

**STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09****Regional School District 12**

BRUCE STORM, Superintendent  
Telephone: (860) 868-6100

Location: 11a School Street  
Washington Depot,  
Connecticut

Website: [www.region-12.org](http://www.region-12.org)

This regional school district serves Bridgewater, Roxbury, Washington

---

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](http://www.sde.ct.gov).

---

**COMMUNITY DATA**

County: Litchfield

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$44,020

Town Population in 2000: 7,556

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 7.8%

1990-2000 Population Growth: 2.3%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000\*: 0.3%

Number of Public Schools: 5

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 91.2%

\*To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://www.sde.ct.gov) and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

---

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**

Enrollment on October 1, 2008 1,011  
5-Year Enrollment Change -14.2%

**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	45	4.5	5.5	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	7	0.7	0.6	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented	0	0.0	4.0	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	154	15.2	11.0	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	57	96.6	86.0	79.7
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	36	17.8	16.9	19.0

## SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	4	0.4
Asian American	19	1.9
Black	11	1.1
Hispanic	28	2.8
White	949	93.9
Total Minority	62	6.1

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff:** 1.7%

**Non-English Home Language:** 1.2% 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 4.

---

### 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.

#### EFFORTS TO REDUCE RACIAL, ETHNIC, AND ECONOMIC ISOLATION

Given the relative isolation of the district in the northwest corner of the state, and inasmuch as the region's population is largely white, the district attempted to provide as many opportunities as possible for teachers and for students to increase their awareness of diversity, to encourage greater sensitivity to differences, and unique experiences to expand cultural awareness.

The individual school reports tell the complete "story," but in summary, the elementary schools (three) and our high school/middle school participated in pen pal programs with students in Waterbury, inter-district grant programs involving several districts including Danbury and Waterbury having to do with expanded literacy, after school programs in the arts (provided by ASAP, a community-based arts program) that broadened cultural sensitivity through the arts, poetry competitions with students in other districts and around the world, and various courses that promoted cultural and gender awareness among students. Faculty participated in a PD program sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League regarding *Sheff v. O'Neill* and focusing on tolerance.

---

## 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	73.0	54.6	78.0
Writing	78.1	62.5	75.5
Mathematics	82.8	62.8	83.0
Grade 4 Reading	74.6	60.7	68.7
Writing	78.7	64.2	74.5
Mathematics	89.8	63.6	95.7
Grade 5 Reading	89.3	66.0	94.4
Writing	79.1	66.5	70.4
Mathematics	84.9	68.8	84.0
Science	77.9	58.1	72.8
Grade 6 Reading	81.3	68.9	60.7
Writing	76.3	62.2	66.9
Mathematics	80.0	68.8	58.3
Grade 7 Reading	80.2	74.9	47.1
Writing	64.6	62.9	38.9
Mathematics	68.3	66.0	42.7
Grade 8 Reading	84.3	68.4	74.2
Writing	76.7	66.5	54.8
Mathematics	73.5	64.5	49.7
Science	81.4	60.6	76.1

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](http://www.ctreports.com).

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://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	62.9	47.4	68.9
Writing Across the Disciplines	73.9	55.0	74.0
Mathematics	64.4	47.8	68.7
Science	62.8	42.8	77.1

For more detailed CAPT results, go to [www.ctreports.com](http://www.ctreports.com).

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://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
	55.3	36.2	93.7

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		93.9	74.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	506	507	45.0
	Critical Reading	513	503	56.6
	Writing	516	506	56.6

**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	100.0	92.1	100.0
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	0.0	6.6	100.0
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.5	2.5	77.4

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	92.9	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	7.1	11.0

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	84.66
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	17.42
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	11.70
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	30.35
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	4.50
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	4.00
School Level	6.17
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	0.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	6.51
School Nurses	4.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	71.41

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	16.5	14.4	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	82.2	77.3	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	14.8	17.5	18.3
Grade 2	18.5	19.5	19.3
Grade 5	17.2	20.3	21.0
Grade 7	16.4	19.7	20.5
High School	25.5	18.9	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	987	993	988
Middle School	1,021	1,025	1,016
High School	987	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*	2.2	3.3	3.3
Middle School	2.1	2.4	2.6
High School	1.8	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	PK-12 Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$9,993	\$9,445	\$7,521	\$7,069	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$619	\$585	\$267	\$282	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$808	\$764	\$461	\$415	\$446
Student Support Services	\$1,387	\$1,311	\$808	\$769	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$1,814	\$1,715	\$1,351	\$1,334	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$2,727	\$2,578	\$1,382	\$1,357	\$1,377
Transportation	\$1,289	\$1,208	\$649	\$638	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$499	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$372	\$352	\$152	\$141	\$151
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$19,509</b>	<b>\$18,198</b>	<b>\$12,869</b>	<b>\$12,448</b>	<b>\$12,805</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$541	\$511	\$1,791	\$1,180	\$1,759

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$3,561,410	18.3	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	91.0	4.4	1.9	2.7
Excluding School Construction	91.2	4.1	2.0	2.8

---

**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.

Not unlike most school districts, RSD #12 has a budget development process that consumes administration and teachers throughout most of the fall months. This process essentially allows for each principal and program leader to develop and propose a budget request for the next fiscal year, including requests for materials, supplies and equipment. Personnel funding is handled centrally and is largely controlled by maintaining class sizes that are similar across the levels to insure that no K-8 student is disadvantaged by having overly large classes. Special education costs are dictated by the requirements of the several PPT's that define program needs, ranging from in-class supports to costly out placements.

The most recent budget request (09-10) brought to the voters for approval had to be level funded with no increase to finally gain community authorization. To achieve a 0% increase, several positions had to be eliminated across the district among both certified and non-certified staff. Learning opportunities remain at present equitable and reasonably comprehensive among all the schools. In future years, with declining enrollment, steep escalations in energy costs, and the mounting prices for health insurance, it will become a much greater challenge to preserve a semblance of programs as they are now, and will require vigilance in just making sure that the students of the Region receive an equitably opportunity for success when compared with other districts.

---

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**


---

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	155
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	16.2%

---

<b>Of All K-12 Students for Whom District is Financially Responsible, Number and Percentage with Disabilities</b>				
<b>Disability</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>District Percent</b>	<b>DRG Percent</b>	<b>State Percent</b>
Autism	7	0.7	0.9	0.8
Learning Disability	59	6.2	4.1	3.9
Intellectual Disability	4	0.4	0.4	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	5	0.5	0.7	1.0
Speech Impairment	35	3.7	2.2	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	33	3.5	1.9	2.1
Other Disabilities**	12	1.3	0.6	0.9
Total	155	16.2	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

<b>Graduation and Dropout Rates of Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>State</b>
% Who Graduated in 2007-08 with a Standard Diploma	91.7	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	50.0	30.2	81.1	65.7
	Writing	35.3	19.5	75.4	64.1
	Mathematics	40.3	30.7	79.3	65.7
	Science	43.8	23.8	79.7	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	62.9	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	73.9	55.0
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	64.4	47.8
	Science	N/A	N/A	62.8	42.8

For more detailed CMT or CAPT results, go to [www.ctreports.com](http://www.ctreports.com). To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://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	9.3
	% With Accommodations	90.7
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	8.3
	% With Accommodations	91.7
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		3.7

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	14	9.0

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	60.6	74.3	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	48	31.0	19.1	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	13	8.4	6.6	11.2

---

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

In order to insure that all of the Region's students learn at high levels, the administration undertook a revision of the previous Strategic Plan during the 08-09 school year and arrived at a streamlined version that established direction for improvement for the next three years. The key Goal areas are: Curriculum, Student Needs, Data, and Technology. In each area a Goal Team, working with the Superintendent and the Director of Curriculum, established the near term objectives, measurement indicators, and completion timelines. These Goals, and attendant objectives and implementation plans then drove development of School Success Plans at each facility with SMART goals being written by faculty with the intention of knowing where instruction was successful and where it was not. Gradually each building is developing its own data culture where student accomplishment is central.

Focuses for improvement are gleaned from close analysis of CMT and CAPT scores, as well as through the use of various interim assessments that allow for the adjustment of instruction to insure the success of all learners. Further, work done over the last few years in the areas of differentiated instruction and Understanding by Design now finds its application under the broader umbrella of measured performance. Clear curricular outcomes and an array of instructional strategies will contribute significantly to the instructional adjustments called for by the periodic assessments of the learning students managed to achieve.

Each of our buildings is gradually evolving their own professional learning communities which encourage the sharing of data and related information in jointly and collegially developing responsive interventions.

---