7-00 Rev. 11-6

### STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09

## **Berlin School District**

MICHAEL T. CICCHETTI, Superintendent Location: 238 Kensington Road

Telephone: (860) 828-6581 Berlin,
Connecticut

Website: www.berlin.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 <a href="https://www.sde.ct.gov">www.sde.ct.gov</a>.

### **COMMUNITY DATA**

County: Hartford Per Capita Income in 2000: \$27,744

Town Population in 2000: 18,215 Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 13.0% 1990-2000 Population Growth: 8.5% Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000\*: 2% District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 92.2%

District Reference Group (DRG): D 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

## DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Enrollment on October 1, 2008 3,218 Grade Range PK-12 5-Year Enrollment Change -3.8%

## INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in	Percent		
	District	District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	226	7.0	11.7	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	79	2.5	2.3	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented	0	0.0	4.9	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	400	12.4	11.2	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	221	94.4	85.8	79.7
Homeless	5	0.2	0.1	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	87	17.0	22.8	19.0

<sup>\*</sup>To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to <a href="https://www.sde.ct.gov">www.sde.ct.gov</a> and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

### SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity				
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent		
American Indian	7	0.2		
Asian American	132	4.1		
Black	43	1.3		
Hispanic	90	2.8		
White	2,946	91.5		
Total Minority	272	8.5		

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.4%** 

**Open Choice:** 26 student(s) 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**: 7.8% 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 28.

### 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.

The Berlin Public Schools provide a variety of programs and experiences that are designed to reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation. We are encouraged with the response to these efforts from students, staff, and members of our community. Our participation in the Open CHOICE Program has been expanded to all of our elementary schools and to McGee Middle School. We will welcome up to nine additional students for the 2009-10 school year, for a total of 36 students. This initiative is perhaps the most significant accomplishment for our community as it signals a sincere commitment to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation. The Board of Education recognizes that Berlin is not a highly diverse community and that the greater Berlin community also benefits from participation in CHOICE.

Each of our district's five schools has increased the number of learning activities designed to promote diversity. Curriculum revision increasingly reflects cultural diversity, particularly in the areas of language arts, social studies, and the arts. Fortunately, the district continues to receive grant funding for multiple sister school projects that link Berlin schools with urban schools in the greater Hartford area. The school administration provides periodic updates to the Board of Education, and subsequently to the community, detailing the activities that are conducted as part of the district's efforts to educate its students about understanding differences among people. It is in the best interests of the community-at-large to build upon the efforts of the school district and incorporate similar efforts for adult members of our community.

### 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	72.3	54.6	75.5
Writing	75.3	62.5	66.7
Mathematics	75.6	62.8	65.4
Grade 4 Reading	75.6	60.7	73.6
Writing	77.0	64.2	65.5
Mathematics	80.6	63.6	76.2
Grade 5 Reading	84.9	66.0	84.5
Writing	85.8	66.5	90.7
Mathematics	82.4	68.8	72.8
Science	70.3	58.1	53.1
Grade 6 Reading	83.4	68.9	68.7
Writing	83.5	62.2	87.1
Mathematics	81.0	68.8	61.3
Grade 7 Reading	83.0	74.9	56.1
Writing	81.7	62.9	85.4
Mathematics	86.0	66.0	86.0
Grade 8 Reading	85.0	68.4	79.4
Writing	82.9	66.5	75.5
Mathematics	84.8	64.5	79.4
Science	79.9	60.6	71.6

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.

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to <u>www.sde.ct.gov</u> 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	60.8	47.4	65.9
Writing Across the Disciplines	67.6	55.0	62.6
Mathematics	60.8	47.8	61.8
Science	46.4	42.8	45.0

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	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard
Four Tests	50.3	36.2	84.7

SAT® I: Reasonin Class of 2008	g Test	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or	
% of Graduates Te	sted	83.0	74.5	Lower Scores	
Average Score	Mathematics	517	507	58.1	
	Critical Reading	496	503	36.4	
	Writing	501	506	40.3	

**SAT**<sup>®</sup> **I.** The lowest possible score on each SAT<sup>®</sup> 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	91.8	92.1	31.3
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	7.3	6.6	27.0
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	2.1	2.5	26.3

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	91.9	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	5.6	11.0

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

## DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	203.71
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	20.63
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	36.20
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	43.92
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	9.94
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.55
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	6.00
School Level	12.00
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	5.80
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	17.80
School Nurses	5.50
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	123.81

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	14.1	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	81.6	75.1	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	19.5	17.5	18.3
Grade 2	20.6	19.0	19.3
Grade 5	20.8	20.9	21.0
Grade 7	20.5	20.7	20.5
High School	21.3	20.0	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	999	986	988
Middle School	1,072	1,026	1,016
High School	1,053	1,008	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*	3.4	3.7	3.3
Middle School	2.5	3.0	2.6
High School	3.2	3.0	2.4

<sup>\*</sup>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	Total	Expenditures Per Pupil			
All figures are unaudited.	(in 1000s)	District	PK-12	DRG	State
			Districts		
Instructional Staff and Services	\$20,735	\$6,343	\$7,521	\$7,079	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$909	\$278	\$267	\$266	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and	\$1,010	\$309	\$461	\$372	\$446
Educational Media Services					
Student Support Services	\$3,386	\$1,036	\$808	\$754	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$4,215	\$1,289	\$1,351	\$1,261	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$4,790	\$1,465	\$1,382	\$1,261	\$1,377
Transportation	\$1,778	\$523	\$649	\$590	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,032	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$734	\$225	\$152	\$151	\$151
Total	\$38,590	\$11,722	\$12,869	\$12,042	\$12,805
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$665	\$203	\$1,791	\$1,047	\$1,759

Special Education	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education				
Expenditures		District	DRG	State		
	\$7,273,030	18.8	20.6	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	79.7	18.6	1.7	0.0
Excluding School Construction	80.1	18.1	1.7	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.

It has been the practice of the Berlin Board of Education and its central office administration that each school in the district should have comparable resources while recognizing factors such as equipment and specialized supply needs at the secondary school are inherently more costly in nature. The proposed budget for our school district is created by our administrators in the late fall. It is built on the assumption that our three elementary schools would receive a fixed amount for each student enrolled in the school. This would "guarantee" an equitable allocation of resources among our schools. Once that assumption was met, adjustments were then made to determine what additional resources would be allocated to particular schools to adequately address needs particular to a certain school. The same process was then used at our two secondary schools. However, a different per student fixed amount was used because of the significantly higher costs as mentioned above.

Once the proposed budget is adopted, appropriate reductions, if necessary, are made "across the board," and the same per student expenditure ratio described above is maintained as closely as possible.

## **SPECIAL EDUCATION**

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	384
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	12.1%

Of All K-12 Students for Whom District is Financially Responsible, Number and Percentage with Disabilities						
Disability	Count	<b>District Percent</b>	<b>DRG Percent</b>	State Percent		
Autism	35	1.1	1.0	0.8		
Learning Disability	103	3.2	3.3	3.9		
Intellectual Disability	6	0.2	0.4	0.5		
Emotional Disturbance	26	0.8	0.9	1.0		
Speech Impairment	108	3.4	2.5	2.3		
Other Health Impairment*	92	2.9	2.2	2.1		
Other Disabilities**	14	0.4	0.9	0.9		
Total	384	12.1	11.2	11.6		

<sup>\*</sup>Includes chronic health problems such as attention deficit disorders and epilepsy

<sup>\*\*</sup>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	87.2	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	37.7	30.2	80.7	65.7
	Writing	34.3	19.5	81.1	64.1
	Mathematics	37.3	30.7	81.8	65.7
	Science	36.8	23.8	75.2	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	16.1	14.1	60.8	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	16.1	13.6	67.6	55.0
·	Mathematics	3.2	15.4	60.8	47.8
	Science	6.2	10.6	46.4	42.8

For more detailed CMT or CAPT results, go to <a href="www.ctreports.com">www.ctreports.com</a>. To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to <a href="www.sde.ct.gov">www.sde.ct.gov</a> and click on "No Child Left Behind."

Participation in State Assessments of Students with Disabilities Attending District Schools					
CMT	% Without Accommodations	27.5			
% With Accommodations 72.5					
CAPT	CAPT % Without Accommodations				
	% With Accommodations 75.0				
% Asse	ssed Using Skills Checklist	2.4			

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 nondisabled peers, and of receiving the same education.

Settings Other Than This District's Schools					
Placement	Count	Percent			
Public Schools in Other Districts	1	0.3			
Private Schools or Other Settings	14	3.6			

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 Count of Percent of Students					
Peers	Students	District	DRG	State	
79.1 to 100 Percent of Time	275	71.6	75.5	72.7	
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	76	19.8	15.2	16.1	
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	33	8.6	9.3	11.2	

### SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

#### Student Performance and Accomplishments:

District administration and staff present to the Board of Education an annual report on student performance on the Connecticut Mastery Tests (CMT), the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) and the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT). The 2008 CMT results reflected exceptionally high participation rates at 99.9% and strong performance in both math and reading (93.6% at/above proficient in math and 91.3% at/above proficient in reading). CAPT participation rate was 98.8%, with 94.6% of our students scoring at/above proficient in math and 98.2% at/above proficient in reading.

While pleased with the district's overall performance, the staff recognizes the need to evaluate performance levels of specific subgroups and individual students. Our analysis includes work with individual schools and grade levels within the school. Individual schools have instituted instructional support programs to assist in the analysis of student performance data and to help teachers use data to inform instruction and to coach teachers in instructional strategies and best practices.

In addition to the use of data teams at all levels, there has been increased collaboration between our special education and general education teachers. We recognize the specific learning needs that some students have and we are committed to planning and implementing instruction so that all students can meet grade level expectations. As part of the district's implementation of the Scientific Research Based Intervention model administrators have identified grade level benchmark assessments and regular monitoring systems.

Efforts underway to improve student learning include:

- Alignment of teacher, department, school and district goals using student performance data to identify areas in need of improvement
- Use of the Continuous Improvement Model to guide all schools in the development of focused data-driven action plans and performance indicators
- Assessment of all students special education and general education using established benchmark assessments and common formative assessments
- Instructional support staff for math and reading at all levels
- · Increased opportunities for instruction through after school and summer programs
- Established summer reading programs at all schools
- Regular monitoring of students who receive support services to evaluate instruction and to make adjustments as necessary
- Implementation of Scientific Research Based Intervention (SRBI) model
- Coordinated professional development focusing on instructional strategies and reading in the content area for professional and paraprofessional staff at all levels
- Vertical teams for math, science and language arts comprised of general and special education teachers to ensure consistency and continuity of instruction in grades K-12