

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

Patricia B. Charles, Superintendent

Location: 311 Hunting Hill Avenue  
Middletown,  
Connecticut

Telephone: (860) 638-1401

Website: [www.middletownschoools.org/](http://www.middletownschoools.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: Middlesex

Town Population in 2000: 43,167

1990-2000 Population Growth: 0.9%

Number of Public Schools: 11

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$25,720

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 16.3%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000\*: 3.0%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 87.4%

---

\*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, 2012      4,874  
5-Year Enrollment Change      -3.3%

---

**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	2,154	44.2	43.3	36.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	162	3.4	4.0	5.8
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	270	5.5	3.8	3.8
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	548	11.2	12.8	11.9
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	357	83.2	74.2	79.3
Homeless	13	0.3	0.3	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	19	10.6	13.9	12.7

\*0.0 % 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	243	5.0
Black	1,025	21.0
Hispanic	770	15.8
Pacific Islander	4	0.1
White	2,624	53.8
Two or more races	194	4.0
Total Minority	2,250	46.2

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 7.6%**

**Non-English Home Language:**

6.7% 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 39.

---

### 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.

As in the past Middletown schools continue to offer many programs for students, staff, parents, and community members – all designed to enrich interaction and understanding among Middletown’s diverse educational community. After years of revising and reporting out on the district’s Diversity enhancement Plan, with its emphasis on raising expectations, maximizing parent and community involvement, and offering enrichment to support academic performance, the district now chooses to focus intensely upon meeting its district goal to close the achievement gap by implementing balanced literacy PreK-10, Scientifically Researched Based Intervention (SRBI) for grades K-12 and the more rigorous Common Core Curriculum. The data shows that narrowing of the achievement gap since 2006 has improved in reading, writing, and mathematics at all grade levels. In addition to this more focused effort on closing the achievement gap, Middletown continued to offer activities and programs to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation:-A range of after-school programs, including the elementary Free to Be Club, After School Academic Enrichment Programs at Title I schools, and X-Men at Keigwin and Woodrow Wilson continue to promote multicultural appreciation and interest. Middletown High School’s Minority Student Coalition continues to educate students, teachers, administrators and community members about the challenges facing students of color along with ways to meet those challenges;-The District Data Team and many of the School Data Teams continue to be involved in a “Courageous Conversation” Initiative around diversity, cultural sensitivity, high expectations for all students:-All eleven schools have now become members of the state’s School, Family, and Community Partners initiative;-The district’s Cultural Council continues to organize and offer programs at all grades in multicultural music, dance, drama, and the arts – to all schools.-The district has purchased PowerSchool, Pearson Inform, AIMSWeb, and NWEA in order to progress monitor student progress and disaggregate data to better inform the progress of all our students; particularly students who are at risk. Again, with reduced Title I funding the district have become more aggressive and creative in pursuing grants and drawing upon its own resources as reflected in additional pre-school program and the expanded after-school program with 21st Century after-school programs at four elementary schools.

---

## 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	53.6	56.9	26.9
Writing	64.0	60.0	44.1
Mathematics	58.6	61.4	28.0
Grade 4 Reading	60.7	62.6	28.5
Writing	63.0	63.0	36.1
Mathematics	63.7	65.1	32.3
Grade 5 Reading	63.7	66.9	29.8
Writing	69.5	65.6	44.7
Mathematics	72.0	69.2	38.5
Science	58.6	62.3	25.5
Grade 6 Reading	65.3	73.3	16.2
Writing	61.2	65.1	30.0
Mathematics	58.9	67	23.2
Grade 7 Reading	70.9	78.9	17.1
Writing	65.0	64.9	35.4
Mathematics	54.0	65.4	19.6
Grade 8 Reading	68.1	76.2	17.7
Writing	60.6	67.2	19.5
Mathematics	45.1	65.0	11.9
Science	40.9	60.4	12.6

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.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	40.7	48.5	29.5
Writing Across the Disciplines	61.4	62.1	31.1
Mathematics	41.2	52.4	22.0
Science	35.2	48.8	23.3

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
	38.0	51.1	19.9

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2012		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		91.2	78.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	475	503	24.1
	Critical Reading	477	499	26.3
	Writing	480	504	22.6

**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	76.1	84.8	14.7
2011-12 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.8	2.1	39.3

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	89.7	82.6
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	6.9	9.8

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	307.33
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	61.55
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	48.40
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	118.50
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	10.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	6.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	5.67
School Level	19.80
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	11.50
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	29.55
School Nurses	16.52
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	241.71

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	13.0	14.5	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	81.8	81.1	79.8

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	17.2	18.4	18.9
Grade 2	18.4	19.1	19.8
Grade 5	19.9	20.8	21.3
Grade 7	21.5	19.5	20.2
High School	18.3	18.7	18.8

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	974	986	999
Middle School	986	1,019	1,029
High School	1,041	1,006	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*	3.9	3.0	2.7
Middle School	3.1	2.2	2.1
High School	1.7	2.1	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	\$40,529	\$8,042	\$8,570	\$8,571	\$8,570
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$774	\$154	\$252	\$180	\$257
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,263	\$251	\$475	\$421	\$471
Student Support Services	\$4,975	\$987	\$949	\$1,097	\$950
Administration and Support Services	\$6,341	\$1,258	\$1,526	\$1,486	\$1,547
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$8,334	\$1,654	\$1,466	\$1,455	\$1,459
Transportation	\$5,985	\$1,115	\$775	\$753	\$765
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$5,486	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$1,726	\$343	\$170	\$195	\$170
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$75,414</b>	<b>\$14,059</b>	<b>\$14,444</b>	<b>\$14,327</b>	<b>\$14,333</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$5,949	\$1,180	\$1,405	\$1,688	\$1,398

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$16,900,013	22.4	22.8	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	67.2	28.2	4.2	0.4
Excluding School Construction	64.7	30.4	4.6	0.4

---

**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.

The Middletown Board of Education's policy regarding distribution of resources among district schools ensures that each school receives a base level of material and financial resources. That level is determined in part by the approved school budget for the year. Funds budgeted for instruction are distributed equally among the eight elementary schools, the two middle schools and one high school, taking into account numbers of students and staff, the program and material costs, and to some extent the needs of each school relative to student performance and socio-economic considerations. For instance, among Middletown's economically needier schools where PTA, PTO, and booster fund-raising capacity is limited, programs like the district's Cultural Council ensure that all students, irrespective of parent financial support, receive the same experiences in the fine and performing arts.

---

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**


---



---

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	594
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	11.5%

---

<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	57	1.1	1.5	1.3
Learning Disability	158	3.1	4.0	4.0
Intellectual Disability	33	0.6	0.5	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	68	1.3	1.2	1.0
Speech Impairment	137	2.7	2.2	2.0
Other Health Impairment*	96	1.9	2.5	2.4
Other Disabilities**	45	0.9	1.2	1.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>594</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>13.1</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

<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 2011-12 with a Standard Diploma	52.5	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	11.5	34.5	63.2	69.2
	Writing	10.9	19.9	63.9	64.4
	Mathematics	11.5	29.0	59.1	65.5
	Science	6.2	21.3	50.1	61.3
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	40.7	48.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	7.7	16.7	61.4	62.1
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	41.2	52.4
	Science	3.6	14.6	35.2	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	18.0
	% With Accommodations	82.0
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	26.5
	% With Accommodations	73.5
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		9.3

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	9	1.5
Private Schools or Other Settings	96	16.2

### 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	464	78.1	68.2	72.0
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	55	9.3	16.0	16.4
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	75	12.6	15.8	11.6

---

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

Middletown's overarching strategy for improving student achievement has been to move forward in the process of transitioning to the CCSS. The district is committed to designing and implementing a consistent curriculum that promotes higher level thinking across all disciplines. The district has formed curriculum committees in every grade with representation from every school at every grade level to develop units of instruction. In 2012-13, three of the six units were developed and implemented in each of the core and encore subject. The process of designing the district's CCSS units has enhanced the capacity of teachers to think deeply about their content and instructional practice. All units are organized with common structure and process and are posted on the district's SharePoint portal. The district has also focused on creating a tiered intervention structure at each school, with emphasis on the lowest performing schools. Each of the lower tiered schools has implemented a 90-minute literacy block, and a 60-90 minute mathematics block, with additional intervention blocks to support tiered intervention. The district has purchased significant fiction and non-fiction resources and mathematics manipulatives to support CCSS and tiered intervention. Lower performing schools had up to six interventionists. All elementary schools have instructional support specialists and all secondary schools have department heads. The district is focused on the importance of early literacy and began the process of training 30 teachers in Grades K-1 in the Wilson Foundations Reading program. There will be a certified Wilson reading coach at every school by the end of the 2014-15 school year. Middletown's one Focus School (Bielefield) staff was provided professional development to deliver culturally responsive, relative instruction to improve student achievement for all students, but in particular to the school's underperforming Hispanic subgroup. This professional development was provided by a SERC team that delivered on-site group and individual coaching and modeling of culturally responsive practices. The resources provided to Bielefield by the SDE provided an extended day program for students. Interventionists at the high school focused on improving the 4-year cohort graduation rate with proven success in at least seven individual cases where the students would not have attained graduation without the focused and individualized intervention they received. Executive Coaches provided mentoring support to new principals to help them align their School Improvement Plans to district goals and objectives. All administrators participated in intensive teacher evaluation training throughout the school year to prepare them for full implementation of SEED in August 2013. Administrators spent 25 hours over the summer watching teacher videos and practicing calibration with the Danielson Framework for Teaching. Administrators took the proficiency assessment in August 2013. The district has purchased TeachScape to provide administrators with professional development opportunities and a data management system in order to efficiently implement the teacher evaluation and development system. The administration will participate in professional development provided by ACES for 6 hours per month, throughout the school year. This professional development will provide administrators with assistance in writing SLOs and IAGDs, calibrating the Danielson Framework rubric, and providing an opportunity for inter-reliability of how teachers are rated district wide.

---