

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2007-08**Oxford School District**

JUDITH PALMER, Superintendent
Telephone: (203) 888-7754

Location: 1 Great Hill Road
Oxford,
Connecticut

Website: www.oxfordpublicschools.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.

COMMUNITY DATA

County: New Haven	Per Capita Income in 2000: \$28,250
Town Population in 2000: 9,821	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 9.2%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 13.1%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.3%
Number of Public Schools: 4	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 94.8%

*To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

District Reference Group (DRG): C 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, 2007	1,850
5-Year Enrollment Change	32.8%

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Grade Range	PK-10
-------------	-------

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	121	6.5	4.7	28.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	29	1.6	0.6	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	94	5.1	3.8	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	148	8.0	11.0	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	170	100.0	87.9	79.2
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

*62.8% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	3	0.2
Asian American	37	2.0
Black	22	1.2
Hispanic	61	3.3
White	1,727	93.4
Total Minority	123	6.6

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 0.7%

Non-English Home Language: 2.5% 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 13.

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.

The Oxford Public School System strives to provide an array of opportunities for teachers and students to increase their awareness of and appreciation for differences between human beings. Over the past three years, we have created more opportunities for our students to have personal contact with students in other districts. For example, this year Oxford students participated in Green Team program where Oxford students worked with students from Bridgeport to rebuild stone walls at the Weir Farm National Historic Site. This unique partnership included Oxford High School students who participate in the Youth Conservation Corps and Bridgeport Groundworks under the supervision of the National Park Service.

The Oxford Regional Innovation Center works with surrounding towns to create entrepreneurial projects for our students. Oxford students work with those from other districts to create business ideas and present them to a panel of judges.

Oxford High School science department welcomed two Chinese visitors to observe how students from different school districts work together in the science lab. Our science department participated in a program offered by Education Connection that welcomed students from Bridgeport, Redding, Danbury and Hartford to Oxford High School where they engaged in a spectrometry experiment in an effort to encourage interdistrict science experiments. This opportunity was part of the effort of the Connecticut Academy of Science Research to bring students from different backgrounds together for shared learning experiences.

Oxford students participate in interdistrict magnet school programs in growing numbers. In 2005, only three students participated. In 2006, that number doubled to six students. In 2007, we had 10 students participating in magnet school offerings.

Oxford school staff is very active in creating cultural awareness activities for our students, both inside and outside of school hours.

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	60.7	52.0	49.1
Writing	84.7	63.4	93.9
Mathematics	71.0	60.0	59.5
Grade 4 Reading	64.2	55.9	54.4
Writing	69.8	62.9	50.9
Mathematics	69.9	60.3	56.6
Grade 5 Reading	76.2	62.2	69.1
Writing	81.0	64.5	77.2
Mathematics	83.8	65.9	78.4
Science	69.2	54.9	58.0
Grade 6 Reading	73.4	66.3	45.8
Writing	67.4	61.9	51.2
Mathematics	72.6	66.4	46.4
Grade 7 Reading	85.0	71.1	69.7
Writing	72.3	62.0	58.1
Mathematics	71.7	63.0	50.3
Grade 8 Reading	74.4	64.8	54.1
Writing	70.7	63.4	49.1
Mathematics	69.0	60.8	47.2
Science	70.4	58.6	45.3

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.

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to 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	39.3	45.5	33.8
Writing Across the Disciplines	57.0	57.9	33.8
Mathematics	53.7	50.1	44.6
Science	47.2	46.3	41.5

For more detailed CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com.

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to 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
	44.6	36.1	73.3

SAT [®] I: Reasoning Test Class of 2007		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		N/A	N/A	
Average Score	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Critical Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A

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 2007	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2007	N/A	N/A	N/A
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	N/A	N/A	N/A

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	N/A	N/A
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	N/A	N/A

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	96.50
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	7.17
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	13.80
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	15.60
Library/Media Specialists and Assistants	4.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	3.00
School Level	6.60
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	1.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	7.00
School Nurses	4.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	43.87

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	16.2	14.3	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	81.7	75.5	75.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	21.5	17.1	18.1
Grade 2	23.3	18.6	19.3
Grade 5	28.8	20.4	20.9
Grade 7	23.3	19.9	20.5
High School	16.9	17.8	18.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	960	993	987
Middle School	1,020	1,032	1,017
High School	1,092	1,021	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*	8.0	3.3	3.4
Middle School	7.9	2.2	2.7
High School	1.5	2.2	2.7

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2006-07

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	Elementary Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$9,712	\$6,167	\$7,141	\$6,737	\$7,159
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$524	\$333	\$314	\$287	\$266
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$416	\$264	\$219	\$395	\$429
Student Support Services	\$713	\$452	\$732	\$713	\$761
Administration and Support Services	\$2,718	\$1,725	\$1,370	\$1,267	\$1,271
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$1,905	\$1,210	\$1,146	\$1,295	\$1,322
Transportation	\$1,434	\$679	\$575	\$605	\$601
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out*	\$1,019	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$65	\$41	\$62	\$130	\$145
Total*	\$18,507	\$11,481	\$12,187	\$11,824	\$12,151
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$12,715	\$8,073	\$1,737	\$1,979	\$1,882

*Town total expenditures (in 1000s) for PK-12 are: Total, \$23,214; Tuition Costs, \$5,727.

Total town expenditures per pupil for PK-12 are \$11,028.

Special Education Expenditures	
Total Expenditures	\$5,168,484
Percent of Total PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education	22.3%

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	54.7	44.6	0.8	0.0
Excluding School Construction	79.9	18.9	1.2	0.0

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.

We opened Oxford High School on September 4, 2007, so naturally additional resources were required to open the town's first high school. Some start up costs included hiring new staff, funding the school's library, acquiring software, purchasing text books, and obtaining marching band and sport teams uniforms.

However, it is a practice of the Oxford Board of Education to provide equitable resources to all its schools. Each building administrator provides an estimate of expenditures for his or her school based on the needs presented in their school improvement plans. This process assures that all funding is tied to school improvement goals that ultimately benefit the students.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	161
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	7.6%

Of All K-12 Students for Whom District is Financially Responsible, Number and Percentage with Disabilities				
Disability	Count	District Percent	DRG Percent	State Percent
Autism	17	0.8	0.8	0.7
Learning Disability	59	2.8	4.1	4.0
Intellectual Disability	6	0.3	0.4	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	8	0.4	0.7	1.0
Speech Impairment	23	1.1	2.2	2.4
Other Health Impairment*	30	1.4	1.9	2.1
Other Disabilities**	18	0.8	0.6	0.9
Total	161	7.6	10.7	11.5

*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

Graduation and Dropout Rates of Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible	District	State
% Who Graduated in 2006-07 with a Standard Diploma	100.0	77.2
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	0.0	2.8

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	21.7	20.4	72.0	62.1
	Writing	20.6	19.3	74.2	63.0
	Mathematics	17.6	22.6	72.7	62.7
	Science	N/A	N/A	69.9	56.8
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	4.5	11.4	39.3	45.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	13.0	16.3	57.0	57.9
	Mathematics	12.5	14.7	53.7	50.1
	Science	16.7	14.4	47.2	46.3

For more detailed CMT or CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com. To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to 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	15.3
	% With Accommodations	84.7
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	48.0
	% With Accommodations	52.0
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		4.1

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	13	8.1

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	120	74.5	71.7	71.6
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	27	16.8	21.8	16.6
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	14	8.7	6.5	11.8

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

This year, we held a Community Conversation, funded by the Graustein Foundation, to discuss the elements of a quality education with citizens of varying backgrounds and experiences. Four guiding principles evolved: to celebrate diversity, to utilize our resources wisely, to strive for open communication and to focus on continuous academic improvement. The Oxford Board of Education wove these themes into their goals for the 2008-2009 school year.

Each school has designed a School Improvement Team that creates the detailed improvement plans in the following areas; improving teaching and learning for all students, improving communication, maintaining a safe and secure school culture, and improving technology integration. Each school has posted their detailed School Improvement Plan on their web site for easy access by the parents and community members.

Further, all Professional Development opportunities are directly linked to the School Improvement Plans. Each principal's budgetary request is tied back to a goal found within the School Improvement Plan. This process assures that all activity and expenditures are directly linked to the improvement efforts contained within these documents.
