

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

JUDITH PALMER, Superintendent

Telephone: (203) 888-7754

Location: 1 Great Hill Road

Oxford,

Connecticut

Website: [www.oxfordpublicschools.org](http://www.oxfordpublicschools.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: New Haven

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$28,250

Town Population in 2000: 9,821

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 9.2%

1990-2000 Population Growth: 13.1%

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

Number of Public Schools: 4

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 93.9%

---

\*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 2,014

5-Year Enrollment Change 42.2%

**DISTRICT GRADE RANGE**

Grade Range

PK-11

**INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED**

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	121	6.0	5.5	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	40	2.0	0.6	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	89	4.4	4.0	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	144	7.1	11.0	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	156	89.7	86.0	79.7
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	0	0.0	16.9	19.0

\*73.0% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

## SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	6	0.3
Asian American	39	1.9
Black	33	1.6
Hispanic	68	3.4
White	1,868	92.8
Total Minority	146	7.2

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff:** 1.2%

**Non-English Home Language:** 3.3% 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 15.

---

### 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 Oxford Public School System celebrates diversity. In fact, one of the Board of Education's goals is to create a climate of appreciation, acceptance, respect, care and compassion for all students, parents and staff members. Therefore, we strive to provide an array of opportunities for teachers and students to increase their awareness of and appreciation for differences between human beings. At Oxford High School, an advisory group researched different disabilities and created presentations to be made to other advisory groups, with the focus on acceptance, compassion and care for all.

We continue to create opportunities for our students to have personal contact with students in other districts. For example, this year Great Oak Middle School students are video conferencing with students from Branford and Meriden on model CMT technology based lessons. Oxford teachers collaborate with teachers from these districts regarding best teaching practices that integrate technology and content areas.

Oxford High School students continue their relationship with Groundwork, Bridgeport's Green Team. Oxford students work with students from Harding High School to better the condition of recreational areas and parks. This unique partnership included Oxford High School students who participate in the Youth Conservation Corps and work closely with the Oxford Land Trust.

Oxford school staff is very active in creating cultural awareness activities for our students, both inside and outside of school hours. Great Oak Middle School sponsored an African Culture Day. Speakers and performers from Senegal spent the day at the school teaching about their culture and traditions. The day culminated in a school wide performance of Senegalese dancing and singing. Oxford Center School devotes days to learn more about Native Americans and Alaskans. Quaker Farms School incorporates many different religious and cultural backgrounds in to their seasonal festivities.

The Oxford Public School District continues to promote a respectful environment that not only accepts all human beings, but embraces our differences.

---

## 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	74.5	54.6	84.3
Writing	87.3	62.5	97.5
Mathematics	71.5	62.8	53.5
Grade 4 Reading	65.2	60.7	42.3
Writing	77.2	64.2	67.3
Mathematics	71.7	63.6	54.3
Grade 5 Reading	80.3	66.0	70.2
Writing	82.0	66.5	79.0
Mathematics	80.3	68.8	67.3
Science	79	58.1	77.2
Grade 6 Reading	75.0	68.9	42.9
Writing	75.7	62.2	66.3
Mathematics	73.5	68.8	41.7
Grade 7 Reading	82.6	74.9	54.8
Writing	76.2	62.9	68.8
Mathematics	75.5	66.0	57.3
Grade 8 Reading	84.8	68.4	78.1
Writing	76.2	66.5	53.5
Mathematics	77.9	64.5	58.1
Science	75.7	60.6	61.9

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	59.9	47.4	63.6
Writing Across the Disciplines	67.5	55.0	61.8
Mathematics	55.3	47.8	51.9
Science	50.3	42.8	53.4

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
	42.4	36.2	64.2

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		N/A	N/A	
Average Score	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Critical Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A

**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	N/A	N/A	N/A
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	0.0	2.5	100.0

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	N/A	N/A
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	N/A	N/A

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	115.80
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	37.84
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	16.30
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	28.50
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	4.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	3.00
School Level	7.60
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	1.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	7.00
School Nurses	4.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	43.57

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	15.0	14.4	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	83.2	77.3	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	21.6	17.5	18.3
Grade 2	21.3	19.5	19.3
Grade 5	25.3	20.3	21.0
Grade 7	21.5	19.7	20.5
High School	21.4	18.9	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	960	993	988
Middle School	1,020	1,025	1,016
High School	932	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*	7.8	3.3	3.3
Middle School	6.2	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	Elementary Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$11,711	\$6,331	\$7,411	\$7,069	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$528	\$285	\$332	\$282	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$50	\$27	\$232	\$415	\$446
Student Support Services	\$1,088	\$588	\$796	\$769	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$3,350	\$1,811	\$1,508	\$1,334	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$2,287	\$1,236	\$1,249	\$1,357	\$1,377
Transportation	\$1,374	\$637	\$610	\$638	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out*	\$516	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$244	\$132	\$87	\$141	\$151
<b>Total*</b>	\$21,149	\$11,226	\$12,897	\$12,448	\$12,805
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$923	\$499	\$1,185	\$1,180	\$1,759

\*Town total expenditures (in 1000s) for PK-12 are: Total, \$24,130; Tuition Costs, \$3,497.

Total town expenditures per pupil for PK-12 are \$11,233.

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$5,415,177	22.4	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	64.0	34.7	1.3	0.0
Excluding School Construction	78.3	20.3	1.4	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.

Each building administrator and the special education director submit a budget to the superintendent, outlining their anticipated expenditures for the upcoming year. These budgets are based on identified school goals and/or needs. The Oxford Public Schools' annual budget is thoughtfully prepared using the budget submissions provided by the school administrators. The superintendent, finance director and school board's finance sub-committee work to ensure equity of resources throughout the district. When a final budget is presented to the entire Board of Education it is then adjusted, voted on and sent to Town Hall for submission in the Town of Oxford's Annual Budget. At some point during this process, it may be necessary to reduce our overall budget request. Careful consideration is given to the equity of resources when we are creating the budget and also

---

### SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	151
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	7.0%

---

<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	16	0.7	0.9	0.8
Learning Disability	65	3.0	4.1	3.9
Intellectual Disability	9	0.4	0.4	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	8	0.4	0.7	1.0
Speech Impairment	22	1.0	2.2	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	23	1.1	1.9	2.1
Other Disabilities**	8	0.4	0.6	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>11.6</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

<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	100.0	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	24.6	30.2	77.1	65.7
	Writing	21.0	19.5	79.1	64.1
	Mathematics	27.9	30.7	75.2	65.7
	Science	15.4	23.8	77.4	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	59.9	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	67.5	55.0
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	55.3	47.8
	Science	N/A	N/A	50.3	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	0.0
	% With Accommodations	100.0
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	36.4
	% With Accommodations	63.6
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		6.0

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	9.3

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	114	75.5	74.3	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	26	17.2	19.1	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	11	7.3	6.6	11.2

---

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

Each year, the building principals lead their School Improvement Teams to create building based goals relative to the district's goals. The teams produce detailed improvement plans based on needs identified through student data and other various assessments. The following areas identified for continuous improvement are; improving teaching and learning for all students, increasing technology integration in core subject areas, maintaining safe and secure school cultures, and improving communication. These goals are followed by detailed action steps. The School Improvement Plans are placed on the schools' websites for easy public access.

The principals' budget submissions are tied to their School Improvement Team goals and professional development opportunities are used to promote their advancement. This process assures that all activities and expenditures are directly linked to improvement efforts contained within the School Improvement Plans.

---