



**GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
MONITORING REPORT  
STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT: READING (E-003)  
MARCH 2007**

I hereby present my monitoring report on the District Ends Policy “Student Achievement.” I certify compliance and that the information contained in this report is accurate.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Betty J. Sternberg, Superintendent of Schools)

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**BROADEST POLICY PROVISION**

*The District shall establish an assessment system that is aligned with the District’s Mission and Vision and provides a comprehensive, consistent and integrated system of student learner objectives / outcomes, assessment, analysis and reporting.*

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In order to ensure that all students master the objectives of the Greenwich curriculum and achieve to their highest potential, student achievement in reading is assessed against four broad groups of indicators: 1) aggregate performance of standardized tests such as the Degrees of Reading Power Test (DRP), Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) and the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT), 2) preparation for post secondary options including average scores on the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT 1) and Advanced Placement Tests (AP), 3) annual growth in achievement on DRP and CMT, and 4) performance disaggregated by student subgroup on CMT and CAPT.

Accomplishments include compliance with the policy, an increase in the percentage of students scoring at the goal level on the CAPT, growth in student achievement on the CMT at the highest performance levels, an upward trend in scores on SAT 1, and an increase in student participation in Advanced Placement English Literature. While there were no major exceptions to any policy provision, there are a number of governance and management issues which require further attention. Governance issues include instructional time as it relates to the implementation of the revised language arts curriculum at the elementary level. The additional time required to implement the balanced literacy framework in kindergarten through second grade may require the District to adjust curriculum expectations for social studies and science. Management issues focus on closing gaps in achievement among student subgroups, improving staff training, monitoring changes in classroom instructional practice, “fine tuning” curriculum alignment, using formative assessment to guide instruction, reporting student progress to parents and implementing a three tier intervention model for students reading below standard at the elementary level.

**Note:** Descriptions of the measures discussed in the next three sections and data tables describing student achievement over the last five years are attached at the end of this report.

## ACCOMPLISHMENTS / HIGHLIGHTS

1. Over the last five years, student achievement on the DRP was relatively flat at the advanced and goal levels and trended slightly downward at the proficient level (Table 1).
2. The percentage of students performing at the proficient, goal and advanced levels on the DRP reached a five year high at Hamilton Avenue School. Riverside students achieved five year highs at the advanced and goal levels (Table 2).
3. The DRP scores of the cohort of Greenwich students who were tested in both the spring of 2006 in grade five *and* the spring of 2003 in grade two improved slightly: 14% of the students tested scored at a higher level, 74% at the same level and 11% at a lower level. Most notable was the reduction in the percentage of students performing below proficiency (Table 10).
4. From 2001-2002 to 2005-2006, reading achievement on the CMT was relatively flat at the proficient, goal and advanced levels. Relative to students in similar districts, Greenwich students score the same at the proficient level and higher at the goal and advanced levels (Table 4).
5. The percentage of students performing at the proficient, goal and advanced levels on the CMT reading reached a five year high at New Lebanon School and Western Middle School. Parkway students achieved five year highs at the goal and proficient levels, and Hamilton Avenue students achieved five year highs at the advanced and proficient levels. 50% of the students at Riverside school in grades three, four and five scored at the advanced level (Tables 5 and 6).
6. Over the last five years, the achievement gap on CMT reading narrowed between the District average and some disaggregated subgroups: African American students (advanced level), Hispanic students (all three levels), students receiving free and reduced lunch (proficient and goal levels) and English Language Learners (all three levels) (Table 4).
7. The CMT reading achievement of the cohort of Greenwich students who were tested in both the spring of 2006 *and* the fall of 2003 or 2004 improved significantly: 28% of the students tested scored at a higher level, 60% at the same level and 12% at a lower level. The improvement in achievement was most notable at the advanced level (Table 8).
8. Over the last five years, student achievement on the reading section of the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) remained relatively flat at the proficient level and increased at the goal and advanced levels. Relative to students in similar districts, Greenwich students score higher at the goal and advanced levels and lower at the proficient level (Table 7).
9. The mean reading/verbal score on the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT1) increased from 549 in 2001-2002 to 565 in 2005-2006. Over the same period of time, the percentage of

graduates tested declined from 93% to 90%. Relative to students in similar districts, Greenwich students have the highest mean score on SAT1 reading/verbal (Table 8).

10. Over the last five years, enrollment increased in Advanced Placement English while student achievement on the AP exam remained constant or improved. Approximately, 23% of graduates in 2006 enrolled in AP English (Table 9).

## **GOVERNANCE ISSUES**

1. The revised K-5 literacy program balances the acquisition of decoding/encoding, reading comprehension and writing. As the District implements the revised program, instructional time is emerging as a major challenge at the elementary level. What impact will implementing the revised balanced literacy program have on other areas of the District curriculum?

## **MANAGEMENT ISSUES**

1. There are significant gaps in the performance of student subgroups across measures of core reading skills (CMT and CAPT). Many students who lack these core skills (below proficiency) demonstrate less than expected annual growth and are falling further behind their peers. District strategies to close gaps in achievement among student subgroups include fostering a continuing community and professional dialogue around closing the achievement gap, improving curriculum and professional learning, systematically providing extended day and extended school year programs, monitoring intervention plans for students performing below grade level, and exploring options for extending preschool programs to at-risk students. Based on trends in student achievement data, the extended school day program in operation at Hamilton Avenue, Julian Curtiss and New Lebanon was also implemented this year at Cos Cob, Glenville and Western Middle School. The implementation of individual student intervention plans (ISIP) continues to present challenges. The District is working to simplify the process, improve the technology for managing the plans and extend planning to students in ninth and tenth grade at Greenwich High School. In kindergarten through eighth grade the focus is on improving the quality of the intervention plans and monitoring student progress.
2. Implementing the revised balanced literacy program at the elementary level requires a substantial investment in staff training. During the 2005-2006 school year, all grade three through five classroom teachers received extensive and ongoing training in the reader's workshop component of the balanced literacy program. During the 2006-2007 school year, this initial training is being supported through District and school grade level meetings. Throughout the 2006-2007 school year, teachers in kindergarten through second grade are receiving initial training in balanced literacy and the new phonics program. In an effort to better coordinate instruction, training was also extended to Special Education and English as a Second Language teachers. We plan to provide differentiated training in future years in order to ensure that staff new to the District receive the initial training and experienced staff continue to improve their instructional practice.

3. Training needs to be reinforced by monitoring changes in classroom practice. Focus walks and instructional walk throughs are means of supporting the improvement of classroom practice. These observation protocols are designed to guide the improvement of instruction. The purpose of these protocols is to create a safe, non-threatening environment for systematic reflection and dialogue about classroom practice. The program coordinator for language arts and building principals are currently engaged in conducting focus walks in their buildings around the implementation of balanced literacy in kindergarten through second grade. Last year, focus walks were conducted in grades three through five around the organization of the classroom and the implementation of guided reading groups. The revision of the District Teacher Evaluation Plan will support these efforts by setting clearer standards for planning instruction and using formative assessment to differentiate instruction.
4. Over the last three years, the role of the elementary literacy specialist has shifted from primarily providing remediation to students performing below standard to a balance between direct instruction and consultation with classroom teachers. This transition is now codified in a three tier intervention model which the District is beginning to implement in kindergarten through second grade. In tier one the classroom teacher is responsible for teaching the core language arts program to all students. Literacy specialists provide direct consultation and specific instructional support to teachers as they implement the new language arts standards of practice. In tier two, direct instruction is provided by the literacy specialists, usually in small, classroom based guided reading groups. Tier three reading support is provided on an individual basis as needed, usually by the special education teachers. Staffing the three tier intervention model is proving to be a challenge because tier two and tier three instruction are mandated by student intervention plans or Special Education Individual Education Plans. In some instances, it is believed that literacy specialists have more specific expertise in the reading areas cited for instruction. As a result, they are increasingly being requested to provide tier three instruction. This presents a staffing problem because it is imperative that literacy specialists continue to provide consultation to teachers in tier one. It is our responsibility to make sure that our core reading program is strong and meets the needs of all of our students. Without the support of literacy specialists at this level, more students will be referred for tier two and tier three instruction. Our challenge is to maintain the consulting role of the literacy specialist while, at the same time, providing appropriate direct instruction to struggling readers.
5. The program coordinator for language arts is working with the teaching staff to ensure alignment between the balanced literacy program and the state curriculum framework assessed by the CMT.
6. While summative assessments (CMT, CAPT, SAT1 and AP) are in place to measure student progress and program effectiveness, formative assessments guide daily instruction. All elementary teachers have been trained in using the Direct Reading Assessment and “running records” to assess the development of basic reading skills. DRA is particularly useful in kindergarten through second grade as a means of identifying struggling readers prior to the administration of summative assessments in the intermediate grades. Teachers use the

analysis of these assessments along with conferring notes, language analysis assessments, dictation tasks, informal reading inventories and written work, to differentiate their daily instruction for students. The District is in the process of piloting a standards-based report card that assesses a student's progress against grade level curriculum objectives. Aligning the language arts formative assessments and curriculum objectives to the new report card will continue to be a part of this work.

7. Funding is provided in the 2007-2008 budget for replacing the core novels at the middle school level and purchasing encoding/decoding instructional materials for grades three through five. Given some of the concerns surrounding the selection of the primary phonics program, the District will develop a schedule for reviewing and selecting materials that includes opportunities for public input and Board of Education approval.
8. The District has made a substantial investment in reviewing and implementing a revised balanced literacy framework in kindergarten through fifth grade. The changes in curriculum, materials and instructional practice are extensive and will take time to implement. We need to be mindful that both organizations and individuals have learning curves as we assess the impact of the changes.

## **EXCEPTIONS**

1. None.

## DESCRIPTION OF STANDARDIZED MEASURES

The **Degrees of Reading Power Test (DRP)** is administered to students in grades two through eight in both the fall and the spring. DRP measures how well a student understands the “surface” meaning of text. Scores are reported on continuous scale in DRP units which can be used to select reading material at a level of difficulty appropriate to the learner. At each grade, student DRP scores are compared to performance standards set by the Greenwich Public Schools. The advanced standard is set at a level that would put a student on track to read college level texts by the end of high school. Goal describes student performance at the grade level standard set by the Connecticut State Department of Education. Students scoring at the proficient standard can read grade level textbooks without significant support or remediation. Students scoring below the proficient level require intervention to accelerate their academic progress. Results are disaggregated by school, subtest, and student subgroup. Data tables summarize scores from the spring administration of the DRP.

The **Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT)** is a state-mandated program that assesses and reports the achievement of students in grade three through grade eight in three areas: Mathematics, Reading, and Writing. Prior to the 2005-2006 school year, the CMT was administered in grades four, six 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. Students scoring at the advanced level are performing at the top of all students across the state. Students scoring in the goal category possess the knowledge, ability, and skill necessary to successfully perform the tasks and assignments appropriately expected of a student with minimal teacher assistance. Students who score in the proficient category are able to successfully participate in their regular grade appropriate course work. The proficient standard is used to calculate adequate yearly progress under No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Students scoring below the proficient level require intervention to accelerate their academic progress.

The **Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT)** is a 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. Students scoring at the advanced level are performing at the top of all students across the state. Students scoring in the goal category possess the knowledge, ability, and skill necessary to successfully perform the tasks and assignments appropriately expected of a student with minimal teacher assistance. Students who score in the proficient category are able to successfully participate in their regular grade appropriate course work. The proficient standard is used to calculate adequate yearly progress under No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Scoring at the proficient level or higher on the mathematics, reading and writing subtests is required for graduation from Greenwich High School. Students scoring below the proficient level require intervention to accelerate their academic progress.

The **Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT I)** is a measure of developed verbal and mathematical skills important for success in college. Scores are reported on a scale from 200 to 800. SAT I 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)** is a 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. Greenwich High School offers two levels of AP calculus (AB and BC) and AP statistics. During the 2005-2006 school year, 28% of the graduating class was enrolled in AP mathematics.

**Table 1: Degrees of Reading Power by Student Subgroup (%)**

		Spring 02	Spring 03	Spring 04	Spring 05	Spring 06
District (all schools and grades)	Advanced	68	69	65	67	67
	Goal	82	83	80	81	81
	Proficient	91	92	89	90	89
Asian	Advanced	75	74	72	70	65
	Goal	87	88	87	86	76
	Proficient	93	97	94	91	86
Black	Advanced	29	33	31	29	28
	Goal	49	55	46	45	44
	Proficient	72	75	65	66	58
Hispanic	Advanced	36	38	39	38	38
	Goal	57	59	58	58	56
	Proficient	76	77	75	76	74
White	Advanced	72	73	69	71	73
	Goal	86	86	83	85	86
	Proficient	93	93	91	93	93
Female	Advanced	67	69	65	67	68
	Goal	82	83	81	83	81
	Proficient	91	92	89	92	91
Male	Advanced	69	69	66	66	67
	Goal	83	83	79	80	80
	Proficient	91	92	88	88	88
Special Education	Advanced	32	30	24	23	27
	Goal	48	47	41	40	42
	Proficient	67	66	57	56	59
English Language Learners	Advanced	Subgroup < 20	Subgroup < 20	Subgroup < 20	17	15
	Goal	Subgroup < 20	Subgroup < 20	Subgroup < 20	38	29
	Proficient	Subgroup < 20	Subgroup < 20	Subgroup < 20	56	49
Free or Reduced Lunch	Advanced	22	28	22	24	26
	Goal	42	46	43	48	48
	Proficient	67	68	62	66	68

**Table 2: Degrees of Reading Power by Elementary School (%)**

		Spring 02	Spring 03	Spring 04	Spring 05	Spring 06
District (all schools and grades)	Advanced	68	69	65	67	67
	Goal	82	83	80	81	81
	Proficient	91	92	89	90	89
Cos Cob	Advanced	67	65	63	59	60
	Goal	81	78	77	76	74
	Proficient	91	91	86	86	84
Glenville	Advanced	59	62	54	56	54
	Goal	78	80	68	72	75
	Proficient	90	91	84	88	85
Hamilton Avenue	Advanced	32	33	28	40	47
	Goal	53	53	47	60	62
	Proficient	75	75	67	75	79
Dundee	Advanced	78	77	72	75	72
	Goal	90	90	81	88	84
	Proficient	96	96	89	93	90
Julian Curtiss	Advanced	54	60	60	64	61
	Goal	75	78	76	81	76
	Proficient	88	91	85	90	85
New Lebanon	Advanced	45	48	32	37	42
	Goal	60	62	56	51	63
	Proficient	74	76	73	71	74
North Mianus	Advanced	72	70	69	67	66
	Goal	87	86	87	86	81
	Proficient	97	97	96	94	93
North Street	Advanced	78	74	73	73	74
	Goal	90	90	87	88	84
	Proficient	95	97	95	96	93
Old Greenwich	Advanced	75	74	72	74	74
	Goal	90	90	85	88	87
	Proficient	95	96	93	92	93
Parkway	Advanced	72	72	73	70	75
	Goal	84	85	88	83	86
	Proficient	90	93	95	95	92
Riverside	Advanced	81	81	76	81	82
	Goal	92	92	87	89	92
	Proficient	96	97	92	96	96

Table 3: Degrees of Reading Power by Middle School (%)

		Spring 02	Spring 03	Spring 04	Spring 05	Spring 06
District (all schools and grades)	Advanced	68	69	65	67	67
	Goal	82	83	80	81	81
	Proficient	91	92	89	90	89
Central	Advanced	69	69	64	69	69
	Goal	85	81	81	84	82
	Proficient	92	90	90	91	90
Eastern	Advanced	84	83	78	78	77
	Goal	93	93	89	90	88
	Proficient	97	97	94	95	94
Western	Advanced	54	60	58	54	55
	Goal	72	74	74	72	71
	Proficient	85	86	85	82	84

**Table 4: Connecticut Mastery Test Reading by Student Subgroup (%)**

		01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06
District (all schools and grades)	Advanced	NA	38	34	35	36
	Goal	81	83	78	79	81
	Proficient	89	90	87	88	89
Asian	Advanced	NA	46	37	43	44
	Goal	86	82	78	78	80
	Proficient	91	91	88	86	87
Black	Advanced	NA	10	5	6	12
	Goal	55	57	41	42	45
	Proficient	70	71	59	56	55
Hispanic	Advanced	NA	15	9	14	14
	Goal	57	58	52	56	59
	Proficient	70	70	69	71	75
White	Advanced	NA	41	38	39	39
	Goal	84	87	82	84	85
	Proficient	92	93	90	91	92
Female	Advanced	NA	43	39	40	40
	Goal	82	83	81	83	84
	Proficient	89	91	90	91	92
Male	Advanced	NA	33	30	32	33
	Goal	80	82	75	76	78
	Proficient	89	89	85	85	86
Special Education	Advanced	NA	10	5	6	9
	Goal	46	45	34	33	41
	Proficient	61	60	55	45	54
English Language Learners	Advanced	NA	Subgroup < 20	Subgroup < 20	2	5
	Goal	Subgroup < 20	Subgroup < 20	Subgroup < 20	11	35
	Proficient	Subgroup < 20	Subgroup < 20	Subgroup < 20	31	56
Free or Reduced Lunch	Advanced	NA	5	4	6	5
	Goal	38	45	40	42	50
	Proficient	58	63	59	57	65

**Table 5: Connecticut Mastery Test Reading by Elementary School (%)**

		01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06
District (all schools and grades)	Advanced	NA	38	34	35	36
	Goal	81	83	78	79	81
	Proficient	89	90	87	88	89
Cos Cob	Advanced	NA	39	37	40	29
	Goal	70	77	81	81	72
	Proficient	80	91	87	87	81
Glenville	Advanced	NA	38	33	17	19
	Goal	73	78	84	71	67
	Proficient	86	85	95	90	82
Hamilton Avenue	Advanced	NA	6	7	13	14
	Goal	63	59	51	40	61
	Proficient	69	71	71	60	77
Dundee	Advanced	NA	50	46	39	46
	Goal	86	89	85	82	84
	Proficient	88	96	92	89	91
Julian Curtiss	Advanced	NA	36	29	18	31
	Goal	63	62	63	71	78
	Proficient	82	82	75	88	84
New Lebanon	Advanced	NA	14	12	5	14
	Goal	56	55	29	54	58
	Proficient	71	69	53	62	71
North Mianus	Advanced	NA	34	40	27	32
	Goal	90	92	86	82	83
	Proficient	94	97	95	91	95
North Street	Advanced	NA	37	36	39	33
	Goal	83	90	84	82	84
	Proficient	96	97	91	94	91
Old Greenwich	Advanced	NA	39	41	35	40
	Goal	83	86	82	79	90
	Proficient	92	96	90	91	94
Parkway	Advanced	NA	45	39	38	42
	Goal	83	83	82	81	85
	Proficient	88	90	92	87	92
Riverside	Advanced	NA	48	35	40	50
	Goal	94	95	83	87	91
	Proficient	96	98	89	94	97

**Table 6: Connecticut Mastery Test Reading by Middle School (%)**

		01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06
District (all schools and grades)	Advanced	NA	38	34	35	36
	Goal	81	83	78	79	81
	Proficient	89	90	87	88	89
Central	Advanced	NA	39	35	43	41
	Goal	85	85	80	84	82
	Proficient	94	92	90	91	89
Eastern	Advanced	NA	48	45	46	46
	Goal	92	92	86	88	89
	Proficient	94	95	91	94	95
Western	Advanced	NA	27	22	25	28
	Goal	71	71	69	70	75
	Proficient	82	80	82	79	84

**Table 7: Connecticut Academic Performance Test Reading (%)**

		01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06
GHS (all students in Gr 10)	Advanced	NA	35	40	31	38
	Goal	63	65	67	69	71
	Proficient	89	91	90	89	91
Asian	Advanced	NA	29	53	31	45
	Goal	70	71	73	71	74
	Proficient	77	86	85	96	93
Black	Advanced	The number of students in this subgroup is insufficient for reporting purposes.				
	Goal					
	Proficient					
Hispanic	Advanced	NA	10	11	11	9
	Goal	28	32	32	44	36
	Proficient	72	76	68	73	77
White	Advanced	NA	40	43	35	45
	Goal	69	71	72	74	80
	Proficient	93	94	94	92	95
Female	Advanced	NA	41	46	41	46
	Goal	68	71	74	77	77
	Proficient	92	97	92	93	95
Male	Advanced	NA	30	34	22	32
	Goal	57	60	61	61	65
	Proficient	87	89	88	86	88
Special Education	Advanced	NA	18	8	10	8
	Goal	26	31	23	24	23
	Proficient	72	63	65	64	60
English Language Learners	Advanced	The number of students in this subgroup is insufficient for reporting purposes.				
	Goal					
	Proficient					
Free or Reduced Lunch	Advanced	NA	0	7	7	8
	Goal	24	19	29	36	32
	Proficient	73	58	65	62	72

**Table 8: Scholastic Assessment Test 1 Verbal/Reading**

	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06
% of Graduates Tested	93%	92%	88%	91%	90%
Mean Score	549	554	555	563	565

**Table 9: Advanced Placement English**

		01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06
English	# Tested	102	124	128	129	144
	Mean Score	3.9	3.9	3.5	3.5	3.7

**Table 10: Change in DRP Reading Level Grades 2 - 5**

Spring 2006	Spring 2003				
	Advanced	Goal	Proficient	Below Proficient	Total
Advanced	324	26	9	2	361
Goal	33	23	13	9	78
Proficient	8	9	9	11	37
Below Proficient	3	3	3	15	24
Total	368	61	34	37	500

Up One or More Levels	14%
Same Level	74%
Down One or More Levels	11%

Percentage of Students Tested in Spring 2006 <b>and</b> in Spring 2003	82.5%
------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

	2003	2006
Advanced	73.6%	72.2%
Goal	12.2%	15.6%
Proficient	6.8%	7.4%
Below Proficient	7.4%	4.8%

**Table 11: Change in CMT Reading Level Grades 5 – 8**

Spring 2006	Fall 2003 or Fall 2004					
	Advanced	Goal	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	Total
Advanced	533	290	9	1		833
Goal	146	630	142	50	37	1005
Proficient	2	58	38	19	24	141
Basic		15	14	13	32	74
Below Basic		4	11	19	74	108
Total	681	997	214	102	167	2161

Up One or More Levels	28%
Same Level	60%
Down One or More Levels	12%

Percentage of Students Tested in Spring 2006 <b>and</b> in Fall 2003 / Fall 2004	91%
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

	03 / 04	06
Advanced	31.5%	38.5%
Goal	46.1%	46.5%
Proficient	9.9%	6.5%
Basic	4.7%	3.4%
Below Basic	7.7%	5.0%