213-00 Rev. 11-6

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09

Regional School District 13

SUSAN VICCARO, Superintendent Location: 135-A Pickett Lane

Telephone: (860)-349-7200 Durham,
Connecticut

Website: www.rsd13ct.org/

This regional school district serves Durham, Middlefield

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: Middlesex Per Capita Income in 2000: \$27,911

Town Population in 2000: 10,830 Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 11.0% 1990-2000 Population Growth: 12.1% Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.5% District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 91.2%

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

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Enrollment on October 1, 2008 2,126 Grade Range PK-12 5-Year Enrollment Change -1.3%

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in	_	Percent	
	District	District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	92	4.3	5.5	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	11	0.5	0.6	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	52	2.4	4.0	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	263	12.4	11.0	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	131	87.9	86.0	79.7
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	32	11.1	16.9	19.0

^{*0.0%} of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity				
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent		
American Indian	2	0.1		
Asian American	38	1.8		
Black	20	0.9		
Hispanic	35	1.6		
White	2,031	95.5		
Total Minority	95	4.5		

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.9%

Non-English Home Language: 1.1% 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 10.

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.

Regional School District 13 continuously looks for opportunities for our students that will reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation. At the elementary level this primarily takes the focus of curricular studies that expose the children to the diverse world they live in. They have a variety of opportunities to explore different cultures and traditions from around the world. Special celebrations, assembly programs, and exposure to different languages also help to increase students' awareness and knowledge of other cultures. In addition, a sister school project in one class allowed students to interact via web cameras and culminated in a joint meeting of the classes. Lastly, elementary students contributed to a variety of community endeavors including donating food items to the local food bank, participating in toy drives and raising money for a variety of local and national causes.

At the middle school, participation in the Thomas Edison Magnet School continued with our students joining students from Middletown and Meriden. Our continued involvement with the Middlesex Consortium again allowed ten students to participate in the Youth Mathematics and Technology Academy along with students from Middletown, Meriden, East Hampton, and Cromwell. Twenty students participated in the Consortium's annual Diversity Day at Wesleyan University. Strong School continued its partnership with Naylor School in Hartford.

At the high school level a variety of activities were held to expose students to differences. These included: Diversity Day, leadership training for students, participation in the Diversity conference with students from surrounding towns as well as a host of curricular activities in world language, English, social studies and health classes. An exchange program also brought students from Coginchaug together with students from Mexico.

All buildings demonstrated significant efforts in reducing bullying through added focus on the Core Ethical Values of the School District: Respect, Responsibility, Kindness, Courage and Honesty. In addition a variety of programs were held across the District emphasizing these values. Lastly, additional teachers and administrators were trained in "Capturing Kids' Hearts," a program designed to foster student connectedness.

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	69.8	54.6	68.6
Writing	76.6	62.5	72.3
Mathematics	69.3	62.8	47.2
Grade 4 Reading	66.3	60.7	45.4
Writing	68.8	64.2	43.0
Mathematics	63.8	63.6	36.6
Grade 5 Reading	74.4	66.0	53.4
Writing	78.1	66.5	64.8
Mathematics	76.5	68.8	55.6
Science	80.6	58.1	83.3
Grade 6 Reading	87.1	68.9	79.1
Writing	79.5	62.2	74.2
Mathematics	87.2	68.8	75.5
Grade 7 Reading	83.0	74.9	56.1
Writing	71.1	62.9	51.0
Mathematics	76.2	66.0	58.6
Grade 8 Reading	83.5	68.4	71.6
Writing	84.3	66.5	79.4
Mathematics	86.0	64.5	81.9
Science	82.7	60.6	78.7

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.

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to <u>www.sde.ct.gov</u> 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	57.6	47.4	60.6
Writing Across the Disciplines	71.1	55.0	69.5
Mathematics	69.8	47.8	79.4
Science	62.4	42.8	76.3

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	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard
Four Tests	50.0	36.2	83.7

SAT® I: Reasonin Class of 2008	g Test	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or	
% of Graduates Te	sted	86.7	74.5	Lower Scores	
Average Score	Mathematics	522	507	64.3	
	Critical Reading	520	503	62.0	
	Writing	526	506	68.2	

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	94.7	92.1	50.4
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	4.9	6.6	46.7
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.0	2.5	100.0

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	93.7	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	6.3	11.0

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	150.20
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	15.90
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	20.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	31.70
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	8.70
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	4.00
School Level	9.20
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	0.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	11.10
School Nurses	6.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	95.30

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	13.8	14.4	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	76.1	77.3	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	14.9	17.5	18.3
Grade 2	19.9	19.5	19.3
Grade 5	21.8	20.3	21.0
Grade 7	20.4	19.7	20.5
High School	20.1	18.9	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	984	993	988
Middle School	1,055	1,025	1,016
High School	986	1,011	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*	4.5	3.3	3.3
Middle School	3.0	2.4	2.6
High School	2.5	2.2	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	Total		Expenditure	es Per Pupil	
All figures are unaudited.	(in 1000s)	District	PK-12	DRG	State
			Districts		
Instructional Staff and Services	\$15,432	\$7,195	\$7,521	\$7,069	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$370	\$172	\$267	\$282	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,380	\$643	\$461	\$415	\$446
Student Support Services	\$2,553	\$1,190	\$808	\$769	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$2,329	\$1,086	\$1,351	\$1,334	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$3,133	\$1,461	\$1,382	\$1,357	\$1,377
Transportation	\$1,852	\$815	\$649	\$638	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$980	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$369	\$172	\$152	\$141	\$151
Total	\$28,397	\$13,020	\$12,869	\$12,448	\$12,805
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$2,528	\$1,178	\$1,791	\$1,180	\$1,759

Special Education	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education				
Expenditures		District	DRG	State		
	\$5,452,869	19.2	19.7	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	73.7	24.2	1.5	0.6
Excluding School Construction	74.0	23.7	1.7	0.6

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.

Recognizing the need for good planning in distributing District resources equitably, the Board of Education holds a fall and a winter retreat to identify budget priorities as well as the goals identified in the 5 year strategic plan. Budgets are first developed beginning at the building level ensuring that unique situations (student growth, new programs, individual student needs, etc.) are addressed by those knowing the issues best. Building administrators meet with central office staff and overall priorities are determined before the budget is presented to the Board in March. Board of Education meetings, a public hearing and a District meeting allow for significant input from the public during the months of March, April and May. A budget summary is provided for every postal patron in Durham and Middlefield. In addition information is posted and updated on the website during this time. The budget is voted on in a District-wide referendum held in May. A new budget format, developed a year ago, allows for greater clarity and transparency for the general public.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	265
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	12.5%

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	21	1.0	0.9	0.8		
Learning Disability	89	4.2	4.1	3.9		
Intellectual Disability	8	0.4	0.4	0.5		
Emotional Disturbance	16	0.8	0.7	1.0		
Speech Impairment	65	3.1	2.2	2.3		
Other Health Impairment*	59	2.8	1.9	2.1		
Other Disabilities**	7	0.3	0.6	0.9		
Total	265	12.5	10.8	11.6		

^{*}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 2007-08 with a Standard Diploma	100.0	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 wit	Students with Disabilities		udents
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	41.5	30.2	77.4	65.7
	Writing	27.4	19.5	76.4	64.1
	Mathematics	41.7	30.7	76.6	65.7
	Science	46.8	23.8	81.7	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	57.6	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	71.1	55.0
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	69.8	47.8
	Science	N/A	N/A	62.4	42.8

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	13.6			
	% With Accommodations 86.4				
CAPT	CAPT % Without Accommodations 27.8				
	% With Accommodations 72.2				
% Asse	ssed Using Skills Checklist	6.9			

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 nondisabled 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	4	1.5		
Private Schools or Other Settings	19	7.2		

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 Count of Percent of Students					
Peers	Students	District	DRG	State	
79.1 to 100 Percent of Time	205	77.4	74.3	72.7	
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	46	17.4	19.1	16.1	
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	14	5.3	6.6	11.2	

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

Literacy continued to be the primary focus in the Contemporary Program. At Brewster the Literacy Team met weekly to monitor student progress. A new phonics scope and sequence was developed to ensure consistency from classroom to classroom. Added focus on reading comprehension emphasized students responding to questions from Strands A, B, C and D after a reading selection. A data wall consisting of information from the DIBELS and DRA 2 was used to monitor student progress throughout the year.

At Korn School in addition to literacy, the math scope and sequence calendar was carefully followed to ensure mastery by spiraling skills throughout the year. In the elementary Integrated Day Program both a reading and a math strand were areas of focus, specifically making reader text connections and time as the focus in math. All teachers were trained in ways to differentiate instruction and integrate technology as a way to meet a variety of learner needs. Continued focus on including students with disabilities in the regular classroom was emphasized in all buildings.

At the middle school level emphasis on differentiated instruction continued. There was additional focus on the development and implementation of pre assessments to improve student learning as well as training on lesson tiering. This is all designed to help teachers match their instruction to individual student learning needs. Strong School, via data teams also focused on nine individual case studies focusing on student achievement aligned with the Connecticut Mastery Test.

At the high school the new Site Plan gave specific direction to staff on areas of focus. Examples include student engagement, matching student and teacher learning styles, streamlining initiatives and life-long learning standards. CAPT scores were above the state average in all areas while SAT scores were improved over last year and remained high. Out of eighty-seven students taking the Advanced Placement Tests, seventy-four scored a three or better. Students also showed significant improvement on the Concentrator Exam that assesses student knowledge of technical education.

All certified staff participated in professional development in the area of Scientifically Researched Based Instruction (SRBI). This will lead to additional training in CALI initiatives as well as the development of common formative assessments developed by grade level data teams. Across all buildings parents continued to partner with building staff through monthly meetings, open houses, conferences and workshops. Transition activities for students in grades five through nine were given particular emphasis. It is a District expectation that all students will participate in the regular classroom. Training provided in differentiation and emphasis on pre-teaching foster continued improvement in our ability to meet individual student needs. Student assistance teams in every building analyze and monitor the social, academic and behavioral needs of all students. Increased interventions have resulted in a significant drop in office referrals and suspensions.