

**GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS**  
**Greenwich, Connecticut**

Date of Meeting September 25, 2008

Title of Item Success System Report

Agenda No. 4.b.

REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION OR PRESENTATION OF INFORMATIONAL ITEM

Action Required

Informational Only

Submitted By: Mr. John P. Curtin

Position: Assistant Superintendent/Research & Evaluation

I will be present at Board meeting to explain if called upon:

Yes

No

Synopsis of Proposal:

The Success System was adopted by the Board of Education in March of 2007 using baseline data from the 2005-2006 school year. The attached update includes performance data from the 2007-2008 school year. The Success System provides an overview of district performance across both outcome and process measures.

Guiding questions for discussion include:

1. What accounts for the decrease in stakeholder satisfaction as measured by the Harris Survey (primary measures in the Aligning Adults arena)? Is stakeholder satisfaction a "leading" or "lagging" measure?
2. In the areas where District performance is improving, is progress sufficient to reach the targets set for 2010-2011?
3. District improvement initiatives are organized around two themes: transforming classroom practice and building relationships. Are these themes aligned with recent Success System data?
4. What modifications to the Success System should be considered?

# **Greenwich Public Schools Success System Update**

**Board of Education Meeting  
September 25, 2008**

## **Purpose of the Success System**

Board of Education Ends Policy E-010 (Strategic Roadmap and Annual Goals) stipulates: *The Success System shall be comprised of measures of the District's performance in key arenas including student achievement, whole student development, resource management, learning and working environment, governance and leadership and community engagement. Annually or more often, the District shall report to the Board on the planning, goals, accomplishments and challenges encountered by the District, individual schools, program areas in achieving the aims of the Strategic Roadmap as measured by the Success System. The District will provide summary information in an easily understood, "dashboard" format that will effectively communicate the District's results to the community.*

Performance data needs to be collected and analyzed to ensure continuous progress toward fulfilling the District mission. In recent years, the amount of information collected and tracked by the Greenwich Public Schools has increased exponentially. This plethora of data poses a series of questions for policy-makers: What information will tell us if the District is fulfilling its mission? Are we making progress? What is the relationship between our actions and the outcomes we seek for students? The Success System identifies specific indicators that can be used to monitor progress and identify future challenges. The indicators are divided into arenas that include both outcome and process measures.

## **Success System Arenas**

The arenas include student achievement, whole student development, improving teaching and learning, aligning adults and resource management. The first two arenas contain outcome measures such as standardized mathematics scores or physical fitness test results. The last three arenas contain process measures such as staff retention, parent satisfaction or change in net current expenditure per pupil. Within each arena measures are grouped into objectives. The total Success System contains five arenas, twenty-one objectives and forty-seven measures.

## **Selection of Measures**

Measures were selected for each arena from a broad range of data according the following criteria:

- The information is reliable, valid and externally verified.
- Group size is sufficient to reduce variations from year to year due to small numbers of students.
- Benchmark comparisons can be made to groups of students outside of the Greenwich Public Schools.
- The measures represent "leverage points" indicative of broader district performance.
- Data for each measure is readily available, preferably over the last five years.

## Setting Targets

Performance on each measure is characterized according to the following rubric:

- *Intervention* - significantly below expectation and benchmark groups.
- *Concern* - somewhat below recent results and benchmark groups.
- *Baseline* – similar to recent results and benchmark groups.
- *Progress* – significantly higher relative to recent results and benchmark groups.
- *Five Year Target* – goal over the next three to five years. In line with the District vision statement to “set the standard for public education,” the five year target is set at the level of the highest performing benchmark group.

While the rubric categories are somewhat arbitrary, performance targets serve a useful function by making judgments about changes in data and defining progress toward the District mission. Targets were set by considering two factors: 1) the performance of Greenwich Public Schools students relative to benchmark groups and 2) the five year performance trend. Policy makers should focus on the performance range described by the intervention and vision categories. Targets are intended to remain constant over a three to five year period of time and could be reset in conjunction with an adjustment of the District mission, vision and strategic plan.

Descriptions of Success System measures are attached to this report. Additional information about the performance targets is available online at:

[http://www.greenwichschools.org/uploaded/district/pdfs/News\\_Archives/News\\_Archives\\_2006-07/Success\\_System\\_3-29-07\\_Final.pdf](http://www.greenwichschools.org/uploaded/district/pdfs/News_Archives/News_Archives_2006-07/Success_System_3-29-07_Final.pdf)

## Reading the Charts and Tables

Attachments summarize performance across the arenas, objectives and measures. The Success System was adopted by the Board of Education in March of 2007 using baseline data from the 2005-2006 school year. Since each measure score is expressed in terms of the target rubric on a scale of 1 to 5, it is possible to make comparisons from measure to measure, objective to objective and arena to arena. The inclusion of data from the 2007-2008 school year provides information on the areas where District performance is improving and areas that need to be targeted for improvement. As such, the Success System becomes a strategic document providing the Board of Education, school staff, public and policy-makers with information necessary to make decisions regarding improvement goals and resource allocation.

## Radar Chart

The radar chart provides a “snapshot” of District performance across the five arenas of measurement.

From 2005-2006 to 2007-2008, District performance improved in four arenas (student achievement, whole student development, improving teaching and learning and resource management) and declined in one arena (aligning adults). Three-quarters of the measures in the aligning adults arena utilize Harris Survey measures. The Harris Survey will not be administered again until the spring of 2010.

### **Summary Table by Arena and Objective**

The summary table by arena and objective includes the objectives within each arena, the measure(s) used to evaluate the objective, and a rubric score for both the 2005-2006 school year and the 2007-2008 school year. The rubric scores are color coded to allow easier comparison from the baseline year to the current year and objective to objective.


From 2005-2006 and 2007-2008, improvement was also noted on measures of student preparation for college, student participation in extracurricular activities, the rate of suspension of secondary students from school, teacher retention, student access to educational opportunities, the rate of increase in per pupil expenditure, the completion rate of capital projects managed by the school district, and the condition of facilities. Performance declined on measures of student achievement at the highest levels, student satisfaction, student attendance (high school), and community, staff and parent satisfaction.

Closing gaps in achievement among subgroups of students continues to be rated at the intervention level. The recent classification of Greenwich by the Connecticut State Department of Education as a district not making adequate yearly progress under the No Child Left Behind Act underscores continuing disparities in academic achievement when disaggregated by student subgroup. Declines to the intervention level also occurred on measures of student attendance (high school) and parent school choice.

### **Summary Tables by Arena and Measure**

The final set of tables summarizes performance on each measure by arena. Column headings from left to right include the measure name and number, the weight of the measure within the arena, measure scores for the last five years (if available), rubric scores for the last two years, and the five year target for each measure. The colored arrow next to the measure score for 2007-2008 indicates whether that score is improving or declining relative to the previous four years. At the bottom of each table, the weighted rubric score for the arena is calculated to the nearest tenth. These weighted scores are used in the radar chart.

# Greenwich Public Schools Success System by Arena



◆ 2005-2006    ● 2007-2008

| Key |                                    |
|-----|------------------------------------|
| 5   | Five Year Target (top districts)   |
| 4   | Progress (improving performance)   |
| 3   | Baseline (similar districts)       |
| 2   | Concern (monitor and adjust)       |
| 1   | Performance Requiring Intervention |

## Greenwich Public Schools Success System

| Arena                                  | Objective  | Measures         | 05-06 | 07-08 |
|--|--|------------------|-------|-------|
| <b>Student Achievement</b>             | Students master the academic curriculum                            | SA-01 to SA-07   | 2.6   | 2.6   |
|  | Gaps in student achievement are closing                            | SA-08 to SA-09   | 1.0   | 1.0   |
|  | Students demonstrate preparation for college                       | SA-10 to SA-11   | 3.0   | 4.0   |
|  | Students achieve at the highest levels                             | SA-12 to SA-14   | 3.8   | 3.5   |
| <b>Whole Student Development</b>       | Students are satisfied with school experience                      | WSD-01 to WSD-03 | 4.0   | 3.7   |
|  | Students participate in extra-curricular activities                | WSD-04 to WSD-05 | 3.5   | 4.5   |
|  | Students demonstrate physical fitness                              | WSD-06           | 3.0   | 3.0   |
|  | Student attendance reflects a commitment to school                 | WSD-07           | 2.0   | 1.0   |
|  | Students demonstrate respect for themselves and others             | WSD-08 to WSD-10 | 1.5   | 2.5   |
| <b>Aligning Adults</b>                 | Community, parents & staff are satisfied with District performance | AA-01 to AA-04   | 3.3   | 1.8   |
|  | District leadership supports shared decision making                | AA-05 to AA-07   | 2.5   | 1.8   |
|  | Parent school choice demonstrates confidence in GPS                | AA-08            | 2.0   | 1.0   |
| <b>Improving Teaching and Learning</b> | Professional practice promotes student learning                    | TL-1             | 3.0   | 4.0   |
|  | Students have access to educational opportunities                  | TL-02 to TL-04   | 2.7   | 3.0   |
|  | Students & parents are satisfied with the quality of teaching      | TL-05 to TL-07   | 3.5   | 3.3   |
| <b>Resource Management</b>             | The school budget demonstrates fiscal responsibility               | RM-01            | 2.0   | 3.0   |
|  | Staff allocation is driven by changes in enrollment & student need | RM-02            | 2.0   | 2.0   |
|  | Capital projects are completed on time                             | RM-03            | 3.0   | 5.0   |
|  | Facilities are maintained to an acceptable standard                | RM-04            | 3.0   | 4.0   |
|  | Facilities are utilized in an efficient manner                     | RM-05            | 3.0   | 3.0   |
|  | Parents, students and staff are satisfied with facilities          | RM-06 to RM-08   | 3.0   | 2.3   |

|            |   |     |
|------------|---|-----|
| <b>KEY</b> | <b>5 year Target</b> (top performing districts) | 5.0 |
|            | <b>Progress</b> (improving performance)         | 4.0 |
|            | <b>Baseline Performance</b> (similar districts) | 3.0 |
|            | <b>Concern</b> (monitor and adjust)             | 2.0 |
|            | Performance Requiring <b>Intervention</b>       | 1.0 |

## Greenwich Public Schools Success System

| Measure |  | Weight | 03-04 | 04-05 | 05-06 | 06-07 | Trend<br>07-08 | Base<br>05-06 | Rubric<br>07-08 | Target<br>10-11 |
|---------|--|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| SA-01   | CMT Reading Gr 3 (Goal)                          | 10.0%  | 77%   | 76%   | 76%   | 73%   | ↓ 71%          | 3             | 2               | 80%             |
| SA-02   | CMT Math Gr 5 (Goal)                             | 5.0%   | 74%   | 74%   | 77%   | 83%   | ↑ 84%          | 3             | 4               | 86%             |
| SA-03   | CMT Writing Gr 8 (Goal)                          | 5.0%   | 79%   | 78%   | 80%   | 80%   | ↑ 80%          | 2             | 2               | 90%             |
| SA-04   | CAPT Science Gr 10 (Goal)                        | 5.0%   | 56%   | 65%   | 59%   | 62%   | ↓ 53%          | 1             | 1               | 76%             |
| SA-05   | FLES Gr 5 (Mean fluency and comprehension level) | 5.0%   |       | 2.7   | 3.5   | 3.5   | ↑ 3.7          | 3             | 3               | 4.2             |
| SA-06   | Visual Arts Gr 5 (Goal)                          | 5.0%   |       |       | 74%   | 82%   | ↘ 77%          | 3             | 4               | 80%             |
| SA-07   | Social Studies Research Gr 10 (Goal)             | 5.0%   |       | 57%   | 57%   | 55%   | ↑ 58%          | 3             | 3               | 63%             |
| SA-08   | CMT Reading Gr 3-8 (F/R Lunch Gap at Goal)       | 10.0%  | 38%   | 37%   | 31%   | 33%   | → 34%          | 1             | 1               | 10%             |
| SA-09   | CAPT Science Gr 10 (F/R Lunch Gap at Goal)       | 10.0%  | 40%   | 48%   | 40%   | 40%   | ↑ 40%          | 1             | 1               | 10%             |
| SA-10   | SAT 1 Math & Reading Gr 12 (Mean Score)          | 10.0%  | 1131  | 1149  | 1147  | 1122  | ↘ 1140         | 4             | 4               | 1172            |
| SA-11   | CAPT Writing Gr 10 (Goal)                        | 10.0%  | 71%   | 75%   | 69%   | 77%   | ↑ 79%          | 2             | 4               | 83%             |
| SA-12   | CMT Writing Gr 8 (Advanced)                      | 5.0%   | 38%   | 35%   | 38%   | 36%   | ↓ 33%          | 2             | 1               | 50%             |
| SA-13   | CMT Math Gr 8 (Advanced)                         | 5.0%   | 41%   | 42%   | 47%   | 48%   | ↘ 46%          | 3             | 3               | 53%             |
| SA-14   | Advanced Placement (Scores of 3 or higher)       | 10.0%  | 84%   | 83%   | 91%   | 91%   | ↑ 92%          | 5             | 5               | 90%             |

**Student Achievement  
Mean Measure Score**

|     |     |
|-----|-----|
| 2.6 | 2.8 |
|-----|-----|

## Greenwich Public Schools Success System

| Measure   | Weight | 03-04 | 04-05 | 05-06 | 06-07 | Trend<br>07-08 | Base<br>05-06 | Rubric<br>07-08 | Target<br>10-11 |
|---|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| WSD-01 Elementary Student Satisfaction (10 point scale)         | 10.0%  |       |       | 8.4   | 8.4   | ↓ 8.3          | 4             | 4               | 8.5             |
| WSD-02 Middle School Student Satisfaction (10 point scale)      | 10.0%  |       |       | 7.9   | 7.9   | ↓ 7.4          | 4             | 3               | 8.0             |
| WSD-03 High School Student Satisfaction (10 point scale)        | 10.0%  |       |       | 7.8   | 7.8   | ↑ 7.8          | 4             | 4               | 7.9             |
| WSD-04 GHS Interscholastic Athletics (% students participating) | 10.0%  | 39%   | 40%   | 42%   | 38%   | ↑ 51%          | 4             | 5               | 46%             |
| WSD-05 GHS Performing Music (% students participating)          | 10.0%  | 20%   | 21%   | 22%   | 22%   | ↑ 23%          | 3             | 4               | 27%             |
| WSD-06 Physical Fitness Scores (% passing all four tests)       | 20.0%  | 48%   | 47%   | 48%   | 52%   | ↗ 51%          | 3             | 3               | 61%             |
| WSD-07 High School Attendance (mean % by class)                 | 10.0%  | 91.0% | 90.3% | 90.8% | 89.6% | ↓ 89.1%        | 2             | 1               | 93.0%           |
| WSD-08 Secondary Suspension Rate (% of students grades 6-12)    | 10.0%  | 8.6%  | 9.1%  | 8.8%  | 7.3%  | ↑ 6.2%         | 2             | 4               | 5.0%            |
| WSD-09 Secondary Suspension Rate (% of Hispanic students)       | 5.0%   | 17.9% | 19.4% | 22.4% | 15.5% | ↑ 12.5%        | 1             | 1               | 5.0%            |
| WSD-10 Secondary Suspension Rate (% of SPED students)           | 5.0%   | 22.8% | 27.3% | 18.0% | 14.6% | ↑ 13.4%        | 1             | 1               | 5.0%            |

**Whole Student Development  
Mean Measure Score**

|            |            |
|------------|------------|
| <b>3.0</b> | <b>3.2</b> |
|------------|------------|

## Greenwich Public Schools Success System

| Measure  | Weight | 03-04 | 04-05 | 05-06 | 06-07 | Trend<br>07-08 | Base<br>05-06 | Rubric<br>07-08 | Target<br>10-11 |       |
|--|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------|
| AA-01 Town Leader Satisfaction (10 point scale)                    | 5.0%   |       |       | 8.3   | 8.3   | ↓              | 7.0           | 4               | 1               | 8.5   |
| AA-02 Reductions to Operating Budget (% of proposed budget)        | 5.0%   | .13%  | .00%  | .00%  | .42%  | ↑              | .01%          | 5               | 5               | 0.00% |
| AA-03 Staff Satisfaction (10 point scale)                          | 20.0%  |       |       | 7.4   | 7.4   | ↓              | 6.6           | 3               | 1               | 7.9   |
| AA-04 Parent Satisfaction (10 point scale)                         | 20.0%  |       |       | 7.9   | 7.9   | ↓              | 7.6           | 3               | 2               | 8.4   |
| AA-05 Parent Involvement in Decision Making (10 point scale)       | 10.0%  |       |       | 7.6   | 7.6   | ↓              | 7.4           | 3               | 3               | 8.1   |
| AA-06 Parent Satisfaction with the Budget Process (10 point scale) | 5.0%   |       |       | 6.8   | 6.8   | ↓              | 6.5           | 3               | 2               | 7.5   |
| AA-07 Staff Involvement in Decision Making (10 point scale)        | 15.0%  |       |       | 6.0   | 6.0   | ↓              | 5.5           | 2               | 1               | 7.0   |
| AA-08 Enrollment in GPS (% resident students K-12)                 | 20.0%  | 75.7% | 75.3% | 74.5% | 73.7% | ↓              | 73.3%         | 2               | 1               | 77.2% |

**Aligning Adults  
Mean Measure Score**

|            |            |
|------------|------------|
| <b>2.8</b> | <b>1.7</b> |
|------------|------------|

## Greenwich Public Schools Success System

|       | Measure  | Weight | 03-04 | 04-05 | 05-06 | 06-07 | Trend<br>07-08 | Base<br>05-06 | Rubric<br>07-08 | Target<br>10-11 |
|-------|--|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| TL-01 | Teacher Retention (% annual retention)                         | 25.0%  | 89%   | 89%   | 91%   | 92%   | ↑ 93%          | 3             | 4               | 95%             |
| TL-02 | Advanced Placement Tested (% of graduates)                     | 15.0%  | 42%   | 41%   | 36%   | 39%   | → 39%          | 3             | 3               | 45%             |
| TL-03 | Students Completing Algebra 1 (% by end of 8th grade)          | 15.0%  | 37%   | 41%   | 36%   | 40%   | ↑ 48%          | 2             | 3               | 60%             |
| TL-04 | Time with Non-Disabled Peers (% time for SPED students)        | 15.0%  | 76%   | 77%   | 78%   | 79%   | ↑ 80%          | 3             | 3               | 85%             |
| TL-05 | Elementary Student Satisfaction with Teaching (10 point scale) | 7.5%   |       |       | 8.9   | 8.9   | ↓ 8.8          | 4             | 4               | 9.0             |
| TL-06 | Secondary Student Satisfaction with Teaching (10 point scale)  | 7.5%   |       |       | 7.9   | 7.9   | ↓ 7.7          | 4             | 3               | 8.2             |
| TL-07 | Parent Satisfaction with Teaching (10 point scale)             | 15.0%  |       |       | 8.0   | 8.0   | ↓ 7.8          | 3             | 3               | 8.5             |

**Teaching and Learning  
Mean Measure Score**

|            |            |
|------------|------------|
| <b>3.0</b> | <b>3.3</b> |
|------------|------------|

## Greenwich Public Schools Success System

|       | Measure  | Weight | 03-04 | 04-05 | 05-06 | 06-07 | Trend<br>07-08 | Base<br>05-06 | Rubric<br>07-08 | Target<br>10-11 |
|-------|--|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| RM-01 | Net Current Expenditures per Pupil<br>(% annual growth 5 yr avg) | 20.0%  | 3.5%  | 4.4%  | 5.7%  | 6.2%  | → 5.1%         | 2             | 3               | 3.5%            |
| RM-02 | Students per Certified Staff<br>Member (TOG + Grants)            | 20.0%  | 9.97  | 9.80  | 9.77  | 9.83  | → 9.86         | 2             | 2               | 10.5            |
| RM-03 | Capital Projects (% completed on<br>time & in budget)            | 15.0%  |       | 100%  | 81%   | 87%   | ↑ 100%         | 3             | 5               | 95%             |
| RM-04 | Facilities Condition (poor=1 to<br>excellent=4)                  | 15.0%  |       |       | 2.82  | 2.97  | ↑ 3.08         | 3             | 4               | 4.00            |
| RM-05 | Elementary Facilities Utilization                                | 15.0%  | 99%   | 97%   | 95%   | 95%   | ↑ 95%          | 3             | 3               | 85% -<br>95%    |
| RM-06 | Student Satisfaction with Facilities<br>(10 point scale)         | 5.0%   |       |       | 7.8   | 7.8   | ↓ 7.6          | 4             | 4               | 7.9             |
| RM-07 | Parent Satisfaction with Facilities<br>(10 point scale)          | 5.0%   |       |       | 7.5   | 7.5   | ↓ 7.3          | 3             | 2               | 8.1             |
| RM-08 | Staff Satisfaction with Facilities (10<br>point scale)           | 5.0%   |       |       | 6.9   | 6.9   | ↓ 6.4          | 2             | 1               | 7.8             |

**Resource Management  
Mean Measure Score**

|     |     |
|-----|-----|
| 2.6 | 3.2 |
|-----|-----|

## Success System Measures

### Harris Survey

In the spring of 2006, the Harris Interactive School Poll was administered to students, parents, staff and town leaders. Survey results are used in the Whole Student Development, Aligning Adults, Improving Teaching and Learning, and the Resource Management arenas to assess satisfaction with district performance, stakeholder inclusion in the decision making process, the quality of teaching, and facilities condition. Response rates ranged from 91% for elementary students to 74% for secondary students to 81% for teachers and staff to 26% for parents and 30% for town leaders. The lower response rates for parents and town leaders were within the tolerances set by Harris for valid interpretation of the results. The survey asks respondents to “grade” system performance on an eleven point scale with A=10, A-=9, B+=8, B=7, B-=6, C+=5, C=4, C-=3, D+=2, D=1 and F=0. For the purposes of the arena rubrics, the numerical means were used to represent responses. Harris benchmark groups include the “Harris 9,” nine districts with similar demographic profiles to Greenwich and “Harris All,” all 150 districts across the United States that use the Harris Interactive Poll on a regular basis.

### Student Achievement Measures

This arena assesses student achievement in four broad objectives specified in Board of Education Policy E-003 (Student Achievement): mastery of the curriculum, achievement by student subgroup, preparation for college, and achievement at the highest levels. Measures include:

**Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT)** - State-mandated program that assesses and reports the achievement of students in grade three through grade eight in three areas: Mathematics, Reading, and Writing. In March 2008, a Science assessment was added to the CMT in grades five and eight. The CMT assesses core academic competencies and serves as a key indicator of a student’s readiness to successfully access the high school curriculum. Student scores are characterized by performance level: 5-Advanced, 4-Goal, 3-Proficient, 2-Basic and 1-Below Basic.

**Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT)** - State-mandated program that assesses and reports the achievement of tenth grade students in four areas: Mathematics, Science, Reading Across the Disciplines, and Writing Across the Disciplines. Student scores are characterized by performance level: 5-Advanced, 4-Goal, 3-Proficient, 2-Basic and 1-Below Basic.

**Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT I)** - Measure of developed reading, writing and mathematical skills important for success in college. Scores are reported on a scale from 200 to 800. SAT1 is a college entrance examination and student participation is voluntary. Over the last five years,

the percentage of graduating seniors taking SAT1 has been relatively constant in a range from 88% to 93%.

**Advanced Placement (AP)** - College Board-sponsored program administered and operated by Educational Testing Service. The AP Program gives high school students an opportunity to take college-level courses and exams, and earn credit, advanced placement, or both for college. Greenwich High School offers sixteen advanced placement classes in five different disciplines. Examinations are administered in May and scored by the Educational Testing Service. AP Examination grades are reported on a 5-point scale as follows: 5-Extremely well qualified, 4-Well qualified, 3-Qualified, 2-Possibly qualified, 1-No recommendation.

**SOPA** - Assesses a student's oral proficiency and listening comprehension in a foreign language. SOPA is administered to all fifth grade students in the spring and is used for middle school foreign language placement. The FLES teacher uses a nine level scale from Junior Novice Low (Level 1) to Junior Advance High (Level 9) to describe language proficiency. Students tested in the spring of 2005 had been in the program for one year whereas the students who were tested in the spring of 2006 had been in the program for two years. This year's fifth graders represent the first cohort to complete all three years of the program.

**Visual Arts Assessment** - Developed locally and piloted during the 2004-2005 school year. The assessment consists of a rubric scored evaluation of two pieces of student work, one two dimensional and the other three dimensional. The rubric assesses the student's selection of content, ability to evaluate and interpret their own and peer's work, mastery of media and technique, and demonstration of the elements and principles of artistic design. Student performance is characterized by level: advanced, mastery, proficient or below proficient

**Social Studies Assessment** - Interdisciplinary research project completed during the spring of the student's sophomore year at Greenwich High School. Teachers use a standards-based rubric to assess all aspects of the student project including selection of a research question, identification of resources, development of a thesis statement, and organization and presentation of evidence. The rubric characterizes student performance by level: advanced, mastery, proficient, basic or below basic.

### **Whole Student Development Measures**

The Whole Student Development arena assesses progress towards the ends specified by Board of Education Policy E-003 - Whole Student Development. Measures include:

**Student Satisfaction** – Students were asked to rate “overall satisfaction for your school.”

**Extra-Curricular Participation** – Two areas where we have reasonably good participation data are interscholastic athletics and performing music groups at Greenwich High School. It is important to note that performing music is both part of the core academic program and an activity that extends beyond the school day.

**Fitness Scores** – Student fitness levels are assessed annually across all school districts in Connecticut. Scores represent the percentage of students meeting state standards in all four areas (flexibility, core strength, upper body strength and cardio-vascular conditioning) assessed.

**Student Attendance** – Percentages represent the average attendance by student. High school attendance is recorded class by class.

**Secondary Suspension Rate** – All student disciplinary offenses resulting in suspension or expulsion from school are recorded in the student data management system, Starbase. This measure calculates the percentage of secondary students (unduplicated count) who are suspended during a given school year. In addition to a district summary for all students in grades six through twelve, the rate is disaggregated for Hispanic students and students receiving Special Education services.

### **Aligning Adults Measures**

The Aligning Adults arena assesses the degree to which various stakeholders are working productively together to improve the education of children enrolled in the public school system. Measures include:

**Town Leader Satisfaction** – Members of the Representative Town Meeting, Board of Estimate and Taxation, town department heads and other community leaders were asked to rate overall satisfaction with the public school system.

**Reductions to the Operating Budget** – Tracks the reductions made by the Board of Estimate and Taxation to the operating budget proposed by the Board of Education as a measure of satisfaction with the operation of the school system.

**Staff Satisfaction** – All certified and non-certified employees of the Greenwich Public Schools were asked to rate their overall satisfaction.

**Parent Satisfaction** – Surveys were mailed to the parents of students enrolled in the Greenwich Public Schools. In cases where two or more students from one family were enrolled in the school system, the parent was asked to respond to the survey from the perspective of the student

whose birthday was earliest in the calendar year. Parents were asked to rate overall satisfaction with their child's school.

**Parent Involvement in Decision Making** – Parents were asked to rate the quality of school communications and involvement in decisions regarding the education of their child.

**Parent Satisfaction with the Budget Process** – Parents were asked to rate their satisfaction with the overall budget and the budget development process.

**Staff Involvement in Decision Making** – Staff were asked to rate the quality of their level of involvement and ability to influence decision making.

**Enrollment in the Greenwich Public Schools** – This measure tracks the percentage of resident, school-age children who attend the Greenwich Public Schools. The source of this data is the Connecticut State Department of Education.

### **Improving Teaching and Learning Measures**

The Improving Teaching and Learning arena assesses progress towards the ends specified by Board of Education Policies E-040 (Effective Learning Environment) and E-050 (Management of Human Resources). Measures include the following:

**Annual Teacher Retention** – The percentage of certified staff who continue their employment with the Greenwich Public Schools from one year to the next. Reasons for turnover include retirement, resignation and non-renewal.

**Advanced Placement Enrollment** – Measures the percentage of graduating seniors who enrolled in one or more Advanced Placement courses in grades nine through twelve.

**Students Completing Algebra 1 by the End of 8<sup>th</sup> Grade** – The percentage students who successfully complete either Algebra 1 or Geometry by the end of eighth grade. This measure will be used to monitor the implementation of the revised mathematics program.

**Time with Non-Disabled Peers** – Time spent with non-disabled peers (TWNDP) is an important indicator of the access of students who are receiving Special Education services to the general curriculum. Performance on this measure is also used to demonstrate compliance with the IDEA requirement that students with disabilities are educated with their non-disabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate. TWNDP is calculated as an average for all students with disabilities for whom the district is fiscally responsible.

**Satisfaction with the Quality of Teaching** – Harris Survey results are used in the Improving Teaching and Learning arena to assess stakeholder satisfaction with the quality of classroom instruction.

### **Resource Management Measures**

The Resource Management arena assesses progress towards the ends specified by Board of Education Policies E-020 and E-051. Measures include the following:

**Net Current Expenditures per Pupil (NCEP)** – As defined in Connecticut General Statutes, the State Department of Education uses data provided in the annual ED001 Financial Report filed by each school system to determine a district’s NCEP. Given the potentially significant impact of capital spending, the Success System tracks the five year average growth on a “rolling” basis from one year to the next. The District benchmarks against itself over time and against SWRPA (Southwest Regional Planning Agency) school districts which face comparable economic situations.

**Students per Certified Staff Member** – Staff allocation is driven by changes in student enrollment and student need. Since salaries represent approximately 85% of the school system’s operating budget, staff allocation is a significant measure of effective resource management.

**Capital Project Execution** – Performance in this area is measured in terms of on-time completion within budget. On-time is determined by comparing each capital project’s projected completion date at the point of appropriation against the actual completion date.

**Facilities Condition** – The Facilities Department uses a five point scale to assess the extent to which each building (schools, central office) meets the District standards for the same fifteen divisions used for capital planning (e.g., concrete, thermal and moisture, doors and windows, furnishings, mechanical, electrical). The Success System rating represents the composite average score for fifteen divisions at sixteen locations.

**Satisfaction with Equipment and Facilities** – Harris Survey results are used in the Resource Management arena to assess overall satisfaction with equipment and facilities. While the Success System uses a single overall satisfaction measure, questions clustered in this part of the survey cover a wide range of topics including food services, parking, cleanliness, temperature, availability of and access to instructional resources, etc

**Elementary Facilities Utilization** – The extent to which facilities are utilized in an efficient manner is informed by the Board of Education’s approved Facility Planning Guidelines. The

acceptable utilization range for the network of elementary schools is defined as between 85% and 95%.