

# **RSU No. 5 Performance Indicator Task Force**

## **Report to the Board of Directors**

May 12, 2010

### **The Task Force's Charge and Composition**

As a part of its work on the *Strategic Framework*, the RSU No. 5 Board of Directors reviewed an initial set of pre-existing indicators of student achievement (see *Adopted Strategic Framework 2/24/10*). As a next step, the Board asked the superintendent to create a task force to evaluate and expand the list of indicators to create a comprehensive set of indicators of student achievement that tie directly to the *Strategic Framework*. This set of indicators must be 1) measurable; 2) communicate success to parents and the broader public; and 3) be usable by district teachers and administrators and the RSU No. 5 Board to guide ongoing improvement efforts. This comprehensive list of indicators along with available baseline and target data will be presented to the RSU No. 5 Board for review in March /April and for final approval in May 2010.

An open invitation to participate on the Performance Indicator Task Force was extended to parents, community, staff and students via several *Delivering on the Mission* e-mails from Dr. Shannon Welsh, Superintendent of RSU No. 5. The Task Force was composed of teachers (10), students (3), parents/community members (3), administrators (3), Board of Directors member (1), and included representatives from each of RSN No. 5's six schools and three communities (See Appendix A).

The Task Force met on Thursday, March 11, 2010 for six hours, Monday, April 12 for two hours, and again on Monday, May 3 for two hours. David Ruff, Co-Director of Great Schools Partnership, facilitated the group's work. Sarah Simmonds, RSU No. 5's Curriculum Director, provided additional support.

### **Beginning to Develop Potential Indicators List**

On the morning of March 11, Dr. Shannon Welsh, Superintendent, welcomed the group, outlined its charge, and then turned the meeting over to David. After an initial overview and outline of the day's work, participants worked in small groups and also had large group conversations to brainstorm responses to the following questions:

1. What do we want to know as a result of having a comprehensive set of educational indicators?
2. What criteria does the system need to meet? What criteria does each indicator need to meet?

In the afternoon, the group worked initially in small groups and had large group conversations later as they began developing a list of potential indicators (See Appendix B). At the end of the day it was determined that further work was necessary in order to more definitively identify the performance indicators, and make recommendations to the RSU No. 5 Board of Directors.

The group agreed that Sarah Simmonds and David Ruff would meet to do further work to bring back to the group for an afternoon "reaction session" and to finalize the group's work. A meeting date for the Task Force was set for Monday, April 12 from 4:00-6:00 at the Freeport High School Library.

## **Analyzing Meeting Information**

At the conclusion of the March 11<sup>th</sup> meeting, Sarah and David reviewed the list of potential indicators and determined that 1) they fell into 3 categories and, 2) there were connections to/implications for future curriculum work that needed to be explored and, 3) there were connections to/implications for the work planned for the identification of work and college readiness skills, and assessments that demonstrate those work and college readiness skills that needed to be explored.

The brainstormed list of potential indicators developed by the Task Force was categorized in the following ways:

- 1) HAVE: Those PIs for which assessments exist currently and the data can be collected this year for baseline data.
- 2) NEED WORK: Those PIs that require the use of existing assessments or information, but need some work in order to meet the criteria (valid, reliable...), and/or require some research and decision making. Data from these measures would not be collected this year, but work would take place (spring?, summer?, fall 2010?) in order to be able to use the measures and collect baseline data in 2010-11.
- 3) TO BE DEVELOPED: Those PIs that require development of assessments. These are the PIs/assessments that make connections to and have significant implications for both the work with work/college readiness standards and assessments, and also to future curriculum work. A timeline for these assessments might look like: development in 2010-11, piloting in 2010-11/2011-12, and baseline data would be available in 2012-13.

On March 30, 2010, Sarah and David met to more deeply analyze the possible indicators work and to prepare information and materials for the next meeting of the Task Force. The following items were developed to present to the Task Force at their April 12 meeting:

1. A template with detailed information about each performance indicator (See Appendix C).
2. An analysis of the assessment types and data points represented in the possible indicators (See Appendix D).

## **Finalizing the Work**

The Task Force initially reconvened on April 12, with an additional meeting scheduled for May 3, to review and discuss the materials, and to make decisions. For each proposed indicator a number of discussion points and decisions were necessary. The group worked through the benefits and challenges for each decision point, and came to understand the many layers and intricacies that are involved with making decisions about what data will be collected, how it will be collected, and how it will be reported.

A draft of the Task Force's work was shared with members of the Strategic Planning Subcommittee of the RSU No. 5 Board of Directors at their April 6 meeting. Questions posed by this committee were woven into the Task Force's work on April 12 and May 3. A document was created in a question and answer format that outlines some of the key decisions that were made by the Task Force along with their rationale (See Appendix E).

## **Next Steps**

The work of the Task Force will be presented to the RSU No. 5 Board of Directors at their May 12, 2010 meeting. The members of the Task Force support the proposed performance indicators and recommend that the Board of Directors take action to approve them as written.

Once approved, work can begin to develop the various collection processes that will be necessary to gather the data that currently is available for several of the indicators. For those indicators requiring development, refinement, and norming, various committees either are in place or will be established to carry out this work.

For example, a representative group will be convened in late June to identify the work and college readiness skills and develop the tools that will be used to score student assessments of those standards. Over the course of the 2010-11 school year, this work will be used by district level curriculum committees to develop student exhibitions that will be embedded within the identified grade/course level curricula. Piloting and refinement of these exhibitions will take place during the 2011-12 school year, with baseline data to be gathered in 2012-13. A similar process will be used to carry out the work that will be necessary in order to gather data around district writing prompts at various grade levels.

The work that is necessary in order to be able to gather data on the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) indicator will involve the RSU's literacy specialists. These staff members began meeting during the course of the 2009-10 school year and have already begun to identify places where there is consistency across the RSU, and where there are opportunities for working together to strengthen and enhance the consistency of administration, and use of the DRA to improve student learning.

A key element for all of this work to take place will be the development of aligned building and district level plans for the use of professional development time and resources in order to make progress toward the goals outlined in the Strategic Framework. Building and district level administrators have already begun these conversations and will be meeting both as a district level team and building teams to formalize and coordinate these plans. Utilizing a continuous improvement approach and continued support in the form of professional development time and funding will be essential for success.

## **APPENDIX**

**APPENDIX A****RSU No. 5 Performance Indicator Task Force  
Participants**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>
David Ruff	Facilitator Great Schools Partnership
Sarah Simmonds	Curriculum Director RSU No. 5
Monique Culbertson	Durham Parent/Community Member
Kelly Fitz-Randolf	Freeport Parent/Community Member
Kristen Dorsey	RSU No. 5 Board of Directors
Liza Moore	Teacher Mast Landing School
Lois Kilby-Chesley	Teacher Mast Landing School
Beth Daniels	Teacher Durham Elementary School
Susan Smith	Special Education Teacher Freeport Middle School
Pam Lizotte	Guidance Counselor Durham Elem. School
Beth Markelon	Teacher Morse Street School
Terry Lincoln	Teacher Morse Street School
Hank Ogilby	Teacher Freeport High School
Hannah Goodenow	Senior Freeport High School
Lauren Parker	Senior Freeport High School
Annika Leavitt	Pownal Parent/Community Member
Beth Willhoite	Administrator Mast Landing School
Deidre Carr	Teacher Freeport High School
Ray Grogan	Administrator Freeport Middle School
Beth Moulton	Teacher Pownal Elementary School
Ian Connelly	Senior Freeport High School

## APPENDIX B

### Brainstorm of Possible Indicators of Student Learning and Discussion Notes Performance Indicator Task Force March 11, 2010

This document reflects the information generated by the Performance Indicator Task Force at their meeting on March 11, 2010 regarding possible indicators of student learning, as well as notes from the group conversation about each item.

The items listed in the first section below were shared with the large group based on small group conversations. There was more group conversation and general sense of agreement about the items in this section than those in the second section below however; a formal vote on each item was not taken.

1. NWEA- to include % of students meeting their NWEA growth targets (Grades? Both tests?)
2. % of students at proficient or better on NECAP
3. Double scored writing prompt grades 2-12 (HS school-wide fall writing prompt)
4. HS English Writing Portfolios (9<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> grade), cumulative, particular types of writing (rubric is the same for both)
5. Senior Project (currently an option, not a graduation requirement currently) (honors, merit, pass, fail) (oral presentation rubric)
6. What about % of students who do choose to participate in the Senior Project? (keep in mind that in some cases students do not have a choice to do Sr. Proj. given that they are in academic difficulty or absent too often...so would want to keep track or account for that.)
7. Reading level benchmarks along the way and times to report out.
8. Graduation rate- 4 year, 5 year or 6 year? Or attendance at a post-secondary?
9. Exhibition- % of students proficient in a K-12 standards-based portfolio with an exhibition at various “knee-joint” grades (2<sup>nd</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, HS). Perhaps infuse/enhance with specific/particular requirements- arts, science, social studies, research... (There seemed to be a particular amount of positive energy around this item from multiple groups.)

These were items that came from small group conversations and were shared with the large group. In some cases (#s10-14) we had time to be able to go back to the items and take an informal “group vote” about whether each item should move forward or not. Remaining items were brought to the group with some discussion, but a group vote was not taken.

10. Common Algebra 1 final and Basic Skills Test (for HS placement- all 8<sup>th</sup> graders unless they took Alg. 1 as an 8<sup>th</sup> grader), How about the % of 8<sup>th</sup> graders who “pass” the Basic Skills Test? (*Group Vote- NO*)
11. 6<sup>th</sup> grade math test? (*Group Vote- Maybe*) (Students say students will take this more seriously)
12. EDM end of year secure skills? (*Group Vote- NO*)
13. HS Research paper? (earlier grades?) (see Scarb. Process- research each year with a theme/focus, woven into the Big 6, one year focus on science, the next social studies) (weave into others above?)
14. World Lang. competencies (not all) (*Group Vote- NO*)
15. Common visual presentation rubric (NEASC) (school-wide holistic rubric) (weave these rubrics into some of the other projects above)

16. Community Service Project (vs. Service Learning Project)- There is an existing community service project in the American Studies (still to be worked out, there is a need/desire to do this but more to be worked out, perhaps woven into others above?)
17. SAT
18. Course passing (Helpful to know at various “worry points” how many students are a grade/two below reading level- DRA? Done the same everywhere? Subjectivity? Will need to talk more about?)
19. Co-Curricular participation (May be disaggregated to the various types of activities- sports, arts, community service...and the # of students who do more than one- Maybe look at the numbers of students who are NOT participating?)

## APPENDIX C: Proposed Academic Performance Indicators

Type	Standardized Tests		
<b>Measure</b>	NWEA	NECAP	SAT
<b>Metric</b>	Percent of students who meet their growth targets from spring to spring administration of the test. When an individual student scores come from two different schools, growth will be reported from the school involved in the second administration of the test.	Percent of students who meet or exceed the standard in grades noted.	Percent of students who meet or exceed the standard in grades noted.
<b>Target</b>	Math & Reading	Math & Reading	Math, Reading and Writing
<b>Grade(s)</b>	4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	3, 5, 8	11
<b>Baseline</b>	Spring 2009 and Spring 2010	2009/10	2008/09
<b>Guidance</b>	Only include students who are enrolled at RSU No. 5 for both administrations of the test. Scores will be combined into one score for math and one score for reading for the district as a whole. School-by-school data will be available upon request.	Measures change from one class to the next class. Data will be reported in the aggregate at the district level.	Measure changes from one class to the next class. Data will be reported in the aggregate.
<b>Comparison Set</b>	NWEA national norm group	RSU No. 5 aggregate scores will be published with similar scores for Brunswick, Falmouth, SAD 15, SAD 51, Lisbon, and Yarmouth	RSU No. 5 aggregate scores will be published with similar scores for Brunswick, Falmouth, SAD 15, SAD 51, Lisbon, and Yarmouth, and Maine
<b>Data Points</b>	2	6	3
<b>Scoring</b>	External	External	External
<b>Status</b>	Existing	Existing	Existing



Type	Outcome	
<b>Measure</b>	Graduation Rates	Post Secondary
<b>Metric</b>	Percent of 9 <sup>th</sup> grade students who meet graduation requirements within four years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Percent of graduating seniors who attend 2 year institutions, 4 year institutions, within the 1<sup>st</sup> year, the 2<sup>nd</sup> year, and the 5<sup>th</sup> year after graduation.</li> <li>•Percent of graduating seniors who enter the military, certificate programs, employment, and other within the 1<sup>st</sup> year and the 2<sup>nd</sup> year after graduation.</li> </ul>
<b>Target</b>	Outcome	Outcome
<b>Grade(s)</b>	All	All
<b>Baseline</b>	2008/09	2008/09
<b>Guidance</b>	Will use state issued metric.	RSU No.5 will start with NSC data. The high school will follow up with individual students who are not identified.
<b>Comparison Set</b>	RSU No. 5 aggregate scores will be published with similar scores for Brunswick, Cape Elizabeth, Falmouth, SAD 15, SAD 51, SAD 75, and Yarmouth, and Maine	If possible, NSC data from comparison districts will be published with RSU No. 5 scores. As involvement with NSC is not a required, access to such data may not be possible.
<b>Data Points</b>	1	10
<b>Scoring</b>	External	External and Internal
<b>Status</b>	In development by Maine DOE	In development by RSU No. 5

Type	Performance Assessment
Measure	Exhibitions
Metric	TBD. Will look at student performance levels on the to-be-created rubric.
Target	Work and college readiness skills
Grade(s)	Propose 2, 5, 8, 12 <i>Could be 2, 4, 7, 12. TBD during Exhibition development.</i>
Baseline	2012/13
Guidance	Structure developed in 2010/11; pilot in 2011/12; baseline in 2012/13. This will build off of preexisting exhibitions already in place within RSU No. 5. Allow flexibility to adjust during development process.
Comparison Set	No comparison districts
Data Points	4, most likely
Scoring	Internal
Status	To be developed

Type	Constructed Response	
Measure	Developmental Reading Assessment	District Writing Prompt
Metric	Percent of students scoring at different reading levels	Percentage of students scoring at different writing levels
Target	Reading	Writing
Grade(s)	K, 1, 2	Propose 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 <i>TBD during development</i>
Baseline	2010/11	2010/11
Guidance	Norming across district needs to occur	Propose- Structure developed in 2010/11; pilot in 2011/12; baseline in 2012/13. This will build off of preexisting exhibitions already in place within RSU No. 5. Allow flexibility to adjust during development process.
Comparison Set	No comparison districts	No comparison districts
Data Points	5	11
Scoring	Internal	Internal
Status	To be refined and normed	To be developed and/or refined and normed

Type	Participation	
<b>Measure</b>	Co-curricular Participation	Advanced Placement Participation
<b>Metric</b>	The percents of students who participate in school sponsored activities that occur outside of the school day or outside of class periods. This could include before school, after school, or during lunch. Students do not earn course credit for these activities.	The percent of students who participate in Advanced Placement courses.
<b>Target</b>	Student Involvement	Student Involvement
<b>Grade(s)</b>	6-12	9-12
<b>Baseline</b>	2009/2010	2008/2009
<b>Guidance</b>	<p>Data will be collected in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percent of students in grades 6-8 participating in at least one activity</li> <li>• Percent of students in grades 6-8 participating in three or more activities</li> <li>• Percent of students in grades 9-12 participating in at least one activity</li> <li>• Percent of students in grades 9-12 participating in three or more activities</li> </ul> <p>From each 6-8 building and the HS, we will need the total number of student for each of the two applicable categories, split into athletic and non-athletic activities, and the total number of students enrolled at any point during the school year.</p> <p>Students who leave the school are not removed from the total count of students. Students who are enrolled, leave and return are only counted one time.</p>	The percent will be determined by calculating the number of students enrolled in an AP course on April 1 <sup>st</sup> , over the total number of students enrolled in the school on April 1 <sup>st</sup> .
<b>Comparison Set</b>	No comparison districts	No comparison districts
<b>Data Points</b>	4	1
<b>Scoring</b>	Internal	Internal
<b>Status</b>	Need to create the official list of activities. Data will be collected for the 2009/2010 school year.	Data is available for 2008/2009 and 2009/2010 school years

## **APPENDIX D: Summary of Data Points**

Standardized Tests:	11 data points
Performance Assessments:	4 data points
Outcome Data:	11 data points
Constructed Response:	16 data points
Participation:	5 data points

## **APPENDIX E: Anticipated Questions about Various Decision Points**

1. Why did the Task Force decide not to use any specific standardized testing data on science?

The Task Force was conscious of not overweighting any single type of measure to evaluate overall system performance. Consequently, despite additional measures being possible through standardized testing, the task force felt that the current assessment points provide strong and adequate information on the success of the system. At an individual school and classroom level, these data will be used to review curriculum, organizational structures, and overall learning environments.

2. NECAP provides data on additional years. Why did the Task Force decide not to use these additional data points?

Again, these additional data points can be very helpful when undertaking an in-depth review of the learning program at a school (an activity routinely done by teachers and administrators and the building and district level), but the additional data do not necessarily provide a clearer overall picture of the progress of the district as a system.

3. NECAP provides data on writing. Why did the Task Force decide not to use these data?

The Task Force identified district developed writing prompts at various grade levels as one of the performance indicators. The data from these writing prompts will provide in-depth information regarding student writing skills to enhance instructional practice. The task force believed that it would be more beneficial to use these strategies to measure student writing abilities as the assessment process provides more detailed information and supports better instructional practice.

4. How did you determine the comparison districts?

The Task Force used three criteria: 1) geographic location, looking at the immediate neighboring districts with a few beyond the immediate ring; 2) ensuring diversity in terms of socioeconomic demographics; 3) diversity in terms of district sizes; and 4) a combination of rural and suburban populations (urban populations were not considered necessary as no RSU No. 5 students live in urban situations).

5. Why did the Task Force decide not to report data by individual school for the purposes of the strategic plan?

These data are readily available on various websites and will be used individually at the school level. However, the intent of the RSU No. 5 strategic plan is to gauge the health and success of the district as a system. Consequently, the Task Force felt that presenting data at the aggregate systems level best met these criteria.

6. Why did the Task Force decide not to track course passing rates?

Currently, decisions on course grades are made teacher by teacher based on a combination of factors including test and quiz scores, attendance, class participation, projects, and homework. The specific “weighting” of various elements is determined by each teacher. Consequently, comparing grades would essentially be comparing disparate data. One commitment of the Strategic Framework is to implement standards-based instruction and reporting. As this is undertaken and finalized, the district may be able to

revisit this decision and decide to use this measure in the future.

7. Why don't we have baseline data for several of the indicators?

Data gathering on a system that has over 1800 moving parts (students) represents an extremely complex process. This process has been further complicated by the creation of a single district in RSU No. 5. Consequently, the data gathering process outlined here will require the creation of new collection systems to accomplish this. In addition, several of these measures themselves—let alone the collection system—are necessary but not yet created. These indicators provide both an initial system and a road map for the build up of a system that will ultimately provide a clearer picture of student learning in RSU No. 5.

## INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The RSU No. 5 Strategic Framework is the result of nine months of joint effort between the community, district educators, and the Board of Directors to develop a forward-looking document to guide decision-making at multiple levels. This is a living document that will change and adapt as situations warrant. This is intended to be ambitious and bold, a necessity for the ever-changing world that our children will inherit.

The RSU No. 5 Board of Directors intends to use this document to create a broader system of *community* accountability and transparency for the towns of Durham, Freeport, and Pownal as well as their schools. As such, we acknowledge that there are many pivotal roles required to provide quality education for the students in our district.

- As Board members, providing leadership which upholds the Vision and Mission of RSU No. 5, as well as dedication to the school/community collaborations and communication that is fundamental to continuous improvement.
- As community members, adequate funding for the programs, learning opportunities, physical buildings, and professional development requirements of our system is essential.
- As parents, direct involvement and support in learning are critical to the success of our children.
- As educators, commitment and innovation are crucial to finding new ways to meet the learning needs of our students.
- As students, engagement and full participation are fundamental for learning and fulfilling personal aspirations.

This document is the framework for the strategies this community will use to help RSU No. 5 realize the goal of educational excellence while demonstrating a greater efficiency in the use of our resources.

## SECTION I DISTRICT VISION AND MISSION STATEMENT

### Our Mission:

To provide our students with a world-class education that will challenge minds, engage creativity, develop self-discipline, and advance inherent strengths.

### Our Vision:

- Our schools provide a safe, engaging environment that fosters a passion for life-long learning.
- Our educators are mentors dedicated to providing our students with the knowledge and skills that will help them adapt to our changing world.

- Our community supports the concept that each individual—be they student, educator, parent, or community member—bears responsibility to the success of our mission.
- All stakeholders understand that financial responsibility is a facet of each decision that is made and tirelessly seek the resources to support our mission and vision.

## **SECTION II DISTRICT COMMITMENTS**

RSU No. 5 is committed to supporting the following activities over the next four years in order to enhance the quality of learning for our students. This plan is deliberately broad and not overly prescriptive. Each school will design specific and innovative strategies to meet the learning needs of their students. The RSU No. 5 Board of Directors intends to hold themselves and our educators accountable for implementing strategies to achieve the following academic and financial goals.

Our academic program commitments over the next four years are to:

- 1) Identify and Adopt a Set of Work and College Readiness Skills
- 2) Create Assessments that Demonstrate Work and College Readiness
- 3) Recruit and Retain High Quality Educators
- 4) Implement Standards-based Education
- 5) Use Technology Effectively to Enhance Learning
- 6) Explore Multiple Pathways for Learning
- 7) Support Ongoing Leadership Development

Our financial commitments over the next four years are to:

- 1) Establish the optimal use of our 6 physical buildings to most efficiently advance our K-12 programming goals
- 2) Explore strategies to increase revenues beyond taxes
- 3) Establish a meaningful measure to compare and track our per pupil expenditure to other state and regional schools
- 4) Review state and regional comparative data regarding account areas for school expenditures to ensure spending most closely to students
- 5) Explore and implement a range of strategies to support energy efficiency and cost savings

Each commitment is further described below.

### **ACADEMIC PROGRAM COMMITMENTS:**

#### **Identify and Adopt a Set of Work and College Readiness Skills**

The world has changed rapidly over the past 20 years. The knowledge and skills required for success at work, in further education, and as involved citizens have correspondingly shifted. There is significant research identifying that students need to learn



both the content traditionally associated with pre K-12 public education and the skills directly associated with success in both college and the new world of work. Examples of the latter include - but are not limited to - themes like financial and entrepreneurial literacy, global awareness, productivity and accountability, and initiative and self direction. The district will commit to identifying a comprehensive set of skills representing work and college readiness skills for broad implementation across instruction, curriculum, and assessment. This identification process will build on current district efforts and make use of the research that has been conducted in this area.

### **Create Assessments through which Students can Demonstrate Work and College Readiness**

Once identified, we take the next step to track the acquisition of these skills over time. Currently, there are numerous examples of classroom-embedded assessment strategies in place in RSU No. 5 that measure these readiness skills. The district will use these existing models as a framework to develop additional assessments that will be largely “demonstration-based,” requiring students to apply these skills and demonstrate acquisition over time. We anticipate that students would have multiple opportunities to work through these assessments and that student learning—rather than calendar time—will dictate when and how students engage with these assessments. The data gathered from these assessments will be used to improve instruction and curriculum, to provide feedback to students and parents, and as a community accountability measure.

### **Recruit and Retain High Quality Educators**

Ultimately, the most significant impact on student learning under the control of the district is the quality of the educators in our buildings. To this end, the district is committed not only to recruiting, but also retaining teachers who bring strong skills and knowledge into the system as they enter our schools. To demonstrate our commitment to life long learning, the district will ensure ongoing professional development for our educators. Our investment in this area is recognition that the rapidly changing world requires constant updating of teacher skills and knowledge. Professional development will be aligned with our district and school strategic commitments, coordinated and designed by the educators and embedded in the daily work of our administrators and teachers.

### **Implement Standards-based Education**

The district is committed to finding a means to ensure that all students will achieve at the highest levels of learning the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to succeed in a rapidly changing world. To accomplish this, the district will implement a standards-based education which requires empowering and engaging students in their learning and ensuring all students can demonstrate the desired knowledge and skills at high levels of proficiency. The district will develop standards-based curriculum, instruction, assessment, and reporting linked to clearly defined standards. There are many existing models within our schools that can be used as a framework to develop a more consistent, effective, and innovative educational program for the district. This will require the involvement of educators, parents, and students working together over time.

### **Use Technology Effectively to Enhance Learning**

There is little doubt that future success in life is—and will continue to be—tightly tied to adept use of technology. We are committed to pursuing technology that broadens and deepens student learning, that increases student responsibility for learning and that prepares them for work and or college.. To meet these goals we will need to help our educators learn how best to graduate “tech-literate” students, financially support appropriate technology in the classroom and continually review best practices with the use of technology for life-long learning.

### **Expand our Commitment to Multiple Pathways for Learning**

Every effective teacher and parent knows that a good learning opportunity for one student is not necessarily a good learning opportunity for another. RSU No. 5 has been an innovator in this area providing students with multiple pathways at the elementary level for many years. During the next four years we will explore options to expand this commitment to multiple pathways. This expansion may result in the creation of different programs within other district schools, differentiated learning within classrooms, or the creation of different organizational structures across the district. The main criteria for expansion will remain—continually increasing quality learning for students while remaining fiscally responsible.

### **Support Ongoing Leadership Development**

Each individual within the organization bears a responsibility to the success of our mission. As such, leadership needs to be supported at all levels including students, teachers, administrators, and Board members. For students, leadership development will enable them to grow as leaders while in our schools, but more importantly, to be confident leaders in their lives after school. We believe that school leadership must be shared across teachers and administrators, even as we recognize the different job requirements of these positions. We need to explicitly encourage and support educator leadership to ensure that decisions continue to be made in the best interest of students. And as a new Board of Directors, members of the Board need ongoing development to fully understand their roles and responsibilities.

### **FINANCIAL COMMITMENTS:**

Financial resources are—and will continue to be—scarce and often less than optimally desired. Knowing this, all members of RSU No. 5 need to be vigilant in ensuring that our resources are best spent in ways that will continue to promote our mission and vision. As such we are committed to the following goals:

### **Establishing the optimal use of our 6 physical buildings to most efficiently advance our K-12 programming goals**

We will examine the best strategies for using our 6 physical buildings to provide a safe and effective environment in which to achieve our mission. We will seek efficiencies by carefully considering factors like transportation costs, transportation time, square footage per

student, maintenance and debt service along with other key metrics to determine quality solutions that ensure both fiscal efficiency and quality student learning

**Exploring strategies to increase revenues beyond taxes**

We recognize that in both good economic times and bad that alternative funding sources are important to sustain our commitment to excellence. We will explore strategies that will diversify our revenues such as attracting grant dollars for innovative programs and initiatives.

**Establish a meaningful measure to compare our per pupil expenditure to other state and regional districts**

Benchmarking and communicating our per pupil expenditures against relevant state and regional school districts will help our community gauge our relative effectiveness and help us better plan for the future. We are committed to establishing a metric that reflects both our desire for excellence in educational programming and financial efficiency – and one with data that is readily available from comparable systems.

**Establish meaningful comparative measures to demonstrate financial focus on students and programming**

Benchmarking and communicating the percentage of our total budget which is spent on educational programming against the same metric from relevant state and regional school districts will ensure that the Board and district educators constantly strive to align expenditures with actions that focus on the district mission and vision.

**Explore and Implement a Range of Strategies to Support Energy Efficiency and Cost Savings**

This initiative is as important to the district financially as it is educationally. This effort will enable us to research ways to reduce our budgets in all areas while we demonstrate effective use of sustainable resources for our students.

**SECTION III PERFORMANCE INDICATORS TO DEMONSTRATE OUR PROGRESS**

RSU No. 5 Board of Directors is committed to establishing performance indicators which will gauge our success relative to this strategic framework – specifically our vision and mission, and district commitments listed above.

**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT:**

RSU No. 5 endorses the notion that a comprehensive understanding of student learning requires multiple measures, and that these measures need to be drawn from a variety of assessment methods. This is true both in the case of individual students and in gauging the overall success of the district in achieving its goals.

The Board of Directors has reviewed an initial set of pre-existing indicators of student achievement below. As a next step, the Board has asked the superintendent to create a task force consisting of teachers and administrators to evaluate and expand this list to create a comprehensive set of indicators of student achievement that tie directly to this strategic framework. This set must be 1) measurable; 2) communicate success to parents and the broader public; and 3) be usable by district teachers and administrators and the RSU No. 5 Board to guide ongoing improvement efforts. This comprehensive list of indicators along with available baseline and target data will be presented to the RSU No. 5 Board for review in March/April 2010 and for final approval in April 2010.

**Initial Indicators for Task Force consideration & expansion**

<b>Indicator</b>
NWEA mean RIT score in reading grade 3, spring.
NWEA mean RIT score in math grade 5, spring
Percentage of 8 <sup>th</sup> grade students scoring at meets or exceeds on NECAP, Reading
Percentage of 8 <sup>th</sup> grade students scoring at meets or exceeds on NECAP, Writing
Percentage of 8 <sup>th</sup> grade students scoring at meets or exceeds on NECAP, Mathematics
Percentage of 8 <sup>th</sup> grade students passing all of their English, math, science, and social studies courses
Percentage of grades 8-12 students participating in school-sponsored extra curricular activities
Percentage of 9 <sup>th</sup> grade students passing all of their English, math, science, and social studies classes
Percentage of students scoring at meets or exceeds on the SAT, Reading
Percentage of students scoring at meets or exceeds on the SAT, Writing
Percentage of students scoring at meets or exceeds on the SAT, Mathematics
Percentage of students scoring at meets or exceeds on the Maine High School Assessment in science
Four-year graduation rate
Percentage of students entering college (2 or 4 year) during past three years

**FINANCIAL EFFICIENCIES:**

RSU No. 5 endorses the notion that effective use of financial resources is vital to the development of a high performing school system. We look to the community to provide adequate funding. In return, the community expects that financial responsibility will be a facet of each decision made by the RSU as we work to attain our mission and vision.

RSU No. 5 will identify an initial set of indicators of financial efficiencies that will be monitored and communicated with the members of our communities. The Finance Committee will make recommendations on creating an indicator that ties financial investment and expenditure to student performance. This list of indicators will be presented to the RSU No. 5 Board for review in March 2010 and for final approval in April 2010.

**Section V. Public Communication Commitments**

The RSU No. 5 Board is committed to building effective communication with parents and the larger community so that they understand and engage in actively supporting the education of our students. To this end, the RSU No. 5 Board in conjunction with the superintendent will coordinate the following activities:

- 1) Create an annual *State of the Schools Report* indicating annual progress as measured by the Strategic Framework Indicators and present this report to the RSU No. 5 Board.
- 2) Host an annual *Community Education Conversation* where the *State of the Schools Report* is distributed and discussed with all interested community members. This gathering will also provide the opportunity for the community to engage in conversations about the report.
- 3) The annual *State of the Schools Report* will be made available on line at the RSU No. 5 web site. A link will be provided for comments or questions.
- 4) The superintendent will hold an annual gathering with district educators to share the *State of the Schools Report* and to engage in conversations about the report. Principals and leadership teams will then use this information as a springboard for action planning for the following school year.
- 5) The RSU No. 5 Board will use the *State of the Schools Report* and conversations with the community members and district educators to review the Strategic Plan on an annual basis and make adjustments for the ensuing year as appropriate.
- 6) Building administrators and the superintendent will present annual school and district-based action plans to the RSU No. 5 Board. These plans will work in alignment with the district Strategic Plan and any annual adjustments made by the RSU No. 5 Board.

## APPENDIX A. GLOSSARY

**Annual Indicators:** data measures collected on an annual basis that define annual progress. Indicators may include both student learning outcomes and process implementation practices. RSU No. 5 will also collect and report on financial indicators.

**Baseline:** The starting data point. Whenever possible, in this Strategic Framework, the baseline data are determined by a three year average including the year prior to the start of this plan and the two proceeding years.

**Maine High School Assessment:** The SAT Reasoning Test does not measure science. In this case, the State of Maine has developed an additional standardized test to measure science attainment. Taken collectively, the SAT Reasoning Test and the Maine science test are the Maine High School Assessment in compliance with federal law.

**Mission:** Defines the fundamental purpose of an organization describing why it exists and what it does.

**NECAP:** The New England Comprehensive Assessment Program. This is a statewide standardized test given annually in Maine in grades 3 through 8. This is the federally mandated state test and replaced the Maine Educational Assessment starting in the 2009/10 school year.

**NEASC:** The New England Association of Schools and Colleges, the regional accrediting agency for high schools in Maine.

**NWEA:** The Northwest Educational Assessment, a computer based assessment tool that can be used multiple times during the course of a year to measure student learning progress

**RIT:** Rasch Unit is a scale used to measure student achievement and growth

**SAT:** The SAT Reasoning Test is a standardized test predominantly used as a measure for college admissions. In Maine, all 11<sup>th</sup> grade students are required to take the SAT as part of the federally required testing program.

**Standards Based Assessment:** This refers to assessment strategies that specifically target a set of common learning standards.

**Standards Based Instruction:** This refers to instructional practices that specifically address a set of common learning standards.

**Standards Based Reporting:** This refers to the practice of providing learning reports based on a common set of learning standards. The reports could be numerical or narrative, but focus only on student learning in relation to the learning standard, not other commonly measured aspects such as homework completion, attendance, participation, or timeliness of response. In most cases, grades are not averaged. And in most cases, schools provide additional information regarding other commonly measured issues such as student attendance, participation, or effort

**Three-year goals:** These describe student learning outcomes to be achieved over a three-year basis.

**Vision:** a clear and inspirational picture of what an organization seeks to achieve over a longer time frame. Visions serve to energize an organization and push the thinking beyond current capabilities, conventions and organizational structures

# **RSU No. 5 Performance Indicator Task Force**

## **Report to the Board of Directors**

May 12, 2010

### **The Task Force's Charge and Composition**

As a part of its work on the *Strategic Framework*, the RSU No. 5 Board of Directors reviewed an initial set of pre-existing indicators of student achievement (see *Adopted Strategic Framework 2/24/10*). As a next step, the Board asked the superintendent to create a task force to evaluate and expand the list of indicators to create a comprehensive set of indicators of student achievement that tie directly to the *Strategic Framework*. This set of indicators must be 1) measurable; 2) communicate success to parents and the broader public; and 3) be usable by district teachers and administrators and the RSU No. 5 Board to guide ongoing improvement efforts. This comprehensive list of indicators along with available baseline and target data will be presented to the RSU No. 5 Board for review in March /April and for final approval in May 2010.

An open invitation to participate on the Performance Indicator Task Force was extended to parents, community, staff and students via several *Delivering on the Mission* e-mails from Dr. Shannon Welsh, Superintendent of RSU No. 5. The Task Force was composed of teachers (10), students (3), parents/community members (3), administrators (3), Board of Directors member (1), and included representatives from each of RSN No. 5's six schools and three communities (See Appendix A).

The Task Force met on Thursday, March 11, 2010 for six hours, Monday, April 12 for two hours, and again on Monday, May 3 for two hours. David Ruff, Co-Director of Great Schools Partnership, facilitated the group's work. Sarah Simmonds, RSU No. 5's Curriculum Director, provided additional support.

### **Beginning to Develop Potential Indicators List**

On the morning of March 11, Dr. Shannon Welsh, Superintendent, welcomed the group, outlined its charge, and then turned the meeting over to David. After an initial overview and outline of the day's work, participants worked in small groups and also had large group conversations to brainstorm responses to the following questions:

1. What do we want to know as a result of having a comprehensive set of educational indicators?
2. What criteria does the system need to meet? What criteria does each indicator need to meet?

In the afternoon, the group worked initially in small groups and had large group conversations later as they began developing a list of potential indicators (See Appendix B). At the end of the day it was determined that further work was necessary in order to more definitively identify the performance indicators, and make recommendations to the RSU No. 5 Board of Directors.

The group agreed that Sarah Simmonds and David Ruff would meet to do further work to bring back to the group for an afternoon "reaction session" and to finalize the group's work. A meeting date for the Task Force was set for Monday, April 12 from 4:00-6:00 at the Freeport High School Library.



## **Analyzing Meeting Information**

At the conclusion of the March 11<sup>th</sup> meeting, Sarah and David reviewed the list of potential indicators and determined that 1) they fell into 3 categories and, 2) there were connections to/implications for future curriculum work that needed to be explored and, 3) there were connections to/implications for the work planned for the identification of work and college readiness skills, and assessments that demonstrate those work and college readiness skills that needed to be explored.

The brainstormed list of potential indicators developed by the Task Force was categorized in the following ways:

- 1) HAVE: Those PIs for which assessments exist currently and the data can be collected this year for baseline data.
- 2) NEED WORK: Those PIs that require the use of existing assessments or information, but need some work in order to meet the criteria (valid, reliable...), and/or require some research and decision making. Data from these measures would not be collected this year, but work would take place (spring?, summer?, fall 2010?) in order to be able to use the measures and collect baseline data in 2010-11.
- 3) TO BE DEVELOPED: Those PIs that require development of assessments. These are the PIs/assessments that make connections to and have significant implications for both the work with work/college readiness standards and assessments, and also to future curriculum work. A timeline for these assessments might look like: development in 2010-11, piloting in 2010-11/2011-12, and baseline data would be available in 2012-13.

On March 30, 2010, Sarah and David met to more deeply analyze the possible indicators work and to prepare information and materials for the next meeting of the Task Force. The following items were developed to present to the Task Force at their April 12 meeting:

1. A template with detailed information about each performance indicator (See Appendix C).
2. An analysis of the assessment types and data points represented in the possible indicators (See Appendix D).

## **Finalizing the Work**

The Task Force initially reconvened on April 12, with an additional meeting scheduled for May 3, to review and discuss the materials, and to make decisions. For each proposed indicator a number of discussion points and decisions were necessary. The group worked through the benefits and challenges for each decision point, and came to understand the many layers and intricacies that are involved with making decisions about what data will be collected, how it will be collected, and how it will be reported.

A draft of the Task Force's work was shared with members of the Strategic Planning Sub-Committee of the RSU No. 5 Board of Directors at their April 6 meeting. Questions posed by this committee were woven into the Task Force's work on April 12 and May 3. A document was created in a question and answer format that outlines some of the key decisions that were made by the Task Force along with their rationale (See Appendix E).

## **Next Steps**

The work of the Task Force will be presented to the RSU No. 5 Board of Directors at their May 12, 2010 meeting. The members of the Task Force support the proposed performance indicators and recommend that the Board of Directors take action to approve them as written.

Once approved, work can begin to develop the various collection processes that will be necessary to gather the data that currently is available for several of the indicators. For those indicators requiring development, refinement, and norming, various committees either are in place or will be established to carry out this work.

For example, a representative group will be convened in late June to identify the work and college readiness skills and develop the tools that will be used to score student assessments of those standards. Over the course of the 2010-11 school year, this work will be used by district level curriculum committees to develop student exhibitions that will be embedded within the identified grade/course level curricula. Piloting and refinement of these exhibitions will take place during the 2011-12 school year, with baseline data to be gathered in 2012-13. A similar process will be used to carry out the work that will be necessary in order to gather data around district writing prompts at various grade levels.

The work that is necessary in order to be able to gather data on the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) indicator will involve the RSU's literacy specialists. These staff members began meeting during the course of the 2009-10 school year and have already begun to identify places where there is consistency across the RSU, and where there are opportunities for working together to strengthen and enhance the consistency of administration, and use of the DRA to improve student learning.

A key element for all of this work to take place will be the development of aligned building and district level plans for the use of professional development time and resources in order to make progress toward the goals outlined in the Strategic Framework. Building and district level administrators have already begun these conversations and will be meeting both as a district level team and building teams to formalize and coordinate these plans. Utilizing a continuous improvement approach and continued support in the form of professional development time and funding will be essential for success.

## **APPENDIX**

**APPENDIX A****RSU No. 5 Performance Indicator Task Force  
Participants**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>
David Ruff	Facilitator Great Schools Partnership
Sarah Simmonds	Curriculum Director RSU No. 5
Monique Culbertson	Durham Parent/Community Member
Kelly Fitz-Randolf	Freeport Parent/Community Member
Kristen Dorsey	RSU No. 5 Board of Directors
Liza Moore	Teacher Mast Landing School
Lois Kilby-Chesley	Teacher Mast Landing School
Beth Daniels	Teacher Durham Elementary School
Susan Smith	Special Education Teacher Freeport Middle School
Pam Lizotte	Guidance Counselor Durham Elem. School
Beth Markelon	Teacher Morse Street School
Terry Lincoln	Teacher Morse Street School
Hank Ogilby	Teacher Freeport High School
Hannah Goodenow	Senior Freeport High School
Lauren Parker	Senior Freeport High School
Annika Leavitt	Pownal Parent/Community Member
Beth Willhoite	Administrator Mast Landing School
Deidre Carr	Teacher Freeport High School
Ray Grogan	Administrator Freeport Middle School
Beth Moulton	Teacher Pownal Elementary School
Ian Connelly	Senior Freeport High School

## APPENDIX B

### Brainstorm of Possible Indicators of Student Learning and Discussion Notes

Performance Indicator Task Force

March 11, 2010

This document reflects the information generated by the Performance Indicator Task Force at their meeting on March 11, 2010 regarding possible indicators of student learning, as well as notes from the group conversation about each item.

The items listed in the first section below were shared with the large group based on small group conversations. There was more group conversation and general sense of agreement about the items in this section than those in the second section below however; a formal vote on each item was not taken.

1. NWEA- to include % of students meeting their NWEA growth targets (Grades? Both tests?)
2. % of students at proficient or better on NECAP
3. Double scored writing prompt grades 2-12 (HS school-wide fall writing prompt)
4. HS English Writing Portfolios (9<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> grade), cumulative, particular types of writing (rubric is the same for both)
5. Senior Project (currently an option, not a graduation requirement currently) (honors, merit, pass, fail) (oral presentation rubric)
6. What about % of students who do choose to participate in the Senior Project? (keep in mind that in some cases students do not have a choice to do Sr. Proj. given that they are in academic difficulty or absent too often...so would want to keep track or account for that.)
7. Reading level benchmarks along the way and times to report out.
8. Graduation rate- 4 year, 5 year or 6 year? Or attendance at a post-secondary?
9. Exhibition- % of students proficient in a K-12 standards-based portfolio with an exhibition at various “knee-joint” grades (2<sup>nd</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, HS). Perhaps infuse/enhance with specific/particular requirements- arts, science, social studies, research... (There seemed to be a particular amount of positive energy around this item from multiple groups.)

These were items that came from small group conversations and were shared with the large group. In some cases (#s10-14) we had time to be able to go back to the items and take an informal “group vote” about whether each item should move forward or not. Remaining items were brought to the group with some discussion, but a group vote was not taken.

10. Common Algebra 1 final and Basic Skills Test (for HS placement- all 8<sup>th</sup> graders unless they took Alg. 1 as an 8<sup>th</sup> grader), How about the % of 8<sup>th</sup> graders who “pass” the Basic Skills Test? (*Group Vote- NO*)
11. 6<sup>th</sup> grade math test? (*Group Vote- Maybe*) (Students say students will take this more seriously)
12. EDM end of year secure skills? (*Group Vote- NO*)
13. HS Research paper? (earlier grades?) (see Scarb. Process- research each year with a theme/focus, woven into the Big 6, one year focus on science, the next social studies) (weave into others above?)
14. World Lang. competencies (not all) (*Group Vote- NO*)
15. Common visual presentation rubric (NEASC) (school-wide holistic rubric) (weave these rubrics into some of the other projects above)

16. Community Service Project (vs. Service Learning Project)- There is an existing community service project in the American Studies (still to be worked out, there is a need/desire to do this but more to be worked out, perhaps woven into others above?)
17. SAT
18. Course passing (Helpful to know at various “worry points” how many students are a grade/two below reading level- DRA? Done the same everywhere? Subjectivity? Will need to talk more about?)
19. Co-Curricular participation (May be disaggregated to the various types of activities- sports, arts, community service...and the # of students who do more than one- Maybe look at the numbers of students who are NOT participating?)

## APPENDIX C: Proposed Academic Performance Indicators

Type	Standardized Tests		
<b>Measure</b>	NWEA	NECAP	SAT
<b>Metric</b>	Percent of students who meet their growth targets from spring to spring administration of the test. When an individual student scores come from two different schools, growth will be reported from the school involved in the second administration of the test.	Percent of students who meet or exceed the standard in grades noted.	Percent of students who meet or exceed the standard in grades noted.
<b>Target</b>	Math & Reading	Math & Reading	Math, Reading and Writing
<b>Grade(s)</b>	4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	3, 5, 8	11
<b>Baseline</b>	Spring 2009 and Spring 2010	2009/10	2008/09
<b>Guidance</b>	Only include students who are enrolled at RSU No. 5 for both administrations of the test. Scores will be combined into one score for math and one score for reading for the district as a whole. School-by-school data will be available upon request.	Measures change from one class to the next class. Data will be reported in the aggregate at the district level.	Measure changes from one class to the next class. Data will be reported in the aggregate.
<b>Comparison Set</b>	NWEA national norm group	RSU No. 5 aggregate scores will be published with similar scores for Brunswick, Falmouth, SAD 15, SAD 51, Lisbon, and Yarmouth	RSU No. 5 aggregate scores will be published with similar scores for Brunswick, Falmouth, SAD 15, SAD 51, Lisbon, and Yarmouth, and Maine
<b>Data Points</b>	2	6	3
<b>Scoring</b>	External	External	External
<b>Status</b>	Existing	Existing	Existing

Type	Outcome	
<b>Measure</b>	Graduation Rates	Post Secondary
<b>Metric</b>	Percent of 9 <sup>th</sup> grade students who meet graduation requirements within four years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Percent of graduating seniors who attend 2 year institutions, 4 year institutions, within the 1<sup>st</sup> year, the 2<sup>nd</sup> year, and the 5<sup>th</sup> year after graduation.</li> <li>•Percent of graduating seniors who enter the military, certificate programs, employment, and other within the 1<sup>st</sup> year and the 2<sup>nd</sup> year after graduation.</li> </ul>
<b>Target</b>	Outcome	Outcome
<b>Grade(s)</b>	All	All
<b>Baseline</b>	2008/09	2008/09
<b>Guidance</b>	Will use state issued metric.	RSU No.5 will start with NSC data. The high school will follow up with individual students who are not identified.
<b>Comparison Set</b>	RSU No. 5 aggregate scores will be published with similar scores for Brunswick, Cape Elizabeth, Falmouth, SAD 15, SAD 51, SAD 75, and Yarmouth, and Maine	If possible, NSC data from comparison districts will be published with RSU No. 5 scores. As involvement with NSC is not a required, access to such data may not be possible.
<b>Data Points</b>	1	10
<b>Scoring</b>	External	External and Internal
<b>Status</b>	In development by Maine DOE	In development by RSU No. 5



Type	Performance Assessment
Measure	Exhibitions
Metric	TBD. Will look at student performance levels on the to-be-created rubric.
Target	Work and college readiness skills
Grade(s)	Propose 2, 5, 8, 12 <i>Could be 2, 4, 7, 12. TBD during Exhibition development.</i>
Baseline	2012/13
Guidance	Structure developed in 2010/11; pilot in 2011/12; baseline in 2012/13. This will build off of preexisting exhibitions already in place within RSU No. 5. Allow flexibility to adjust during development process.
Comparison Set	No comparison districts
Data Points	4, most likely
Scoring	Internal
Status	To be developed

Type	Constructed Response	
Measure	Developmental Reading Assessment	District Writing Prompt
Metric	Percent of students scoring at different reading levels	Percentage of students scoring at different writing levels
Target	Reading	Writing
Grade(s)	K, 1, 2	Propose 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 <i>TBD during development</i>
Baseline	2010/11	2010/11
Guidance	Norming across district needs to occur	Propose- Structure developed in 2010/11; pilot in 2011/12; baseline in 2012/13. This will build off of preexisting exhibitions already in place within RSU No. 5. Allow flexibility to adjust during development process.
Comparison Set	No comparison districts	No comparison districts
Data Points	5	11
Scoring	Internal	Internal
Status	To be refined and normed	To be developed and/or refined and normed

Type	Participation	
<b>Measure</b>	Co-curricular Participation	Advanced Placement Participation
<b>Metric</b>	The percents of students who participate in school sponsored activities that occur outside of the school day or outside of class periods. This could include before school, after school, or during lunch. Students do not earn course credit for these activities.	The percent of students who participate in Advanced Placement courses.
<b>Target</b>	Student Involvement	Student Involvement
<b>Grade(s)</b>	6-12	9-12
<b>Baseline</b>	2009/2010	2008/2009
<b>Guidance</b>	<p>Data will be collected in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percent of students in grades 6-8 participating in at least one activity</li> <li>• Percent of students in grades 6-8 participating in three or more activities</li> <li>• Percent of students in grades 9-12 participating in at least one activity</li> <li>• Percent of students in grades 9-12 participating in three or more activities</li> </ul> <p>From each 6-8 building and the HS, we will need the total number of student for each of the two applicable categories, split into athletic and non-athletic activities, and the total number of students enrolled at any point during the school year.</p> <p>Students who leave the school are not removed from the total count of students. Students who are enrolled, leave and return are only counted one time.</p>	The percent will be determined by calculating the number of students enrolled in an AP course on April 1 <sup>st</sup> , over the total number of students enrolled in the school on April 1 <sup>st</sup> .
<b>Comparison Set</b>	No comparison districts	No comparison districts
<b>Data Points</b>	4	1
<b>Scoring</b>	Internal	Internal
<b>Status</b>	Need to create the official list of activities. Data will be collected for the 2009/2010 school year.	Data is available for 2008/2009 and 2009/2010 school years

## **APPENDIX D: Summary of Data Points**

Standardized Tests:	11 data points
Performance Assessments:	4 data points
Outcome Data:	11 data points
Constructed Response:	16 data points
Participation:	5 data points

## **APPENDIX E: Anticipated Questions about Various Decision Points**

1. Why did the Task Force decide not to use any specific standardized testing data on science?

The Task Force was conscious of not overweighting any single type of measure to evaluate overall system performance. Consequently, despite additional measures being possible through standardized testing, the task force felt that the current assessment points provide strong and adequate information on the success of the system. At an individual school and classroom level, these data will be used to review curriculum, organizational structures, and overall learning environments.

2. NECAP provides data on additional years. Why did the Task Force decide not to use these additional data points?

Again, these additional data points can be very helpful when undertaking an in-depth review of the learning program at a school (an activity routinely done by teachers and administrators and the building and district level), but the additional data do not necessarily provide a clearer overall picture of the progress of the district as a system.

3. NECAP provides data on writing. Why did the Task Force decide not to use these data?

The Task Force identified district developed writing prompts at various grade levels as one of the performance indicators. The data from these writing prompts will provide in-depth information regarding student writing skills to enhance instructional practice. The task force believed that it would be more beneficial to use these strategies to measure student writing abilities as the assessment process provides more detailed information and supports better instructional practice.

4. How did you determine the comparison districts?

The Task Force used three criteria: 1) geographic location, looking at the immediate neighboring districts with a few beyond the immediate ring; 2) ensuring diversity in terms of socioeconomic demographics; 3) diversity in terms of district sizes; and 4) a combination of rural and suburban populations (urban populations were not considered necessary as no RSU No. 5 students live in urban situations).

5. Why did the Task Force decide not to report data by individual school for the purposes of the strategic plan?

These data are readily available on various websites and will be used individually at the school level. However, the intent of the RSU No. 5 strategic plan is to gauge the health and success of the district as a system. Consequently, the Task Force felt that presenting data at the aggregate systems level best met these criteria.

6. Why did the Task Force decide not to track course passing rates?

Currently, decisions on course grades are made teacher by teacher based on a combination of factors including test and quiz scores, attendance, class participation, projects, and homework. The specific “weighting” of various elements is determined by each teacher. Consequently, comparing grades would essentially be comparing disparate data. One commitment of the Strategic Framework is to implement standards-based instruction and reporting. As this is undertaken and finalized, the district may be able to

revisit this decision and decide to use this measure in the future.

7. Why don't we have baseline data for several of the indicators?

Data gathering on a system that has over 1800 moving parts (students) represents an extremely complex process. This process has been further complicated by the creation of a single district in RSU No. 5. Consequently, the data gathering process outlined here will require the creation of new collection systems to accomplish this. In addition, several of these measures themselves—let alone the collection system—are necessary but not yet created. These indicators provide both an initial system and a road map for the build up of a system that will ultimately provide a clearer picture of student learning in RSU No. 5.