,329	109,759	104,732
Mean Score	3.60	3.52	3.46	3.59	3.73	3.54	3.21	3.11	2.99	3.10	3.13	3.32	2.83	2.78	2.65	2.75	2.71	2.81

	European History 2016	European History 2017
Number Tested	86	50
Enrolled FPS	144	85
Percentage Tested FPS	59.7%	85.6%

United States Government and Politics	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5	33%	36%	20%	15%	35%	17%	21%	22%	20%	15%	20%	16%	13%	11%	12%	10%	12%	11%
4	25%	20%	21%	29%	20%	24%	21%	21%	17%	19%	17%	16%	15%	14%	12%	14%	14%	12%
3	26%	27%	39%	34%	32%	34%	27%	28%	29%	27%	29%	28%	25%	26%	26%	25%	25%	26%
2	16%	16%	18%	16%	12%	22%	22%	20%	21%	23%	20%	23%	25%	25%	25%	25%	24%	25%
1	0%	1%	2%	5%	0%	2%	10%	10%	13%	16%	15%	17%	23%	24%	25%	27%	25%	26%
Total Exams	80	75	105	154	65	86	2,675	3,221	3,461	3,879	3,816	4,365	239,904	256,217	272,185	283,323	297,038	320,206
Mean Score	3.74	3.73	3.39	3.32	3.78	3.33	3.21	3.26	3.11	2.94	3.06	2.90	2.69	2.65	2.62	2.54	2.64	2.58

	United States Government and Politics 2016	United States Government and Politics 2017
Number Tested	65	86
Enrolled FPS	82	109
Percentage Tested FPS	79.3%	78.9%

Comparative Government & Policy	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	**2017**	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5						44%						35%						23%
4						33%						29%						24%
3						12%						14%						21%
2						8%						11%						18%
1						4%						11%						14%
Total Exams						52						532						21,250
Mean Score						4.06						3.66						3.24

	Comparative Government & Policy 2017
Number Tested	52
Enrolled FPS	66
Percentage Tested FPS	78.8%

	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
Macroeconomics	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
5	26%	22%	25%	15%	33%	29%	25%	21%	25%	23%	27%	27%	14%	15%	16%	15%	17%	16%
4	44%	28%	47%	36%	35%	44%	29%	29%	31%	30%	29%	32%	24%	23%	23%	22%	23%	23%
3	21%	22%	20%	28%	23%	11%	18%	19%	21%	20%	19%	17%	18%	17%	19%	17%	16%	17%
2	6%	18%	8%	13%	8%	11%	13%	17%	14%	16%	14%	14%	18%	19%	17%	17%	17%	16%
1	3%	11%	0%	9%	0%	4%	14%	14%	9%	12%	12%	11%	26%	27%	25%	28%	26%	28%
Total Exams	34	65	60	47	48	45	1,023	1,173	1,138	1,313	1,419	1,579	100,028	108,912	117,542	127,072	135,471	132,329
Mean Score	3.85	3.31	3.88	3.36	3.94	3.82	3.37	3.27	3.49	3.37	3.45	3.50	2.81	2.80	2.89	2.79	2.90	2.83

	Macroeconomics 2016	Macroeconomics 2017
Number Tested	48	45
Enrolled FPS	57	66
Percentage Tested FPS	84.2%	68.2%

Microeconomics	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5	24%	21%	16%	22%	19%	17%	29%	25%	24%	25%	23%	32%	17%	18%	16%	19%	18%	21%
4	47%	37%	38%	39%	42%	40%	35%	37%	36%	34%	33%	35%	28%	29%	29%	29%	28%	28%
3	21%	16%	34%	22%	23%	23%	17%	19%	21%	22%	22%	17%	21%	20%	21%	19%	22%	19%
2	9%	21%	12%	8%	15%	17%	12%	10%	11%	9%	11%	9%	16%	15%	15%	14%	14%	13%
1	0%	5%	0%	8%	2%	4%	8%	9%	8%	10%	11%	8%	18%	18%	19%	19%	19%	20%
Total Exams	34	62	50	49	48	47	1,014	1,243	1,178	1,351	1,511	1,531	62,584	67,658	74,492	78,898	82,687	75,760
Mean Score	3.85	3.48	3.58	3.59	3.60	3.49	3.63	3.59	3.57	3.55	3.46	3.74	3.09	3.13	3.07	3.15	3.11	3.18

	Microeconomics 2016	Microeconomics 2017
Number Tested	48	47
Enrolled FPS	62	76
Percentage Tested FPS	77.4%	61.8%

Computer Science	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5	17%	43%	14%		8%	25%	29%	25%	24%	25%	23%	27%	17%	18%	16%	19%	18%	24%
4	0%	14%	29%		25%	30%	35%	37%	36%	34%	33%	22%	28%	29%	29%	29%	28%	21%
3	33%	29%	21%		25%	25%	17%	19%	21%	22%	22%	24%	21%	20%	21%	19%	22%	22%
2	17%	14%	7%		33%	10%	12%	10%	11%	9%	11%	12%	16%	15%	15%	14%	14%	12%
1	33%	0%	29%		8%	10%	8%	9%	8%	10%	11%	15%	18%	18%	19%	19%	19%	22%
Total Exams	6	7	14		12	20	1,014	1,243	1,178	1,351	1,511	987	62,584	67,658	74,492	78,898	82,687	56,396
Mean Score	2.50	3.86	2.93		2.92	3.50	3.63	3.59	3.57	3.55	3.46	3.33	3.09	3.13	3.07	3.15	3.11	3.13

	Computer Science 2016	Computer Science 2017
Number Tested	12	20
Enrolled FPS	21	36
Percentage Tested FPS	57.1%	55.6%

Latin	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	21%	14%	16%	11%	9%	11%	21%	14%	13%	13%	13%	12%
4	25%	0%	29%	10%	0%	22%	17%	17%	22%	19%	25%	18%	17%	21%	22%	22%	21%	19%
3	0%	17%	43%	60%	50%	44%	26%	32%	27%	35%	34%	34%	25%	32%	30%	29%	32%	31%
2	50%	67%	29%	20%	33%	22%	19%	26%	22%	26%	18%	18%	18%	23%	24%	24%	23%	23%
1	0%	17%	0%	10%	17%	11%	18%	11%	13%	10%	14%	18%	19%	11%	10%	12%	11%	14%
Total Exams	4	6	7	10	6	9	210	270	198	242	177	202	6,436	6,685	6,552	6,627	6,601	6,663
Mean Score	3.25	2.00	3.00	2.70	2.33	2.78	3.05	2.97	3.05	2.94	2.97	2.85	3.04	3.05	3.05	2.99	3.00	2.94

	Latin 2016	Latin 2017
Number Tested	6	9
Enrolled FPS	17	31
Percentage Tested FPS	35.3%	29.0%

Spanish Language and Culture	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5	29%	24%	36%	44%	30%	28%	24%	24%	30%	33%	30%	23%	25%	25%	24%	27%	27%	19%
4	31%	31%	53%	43%	47%	53%	27%	27%	37%	37%	36%	36%	26%	25%	35%	35%	34%	35%
3	27%	26%	12%	13%	21%	17%	21%	19%	24%	23%	25%	30%	21%	20%	30%	28%	27%	34%
2	12%	12%	0%	0%	2%	2%	13%	15%	7%	6%	7%	9%	15%	16%	9%	9%	10%	10%
1	2%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	15%	15%	2%	1%	2%	2%	13%	14%	2%	1%	2%	2%
Total Exams	52	68	78	54	66	53	1,884	1,846	1,987	1,775	2,028	2,162	134,432	139,708	140,984	151,646	165,444	176,103
Mean Score	3.73	3.51	4.24	4.31	4.06	4.08	3.30	3.30	3.88	3.96	3.85	3.70	3.35	3.32	3.70	3.77	3.77	3.58

	Spanish Language and Culture 2016	Spanish Language and Culture 2017
Number Tested	66	53
Enrolled FPS	70	60
Percentage Tested FPS	94.3%	88.3%

French Language and Culture	Fairfield Public Schools						Connecticut						All Tests Taken					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
5	19%	24%	12%	19%	18%	17%	21%	21%	18%	16%	20%	20%	18%	19%	18%	17%	17%	15%
4	29%	43%	24%	25%	18%	29%	35%	31%	33%	31%	31%	27%	27%	26%	26%	25%	26%	24%
3	52%	33%	65%	50%	46%	50%	34%	34%	36%	37%	34%	37%	33%	32%	33%	34%	32%	35%
2	0%	0%	0%	6%	18%	4%	10%	12%	11%	15%	14%	15%	17%	18%	17%	19%	18%	21%
1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	5%	5%	5%	6%	6%	6%
Total Exams	21	21	17	36	28	24	607	629	666	612	610	628	20,833	21,544	22,304	23,564	23,577	21,353
Mean Score	3.67	3.90	3.47	3.58	3.36	3.58	3.66	3.59	3.54	3.46	3.54	3.48	3.35	3.37	3.34	3.28	3.32	3.20

	French Language and Culture 2016	French Language and Culture 2017
Number Tested	28	24
Enrolled FPS	32	25
Percentage Tested FPS	87.5%	96%

Fairfield Public Schools
High School Academic Expectations

Critical & Creative Thinking	Communicating & Collaborating
How do students demonstrate critical and creative thinking to effectively evaluate evidence and construct solutions?	**How do students communicate information clearly and effectively in a variety of contexts and work collaboratively to solve problems?**
Exploring and Understanding The student engages in an investigative process using a variety of research tools and methodologies.	*Conveying Ideas* The student organizes information to support a claim or assertion in a style appropriate to purpose, audience, and task.
Synthesizing and Evaluating The student weighs evidence, arguments, claims and beliefs in order to critically and effectively solve problems and to justify conclusions.	*Using Communication Tools* The student makes strategic and ethical use of a range of media to enhance understanding of and interest in a claim or assertion.
Creating and Constructing The student transforms existing ideas and knowledge into new ideas, products, and processes.	*Collaborating Strategically* The student takes into account prior knowledge, beliefs, and experiences of self and others; roles and relationships within the group; and the group's purpose, goals, and norms.

Critical and Creative Thinking

How do students demonstrate critical and creative thinking to effectively evaluate evidence and construct solutions?	1 Below Standard	2 Developing	3 Achieving	4 Exemplary
Exploring and Understanding The student engages in an investigative process by developing a detailed plan to address the challenges and by using a variety of appropriate resources.	The student identifies information related to the task and/or develops a plan that is unrelated to the challenges presented in the task.	The student identifies issues and develops a plan to address the challenges presented in the task. The student uses limited resources.	The student analyzes key issues and develops a detailed plan to address the challenges presented in the task. The student selects from a variety of relevant resources and can articulate the rationale for the choices made.	The student analyzes key issues and develops a detailed plan to address the challenges presented in the task. The student selects from a variety of relevant resources and can articulate the rationale for the choices made. The student continually reflects on the effectiveness of the process and adjusts the plan when necessary.
Synthesizing and Evaluating The student makes an informed judgment based upon a set of criteria and using credible evidence.	The student uses limited evidence, arguments, claims or beliefs, and/or fails to make connections to the task.	The student uses evidence, arguments, claims, or beliefs and makes general connections to the task.	The student weighs evidence, arguments, claims and beliefs in order to effectively address the task and justify conclusions.	The student weighs evidence, arguments, claims and beliefs in order to effectively address the task and justify conclusions. The student articulates implications and/or impacts resulting from the task or conclusion.
Creating and Constructing The student transforms existing ideas and knowledge into new ideas, products, and processes.	The student recognizes or identifies existing ideas and knowledge from a situation.	The student replicates a process or product from existing ideas or information.	The student demonstrates divergent thinking by constructing an original process or product from the synthesis of existing ideas and information.	The student demonstrates divergent thinking by constructing an original process or product from the synthesis of existing ideas and information. The student can elaborate on the value, uniqueness, and potential benefits of the solution.

Communicating & Collaborating

How do students communicate information clearly and effectively in a variety of contexts and work collaboratively to solve problems?	1 Below Standard	2 Developing	3 Achieving	4 Exemplary
Conveying Ideas The student organizes information to support a claim or assertion in a style appropriate to purpose, audience, and task.	The student had difficulty articulating a claim due to a lack of clarity and/or evidence.	The student can articulate a claim or assertion to the intended audience with limited or partial information and evidence.	The student can clearly and convincingly articulate a claim or assertion to the intended audience using appropriate language and evidence.	The student can clearly and convincingly articulate claims, effectively respond to counterclaims, demonstrate flexibility to address issues to an broad range of audiences using strategic language and evidence.
Using Communication Tools The student makes strategic and ethical use of a range of media to enhance understanding of and interest in a claim or assertion.	The student selects media inappropriate to the purpose, audience, and task.	The student organizes content and selects a communication tool based on a purpose to communicate ideas.	The student purposefully selects and utilizes a variety of communication tools to effectively convey information for a range of purposes and audiences.	The student reflects on choice of communication tools, makes predictions about possible audience reactions, and works through multiple designs to produce a media communication.
Collaborating Strategically The student takes into account prior knowledge, beliefs, and experiences of self and others; roles and relationships within the group; and the group's purpose, goals, and norms.	The student demonstrates limited participation in the group.	The student participates in the group, but does not consider and value group purpose and goals, member roles and relationships, and group norms.	The student participates in the group using strategies that consider and value group purpose and goals, member roles and relationships, and group norms.	The student participates in the group using strategies that consider and value group purpose and goals, member roles and relationships, and group norms. The student enhances group effectiveness and builds group cohesion by eliciting feedback, considering other members' knowledge, experiences, values, and culture.

2015-17 SBA Fairfield and State Results
English/Language Arts

TABLE 1   TABLE 1   **UNMATCHED COHORT GROWTH**

Grade 3

	Enrollment	2015 Fairfield	State	Difference	Enrollment	2016 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2016	Enrollment	2017 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2017
	853				722					755				
% Level 1		23	12	11		10	23	-13	-13		12	25.2	-13.2	-11
% Level 2		21	23	-2		21	23	-2	0		22	22.9	-0.9	1
% Level 3		27	24	3		25	23	2	-2		28	23	5	1
% Level 4		40	30	10		43	31	12	3		28	28.8	-0.8	-12
% Level 3+4		67	54	13		68	54	14	1		67	51.8	15.2	0

Grade 4

	Enrollment	2015 Fairfield	State	Difference	Enrollment	2016 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2016	Enrollment	2017 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2017		2016 to 2017 Cohort Fairfield	State	Difference
	768				860					728								
% Level 1		11	26	-15		12	27	-15	1		10	26.8	-16.8	-1	% Level 1	0	3.8	-3.8
% Level 2		17	19	-2		13	18	-5	-4		16	19.1	-3.1	-1	% Level 2	-5	-3.9	-1.1
% Level 3		29	24	5		28	23	5	-1		28	23.5	4.5	-1	% Level 3	3	0.5	2.5
% Level 4		43	31	12		47	32	15	4		46	30.6	15.4	3	% Level 4	3	-0.4	3.4
% Level 3+4		72	55	17		75	56	19	3		74	54.1	19.9	2	% Level 3+4	6	0.1	5.9

Grade 5

	Enrollment	2015 Fairfield	State	Difference	Enrollment	2016 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2016	Enrollment	2017 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2017		2015 to 2017 Cohort Fairfield	State	Difference
	745				761					885								
% Level 1		7	23	-16		10	23	-13	3		10	25.4	-15.4	3	% Level 1	-13	13.4	-26.4
% Level 2		12	19	-7		14	18	-4	2		13	18.3	-5.3	1	% Level 2	-8	-4.7	-3.3
% Level 3		35	33	2		31	31	0	-4		33	30.2	2.8	-2	% Level 3	6	6.2	-0.2
% Level 4		45	26	19		45	28	17	0		44	26.1	17.9	-1	% Level 4	4	-3.9	7.9
% Level 3+4		80	59	21		76	59	17	-4		77	56.3	20.7	-3	% Level 3+4	10	2.3	7.7

Grade 6

	Enrollment	2015 Fairfield	State	Difference	Enrollment	2016 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2016	Enrollment	2017 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2017		2015 to 2017 Cohort Fairfield	State	Difference
	789				**759**					769								
% Level 1		5	19	-14		7	22	-15	2		6	22.2	-16.2	1	% Level 1	-5	-3.8	-1.2
% Level 2		17	25	-8		17	23	-6	0		20	23.8	-3.8	3	% Level 2	3	4.8	-1.8
% Level 3		43	35	8		40	33	7	-3		41	33.2	7.8	-2	% Level 3	12	9.2	2.8
% Level 4		35	21	14		36	22	14	1		33	20.8	12.2	-2	% Level 4	-10	-10.2	0.2
% Level 3+4		78	56	22		76	55	21	-2		74	54	20	-4	% Level 3+4	2	-1	3

Grade 7

	Enrollment	2015 Fairfield	State	Difference	Enrollment	2016 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2016	Enrollment	2017 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2017		2015 to 2017 Cohort Fairfield	State	Difference
	779				**798**					760								
% Level 1		8	21	-13		8	23	-15	0		7	22.6	-15.6	-1	% Level 1	0	-0.4	0.4
% Level 2		15	22	-7		18	22	-4	3		13	22.5	-9.5	-2	% Level 2	1	3.5	-2.5
% Level 3		51	39	12		43	35	8	-8		49	35.9	13.1	-2	% Level 3	14	2.9	11.1
% Level 4		27	18	9		31	20	11	4		31	19	12	4	% Level 4	-14	-7	-7
% Level 3+4		78	57	21		74	55	19	-4		80	54.9	25.1	2	% Level 3+4	0	-4.1	4.1

Grade 8	Enrollment 825	2015 Fairfield	State	Difference	Enrollment 782	2016 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015-16	Enrollment 793	2017 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2017		2015 to 2017 Cohort Fairfield	State	Difference
% Level 1		8	20	-12		7	21	-14	-1		6	22.3	-16.3	-2	% Level 1	1	3.3	-2.3
% Level 2		22	26	-4		19	24	-5	-3		18	24	-6	-4	% Level 2	1	-1	2
% Level 3		46	37	9		46	57	-11	0		45	36.2	8.8	-1	% Level 3	2	1.2	0.8
% Level 4		25	17	8		29	18	11	4		31	17.5	13.5	6	% Level 4	-4	-3.5	-0.5
% Level 3+4		71	54	17		75	56	19	4		76	53.7	22.3	5	% Level 3+4	-2	-2.3	0.3

2015-16 SBA Fairfield and State Results
Mathematics

TABLE 2   TABLE 2

Grade 3	Enrollment 853	2015 Fairfield	State	Difference	Enrollment 722	2016 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2016	Enrollment 754	2017 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2017
% Level 1		11	27	-16		9	24	-15	-2		9	23.6	-14.6	-2
% Level 2		25	25	0		20	24	-4	-5		20	23.3	-3.3	-5
% Level 3		41	30	11		40	30	10	-1		36	29.5	6.5	-5
% Level 4		23	18	5		31	23	8	8		35	23.6	11.4	12
% Level 3+4		64	48	16		72	53	19	8		71	53.1	17.9	7

Grade 4	Enrollment 860	2015 Fairfield	State	Difference	Enrollment 860	2016 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2016	Enrollment 728	2017 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2017		2016 to 2017 Cohort Fairfield	State	Difference
% Level 1		9	23	-14		7	22	-15	-2		7	20.5	-13.5	-2	% Level 1	-2	-3.5	1.5
% Level 2		27	33	-6		26	31	-5	-1		25	29.5	-4.5	-2	% Level 2	5	5.5	-0.5
% Level 3		40	27	13		39	28	11	-1		37	27.4	9.6	-3	% Level 3	-3	-2.6	-0.4
% Level 4		24	17	7		29	20	9	5		32	22.6	9.4	8	% Level 4	1	-0.4	1.4
% Level 3+4		63	44	19		68	48	20	5		69	50	19	6	% Level 3+4	-3	-3	0

Grade 5	Enrollment 759	2015 Fairfield	State	Difference	Enrollment 761	2016 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2016	Enrollment 884	2017 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2017		2015 to 2016 Cohort Fairfield	State	Difference
% Level 1		11	33	-22		11	31	-20	0		8	30.2	-22.2	-3	% Level 1	-3	3.2	-6.2
% Level 2		27	30	-3		25	28	-3	-2		22	26.8	-4.8	-5	% Level 2	-3	1.8	-4.8
% Level 3		30	19	11		30	20	10	0		28	19.5	8.5	-2	% Level 3	-13	-10.5	-2.5
% Level 4		33	18	15		34	21	13	1		42	23.4	18.6	9	% Level 4	19	5.4	13.6
% Level 3+4		63	37	26		64	41	23	1		70	42.9	27.1	7	% Level 3+4	6	-5.1	11.1

Grade 6	Enrollment 789	2015 Fairfield	State	Difference	Enrollment 756	2016 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2016	Enrollment 769	2017 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2017		2015 to 2017 Cohort Fairfield	State	Difference
% Level 1		10	31	-21		10	30	-20	0		10	28.1	-18.1	0	% Level 1	1	5.1	-4.1
% Level 2		26	31	-5		26	30	-4	0		24	28.3	-4.3	-2	% Level 2	-3	-4.7	1.7
% Level 3		35	21	14		27	21	6	-8		27	21.8	5.2	-8	% Level 3	-13	-5.2	-7.8
% Level 4		29	16	13		36	20	16	7		39	21.8	17.2	10	% Level 4	15	4.8	10.2
% Level 3+4		64	37	27		63	41	22	-1		66	43.6	22.4	2	% Level 3+4	3	-0.4	3.4

Grade 7

Grade 7	Enrollment 777	2015 Fairfield	State	Difference	Enrollment 792	2016 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2016	Enrollment 759	2017 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2017	2015 to 2017 Cohort Fairfield	State	Difference
% Level 1		14	32	-18		12	29	-17	-2		13	29.8	-16.8	-1	2	-3.2	5.2
% Level 2		27	30	-3		27	29	-2	0		22	27.5	-5.5	-5	-5	-2.5	-2.5
% Level 3		29	22	7		31	23	8	2		27	21.3	5.7	-2	-3	2.3	-5.3
% Level 4		29	17	12		30	19	11	1		38	21.4	16.6	9	5	3.4	1.6
% Level 3+4		58	39	19		61	42	19	3		65	42.7	22.3	7	2	5.7	-3.7

Grade 8

Grade 8	Enrollment 819	2015 Fairfield	State	Difference	Enrollment 780	2016 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2016	Enrollment 792	2017 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2017	2015 to 2017 Cohort Fairfield	State	Difference
% Level 1		19	37	-18		14	35	-21	-5		13	34.1	-21.1	-6	3	3.1	-0.1
% Level 2		26	26	0		23	25	-2	-3		20	24.1	-4.1	-6	-6	-6.9	0.9
% Level 3		24	19	5		27	20	7	3		25	19.5	5.5	1	-10	-1.5	-8.5
% Level 4		31	18	13		36	21	15	5		42	22.3	19.7	11	13	6.3	6.7
% Level 3+4		55	37	18		63	40	23	8		67	41.8	25.2	12	3	4.8	-1.8

2015-16 CMT/CAPT Fairfield and State Results
Science

TABLE 3

TABLE 3

Grade 5

Grade 5	Enrollment 752	2015 Fairfield	State	Difference	Enrollment 765	2016 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2016	Enrollment 887	2017 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2017
% Level 1		2.5	10.2	-7.7		2	9.7	-7.7	-0.5		3		3	0.5
% Level 2		4	10.6	-6.6		4	11.6	-7.6	0		4		4	0
% Level 3		17.2	23.6	-6.4		12	19.1	-7.1	-5.2		16		16	-1.2
% Level 4		53.5	38.8	14.7		44	39.3	4.7	-9.5		49		49	-4.5
% Level 5		22.9	16.7	6.2		36	20.3	15.7	13.1		27		27	4.1
% Level 4+5		76.3	55.5	20.8		80	59.6	20.4	3.7		77		77	0.7

Grade 8

Grade 8	Enrollment 841	2015 Fairfield	State	Difference	Enrollment 784	2016 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2016	Enrollment 803	2017 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2017
% Level 1		4	13.9	-9.9		4.1	14.9	-10.8	0.1		3		3	-1
% Level 2		5.1	9.5	-4.4		3.1	9	-5.9	-2		4		4	-1.1
% Level 3		11.8	15.6	-3.8		9.7	15.9	-6.2	-2.1		8		8	-3.8
% Level 4		52.6	45.4	7.2		54.3	43.3	11	1.7		53		53	0.4
% Level 5		26.5	15.7	10.8		28.9	16.9	12	2.4		31		31	4.5
% Level 4+5		79.1	61.1	18		83.2	60.2	23	4.1		84		84	4.9

Grade 10

Grade 10	Enrollment 716	2015 Fairfield	State	Difference	Enrollment 754	2016 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2016	Enrollment 759	2017 Fairfield	State	Difference	Fairfield 2015 to 2017
% Level 1		2	10	-8		1.7	11.4	-9.7	-0.3		4		4	2
% Level 2		4	13	-9		3.9	12.1	-8.2	-0.1		5		5	1
% Level 3		24	33	-9		23.8	29.2	-5.4	-0.2		27		27	3
% Level 4		25	19	6		30.1	20	10.1	5.1		28		28	3
% Level 5		45	26	19		40.6	27.2	13.4	-4.4		36		36	-9
% Level 4+5		70	45	25		70.6	47.2	23.4	0.6		64		64	-6