

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2009-10**Regional School District 13**

SUSAN VICCARO, Superintendent

Location: 135-a Pickett Lane

Telephone: (860)-349-7200

Durham,
ConnecticutWebsite: www.rsd13ct.org/

This regional school district serves Durham, Middlefield

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: Middlesex

Town Population in 2000: 10,830

1990-2000 Population Growth: 12.1%

Number of Public Schools: 6

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$27,911

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 11.0%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.5%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: N/A

*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): 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, 2009 2,084
5-Year Enrollment Change -4.4%

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	94	4.5	6.7	32.6
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	12	0.6	0.7	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	38	1.8	4.6	4.1
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	267	12.8	10.8	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	110	93.2	85.9	80.5
Homeless	1	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	32	11.0	12.7	13.6

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	7	0.3
Asian American	42	2.0
Black	20	1.0
Hispanic	51	2.4
White	1,964	94.2
Total Minority	120	5.8

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 2.0%

Non-English Home Language:

1.3% 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 13.

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.

Regional School District 13 continuously looks for opportunities for our students that will reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation. At the elementary level this is primarily attained through curricular offerings, the utilization of technology and participation in cultural presentations and activities. Specifically, some of our second graders became pen pals with students from China sharing letters and photos and examining the similarities and differences between their respective cultures. Two classes of third and fourth grade students participated in artist residencies partnering with students from the John C. Daniels School in New Haven. A Literacy Unifying Children in Diversity (LUCID) grant from Area Cooperative Educational Services allowed some of our third graders to interact with sister schools using web cameras, writing letters and visiting one another several times throughout the year. At the middle school level we continued to send students to the Thomas Edison Magnet School in Meriden. This math, science and technology focused magnet serves students in grades 6-8. Two other sister school projects teamed us with students from Wolcott and Hartford. Students also participated in several units that used a film medium to study the impact of racial segregation. Students continued to participate in the Diversity Conference sponsored by the Middlesex Consortium. This partnered our students with others from Middletown, Cromwell, Portland and East Hampton. At the high school level programs offered by the Diversity, Edge and Helping Hands Clubs offer students a myriad of opportunities to examine diverse cultures and participate in volunteer activities throughout the communities at large. The majority of students participate in either extra curricular activities, sports or both demonstrating their connection to the school. As part of our Health Curriculum, all juniors and seniors volunteer or participate in service learning activities. A large number of teachers were trained in Capturing Kids Hearts as part of a multi-year focus to further improve school climate and to help students feel connected to their respective schools. This coupled with activities in every building focusing on our Core Ethical Values of Respect, Responsibility, Kindness, Courage and Honesty further promoted our climate initiatives.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Connecticut Mastery Test, Fourth Generation, % 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	71.7	57.0	68.7
Writing	66.3	58.3	55.2
Mathematics	62.9	62.4	38.0
Grade 4 Reading	77.4	59.9	77.4
Writing	74.3	63.6	55.6
Mathematics	75.8	67.0	55.3
Grade 5 Reading	68.7	61.8	50.3
Writing	76.1	68.2	48.8
Mathematics	77.2	72.4	45.2
Science	71.8	59.4	53.0
Grade 6 Reading	82.5	74.9	52.1
Writing	77.6	65.9	63.4
Mathematics	84.3	70.7	65.0
Grade 7 Reading	87.4	77.4	59.1
Writing	66.1	61.2	43.5
Mathematics	84.9	68.5	72.1
Grade 8 Reading	80.4	73.3	53.5
Writing	74.1	62.6	58.0
Mathematics	77.7	67.3	56.7
Science	76.5	62.8	59.9

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 scorable 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	51.1	45.9	53.8
Writing Across the Disciplines	79.6	59.6	78.2
Mathematics	66.4	48.7	71.2
Science	60.6	45.3	66.7

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
	67.4	50.7	86.9

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2009		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		78.2	68.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	526	508	58.1
	Critical Reading	539	503	80.6
	Writing	529	506	69.8

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 2009	68.4	91.3	2.3
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.4	3.0	84.6

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	91.6	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	8.4	10.4

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	146.20
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	14.50
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	18.80
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	34.00
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	8.10
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	4.00
School Level	9.20
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	0.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	10.10
School Nurses	6.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	97.30

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	14.0	14.5	13.8
% with Master's Degree or Above	80.7	79.0	77.8

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	14.8	17.2	18.5
Grade 2	18.6	18.5	19.7
Grade 5	23.4	20.7	21.1
Grade 7	22.3	19.9	20.8
High School	19.4	19.0	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	988	994	992
Middle School	1,054	1,034	1,018
High School	983	1,007	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*	3.7	3.1	3.2
Middle School	2.9	2.2	2.5
High School	2.4	2.4	2.3

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2008-09

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	\$15,396	\$7,242	\$7,819	\$7,380	\$7,829
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$460	\$216	\$274	\$281	\$279
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,096	\$516	\$474	\$406	\$459
Student Support Services	\$3,518	\$1,655	\$863	\$816	\$859
Administration and Support Services	\$2,932	\$1,379	\$1,405	\$1,400	\$1,426
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$3,637	\$1,711	\$1,469	\$1,468	\$1,462
Transportation	\$1,888	\$847	\$701	\$675	\$694
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,218	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$506	\$238	\$163	\$148	\$162
Total	\$30,650	\$14,164	\$13,458	\$13,077	\$13,386
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$2,448	\$1,152	\$1,864	\$1,030	\$1,825

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$6,536,220	21.3	20.2	20.7

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	73.9	24.2	1.3	0.6
Excluding School Construction	74.9	23.0	1.4	0.6

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.

Recognizing the need for good planning in distributing District Resources equitably, the Board of Education holds a fall and winter retreat to determine budget priorities and set district goals within the parameters of the 5-year strategic plan. The Board has also developed a 5 year capital plan that outlines buildings and grounds and infrastructure improvements. Budgets are first developed at the building level ensuring that unique situations (student growth, new programs, individual student needs, etc.) are addressed by those knowing the issues best. Building administrators meet with central office staff and overall priorities are determined before the budget is presented to the Board in March. Board of Education meetings, a public hearing and a District meeting allow for significant input from the public in March, April and May. The budget is voted on in a District-wide referendum held in May. The Board continues to streamline and clarify the budget process in an effort to provide the public with more information and greater transparency.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	271
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	13.0%

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	28	1.3	1.0	1.0
Learning Disability	86	4.1	3.9	3.9
Intellectual Disability	8	0.4	0.4	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	15	0.7	0.7	1.0
Speech Impairment	70	3.4	2.1	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	58	2.8	1.9	2.1
Other Disabilities**	6	0.3	0.7	0.9
Total	271	13.0	10.5	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 2008-09 with a Standard Diploma	100.0	81.0
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	0.0	4.1

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	34.9	31.6	77.9	67.5
	Writing	19.4	19.6	72.4	63.3
	Mathematics	47.3	32.9	77.1	68.1
	Science	30.0	23.7	74.0	61.1
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	13.3	13.8	51.1	45.9
	Writing Across the Disciplines	47.4	16.8	79.6	59.6
	Mathematics	37.5	16.7	66.4	48.7
	Science	26.3	13.0	60.6	45.3

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	14.3
	% With Accommodations	85.7
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	0.0
	% With Accommodations	100.0
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		5.5

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	1	0.4
Private Schools or Other Settings	12	4.4

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	230	84.9	76.7	73.4
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	31	11.4	16.4	15.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	10	3.7	6.9	11.3

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

This year there was a concerted effort across the district in all buildings to create grade level and department data teams that developed and implemented Common Formative Assessments (CFA's) as a means to inform and improve instruction. Data teams also served as a vehicle for teachers to discuss curriculum and evaluate instructional strategies. Individual buildings remain at various stages in their development of CFA's and their development of data teams. Brewster School continued to focus on early literacy and writing for their school improvement plan. The half day kindergarten program was redesigned to integrate literacy throughout the half day session. Students participated in literacy centers as well as guided reading groups. First and second graders participated in Reader's Workshop along with Guided Reading. Fiction and non-fiction texts were used to promote fluency and comprehension. DIBELS and DRA 2 results were utilized to inform instruction and a data wall was created to monitor student progress throughout the year. Brewster also focused on writing, utilizing the CMT handbook to develop a variety of methods to improve students' editing and revising ability. Korn School's school improvement plan focused on reading comprehension along with editing and revising. Instruction focused on helping students use evidence from the text in order to elaborate on open-ended questions when writing a response to comprehension questions. Classroom teachers focused on fluency and identified students' needing interventions based on the results of the DIBELS assessment. The Empowering Writers program was used for instructing both the narrative and expository writing process. John Lyman Elementary School focused on both reading and math as part of their school improvement plan. Specifically in reading they focused on reading comprehension in the area of meaningful text connections. In math the focus was on developing effective strategies to solve fraction problems. Grade level teams worked throughout the year to develop CFA's regarding appropriate reading skills. Memorial Middle School focused its improvement plan on differentiating instruction and in particular, specifically tiered lessons. These lessons consist of a variety of learning tasks that differ in depth to meet the needs of all learners in a classroom. All teachers designed and implemented at least two lessons with their classroom. Strong School's improvement plan focused on reading comprehension assessment as well as creating differentiated lesson plans in the area of math. Strong teachers also continued their focus on utilizing a variety of student data to inform their assessment strategies and instruction. At Coginchaug, teachers focused on differentiated instruction as well as focusing on improving communication as part of the high school's site plan. All departments also had goals in the area of technology as well as developing CFA's within departments. Data team development is the next step in this process. All schools were provided training in Scientifically Researched Based Instruction (SRBI) as well as data teams and CFA's. Grade level teams and middle and high school based departments all developed CFA's and used them to inform instruction and assess student progress.
