### Connecticut State Department of Education

# DISTRICT PROFILE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2015–16



### Plymouth School District

Dr. Martin Semmel, Superintendent • 860-314-8005 • http://plymouth.k12.ct.us/

#### **District Information**

Grade Range	PK-12
Number of Schools/Programs	5
Enrollment	1,522
Per Pupil Expenditures <sup>1</sup>	\$14,330
Total Expenditures <sup>1</sup>	\$24,805,250

<sup>1</sup>Expenditure data reflect the 2014-15 year.



### **Community Information**

<u>CERC Town Profiles</u> provide summary demographic and economic information for Connecticut's municipalities

### **Related Reports/Publications**

CT Reports (CMT/CAPT)

District and School Performance Reports

Special Education Annual Performance Reports

SAT®, AP®, PSAT® Report by High School (Class of 2016)

(2016® The College Board)

#### Contents

Studen	ts	1
Educat	ors2	2
Instruc	tion and Resources2	2
Perform	mance and Accountability	1
Narrati	ves 7	7

#### **Notes**

Unless otherwise noted, all data are for 2015-16 and include all grades offered by the district.

In most tables, data are displayed only for the three major race/ethnicity categories. For additional race/ethnicity categories, please visit edsight.ct.gov.

State totals are not displayed as they are not comparable to district totals.

Special Education tables reflect only students for whom the district is fiscally responsible.

\* When an asterisk is displayed, data have been suppressed to ensure student confidentiality. N/A is displayed when a category is not applicable for a district or school.

### **Students**

October 1, 2015 Enrollment				
		District	State	
	Count	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)	
Female	715	47.0	48.3	
Male	807	53.0	51.6	
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	0.2	
Asian	22	1.4	4.9	
Black or African American	*	*	12.8	
Hispanic or Latino	108	7.1	23.0	
Pacific Islander	0	0.0	0.0	
Two or More Races	22	1.4	2.7	
White	1,348	88.6	55.9	
English Learners	15	1.0	6.4	
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	486	31.9	38.0	
Students with Disabilities <sup>1</sup>	229	15.0	13.7	

<sup>1</sup>Students in this category are students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) only. This category does not include students with Section 504 Plans.

### **Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension/Expulsion**

	Chronic		Suspension/	
	Absenteeism <sup>2</sup>		Expu	ılsion³
	Count	Rate (%)	Count	Rate (%)
Female	78	11.2	19	2.6
Male	83	10.8	63	7.8
Black or African American	*	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	14	13.1	*	*
White	141	10.9	72	5.3
English Learners	*	*	*	*
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	90	19.7	51	9.8
Students with Disabilities	49	22.8	26	10.2
District	161	11.0	82	5.4
State		9.6		7.0

Number of students in 2014-15 qualified as truant under state statute: 135

Number of school-based arrests: Fewer than 6

<sup>2</sup>A student is chronically absent if he/she misses ten percent or greater of the total number of days enrolled in the school year for any reason. Pre-Kindergarten students are excluded from this calculation.

<sup>3</sup>The count and percentage of students who receive at least one in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension or expulsion.

### **Educators**

### Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)1 Staff

	FTE
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	97.0
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	14.4
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	15.0
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	16.9
Administrators, Coordinators and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	5.0
School Level	6.0
Library/Media	
Specialists (Certified)	1.0
Support Staff	3.0
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers	14.3
Counselors, Social Workers and School Psychologists	10.0
School Nurses	4.0
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services/Support	111.0

<sup>1</sup>In the full-time equivalent count, staff members working part-time in the school are counted as a fraction of full-time. For example, a teacher who works half-time in a school contributes 0.50 to the school's staff count.

### **Educators by Race/Ethnicity**

		District	State
	Count	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0.0	0.1
Asian	0	0.0	1.0
Black or African American	1	0.7	3.5
Hispanic or Latino	2	1.3	3.5
Pacific Islander	0	0.0	0.0
Two or More Races	0	0.0	0.1
White	146	98.0	91.7

### Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers<sup>2</sup>

	Percent of Total (%)	
District	98.6	
District Poverty Quartile: Middle		
State High Poverty Quartile Schools	97.6	
State Low Poverty Quartile Schools	99.6	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Core academic classes taught by teachers who are fully certified to teach in that subject area.

#### **Classroom Teacher Attendance: 2014-15**

	District	State
Average Number of FTE Days Absent Due to Illness or Personal Time	7.9	9.4

### **Instruction and Resources**

# 11th and 12th Graders Enrolled in College-and-Career-Readiness Courses during High School<sup>3</sup>

	11th		12th	
	Count	Rate (%)	Count	Rate (%)
Black or African American	*	*	0	0.0
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	6	*
White	99	88.4	87	87.0
English Learners	*	*	*	*
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	25	73.5	27	87.1
Students with Disabilities	12	*	15	71.4
District	105	87.5	95	87.2
State		61.2		73.9

<sup>3</sup>College-and-Career-Readiness Courses include Advanced Placement®(AP), International Baccalaureate®(IB), Career and Technical Education(CTE), workplace experience and dual enrollment courses.

# Students with Disabilities Who Spend 79.1 to 100 Percent of Time with Nondisabled Peers<sup>4</sup>

	Count	Rate (%)
Autism	*	*
Emotional Disturbance	19	73.1
Intellectual Disability	0	0
Learning Disability	49	90.7
Other Health Impairment	53	81.5
Other Disabilities	*	*
Speech/Language Impairment	30	100.0
District	163	73.4
State		68.8

<sup>4</sup>Ages 6-21

### Students with Disabilities by Primary Disability<sup>1</sup>

	Dis	State	
	Count	Rate (%)	Rate (%)
Autism	31	1.9	1.6
Emotional Disturbance	26	1.6	1.0
Intellectual Disability	7	0.4	0.5
Learning Disability	54	3.3	4.6
Other Health Impairment	65	4.0	2.8
Other Disabilities	15	0.9	1.0
Speech/Language Impairment	38	2.3	1.9
All Disabilities	236	14.4	13.4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Grades K-12

### Overall Expenditures: 2014-15

		Per Pupil	
	Total (\$)	District (\$)	State (\$)
Instructional Staff and Services	14,089,452	9,155	9,387
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	667,266	434	318
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	430,010	279	541
Student Support Services	748,322	486	1,048
Administration and Support Services	2,558,553	1,662	1,790
Plant Operation and Maintenance	2,439,251	1,585	1,608
Transportation	1,891,817	1,061	845
Costs of Students Tuitioned Out	1,518,021	N/A	N/A
Other	462,558	301	194
Total	24,805,250	14,330	15,762
Additiona	al Expenditures		
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	1,421,392	924	1,524

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources.

### **Special Education Expenditures: 2014-15**

	Dist	District		
	Total (\$)	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)	
Certified Personnel	2,032,229	34.2	35.1	
Noncertified Personnel	628,981	10.6	14.5	
Purchased Services	364,075	6.1	5.5	
Tuition to Other Schools	1,311,661	22.1	21.6	
Special Ed. Transportation	555,248	9.4	8.3	
Other Expenditures	1,041,576	17.6	15.0	
Total Expenditures	5,933,770	100.0	100.0	

# Expenditures by Revenue Source:4 2014-15

	Percent of Total (%)				
	Including Excluding				
	School School				
	Construction Construction				
Local	56.3	53.7			
State	41.0	43.3			
Federal	2.6	2.7			
Tuition & Other	0.2	0.2			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>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 Correction).

### **Performance and Accountability**

### **District Performance Index (DPI)**

A District Performance Index (DPI) is the average performance of students in a subject area (i.e., ELA, Mathematics or Science) on the state summative assessments. The DPI ranges from 0-100. A DPI is reported for all students tested in a district and for students in each individual student group. Connecticut's ultimate target for a DPI is 75.

	English Langua	ge Arts(ELA)	Mat	h	Scien	ce
	Count	DPI	Count	DPI	Count	DPI
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*	*	0	N/A
Asian	12	*	12	*	*	*
Black or African American	*	*	*	*	6	*
Hispanic or Latino	39	62.9	39	54.5	18	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Two or More Races	10	*	10	*	*	*
White	684	67.3	684	62.7	301	55.8
English Learners	10	*	10	*	*	*
Non-English Learners	747	66.8	747	62.2	*	*
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	248	60.8	248	55.4	97	50.1
Not Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	509	69.5	509	65.2	237	57.1
Students with Disabilities	124	48.7	124	44.8	65	42.3
Students without Disabilities	633	70.1	633	65.4	269	58.1
High Needs	305	58.7	305	53.6	132	48.0
Non-High Needs	452	72.0	452	67.7	202	59.6
District	757	66.6	757	62.0	334	55.0

# National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP): Percent At or Above Proficient<sup>1</sup>

	NAEP	NAEP 2013	
READING	Grade 4 Grade 8		Grade 12
Connecticut	43%	43%	50%
National Public	35%	33%	36%
MATH	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade 12
Connecticut	41%	36%	32%
National Public	39%	32%	25%

<sup>1</sup>NAEP is often called the "Nation's Report Card." It is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education. This table compares Connecticut's performance to that of national public school students. Performance standards for state assessments and NAEP are set independently. Therefore, one should not expect performance results to be the same across Smarter Balanced and NAEP. Instead, NAEP results are meant to complement other state assessment data. To view student subgroup performance on NAEP, click here.

### Physical Fitness Tests: Students Reaching Health Standard<sup>2</sup>

	Percent of Students by Grade <sup>3</sup> (%)				All Teste	d Grades
	4	6	8	10	Count	Rate (%)
Sit & Reach	81.7	81.7	74.1	97.4	454	83.9
Curl Up	72.5	84.4	88.0	98.3	454	85.7
Push Up	49.2	83.5	66.7	81.2	454	69.8
Mile Run/PACER	64.2	80.7	63.0	60.7	454	67.0
All Tests - District	42.5	71.6	58.3	57.3	454	57.0
All Tests - State	50.6	49.8	50.6	51.1		50.5

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>The Connecticut Physical Fitness Assessment (CPFA) is administered to all students in Grades 4, 6, 8 and 10. The health-related fitness scores gathered through the CPFA should be used to educate and motivate children and their families to increase physical activity and develop lifetime fitness habits.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Only students assessed in all four areas are included in this calculation.

Cohort Graduation: Four-Year<sup>1</sup>

	2014-15				2015-16
	Cohort Count <sup>2</sup>	Rate (%)	Target <sup>3</sup> (%)	Target Achieved	Target³ (%)
Black or African American	*	*			
Hispanic or Latino	*	*			
English Learners	*	*			
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	46	78.3			
Students with Disabilities	21	57.1			
District	121	87.6	91.3	No	91.6
State <sup>4</sup>		87.2			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The four-year cohort graduation rate represents the percentage of first-time 9th graders who earn a standard high school diploma within four years. Statewide, district and school results for cohorts of 2010 through 2014 are available online.

# 11th and 12th Graders Meeting Benchmark on at Least One College Readiness Exam<sup>5</sup>

	Participation <sup>6</sup>	Meeting E	Benchmark
	Rate (%)	Count	Rate (%)
Female	96.0	35	35.0
Male	92.2	39	30.2
Black or African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	0	*
White	93.4	72	34.0
English Learners	*	0	*
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	96.9	10	15.4
Students with Disabilities	*	0	*
District	93.9	74	32.3
State	95.6		40.7

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>College readiness exams and benchmark scores are as follows:

- SAT® meets benchmark score on SAT, Revised SAT or Connecticut School Day SAT
- ACT® meets benchmark score on 3 of 4 exams (benchmark score varies by subject)
- AP® 3 or higher on any one AP® exam
- IB® 4 or higher on any one IB® exam
- Smarter Balanced Level 3 or higher on both ELA and math

<sup>6</sup>Participation Rate equals the number of test-takers in 11th and 12th grade divided by the number of students enrolled in those grades, as a percent. Sources:

SAT® and AP® statistics derived from data provided by the College Board.

Copyright © 2016 The College Board. www.collegeboard.org

ACT® statistics derived from data provided by ACT, Inc.

Copyright © 2016 ACT, Inc. www.act.org

IB® statistics derived from data provided by the International Baccalaureate Organization.

Copyright © International Baccalaureate Organization 2016

#### **College Entrance and Persistence**

	Class of 2015	Class of 2014
	Entrance <sup>7</sup>	Persistence <sup>8</sup>
	Rate (%)	Rate (%)
Female	77.8	88.9
Male	60.0	85.7
Black or African American	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*
White	*	89.3
English Learners	*	*
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	61.1	*
Students with Disabilities	*	*
District	68.8	87.2
State	71.9	88.3

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>College entrance refers to the percent of high school graduates from the year who enrolled in college any time during the first year after high school.

Source: National Student Clearinghouse

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Cohort count includes all students in the cohort as of the end of the 2014-15 school year.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Targets are calculated when there are at least 20 students in a cohort in the base year (i.e., 2010-11).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Targets are not displayed at the state level.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>College persistence refers to the percent of students who enrolled in college the first year after high school and returned for a second year (Freshman to Sophomore persistence).

### **Next Generation Accountability Results**

These statistics are the results from Connecticut's Next Generation Accountability System for districts and schools. This system is a broad set of 12 indicators that help tell the story of how well a school is preparing its students for success in college, careers and life. It moves beyond test scores and graduation rates and instead provides a more holistic, multifactor perspective of district and school performance and incorporates student growth over time.

Indicator		Index/Rate	Target	Points	Max	% Points	State Average
ELA Performance Index	All Students	66.6	75	44.4	50	88.8	67.7
ELA Performance muex	High Needs Students	58.7	75	39.1	50	78.2	56.7
Math Performance Index	All Students	62.0	75	41.3	50	82.7	61.4
Math Performance index	High Needs Students	53.6	75	35.7	50	71.5	49.9
Science Performance Index	All Students	55.0	75	36.7	50	73.4	57.5
Science Performance muex	High Needs Students	48.0	75	32.0	50	64.0	47.0
ELA Academic Growth	All Students	64.0%	100%	64.0	100	64.0	63.8%
ELA ACAGEMIC Growth	High Needs Students	59.2%	100%	59.2	100	59.2	58.3%
Math Academic Growth	All Students	73.7%	100%	73.7	100	73.7	65.0%
Math Academic Growth	High Needs Students	67.6%	100%	67.6	100	67.6	57.4%
Chronic Absenteeism	All Students	11.0%	<=5%	38.0	50	76.0	9.6%
Cilionic Absenteeisin	High Needs Students	19.8%	<=5%	20.5	50	41.0	15.6%
Droparation for CCB	% Taking Courses	87.3%	75%	50.0	50	100.0	67.6%
Preparation for CCR	% Passing Exams	32.3%	75%	21.5	50	43.1	40.7%
On-track to High School Gra	duation	92.4%	94%	49.2	50	98.3	85.1%
4-year Graduation All Stude	nts (2015 Cohort)	87.6%	94%	93.2	100	93.2	87.2%
6-year Graduation - High Needs Students (2013 Cohort)		80.9%	94%	86.0	100	86.0	78.6%
Postsecondary Entrance (Class of 2015)		68.8%	75%	91.7	100	91.7	71.9%
Physical Fitness (estimated part rate) and (fitness rate)		93.8%   57.0%	75%	38.0	50	76.1	89.2%   50.5%
Arts Access		46.0%	60%	38.4	50	76.7	47.5%
Accountability Index				1020.4	1350	75.6	

Gap Indicators	Non-High Needs Rate <sup>1</sup>	High Needs Rate	Size of Gap	State Gap Mean + 1 Stdev²	Is Gap an Outlier?²
Achievement Gap Size Outlier?					N
ELA Performance Index Gap	72.0	58.7	13.3	16.5	
Math Performance Index Gap	67.7	53.6	14.0	18.9	
Science Performance Index Gap	59.6	48.0	11.6	17.2	
Graduation Rate Gap	92.5%	80.9%	11.6%	15.3%	N

<sup>1</sup> If the Non-High Needs Rate exceeds the ultimate target (75 for Performance Index and 94% for graduation rate), the ultimate target is used for gap calculations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>If the size of the gap exceeds the state mean gap plus one standard deviation, the gap is an outlier.

Sul	oject/Subgroup	Participation Rate (%) <sup>3</sup>	
ELA	All Students	98.1	<sup>3</sup> Minimum
ELA	High Needs Students	97.3	participation standard is 95%.
Math	All Students	98.1	
IVIALII	High Needs Students	97.3	
Science	All Students	98.3	
Science	High Needs Students	97.2	

## Connecticut's State Identified Measurable Goal for Children with Disabilities (SIMR)

Increase the reading performance of all 3rd grade students with disabilities statewide, as measured by Connecticut's English Language Arts (ELA) Performance Index.

Grade 3 ELA Performance Index for Students with Disabilities:

District: 52 State: 51.4

#### **Supporting Resources**

Two-page FAQ

**Detailed Presentation** 

Using Accountability Results to Guide Improvement: comprehensive documentation and supports

### **Narratives**

### **School District Improvement Plans and Parental Outreach Activities**

The 2015-2016 school year saw significant improvements in the district. In the 2015-2016 school year we began our pilot for Reader's workshop. Teachers at each elementary school implemented at least one unit of instruction using the Reader's workshop material. However, many teachers implemented additional units and some even fully implemented the program. This allowed us to set up research sites where our teachers could observe and ask questions. At the same time, we fully implemented our new K-5 math program and teachers received professional development from our embedded support coaches. During the 2015-2016 school year we used our literacy team at the elementary school to investigate different PK – 2 word study programs. A decision was made to use "Fundations" for this age group. Our literacy coaches continued to receive training during sessions at Columbia's Teacher college on the workshop model and those same coaches spent the year supporting our teachers. At the middle school level, the administration reviewed their student schedule. They visited other middle schools to better understand their structure. By midyear the team had decided on a structure that allowed for far more support for our needy students. Additional changes were made to ensure that our Spanish program was more effective. Additionally, a District Data Team was created that identified indicators for student success from Kindergarten to Graduation. Each of these indicators, tied to Board of Education goals, were discussed and a template for tracking the data was created. By the end of the school year, steps were being taken to develop templates for both the District Improvement Plan and the School Improvement Plans. .During the 2015-2016 school year, a full review of all of our Special Education programs was completed and a presentation was provided to the full Board of Education in January, 2016. We continued to enhance programs to meet the needs of our students and tailor programs to students' individual needs. Our 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's services are personalized and tailored to individual needs. We also take advantage of a co-teaching model at both the high school and middle school that provides appropriate support so that all students engage with a rigorous curriculum. During the year we made further improvements to our transition programming for our students. Additional efforts were made to ensure that all students had multiple opportunities to participate in learning activities outside of the school building.

In terms of communication, each principal sent out weekly or bi-weekly email blasts to all of their parents. A monthly update to all parents in the district was provided by the Superintendent of Schools. These e-blasts are meant to be informative and have been met with very positive reactions from parents. These frequent communications in conjunction with long established parent meetings provided significant opportunities for the schools to provide support to parents working at home with their children. Monthly parent meetings with the Superintendent of Schools was added and appropri

### Efforts to Reduce Racial, Ethnic and Economic Isolation

Plymouth Public Schools engage in many activities designed to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation. 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. Embedded in the curriculum for all elementary levels are many opportunities that expose students to our diverse world. For instance, students in grade three, four and five explore various authors of different ethnicity and spend time researching and presenting information on various influential figures of different races and cultures and their contributions to the world. Social Studies, Civics, World Language, and Language Arts teachers at the middle school level introduce students to a variety of cultures and traditions through the utilization of multicultural literature as a component of our students' literacy experience. The 8th grade curriculum contains a unit of study on Prejudice and how it affects Human Rights.

The Leo Club at Terryville High School continues to engage in a significant number of civic opportunities. 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 Day of Caring for the United Way, Youth 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.

During this past school year, we held an international exchange with students coming to live and go to high school with students in our district.

Additionally, our students were provided the opportunity to participate in a Robotics program run by the 4-H club out of Litchfield. The 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.

### **Equitable Allocation of Resources among District Schools**

The Plymouth Public Schools is committed to allocating resources in an equitable manner. The Board of Education goals drive the district and school improvement plans. These plans drive the budget development process and ensure that student needs are the driving force in the process. Each cost center is required to use a zero-based budgeting process to develop and then defend their budget. The district leadership team reviews data from the schools to identify inequitable funding situations and uses the budget development process to realign resources. During the 2015-2016 school year, a District Data Team was established and identified a number of indicators that are directly connected to the Board of Education goals. The District Data Team will collect data on these indicators in the coming year and identify strengths and weaknesses in curriculum and instruction across all buildings. That information will also be used to drive the budget process in the coming year.