

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2007-08**New Haven School District**

REGINALD R. MAYO, Superintendent
Telephone: (203) 946-8888

Location: 140 Dewitt Street
New Haven,
Connecticut

Website: www.nhps.net/

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: \$16,393
Town Population in 2000: 123,626	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 25.2%
1990-2000 Population Growth: -5.2%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 6.3%
Number of Public Schools: 43	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 91.7%

*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): I 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 19,851
5-Year Enrollment Change -2.9%

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Grade Range PK-12

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	13,995	70.5	81.7	28.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	2,331	12.8	15.0	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	660	3.3	2.0	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	1,826	9.2	12.6	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	1,028	68.4	61.5	79.2
Homeless	116	0.6	0.5	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	227	10.3	16.0	20.2

*66.4% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	36	0.2
Asian American	293	1.5
Black	10,080	50.8
Hispanic	7,056	35.5
White	2,386	12.0
Total Minority	17,465	88.0

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 27.5%

Open Choice: 49 students attended this district as part of the Open Choice program. Open Choice brings students from urban areas to attend school in suburban or rural towns, and students from non-urban areas to attend city schools.

Non-English Home Language: 28.6% 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 57.

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.

New Haven hosts the largest Interdistrict Magnet Program in the State of Connecticut and through the support of the Mayor, Superintendent, and the community, New Haven has reduced the racial, ethnic and economic isolation for thousands of students who attend our public schools.

New Haven offers choice to students in many ways. Through our partnership with 30 area towns, ACES and the State Department of Education, we are able to offer programs and/or schools with specific themes integrated into a rigorous academic curriculum. This past year, with the opening of four new Interdistrict Magnet Schools, Beecher (Museum), Ross/Woodward (Classical Studies), John Daniels (International Studies) and The Engineering and Science Magnet at UNH, we brought our total of interdistrict magnet schools to eighteen and attracted nearly 2,000 suburban students to the New Haven Public School District. This year's student recruitment and lottery process increased the number of suburban applicants to 1,500. The number of white suburban students accepted into our interdistrict magnet schools has increase as well.

These interdistrict magnet schools join nine intradistrict magnet schools, plus four charter schools and two regional magnet schools to compose a comprehensive plan which can accommodate the challenges and interests of all kids. Through our Open Choice program sponsored by ACES and the State, we have a total of 420 students attending suburban schools, while 50 suburban students came to New Haven under the sponsorship of the same program. Under the Voluntary School Choice Grant awarded to New Haven and in fulfillment of the No Child Left Behind objective, we have expanded from six intradistrict Lighthouse Schools to nine. This provides hundreds of children in low performing schools the opportunity to attend higher performing Lighthouse Schools through an application and lottery process. All of our programs provide the optimum choice for all students and to achieve a diverse environment from which students will learn with and from each other, while understanding and appreciating the differences in all of us.

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	20.5	52.0	3.1
Writing	36.9	63.4	4.3
Mathematics	36.3	60.0	5.5
Grade 4 Reading	28.2	55.9	5.1
Writing	37.2	62.9	3.8
Mathematics	36.6	60.3	7.5
Grade 5 Reading	29.9	62.2	3.7
Writing	27.3	64.5	1.9
Mathematics	36.7	65.9	4.3
Science	21.3	54.9	6.2
Grade 6 Reading	38.2	66.3	5.4
Writing	32.9	61.9	3.6
Mathematics	42.2	66.4	7.1
Grade 7 Reading	42.1	71.1	8.4
Writing	29.3	62.0	3.9
Mathematics	32.3	63.0	7.1
Grade 8 Reading	33.9	64.8	5.0
Writing	28.6	63.4	3.1
Mathematics	33.2	60.8	8.2
Science	24.9	58.6	7.5

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	16.7	45.5	8.5
Writing Across the Disciplines	26.4	57.9	5.4
Mathematics	15.4	50.1	7.7
Science	15.5	46.3	6.9

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
	24.4	36.1	13.9

SAT [®] I: Reasoning Test Class of 2007		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		72.2	77.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	407	504	6.9
	Critical Reading	415	502	5.4
	Writing	417	503	6.9

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	78.6	92.6	3.8
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2007	15.3	6.2	4.5
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	5.6	1.7	3.0

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	87.1	83.4
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	8.2	12.3

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	1274.90
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	302.00
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	197.45
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	152.00
Library/Media Specialists and Assistants	37.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	21.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	38.00
School Level	109.00
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	69.20
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	96.20
School Nurses	32.10
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	966.00

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	11.1	12.5	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	66.1	73.0	75.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	24.0	20.3	18.1
Grade 2	21.1	20.5	19.3
Grade 5	20.5	22.3	20.9
Grade 7	20.4	22.2	20.5
High School	7.8	14.9	18.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,003	986	987
Middle School	1,025	1,009	1,017
High School	1,015	994	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*	2.5	3.1	3.4
Middle School	1.6	3.0	2.7
High School	2.7	2.7	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	PK-12 Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$172,280	\$8,596	\$7,153	\$7,692	\$7,159
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$5,239	\$261	\$262	\$299	\$266
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$8,832	\$441	\$443	\$567	\$429
Student Support Services	\$10,103	\$504	\$764	\$752	\$761
Administration and Support Services	\$33,304	\$1,662	\$1,256	\$1,315	\$1,271
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$32,105	\$1,602	\$1,329	\$1,392	\$1,322
Transportation	\$16,615	\$857	\$605	\$723	\$601
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$13,909	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$4,316	\$215	\$147	\$154	\$145
Total	\$296,702	\$14,508	\$12,203	\$13,260	\$12,151
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$126,086	\$6,291	\$1,875	\$2,960	\$1,882

Special Education Expenditures	
Total Expenditures	\$53,408,597
Percent of Total PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education	18.0%

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	19.9	70.2	8.4	1.4
Excluding School Construction	27.2	58.7	12.0	2.1

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.

NHPS continues to work with its state and local partners to formulate structures and systems that will allow each school and individual student to reach their potential. With a strong data driven process in place in both the academic and facility management area, NHPS is able to identify areas of need and deploy necessary resources within the system to track progress of schools and students. NHPS is, in fact, a leader in the state with this data driven model and the significant gains in test scores are reflective of this success. With respect to facilities, NHPS is implementing an on-line work order system and is planning to greatly enhance its computerized tracking system for school meals and food inventory. In addition, NHPS is engaging in long range maintenance planning and capital investment reviews. All of these elements will allow for well reasoned budget decision making for both the short and long terms through data driven analysis. The successful Magnet School Program continues to grow utilizing a lottery system, to ensure equitable educational opportunities for all children. The Billion Dollar City wide School Construction Program is on target to renovate or rebuild every school in the district with state of the art facilities and learning environments by the year 2012.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	1,920
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	10.6%

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	131	0.7	0.6	0.7
Learning Disability	579	3.2	5.0	4.0
Intellectual Disability	142	0.8	0.8	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	257	1.4	1.6	1.0
Speech Impairment	335	1.8	2.4	2.4
Other Health Impairment*	343	1.9	1.9	2.1
Other Disabilities**	133	0.7	1.1	0.9
Total	1,920	10.6	13.5	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	80.2	77.2
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	5.6	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	5.5	20.4	31.6	62.1
	Writing	4.4	19.3	32.2	63.0
	Mathematics	9.6	22.6	36.2	62.7
	Science	6.4	22.2	23.0	56.8
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	6.9	11.4	16.7	45.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	4.8	16.3	26.4	57.9
	Mathematics	8.8	14.7	15.4	50.1
	Science	15.9	14.4	15.5	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	23.8
	% With Accommodations	76.2
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	74.6
	% With Accommodations	25.4
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		11.2

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	86	4.5
Private Schools or Other Settings	275	14.3

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	1,391	72.4	67.7	71.6
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	230	12.0	16.5	16.6
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	299	15.6	15.8	11.8

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

New Haven is a Data Driven District confirmed by Cambridge Review; Data Teams have been established in every school as well as Central Office; Comprehensive Professional Development Program with focus on classroom practice and teachers' professional knowledge; Comprehensive Curriculum Package & five-year cycle of review; Regular district-wide formative assessments in the core areas; ELL's has been strengthened.

Significantly reduced identification rate of students with disabilities; Proactive effort to reach out to parents & the community; Detailed communications & engagement strategy; Key Stakeholder groups provide regular feedback- this includes High School Leadership Council; Strong partnership with the teacher's union Administrator's union & senior management are generally positive; Behavioral Supports-partners with School Development Program of Yale Child Study Center.

What will be different in the district one year/New Strategies/interventions>

Benchmark Goals for 2007-2011 have been established; to accomplish these goals the District will focus on the following Tier II's: Improving Teacher Quality; Improving Administrator Quality; Implementing & Monitoring effective Data Teams at all levels; Developing & Implementing a District Wide Literacy Intervention Plan.

Two key recommendations from Cambridge Review will be addressed: Strengthening mechanisms for supporting and challenging schools and review the role of director of instruction; Providing Leadership & Accountability Training for Directors & Curriculum Supervisors; Providing Leadership & Accountability Training for schools; Implement and monitor a Comprehensive district-wide behavior support strategy; Implement in-school suspension and expulsion pilot; Positive Behavior Support (PBS) will expand based on data; Truancy Plan will be expanded; Revitalization of the Comer School Reform Model.

During the 2007-08 year the New Haven Public Schools' Student Services/Special Education Department has been in the fore front in tracking suspensions and disciplinary infractions of special education students via the newly developed Discipline Tracking Form. Every school uses this document to track student who require alternatives to suspensions.

On the behavior front, the student services department in conjunction with the Special Education Resource Center (SERC) has received training in scientifically researched based positive behavior supports (PBS) to address the social/emotional/behavior needs of students. New Haven Public Schools is in it's first year planning phase relative to implementation.

The Department has purchased, trained and implemented a Web-Based Planning and Placement Team System called IEP Direct to continue educating the community. The Department developed a district web site that supports access to state and local district policies, procedures, personnel and programs.

The Student Services' Department embarked on the journey to provide professional development to district personnel relating to Cultural Responsive Education. This model is supported by the National Center for culturally responsive Educational Systems (NCCRES) in collaboration and support from Stupski Foundation.

With regards to literacy intervention, the Department of Student Services continues to expand professional development opportunities in various reading intervention programs. In an effort to increase capacity in our schools, training of teachers in such programs as Wilson, Lexia, Corrective Reading SRA, and Edmark have continued. More positively, student data collected towards the end of this school year demonstrates positive results as measured by the increase in student reading scores.

In response to the CSDE drive for Response to Intervention (RTI), the NHPS developed a literacy committee to provide a 3 Tier's model of service delivery. This delivery model specifically focused on enhancing literacy outcomes in this District.

As an ongoing effort to strengthen the connection between New Haven Public Schools and community agencies, the Student Services Department has conducted several townhouse meetings with community based child guidance organizations to support needs of students with social/emotional needs.
