

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09**Regional School District 09**

ALLEN J. FOSSBENDER, Superintendent
Telephone: (203) 261-2513

Location: 605 Main Street
Monroe,
Connecticut

Website: www.er9.org

This regional school district serves Easton, Redding

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: Fairfield	Per Capita Income in 2000: \$52,183
Town Population in 2000: 15,542	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 5.1%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 9.2%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 1.1%
Number of Public Schools: 1	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 84.4%

*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): A 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, 2008 957
5-Year Enrollment Change 3.5%

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Grade Range 9-12

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	8	0.8	1.1	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	2	0.2	0.6	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	33	3.4	5.8	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	102	10.7	10.2	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	62	12.7	9.2	19.0

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	2	0.2
Asian American	24	2.5
Black	7	0.7
Hispanic	29	3.0
White	895	93.5
Total Minority	62	6.5

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 0.9%

Non-English Home Language: 1.6% 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 9.

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.

- ? Honors Physics students competed in the Yale Physics Olympics competition with area high school students.
 - ? Students attended workshops on choral singing at Central CT State University with area high school students.
 - ? Science students attended CT Academy of Scientific Research (CTASR) monthly meetings at CT Agricultural Experiment Station in New Haven to develop and plan regional, state and/or international science competitions.
 - ? Music students participated in a regional music festival at Danbury High School and in the All-State Music competitive music auditions in North Haven with students from area schools.
 - ? Two students and an art teacher were interviewed on WICC radio to offer commentary on the jewelry auction that was held to raise funds for Lakota Indians.
 - ? The chess team competed in four tournaments with students from area schools including Danbury.
 - ? Barlow students participated in a RYASAP-sponsored workshop in Bridgeport entitled Finding Her Voice to build leadership skills and identify issues impacting the lives of female high school students.
 - ? Drama students participated in CT Drama Association Festival with students from thirteen CT high schools.
 - ? Science students participated in the Annual Science Bowl Competition at UCONN.
 - ? World language students participated in a two-way Spanish immersion exchange project at Danbury High School with members of the ASPIRA club: Latino students who have lived in the US less than six years.
 - ? Science students attended the Science Demo Show and CT Science Fair sponsored by CTASR to meet with other students and view projects and demonstrations.
 - ? Instrumental music students performed at the four-day Heritage Music Festival in Williamsburg, VA and interacted with music students of diverse backgrounds from all states.
 - ? World Language Latin Club students competed with over 2,000 students in the annual State of CT Latin Day.
 - ? Science/technology students attended the ITLA Convention at the Hartford Convention Center EXPO 2009 and participated in all seven-day rounds of the challenge program sponsored by IBM's research center.
 - ? The debate team competed in 13 tournaments with debaters from schools throughout Connecticut.
 - ? Students competed in the Mock Trial Competitions in Danbury, Simsbury and New Britain with students from area high schools.
 - ? Students with disabilities attended Norwalk Community College as a transition activity.
 - ? Partners-In-Science students toured Boehringer-Ingelheim labs and attended research-based lectures with students from area schools.
-

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	N/A	N/A	N/A
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 4 Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 5 Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 6 Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 7 Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 8 Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	71.9	47.4	85.6
Writing Across the Disciplines	84.0	55.0	92.4
Mathematics	74.9	47.8	89.3
Science	69.3	42.8	87.8

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
	N/A	N/A	N/A

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		91.8	74.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	561	507	88.4
	Critical Reading	553	503	89.9
	Writing	570	506	93.8

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	99.6	92.1	96.2
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	0.4	6.6	91.2
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.3	2.5	87.6

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	95.1	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	1.6	11.0

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	71.53
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	0.00
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	5.43
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	0.00
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	2.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	1.00
School Level	8.20
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	3.85
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	9.30
School Nurses	1.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	81.80

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	14.3	12.9	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	82.6	86.3	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A
High School	19.1	19.7	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	N/A	N/A	N/A
Middle School	N/A	N/A	N/A
High School	975	988	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*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Middle School	N/A	N/A	N/A
High School	1.7	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 All figures are unaudited.	Total (in 1000s)	Expenditures Per Pupil			
		District	Secondary Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$10,815	\$11,231	\$7,913	\$8,787	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$307	\$318	\$320	\$237	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$293	\$304	\$386	\$660	\$446
Student Support Services	\$164	\$170	\$720	\$881	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$1,371	\$1,424	\$1,828	\$1,503	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$2,021	\$2,099	\$1,517	\$1,796	\$1,377
Transportation	\$946	\$869	\$788	\$714	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,508	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$0	\$0	\$331	\$168	\$151
Total	\$17,425	\$17,672	\$14,310	\$15,251	\$12,805
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$2,710	\$2,814	\$2,027	\$1,884	\$1,759

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$3,531,234	20.3	19.1	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	93.9	5.3	0.8	0.0
Excluding School Construction	93.1	6.0	0.9	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.

Joel Barlow High School is a regional school serving the towns of Easton and Redding. It is the only school in Region 9. Allocation of resources is determined through the annual process of developing the school's operating budget. Budgetary decisions are guided by the district's strategic commitment to academic excellence, character education, personalized learning, and community involvement. All teachers provide input to their department chairs who work collaboratively with the head of school to develop a budget that reflects the school's mission, particularly Joel Barlow's commitment to the students' academic, civic, and social development. The budget is proposed publicly at meetings conducted by the board of education, where members of the public are able to provide input. The board of education regularly convenes advisory committee meetings to discuss the allocation of resources. These include financial oversight, facilities and fields, and capital maintenance. High school students participate in course registration with guidance from their families. Registration precedes the budget, which means that specific up-to-date data can be used to predict staffing needs. This is taken into account when budgets are developed. Both towns bear proportionate costs, which are allocated according to the percentage of students enrolled from each town. Expenditures are balanced to sustain all academic and non-academic programs and determined in a manner that ensures full participation by members of the staff and full transparency to the community.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	116
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	11.9%

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	8	0.8	0.9	0.8
Learning Disability	36	3.7	3.9	3.9
Intellectual Disability	5	0.5	0.2	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	17	1.7	0.4	1.0
Speech Impairment	8	0.8	2.3	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	36	3.7	1.9	2.1
Other Disabilities**	6	0.6	0.6	0.9
Total	116	11.9	10.1	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	90.0	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 with Disabilities		All Students	
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Writing	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
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	39.3	14.1	71.9	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	58.1	13.6	84.0	55.0
	Mathematics	40.0	15.4	74.9	47.8
	Science	36.4	10.6	69.3	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	N/A
	% With Accommodations	N/A
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	20.5
	% With Accommodations	79.5
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		5.7

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	11.2

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 Peers	Count of Students	Percent of Students		
		District	DRG	State
79.1 to 100 Percent of Time	94	81.0	77.9	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	9	7.8	15.4	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	13	11.2	6.6	11.2

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

Joel Barlow High School spent the 08-09 school year in preparation for implementation of the new guidelines for the identification of students with specific learning disabilities. In-service opportunities were held for the entire faculty in understanding the intent of Response to Intervention, the associated responsibilities of all teachers, and the CT plan for SRBI (Scientific, Research-based Interventions). Members of the pre-referral team received further training for SRBI, while special education, general education, administration and school psychologists attended conferences around the state to develop and refine the SRBI plan. In conjunction with this initiative, literacy training was provided for all members of the faculty with a focus on improved reading fluency and comprehension strategies at the secondary level. The work of our Academic Center, which has provided drop-in support for students in reading, writing and mathematics, was also reviewed and refined to support ongoing supplemental, direct instruction for students experiencing academic difficulties. Our school psychologists focused their time on review of emotional and behavioral concerns that resulted in referral for special education and plans to provide appropriate interventions to those students prior to PPT referrals. This work that will continue into the 09-10 school year as we increase mentoring time for all students and improved understanding of positive behavior supports in the classroom. Transition was also a priority of the Special Education Department, as it moved toward improved use of transition assessments to guide long-term planning for all identified students.

Significant progress has been made on a number of fronts: First, in alignment with the K-8 Easton and Redding School Systems, Region 9 has committed to using Power School as the tri-districts' data management program, which will vastly improve recordkeeping and longitudinal data analysis. Second, a multi-year rotation of professional development was developed, based on an in-house needs assessment. All teachers will receive extended professional development in (1) the use of technology and data-based decision-making, (2) reading comprehension across the disciplines, (3) inquiry-based lesson design, and (4) SRBI/Differentiated Instruction.

Third, significant progress has been made in the quality of the HVAC system and issues related to maintenance of the building. Fourth, during the 2008-2009 school year a revision of our faculty Performance Appraisal System was instituted, which improved feedback to teachers. Fifth, the technology department completed the third year of updating all computers, including upgrades of individual laptops for each teacher, all desktops for staff and classrooms, all computer labs, and the installation of either digital projectors or SmartBoards in almost all of our instructional areas. Sixth, we revised our approach to collaboration with the PTSA to a format that reflected greater partnership by holding monthly informational presentations. Seventh, a new dean revised our approach to discipline replacing the metaphor of a police officer with a more proactive form of intervention. Eighth, through the use of data gathering and oversight, our extracurricular program improved as can be seen in greater attendance and positive school spirit and attendance at our athletic competitions. Ninth, we developed a safety protocol that the nurse uses in all emergencies, including accurate recordkeeping and notification of relevant parties. Tenth, we convened a series of meetings with our middle schools to develop a transition plan. Eleventh, we convened a six-month study of the feasibility of a full 9-12 advisory program. Twelfth, our athletic director created a parents' advisory panel to help design a more inclusive athletics program. Thirteenth, during the 2008-2009 school year, the dean, both assistant principals, the athletic director, and the head of guidance were all new to their jobs; the principal was in his second year; the leadership team developed and assigned job descriptions and responsibilities for the leadership team. Finally, we successfully submitted our five-year interim report to NEASC.
