### Connecticut State Department of Education

# DISTRICT PROFILE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2013–14



### **Cooperative Educational Services**

Dr. Evan Pitkoff, Superintendent • 203-365-8803

#### **District Information**

Grade Range	PK-12
Number of Schools	7
Enrollment	822
Per Pupil Expenditures <sup>1</sup>	N/A
Total Expenditures <sup>1</sup>	N/A

<sup>1</sup>Expenditure data reflect the 2012-13 year.



### **Community Information**

<u>CERC Town Profiles</u> provide summary demographic and economic information for Connecticut's municipalities

### **Related Reports/Publications**

CT Reports (CMT/CAPT)

District and School Performance Reports

Special Education Annual Performance Reports

SAT®, AP®, PSAT® Report by High School (Class of 2014)

(2014® The College Board)

#### Contents

Students	1
Educators	2
Instruction and Resources	2
Performance	4
Narratives	6

#### **Notes**

Unless otherwise noted, all data are for 2013-14 and include all grades offered by the district.

In most tables, data are displayed only for the three major race/ethnicity categories. For additional race/ethnicity categories, please visit EdSight.

State totals are not displayed as they are not comparable to district totals.

Special Education tables reflect only students for whom the district is fiscally responsible.

suppressed to ensure student confidentiality. N/A is displayed when a category is not applicable for a district or school.

### **Students**

October 1, 2013 Enrollment				
		District	State	
	Count	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)	
Female	329	40.0	48.3	
Male	493	60.0	51.6	
American Indian	0	0.0	0.2	
Asian	32	3.9	4.6	
Black or African American	239	29.1	12.9	
Hispanic or Latino	247	30.0	21.2	
Pacific Islander	*	*	0.0	
White	281	34.2	58.4	
Two or More Races	*	*	2.3	
English Language Learners	0	0.0	5.7	
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	238	29.0	37.3	
Students with Disabilities <sup>1</sup>	341	41.5	12.8	

<sup>1</sup>Students in this category are students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) only. This category does not include students with Section 504 Plans.

### Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension/Expulsion

	Chronic		Suspension/	
	Absen	Absenteeism <sup>2</sup>		ılsion³
	Count	Rate (%)	Count	Rate (%)
Female	31	11.8	6	1.8
Male	80	18.2	33	6.4
Black or African American	24	11.6	15	6.3
Hispanic or Latino	33	16.0	7	2.7
White	44	18.1	14	4.7
English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	45	22.0	23	9.3
Students with Disabilities	94	26.3	34	8.9
District	111	15.8	39	4.6
State		10.8	·	7.4

Number of students in 2012-13 qualified as truant under state statute: 0

\* When an asterisk is displayed, data have been

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>A student is chronically absent if he/she misses ten percent or greater of the total number of days enrolled in the school year for any reason. Pre-Kindergarten students are excluded from this calculation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>The count and percentage of students who receive at least one in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension or expulsion.

### **Educators**

### Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)1 Staff

	FTE
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	46.6
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	28.0
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	67.8
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	1.0
Administrators, Coordinators and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	3.0
School Level	11.0
Library/Media	
Specialists (Certified)	1.0
Support Staff	0.0
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers	11.8
Counselors, Social Workers and School Psychologists	20.7
School Nurses	1.0
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services/Support	46.5

<sup>1</sup>In the full-time equivalent count, staff members working part-time in the school are counted as a fraction of full-time. For example, a teacher who works half-time in a school contributes 0.50 to the school's staff count.

### **Educators by Race/Ethnicity**

		District	State
	Count	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)
Asian	1	0.6	1.0
Black or African American	2	1.2	3.5
Hispanic	5	2.9	3.6
Native American	0	0	0.1
White	164	95.3	91.7

### Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers<sup>2</sup>

	Percent of Total (%)	
District	99.3	
District Poverty Quartile: Middle		
State High Poverty Quartile Schools 97.8		
State Low Poverty Quartile Schools	99.5	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Core academic classes taught by teachers who are fully certified to teach in that subject area.

#### Classroom Teacher Attendance: 2012-13

	District	State
Average Number of FTE Days Absent Due to Illness or Personal Time	6.8	9.3

### **Instruction and Resources**

# 11th and 12th Graders Who Enrolled in at Least Two Advanced Placement® or International Baccalaureate® Courses during High School<sup>3</sup>

	11th		12th	
	Count	Rate (%)	Count	Rate (%)
Black or African American	0	0	0	0
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	0	0
White	0	0	0	0
English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	0	0	0	0
Students with Disabilities	0	0	0	0
District	0	0	0	0
State		14.2		26.8

<sup>3</sup>Effective 2014-15, this calculation will also include students who participate in dual enrollment courses and two or more courses within a career and technical education (CTE) concentration.

# Students with Disabilities Who Spend 79.1 to 100 Percent of Time with Nondisabled Peers<sup>4</sup>

	Count	Rate (%)
Autism	N/A	N/A
Emotional Disturbance	N/A	N/A
Intellectual Disability	N/A	N/A
Learning Disability	N/A	N/A
Other Health Impairment	N/A	N/A
Other Disabilities	N/A	N/A
Speech/Language Impairment	N/A	N/A
District	N/A	N/A
State		69.2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Ages 6-21

### Students with Disabilities by Primary Disability<sup>1</sup>

	District		State
	Count	Rate (%)	Rate (%)
Autism	0	0	1.4
Emotional Disturbance	0	0	1.0
Intellectual Disability	0	0	0.4
Learning Disability	0	0	4.2
Other Health Impairment	0	0	2.5
Other Disabilities	0	0	1.0
Speech/Language Impairment	0	0	1.9
All Disabilities	0	0	12.4

### Students with Disabilities Placed Outside of the District<sup>2</sup>

	District		State
	Count	Rate (%)	Rate (%)
Public Schools in Other Districts	0	0	2.8
Private Schools or Other Settings	0	0	8.1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Grades K-12

Overall Expenditures: 2012-13

		Per Pupil		
	Total (\$)	District (\$)	State (\$)	
Instructional Staff and Services	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Student Support Services	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Administration and Support Services	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Plant Operation and Maintenance	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Transportation	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Costs of Students Tuitioned Out	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Additiona	al Expenditures			
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	N/A	N/A	N/A	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources.

#### **Special Education Expenditures: 2012-13**

	Distr	State	
	Total (\$)	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)
Certified Personnel	N/A	N/A	N/A
Noncertified Personnel	N/A	N/A	N/A
Purchased Services	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tuition to Other Schools	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Ed. Transportation	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other Expenditures	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total Expenditures	N/A	N/A	N/A
		·	
PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Educ	N/A	N/A	

### Expenditures by Revenue Source:<sup>4</sup> 2012-13

	Percent of Total (%)				
	Including	Excluding			
	School	School			
	Construction	Construction			
Local	N/A	N/A			
State	N/A	N/A			
Federal	N/A	N/A			
Tuition & Other	N/A	N/A			

<sup>4</sup>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 Correction).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Grades K-12

### **Performance**

### **District Performance Index (DPI)**

A District Performance Index (DPI) for the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) and the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) is the test performance of all subjects tested in the respective assessment for all students in the district. The DPI ranges in value from 0 to 100 points. Connecticut's ultimate target for a DPI is 88 because in a district with a DPI of 88 or above, students will have performed at or above the 'goal' level on the majority of tests. Detailed reports of CMT and CAPT assessment results are available at www.ctreports.com. School and District Performance Reports produced by the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) are also available online.

CMT		DPI				2013-14		
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	Count	DPI	Target	Achieved
Black or African American	76.4	76.3	80.5	81.4				
Hispanic or Latino	72.3	82.8	87.1	81.9				
English Language Learners								
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	69.4	77.0	81.6	78.6				
Students with Disabilities			70.3	74.0				
High Needs	67.2	77.1	80.0	77.1				
District	78.2	81.7	85.5	83.6				

Note: If no data are displayed for 2013-14, the district implemented the Smarter Balanced Field Test.

САРТ	DPI				2013-14			
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	Count	DPI	Target	Achieved
Black or African American			•	•				
Hispanic or Latino			•	•				
English Language Learners								
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals								
Students with Disabilities								
High Needs								
District								

Note: If no data are displayed for 2013-14, the district implemented the Smarter Balanced Field Test.

# 2013 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP): Percent At or Above Proficient<sup>1</sup>

READING	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade 12
Connecticut	43%	45%	50%
National Public	34%	34%	36%
MATH	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade 12
Connecticut	45%	37%	32%
National Public	41%	34%	25%

<sup>1</sup>NAEP is often called the "Nation's Report Card." It is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education. This table compares Connecticut's performance to that of national public school students. Performance standards for state assessments and NAEP are set independently. Therefore, one should not expect performance results to be the same across CMT/CAPT and NAEP. Instead, NAEP results are meant to complement CMT/CAPT results.

### Physical Fitness Tests: Students Reaching Health Standard<sup>2</sup>

	Percent	of Studer	All Teste	d Grades		
	4	6	8	10	Count	Rate (%)
Sit & Reach	59.1	79.4	75.9	N/A	107	70.1
Curl Up	97.7	76.5	93.1	N/A	107	89.7
Push Up	84.1	64.7	86.2	N/A	107	78.5
Mile Run/PACER	70.5	70.6	58.6	N/A	107	67.3
All Tests - District	38.6	35.3	41.4	N/A	107	38.3
All Tests - State	50.2	50.7	50.3	53.9		51.1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>The Connecticut Physical Fitness Assessment (CPFA) is administered to all students in Grades 4, 6, 8 and 10. The health-related fitness scores gathered through the CPFA should be used to educate and motivate children and their families to increase physical activity and develop lifetime fitness habits.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Only students assessed in all four areas are included in this calculation.

Cohort Graduation: Four-Year<sup>1</sup>

		2013-14			
	Cohort Count <sup>2</sup>	Rate (%)	Target³ (%)	Target Achieved	Target³ (%)
Black or African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
District	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
State <sup>4</sup>		85.5			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The four-year cohort graduation rate represents the percentage of first-time 9th graders who earn a standard high school diploma within four years. Statewide, district and school results for cohorts of 2010 through 2013 are available online.

# 11th and 12th Graders Meeting Benchmark on at Least One College Readiness Exam<sup>5</sup>

	Participation <sup>6</sup>	Meeting Benchmark		
	Rate (%)	Count	Rate (%)	
Female	*	*	*	
Male	*	0	0.0	
Black or African American	0.0	0	0.0	
Hispanic or Latino	*	0	*	
White	*	*	*	
English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	0.0	0	0.0	
Students with Disabilities	*	*	*	
District	*	*	*	
State	72.9		37.6	

 $<sup>^5\</sup>mbox{College}$  readiness exams and benchmark scores are as follows:

- SAT® composite score of 1550 or higher
- ACT® meets benchmark score on 3 of 4 exams (benchmark score varies by subject)
- AP® 3 or higher on any one AP® exam
- IB® 4 or higher on any one IB® exam

<sup>6</sup>Participation Rate equals the number of test-takers in 11th and 12th grade divided by the number of students enrolled in those grades, as a percent.

#### Sources:

SAT® and AP® statistics derived from data provided by the College Board.

Copyright © 2014 The College Board. www.collegeboard.org

 $\mathsf{ACT}^{\$}$  statistics derived from data provided by ACT, Inc.

Copyright © 2015 ACT, Inc. www.act.org

IB® statistics derived from data provided by the International Baccalaureate Organization.

Copyright © International Baccalaureate Organization 2014

#### **College Entrance and Persistence**

	Class of 2013	Class of 2012
	Entrance <sup>7</sup>	Persistence <sup>8</sup>
	Rate (%)	Rate (%)
Female	*	*
Male	*	*
Black or African American	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	N/A	N/A
White	*	*
English Language Learners	N/A	N/A
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	*	*
Students with Disabilities	*	*
District	*	*
State	72.7	88.5

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>College entrance refers to the percent of high school graduates from the year who enrolled in college any time during the first year after high school.

Source: National Student Clearinghouse

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Cohort count includes all students in the cohort as of the end of the 2012-13 school year.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Targets are calculated when there are at least 20 students in a cohort in the base year (i.e., 2010-11).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Targets are not displayed at the state level.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>College persistence refers to the percent of students who enrolled in college the first year after high school and returned for a second year (Freshman to Sophomore persistence).

### **Narratives**

### **School District Improvement Plans and Parental Outreach Activities**

Through the efforts of the district's School Planning and Management Team (SPMT), which is made up of administration, teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents at Six to Six Magnet School, and our understandings that sustained improvement for students can only happen when a school community works together, we developed a comprehensive school improvement plan focused on the goal to continuously improve student academic and social emotional/behavioral performance. The staff continued to engage in professional development on Common Core State Standards in literacy and mathematics, as well as science instruction. Curriculum revisions based on the new Common Core State Standards began in 2010-11 and continued through 2013-14. Six to Six effectively utilizes Scientifically Research-based Interventions to meet the needs of students in both literacy and mathematics. We have partnerships in science with The Maritime Aquarium, the Eli Whitney Museum, The Jason Project, and the Goldstone Apple Valley Remote Telescope (NASA). Our school is infused with the latest technologies; such as interactive whiteboards, iPods, laptops, desktop computers, probes, digital cameras, and flex cameras. In regard to special education, we have added a variety of new assessment tools and refined our protocols and communication with the variety of school districts with whom we must collaborate. We also added support staff providing scientifically research-based interventions in order to provide early intervention. In regard to truancy, our procedures include daily parent communication regarding unexcused absences, weekly review of student attendance concerns, and family meetings when needed.

Through our family center, our before and after-school programs, our pre-school (for children ages 3 and 4) and our health center, Six to Six Interdistrict Magnet School strives to build strong relationships between home and school and support the needs of working parents and families. Understanding that these bonds have a profound impact on student achievement, we continue to find ways in which these connections can be strengthened. In fall 2013 we updated our School-Family Compacts through collaboration with staff, families, and students. The result is specific compacts for each grade level that align with our school improvement plan. Our family center coordinator works with parents on how to help their child read each night at home as well as conducting parenting skill workshops. These workshops are well attended and focus on both social and academic support strategies.

Six to Six Magnet School parents participate in our Strategic Planning and Management Team (SPMT) which is a site-based leadership team modeled after Yale University's Comer-Zigler process. One parent from each participating town has a seat on our SPMT. Parent involvement at Six to Six is an essential part of our culture. Parents actively attend PTSA meetings and events and volunteer in our classrooms. School newsletters as well as the electronic Blackboard Connect messaging system are used to communicate with families on a variety of topics.

### Efforts to Reduce Racial, Ethnic and Economic Isolation

As an Interdistrict Magnet School, Six to Six epitomizes the state's efforts to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation. We admit students from 15 districts with a focus to attain a 50% - 50% urban-suburban balance as well as a minority – non minority balance. Admittance into Six to Six is entirely through a random lottery. In 2013-14, Six to Six enrolled 471 students participating in the program from the age of three through 8th grade. Our classrooms held multicultural potluck suppers throughout the year to celebrate student learning. We also operated a Summer Session for first and second grade students through the CSDE Interdistrict Cooperative Grants. This program brought students together of varying backgrounds to improve reading and writing skills.

### **Equitable Allocation of Resources among District Schools**

At C.E.S., Six to Six Magnet School is our only comprehensive school. Therefore, district resources are allocated based on student enrollment and student need. All Title I funds are allocated to the school to support targeted interventions for students performing below grade level.