

**STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09****Regional School District 18**

ELIZABETH M. OSGA, Superintendent  
Telephone: (860) 434-7238

Location: 4 Davis Road West  
Old Lyme,  
Connecticut

Website: [www.region18.org](http://www.region18.org)

This regional school district serves Lyme, Old Lyme

---

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 London

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$41,806

Town Population in 2000: 9,422

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 6.9%

1990-2000 Population Growth: 11.1%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000\*: 0.2%

Number of Public Schools: 5

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 91.2%

\*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 1,463

5-Year Enrollment Change -6.3%

**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	79	5.4	5.5	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	4	0.3	0.6	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	84	5.7	4.0	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	150	10.3	11.0	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	86	90.5	86.0	79.7
Homeless	1	0.1	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	30	14.2	16.9	19.0

\*75.0% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

## SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	3	0.2
Asian American	48	3.3
Black	11	0.8
Hispanic	31	2.1
White	1,370	93.6
Total Minority	93	6.4

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff:** 2.4%

**Open Choice:** 2 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:** 1.7% 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 11.

---

### 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 Lyme-Old Lyme School District continues its commitment to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation. It has done so by embedding culturally enriching activities into its curriculum and by capitalizing on opportunities for its students to interact with others in order to broaden their understandings and experiences.

Many cultural activities continue to be integrated into the District's programs. The expansion of the world language program to include Chinese is a recent contribution to the effort. Continuing efforts include Native American and international projects and experiences. Among the activities have been dance, music, storytelling, museum outreach and special celebrations.

Through the LEARN Regional Educational Service Center, Sound School Science and Hartford Share, students have had opportunities for interacting with students from other districts. High school students have had even wider interactions through their participation in virtual learning courses.

---

## 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	69.7	54.6	67.3
Writing	67.9	62.5	50.9
Mathematics	78.4	62.8	73.6
Grade 4 Reading	71.3	60.7	58.9
Writing	69.7	64.2	44.2
Mathematics	83.5	63.6	83.5
Grade 5 Reading	83.8	66.0	80.1
Writing	74.5	66.5	54.9
Mathematics	90.9	68.8	94.4
Science	77.5	58.1	71.6
Grade 6 Reading	80.9	68.9	58.9
Writing	84.5	62.2	88.3
Mathematics	89.6	68.8	82.8
Grade 7 Reading	96.5	74.9	97.5
Writing	83.9	62.9	91.7
Mathematics	83.3	66.0	75.8
Grade 8 Reading	77.1	68.4	53.5
Writing	79.2	66.5	63.2
Mathematics	78.6	64.5	60.0
Science	84.2	60.6	84.5

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	78.7	47.4	94.7
Writing Across the Disciplines	75.4	55.0	79.4
Mathematics	66.4	47.8	71.8
Science	68.3	42.8	85.5

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
	40.5	36.2	58.4

<b>SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008</b>		<b>District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores</b>
% of Graduates Tested		87.4	74.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	565	507	90.7
	Critical Reading	557	503	93.0
	Writing	565	506	91.5

**SAT® I.** The lowest possible score on each SAT® I subtest is 200; the highest possible score is 800.

<b>Graduation and Dropout Rates</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>% of Districts in State with Equal or Less Desirable Rates</b>
Graduation Rate, Class of 2008	97.7	92.1	74.0
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	2.3	6.6	70.1
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.6	2.5	69.3

<b>Activities of Graduates</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>State</b>
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	94.5	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	3.9	11.0

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

<b>Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff</b>	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	117.80
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	12.10
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	19.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	35.90
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	6.60
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	4.00
School Level	6.80
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	0.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	8.80
School Nurses	5.40
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	72.22

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.

<b>Teachers and Instructors</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>DRG</b>	<b>State</b>
Average Years of Experience in Education	17.9	14.4	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	89.1	77.3	76.1

<b>Average Class Size</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>DRG</b>	<b>State</b>
Grade K	15.8	17.5	18.3
Grade 2	17.3	19.5	19.3
Grade 5	16.3	20.3	21.0
Grade 7	17.1	19.7	20.5
High School	17.0	18.9	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	994	993	988
Middle School	1,030	1,025	1,016
High School	1,056	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*	3.0	3.3	3.3
Middle School	2.3	2.4	2.6
High School	2.1	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	PK-12 Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$11,979	\$7,814	\$7,521	\$7,069	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$455	\$297	\$267	\$282	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,400	\$913	\$461	\$415	\$446
Student Support Services	\$1,892	\$1,234	\$808	\$769	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$2,837	\$1,851	\$1,351	\$1,334	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$3,759	\$2,452	\$1,382	\$1,357	\$1,377
Transportation	\$1,160	\$698	\$649	\$638	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,176	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$510	\$333	\$152	\$141	\$151
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$25,168</b>	<b>\$16,144</b>	<b>\$12,869</b>	<b>\$12,448</b>	<b>\$12,805</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$2,008	\$1,310	\$1,791	\$1,180	\$1,759

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$6,010,978	23.9	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	93.3	5.5	1.3	0.0
Excluding School Construction	92.7	5.9	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.

The challenging state of the national, state and local economies has provided new impetus for examining the allocation of resources among schools. Because it was so apparent that funding was going to fall short of sustaining all programs and services to the degree previously enjoyed, the district began its budget work in the fall of 2008 by examining data about resources and distributions.

The administrative team reviewed data on staffing ratios, services and goods that were in the proposed budgets. While allowing for scale variations, the administrators came to agreements on the proportion of adjustments to be made. Great care was made to assure equitable experiences for students, regardless of which school they attend.

---

### SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	146
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	10.0%

---

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	10	0.7	0.9	0.8
Learning Disability	61	4.2	4.1	3.9
Intellectual Disability	4	0.3	0.4	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	8	0.6	0.7	1.0
Speech Impairment	31	2.1	2.2	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	19	1.3	1.9	2.1
Other Disabilities**	13	0.9	0.6	0.9
Total	146	10.0	10.8	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 2007-08 with a Standard Diploma	N/A	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	38.0	30.2	79.8	65.7
	Writing	26.4	19.5	76.5	64.1
	Mathematics	47.3	30.7	83.7	65.7
	Science	N/A	N/A	81.1	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	78.7	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	75.4	55.0
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	66.4	47.8
	Science	N/A	N/A	68.3	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	36.0
	% With Accommodations	64.0
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	64.7
	% With Accommodations	35.3
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		9.1

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	0.7
Private Schools or Other Settings	12	8.2

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	111	76.0	74.3	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	23	15.8	19.1	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	12	8.2	6.6	11.2

---

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The Lyme-Old Lyme Public School District is proud of its reputation for academic, artistic and athletic success, but recognizes that ongoing improvement can and should be a coveted goal. For these reasons, the district maintains an ongoing analysis of performance indicators and uses these to direct the deployment of resources.

A multi-year effort to strengthen fundamental reading competencies at the elementary level is entering its third year of implementation. A pure reading block has been scheduled for each class during which a team of educators works to provide instruction tailored to the needs of individuals and small groups. Regularly administered assessment probes help to chart growth and direct instruction. Appropriate interventions are made with students. The model has been developed in partnership with the Haskins Reading Lab.

At the middle school level, a special effort was made to improve writing performances during the 2008-09 school year. The Director of Curriculum and the Principal worked collaboratively with teachers to increase the amount of time devoted to writing and to modify the instruction. The efforts were rewarded with some marked improvements in writing performance. A next step in solidifying ongoing improvements was to modify team schedules and structures for 2009-10. The modifications will expand the amount of time available for language arts instruction.

Lyme-Old Lyme High School has been devoting much of its improvement effort to facility improvements. The current facility is not adequate to support twenty-first century high school programming. An approved renovation project is in the pre-construction phase and a new track is nearing completion. In addition to improving the facility, the school is positioning itself to meet all standards of the high school reform model, including work on e-portfolios. In an effort to improve special education programs and services for students with disabilities, the region's special education teachers and related services providers participated in district-wide literacy and technology professional development activities alongside regular education teachers throughout the 2008-2009 school year. This collaboration has helped ensure that special education programs and services are more closely aligned to regular education and grade level standards. In addition, it has resulted in the effective "melding" of regular education and special education in the effort to provide appropriate early intervention services and more inclusive educational practices.

Our district worked jointly with several other local school districts during the 2008-2009 school year to present two parent forums focusing on transition planning and to hire/share a transition consultant to help improve the vocational opportunities and transition services for the students in our districts.

---