

**STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2009-10****Greenwich School District**

SIDNEY FREUND, Superintendent

Location: Havemeyer Building

Telephone: (203) 625-7425

Greenwich,  
ConnecticutWebsite: [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

Town Population in 2000: 61,101

1990-2000 Population Growth: 4.6%

Number of Public Schools: 15

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$74,346

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 8.5%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000\*: 3.2%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 72.6%

\*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, 2009 8,847  
5-Year Enrollment Change -2.8%

**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	1,037	11.7	7.7	32.6
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	487	5.6	2.1	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	917	10.4	6.5	4.1
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	974	11.0	10.1	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	670	96.3	90.7	80.5
Homeless	3	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	129	9.7	12.1	13.6

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

## SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	8	0.1
Asian American	779	8.8
Black	262	3.0
Hispanic	1,239	14.0
White	6,559	74.2
Total Minority	2,288	25.9

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff:** 9.2%

**Non-English Home Language:**

18.3% 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 46.

---

### 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, twelve 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 six 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, recent patterns of enrollment growth have contributed to racial imbalance in some neighborhood 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 and relieving overcrowding in elementary schools located in the eastern section of the town. 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 opened at New Lebanon School in the fall of 2009. While magnet enrollment is increasing at both Hamilton Avenue and New Lebanon, both schools continue to be racially imbalanced.

---

## STUDENT PERFORMANCE

**Connecticut Mastery Test, Fourth Generation, % 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	76.1	57.0	79.8
Writing	78.9	58.3	90.2
Mathematics	76.1	62.4	68.1
Grade 4 Reading	77.7	59.9	78.6
Writing	80.4	63.6	78.8
Mathematics	80.3	67.0	70.4
Grade 5 Reading	79.9	61.8	75.8
Writing	83.5	68.2	75.9
Mathematics	86.5	72.4	72.3
Science	72.3	59.4	54.8
Grade 6 Reading	88.7	74.9	74.8
Writing	79.0	65.9	66.5
Mathematics	83.5	70.7	63.2
Grade 7 Reading	90.5	77.4	72.7
Writing	76.7	61.2	69.5
Mathematics	83.6	68.5	67.5
Grade 8 Reading	84.1	73.3	62.4
Writing	77.6	62.6	70.1
Mathematics	80.1	67.3	63.7
Science	73.7	62.8	49.7

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 scorable 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	66.0	45.9	74.2
Writing Across the Disciplines	81.2	59.6	82.0
Mathematics	71.3	48.7	80.3
Science	64.0	45.3	72.7

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
	68.6	50.7	88.5

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2009		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		75.6	68.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	592	508	95.3
	Critical Reading	569	503	93.0
	Writing	577	506	93.0

**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 2009	97.7	91.3	75.4
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.5	3.0	78.7

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	91.5	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	3.6	10.4

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	628.80
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	0.00
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	99.90
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	0.00
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	19.50
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	18.40
School Level	41.80
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	19.50
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	62.81
School Nurses	17.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	599.88

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	14.2	13.8
% with Master's Degree or Above	88.6	84.7	77.8

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	18.8	18.4	18.5
Grade 2	19.2	19.6	19.7
Grade 5	21.4	21.8	21.1
Grade 7	19.9	21.7	20.8
High School	20.7	20.1	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	954	990	992
Middle School	1,059	1,023	1,018
High School	1,027	981	1,006

\*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*	3.0	3.3	3.2
Middle School	2.4	2.5	2.5
High School	2.5	2.6	2.3

\*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

### DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2008-09

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	\$101,322	\$11,427	\$7,819	\$7,576	\$7,829
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$3,331	\$376	\$274	\$268	\$279
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$3,238	\$365	\$474	\$503	\$459
Student Support Services	\$10,364	\$1,169	\$863	\$912	\$859
Administration and Support Services	\$14,974	\$1,689	\$1,405	\$1,364	\$1,426
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$17,117	\$1,930	\$1,469	\$1,412	\$1,462
Transportation	\$4,560	\$474	\$701	\$617	\$694
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$3,193	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$0	\$0	\$163	\$159	\$162
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$158,098</b>	<b>\$17,909</b>	<b>\$13,458</b>	<b>\$13,145</b>	<b>\$13,386</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$21,095	\$2,379	\$1,864	\$1,228	\$1,825

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$32,493,509	20.6	19.8	20.7

**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	94.3	3.7	1.7	0.3
Excluding School Construction	94.5	3.3	1.9	0.3

---

**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	953
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	11.0%

---

<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	80	0.9	1.1	1.0
Learning Disability	350	4.0	3.4	3.9
Intellectual Disability	24	0.3	0.3	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	50	0.6	0.5	1.0
Speech Impairment	242	2.8	2.0	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	180	2.1	2.1	2.1
Other Disabilities**	27	0.3	0.7	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>953</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>10.1</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 2008-09 with a Standard Diploma	97.8	81.0
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	0.5	4.1

## 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	44.1	31.6	82.6	67.5
	Writing	34.0	19.6	79.4	63.3
	Mathematics	45.6	32.9	81.6	68.1
	Science	32.7	23.7	73.0	61.1
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	42.5	13.8	66.0	45.9
	Writing Across the Disciplines	43.8	16.8	81.2	59.6
	Mathematics	46.3	16.7	71.3	48.7
	Science	31.5	13.0	64.0	45.3

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	17.8
	% With Accommodations	82.2
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	0.0
	% With Accommodations	100.0
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		3.9

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	23	2.4

### 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	800	83.9	77.2	73.4
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	109	11.4	15.8	15.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	44	4.6	7.0	11.3

---

**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. In response to a “leveling off” of improvement in standardized test scores and continuing disparities in performance among disaggregated subgroups of students, the district formed a “data team” 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. The current three year District improvement plan includes the following strategies: Implement and monitor a new teacher evaluation and professional learning plan (TEPL). TEPL focuses on improving the capacity of our teachers to teach. TEPL creates a system of continuous improvement that sets high expectations for performance and holds both teachers and administrators accountable for meeting those standards. TEPL provides clear and consistent expectations for instruction across the District at all levels. The teaching and learning indicators represent current best practices and are aligned with research that connects these teacher behaviors with improved student outcomes. Build capacity within the school system to collaborate around student data and student needs through district, school and instructional data teams & student assistance teams. The District implemented Data Teams in order to create a consistent and comprehensive framework for improvement planning that translates from district to school to classroom to individual students. Design and implement common benchmark assessments in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts, English and Science. Teachers use information from formative and benchmark assessments to monitor student academic progress and modify instruction to address specific class, small group and/or individual student needs during the course of the school year. Create and implement curricula in all subject areas that are vertically and horizontally aligned to State standards and the Vision of the Graduate. In addition to ensuring alignment to State standards, the action plan for this strategy also calls for the development and implementation of transdisciplinary units and capstone projects in fifth, eighth and twelfth grades. Build technology capacity within the school system to improve student achievement, instruction, communication, and evaluation. Wireless infrastructure will help to break the barriers posed by limited numbers of data outlets and dependency on specific types of computers. In addition, the technology action plan addresses the completion of the implementation of the SmartBoard plan; research, exploration and planning for the use of various eResources in the future; and the review of our learning, content and student information management system to create better alignment and efficiencies. Refine and revise the current versions of the Social Emotional Learning Student rubrics to align with the language in the standards-based report card and reflect the behaviors associated with the capacity statements in the Vision of the Graduate. The instructional impact expected when students are demonstrating the behaviors in the Student Rubrics is a decrease in the amount of “off task” behavior on the part of the students thus increasing the amount of time spent on instruction.

---