

**STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2010-11****Ridgefield School District**

DEBORAH LOW, Superintendent

Location: 70 Prospect Street  
Ridgefield,  
Connecticut

Telephone: (203) 431-2800

Website: [www.ridgefield.org](http://www.ridgefield.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: Fairfield

Town Population in 2000: 23,643

1990-2000 Population Growth: 13%

Number of Public Schools: 9

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$51,795

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 4.9%

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

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 90.8%

\*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): A 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, 2010      5,419  
5-Year Enrollment Change      -2.5%

**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	111	2.0	1.6	34.1
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	42	0.8	0.6	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	295	5.4	6.7	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	435	8.0	9.9	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	299	84.9	94.9	80.2
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	90	12.8	8.6	13.2

\*0.0 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

### SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	6	0.1
Asian American	242	4.5
Black	43	0.8
Hispanic	220	4.1
Pacific Islander	0	0.0
White	4,874	89.9
Two or more races	34	0.6
Total Minority	545	10.1

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 2.1%**

**Non-English Home Language:**

0.8% 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 13.

---

### 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.

Two initiatives represent the district's efforts to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation in Ridgefield. At the elementary level, over 50% of the teachers have been trained in Responsive Classroom procedures. The middle schools continue to implement the Character Counts! initiative through special assembly programs, class discussions, and lessons emphasizing the character pillars and respecting differences. The high school has expanded its student life program, and incorporates student visits and exchanges into its world language program. Additionally, a variety of school and community events engage students in learning about other diverse people and cultures, and our middle and high school students go on extended foreign field trips. Ridgefield Public Schools participate in a teacher visitation program with teachers from Lebanon. This experience engages our students in learning about students and events in the Middle East. Ridgefield has participated in two of the inter-district building projects in the C.E.S. region aimed at reducing racial, ethnic and economic isolation. Some students from the Ridgefield Public Schools also attend the Academy for Performing Arts, the Academy for Information Technology Engineering, and the Center for Global Studies. We are working with C.E.S. to improve communication about these and other magnet schools to our students and their parents. Ridgefield continues to make strong efforts to attract candidates of all cultures and economic groups to our teaching/administrative positions. This year, we have continued our already-extensive electronic posting of vacancies and broadened our use of conventional advertising media. Our efforts have also included frequent attendance at recruitment fairs and participation in consortium minority recruitment activities.

---

## 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	79.5	58.4	88.8
Writing	78.3	61.1	80.1
Mathematics	87.1	63.0	93.2
Grade 4 Reading	82.2	62.5	82.8
Writing	84.7	65.5	84.8
Mathematics	89.9	67.0	90.9
Grade 5 Reading	85.3	61.4	93.3
Writing	86.0	66.8	85.9
Mathematics	93.8	72.5	99.4
Science	88.4	59.9	96.9
Grade 6 Reading	90.2	76.0	75.6
Writing	90.2	65.2	98.8
Mathematics	92.0	71.3	89.3
Grade 7 Reading	95.0	77.8	91.1
Writing	86.8	58.9	96.8
Mathematics	90.7	68.4	90.4
Grade 8 Reading	92.5	74.7	89.2
Writing	87.2	64.8	85.4
Mathematics	91.7	66.6	93.0
Science	84.7	63.1	77.7

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	81.0	44.7	95.5
Writing Across the Disciplines	91.2	61.2	97.0
Mathematics	88.0	49.5	99.2
Science	77.6	47.0	94.7

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
	59.2	51.0	65.1

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2010		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		88.7	70.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	585	510	95.4
	Critical Reading	569	505	94.7
	Writing	580	510	96.2

**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 2010	96.5	81.8	99.2
2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.2	2.8	85.6

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	96.1	84.8
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	1.6	9.1

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	344.03
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	21.04
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	40.70
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	67.81
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	13.20
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	8.00
School Level	22.17
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	1.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	26.60
School Nurses	13.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	209.78

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	13.4	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	85.6	89.7	79.0

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	17.6	18.9	18.4
Grade 2	19.6	20.6	19.9
Grade 5	22.4	21.4	21.2
Grade 7	21.1	20.6	20.6
High School	21.3	21.0	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	993	998	992
Middle School	1,012	1,008	1,017
High School	965	988	1,010

\*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*	3.6	2.8	3.1
Middle School	2.7	2.4	2.4
High School	1.7	2.0	2.2

\*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

### DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2009-10

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	\$46,986	\$8,635	\$8,232	\$9,688	\$8,237
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$927	\$170	\$299	\$261	\$300
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$4,168	\$766	\$477	\$682	\$463
Student Support Services	\$3,867	\$711	\$875	\$997	\$872
Administration and Support Services	\$6,197	\$1,139	\$1,433	\$1,574	\$1,459
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$8,481	\$1,559	\$1,421	\$1,763	\$1,410
Transportation	\$4,709	\$825	\$701	\$732	\$692
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$2,937	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$1,317	\$242	\$161	\$225	\$159
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$79,589</b>	<b>\$14,555</b>	<b>\$13,878</b>	<b>\$16,448</b>	<b>\$13,780</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$8,746	\$1,607	\$1,622	\$1,708	\$1,616

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$14,443,066	18.1	21.2	21.5

**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	94.3	3.6	1.9	0.2
Excluding School Construction	93.9	3.8	2.1	0.2

## 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.

It is the policy of the Ridgefield Board of Education to ensure that all resident students are offered equal access to educational opportunities provided within the school program. Not only does the Board provide for a budget process that assures equity within and among all schools, it also funds district-wide instructional administrative positions in the areas of math, science, language arts and technology. Our professional development program makes available a wide range of training opportunities for all teachers K-12. Since funds for each school's materials, supplies, equipment and other resources are formulated and distributed based upon a "per pupil" allocation, each school receives an appropriate percentage of the district budget. In addition, principals submit requests for necessary support to run any needed/desired specialized programs. Special projects such as reading or math program pilots are funded separately and are evenly distributed across the schools. The district plans for improvement and maintenance projects with a focus on achieving parity among schools. Throughout the year, the Superintendent, as an agent for the Board, oversees all expenditures. The Superintendent also requests Board funds for district-wide initiatives when the needs present themselves

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	436
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	8.1%

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	57	1.1	1.1	1.1
Learning Disability	173	3.2	3.7	3.9
Intellectual Disability	14	0.3	0.2	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	35	0.6	0.4	1.0
Speech Impairment	80	1.5	2.0	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	61	1.1	2.0	2.1
Other Disabilities**	16	0.3	0.6	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>9.9</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

Graduation and Dropout Rates of Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible	District	State
% Who Graduated in 2009-10 with a Standard Diploma	83.3	62.5
2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	0.0	3.9

## 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	41.3	33.0	87.8	68.6
	Writing	37.2	19.3	85.7	63.7
	Mathematics	50.3	33.4	90.9	68.2
	Science	39.7	21.2	86.5	61.5
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	30.0	14.1	81.0	44.7
	Writing Across the Disciplines	38.1	17.3	91.2	61.2
	Mathematics	15.0	15.8	88.0	49.5
	Science	18.2	13.1	77.6	47.0

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	13.9
	% With Accommodations	86.1
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	36.0
	% With Accommodations	64.0
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		6.2

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	23	5.3

### 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	370	84.9	76.5	74.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	33	7.6	16.8	14.9
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	33	7.6	6.7	11.0

---

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

One of the ongoing goals of the Ridgefield Public Schools is to improve all students' performance on district assessments as well as on state and national tests. To achieve that goal, Ridgefield has launched an ambitious plan of curriculum and instructional improvement. In addition to our K-12 curriculum with embedded performance-based assessment, we have added benchmark assessments in reading at every grade level from K-12, in writing at every level from Kindergarten through grade eight, and in math at every level from Kindergarten through grade five. These assessments are used to form instruction for all students, including our special education and struggling/at risk population. The district has focused on professional development to improve our differentiation practices. Our K-5 mathematics department leader provided ongoing coaching, modeling, and professional development about effective differentiation strategies to be used in elementary classrooms. Our middle and high school mathematics teachers focused on differentiation at the secondary level as well. Elementary classroom teachers also received coaching and professional development on balanced literacy instruction, with focused emphasis on small-group instructional strategies for reading. Teachers' classroom libraries are well stocked with leveled books to provide students with reading selections that match their interests as well as their instructional levels. Students participate in both reading and writing workshops to ensure that they access appropriate texts and generate independent written work that reflects their personal best. Additionally, middle and high school teachers of English, Science, and Social Studies regularly implement reading comprehension strategies within their content instruction. Finally, teachers of all disciplines have been implementing SRBI by collecting data about student performance and designing lessons informed by their assessments. In the area of special education, we have focused on increasing the inclusion of all students with disabilities in the regular classroom. We continued to provide training for the additional special education support staff members working in co-teaching situations and hired consultants to work with and train our K-12 special education staff on inclusion practices. Our Special Education Director provided numerous information sessions for the special education staff to clarify expectations for their inclusion practices. Additionally, during the year, professional development activities involved a large number of staff in "differentiated instruction" for the regular education classroom. The intent of both this training and the literacy training is to foster greater success for mainstreamed students. We are engaged in a strategic planning process that frames our goals for improvement for the multiple years. Three long range planning committees (one representing elementary education, a second representing middle school grades, and a third committee representing the high school) provide the Board of Education with school program goals. The goals support student learning and help ensure continuous improvement of the schools. The committees included teachers, parents, students, staff members, community members, administrators, Board members, and various municipal officials. Each committee met once per month throughout the year to identify, research, and extensively discuss critical issues that would shape our students' futures. All committees presented their findings to the Board of Education in the form of reports and recommendations for district priorities. These priorities, in turn, shape both Board and school goals for improvement. All schools enjoy a high level of parent involvement, including strong relationships with their respective Parent Teacher Associations. The PTAs work closely with the district to support school improvement goals. Our mission statement, "Our mission is excellence for all students in partnership with parents and the community", is an indication of the important role that parental involvement plays in our students' academic success.

---