

**STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09****Greenwich School District**

BETTY J. STERNBERG, Superintendent  
Telephone: (203) 625-7425

Location: Havemeyer Building  
Greenwich,  
Connecticut

Website: [www.greenwichschools.org/](http://www.greenwichschools.org/)

---

This profile was produced by the Connecticut State Department of Education in accordance with CT General Statutes 10-220(c) using data and narratives provided by the school district, testing services, or the US Census. Profiles and additional education data, including longitudinal data, are available on the internet at [www.sde.ct.gov](http://www.sde.ct.gov).

---

**COMMUNITY DATA**

County: Fairfield	Per Capita Income in 2000: \$74,346
Town Population in 2000: 61,101	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 8.5%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 4.6%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 3.2%
Number of Public Schools: 15	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 73.1%

\*To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://www.sde.ct.gov) and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

---

District Reference Group (DRG): B DRG is a classification of districts whose students' families are similar in education, income, occupation, and need, and that have roughly similar enrollment. The Connecticut State Board of Education approved DRG classification for purposes of reporting data other than student performance.

---

**STUDENT ENROLLMENT**

Enrollment on October 1, 2008 8,867  
5-Year Enrollment Change -2.3%

**DISTRICT GRADE RANGE**

Grade Range PK-12

**INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED**

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	925	10.4	6.4	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	513	5.9	2.2	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	967	10.9	6.6	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	978	11.0	10.2	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	639	94.9	91.3	79.7
Homeless	4	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	122	8.9	14.2	19.0

\*100.0% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

## SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	6	0.1
Asian American	764	8.6
Black	229	2.6
Hispanic	1,245	14.0
White	6,623	74.7
Total Minority	2,244	25.3

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff:** 9.1%

**Non-English Home Language:** 18.4% of this district's students (excluding prekindergarten students) come from homes where English is not the primary language. The number of non-English home languages is 45.

---

### EFFORTS TO REDUCE RACIAL, ETHNIC, AND ECONOMIC ISOLATION

---

Below is the description submitted by this school of how it provides educational opportunities for its students to interact with students and teachers from diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds.

Greenwich is characterized by socioeconomic and demographic diversity. While per capita income is among the highest in Connecticut, ten percent of the children enrolled in public school qualify for free or reduced price meals. Eighteen percent of the school population comes from homes where English is not the dominant language and six percent of students are not fluent in English. Minority students total twenty five percent of the school population. Given this diversity, efforts to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation have focused primarily on bridging the gaps within the town rather than developing relationships with other communities.

The primary challenge to reducing economic, ethnic and racial isolation within the Town of Greenwich is geographic. While sufficient building capacity exists to accommodate enrollment, a long-standing tradition of neighborhood elementary schools and recent patterns of enrollment growth have contributed to racial imbalance in some schools and overcrowding in others. In the late 1990's, the district developed a plan to reconfigure some buildings into "magnet" or theme schools. The hope was to induce the parents in overcrowded elementary attendance areas to voluntarily choose to send their children to one of the magnet schools. Since the magnet schools tend to have a higher percentage of minority students and the overcrowded schools a lower percentage of minority students than the district average, the magnet schools would serve to distribute elementary enrollment more efficiently across the eleven school buildings and reduce racial imbalance.

The first intradistrict magnet school, International School at Dundee, opened in September 2000, and was followed by Hamilton Avenue School in 2002 and Julian Curtiss School in 2003. The Dundee magnet was successful in attracting an enrollment that reflects the overall diversity of the school system. The growth of the minority population at Julian Curtiss School has stabilized since the magnet opened and is now just below the threshold for "impending racial imbalance." The magnet program has been less successful at Hamilton Avenue School due to facilities issues. Hamilton Avenue is now located in a renovated facility with capacity sufficient to address racial imbalance through the magnet program. A fourth magnet school is scheduled to open at New Lebanon School in the fall of 2009.

---

## STUDENT PERFORMANCE

**Connecticut Mastery Test, Fourth Generation, % Meeting State Goal.** The Goal level is more demanding than the Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards.

Grade and CMT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Grade 3 Reading	72.3	54.6	75.5
Writing	82.3	62.5	86.8
Mathematics	76.5	62.8	66.0
Grade 4 Reading	79.6	60.7	83.4
Writing	80.2	64.2	81.2
Mathematics	79.1	63.6	72.0
Grade 5 Reading	82.0	66.0	74.5
Writing	84.9	66.5	88.9
Mathematics	83.5	68.8	75.9
Science	71.5	58.1	56.8
Grade 6 Reading	83.8	68.9	69.9
Writing	81.0	62.2	80.4
Mathematics	83.5	68.8	66.9
Grade 7 Reading	84.0	74.9	61.8
Writing	76.5	62.9	70.1
Mathematics	81.0	66.0	69.4
Grade 8 Reading	84.3	68.4	74.2
Writing	80.0	66.5	66.5
Mathematics	82.9	64.5	73.5
Science	75	60.6	60.0

These results reflect the performance of students with scoreable tests who were enrolled in the district at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the district. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

For more detailed CMT results, go to [www.ctreports.com](http://www.ctreports.com).

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://www.sde.ct.gov) and click on "No Child Left Behind."

**Connecticut Academic Performance Test, Third Generation, % Meeting State Goal.** The CAPT is administered to Grade 10 students. The Goal level is more demanding than the state Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards. The following results reflect the performance of students with scoreable tests who were enrolled in the school at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the school. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

CAPT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Reading Across the Disciplines	71.0	47.4	84.8
Writing Across the Disciplines	79.1	55.0	87.0
Mathematics	70.1	47.8	80.2
Science	61.5	42.8	74.0

For more detailed CAPT results, go to [www.ctreports.com](http://www.ctreports.com).

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://www.sde.ct.gov) and click on "No Child Left Behind."

**Physical Fitness.** The assessment includes tests for flexibility, abdominal strength and endurance, upper-body strength and aerobic endurance.

Physical Fitness: % of Students Reaching Health Standard on All Four Tests	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard
	48.2	36.2	80.5

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		89.7	74.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	578	507	93.8
	Critical Reading	562	503	94.6
	Writing	571	506	94.6

**SAT® I.** The lowest possible score on each SAT® I subtest is 200; the highest possible score is 800.

Graduation and Dropout Rates	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Less Desirable Rates
Graduation Rate, Class of 2008	97.5	92.1	72.5
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	2.3	6.6	70.1
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.9	2.5	59.1

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	87.7	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	7.2	11.0

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	633.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	50.20
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	93.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	137.00
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	37.50
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	20.50
School Level	41.70
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	21.80
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	62.31
School Nurses	17.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	392.32

In the full-time equivalent (FTE) count, staff members working part-time in the school district are counted as a fraction of full-time. For example, a teacher who works half-time in the district contributes 0.50 to the district's staff count.

Teachers and Instructors	District	DRG	State
Average Years of Experience in Education	14.0	13.7	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	89.4	83.3	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	17.7	18.4	18.3
Grade 2	20.6	19.4	19.3
Grade 5	21.6	22.0	21.0
Grade 7	21.6	21.6	20.5
High School	20.0	20.0	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	954	991	988
Middle School	1,059	1,018	1,016
High School	1,027	977	1,007

\*State law requires that at least 900 hours of instruction be offered to students in grade 1-12 and full-day kindergarten, and 450 hours to half-day kindergarten students.

Students Per Academic Computer	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School*	2.9	3.4	3.3
Middle School	2.1	2.5	2.6
High School	3.5	2.9	2.4

\*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

## DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2007-08

Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources. DRG and state figures will not be comparable to the district if the school district does not teach both elementary and secondary students.

Expenditures All figures are unaudited.	Total (in 1000s)	Expenditures Per Pupil			
		District	PK-12 Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$99,053	\$11,045	\$7,521	\$7,233	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$3,065	\$342	\$267	\$245	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$3,338	\$372	\$461	\$461	\$446
Student Support Services	\$9,825	\$1,096	\$808	\$862	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$14,997	\$1,672	\$1,351	\$1,342	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$17,057	\$1,902	\$1,382	\$1,386	\$1,377
Transportation	\$4,544	\$468	\$649	\$575	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$3,002	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$0	\$0	\$152	\$164	\$151
<b>Total</b>	\$154,881	\$17,328	\$12,869	\$12,531	\$12,805
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$16,747	\$1,867	\$1,791	\$1,180	\$1,759

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$31740869	20.5	19.2	20.5

**Revenue Sources, % of Expenditures from Source.** Revenue sources do not include state funded Teachers' Retirement Board contributions, vocational-technical school operations, SDE budgeted costs for salaries and leadership activities and other state-funded school districts (e.g., Dept. of Children and Families and Dept. of Corrections).

District Expenditures	Local Revenue	State Revenue	Federal Revenue	Tuition & Other
Including School Construction	94.7	3.1	1.8	0.4
Excluding School Construction	94.5	3.1	2.0	0.4

---

**EQUITABLE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES AMONG DISTRICT SCHOOLS**


---

Below is the description submitted by this district of how it allocates resources to insure equity and address needs.

Staff and budget resources are allocated to schools on a per pupil basis using projected enrollments. Adjustments to this per pupil allocation are made based on student need and performance. Principals and program leaders then develop a spending plan based on the improvement priorities of their buildings or programs. Additional funds are available to schools with high need student populations through the Consolidated Grant. A fifteen-year capital plan, which is reviewed and adjusted annually, ensures the maintenance of district facilities.

---



---

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**


---

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	963
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	11.1%

---

<b>Of All K-12 Students for Whom District is Financially Responsible, Number and Percentage with Disabilities</b>				
<b>Disability</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>District Percent</b>	<b>DRG Percent</b>	<b>State Percent</b>
Autism	76	0.9	1.0	0.8
Learning Disability	340	3.9	3.5	3.9
Intellectual Disability	24	0.3	0.3	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	61	0.7	0.6	1.0
Speech Impairment	249	2.9	2.1	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	185	2.1	2.1	2.1
Other Disabilities**	28	0.3	0.7	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>963</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>11.6</b>

\*Includes chronic health problems such as attention deficit disorders and epilepsy

\*\*Includes hearing, visual, and orthopedic impairments, deaf-blindness, multiple disabilities, traumatic brain injury, and developmental delay

<b>Graduation and Dropout Rates of Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>State</b>
% Who Graduated in 2007-08 with a Standard Diploma	96.9	81.4
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	N/A	3.5

## STATE ASSESSMENTS

**Percent of Students with Disabilities Meeting State Goal.** The Goal level is more demanding than the Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards. These results are for students attending district schools who participated in the standard assessment with or without accommodations for their disabilities. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

- **Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT), Fourth Generation.** The CMT reading, writing and mathematics tests are administered to students in Grades 3 through 8, and the CMT science test to students in Grades 5 and 8.
- **Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT), Third Generation.** The CAPT is administered to Grade 10 students.

State Assessment		Students with Disabilities		All Students	
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	43.5	30.2	81.0	65.7
	Writing	36.3	19.5	80.8	64.1
	Mathematics	46.5	30.7	81.1	65.7
	Science	41.3	23.8	73.2	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	41.1	14.1	71.0	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	51.6	13.6	79.1	55.0
	Mathematics	32.8	15.4	70.1	47.8
	Science	18.8	10.6	61.5	42.8

For more detailed CMT or CAPT results, go to [www.ctreports.com](http://www.ctreports.com). To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://www.sde.ct.gov) and click on “No Child Left Behind.”

Participation in State Assessments of Students with Disabilities Attending District Schools		
CMT	% Without Accommodations	24.1
	% With Accommodations	75.9
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	27.7
	% With Accommodations	72.3
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		5.5

Accommodations for a student’s disability may be made to allow him or her to participate in testing. Students whose disabilities prevent them from taking the test even with accommodations are assessed by means of a list of skills aligned to the same content and grade level standards as the CMT and CAPT.

Federal law requires that students with disabilities be educated with their non-disabled peers as much as is appropriate. Placement in separate educational facilities tends to reduce the chances of students with disabilities interacting with non-disabled peers, and of receiving the same education.

K-12 Students with Disabilities Placed in Educational Settings Other Than This District’s Schools		
Placement	Count	Percent
Public Schools in Other Districts	0	0.0
Private Schools or Other Settings	32	3.3

Number and Percentage of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible by the Percentage of Time They Spent with Their Non-Disabled Peers				
Time Spent with Non-Disabled Peers	Count of Students	Percent of Students		
		District	DRG	State
79.1 to 100 Percent of Time	803	83.4	75.9	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	95	9.9	17.2	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	65	6.7	6.9	11.2

---

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The mission of the Greenwich Public Schools is to educate all students to the highest levels of academic achievement; enable them to reach and expand their potential; and prepare them to become productive, responsible, ethical, creative and compassionate members of society. The Greenwich Board of Education sets strategic directions and specific indicators of success as a means of measuring progress toward achieving this vision and mission and providing focus for improvement efforts.

The Connecticut Mastery Test and the Connecticut Academic Performance Test are state-mandated measures of core academic skills. After increasing steadily during the 1990's, the percentage of students performing at or above the goal in reading, writing and mathematics on the CMT in grades three through eight has remained relatively unchanged over the last four years. Tenth grade CAPT scores have moved up and down within a range over the last five years. In response to this "leveling off" of improvement in scores and continuing disparities in performance among disaggregated subgroups of students, the district adopted a strategic direction of accelerating achievement for all students and closing gaps in achievement among subgroups of students. Key initiatives to improve student achievement during the 2008-2009 school year included refining the implementation of mathematics and literacy programs in grades K -8, initiating a review of the science curriculum, and expanding supplemental programs for students performing below grade level standards.

A second district strategic direction focuses on transforming classroom practice through leadership development, high quality supervision of classroom instruction, alignment of assessment to instruction, and better use of data to drive decisions. Leadership training focused on instructional best practice, increasing the time administrators spend in the classroom working with teachers, and using data to set meaningful goals for school and program improvement. The teacher evaluation plan was reviewed and rewritten by a cross role group of teachers and administrators to better define research-based standards for classroom instruction. The revised plan was piloted during the 2007-2008 school year with professional development provided for both teachers and administrators during the 2008-2009 school year. The teacher evaluation plan will be fully implemented in 2009-2010. Finally, the standardized testing program was broadened to include assessments of technology literacy in fifth and eighth grade. The development of benchmark assessments was initiated in reading and mathematics at the elementary level to provide teachers with data necessary to improve instruction during the course of the school year.

A third district strategic direction seeks to build relationships by aligning teachers, administrators, parents, staff, and members of the community in support of improving teaching and learning. The district mission statement was reviewed by the Board of Education during the 2007-2008 school year with revisions adopted in the fall of 2008. A representative group of community members and educators conducted a broad review of the secondary program and developed a district "Vision of the Graduate." In the spring of 2009, a district data team was formed to set improvement targets for academic achievement, develop a three year district action plan, and ensure the alignment of school improvement plans to district goals. A district-wide approach to measuring success on key performance measures has been implemented allowing the Board and the public to monitor progress toward the fulfillment of the district mission.

---