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## NEW HAVEN SCHOOL PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

## New Haven School Change - Initiative Map

- Close the gap between the performance of New Haven students and the rest of the State in 5 years
- Cut the drop-out rate in half
- Ensure that every graduating student has the academic ability and the financial resources to attend and succeed in college
defining areas of student learning to focus adult
actions in the school district, including college success, expressed
engagement, completed coursework, demonstrated skills, and tested knowledge



## Portfolio Management:

- Depending on school performance, provide appropriate school-based flexibility in work-rules and instructional program (i.e. curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment)
- Ensure highest quality support to schools from central office


## Talent

## Administrator evaluation \& development

- Recraft and clarify administrator evaluation and development process
- Emphasize pipeline and long-term career development of leadership
- Incorporate $360^{\circ}$ feedback from teachers on leadership practices


## Teacher evaluation \& development

- Ensure clear, professional, and consequential teacher evaluation and development process, including evaluation of teacher impact on student learning, instructional practice, and professional values
Administrator and Teacher Recruitment
- Strengthen recruiting practices to secure the best new talent


## Community Investment

## Parent engagement

- Launch city-wide Parent Leadership Organization, made up of PTO leadership, to provide input to district
- Build ways for parents to be involved in their students' education, including SchoolNet access and feedback surveys


## Wrap-around

- Ensure that non-academic supports are coordinated and aligned, both in- and out-of-school, so that every student is available to focus and learn in the classroom


## Promise scholarship

- Provide college funding to all residents who graduate from NHPS ready to be successful in college


## Board Decision Making on School Change - Informed by Working Committees, and Building Sequentially

## Projected Board Decision Making - 3/8/10



- Teacher: use of data in teacher evaluation $3 / 22$; revised system of teacher evaluation and development, including peer review
- Principal Evaluation and Development: revised system of principal evaluation and development 4/12 and 4/26
- Performance Tiering of Schools: discussion $2 / 8$, criteria approved on 2/22, 2010 prototypes determined
- School Climate Surveys: under development, will be implemented this year
- Student Learning Measures: Preliminary discussion $1 / 11$, summary recommendations made by the Reform Committee on 2/22

All substantive decisions informed by Working Committee discussions and management recommendations

## Prototype School Performance Measures

Proposed 2009-2010 School Tiering: 6 to 8 schools selected by the Superintendent, informed by three areas of student learning and several qualitative factors

## Student Progress

- Student progress on the CMT, relative to other students with similar academic histories


## Student Performance

- Percent of students scoring Proficient and above and Goal and above on standardized assessments
- Rate of enrollment in accredited post-secondary institution (HS)


## Student Engagement / School Environment

- Attendance rate
- Percent of students in K - 5th grades rated as competent or highly competent on three Teacher Child Rating Scale indicators: Behavior Control, Task Orientation, and Peer Social Skills


## Qualitative Factors

- Quality of school leadership team
- Readiness of school team to engage in collaborative planning
- Community and other resources available to support school-level planning efforts


## Tier I

Consistently high performing across student learning areas

## Tier II

Mixed or average performance across student learning areas

Tier III (Improvement and Turnaround)
Consistently low performing across student learning areas

## Next Year...

- All NHPS schools will be tiered yearly
- School Performance Measures will be adjusted to incorporate more student learning measures recommended by the Reform Committee, state-wide CMT growth comparison, and school climate surveys, as well as lessons learned from prototype measures this year


## Prototype Elementary/Middle School Performance Measurement

Elementary/Middle School performance is calculated using multiple measures with the established areas of student learning.

|  | Student progress | Student Performance |  | School Environment / Student Engagement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School Name | Median Student Growth Percentile on CMT | \% At or Above Proficient (CMT $3^{\text {rd }}-8^{\text {th }}$ Grade) | \% At or Above Goal (CMT $3^{\text {rd }}-8^{\text {th }}$ Grade) | Elem/Middle School Student Engagement Index (Attendance Rate and TCRS scores) |
| School A | 54 | 88\% | 69\% | 122 |
| School B | 43 | 55\% | 30\% | 114 |
| School C | 39 | 28\% | 6\% | 64 |
| School D | 46 | 69\% | 53\% | 105 |
| School E | 54 | 60\% | 36\% | 101 |
| School F | 68 | 76\% | 53\% | 109 |
| School G | 32 | 37\% | 16\% | 88 |
| School H | 67 | 49\% | 20\% | 95 |
| District Average | 50 | 57\% | 35\% | 100 |
| State Average | Not Available | 80\% | 64\% | Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | See page 7 | See | ge 8 | See page 9 |

## Visual Representation of School Performance Measurement

Student growth vs. Student Performance (\% At or Above Goal) by Student Engagement


## Prototype Student Progress Measure: Median Student Growth Percentile on CMT

## Methodology for calculating the overall Median Student Growth Percentile on CMT

- The Median Student Growth Percentile is the median growth percentile of all students in a given school, where the student growth percentile measures individual student growth on the CMT relative to a student's academic peers
- The Student Growth Percentile is calculated based on at least two years of consecutive CMT scores, therefore Median Student Growth Percentile only includes the growth of students who have taken the CMT in the district for at least the past two years
- The overall Median Student Growth Percentile is calculated as the average of each school's reading and math MGSP and the weighted average of 2007-08 MGSP and 2008-09 MGSP, where weighting is allocated as:
2008-09: 2/3
2007-08: 1/3


## What does it mean?

The Median Student Growth Percentile describes the growth of students in a school compared to students with similar academic history in other schools in the district. In other words:

- Students in School F grew, on average, as well or better than $68 \%$ of schools in the district
- Students in School A and School E both grew, on average, as well or better than a little more than half (54\%) of schools in the district


## Prototype Student Performance Measure: \% of Students At or Above Proficient or Goal on CMT

|  | Student Performance |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| School Name | $\begin{array}{c}\text { \% At or Above } \\ \text { Proficient } \\ \text { (CMT 3rd-8㗐 Grade) }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { \% At or Above Goal } \\ \text { (CMT 3rd - 8 }\end{array}$ |
| Sch Grade) |  |  |$\}$

Methodology for calculating overall \% of students at or above proficient or goal

- The \% of students at or above proficient or goal is the percent of students in grades 3-8 within a given school who scored proficient, goal or advanced (\% at or above proficient) or goal or advanced (\% at or above goal) on the CMT in a given subject
- The overall \% of students at or above proficient or goal is calculated as the average of each school's reading and math percent and the weighted average of 2006-07, 200708 and 2008-09 percentages where weighting is allocated as:
2008-09: 1/2
2007-08: 1/4
2006-07: 1/4


## What does it mean?

The \% of students at or above proficient or goal describes how well students in a school are doing on the academic skills assessed by the CMT. In other words:

- $69 \%$ of students in School D demonstrate proficient goal, or advanced understanding on their grade level CMT assessment, while 53\% demonstrate goal or advanced understanding on their grade level CMT


## Prototype School Environment / Student Engagement: Elementary/Middle School Student Engagement Index

## Methodology for calculating the Student Engagement Index

|  | Student Engagement// <br> School Environment |
| :--- | :---: |
| School Name | Elementary/Middle <br> School Student <br> Engagement Index |
| School A | 122 |
| School B | 114 |
| School C | 64 |
| School D | 105 |
| School E | 101 |
| School F | 109 |
| School G | 88 |
| School H | 95 |
| $----------------------------------100 ~$ |  |
| District Average | Not Available |
| State Average |  |

- The Elementary/Middle School Student Engagement Index is a composite score of school Attendance Rate and Teacher Child Rating Scale results for each school
- Attendance Rate is the weighted average of the 200607, 2007-08 \& 2008-09 rates, where weighting is: 2006-07 (25\%) 2007-08 (25\%) 2008-09 (50\%)
- The Teacher Child Rating Scale K-5 teacher survey rates students on key dimensions of behavior and engagement. School TCRS scores are the average of the 2009 TCRS '\% of student that are competent or highly competent' on behavior control, task orientation, and peer social skills dimensions
- The index is calculated as the average of the standardized scores for each indicator


## What does it mean?

The Student Engagement Index describes how a school is doing on selected student engagement indicators relative to other schools in the district. The index score average is 100 and we expect $68 \%$ of all school index scores to fall between 85 and115 ( $16 \%$ above 115 and $16 \%$ below 85 ). Schools outside of this range can be interpreted as having particular strength or weakness on the selected indicators. In other words:

- School A has an index score of 122 and is performing in the top $16 \%$ of district schools on the selected indicators


## Prototype High School Performance Measurement

High School Performance is calculated using multiple measures with the established areas of student learning.

|  | Student progress | Student Performance |  | College Success | Student Engagement / School Environment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School Name | Growth Measure TBD | \% At or Above Proficient (CAPT) | \% At or Above Goal (CAPT) | \% of graduates completing first year of college within 2years after HS | High School Student Engagement Index (Attendance Rate \& School Retention) |
| School 1 | TBD | 60\% | 18\% | 51\% | 123 |
| School 2 |  | 59\% | 20\% | 47\% | 112 |
| School 3 |  | 65\% | 17\% | 68\% | 95 |
| School 4 |  | 45\% | 9\% | 57\% | 77 |
| School 5 |  | 48\% | 7\% | 42\% | 105 |
| School 6 |  | 38\% | 10\% | 39\% | 88 |
| School 7 |  | 53\% | 9\% | 53\% | 96 |
| School 8 |  | 50\% | 20\% | 52\% | 103 |
| District Average |  | 51\% | 14\% | 48\% | 100 |
| State Average | Not Available | 78\% | 48\% | Not Available | Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  | - |
|  | To Be Developed | See page 11 |  | See page 12 | See page 13 |

## Prototype Student Performance Measure: \% of Students At or Above Proficient or Goal on CAPT <br> Methodology for calculating overall \% of

|  | Student Performance |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| School Name | \% At or Above <br> Proficient <br> (CAPT) | \% At or Above Goal <br> (CAPT) |
| School 1 | $60 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| School 2 | $65 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| School 3 | $59 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| School 4 | $45 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| School 5 | $38 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| School 6 | $48 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| School 7 | $50 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| School 8 | $53 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| $-------------------------------------------14 \%$ |  |  |
| Strict Average | $51 \%$ | $48 \%$ |

students at or above proficient or goal

- The \% of students at or above proficient or goal is the percent of students within a given school who scored proficient, goal or advanced (\% at or above proficient) or goal or advanced (\% at or above goal) on the CAPT in a given subject
- The overall \% of students at or above proficient or goal is calculated as the average of each school's reading and math percent and the weighted average of 2006-07, 200708 and 2008-09 percentages where weighting is allocated as:
2008-09: 1/2
2007-08: 1/4
2006-07: 1/4


## What does it mean?

The \% of students at or above proficient or goal describes how well students in a school are doing on the academic skills assessed by the CAPT In other words:

- $59 \%$ of students in School 3 demonstrate proficient goal, or advanced understanding on the CAPT assessment, while $17 \%$ demonstrate goal or advanced understanding


## Prototype College Success: \% of Graduates Completing Their First year of College Within 2-years

|  | College Success |
| :---: | :---: |
| School Name | \% of graduates completing first year of college within 2 -years after HS graduation |
| School 1 | 51\% |
| School 2 | 47\% |
| School 3 | 68\% |
| School 4 | 57\% |
| School 5 | 42\% |
| School 6 | 39\% |
| School 7 | 53\% |
| School 8 | 52\% |
| District Average | 48\% |
| State Average | Not Available |

## Methodology for calculating the college success indicator

- The \% of graduates completing first year of college within 2-years is the percent of students who enroll in college in the first year after graduation and return for their second year.
- For school performance measurement the indicator is calculated based on a weighted average:
Class of 2008:1/2
Class of 2007: 1/4
Class of 2006: 1/4
- Data for calculating this indicator is based on information provided by the National Student Clearinghouse, nonprofit organization focused on maintaining student higher education enrollment and degree verification
- The National Student Clearinghouse maintains records on $92 \%$ of total U.S. enrollment in higher education and we expect an approximately $85 \%$ match rate for New Haven public school graduates


## What does it mean?

The \% of graduates completing first year of college within 2-years describes the proportion of student who enroll in college within the first year after graduation and then return for their second year.

## Prototype Student Engagement / School Environment: High School Student Engagement Index

|  | Student Engagement / <br> School Environment |
| :--- | :---: |
| School Name | High School Student <br> Engagement Index <br>  <br> School Retention Rate) |
| School 1 | 123 |
| School 2 | 112 |
| School 3 | 95 |
| School 4 | 77 |
| School 5 | 105 |
| School 6 | 88 |
| School 7 | 96 |
| School 8 | 103 |
| District Average | 100 |
| State Average | Not Available |

## Methodology for calculating the Student Engagement Index

- The High School Student Engagement Index is a composite score of school Attendance Rate and School Retention Rate results for each school
- Attendance Rate is calculated as the \% of Days Attended
- Preliminary School Retention Rate is calculated as the '\# of students leaving a school in a year*/\# of students enrolled in a school in a year'
- Attendance and School Retention Rate is the weighted average of the 2006-07, 2007-08 \& 2008-09 rates, where weighting is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2006-07 (25\%) } \\
& \text { 2007-08 (25\%) } \\
& \text { 2008-09 (50\%) }
\end{aligned}
$$

- The index calculated as the average of the standardized scores for each indicator


## What does it mean?

The Student Engagement Index describes how a school is doing on selected student engagement indicators relative to other schools in the district. The index score average is 100 and we expect $68 \%$ of all school index scores to fall between 85 and 115 ( $16 \%$ above 115 and $16 \%$ below 85 ). Schools outside of this range can be interpreted as having particular strength or weakness on the selected indicators. In other words:

- School A has an index score of 123 and is performing in the top $16 \%$ of NHPS schools on the selected indicators


## School Performance Measures - Areas for Development

## Student Progress and Performance

## College Success

## Student <br> Engagement and School Environment

## Areas for further development

- Addition of statewide CMT student growth data
- Development of growth metric for high school
- Exploration of additional learning measures recommended by the Reform Committee, including performance assessments and enhanced district assessments
- Verification of National Student Clearinghouse data
- Inclusion of parent, teacher and student School Climate Survey results, to be conducted this Spring
- Further development of student engagement measures, including refinement of dropout calculations used for the district and the state

