

**STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2012-13****Plymouth School District**

Anthony W. Distasio, Superintendent

Location: 77 Main Street

Telephone: (860) 314-8004

Terryville,  
ConnecticutWebsite: [plymouth.k12.ct.us/](http://plymouth.k12.ct.us/)


---

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

Town Population in 2000: 11,634

1990-2000 Population Growth: -1.6%

Number of Public Schools: 4

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$23,244

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 18.5%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000\*: 0.6%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 96.3%

---

\*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): F 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, 2012      1,606  
 5-Year Enrollment Change      -15.3%

---

**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	427	26.6	30.5	36.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	8	0.5	2.0	5.8
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented	0	0.0	2.2	3.8
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	231	14.4	12.0	11.9
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	76	82.6	72.5	79.3
Homeless	1	0.1	0.3	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	29	11.2	15.1	12.7

## SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	6	0.4
Asian American	19	1.2
Black	33	2.1
Hispanic	61	3.8
Pacific Islander	1	0.1
White	1,482	92.3
Two or more races	4	0.2
Total Minority	124	7.7

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff:** 1.9%

**Non-English Home Language:**

0.6% 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 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.

Plymouth Public Schools engages in many activities designed to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation. Either through intra-district collaborative programs or community based efforts, the students that attend Plymouth schools are nurtured and cared for despite Plymouth being a community of moderate means and with 30% of its students on free and reduced lunch. At graduation this past June, over \$250,000 of local scholarships were given to a graduating class of approximately 150 students. The level of community involvement allows students and community members alike to develop deeper understandings for differences and promotes greater tolerance for diversity. The Leo club at Terryville High School engages in many civic activities and fundraising for those less fortunate. We send more than 100 students to magnet schools in Waterbury, such as Maloney, Rotella and the Performing Arts Magnet School. Our School to Career program is heavily involved in community work; our students also participate in the Conference for the United Way Youth Forum, Youth and Government Day, and the Diversity Club. Our Kids in the Middle program also works on civic and philanthropic activities, this middle school program partners with the United Way in Bristol, Burlington and Plainville. The school district has started taking foreign exchange students again, and is planning on adding Japanese to its Worlds Language program. One of the initiatives is to take students to Japan and develop a sister school partnership with a Japanese high school program. Plymouth Public Schools is committed to helping our students develop understandings and greater acceptance for diverse cultures. In order to prepare our students for a global economy and the 21st century experience, we strive to engage our students in as many authentic and real-life opportunities as possible.

---

## 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	65.1	56.9	50.6
Writing	69.5	60.0	55.3
Mathematics	57.9	61.4	26.7
Grade 4 Reading	65.1	62.6	39.2
Writing	58.2	63.0	27.2
Mathematics	59.5	65.1	27.2
Grade 5 Reading	66.4	66.9	33.5
Writing	67.3	65.6	37.9
Mathematics	70.3	69.2	35.4
Science	66.4	62.3	37.3
Grade 6 Reading	77.8	73.3	42.5
Writing	65.0	65.1	35.3
Mathematics	61.3	67	27.4
Grade 7 Reading	69.9	78.9	15.8
Writing	43.5	64.9	10.1
Mathematics	62.9	65.4	31.6
Grade 8 Reading	65.5	76.2	13.9
Writing	47.4	67.2	8.8
Mathematics	66.9	65.0	34.6
Science	58.6	60.4	28.3

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 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	53.0	48.5	43.2
Writing Across the Disciplines	72.0	62.1	50.8
Mathematics	54.5	52.4	40.2
Science	41.0	48.8	30.1

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
	63.0	51.1	75.9

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2012		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		64.6	78.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	491	503	36.1
	Critical Reading	483	499	30.8
	Writing	494	504	33.8

**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, Adjusted Cohort Rate 2012	84.2	84.8	25.0
2011-12 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	2.0	2.1	15.0

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	78.8	82.6
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	18.6	9.8

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	113.80
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	8.05
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	19.80
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	26.96
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	4.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	5.00
School Level	6.00
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	1.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	8.00
School Nurses	4.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	125.60

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	14.4	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	83.0	81.1	79.8

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	15.3	16.7	18.9
Grade 2	15.7	18.3	19.8
Grade 5	18.5	20.8	21.3
Grade 7	35.3	18.3	20.2
High School	17.1	17.4	18.8

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	999	988	999
Middle School	1,025	1,037	1,029
High School	1,030	1,035	1,027

\*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*	2.4	2.4	2.7
Middle School	1.7	2.5	2.1
High School	0.9	1.7	2.1

\*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

### DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2011-12

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	\$14,291	\$8,725	\$8,570	\$8,246	\$8,570
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$983	\$600	\$252	\$310	\$257
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$214	\$131	\$475	\$275	\$471
Student Support Services	\$756	\$461	\$949	\$775	\$950
Administration and Support Services	\$1,908	\$1,165	\$1,526	\$1,611	\$1,547
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$2,767	\$1,689	\$1,466	\$1,488	\$1,459
Transportation	\$2,195	\$1,170	\$775	\$811	\$765
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,322	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$384	\$235	\$170	\$175	\$170
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$24,821</b>	<b>\$13,512</b>	<b>\$14,444</b>	<b>\$13,850</b>	<b>\$14,333</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$1,905	\$1,163	\$1,405	\$1,495	\$1,398

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$5,025,592	20.2	20.6	21.8

**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	52.3	43.1	4.5	0.0
Excluding School Construction	50.4	44.8	4.9	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.

Plymouth Public Schools is committed to allocating resources equally across the district. The district and the community collaborated this summer to develop a new Strategic Plan and board of education goals that raises expectations for all students. This framework provides the foundation for the development of district improvement plans and school improvement plans which will result in creating a through-line of instructional fidelity Pre-K - 12.

This framework also becomes the underpinnings for budget planning. The superintendent and Board of Education, along with administration, staff, students and the community, are working shoulder to shoulder to provide equitable resources to all students through budget decisions and reallocation of staff. Special Education resources, as well as Title I funding has been redistributed according to the most demonstrated need. Team work has been emphasized district-wide so staff are working more effectively and efficiently with each other; work that will most certainly result in better outcomes for all students.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	247
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	14.2%

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	26	1.5	1.3	1.3
Learning Disability	74	4.2	3.8	4.0
Intellectual Disability	6	0.3	0.5	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	29	1.7	1.3	1.0
Speech Impairment	36	2.1	2.1	2.0
Other Health Impairment*	63	3.6	2.3	2.4
Other Disabilities**	13	0.7	0.9	1.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>12.1</b>

\*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 2011-12 with a Standard Diploma	41.2	64.4
2011-12 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	N/A	3.2

## 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	21.6	34.5	68.3	69.2
	Writing	11.8	19.9	57.2	64.4
	Mathematics	16.7	29.0	63.3	65.5
	Science	20.0	21.3	61.9	61.3
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	53.0	48.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	10.0	16.7	72.0	62.1
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	54.5	52.4
	Science	10.0	14.6	41.0	48.8

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	16.1
	% With Accommodations	83.9
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	7.1
	% With Accommodations	92.9
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		9.5

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	0	0.0
Private Schools or Other Settings	15	6.1

### 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	190	76.9	73.7	72.0
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	31	12.6	15.9	16.4
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	26	10.5	10.4	11.6

---

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

In 2012, there was a concentrated effort to update the school curriculum to align to the new Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in English Language Arts, Mathematics, and several content areas. Middle school teachers worked with a professional consultant to develop curriculum maps aligned to the CCSS and began developing CCSS assessments and learning tasks. In the elementary schools, teams created theme-based mapped units which integrated literacy with Science and Social Studies and focus on authentic learning tasks. In all schools, the teachers will continue to enhance the curriculum and develop performance-based assessments using the CCSS and other CCSS resources. The revision of common assessments and their analysis to target instruction will continue to be a district-wide initiative. In the area of Special Education, we continue to enhance programs to meet the needs of our students and tailor programs to students' individual needs. In most classrooms, an inclusion model is used so that students in special education programs have access to the regular classroom. Our self-contained Apple Program provides structured, intensive support for students with intense needs such as autism, intellectual disabilities, multiple disabilities, or other health impairments. In several cases, students in the Apple Program are partially mainstreamed so that student services are personalized and tailored to each student. We continue to increase literacy support for identified special education students who are also in need of literacy support. We implemented new literacy labs in the middle school. In addition, we implemented our SWAT program which uses technology-based instruction with support from a certified Special Education Teacher to offer high-interest, individualized instruction to high school students. In addition, our district added a school-based social worker through Community Mental Health Affiliates (CMHA) who offers individual and family counseling to our students and families to support their social development. To decrease truancy, our school social workers work closely with the School-Resource Officer (SRO) to work with families of truant students. After a prescribed number of absences, students will meet with the school social worker and the SRO will visit the student's home to work with families so that students attend school regularly. Our district continues to use the Juvenile Review Board. Rather than going to court, students and families with truancy issues come before and work with the Juvenile Review Board to resolve truancy issues. In order to engage parents in school programs, our Parent Teacher Associations and PTA Council meet monthly. In addition, in the high school, parents work with the school to improve programs through the Booster Club and Friends of Music. Furthermore, parents were involved in the hiring of the new district Superintendent. The district encouraged all parents to take an online survey on the qualities they were seeking in a new Superintendent. Two parents also served on the hiring committee for the new Superintendent who began in December 2012. In the summer of 2013, the district formed a district improvement team composed of stakeholders from the school and broader community. The team revised the district mission and vision which will serve as the foundation for an updated district improvement plan.

---