Connecticut State Department of Education

DISTRICT PROFILE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2016–17



Mansfield School District

Mrs. Kelly Lyman, Superintendent • 860-429-3350 • http://www.mansfieldct.gov/mboe

District Information

Grade Range	PK-8
Number of Schools/Programs	5
Enrollment	1,217
Per Pupil Expenditures ¹	\$18,308
Total Expenditures ¹	\$23,177,553

¹Expenditure data reflect the 2015-16 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)

Special Education Annual Performance Reports

SAT®, AP®, PSAT® Report by High School (Class of 2017)

(2017® The College Board)

Contents

Students1
Educators2
Instruction and Resources
Performance and Accountability 4
Narratives 6

Notes

Unless otherwise noted, all data are for 2016-17 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.ct.gov.

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.

* When an asterisk is displayed, data have been suppressed to ensure student confidentiality. N/A is displayed when a category is not applicable for a district or school.

Students

October 1, 2016 Enrollment				
		District	State	
	Count	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)	
Female	600	49.3	48.4	
Male	617	50.7	51.6	
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	0.3	
Asian	160	13.1	5.1	
Black or African American	*	*	12.9	
Hispanic or Latino	143	11.8	24.0	
Pacific Islander	0	0.0	0.1	
Two or More Races	54	4.4	2.9	
White	825	67.8	54.8	
English Learners	56	4.6	6.8	
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	301	24.7	35.9	
Students with Disabilities ¹	141	11.6	14.3	

¹Students 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		Suspe	ension/
	Absenteeism ²		Expu	lsion ³
	Count	Rate (%)	Count	Rate (%)
Female	21	3.8	*	*
Male	28	4.9	*	*
Black or African American	*	*	0	0.0
Hispanic or Latino	13	10.2	7	5.3
White	30	3.9	22	2.6
English Learners	*	*	0	0.0
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	19	7.1	14	4.8
Students with Disabilities	14	9.9	10	6.1
District	49	4.4	32	2.7
State		9.9		6.7

Number of students in 2015-16 qualified as truant under state statute: Fewer than 6 Number of school-based arrests: 0

²A 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.

³The 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	95.5
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	26.8
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	13.5
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	34.0
Administrators, Coordinators and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	3.3
School Level	5.0
Library/Media	
Specialists (Certified)	1.0
Support Staff	6.1
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers	8.0
Counselors, Social Workers and School Psychologists	6.0
School Nurses	4.5
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services/Support	63.4

¹In 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 (%)
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0.7	0.1
Asian	2	1.5	1.0
Black or African American	2	1.5	3.6
Hispanic or Latino	1	0.7	3.6
Pacific Islander	0	0.0	0.0
Two or More Races	0	0.0	0.1
White	128	94.1	91.4

Classroom Teacher Attendance: 2015-16

	District	State
Average Number of FTE Days Absent Due to Illness or Personal Time	9.5	9.6

Instruction and Resources

Students with Disabilities Who Spend 79.1 to 100 Percent of Time with Nondisabled Peers³

	Count	Rate (%)
Autism	*	*
Emotional Disturbance	*	*
Intellectual Disability	0	0
Learning Disability	46	82.1
Other Health Impairment	18	72.0
Other Disabilities	0	0
Speech/Language Impairment	17	*
District	93	75.0
State		68.2

³Ages 6-21

Students with Disabilities by Primary Disability¹

	Di	State	
	Count	Rate (%)	Rate (%)
Autism	17	1.5	1.7
Emotional Disturbance	*	*	1.0
Intellectual Disability	*	*	0.5
Learning Disability	56	4.9	4.9
Other Health Impairment	25	2.2	2.9
Other Disabilities	*	*	1.1
Speech/Language Impairment	25	2.2	1.8
All Disabilities	132	11.5	13.9

¹Grades K-12

Overall Expenditures: 2015-16

		Per Pupil	
	Total (\$)	District (\$)	State (\$)
Instructional Staff and Services	14,072,644	11,285	9,663
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	608,217	488	321
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	531,194	426	578
Student Support Services	1,372,982	1,101	1,103
Administration and Support Services	3,152,529	2,528	1,861
Plant Operation and Maintenance	1,690,482	1,356	1,637
Transportation	990,914	541	877
Costs of Students Tuitioned Out	657,891	N/A	N/A
Other	100,700	81	201
Total	23,177,553	18,308	16,236
Additiona	al Expenditures		
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	106,778	86	1,749

³Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources.

Special Education Expenditures: 2015-16

	Dist	State	
	Total (\$)	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)
Certified Personnel	1,664,230	38.4	34.6
Noncertified Personnel	765,269	17.6	14.6
Purchased Services	221,561	5.1	5.8
Tuition to Other Schools	622,373	14.3	21.8
Special Ed. Transportation	278,757	6.4	8.5
Other Expenditures	787,121	18.1	14.7
Total Expenditures	4,339,311	100.0	100.0

Expenditures by Revenue Source:⁴ 2015-16

	Percent of Total (%)			
	Including Excluding			
	School	School		
	Construction	Construction		
Local	65.8	65.6		
State	32.4	32.5		
Federal	1.8	1.8		
Tuition & Other	0.0	0.0		

⁴Revenue 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).

Performance and Accountability

District Performance Index (DPI)

A District Performance Index (DPI) is the average performance of students in a subject area (i.e., ELA, Mathematics or Science) on the state summative assessments. The DPI ranges from 0-100. A DPI is reported for all students tested in a district and for students in each individual student group. Connecticut's ultimate target for a DPI is 75.

	English Language Arts(ELA)		Mat	h	Science	
	Count	DPI	Count	DPI	Count	DPI
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*	*	0	N/A
Asian	88	86.4	88	91.3	20	71.9
Black or African American	17	*	17	*	7	*
Hispanic or Latino	86	70.1	85	65.2	33	56.9
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Two or More Races	38	81.5	38	78.7	13	*
White	516	79.2	517	76.0	191	65.9
English Learners	47	67.2	47	74.9	11	*
Non-English Learners	699	79.7	699	76.6	253	65.6
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	182	68.9	181	67.3	68	60.8
Not Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	564	82.2	565	79.5	196	66.5
Students with Disabilities	100	54.5	100	52.5	41	51.3
Students without Disabilities	646	82.7	646	80.2	223	67.6
High Needs	266	67.3	266	66.4	98	57.5
Non-High Needs	480	85.4	480	82.1	166	69.5
District	746	78.9	746	76.5	264	65.1

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP): Percent At or Above Proficient¹

	NAEP	NAEP 2013		
READING	Grade 4 Grade 8		Grade 12	
Connecticut	43%	43%	50%	
National Public	35%	33%	36%	
MATH	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade 12	
Connecticut	41%	36%	32%	
National Public	39%	32%	25%	

¹NAEP 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 Smarter Balanced and NAEP. Instead, NAEP results are meant to complement other state assessment data. To view student subgroup performance on NAEP, click here.

Physical Fitness Tests: Students Reaching Health Standard²

	Percent of Students by Grade ³ (%)				All Tested Grades	
	4 6 8 10			Count	Rate (%)	
Sit & Reach	86.6	85.3	80.6	N/A	407	84.3
Curl Up	89.3	85.3	93.0	N/A	407	89.2
Push Up	75.8	70.5	74.4	N/A	407	73.7
Mile Run/PACER	77.9	89.1	85.3	N/A	407	83.8
All Tests - District	65.8	55.8	56.6	N/A	407	59.7
All Tests - State	52.8	51.4	51.4	50.6		51.6

²The 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.

³Only students assessed in all four areas are included in this calculation.

Next Generation Accountability Results

Connecticut's Next Generation Accountability System is a broad set of 12 indicators that help tell the story of how well a district/school is preparing its students for success in college, careers, and life. It moves beyond test scores and graduation rates to provide a more holistic, multifactor perspective of district and school performance.

Indi	cator	Index/Rate	Target	Points Earned	Max Points	% Points Earned	State Average Index/Rate
ELA Performance Index	All Students	78.9	75	50.0	50	100.0	67.1
ELA Performance muex	High Needs Students	67.3	75	44.9	50	89.8	55.9
Math Performance Index	All Students	76.5	75	50.0	50	100.0	62.2
Math Performance muex	High Needs Students	66.4	75	44.3	50	88.6	50.5
Science Performance	All Students	65.1	75	43.4	50	86.7	55.3
Science Performance	High Needs Students	57.5	75	38.4	50	76.7	45.2
FLA Acadomic Crowth	All Students	61.0%	100%	61.0	100	61.0	55.4%
ELA Academic Growth	High Needs Students	54.5%	100%	54.5	100	54.5	49.8%
Math Academic Growth	All Students	70.1%	100%	70.1	100	70.1	61.7%
	High Needs Students	61.8%	100%	61.8	100	61.8	53.7%
	All Students	4.4%	<=5%	50.0	50	100.0	9.9%
Chronic Absenteeism	High Needs Students	7.0%	<=5%	45.9	50	91.8	15.8%
Duamanation for CCD	% Taking Courses	N/A	75%	0.0	0	0.0	70.7%
Preparation for CCR	% Passing Exams	N/A	75%	0.0	0	0.0	43.5%
On-track to High School G	raduation	91.1%	94%	48.5	50	96.9	87.8%
4-year Graduation All Stud	dents (2016 Cohort)	N/A	94%	0.0	0	0.0	87.4%
6-year Graduation - High Needs Students (2014		N/A	94%	0.0	0	0.0	82.0%
Postsecondary Entrance (Class of 2016)		N/A	75%	0.0	0	0.0	72.0%
Physical Fitness (estimated part rate) and (fitness		96.9% 59.7%	75%	39.8	50	79.6	92.0% 51.6%
Arts Access		N/A	60%	0.0	0	0.0	50.5%
Accountability Index				702.6	900	78.1	

Gap Indicators	Non-High Needs Rate ¹	High Needs Rate	Size of Gap	State Gap Mean +1 Stdev ²	Is Gap an Outlier? ²
Achievement Gap Size Outlier?					N
ELA Performance Index Gap	75.0	67.3	7.7	16.7	
Math Performance Index Gap	75.0	66.4	8.6	18.7	
Science Performance Index Gap	69.5	57.5	11.9	16.6	
Graduation Rate Gap					

¹ If the Non-High Needs Rate exceeds the ultimate target (75 for Performance Index and 94% for graduation rate), the ultimate target is used for gap calculations.

 $^{^{2}}$ If the size of the gap exceeds the state mean gap plus one standard deviation, the gap is an outlier.

Sul	oject/Subgroup	Participation Rate (%) ³	
ГІА	All Students	95.4	³ Minimum
ELA	High Needs Students	96.9	participation standard is 95%.
Math	All Students	95.4	
IVIALII	High Needs Students	96.9	
Science	All Students	97.1	
	High Needs Students	97.2	

Connecticut's State Identified Measurable Goal for Children with Disabilities (SIMR)

Increase the reading performance of all 3rd grade students with disabilities statewide, as measured by Connecticut's English Language Arts (ELA) Performance Index.

Grade 3 ELA Performance Index for Students with Disabilities:

District: * State: 50.2

Supporting Resources

Two-page FAQ

Detailed Presentation

Using Accountability Results to Guide Improvement: comprehensive documentation and supports

Narratives

School District Improvement Plans and Parental Outreach Activities

The Mansfield Public Schools seek to continually improve. The Board of Education goal development process focuses the work of the district and in turn each school. Schools identify their own goals connected to the district goals customized to address the needs identified at each school using student performance data and other evidence. These goals become the foundation of the teacher and administrator evaluation plans. As principals and individual teachers develop their own goals for both student performance and professional learning, they seek to advance the work of the district as defined in the Board of Education goals. All educators in the district provide a mid-year and end of year summary of work toward these goals with the opportunity to revise the work based on the needs of students and the school as a whole. Data gathered at the end of the year becomes the starting point for the next year's goals.

Mansfield Public Schools is the fortunate beneficiary of a community that actively supports education. Parents are eager to be included in their child's educational process and seek ways to participate in their child's schooling. Each school regularly communicates with parents through their website which is updated as frequently as daily at some times of the year. A weekly electronic backpack provides information about school and community happenings. Newsletters and principal blogs provide detailed information about instructional programs and school initiatives and provide parents with the information they need to support their child at home. Our annual open house programs typically net ninety percent parent attendance. A similarly high percentage of parents attend parent teacher conferences and hundreds of parents visit the middle school and attend classes with their children during Education Week. Parents are involved directly in the work of our schools through active, collaborative parent organizations, as volunteers in our classrooms and extracurricular activities, and through opportunities to be guest teachers.

Efforts to Reduce Racial, Ethnic and Economic Isolation

Mansfield is a culturally rich community reflective of the student body at the University of Connecticut. Children of graduate students attend our schools resulting in as many as ten percent of our students in a single school coming from homes where English is not the primarily language. We capitalize on this richness by inviting parents into the school to share their culture and family traditions. Several schools host cultural dinners which attract upwards of 200 students and families each. .Our instructional program promotes learning about a variety of cultures including the Hispanic culture as presented in our elementary schools as part of the Spanish language program. By middle school, students may select one of four languages to study. Extracurricular programs and field trips at all school levels further enhance cultural learning for our students. In grades 7 and 8 students are offered the opportunity to spend three weeks in Germany as part of an annual exchange programs or to host students from Germany for three weeks. About 20 students make the trip to Germany every other year and more than 80 students serve as either family or school hosts to German students when they visit Mansfield.

Each year six to ten students attend local magnet schools.

Equitable Allocation of Resources among District Schools

Administrators are directly involved in the annual budget development process. The three elementary principals develop their budgets together to ensure equitable allocation of funds. Some account budgets are developed based on the number of students or staff ensuring that larger schools obtain an equitable amount of funding. Budgets reflect district priorities and are customized at each school to address additional needs. Staffing requests also reflect the number of students attending each school. Class size guidelines are consistent across the schools and an annual report to the Board of Education showing actual numbers of children in each classroom and enrollment trends and predictions assist us with planning for the future. Should a school experience a sustained increase in student population which exceeds the class size guidelines, additional certified or non-certified staff may be added to that school.

Grant funds for Title I and III are distributed based on student population. In addition, our budget for the Enrichment program has been revised to ensure equitable distribution across the four schools as well as being robust enough to support interdistrict competitions.