

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

SUSAN O'BRIEN, Superintendent  
Telephone: (860) 489-2396

Location: 355 Migeon Avenue  
Torrington,  
Connecticut

Website: [www.torrington.org/](http://www.torrington.org/)

---

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: \$21,406
Town Population in 2000: 35,202	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 21.5%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 4.5%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 2%
Number of Public Schools: 7	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 92.5%

\*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): G 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 4,635  
5-Year Enrollment Change -8.8%

**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	1,491	32.2	33.7	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	282	6.1	3.3	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	277	6.0	3.8	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	648	14.0	12.0	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	274	77.6	77.0	79.7
Homeless	21	0.5	0.2	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	89	18.1	21.3	19.0

\*48.0% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

## SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	14	0.3
Asian American	153	3.3
Black	296	6.4
Hispanic	633	13.7
White	3,539	76.4
Total Minority	1,096	23.6

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff:** 3.2%

**Non-English Home Language:** 12.5% 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 35.

---

### 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.

Torrington uses curriculum integration and community connections to inculturate its growing diversity and to prepare its students for a global society.

**Curriculum:** All programming focuses on preparing students to thrive in a global society. Diversity is a core criterion of the district's selection policies and practices for textbook, materials, and technology.. A central office administrator oversees multicultural education so that the thread of diversity experiences weaves its way through all of the K-12 content areas. Educators attend conferences and participate in district-wide and individual professional development that enhances their capacity to deal with learners from diverse backgrounds.

Elementary students participate in CAS programs that expose them to students from all over the state. Character Counts, Growing Good Citizens, and DARE programs teach students to respect others. At the secondary level, students have experiences with young people across the state in curriculum-based programs such as Model UN. Intra-district student activities bring together Torrington's diverse student populations.

Because inclusion is a district initiative, regular and special education students have the opportunity to learn together. In addition, the district's fine arts program regularly incorporates music and guest artists and speakers from diverse groups.

**Connections:** Our schools make connections within and beyond the Torrington borders so that students interact with peers from diverse backgrounds and learn and practice tolerance and acceptance. At all levels, educators use parental and community resources to build students awareness of other cultures. All schools sponsor field trips, co-curricular activities, and community service projects. Athletic teams and music groups participate in regional and state competitions. Through media and professional networks at the state and national level (e.g., NAME), the district seeks to hire and train staff that reflects the growing diversity of our global society.

---

## 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	45.9	54.6	20.8
Writing	57.7	62.5	27.0
Mathematics	56.4	62.8	24.5
Grade 4 Reading	58.2	60.7	29.4
Writing	58.4	64.2	23.6
Mathematics	60.6	63.6	29.9
Grade 5 Reading	66.9	66.0	35.4
Writing	73.0	66.5	50.0
Mathematics	73.0	68.8	44.4
Science	56.8	58.1	27.2
Grade 6 Reading	67.2	68.9	27.6
Writing	56.1	62.2	25.8
Mathematics	65.1	68.8	27.6
Grade 7 Reading	73.1	74.9	31.2
Writing	49.0	62.9	15.3
Mathematics	67.3	66.0	36.9
Grade 8 Reading	60.6	68.4	21.9
Writing	53.1	66.5	18.1
Mathematics	52.8	64.5	18.1
Science	50.8	60.6	21.9

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](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	42.5	47.4	34.8
Writing Across the Disciplines	51.7	55.0	34.4
Mathematics	44.0	47.8	35.9
Science	34.7	42.8	27.5

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
	25.9	36.2	19.5

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		62.0	74.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	495	507	33.3
	Critical Reading	497	503	37.2
	Writing	499	506	38.8

**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	83.4	92.1	10.7
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	13.5	6.6	7.3
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	3.9	2.5	8.8

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	75.6	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	13.3	11.0

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	290.50
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	10.50
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	41.80
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	121.50
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	13.50
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	7.00
School Level	16.00
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	8.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	22.00
School Nurses	10.20
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	188.50

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	15.4	14.5	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	73.9	77.2	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	17.0	17.5	18.3
Grade 2	18.7	18.3	19.3
Grade 5	20.6	20.3	21.0
Grade 7	20.6	19.7	20.5
High School	17.8	19.5	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	944	981	988
Middle School	1,034	1,001	1,016
High School	1,033	1,005	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*	4.1	3.9	3.3
Middle School	3.4	2.8	2.6
High School	3.3	2.6	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	\$34,581	\$7,283	\$7,521	\$7,445	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$536	\$113	\$267	\$227	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,930	\$406	\$461	\$396	\$446
Student Support Services	\$3,395	\$715	\$808	\$887	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$5,239	\$1,103	\$1,351	\$1,294	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$6,235	\$1,313	\$1,382	\$1,360	\$1,377
Transportation	\$3,461	\$683	\$649	\$667	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$5,563	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$723	\$152	\$152	\$166	\$151
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$61,663</b>	<b>\$12,520</b>	<b>\$12,869</b>	<b>\$12,779</b>	<b>\$12,805</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$6,021	\$1,268	\$1,791	\$2,153	\$1,759

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$15896463	25.8	22.1	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	53.7	43.1	2.9	0.3
Excluding School Construction	53.7	42.8	3.2	0.3

---

### 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.

Torrington's budget development process focuses on program and student needs. Building and program administrators work with their respective stakeholders to construct a site budget that meets the Board goals and student needs. Each site budget is then presented by its administrator to the Superintendent and the executive leadership team, who weigh each proposal against criteria based on Board and district goals and the unique needs of each building/ program. The Board's subcommittee on budget then holds public hearings at various schools so that the public can comment on each site budget and the district's budget. Following the Board's adoption of a budget proposal, the city holds a public hearing on the school budget. Built from the building and program level to meet Board goals and vetted by stakeholders, the Torrington budget addresses equitably the diverse needs of each building and program in the district.

---

### SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	732
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	15.3%

---

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	49	1.0	0.9	0.8
Learning Disability	276	5.8	3.8	3.9
Intellectual Disability	27	0.6	0.5	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	83	1.7	1.2	1.0
Speech Impairment	101	2.1	2.6	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	132	2.8	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	64	1.3	1.1	0.9
Total	732	15.3	12.3	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	69.0	81.4
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	5.6	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	28.0	30.2	61.9	65.7
	Writing	14.8	19.5	58.1	64.1
	Mathematics	28.3	30.7	62.4	65.7
	Science	21.3	23.8	53.8	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	12.0	14.1	42.5	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	6.9	13.6	51.7	55.0
	Mathematics	12.5	15.4	44.0	47.8
	Science	10.3	10.6	34.7	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	4.7
	% With Accommodations	95.3
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	42.9
	% With Accommodations	57.1
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		9.4

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	2	0.3
Private Schools or Other Settings	88	12.0

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	411	56.1	70.2	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	173	23.6	14.6	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	148	20.2	15.2	11.2

---

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

Annually the district updates its district improvement plan with the goals of improving student performance and attendance. The state-approved adequate yearly progress was designed to address the needs of all students through changes in curriculum, instruction, and organizational restructuring.

A unique feature of the plan is its commitment to restructuring schools and programs. At the elementary level, each building restructured the work of its literacy teams and extended day programs were offered to at-risk students. At the middle school, the most seriously at-risk students were enrolled in the Upward Bound Academy; high-achieving students were assigned to the Accelerated Pathways for Learning. At the district level, an administrator was assigned to oversee ELL and multicultural education. Elementary and secondary special education supervisors work with buildings to make certain that inclusion works effectively.

Instructional decisions are based on student work---CMT/CAPT, common formative assessments, and other student work. As soon as CMT/CAPT scores are released, intake teachers, including special education teachers, receive a full disaggregation of the data to the strand level for each incoming student. Unduplicated count student subgroup data are also provided to each building. Shortly thereafter, each teacher also receives a similar report for his/her students from the previous year. Extensive curriculum revision is underway. Elementary literacy support teams identify and support at-risk students in flexible clusters. At the secondary level, struggling learners are in small classes, co-taught classes, and/or are provided with additional time to master content through reallocation of staff and/or changes in the building schedule. Professional development for regular and special educators focuses on best practices in literacy and numeracy. Traditional workshops are followed by extensive job-embedded training for staff.

Special education improvements resulted on the program's meeting the State's standards. Planning began for the selection of a special education student database and a program review of the district's outplacements.

---