STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2007-08

Brooklyn School District

LOUISE S. BERRY, Superintendent Location: 119 Gorman Road

Telephone: (860) 774-9153 Brooklyn,
Connecticut

Website: www.brooklynschools.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: Windham Per Capita Income in 2000: \$20,359

Town Population in 2000: 7,173 Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 21.0% 1990-2000 Population Growth: 7.4% Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.7% Number of Public Schools: 2 District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 95.4%

District Reference Group (DRG): E 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, 2007 963 Grade Range PK- 8 5-Year Enrollment Change -0.3%

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in		Percent	
	District	District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	158	16.4	9.7	28.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	0	0.0	0.5	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	42	4.4	4.3	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	97	10.1	11.3	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	87	100.0	82.5	79.2
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

^{*90.5%} 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

Studer	nt Race/Ethnici	ty
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	1	0.1
Asian American	14	1.5
Black	7	0.7
Hispanic	15	1.6
White	926	96.2
Total Minority	37	3.8

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.2%

Non-English Home Language: 1.4% 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 7.

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.

Brooklyn is a small town with very little racial diversity. However, its economic diversity is evidenced by the percentage of students eligible for free/reduced price meals. Hence the issue of economic isolation and fragmented families is an ongoing concern to members of our staff. At the elementary level, we work to address the limitations in the lives of many of our students through a variety of curricular projects to provide opportunities for students to experience other cultures and field trips to enrich and broaden their perspective.

At the middle school level, the many cultural enrichment activities throughout the year in language arts, social studies and science help to broaden students' understanding of the differences and the similarities of different ethnic groups and also help to develop an appreciation of the traditions of other cultures. The faculty has incorporated diversity into their instructional activities and our field trip program provides opportunities for students to interact with students from other schools. Examples of this are: music festivals at the University of Connecticut; the Legacy Exploration Program at UCONN; and trips to the Hyde Cultural Center in Woodstock, CT.

Our secondary students are tuitioned to a number of high schools in eastern Connecticut under the Board's Freedom of Choice policy and thus have access to a broad range of programs/activities and become members of student bodies with much more diversity than is possible in Brooklyn. Within the scope of their experience in our designated high schools, our secondary students have the opportunity to learn about, interact with and respect members of different ethnic, racial and economic backgrounds and cultures.

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	48.5	52.0	28.8
Writing	68.3	63.4	41.7
Mathematics	51.5	60.0	17.2
Grade 4 Reading	53.0	55.9	30.4
Writing	64.3	62.9	37.7
Mathematics	64.0	60.3	45.9
Grade 5 Reading	65.2	62.2	37.0
Writing	63.0	64.5	31.5
Mathematics	63.0	65.9	32.1
Science	53.8	54.9	28.4
Grade 6 Reading	68.1	66.3	33.9
Writing	52.1	61.9	18.5
Mathematics	72.3	66.4	45.2
Grade 7 Reading	68.8	71.1	27.7
Writing	68.8	62.0	50.3
Mathematics	61.6	63.0	31.6
Grade 8 Reading	66.3	64.8	37.1
Writing	59.6	63.4	29.6
Mathematics	68.3	60.8	46.5
Science	76	58.6	62.3

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.

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	N/A	N/A	N/A
Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	38.6	36.1	53.5

SAT® I: Reasonin Class of 2007	g Test	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or
% of Graduates Te	sted	N/A	N/A	Lower Scores
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	59.61
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	9.37
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	6.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	18.92
Library/Media Specialists and Assistants	1.61
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	1.00
School Level	4.02
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	1.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	4.00
School Nurses	2.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	39.93

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	18.1	14.5	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	82.4	78.1	75.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	15.8	15.7	18.1
Grade 2	17.8	16.8	19.3
Grade 5	18.4	19.9	20.9
Grade 7	21.8	19.6	20.5
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	978	984	987
Middle School	999	1,012	1,017
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

*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*	9.1	3.0	3.4
Middle School	3.3	2.5	2.7
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

^{*}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	Total	Expenditures Per Pupil				
All figures are unaudited.	(in 1000s)	District	Elementary Districts	DRG	State	
Instructional Staff and Services	\$5,840	\$5,714	\$7,141	\$6,656	\$7,159	
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$97	\$95	\$314	\$302	\$266	
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$136	\$133	\$219	\$364	\$429	
Student Support Services	\$805	\$788	\$732	\$810	\$761	
Administration and Support Services	\$843	\$825	\$1,370	\$1,264	\$1,271	
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$904	\$884	\$1,146	\$1,301	\$1,322	
Transportation	\$1,040	\$700	\$575	\$622	\$601	
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out*	\$613	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	\$21	\$20	\$62	\$154	\$145	
Total*	\$10,296	\$9,920	\$12,187	\$11,756	\$12,151	
Additional Expenditures						
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$1,623	\$1,588	\$1,737	\$1,899	\$1,882	

^{*}Town total expenditures (in 1000s) for PK-12 are: Total, \$14,306; Tuition Costs, \$4,622. Total town expenditures per pupil for PK-12 are \$10,082.

Special Education Expenditures	
Total Expenditures	\$2,533,296
Percent of Total PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education	17.7%

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	51.1	45.8	3.1	0.1
Excluding School Construction	50.8	45.7	3.5	0.1

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.

The Board of Education's policy on the allocation of district resources provides the framework for both expenditures and revenues and translates into financial terms the priorities and education needs of the district. The Board expects the superintendent to work closely with building level administrators in studying the needs of the schools and recommendations are consistent with those needs. Building administrators are expected to confer with their staff advisory committees to obtain information on needs and priorities.

The Board formulates the annual budget through a committee structure and solicits comments and recommendations from parents and community members. The Board members present their budget to the Board of Finance prior to presenting it to the community at a public hearing. In developing the 2008-09 school budget, members of the Board and the Administration set the following staff and program priorities: maintain current programs and services; expand the concept of inclusion in the regular classroom; emphasize the use of technology consistent with Brooklyn's Long Range Technology Plan; maintain a curriculum consistent with the performance standards listed in Connecticut's K-12 Curricular Goals and Standards; and continue the comprehensive pre-school program for students ages three and four in order to provide an opportunity for every preschool child to have a solid foundation for their educational career.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	119
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	9.5%

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	3	0.2	0.7	0.7		
Learning Disability	48	3.8	3.9	4.0		
Intellectual Disability	4	0.3	0.4	0.5		
Emotional Disturbance	14	1.1	0.7	1.0		
Speech Impairment	31	2.5	3.0	2.4		
Other Health Impairment*	14	1.1	1.9	2.1		
Other Disabilities**	5	0.4	0.7	0.9		
Total	119	9.5	11.2	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	66.7	77.2
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	2.9	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 wit	th Disabilities	All Students	
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	12.0	20.4	61.7	62.1
	Writing	12.0	19.3	62.9	63.0
	Mathematics	14.7	22.6	63.3	62.7
	Science	28.6	22.2	65.5	56.8
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
·	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	17.9		
	% With Accommodations	82.1		
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	N/A		
	% With Accommodations N/A			
% Asse	% Assessed Using Skills Checklist 3.8			

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	0	0.0	
Private Schools or Other Settings	13	10.9	

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	102	85.7	74.4	71.6	
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	7	5.9	18.8	16.6	
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	10	8.4	6.8	11.8	

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

As a result of our scores on the 2007 CMTs, we began the 2007-2008 school year with a school-wide goal to increase the academic achievement of all students, specifically in reading. We trained staff members in the use of data to analyze student progress, we asked team/grade level staff members to use their planning meetings to review student performance and plan appropriate instructional activities and we asked our remedial reading teachers to spend time in the regular classrooms modeling instructional practices. Finally, we increased the time for collaboration between our remedial/developmental reading teachers and our classroom teachers in order to address the needs of struggling readers. Although student performance has improved, we plan to continue these activities with our reading coordinator to work with all classroom teachers in grades K through 4 to help provide both the vertical and horizontal alignment of instruction and the coordination necessary to guide reading instruction in a comprehensive manner.

In the area of special education, our focus has been on inclusion of all special needs students in the regular classroom program when possible thus increasing the time with non-disabled peers. This has been accomplished by an increase in the use of trained paraprofessionals working with individuals or small groups of students in the regular classroom under the supervision of the classroom teacher and the special education instructor. Other areas of emphasis during the 2007-2008 school year have been professional development for staff and workshops for parents. Examples of the programs provided at parent workshops are: Models of Service Delivery in Brooklyn; Inclusion- Vision and Goals; and Understanding the IEP Form.

Our efforts to involve parents and community members in the review of school programs and the planning and/or improvement of school programs include the following:

- The Brooklyn Collaborative for Young Children –parents and staff members of students in our early childhood programs who meet monthly to explore ways to broaden the interest in and support for the education of young children. This group has been in existence for more than six years and has been a valuable asset to the school system through its support of our pre-school programs.
- Parent/Staff Teams—the principal at the elementary school has both established a team of parents and teachers to meet and discuss issues that are important to the planning and operation of their building. This team has been able to look at issues objectively and frequently are able to provide guidance which helps to resolve problems and/or prevent issues from becoming problems.
- Cooperative High School Planning Committee—a committee involving parents, community members, superintendents of schools and elected officials have been meeting since the fall of 2005 to explore a partnership for high school education between Brooklyn and Region 11. Through the development of a cooperative agreement between the parties, Brooklyn committee members have explored their own school system and their goals and plans for education in this community for students from. Pre-K through grade 12.