

Danbury Public Schools

Salvatore Pascarella, Superintendent



District Enhancement Plan

MISSION STATEMENT

Our mission is to develop in all children the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values which will enable them to live a productive and self-fulfilling life and engage in responsible citizenship in an ever-changing global society.

Teaching, Learning and Leadership

School Years: 2009 – 2014

Approved by the Danbury Board of Education on October 14, 2009

Approved by the CT State Board of Education on November 4, 2009

Superintendent Signature:

October 14, 2009

Danbury Public Schools Board of Education

Susan Podhajski, Chairperson

Irving Fox, Vice Chairperson

Kathleen Molinaro, Secretary

Eileen Alberts

Rachael Austin

Gladys Cooper

Michael Fazio

Joan Hodge

Richard Jannelli

Joseph Scozzafava

Robert Taborsak

October 14, 2009

Introduction to the Danbury Public Schools District Enhancement Plan

While the Danbury Public Schools are many things, more than anything else, we are a learning organization. Our core mission is to promote deep and rich levels of learning for all students and adults within our school system. To this end, the district engages in an ongoing process of reflection and decision-making designed to inform our planning, delivery and assessment of all learning services. One powerful tool in this process is the District Enhancement Plan, which serves as a guide and as a blueprint for action.

The plan that follows is the work of a broad based coalition of key educational stakeholders. This coalition is known as The Danbury Enhancement Collaborative or simply TDEC. TDEC is comprised of teachers, parents, representatives from the business community, leaders from community organizations, union leaders, early childhood education, higher education, Board of Education members, principals and central office administrators.

TDEC's mission is to "Study and improve all aspects of curriculum development, instructional planning and delivery, formative and summative assessment, professional development, monitoring of teacher and administrator performance and to establish a rigorous protocol for district-wide and school-based alignment and accountability through the development, implementation, and monitoring of a comprehensive improvement plan and related implementation process." TDEC is the standing curriculum committee of the Danbury Board of Education.

Strengths

The District Enhancement Plan is based upon many effective educational practices that occur within our district. Additionally, the plan is built upon longstanding strengths, which serve as the foundation for all of our efforts to improve our professional practice. Our most important strength is seen in our students and their families. We are one of the most diverse school systems in Connecticut and this wonderful tapestry of cultures only serves to make our community stronger and more vibrant. We celebrate our diversity in all that we do. Another strength is showcased in our high caliber professional staff. Our employees strive daily to live our motto, "Welcome to Danbury – We Reflect Excellence." At the heart of our work is our Instructional Core: Students and teachers in the presence of content.

The content to be mastered is illustrated by our district's symbolic representation of our curriculum – The Learning Tree.



The Learning Tree details the content outcomes, life-long learning skills and the attitudes and aspects of character we expect all members of our learning community to demonstrate. All curriculum efforts are derivatives of the expectations illustrated by The Learning Tree.

Our district's Theory of Action is based upon a medical model of teaching and learning. Specifically, we believe that a recursive process of instructional diagnosis followed by the creation of learning prescriptions coupled with another instructional diagnosis to determine growth will advance learning. To that end, we have been increasing the use of common formative learning assessments to determine the degree to which our students are mastering our curriculum. Once a determination is made, our teachers generate instructional strategies in the form of

October 14, 2009

“learning prescriptions” to address identified areas of student need. This process is repeated in an ongoing manner. We have recently begun the implementation of a data warehousing system to support and advance our diagnostic and prescriptive process. This allows teachers and administrators to more accurately track data and student/staff progress in a manner that allows for instant access to essential information. This information is used to inform instructional planning, the delivery of instruction and related learning assessments.

Highly Qualified Teachers and Professional Development

The district has worked diligently to adhere to all regulations governing hiring practices for all certified staff and paraprofessionals who serve within the Title 1 program. All hiring and professional development requirements have been successfully achieved. Ten-percent of funds have been set-aside from the total district allocation and from schools identified in need of improvement from Title 1 and ARRA allocations for use in professional development around needs identified by the Cambridge Report and the District Enhancement Plan.

Technical Assistance of District and State

The district will utilize Title I funds to support mathematics instructional coaching with an external consultant at the middle and high school levels. Funds will be allocated to provide release time for data team training and grade level collaboration in the elementary schools. Additional funds will be utilized to hire outside consultants to provide literacy coaching and staff development around balanced literacy, explicit teaching, analysis of assessment data, and how to plan for differentiated instruction meeting individual needs of students.

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) will provide technical assistance to Danbury Public Schools through the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI). The CSDE, Regional Education Service Centers (RESCs) and State Education Resource Center (SERC) staff who are highly skilled educators with experience in school improvement will provide technical support to the district (see Appendix D for the complete CSDE Technical Assistance Addendum).

Extended Learning Opportunities

The district engages in both before and after school activities at the elementary level. These programs encompass both academic enrichment in the areas of literacy and numeracy, as well as a wide variety of complementary activities including physical fitness activities, dance, art, and music. The district also provides extended academic support via summer school and additional instructional time for students during the school year. Programmatic and enrichment activities are provided through available funds. After school enrichment activities are also available at the middle school level and are funded through the Extended School Hours Grant.

Community based collaborations such as *Lee Y' Seras* and *Parents as Partners* provide literacy and leadership training to Danbury families. In 2009, the district received a federal grant to open a Family Literacy Center. The center will provide literacy opportunities for parents and children and will include a lending library, literacy classes, computer lab, and serve as a connection center to the greater Danbury area.

October 14, 2009

Challenges

Although we have made progress with our enhancement efforts, our district has not made enough progress to close all identified achievement gaps, which are evident in our test results. Far too many students in our subgroup populations are not meeting our outcome expectations. While there are a number of factors that contribute to this need, there are two overarching challenges that are the most pressing. Addressing these two challenges will be the most main priorities of our work during the next five years.

The first challenge to overcome is the fragmentation between and among our 18 schools. Although protocols and procedures have been put into place, over time, there is still a significant degree of misalignment with our system. We have already begun to address this concern. We are in the process of implementing a rigorous accountability and monitoring system to ensure that all members of our district are in alignment with and addressing our performance expectations. New procedures have been established including a comprehensive restructuring of the central office administrative organization. This reorganization has resulted in a clear and direct line of accountability from the classroom level all the way to the Board of Education. We have also increased the level of supervision, monitoring, support and guidance at the building level for our two middle schools, our high school and our alternative high school through the introduction of Department Heads and an Associate Principal for Instruction. We are also implementing training initiatives to enhance and align the evaluation and observation skills of our administrators. A program designed to improve the ability of each leader who is charged with diagnosing a teacher's instructional skills is already underway.

Secondly, we have not yet achieved the level of fidelity of implementation of our improvement efforts that is needed to allow us to realize our outcome expectations. Some staff members are not following the adopted curriculum or adhering to our assessment protocols. Additionally, the district's curriculum development efforts were impeded due to a financial shortfall. However, there is now adequate funding to allow our curriculum development efforts to once again be fully implemented according to a developmental timeline. Although a lack of updated curriculum at the secondary level contributes to the fidelity of implementation problem, it is more a matter changing a culture that is based upon teaching and learning as an isolated enterprise as opposed to an open and collaborative process. Again, we have already taken actions to address this concern. The introduction of the data team process will help to remedy this issue, as will new curricula, common formative assessments, new strategies to increase student engagement and the process of learning rounds.

The two goals that serve as the foundation of the District Enhancement Plan have been created to reduce the fragmentation within our district while also increasing the degree of fidelity of implementation of all of our instructional improvement efforts. Lastly, this plan is considered to be a "living document" by the Danbury Board of Education. As such, a continuous tracking, monitoring and reporting process has been established that includes regular updates to the Board regarding process throughout the course of any given year coupled with statistical evidence that illustrates the current level of progress and remaining areas of need. This will also serve to inform modifications to the plan. Further, the district has and will continue to solicit input from all staff and the community at large. The work of TDEC has been aired on the local cable access station. The draft plan has been posted on our website. Additionally, we will send an electronic version to all staff requesting that they provide input on a continuing basis. Lastly, we will periodically request feedback through a variety of information sharing vehicles so that we continue to foster improved and effective two-way communication.

October 14, 2009

Belief Statements of The Danbury Public Schools

We believe that....

Children are our first priority and that all educational decisions must be made in their best interest and should be based upon solid educational research, the best available evidence and validated experiences,

Each child is unique with individual talents and needs, each has intrinsic worth and each child can become a life long learner and achieve success,

Each child must have ample opportunity to meet the outcome expectations of the Learning Tree with regard to the content knowledge, universal skills and attitudes and attributes of character that comprise the curriculum for the Danbury Public Schools,

We must hold our educators, board members, employees, students and their parents/guardians to high expectations for learning, development and comportment and the educational community must make a concerted effort to engage and continuously involve parents in the education of their children,

We, as educators, board members, employees and parents/guardians are accountable to the community at large for the education of our children and that collectively, we must work as a team to promote high levels of achievement and success for our students,

In a Professional Learning Community, it's more about learning and less about teaching,

We must continuously maintain safe and orderly learning environments based upon mutual respect, trust and cooperation in order to support student and staff achievement.



Enhancement Model of The Danbury Public Schools

Once an initiative has been researched and the decision has been made to move forward, the steps indicated below are followed to ensure alignment with the district's capacity building efforts.

Action Steps:

- **Declare It**
- **Implement It**
- **Resource It**
- **Monitor It**
- **Adjust It**
- **Repeat It**

Quality Factors:

- Effectiveness of communication**
- Degree of positive change at the classroom level**
- Sufficiency of budget skewing**
- Depth of knowledge of observers**
- Depth of knowledge of root cause**
- Degree of organizational will power**



Vision Statement of Danbury Public Schools

Our vision has been achieved when the citizens of Danbury are advocates for, and act as partners in public education; are satisfied that our students are receiving a quality education; believe our students are prepared for productive work and effective citizenship and feel the district is operated in an efficient and effective manner.

| All Students | All Staff | All Parents | The Board |
|---|--|---|--|
| demonstrate high levels of academic achievement and develop the ability to be life-long learners | plan for and support appropriate, challenging learning experiences and positive learning environments for all students and are committed to the goal of high levels of achievement for <u>all</u> students | are satisfied with opportunities for their child to learn and be successful in school | is highly regarded by staff, parents and community |
| demonstrate the skills, knowledge, attributes and attitudes to be successful and responsible citizens | are committed to continuous self improvement and are responsible for personal performance | are satisfied with their child's school and school and district staff | is committed to excellence, effectiveness and efficiency |
| demonstrate the qualities of caring, productive, effective community members | are service oriented and treat students, colleagues, parents and the community with dignity and respect | are satisfied that the district is operated in an efficient and effective manner | is committed to improving student achievement in the mandated subjects with an emphasis on language arts and mathematics |
| behave in accordance with school and district expectations | are collaborative, collegial, principled and behave with integrity | are partners in the school and with the district and support learning in the home and throughout the year | is committed to improving educational outcomes for students at risk of not completing their schooling |
| are satisfied with their opportunities to learn and be successful | feel valued and respected by the district and are proud of their accomplishments on behalf of children, parents and the community | support school expectations and the learning environment of the school | promotes high quality teaching and high quality leadership |
| feel valued and respected by students and staff | are satisfied with opportunities to be successful in their work | demonstrate respect for school staff | promotes the achievement of high standards of conduct, safety and well-being of students and staff |
| are satisfied with the learning environment of their school | believe the district is operated in an efficient and effective manner | are advocates for public education | is focused on increasing levels of public support and funding for public education |

October 14, 2009

The Danbury Enhancement Collaborative and the Cambridge Program Review

The Danbury Enhancement Collaborative Committee Members

Eileen Alberts – Board of Education Member
Phyllis Bartoli – 9-12 Mathematics Teacher and 6-12 Mathematics Department Head
Marilyn Brenning – Grade Five Teacher
Sam Buck – Technology Education Teacher and NEA-Danbury Representative
Debra Calhoun – Parent and Hord Foundation Representative
Kara Casimiro – K-12 Humanities Curriculum Administrator and TDEC co-chair
Michael Clarke – Assistant Principal, Danbury High School and President, *DPSAA
Eileen Costello – Education Connection, Early Childhood Representative
Louise Michael-Duncan – Parent and regional magnet school representative
Joyce Emmett – Director of Special Services
Jeff Forzani – 6-8 ELL Teacher and Hispanic Center Representative
William Glass – Deputy Superintendent
Augusto Gomes – Coordinator of Bilingual Education and ESL
Mary Gregory – Parent and Director of the Danbury Schools And Business Collaborative
Christine Harris – Grade One Teacher
Josiah Hills – 9-12 Science Teacher and 6-12 Department Head
Richard Janelli - Board of Education Member
Patricia Joaquim – Principal, Rogers Park Middle School and Vice President, *DPSAA
Mary Johnson – Principal, Stadley Rough Elementary School
Ann Lindenmeyer – Administrator for Special Projects and Early Childhood Education

Meghan Martins – Associate Principal of Instruction
Laura Mead – Parent, K-5 Mathematics Specialist and TDEC co-chair
Ellen Meyer – 6-8 Mathematics Teacher
Cindy Mirochine – NEA Danbury President Elect and Grade Five Teacher
Sue Morris – Professional Development Teacher Leader and Grade One Teacher
William Murray – President, NEA Danbury and 9-12 Special Education Teacher
Sal Pascarella – Superintendent
Jose Pimentel – Community Representative
Rev. Ivan Pitts – Pastor, New Hope Baptist Church
Christine Pruss – K-8 Director of Literacy and Title I
Sue Rice – Director of Information Services and Gifted Education
Shirley Rikart – William Knight Foundation
Linda Rinker – Vice President and Provost of WCSU
Ken Robbins – Assistant Principal, Rogers Park Middle School
Jose Rodrigues – 9-12 ESL Teacher
Ian Strever – English Teacher and 6-12 Department Head
Robert Taborsak – Board of Education Member
Mike Wasta - CSDE
Kathleen Wedge – CSDE
*Danbury Public Schools Administrators Association

October 14, 2009

The Danbury Enhancement Collaborative (TDEC) is a subcommittee of the Danbury Board of Education. The purpose of TDEC is to study and improve all aspects of curriculum development, instructional planning and delivery, formative and summative assessment, professional development, monitoring of teacher and administrator performance. In addition, a rigorous protocol will be implemented for the 2009 – 2010 school year for district-wide and school-based alignment and accountability through the development, implementation, and monitoring of a comprehensive improvement plan and related implementation process.

TDEC was charged with developing a response to the Cambridge Program Review. The District Enhancement Plan that is provided below is the response to that charge. The primary Cambridge findings are provided first followed by the district's response.

According to the Cambridge analysis of the Danbury Public Schools, the following areas were found to be in need of improvement:

See Appendix C for the Cambridge Program Review Glossary of Terms

1. Raise achievement and improve test results for all students and subgroups, particularly English language learners by:

- reviewing and revising the comprehensive curriculum for grades kindergarten through 12 in all subjects to provide enhanced guidance to teachers on pacing, differentiated instructional strategies, assessment techniques and expected learning outcomes;
- developing a shared understanding of what constitutes high quality teaching and learning that meets the needs of all students in all subject areas;
- supporting schools to further develop data teams so that better use is made of data to inform the planning of teachers, and lessons are better matched to the needs of the students; and
- embedding the frequent use of formative assessment data to inform planning and instruction.

2. Enhance consistency and develop unity of purpose across the district by:

- further developing the culture of the district to ensure that all stakeholders are empowered to actively engage in the strategic planning process resulting in wide spread ownership and commitment;
- establishing structured forums for all stakeholders to have the opportunity to regularly share feedback, including satisfaction surveys, to reflect on the district and school strategies for improvement achievement;
- improving the coherence and quality of communication at all levels within the district; and
- continue to support and nurture the fledgling administrative union while enhancing the working relationship with the teachers' union to ensure that all groups in the system are working to implement and monitor improvement strategies.

3. Develop and consistently implement a rigorous accountability structure, which includes:

- ensuring that all strategic plans include explicit links to the budget and are supported by clear action plans which include results indicators and timelines for regular monitoring and reporting;
- establishing clear lines of accountability which ensure that the roles and responsibilities of district and school administrators and teachers are clearly understood and that they are enabled and empowered, to complete designated tasks;
- regularly evaluating the impact of programs and services and acting on outcomes; and
- holding people, at all levels, accountable for the efficient implementation of agreed upon strategies, policies and procedures to ensure consistency across schools and all grade levels.

October 14, 2009

4. Maximize the efficient and effective use of resources by:

- reviewing and revising schedules to maximize the use of time, especially instructional time in the middle and high schools; and
- ensuring that professional development opportunities, including time for frequent teacher collaboration, are well matched to the needs to individual staff as evidenced by student outcomes, and school and district improvement strategies

Appendixes:

Appendix A: District Performance Matrix for Reading

Appendix B: District Performance Matrix for Mathematics

Appendix C: Cambridge Program Review: Glossary of Terms

Appendix D: CSDE Technical Assistance Addendum

October 14, 2009

District Enhancement Plan Goals:

Goal One: Raise the academic achievement levels of all students and close all identified achievement gaps in Reading and Mathematics

Student Outcome Indicator 1: All students will demonstrate increased academic performance and students in identified subgroups will demonstrate accelerated increases in academic performance as indicated on the *Performance Matrix.

*See Appendix A: District Performance Matrix for Reading

*See Appendix B: District Performance Matrix for Mathematics

Adult Action Indicator:

- **100% of certified staff members will effectively implement the adopted DPS curricula for all students using research-based planning, instructional delivery and assessment strategies as measured by lesson plans, clinical observations, the data team rubric and learning rounds.**

Results Indicators:

- **Adult Results Indicators:**
 - Lesson planning that reflects the DPS curricula and the lesson design model
 - Formative/summative observations/evaluations
 - Completed Grade/Department/Cluster Data Team Protocol
 - Learning Rounds (evidence of taught curriculum and effective strategies)
- **Student Results Indicator:**
 - District formative and summative data as determined by the District Assessment Matrix

2009-2010 Expected Outcomes for Adults:

- Lesson Plans in place, Formative and Summative Observations/Evaluations in place, Data Team Rubric in place

Person(s) Responsible:

- School-Based and Central Office Administrators
- Specified in each action step

October 14, 2009

| Action Steps | Person(s) Responsible | Timeline | Cost and Source | Deliverables |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p>1. The district will establish a 5-year cycle of curriculum review and revision that will include scope and sequence charts, essential questions, Grade Level Expectations, pacing guides, embedded 21st Century skills and formative and summative assessment procedures for core content areas K-12 that align with national and state standards. This process will also be aligned to the 5-year textbook adoption schedule. Priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mathematics K-12 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Emphasis on 6-12 level II. Specific focus on 6-8 level b. English/LA 6-12 c. ESL appropriate content area text books for grades 6-12 | <p>Deputy Superintendent Curriculum Administrators Program Directors</p> | <p>January 2010 – curriculum model adopted</p> <p>January 2010 – core curriculum cycle established and annual priorities identified</p> <p>February 2010 –core curriculum development teams posted for spring and summer work</p> | <p>Cost of implementing core curriculum writing teams for the spring and summer of 2010 per the teachers union contractual curriculum rate - General operating budget</p> | <p>*Curriculum Development Model</p> <p>*Core Curriculum Implementation Timeline and Cycle</p> <p>*Note: Deliverables will reflect 5 year implementation cycle</p> |
| <p>2. The district will increase academic rigor in the 9-12 English/LA and mathematics programs of instruction in response to the Cambridge and NEASC findings. A high school study team will present a revised sequence of courses in English/LA and mathematics that reflect increased rigor in the areas of higher order thinking, deeper understanding of important ideas, critical self-reflection and the integration of 21st century skills.</p> | <p>High School Principal Associate Principal for Instruction Department Heads Curriculum Administrators Deputy Superintendent</p> | <p>Phase One of newly leveled course offerings will be in place September 2010 for the freshman class</p> <p>Phase Two of newly leveled course offerings will be in place September 2011</p> | <p>NA</p> | <p>September 2010 – September 2011 A reduced number of academic tracks, fewer course offerings and more rigorous curricula in core subjects</p> |

October 14, 2009

| Action Steps | Person(s) Responsible | Timeline | Cost and Source | Deliverables |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>3. All staff will implement research-based planning, instructional delivery, and assessment strategies. Differentiated instruction will be used to meet the needs of all learners with an emphasis on ELL and Special Education students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Training will include, but not be limited to the Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP) model b. The district will continue all regular training initiatives on the topics of instructional planning, delivery and assessment according to the yearly professional development calendar c. The district will implement a comprehensive SRBI training program | <p>Superintendent Deputy Superintendent ELL/World Language Coordinator Director of Special Services</p> | <p>a. SIOP Training phase-in: 2009-10 Cohort Training Content Teachers who teach ESL students (6-12) All secondary (6-12) math teachers 4 days with 50 people each day</p> <p>2010-11 Remaining Gr. 6-8 teachers +(new 9-12)</p> <p>2011-12 Gr. 3-5 teachers +(new 6-12)</p> <p>2012-13 Gr. K-2 teachers +(new 3-12)</p> <p>b. & c. According to the yearly District Professional Development Calendar and Individually scheduled school-specific training sessions</p> | <p>Presenters - \$28,000 (*)</p> <p>Substitute Teachers: \$23,250</p> <p>Funds: Bilingual Grant, Title III Grant, and District PD fund. (Mostly grant funded.)</p> <p>* Includes presenter fees, travel, lodging, workshop materials</p> | <p>All staff trained in SIOP (Jan 2010)</p> <p>All staff trained in SRBI (June 2013)</p> <p>All staff trained in selected instructional and assessment strategies such as common formative assessments, components of differentiated instruction and data driven decision making (ongoing)</p> |
| <p>4. The district will implement the recommendations of the UCLA ELL Program audit as funding allows. Specific actions will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Create a district wide ELL committee to provide guidance with the implementation of the UCLA recommendations. b. Ensure that all schools include the recommendations of the UCLA audit in their Outcome Achievement Plans. c. Encourage participation of ELL teachers on school | <p>ELL/World Language Coordinator Deputy Superintendent K-12 Principals</p> | <p>a. November 2009</p> <p>b. November 2009</p> | <p>a. NA</p> <p>b. NA</p> | <p>a. Committee in place</p> <p>b. Outcome Achievement Plans reflect recommendations</p> |

October 14, 2009

| Action Steps | Person(s) Responsible | Timeline | Cost and Source | Deliverables |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| <p>leadership teams.</p> <p>d. Monitor implementation of ELL services district-wide and take necessary action to ensure consistency.</p> <p>e. Continue to address state requirements for the implementation of bilingual programs.</p> <p>f. Implement professional development on second language acquisition for teachers and administrators with an emphasis on: SIOP, CT ELL Framework, LAS Links and the Co-teaching Model.</p> <p>g. LAS Links Benchmark Pilot: 2009-2010</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">I. Benchmark Administration</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">II. Pilot Schools:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">1. Ellsworth Elementary</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2. Great Plain Elementary</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">3. Hayestown Elementary</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">4. Park Avenue Elementary</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">5. Stadley Rough Elementary</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">6. Broadview Middle School</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">7. Rogers Park Middle School</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">8. Danbury High School</p> <p>h. Provide language transition support services as required by state law.</p> <p>i. Explore the creation of an ELL Cluster at DHS for ESL I and II students.</p> <p>j. Continue to promote parity between the middle school programs of instruction for ELL students.</p> <p>k. Study the feasibility of implementing additional ELL support programs such as a dual language program and extended learning programs such as, after school, summer school and Saturday school.</p> <p>l. Ensure that secondary level ELL students have equal access to science laboratories and experiments.</p> <p>m. Continue to hire additional ELL staff as permitted by the budget.</p> <p>n. Increase emphasis on parent outreach initiatives.</p> | | <p>c. 2009 and ongoing</p> <p>d. Sept 2009 and ongoing</p> <p>e. Sept 2009 and ongoing</p> <p>f. Ongoing</p> <p>g. Benchmark 1: Sept. 2009</p> <p>Benchmark 2: Nov. 2009</p> <p>Annual Assessment of English Proficiency: February 2010</p> <p>Benchmark 3: May 2010</p> <p>h. Ongoing</p> <p>i. Sept 2009 – June 2010</p> <p>j. Ongoing</p> <p>k. Sept 2009 – June 2010</p> <p>l. Sept 2009 and ongoing</p> <p>m. Ongoing</p> <p>n. Sept 2009 and ongoing</p> | <p>c. NA</p> <p>d. NA</p> <p>e. TBD</p> <p>f. Per contract language for teacher stipends</p> | <p>c. Membership includes ELL staff</p> <p>d. NA</p> <p>e. Requirements implemented</p> <p>f. PD Plan implemented according to district training calendar</p> <p>g. Assessment data and related analysis</p> <p>h. Services provided</p> <p>i. Cluster Model potentially in place</p> <p>j. Increased parity</p> <p>k. Potential implementation of new programming approaches</p> <p>l. Equal access in place</p> <p>m. Additional staff (pending budget)</p> <p>n. Greater engagement of parents</p> |

October 14, 2009

| Action Steps | Person(s) Responsible | Timeline | Cost and Source | Deliverables |
|--|--|--|-----------------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o. Ensure that adequate textbook and instructional material are provided for ESL content classes at the secondary level. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o. Sept 2009 and ongoing | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o. Textbooks and instructional materials in place |
| <p>5. The district will implement a comprehensive diagnostic-prescriptive model of teaching and learning via the implementation of common formative assessments and Data Teams at the district, building and grade/department/cluster levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. All administrators will be trained in the Building Data Team Process in a Trainer of Trainers Model, with a core team from each school. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Two-day August training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All principals 2. 3-4 certified staff members from each elementary building 3. 5 certified staff members from each middle school, spanning grades 6-8 and various content areas 4. 10 certified staff members from DHS, spanning grades 9-12 and various content areas 5. Four staff members from the alternative programs b. The core team from each building will train their respective staff on the Building Data Team process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Continue Building Data Teams implementation on 3 additional early release days. Training sessions will be differentiated based upon individual school needs. c. Phase in Grade/Department/Cluster Data Teams <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Group A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ellsworth Elementary School | <p>Superintendent Deputy Superintendent Data Administrator K-12 Principals</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. August 2009 b. Sept and Oct 2009 January, March, April 2010 c. Sept 2009 - June 2010 | <p>\$40,000</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Core Team Trained b. Staff trained in Building Level Data Team process 9 Hours Collaboration Time c. Phase One of Instructional Level: Grade/Department/Cluster Data Team training completed |

October 14, 2009

| Action Steps | Person(s) Responsible | Timeline | Cost and Source | Deliverables |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Morris Street Elementary 3. Hayestown Elementary 4. Park Avenue Elementary 5. Stadley Rough Elementary 6. RPMS Mathematics Department 7. Alternative Center of Excellence II. Group B: All remaining schools and departments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training for Grade/Department/Cluster Data Teams (Instructional Data Teams) 2. Implementation of Grade/Department/Cluster Data Teams III. Monitoring Progress <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2010-2011 monitor and support Group A 2. 2011-2012 monitor and support Groups A & B d. Phase in Learning Rounds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Group A (see above): Train and implement Learning Rounds by 2010-2011. II. Group B: All remaining schools and departments train and implement Learning Rounds by 2011-2012 III. Monitoring Progress <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. monitor and support Group A 2. monitor and support Groups A & B e. Training needs to be ongoing and recursive for all new incoming staff. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> August - Dec 2010 January - June 2011 September 2010 – June 2011 September 2011 – June 2012 d. September 2010 – June 2011 September 2011 – June 2012 Monitoring: September 2011 – June 2012 September 2012 – June 2013 e. Ongoing | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructional data team training complete Complete implementation of instructional data teams at the Grade Level/Dept/Cluster Monitoring system in place d. Learning Rounds implemented and monitoring in place (June 2013) e. Recursive training in place |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6. The district will implement a comprehensive teacher evaluation-training program for all administrators focusing on a common definition of proficiency and inter-rater reliability. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Develop a standardized protocol that articulates lesson plan quality. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Superintendent Deputy Superintendent | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Sept 2009 – June 2010 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$5,000 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lesson Plan Quality Protocol |

October 14, 2009

| Action Steps | Person(s) Responsible | Timeline | Cost and Source | Deliverables |
|---|---|---|-----------------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Provide training on research based best instructional practices. c. Conduct collaborative scoring sessions using instructional vignettes. d. Train administrators in the use of the Data Team Rubric. e. Train administrators in effective evaluation conferencing strategies. f. Implement a monitoring process to determine the degree to which administrators are implementing a high quality teacher evaluation program. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Sept 2009 – June 2010 c. Sept 2009 – June 2010 d. Sept 2009 – June 2010 e. Sept 2009 – June 2010 f. September 2009 – June 2010 and ongoing | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Pedagogy Training completed c. Scoring sessions completed d. Data Team Rubric training complete e. Evaluation training completed f. Monitoring system fully implemented and recursive |
| <p>7. The district will increase district-wide teacher representation on TDEC during the 2009-2010 school year to continue collaboration on issues such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lesson Plan Design b. Teacher Evaluation Process c. Professional Development Needs | <p>Superintendent Deputy Superintendent TDEC Co-Chairs</p> | <p>October 2009</p> | <p>NA</p> | <p>Increased teacher collaboration and input into district decision-making</p> |
| <p>8. The district will implement a comprehensive two-way communication process. The purpose of this process is to solicit suggestions, perspectives, both positive and dissenting, regarding all aspects of the implementation, monitoring and modification of the strategic plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Solicit input from the following groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Teachers II. Administrators III. Board Members IV. Teacher and Administrator Unions V. Parents VI. Students VII. City of Danbury Municipality | <p>Superintendent Deputy Superintendent K-12 Principals</p> | <p>September 2009 and ongoing</p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Analysis of input provided such as meeting minutes and emails |

October 14, 2009

| Action Steps | Person(s) Responsible | Timeline | Cost and Source | Deliverables |
|---|---|--|-----------------|---|
| <p>9. The district will implement a comprehensive Accountability Structure to promote fidelity of implementation of all strategic initiatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Implement, fully, the new Central Office Administrative Reorganization b. Ensure that each school's Outcome Achievement Plan is aligned to the District Enhancement Plan. c. Review and manage the general fund budget to ensure that adequate resource allocations are provided to support the full and effective implementation of the District Enhancement Plan. d. Revamp job descriptions on an as needed basis to ensure that all staff have clear understandings of their roles and responsibilities. e. Implement a recursive program evaluation process to determine the progress of the district-level improvement efforts. | <p>Superintendent Deputy Superintendent K-12 Principals Curriculum Administrators Program Directors Personnel Director Finance Director</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. September 2009 b. December 2009 c. Sept 2009 and ongoing d. Ongoing e. January 2010 and ongoing | <p>NA</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. New Organizational Structure b. Thoroughly aligned plans c. Adequate funding d. New job descriptions e. New program evaluation process |
| <p>10. The district will the monitor the response plan based upon the middle school findings by the New England League of Middle School (NELMS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Rogers Park and Broadview Middle schools will review the NELMS Report and prioritize actions appropriate to address the NELMS recommendations. Action steps should be included in each school's Outcome Achievement Plan. b. NELMS recommendations will serve as a blueprint to guide the development of a revamped middle school instructional model including scheduling options, curricular approaches and less course tracks. | <p>Superintendent Deputy Superintendent 6-12 Principals Curriculum Administrators Program Directors</p> | <p>September 2009 – June 2014</p> | <p>TBD</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Action Steps for improvement and action outcomes b. New schedules, detracted course system, new curricula and pedagogy |

October 14, 2009

| Action Steps | Person(s) Responsible | Timeline | Cost and Source | Deliverables |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| <p>11. The district will take all necessary actions to maximize the use of time and resources in support of the implementation of the District Enhancement Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Revisit secondary scheduling to increase alignment between the two middle schools and to ensure that time is used wisely at the middle and high schools with an emphasis on increasing instructional time. b. Restructure the budget to provide resources to identified sites and address the need to provide equitable resources. c. Increase teacher collaboration time. d. Increase administrator collaboration time. | <p>Superintendent Deputy Superintendent K-12 Principals Curriculum Administrators Program Directors Personnel Director Finance Director</p> | <p>September 2009 – June 2014</p> | <p>TBD</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. New scheduling system and increase in instructional time b. Modified budget lines c. Increased time d. Increased time |

October 14, 2009

District Enhancement Plan Goals:

Goal Two: Increase the engagement levels of all students

Student Outcome Indicator 1: All students will successfully complete Service Learning Projects annually in grades K-9 & independently prior to completing the 12th grade.

Success will be indicated by a 70% or better pass rate on a Performance Based Rubric designed to measure Service Learning targeted outcomes.

NB: Service Learning is a method of teaching, learning and reflecting that combines the academic classroom curriculum with meaningful service, frequently youth service, throughout the community.

Adult Action Indicator:

Adults will provide students with opportunities to participate in authentic learning experiences that connect classroom curricula to community need as measured by a yearly increase in service learning project proposals that meet rubric requirements.

Results Indicators:

- **Adult Results Indicators:**
 - Collection of Service Learning Curriculum Development Team Minutes
 - Collection of Service Learning Proposals
- **Student Results Indicator:**
 - Quarterly collection and analysis of pre & post learning survey results
 - Collection of Student Project Samples.

2009-2010 Expected Outcomes for Adults:

- Establishment of a Service Learning Curriculum Design Team and associated curriculum development time line and deliverables

Person(s) Responsible:

- School-Based and Central Office Administrators

October 14, 2009

District Enhancement Plan Goals:

Goal Two: Increase the engagement levels of all students

Student Outcome Indicator 2: A 15% decrease over 3 years in the number of students suspended from school at the secondary level.

Adult Action Indicators:

Adults will adopt and implement a cohesive approach to discipline.

Adults will focus on proactive measures to reduce the occurrence of problem behavior.

Results Indicators:

• **Adult Results Indicators:**

- Minimum monthly collection & analysis of student suspension data, interventions, and documented efforts.
- Monthly collection and posting of Building Data Team minutes.

○ **Student Results Indicator:**

- A 15% decrease over 3 years in the number of students suspended from school at the secondary level

2009-2010 Expected Outcomes for Adults:

- Establishment of a student discipline data base and identification of a series of student comportment improvement strategies

Person(s) Responsible:

- School-Based and Central Office Administrators

October 14, 2009

| Action Steps | Person(s) Responsible | Timeline | Cost and Source | Deliverables |
|--|--|--|-----------------|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize the new data tracking system to collect district wide suspension information by January 2010. 2. Utilize District and Building level Data Teams to frequently monitor, track and respond to suspension data. The District Data Team will be responsible to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Align suspension policies across the district by June 2010. b. Provide schools with baseline suspension data set by June 2010. c. Identify & communicate building level intervention strategies by January 2010. d. Create a formal “intake” survey for students returning from suspension by January 2010. e. Communicate and track parental outreach efforts by January 2010. 3. Investigate positive behavior support type models and make recommendations by June 2010. 4. Investigate the possible expansion 9th Grade Teams for ALL students at DHS by school year 2011-2012. | K-12 Principals Data Administrator Deputy Superintendent Curriculum Administrators Program Directors | Sept 2009 - January 2010 a. Nov 2009 – June 2010 b. Nov 2009 – June 2010 c. Nov 2009 – January 2010 d. Nov 2009 – January 2010 e. Nov 2009 – January 2010 Sept 2009 - June 2010 Sept 2011 - June 2012 | | Suspension Data a. Aligned policies b. Baseline data c. Interventions d. Intake Surveys e. Outreach efforts tracked PBS recommendations Investigation results |

October 14, 2009

District Enhancement Plan Goals:

Goal Two: Increase the engagement levels of all students

Student Outcome Indicator 3: A 15% decrease over 3 years in the number of students with 10 or more absences from school.

Adult Action Indicator:

- **Adults will adopt a cohesive approach to identify, intervene and track students with chronic absenteeism.**

Results Indicators:

- **Adult Results Indicators:**
 - Minimum monthly collection & analysis of student absenteeism, interventions, and documented efforts.
 - Monthly collection and posting of Building Data Team minutes

Student Results Indicator:

- A 15% decrease over 3 years in the number of students with 10 or more absences from school.

2009-2010 Expected Outcomes for Adults:

- Establishment of a student absenteeism and monitoring process and the implementation of a series of related intervention strategies

Person(s) Responsible:

- School-Based and Central Office Administrators

October 14, 2009

| Action Steps | Person(s) Responsible | Timeline | Cost and Source | Deliverables |
|--|--|--|-----------------|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize the new data tracking system to collect district wide absenteeism information by January 2010 2. Utilize District and Building level Data Teams to frequently monitor, track and respond to absenteeism data. The District Data Team will be responsible to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provide schools with baseline target data identifying students who were absent 10 or more times in the 2008-2009 school year. b. Align absenteeism policies across the district by February 2010. c. Implement intervention strategies for repeat absenteeism and modify as necessary by February 2010. d. Communicate and track parental outreach efforts by February 2010. e. Investigate and make recommendations on the possibility of adding intramurals at the secondary level. | K-12 Principals Data Administrator Deputy Superintendent Curriculum Administrators Program Directors | Sept 2009 - January 2010 a. August 2009 b. Nov 2009 – February 2010 c. Nov 2009 – February 2010 d. Nov 2009 – February 2010 e. Oct 2009 - June 2010 | | Absenteeism Data a. Baseline data b. Aligned policies c. Interventions d. Outreach data e. Intramural recommendations |

October 14, 2009

Appendix A: District Performance Matrix for Reading

The matrix is preceded by a narrative description of the performance goals.

October 14, 2009

All students will demonstrate increased LITERACY performance and students in identified subgroups will demonstrate accelerated increases in LITERACY performance as measured by:

Grades 1-3 and Bilingual Kindergarten:

- 70% of students will meet the grade level standard, as determined by the state DRA2, at the end of each academic year.

Grades 3-8: (Based upon raw data)

- The percentage of students in grades 3 to 8 scoring proficient or higher in LITERACY, as measured by the annual Reading CMT, will increase from 67% to 82% by 2012.
- The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3 to 8 scoring proficient or higher in LITERACY, as measured by the annual Reading CMT, will increase from 51% to 71% by 2012.
- The percentage of Hispanic students in grades 3 to 8 scoring proficient or higher in LITERACY, as measured by the annual Reading CMT, will increase from 50% to 70% by 2012.
- The percentage of black students in grades 3 to 8 scoring proficient or higher in LITERACY, as measured by the annual Reading CMT, will increase from 59% to 79% by 2012.
- The percentage of ELL students in grades 3 to 8 scoring basic or below basic in LITERACY, as measured by the annual Reading CMT, will be reduced by 10% annually through 2012.
- The percentage of Students with Disabilities in grades 3 to 8 scoring basic or below basic in LITERACY, as measured by the annual Reading CMT, will be reduced by 10% annually through 2012.

Grade 10

- The percentage of students in grade 10 scoring proficient or higher in LITERACY, as measured by the annual Reading CAPT, will increase from 75% to 85% by 2012.
- The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students in grade 10 scoring proficient or higher in LITERACY, as measured by the annual Reading CAPT, will increase from 56% to 72% by 2012.
- The percentage of Hispanic students in grade 10 scoring proficient or higher in LITERACY, as measured by the annual Reading CAPT, will increase from 51% to 70% by 2012.
- The percentage of ELL students in grade 10 scoring basic or below basic in LITERACY, as measured by the annual Reading CAPT, will be reduced by 10% annually through 2012.
- The percentage of Students with Disabilities in grade 10 scoring basic or below basic in LITERACY, as measured by the annual Reading CAPT, will be reduced by 10% annually through 2012.

October 14, 2009

Grades 11 & 12

- The percentage of students in grades 11 and 12 taking the SATs will increase 15% above the 2008 participation rate by 2012.
- The percentage of minority students taking Advanced Placement courses will increase 10% above the 2008 participation rate by 2012.
- The mean score of the READING PSAT will increase 15% above the 2008 mean score by 2012.
- The number of students enrolled in advanced language arts courses will increase 15% above the 2008 participation rate by 2012.

October 14, 2009

Reading

| 2006-2008 CMT READING Results Grade 3 - % at/above Proficiency | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| Year | Goal | Total | Goal | Free | Goal | Hispanic | Goal | Black | Goal | ELL | Goal | SPED | EXP% Prof |
| 2006 | | 62 | | 45 | | 47 | | 51 | | 28 | | 16 | 68 |
| 2007 | | 62 | | 48 | | 46 | | 55 | | 28 | | 15 | 68 |
| 2008 | | 58 | | 44 | | 44 | | 50 | | 22 | | 7 | 79 |
| 2009 | 63 | 67 | 49 | 57 | 49 | 56 | 55 | 55 | 29 | 34 | 17 | 24 | 79 |
| 2010 | 67 | | 54 | | 54 | | 60 | | 36 | | 24 | | 79 |
| 2011 | 71 | | 59 | | 59 | | 65 | | 43 | | 31 | | 89 |
| 2012 | 74 | | 64 | | 64 | | 70 | | 51 | | 38 | | 89 |

| 2006-2008 CMT READING Results Grade 4 - % at/above Proficiency | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| Year | Goal | Total | Goal | Free | Goal | Hispanic | Goal | Black | Goal | ELL | Goal | SPED | EXP% Prof |
| 2006 | | 61 | | 47 | | 41 | | 52 | | 27 | | 24 | 68 |
| 2007 | | 65 | | 51 | | 48 | | 61 | | 13 | | 24 | 68 |
| 2008 | | 62 | | 48 | | 44 | | 57 | | 19 | | 17 | 79 |
| 2009 | 65 | 68 | 53 | 55 | 49 | 55 | 62 | 61 | 26 | 30 | 24 | 20 | 79 |
| 2010 | 68 | | 58 | | 54 | | 67 | | 33 | | 31 | | 79 |
| 2011 | 72 | | 63 | | 59 | | 72 | | 40 | | 38 | | 89 |
| 2012 | 77 | | 68 | | 64 | | 77 | | 48 | | 45 | | 89 |

October 14, 2009

2006-2008 CMT READING Results Grade 5 - % at/above Proficiency

| Year | Goal | Total | Goal | Free | Goal | Hispanic | Goal | Black | Goal | ELL | Goal | SPED | EXP% Prof |
|------|------|-------|------|------|------|----------|------|-------|------|-----|------|------|-----------|
| 2006 | | 63 | | 41 | | 39 | | 58 | | 18 | | 20 | 68 |
| 2007 | | 67 | | 57 | | 48 | | 58 | | 30 | | 28 | 68 |
| 2008 | | 71 | | 60 | | 58 | | 61 | | 23 | | 29 | 79 |
| 2009 | 74 | 74 | 65 | 63 | 63 | 59 | 66 | 69 | 30 | 26 | 36 | 43 | 79 |
| 2010 | 78 | | 70 | | 68 | | 71 | | 37 | | 43 | | 79 |
| 2011 | 82 | | 75 | | 73 | | 76 | | 44 | | 50 | | 89 |
| 2012 | 86 | | 80 | | 78 | | 81 | | 52 | | 57 | | 89 |

2006-2008 CMT READING Results Grade 6 - % at/above Proficiency

| Year | Goal | Total | Goal | Free | Goal | Hispanic | Goal | Black | Goal | ELL | Goal | SPED | EXP% Prof |
|------|------|-------|------|------|------|----------|------|-------|------|-----|------|------|-----------|
| 2006 | | 69 | | 53 | | 48 | | 61 | | 30 | | 27 | 68 |
| 2007 | | 65 | | 44 | | 43 | | 57 | | 14 | | 21 | 68 |
| 2008 | | 69 | | 54 | | 51 | | 62 | | 13 | | 34 | 79 |
| 2009 | 72 | 76 | 59 | 63 | 56 | 58 | 67 | 69 | 20 | 21 | 41 | 47 | 79 |
| 2010 | 76 | | 64 | | 61 | | 72 | | 27 | | 48 | | 79 |
| 2011 | 80 | | 69 | | 66 | | 77 | | 34 | | 55 | | 89 |
| 2012 | 84 | | 74 | | 71 | | 82 | | 42 | | 62 | | 89 |

October 14, 2009

2006-2008 CMT READING Results Grade 7 - % at/above Proficiency

| Year | Goal | Total | Goal | Free | Goal | Hispanic | Goal | Black | Goal | ELL | Goal | SPED | EXP% Prof |
|------|------|-------|------|------|------|----------|------|-------|------|-----|------|------|-----------|
| 2006 | | 70 | | 55 | | 55 | | 60 | | 19 | | 28 | 68 |
| 2007 | | 68 | | 49 | | 48 | | 65 | | 14 | | 26 | 68 |
| 2008 | | 72 | | 53 | | 51 | | 65 | | 25 | | 28 | 79 |
| 2009 | 75 | 80 | 58 | 88 | 56 | 69 | 70 | 70 | 32 | 32 | 35 | 62 | 79 |
| 2010 | 79 | | 63 | | 61 | | 75 | | 39 | | 42 | | 79 |
| 2011 | 83 | | 68 | | 66 | | 80 | | 46 | | 49 | | 89 |
| 2012 | 87 | | 73 | | 71 | | 85 | | 54 | | 56 | | 89 |

2006-2008 CMT READING Results Grade 8- % at/above Proficiency

| Year | Goal | Total | Goal | Free | Goal | Hispanic | Goal | Black | Goal | ELL | Goal | SPED | EXP% Prof |
|------|------|-------|------|------|------|----------|------|-------|------|-----|------|------|-----------|
| 2006 | | 73 | | 53 | | 48 | | 74 | | 22 | | 19 | 68 |
| 2007 | | 71 | | 55 | | 58 | | 62 | | 16 | | 29 | 68 |
| 2008 | | 68 | | 49 | | 50 | | 60 | | 17 | | 22 | 79 |
| 2009 | 71 | 76 | 54 | 61 | 55 | 57 | 65 | 74 | 24 | 27 | 29 | 54 | 79 |
| 2010 | 75 | | 59 | | 60 | | 70 | | 31 | | 36 | | 79 |
| 2011 | 79 | | 64 | | 65 | | 75 | | 38 | | 43 | | 89 |
| 2012 | 83 | | 69 | | 70 | | 80 | | 46 | | 50 | | 89 |

October 14, 2009

SUMMARY

2008 CMT READING Results Grades 3-8 - % at/above Proficiency

| | | Total | | Free | | Hispanic | | Black | | ELL | | SPED | EXP% Prof | |
|--------|------|-------|--|------|----|----------|----|-------|----|------|----|------|-----------|----|
| Gr 3 | 2008 | 58 | | 44 | | 44 | | 50 | | 22 | | 7 | 79 | |
| Gr 4 | 2008 | 62 | | 48 | | 44 | | 57 | | 19 | | 17 | 79 | |
| Gr 5 | 2008 | 71 | | 60 | | 58 | | 61 | | 23 | | 29 | 79 | |
| Gr 6 | 2008 | 69 | | 54 | | 51 | | 62 | | 13 | | 34 | 79 | |
| Gr 7 | 2008 | 72 | | 53 | | 51 | | 65 | | 25 | | 28 | 79 | |
| Gr 8 | 2008 | 68 | | 49 | | 50 | | 60 | | 17 | | 22 | 79 | |
| Gr 3-8 | 2008 | 67 | | 51 | | 50 | | 59 | | 20 | | 23 | | |
| | Goal | | | Goal | | Goal | | Goal | | Goal | | Goal | EXP% Prof | |
| 2009 | 70 | 73 | | 56 | 65 | 55 | 59 | 64 | 66 | 27 | 28 | 30 | 42 | 79 |
| 2010 | 74 | | | 61 | | 60 | | 69 | | 34 | | 37 | | 79 |
| 2011 | 78 | | | 66 | | 65 | | 74 | | 41 | | 44 | | 89 |
| 2012 | 82 | | | 71 | | 70 | | 79 | | 49 | | 51 | | 89 |

October 14, 2009

| 2007-2008 CAPT READING Results Grade 10- % at/above Proficiency | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|--|--|------------------|
| Year | Goal | Total | Goal | Free | Goal | Hispanic | Goal | ELL | Goal | SPED | | | EXP% Prof |
| 2007 | | 72 | | 51 | | 53 | | 19 | | 21 | | | 72 |
| 2008 | | 75 | | 56 | | 51 | | 21 | | 38 | | | 81 |
| 2009 | 78 | 68 | 61 | 54 | 56 | 49 | 29 | 19 | 45 | 34 | | | 81 |
| 2010 | 81 | | 65 | | 61 | | 36 | | 51 | | | | 81 |
| 2011 | 83 | | 69 | | 65 | | 43 | | 56 | | | | 91 |
| 2012 | 85 | | 72 | | 69 | | 49 | | 61 | | | | 91 |

October 14, 2009

Appendix B: District Performance Matrix for Mathematics

The matrix is preceded by a narrative description of the performance goals.

October 14, 2009

All students will demonstrate increased MATHEMATICS performance and students in identified subgroups will demonstrate accelerated increases in MATHEMATICS performance as measured by:

Grades K – 2: Current Available Data

- Kindergarten Pre-Post Test
- Grade 1: Quarterly Cumulative Topic Assessments (Out of date)
- Grade 2: Quarterly Cumulative Topic Assessments (Out of date)

Grades 3 – 5:

- The percentage of students in grades 3 to 5 scoring proficient or higher in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual Mathematics CMT will increase from 83% to 92% by 2012.
- The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3 to 5 scoring proficient or higher in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual Mathematics CMT will increase from 76% to 88% by 2012.
- The percentage of Hispanic students in grades 3 to 5 scoring proficient or higher in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual Mathematics CMT will increase from 77% to 90% by 2012.
- The percentage of black students in grades 3 to 5 scoring proficient or higher in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual Mathematics CMT will increase from 74% to 86% by 2012.
- The percentage of ELL students in grades 3 to 5 scoring basic or below basic in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual Mathematics CMT will decrease by 10% annually through 2012.
- The percentage of Students with Disabilities in grades 3 to 5 scoring basic or below basic in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual Mathematics CMT will decrease by 10% annually through 2012.

Grades 6 – 8

- The percentage of students in grades 6 to 8 scoring proficient or higher in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual Mathematics CMT will increase from 80% to 91% by 2012.
- The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 6 to 8 scoring proficient or higher in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual Mathematics CMT will increase from 69% to 84% by 2012.

October 14, 2009

- The percentage of Hispanic students in grades 6 to 8 scoring proficient or higher in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual Mathematics CMT will increase from 69% to 84% by 2012.
- The percentage of black students in grades 6 to 8 scoring proficient or higher in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual Mathematics CMT will increase from 71% to 85% by 2012.
- The percentage of ELL students in grades 6 to 8 scoring basic or below in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual Mathematics CMT will decrease by 10% annually through 2012.
- The percentage of Students with Disabilities in grades 6 to 8 scoring basic or below in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual Mathematics CMT will decrease by 10% annually through 2012.

Grade 10:

- The percentage of students in grade 10 scoring proficient or higher in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual Mathematics CAPT will increase from 67% to 82% by 2012.
- The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students in grade 10 scoring proficient or higher in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual CAPT will increase from 41% to 63% by 2012.
- The percentage of Hispanic students in grade 10 scoring proficient or higher in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual CAPT will increase from 40% to 62% by 2012.
- The percentage of black students in grade 10 scoring proficient or higher in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual CAPT will increase from 62% to 80% by 2012.
- The percentage of ELL students in grade 10 scoring basic or below in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual CAPT will decrease by 10% annually through 2012.
- The percentage of Students with Disabilities in grade 10 scoring basic or below in MATHEMATICS as measured by the annual CAPT will decrease by 10% annually through 2012.

Grades 11 & 12

- The percentage of students in grades 11 and 12 taking the SATs will increase 15% above the 2008 participation rate by 2012.
- The percentage of minority students taking Advanced Placement MATHEMATICS courses will increase 10% above the 2008 participation rate by 2012.
- The mean score of the MATHEMATICS PSAT will increase 15% above the 2008 mean score by 2012.
- The number of students enrolled in advanced MATHEMATICS will increase 15% above the 2008 participation rate by 2012.

October 14, 2009

2006-2008 CMT MATHEMATICS Results Grade 3-5 - % at/above Proficiency

| Grade 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------|-------|------|------|------|----------|------|-------|------|-----|------|------|-----------|
| Year | Goal | Total | Goal | Free | Goal | Hispanic | Goal | Black | Goal | ELL | Goal | SPED | EXP% Prof |
| 2006 | | 85 | | 75 | | 80 | | 74 | | 72 | | 58 | 74 |
| 2007 | | 85 | | 79 | | 78 | | 76 | | 77 | | 58 | 74 |
| 2008 | | 79 | | 69 | | 73 | | 64 | | 69 | | 58 | 82 |
| 2009 | 81 | 86 | 73 | 80 | 76 | 84 | 69 | 65 | 73 | 75 | 62 | 60 | 82 |
| 2010 | 84 | | 77 | | 80 | | 74 | | 77 | | 65 | | 82 |
| 2011 | 87 | | 81 | | 83 | | 79 | | 80 | | 68 | | 91 |
| 2012 | 90 | | 85 | | 88 | | 85 | | 83 | | 71 | | 91 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year | Goal | Total | Goal | Free | Goal | Hispanic | Goal | Black | Goal | ELL | Goal | SPED | EXP% Prof |
| 2006 | | 82 | | 75 | | 77 | | 68 | | 68 | | 60 | 74 |
| 2007 | | 89 | | 84 | | 86 | | 81 | | 78 | | 62 | 74 |
| 2008 | | 83 | | 76 | | 74 | | 81 | | 63 | | 43 | 82 |
| 2009 | 85 | 86 | 79 | 78 | 78 | 82 | 83 | 73 | 66 | 74 | 50 | 66 | 82 |
| 2010 | 87 | | 82 | | 82 | | 85 | | 69 | | 58 | | 82 |
| 2011 | 89 | | 85 | | 86 | | 86 | | 73 | | 64 | | 91 |
| 2012 | 92 | | 87 | | 90 | | 87 | | 79 | | 71 | | 91 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year | Goal | Total | Goal | Free | Goal | Hispanic | Goal | Black | Goal | ELL | Goal | SPED | EXP% Prof |
| 2006 | | 84 | | 74 | | 73 | | 77 | | 67 | | 42 | 74 |
| 2007 | | 87 | | 83 | | 81 | | 77 | | 75 | | 60 | 74 |
| 2008 | | 88 | | 82 | | 83 | | 77 | | 76 | | 57 | 82 |
| 2009 | 90 | 88 | 84 | 80 | 85 | 81 | 80 | 80 | 78 | 74 | 62 | 65 | 82 |
| 2010 | 92 | | 86 | | 87 | | 83 | | 80 | | 65 | | 82 |
| 2011 | 94 | | 88 | | 88 | | 85 | | 82 | | 68 | | 91 |
| 2012 | 95 | | 91 | | 92 | | 87 | | 85 | | 71 | | 91 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

October 14, 2009

| SUMMARY Grades 3-5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|------|-------|------|------|------|----------|------|-------|------|-----|------|------|-----------|
| | Goal | Total | Goal | Free | Goal | Hispanic | Goal | Black | Goal | ELL | Goal | SPED | EXP% Prof |
| Gr 3 - 2008 | | 79 | | 69 | | 73 | | 64 | | 69 | | 58 | 82 |
| Gr 4 - 2008 | | 83 | | 76 | | 74 | | 81 | | 63 | | 43 | 82 |
| Gr 5 - 2008 | | 88 | | 82 | | 83 | | 77 | | 76 | | 57 | 82 |
| 3-5 Avg 2008 | | 83 | | 76 | | 77 | | 74 | | 69 | | 53 | 82 |
| 2009 | 86 | 87 | 79 | 79 | 80 | 82 | 77 | 73 | 72 | 74 | 58 | 64 | 82 |
| 2010 | 88 | | 82 | | 83 | | 81 | | 75 | | 63 | | 82 |
| 2011 | 90 | | 85 | | 86 | | 83 | | 78 | | 67 | | 91 |
| 2012 | 92 | | 88 | | 90 | | 86 | | 82 | | 71 | | 91 |

October 14, 2009

2006-2008 CMT MATHEMATICS Results Grade 6-8 - % at/above Proficiency

| Grade 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------|-------|------|------|------|----------|------|-------|------|-----|------|------|------------|
| Year | Goal | Total | Goal | Free | Goal | Hispanic | Goal | Black | Goal | ELL | Goal | SPED | EXP % Prof |
| 2006 | | 77 | | 62 | | 63 | | 64 | | 46 | | 32 | 74 |
| 2007 | | 79 | | 64 | | 66 | | 70 | | 48 | | 33 | 74 |
| 2008 | | 82 | | 74 | | 73 | | 78 | | 49 | | 44 | 82 |
| 2009 | 83 | 89 | 76 | 81 | 75 | 81 | 80 | 85 | 53 | 63 | 47 | 82 | 82 |
| 2010 | 86 | | 78 | | 78 | | 82 | | 56 | | 51 | | 82 |
| 2011 | 89 | | 81 | | 81 | | 84 | | 61 | | 56 | | 91 |
| 2012 | 91 | | 84 | | 84 | | 85 | | 63 | | 60 | | 91 |
| Grade 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year | Goal | Total | Goal | Free | Goal | Hispanic | Goal | Black | Goal | ELL | Goal | SPED | EXP % Prof |
| 2006 | | 72 | | 58 | | 57 | | 59 | | 30 | | 19 | 74 |
| 2007 | | 77 | | 62 | | 63 | | 65 | | 30 | | 35 | 74 |
| 2008 | | 82 | | 74 | | 73 | | 78 | | 49 | | 44 | 82 |
| 2009 | 84 | 84 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 78 | 80 | 71 | 53 | 55 | 47 | 58 | 82 |
| 2010 | 86 | | 78 | | 78 | | 82 | | 57 | | 51 | | 82 |
| 2011 | 88 | | 81 | | 81 | | 84 | | 60 | | 56 | | 91 |
| 2012 | 91 | | 84 | | 84 | | 85 | | 63 | | 60 | | 91 |
| Grade 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year | Goal | Total | Goal | Free | Goal | Hispanic | Goal | Black | Goal | ELL | Goal | SPED | EXP % Prof |
| 2006 | | 76 | | 62 | | 56 | | 75 | | 42 | | 27 | 74 |
| 2007 | | 75 | | 64 | | 67 | | 59 | | 45 | | 22 | 74 |
| 2008 | | 75 | | 58 | | 61 | | 58 | | 30 | | 33 | 82 |
| 2009 | 79 | 82 | 64 | 80 | 67 | 68 | 65 | 77 | 40 | 47 | 39 | 60 | 82 |
| 2010 | 83 | | 70 | | 73 | | 72 | | 48 | | 48 | | 82 |
| 2011 | 87 | | 76 | | 79 | | 79 | | 55 | | 54 | | 91 |
| 2012 | 91 | | 84 | | 84 | | 85 | | 63 | | 60 | | 91 |

October 14, 2009

| SUMMARY Grades 6-8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| | Goal | Total | Goal | Free | Goal | Hispanic | Goal | Black | Goal | ELL | Goal | SPED | EXP % Prof |
| Gr 6 - 2008 | | 82 | | 74 | | 73 | | 78 | | 49 | | 44 | 82 |
| Gr 7 - 2008 | | 82 | | 74 | | 73 | | 78 | | 49 | | 44 | 82 |
| Gr 8 - 2008 | | 75 | | 58 | | 61 | | 58 | | 30 | | 33 | 82 |
| 6-8 Avg 2008 | | 80 | | 69 | | 69 | | 71 | | 43 | | 40 | 82 |
| 2009 | 82 | 85 | 72 | 79 | 72 | 76 | 75 | 78 | 49 | 55 | 44 | 67 | 82 |
| 2010 | 85 | | 75 | | 76 | | 79 | | 54 | | 50 | | 82 |
| 2011 | 88 | | 79 | | 80 | | 82 | | 59 | | 55 | | 91 |
| 2012 | 91 | | 84 | | 84 | | 85 | | 63 | | 60 | | 91 |

2007-2008 CAPT MATHEMATICS Results Grade 10- % at/above Proficiency

| Grade 10 | Year | Goal | Total | Goal | Free | Goal | Hispanic | Goal | Black | Goal | ELL | Goal | SPED | EXP % Prof |
|----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| | 2007 | | 61 | | 37 | | 43 | | 35 | | 22 | | 15 | 69 |
| | 2008 | | 67 | | 41 | | 40 | | 62 | | 19 | | 28 | 80 |
| | 2009 | 71 | 60 | 47 | 44 | 46 | 42 | 66 | 53 | 27 | 23 | 36 | 32 | 80 |
| | 2010 | 74 | | 53 | | 52 | | 70 | | 35 | | 43 | | 80 |
| | 2011 | 77 | | 58 | | 57 | | 73 | | 42 | | 49 | | 90 |
| | 2012 | 82 | | 63 | | 62 | | 76 | | 48 | | 54 | | 90 |

October 14, 2009

Appendix C: Cambridge Program Review Glossary of Terms

October 14, 2009

Cambridge Program Review Glossary of Terms

CAPT: Connecticut Academic Performance Test given in the spring of tenth grade including the areas of math, science, responding to literature, editing, and an integrated task.

CMT: Connecticut Mastery Test given in the spring for grades 3,4,5,6,7 & 8 including the areas of math, reading, language arts and science (grades 5 & 8)

Data: Factual information that is used to determine the extent to which objectives/goals are being met.

District Assessment Matrix: A compendium of assessments used at the elementary and secondary levels that include state and district required tests, as well as, building/teacher created assessments.

District Performance Matrix (Reading and Mathematics): An illustration of the CMT and CAPT achievement targets that align with the goals of the District Enhancement Plan.

ELL (English Language Learners): A person who is in the process of acquiring English and has a first language other than English. Other terms commonly found in the literature include language minority students, limited English proficient (LEP), English as a second language (ESL), and culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD).

Formative Assessment: An assessment typically created collaboratively by a team of teachers responsible for the same grade level or course. It is designed to provide immediate and explicit feedback that is useful for helping teachers and students with formative decision-making during the learning process.

Instructional Rounds/Walkthroughs: An informal instructional monitoring tool that is not included in the teacher evaluation process. The process consists of 3-8 minutes of observation by one or more persons, to collect data on the written, taught, and tested curriculum to support collaborative improvement conversations.

LAS Links (Language Assessment Scales) : An NCLB compliant instrument that is used in grades K-12 as a formal and standardized method of determining Language proficiency. In CT, the LAS links test is a component of the English Mastery Standard.

LAS Links Benchmark (Language Assessment Scales): A research-based test that surveys the listening, speaking, reading, writing and comprehension skills of ELL students in grades K-12. The benchmark follows the same structure as LAS Links and provides ongoing evaluation of student progress throughout the year.

Service Learning: A method of teaching, learning and reflecting that combines the academic classroom curriculum with meaningful service, frequently youth service, throughout the community.

SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol): Sheltered Instruction is an approach for teaching content to English Language Learners in strategic ways that make subject matter concepts comprehensible while promoting the students' English language development.

October 14, 2009

Summative Assessment: A cumulative evaluation used to measure student growth, after a series of instructional episodes, and is generally given at the end of a unit or course in order to determine whether long-term learning goals have been met.

UCLA –SMP (University of California Los Angeles – School Management Program): A non-profit school reform initiative of the Graduate School of Education at UCLA and Information Studies at The Anderson School at UCLA, Los Angeles. The SMP maintains a satellite office that serves the northeast United States and is located in Trumbull, CT.

The UCLA review process was used to determine strengths and deficit areas within our Bilingual/ESL program.

October 14, 2009

Appendix D: CSDE Technical Assistance Addendum

October 14, 2009

Connecticut State Department of Education

Addendum to School and District Improvement Plans for Technical or Other Assistance Provided by the CSDE to Meet the Requirements of Sec. 1116 of NCLB

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE), in partnership with the Stupski Foundation and Dr. Douglas Reeves' Center for Performance Assessment, will support the school improvement process through the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI). The initiative will serve as a professional development vehicle and will:

- focus on the district as the primary change agent;
- create a culture of professional learning communities in schools, districts, and the state;
- differentiate support based on individual district and school needs; and
- increase student achievement for all students.

The CSDE will provide technical assistance to districts and schools who have been identified as “in need of improvement” through CALI. This support will be provided by the CSDE, Regional Education Service Centers (RESCs) and State Education Resource Center (SERC) staff who are highly skilled educators with experience in school improvement. The following types of support will be provided to district and school-level improvement teams, with priority given to Title I schools and districts identified as “in need of improvement”:

- telephone technical assistance;
- periodic site visits;
- guidance in the development and implementation of improvement plans;
- professional development focused on accountability for student learning, data-driven decision-making, implementation of data teams, understanding standards, aligning standards, instruction and assessment and effective teaching strategies;
- on-site job-embedded professional development, follow-up and support; and
- executive coaching for principals in the neediest schools.

The CSDE and the School Improvement Unit shall coordinate communication between all stakeholders, the schools, districts, RESCs and SERC while working to unify school improvement efforts in the state.