

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2009-10**Avon School District**

DAVID B. ERWIN, Superintendent

Location: 34 Simsbury Road

Telephone: (860) 404-4700

Avon,
ConnecticutWebsite: www.avon.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 www.sde.ct.gov.

COMMUNITY DATA

County: Hartford

Town Population in 2000: 15,832

1990-2000 Population Growth: 13.6%

Number of Public Schools: 5

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$51,706

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 6.0%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.7%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 90.5%

*To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

District Reference Group (DRG): B 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, 2009 3,586

5-Year Enrollment Change 8.3%

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	149	4.2	7.7	32.6
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	49	1.4	2.1	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented	0	0.0	6.5	4.1
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	380	10.6	10.1	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	175	84.5	90.7	80.5
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	52	9.7	12.1	13.6

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	9	0.3
Asian American	328	9.1
Black	105	2.9
Hispanic	151	4.2
White	2,993	83.5
Total Minority	593	16.5

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.4%

Open Choice:

60 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:

5.4% 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 29.

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 Avon Board of Education supports efforts to reduce racial, ethnic, and social isolation in Hartford County. To this end, the Board continues to expand its participation in the Choice program, encourages schools to expand relationships with schools in urban areas, and supports efforts to educate students about cultural and ethnic diversity. The Board supports student participation in several magnet schools, including the University of Hartford Magnet School, the Greater Hartford Academy of Performing Arts, the Big Picture School in Bloomfield, the Reggio-Emilia School for the Arts, the Greater Hartford Academy of Math and Science, and the early childhood school in Bloomfield. With local funding, the sister-school programs with schools in Hartford and New Britain continued during the 2009-10 school year. High school students continue to tutor students at the Boys and Girls Club on Asylum Hill in Hartford. The district uses its resources from the Choice program to support student tuitions in all of the magnet 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	83.1	57.0	94.5
Writing	84.3	58.3	96.9
Mathematics	80.1	62.4	78.5
Grade 4 Reading	84.4	59.9	94.3
Writing	88.2	63.6	99.4
Mathematics	91.1	67.0	96.9
Grade 5 Reading	89.0	61.8	97.6
Writing	88.0	68.2	92.2
Mathematics	92.0	72.4	92.2
Science	85.5	59.4	90.4
Grade 6 Reading	96.4	74.9	98.2
Writing	90.1	65.9	95.7
Mathematics	93.5	70.7	92.6
Grade 7 Reading	96.4	77.4	95.5
Writing	88.1	61.2	97.4
Mathematics	94.7	68.5	96.8
Grade 8 Reading	94.8	73.3	97.5
Writing	89.9	62.6	96.2
Mathematics	90.6	67.3	91.1
Science	88.3	62.8	92.4

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.

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to 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	75.9	45.9	91.7
Writing Across the Disciplines	86.1	59.6	91.0
Mathematics	79.6	48.7	93.9
Science	75.7	45.3	92.4

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 Four Tests	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard
	49.7	50.7	45.5

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2009		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		86.8	68.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	600	508	96.9
	Critical Reading	571	503	95.3
	Writing	581	506	95.3

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 2009	98.7	91.3	90.0
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.2	3.0	94.1

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	94.9	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	4.3	10.4

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	204.85
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	0.90
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	28.02
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	84.29
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	8.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	4.00
School Level	11.00
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	4.55
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	16.87
School Nurses	5.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	131.20

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	14.2	13.8
% with Master's Degree or Above	92.0	84.7	77.8

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	20.0	18.4	18.5
Grade 2	21.8	19.6	19.7
Grade 5	22.2	21.8	21.1
Grade 7	18.7	21.7	20.8
High School	19.1	20.1	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	978	990	992
Middle School	1,050	1,023	1,018
High School	954	981	1,006

*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*	6.7	3.3	3.2
Middle School	4.4	2.5	2.5
High School	2.2	2.6	2.3

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2008-09

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	\$24,203	\$6,804	\$7,819	\$7,576	\$7,829
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$783	\$220	\$274	\$268	\$279
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$965	\$271	\$474	\$503	\$459
Student Support Services	\$4,117	\$1,157	\$863	\$912	\$859
Administration and Support Services	\$3,489	\$981	\$1,405	\$1,364	\$1,426
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$4,540	\$1,276	\$1,469	\$1,412	\$1,462
Transportation	\$1,787	\$498	\$701	\$617	\$694
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,593	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$494	\$139	\$163	\$159	\$162
Total	\$41,970	\$11,575	\$13,458	\$13,145	\$13,386
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$4,963	\$1,395	\$1,864	\$1,228	\$1,825

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$8,868,322	21.1	19.8	20.7

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	91.4	6.9	1.2	0.5
Excluding School Construction	92.7	5.4	1.3	0.6

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 Avon Board of Education policy and practice ensures that the five schools within the district receive base level of financial resources. The base level of support that each school receives is determined, in part, by the approved school board budget for the year. The principals jointly approve and recommend to the Superintendent of Schools any budget reductions. Board of Education strategic planning goals, school-level improvement plans, and other school-level needs determine the allocation of funds beyond the established budget base.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	377
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	10.5%

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	46	1.3	1.1	1.0
Learning Disability	106	2.9	3.4	3.9
Intellectual Disability	13	0.4	0.3	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	18	0.5	0.5	1.0
Speech Impairment	90	2.5	2.0	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	86	2.4	2.1	2.1
Other Disabilities**	18	0.5	0.7	0.9
Total	377	10.5	10.1	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 2008-09 with a Standard Diploma	93.3	81.0
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	0.0	4.1

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	61.7	31.6	90.7	67.5
	Writing	47.4	19.6	88.1	63.3
	Mathematics	62.3	32.9	90.3	68.1
	Science	50.0	23.7	87.0	61.1
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	27.3	13.8	75.9	45.9
	Writing Across the Disciplines	26.1	16.8	86.1	59.6
	Mathematics	36.4	16.7	79.6	48.7
	Science	33.3	13.0	75.7	45.3

For more detailed CMT or 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.”

Participation in State Assessments of Students with Disabilities Attending District Schools

CMT	% Without Accommodations	19.5
	% With Accommodations	80.5
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	N/A
	% With Accommodations	N/A
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		7.3

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	1	0.3
Private Schools or Other Settings	14	3.7

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	247	65.5	77.2	73.4
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	112	29.7	15.8	15.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	18	4.8	7.0	11.3

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The results of the 2010 Connecticut Mastery Test showed that students in grades 3 through 8 continue to sustain high levels of achievement in reading, writing, math and science. Significantly, for the second year, our science students in grade 5 and 8 scored among the highest in the state. In addition, in reading and math, students taking the CMT's outscored the previous year's students in each grade. For the first time in our district's history, over 90% of our students met goal in math from grade 5-8. Overall our writing scores remained flat from the previous year. Our writing scores ranged from the mid to upper eighty percentile, similar to last year's results. Our CAPT scores showed a slight increase in the percentage of students meeting goal. In the area of curriculum and instruction, administrators and teachers continued several important initiatives. Our librarians, Educational Technology Coordinator, and the Assistant Superintendent are mapping student research skills and outcomes K-12 corresponding with our district's Technology Literacy Curriculum and content area curriculum. This will help provide our teachers a framework for ensuring that students utilize technology as a tool for critical thinking and research, thus preparing them for success in our changing world. K-8 reading teachers continue to meet to develop screening tools to identify children with reading deficits and develop strategies to bring them to grade level and able to meet standards. To further support our work, our district has been engaged in training K-8 teachers and assistant principals in effective ways of integrating SRBI into our current mechanisms for identifying and providing effective intervention strategies to our struggling learners. Other professional development focused on developing inquiry-based science units at the elementary level, developing greater continuity and transitions among our secondary subjects, and developing common assessments and grading procedures. As a member of the Tri-State Consortium, our district's language arts program completed a comprehensive program review. As a result of this process and the report recommendations, we used Title I funds to support tutors at the elementary level to enhance our intervention program for language arts and math. This program will expand to support full-time interns at our three elementary schools this coming school year. In addition, our district instituted a Curriculum Professional Development Council (CPDC) made up of teachers and administrators representing each school. This Council, facilitated by the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, is putting into place a plan and timeline for program review, curriculum writing, and professional development. In addition, the CPDC will continue its work in developing a framework for integrating critical and creative thinking and technology skills in all content areas. The Council plans to meet four times during the 2010-11 school year to follow through with its work in these important areas.
